

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 25 students, Grade 6 standing of the Columbus School under direction of Mrs. Breckman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

We also have 24 students, Grade 6 standing from Devil's Lake in North Dakota, under the direction of Mrs. Scherbenske.

And we have 21 students of senior high standing of the Barrett High School from Minnesota, under the direction of Mr. Wickman.

On behalf of the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees;

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, so that there will be more time for the dissemination of information, Tuesday night is Economic Development Committee of the MDC, and Wednesday night is Law Amendments Committee. I will also be discussing with the House Leader for the Opposition, the possibility of seeing whether there can be concurrent meetings of the House or Committee if it's feasible at particular times.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, this is not really a Ministerial Statement. An announcement was made that our former colleague, Art Wright, passed away. There are references of course in today's press as to the service taking place at 2:15 p.m. at Kildonan United Church on Tuesday. A number of the members of the Assembly have been asked to act as Honourary Pallbearers. My purpose at this juncture is to ask them if they would kindly be at the Church at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills;

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the First Minister, a question to the Acting First Minister or to the House Leader relating to the Jenpeg Development. Can the Ministry confirm that the Flanders Installation Corporation at Jenpeg is withdrawing a part or all of its work force on the construction site because of a \$2 million account that is owed to that company by the USSR suppliers of the generators that are being installed on the Jenpeg site?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Acting on behalf of my Leader, Mr. Speaker, I did note in the press this morning some reference to a possible disturbance — let me put it that way, to put it mildly — at Jenpeg in connection with the generators. I haven't had an opportunity of assessing the matter, and I will take it the question of my honourable friend as notice to my Leader. I do want to say that I have had some minor involvement with some of the problems in respect of the generators, but it really evolves around communications between the Ukrainian language and the Russian language, and those that have been performing the job of installation. But insofar as the \$2 million aspect, I will take that as notice for my Premier.

MR. LYON: A further question to the acting First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Could he also take as notice the question as to what contribution this dispute has made to the excessive delay of the coming on stream of this doubtful project in the first place?

MR. PAULLEY: Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, I think it would only be proper for me to reject entirely the comments of my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, when he refers to the advisability or otherwise of proceeding with this project. I think we have had full debate on that; we have had an opportunity in the Public Utilities Committee to ask these types of questions. However, as I indicated with the first major question, I will draw these matters to the attention of my Premier for his consideration and reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Mr. Speaker I direct my question to the same Minister but in the capacity as Minister of Labour. I find it somewhat surprising that a major disruption at a major construction site in Manitoba involving Manitobans on their job, you know, should come to him only by virtue of reading a newspaper account. Has the Minister of Labour not been informed about the serious and the major

disruption and the potential unemployment that is about to be caused at Jenpeg?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my answer to my honourable friend is that newspapers are wont to be speculative in their assessments of what is happening. I have no control over the press — maybe it would be to the advantage of Manitoba if I did have — so that they did not give to the Honourable Members of the Opposition an opportunity to ask such stupid questions as that of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. If there was an industrial dispute or a potential industrial dispute at Jenpeg or anywhere else in Manitoba, affecting the industrial relationships between union and management, it would come onto my desk and I would act accordingly.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question. A supplier not being able to pay a \$2 million debt owing so that that contractor could pay his workers, Manitoba citizens, that doesn't enter into the concerns of the Minister of Labour of this province as being a serious industrial dispute?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether really I should answer my honourable friend. I think, Mr. Speaker, he is really worrying as to whether or not there may be an election in June, July, August or September. I think that is his worry and I think that is why he is posing questions of this nature which, in my opinion, are utterly nonsensical. There is no industrial dispute at this particular time at Jenpeg that has been laid on my table and if my honourable friend wants to speculate on news items that have just come to his attention with the publication of a newspaper this morning, I leave that to his judgment or his lack of good judgment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Acting First Minister. Could he take as a further supplementary question, take notice again, of the question I believe that was asked within the last 24 or 48 hours relating to the same project as to whether or not one of these generators has had to be chiselled out of the concrete footings into which it was set. I don't believe we have had an answer to that one as yet.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would say to my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, in reference to the so-called chiselling out which is typical, of course, of my honourable friend, the Leader of the Conservative Party and Opposition in this House, but that question was taken as notice just yesterday if my memory is correct for my Premier and a reply will be forthcoming in due course.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism. Can the Minister of Tourism confirm that the government is about to sign a contract with the Canada Parks group with respect to park locations along the course of the Red River?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): The matter is under consideration, Mr Speaker, and when the discussions are complete, then an announcement will be made in due course and I would suggest to the honourable member that he not believe everything that he reads in the press. I am well aware of the story which appeared on that matter in today's paper.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, an obvious supplementary, then is the Minister of Tourism saying that the story that is carried in one of today's newspapers is not accurate?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, I haven't taken the time or the trouble to read the story in its entirety, Mr. Speaker, and I doubt whether I will. I am simply saying that the matter is presently being discussed at the staff level and when the discussions are finalized, an announcement will be made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct the question to the Honourable the House Leader. I wonder whether or not he has had an opportunity to consider the invitation that was made to us at the Public Utilities Committee by the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro to invite all members of the Legislature up to the Jenpeg site to see the construction site that was then described as being well ahead of schedule and all things going swimmingly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that it would probably be a wonderful time to view the ideal recreational conditions on Lake Winnipeg at the present time. I was not aware of the invitation that was expressed but if the invitation was made and the honourable member responds to it, I'm sure that it will be taken up. That's my impression of Mr. Bateman's previous invitation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question on the same subject to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. In view of the alleged difficulties at Jenpeg and in view of the Payment of Wages Act and the fact that it has passed second reading in this House, would it be the Minister's intention to ensure that in the future when the Russians were engaged in that kind of an operation, that the Russian government would have to be bonded?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: As to whether or not the government of the Soviet Union has to be bonded because one of their enterprises is engaged in supplying materials for the Province of Manitoba is a very interesting matter for my honourable friend to raise. I do want to say that, as Minister of Labour in the Province of Manitoba, I am not concerned or involved, I should say, with international

relationships with the Soviet Union and its enterprises and the production — or America or anywhere else in the world — I am concerned, however, with industrial disputes and I say to my honourable friend, if he wants to interpret from scanty news reports that appeared in this morning's paper as to an industrial dispute, I don't deal with rumours. As Minister of Labour, I deal with matters that come before me and on my desk pertaining to management-labour relations in the Province of Manitoba. If I were to accept the suggestion or implied suggestion of my honourable friend, I could be so damn well involved in so many rumours about possibilities of industrial dispute that I wouldn't have time even to consider the raised by my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. In view of the recent reports that the moose population on Hecla Island has reached fairly large proportions, is it his intention to ask the Minister of Renewable Resources to open up a hunting season this coming fall?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, we are keeping a close count of the moose population at Hecla Island which, at the present time, is in the order of 200. Whether that will warrant any change or variation with respect to hunting regulations of moose on that island this fall, I really cannot say at this point in time but that will be a matter which no doubt the Minister of Renewable Resources would consider.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: A supplementary question. It has been reported that there has been an intention to have professional hunters go out to reduce the moose population on Hecla Island. Would the Minister consider asking the Minister of Renewable Resources that there be hunting season open for those specialized type of hunters that use bow and arrow and the musket-loaders, which would not be of danger to the people in the area? Hunters normally use high-powered rifles.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not a hunter myself so I'll have to consider the merits of the suggestion from my honourable friend, the Member for Radisson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Attorney-General. I would like to ask the Attorney-General if he has had any recent communication with the police with respect to monitoring the distribution of pornography on the various news stands throughout the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): I have not had any . . . —(Interjection)— I'm afraid I didn't hear the comments by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. They sounded interesting from a distance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not had any personal correspondence. There may in fact have been some correspondence with senior people in my department, but I have not had any personal correspondence.

MR. GRAHAM: Can the Minister indicate whether or not they are proposing to take any action against those that are distributing the pornographic literature?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if there is contravention of the law, then action is taken. In fact, there are two films on which action is presently before the courts in respect to charges under the Criminal Code pertaining to obscenity. So that if there are contraventions of the Criminal Code, action is taken forthwith.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Yes, a question to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General indicate whether the concern expressed by the Member for Birtle-Russell is because his copy of Penthouse is being held up at the customs office and he cannot get hold of it?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader. Order, please. Order, please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 62 is being held by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon but if there is anybody who wishes to speak, I'd like to call Bill 62, if there are any speakers on it.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

ESTIMATES - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): I would refer honourable members to Page 43 of their Estimates Book. Resolution 81(a)(2). The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, when we left off this morning we were engaged in a debate on the Estimates for the budget of the world, not for the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. And the Leader of the Opposition expressed some satisfaction that there was some clarity of position being expressed by myself with regard to our mining policy, and then proceeded to indicate positions which were not related to the mining policy at all, which I have no difficulty in debating except that to do so, to sort of accept my honourable friend's invitation to start talking about whether the type of philosophy that has been expressed has been successful anywhere in the world or whether the philosophy which he professes has not been a failure everywhere it has been tried in the world, would probably expand the Estimates a little too much.

Let me say to my honourable friend and to members of the House, that the policy that we are pursuing with respect to mineral exploration and development, is what is under issue and what is being discussed; and it is that policy which I wish to commend to members of the House when they are discussing these Estimates. We are of the opinion that the public of Manitoba cannot maintain a tax policy which would enable it to obtain a fair share of the wealth produced from its mineral resources on the basis that it was completely dependent on the private sector to develop those resources, that the inevitable consequences of such a policy has been and always was that the person upon whom you are dependent exercises his bargaining power in such a way that he achieves a great deal and the achievements remaining to the public are very small.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition chooses to indicate that our present position is socialism. Mr. Chairman, that has never bothered me. It has never bothered me to be called a socialist. If people started to call me a Liberal I would have great concern and I would have great problems. But, if they call me a socialist it is of absolutely no concern to me.

A MEMBER: How about a Conservative?

MR. GREEN: Well, I have said many times in the House that if I was not a New Democrat, I would probably be a Conservative. I can see some sense, despite my disagreement with it, with a Conservative position. But I cannot make hide or hair out of a Liberal position and if people started to call me a Liberal, I would be in big trouble. I have also acknowledged that whatever government is in power, whether it is Conservative, or Socialist, or New Democrat, that the unfortunate thing is that it is always the Liberals who govern, whether they are in power or whether one of their opponents are in power. But what is a fact, Mr. Chairman, is that it is the New Democrat, the people who take positions, or the Conservatives who move society in one direction or another, that the Liberals then may be at the reins of it happens to be a fact of life and sometimes something that is difficult to stomach but, nevertheless, that occurs. And I suggest to the honourable member that if he wishes to call this socialist policy, that is of no concern of mine; the important thing is that I believe it is a policy which makes sense.

But I did, Mr. Chairman, much to my honourable friend's dislike, confine myself to the mineral policy. And the mineral policy is such that we have indicated that we are prepared to have public participation, we are prepared to have that contributed to with the private sector; that if that were not the case, we would not be able to maintain a tax policy. And the fact that we are spending public moneys, people's moneys, the public moneys is something, which I fully acknowledge — I justify it, Mr. Chairman, on two points. The first is that if the public wishes to have a greater share of the wealth from its natural resources, then it must make the investment, take the initiative and take the risk that is taken by the private sector. I justify it on a more pragmatic basis, Mr. Chairman, in that these moneys that we are spending with regard to mineral exploration, would not be available to the public if it were not for the policy that we're adopting. Because, if we abandon this policy, our tax revenues would definitely go down, we would not be able to maintain the tax revenue, and the money's that the honourable member says that the people would be saving, would not be saved, they would be retained by the mining company. So you would be dependant both ways.

Mr. Chairman, the moneys that we are spending, the moneys that we are spending on mineral explorations are more than made up for by the increased taxation that we have received from mining companies as a result of our new Mineral and Royalty Tax policy. My honourable friend wasn't in the House this morning when I dealt with some of these questions. The Tory literature says that we are collecting seven times as much from the mining companies as they collected. Like other parts of the Tory literature, Mr. Chairman, this is not true. I wish it were true, but it is not true. Unfortunately it is not true. If we were collecting seven times as much, there would be no problem with the mineral exploration company. What is true is that we are collecting twice as much. We are collecting seven times as much in dollars, but even at the rate the Conservatives charge, they would be receiving half of what we are now receiving, because their tax was roughly half the amount.

We could be receiving an additional one third, if we adopted the position of the mining companies, when they said they would prefer a 23 percent rate, and we had it for one year — the honourable

members will collect it' which is time and a half, not time and three quarters — but time and a half of what we are getting now. Except that we changed the Act, saying that as long as there was a period of normal profits, we would be satisfied with the 15 percent, and that we would not proceed with 35 percent unless there were exceptionally good years in which there were exceptionally high profits, in which case the public would be entitled to a higher amount.

So, if we are going to debate the issue, I'm not asking my honourable friend to acknowledge this because he won't, as he says about me. I tell him that the public is not a net loser by the program that we are proceeding with. They are a net gainer both on current and on capital. On current, because the moneys that we are getting on the basis of the increased royalties, are making up for the amount we are expending. And on capital, Mr. Chairman, which is far more important, because what we are doing is investing those public dollars, and when, which is inevitable, Mr. Chairman, as long as there is the patience, when there is a discovery, we will more than have a return for the dollars that we are spending.

And, Mr. Chairman, the honourable members should be aware of that, because that's what the mining companies do. They are not coming here to spend money in the Province of Manitoba. They are not making a contribution to the Province of Manitoba — I'm not saying this in criticism — they are here because they want to take a return from the Province of Manitoba, and that makes perfectly good sense. — (Interjection) —

Well, Mr. Chairman, if you don't argue it for them, you shouldn't argue it for us. That is what we are suggesting — we are suggesting that if the public, and I have thought those people are very contentious, who say that all you have to do is take the money from the mining companies — that it's there — all you have to do is take it, or take the mining companies. And I answer, "not on your life." That is not the policy, never been my policy since I've been involved in politics, and it's not the policy of this government. What we say is if the public wishes that, they have to proceed to make an investment, and they have to proceed to do what the mining companies are doing. In the meantime, our taxes will be based on a fair return, and I am of the opinion, and I don't expect my honourable friend will acknowledge it, that our taxes are amongst the fairest and the most stable in this country. That the most stable political situation *vis-a-vis* mining, exists in the Province of Manitoba.

Now my honourable friend would like to take that position and say that this is a clear cut position on socialism, and that he is happy to hear it and at least he knows now, that what the New Democratic Party is progressing to is inevitably statism, and state control. If my honourable friend wishes to try to make that logic out of his position, Mr. Chairman, I can't stop him except that it's just not so. The analogy which he says applies to Saunders and Flyer is completely different. The Saunders Program and the Flyer Program and the entire Program until 1973 were not a socialist program, they were a free enterprise program.

The mechanism of using the public money to prop up private industry has never been part of socialism, and has always been part of capitalism. Mr. Chairman, from time immemorial, that is what capitalism has done. It has demanded the state to support what is euphemistically referred to as free enterprise. And we are not the ones who invented the ideology which the government followed in dealing with the Saunders and the Flyer programs. What we did, Mr. Chairman, is tried to put some sense into the ideology, and in this regard I have to go for endorsement to a Liberal, Mr. Chairman. It's a dangerous thing, but every once in awhile a Liberal says something useful. What we said is that if the state puts up all the money. . . Oh, I can go to my learned friend, the Member for Morris who also said the same thing, so I can use a Conservative to endorse it too. If the state puts up all the money, and the state is the one that's going to be loser, and if there's going to be a win, then the state should own the enterprise.

And what we said is that if Churchill Forest industry is something that is going to be totally financed by the state, and it involves a public resource, then the state should be the owner of the enterprise, and the former Member for Ste. Rose, Gil Molgat, who is not exactly the most leftwing person that has ever sat in this Legislature, said in these words, "Mr. Speaker," — and he was talking to the House — "I am not a socialist, but if the state puts up the money, the state should own the enterprise." The same thing was said by the Member for Morris. — (Interjection) —

Well, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Potash Industry in Saskatchewan, the Government of Saskatchewan decided that they would expropriate by purchase the potash mines in Saskatchewan. That is something they have decided that they want to do, and for which they have paid value by the way, maybe too much, but they have reached an agreement, and in this regard, Mr. Chairman, they were acting no differently than the Conservative Government of Frank Moore, in the Province of Newfoundland when he said that if certain things don't happen with regard to a resource, that he would expropriate a resource industry in that province.

I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the proposition of the state purchasing by expropriation with a just price, I have absolutely no objection to that. I think it's a good thing. , the Bennett Social Creditor, he's not exactly a socialist, did it with the power company in the Province of British Columbia. My Deputy Minister points out that the Province of Alberta, a Conservative

province, has bought the Gas, Trunk Line, and also PWA, and I think that the balance sheet will be all right in a couple of years. I think that it will be fine. I think that the potash balance sheets will be fine too.

But nevertheless, that's not our program. Our program is that we are going to invest from the start, and try to realize a return on our investment. So when the Leader of the Opposition says, "Well, now we have it." Whether I believe it or not means that we are going to have a system like they have in Russia, and that no system of this kind has ever succeeded anywhere in the world, I don't want to debate the estimates of the Budget of the World. But I have to say that no system such as he advocates has ever succeeded anywhere in the world, anywhere. And that every system that has operated on the basis of his advocacy, has produced large disparities of wealth; produced mass poverty in the midst of relatively small wealth; have produced cycles of "boom and bust" which have caused untold misery to the people who have been part of what would appear to be an affluent system. And if he's talking about a failure of a particular industry, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that in 1929 the entire capitalist system failed, failed miserably costing the public in North America and in Europe, millions and millions of dollars; that the system did not come out of this failure until it generated a massive war which resulted in millions and millions of lives being lost and which subsequently led to some recovery on the basis of many new things being introduced into the system in order to remedy it. If my honourable friend is saying that the public cannot do these things and wishes to make my logic to the point of saying, well, whether the member agrees with it or not, it will result in a Russian type of system, then I say that if he will take his logic and whether he agrees with it or not and pursues it, then it will result in a system like they have in Chile. I suppose it would be best to take the public utilities and the telephone system, the hydro system and the roads and have them all on tolls operated by private people such as was the case many years ago under the theories of pure capitalism. The ultimate logic of that position, whether he agrees with it or not, is a Fascist, totalitarian position. I'm not saying, as my honourable friend was so kind to me, that he is a Fascist totalitarian but the logic of his system, if he wants to pursue it to an unreasonable conclusion is Fascist totalitarianism.

I don't want him to take our logic to unreasonable conclusions; I don't wish to take his logic to ridiculous conclusions; I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that on the Estimates that we are discussing, the mining policy of the Province of Manitoba makes sense. It makes sense in terms of public participation; it makes sense in terms of willing private entrepreneurs as partners and it makes sense in terms of providing a reasonable return on capital to capital invested by private people and a reasonable taxation to the public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that we are getting off our chest those ideological arguments that are within us, even though perhaps the way we have been considering in Estimates, we should be confining our remarks more specifically to the item under consideration such as the item that we are dealing with, Administration.

However, I think that we will proceed the way we are, we won't prolong it, in fact, my contribution will be relatively short. It is not new; the Minister has heard it before and, Mr. Chairman, I do, for the benefit of those that haven't heard it before in this particular instance do not argue an ideological case at all. I have a lot of hang-ups about ideology when it comes to land, farmland, when it comes to the freedom to enterprise versus the state enterprise, when it comes to Crown lands, yes, I have a lot of hang-ups about that but in this particular case, as the Minister has experienced before and I wish only to — because this is and will be, I am convinced of that, my last opportunity, my very last opportunity to make this speech to him from the position that I am sitting in and to him from the position that he is receiving it in.

So I will make this speech one more time, Mr. Chairman, and it has no ideological overtones to it. It has no ideological overtones to it. — (Interjection) — No, it's just a change, it's just a change of a new that's about to take place that I am very much aware of. But you see, Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes, you know, the kind of statement that whatever the Minister is doing in pursuing the mining policies that he has evolved with a great deal of self-satisfaction because it fits his direction that train that he wants to move at 60 miles an hour has, in fact, noticeably swerved to the left and the Minister, of course, is quite correct in suggesting that if one can do that, then that is the source of some satisfaction to any Minister of any government at any time.

The Minister makes a statement that the public, the public, the people of Manitoba, will not suffer as a result. In fact, he makes the statement that they will gain; that they are now participating in the action that they, as shareholders, will gain any hopeful fruition of the Minister's intents. Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that that is quite possible and I have said this before, if for one fact that we were not in a free and open society. But we are in a free and open society and this Minister, as is any other Minister, as is any other Minister under any other government, is subject to the kind of pressures from the people that elect him and the people that elect him want firstly to have what? Health care? Well, the members opposite have often paraded to us about that priority and their acceptance of

responsibility to that. I can tell you, the people right now in the little village of St. Ambrose are worried right now more about anything else than the maintenance of their road, as was witnessed on T.V. last night.

Farmers want support for falling prices from time to time and this government responded to it to the tune of \$10, \$20, \$30, \$34 million and I want you to remember that figure, Mr. Minister, I want you to remember that \$34 million that you were prepared to respond to because of the pressures in a free and open society of a depressed beef industry, that you were part of the government and voted the dollars to put into the beef industry because, while you are prepared to blatantly ignore the advice given to you by people within the private sector that say that there are two main reasons of concern why the private sector — and I am not arguing figures with him but these are statements and letters that the Minister has from leaders of the mining companies that he acknowledges don't like him but are prepared to — after all, hundreds of millions of dollars are involved — are prepared to stay in the game.

But he says that there are two main reasons why, in recent years, you know, the government policies towards mining in Manitoba have effectively reduced exploration activity *vis-a-vis* its historical base and new mine development has accordingly suffered, and the main areas of concern are unreasonably high provincial taxes which are not deductible from federal income tax and lack of security for investment. That comes from the Imperial Oil Company Limited, its Regional President here.

I am suggesting, and I have suggested to the Honourable Minister before and I have even made this allowance for this particular Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, recognizing that he has a reasonable amount of influence in that Cabinet, that he may and another Minister may from time to time exercise that kind of influence to win that tie that we call the people's dollars that the treasury bench has to dispense is being sliced up as to what portion is hacked off, how big that slice will be for education, how big that slice will be for health, how big that slice will be for the kind of services that people normally expect: roads, drainage, conservation programs; what kind will be sliced off for whatever other services: tourism, recreational, other notable programs that every Minister, all sixteen or seventeen of them fight for, when they sit around at Estimate time in September or October to decide what proportion each department will get. I have even made that suggestion that this particular Minister of Mines and Natural Resources undoubtedly wields significant clout to see that he will get his share of the pie.

Now, unlike my honourable friend, the Member for St. George or St. James, I express — and will express it now — total, you know, disappointment that this budget isn't twice as high, that we are not talking about \$20 million, that we should be talking about \$50 million here. It should be \$100 million because you've scared off more than that out of this province and you have lost more jobs — no matter what the level of exploration is — because as the Minister and all of the members so scornfully disdain those decisions made on the polished tables of board rooms of Inco, or Hudson Bay or Sherritt-Gordon. I know that you don't care or worry about what decisions are being made there but you know — and I am not punching wildly — you know that decisions are being made right now, have been made, have been made during the course of this government, they have said, certainly we have an investment to protect in this province. Inco is not going to walk away from \$250 million. They are going to carry on. But you also know that Inco has also dedicated a twenty or thirty or forty million dollar chunk of exploration dollars that could have been in this province to New Caledonia, to Sudbury, to other parts of the world, in fact to some South American countries that they now consider are more stable politically than Manitoba. .

A MEMBER: Well, go live there.

MR. ENNS: That's fine, but the investment dollar — no, I don't want to go live there — but the investment dollar knows no nationalities. The investment dollar knows no nationalities, the investment dollar knows only stability, Mr. Speaker. And I am suggesting that when the Minister says the public will not suffer, I am suggesting that in a free — and that is the caveat of course — in a free, in an open society, no government Minister, no government, will be able to dedicate the kind of risk dollars involved in this particular area of economic activity that is required for the kind of development that we have enjoyed today. And, Sir, nowhere, Mr. Chairman, has that proof been made more positive than the three-year stint of socialism in the Province of British Columbia. Nowhere was it more evident than after twenty years of socialism in Saskatchewan. The Potash was there all those years, and the Deputy Minister knows that, but it wasn't developed. It wasn't developed, certainly not to the point that we now have it.

It's questionable, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, it was just sort of a whisper to me and the honourable member will want to know. Mr. Cawley indicates that all ten mines were started on the process of development under the CCF administration.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I obviously have to accept that information as given from a source that

ought to know, but certainly the impression from a sister province and from a person that wasn't that particularly involved in the process of government — there cannot be denied, even by the Deputy Minister, if he wishes to enter into the political debate at this particular point, even if he chooses that — that there seemed to be a blossoming forth of this kind of activity in the Province of Saskatchewan that simply — well, to do this day, in fact — will mark with some distinction the late Premier Thatcher's relatively short — you know, six or seven-year stint in office — in that province. And it is questionable, it is highly questionable as we look at the next seven-year stint of office, if we look seven years down the line, and only then will it be measured, what state the industry is in and to what extent the citizens of Saskatchewan who, because they still are in a free and open society, have not expropriated this by force, without compensation, but have expropriated this at full value dollars and have paid a massive amount — the Province of Saskatchewan has dedicated a massive amount of dollars. We will not know, and I am not pretending to know, to what extent they have crippled that province, what programs are being denied in that province, what social programs are being denied in that province, what educational advance programs are denied in that province because of this fixation of owning that particular resource.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister shakes his head. I doubt very much, for instance, whether or not in 1950 we had the necessary credit ratings — and credit ratings are very important with this government, they pride themselves on the current credit ratings — whether in that we had the necessary assets or that we could have found a government, Liberal, Conservative, or NDP that in 1955 could have set aside out of a Budget — and I wanted to remind you at the time that the Conservative administration took over the government from the last Liberal administration, the total Budget for the province was in the area of \$80 million. The total Budget — \$80 million, \$78 or \$80 million in 1958. Are you really telling me that we would have found the capital just like that to put together a \$250 million investment at Thompson? — (Interjection) —

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a speculative question, but I am suggesting to you that experience has shown, and the most recent experience surely, an unrefutable experience, is that the mining industry literally dried up in British Columbia in three short years. And that even though you had what my socialist friends opposite would like to call a very progressive, aggressive, humourous, hail-fellow-well-met type Premier in that province under the leadership of Mr. Barrett, he could not hive off the necessary funds to do what this Minister says he is prepared to do, to replace the private risk capital.

Mr. Chairman, I have no argument with this Minister right now on ideological grounds. If he wants to chase out Esso and he wants to chase out Sherritt-Gordon, if he wants to nationalize Hudson's Bay, go to it. Go to it. But you haven't shown me, Mr. Chairman, anywhere in your Estimates, let alone the piddling \$500,000, I believe, what the Manitoba Mineral Exploration Company spent a couple years ago — is it upwards to around a million dollars now, just around a million dollars or a little less than a million dollars that you are spending this year? You are putting up a million dollars to replace unknown private moneys.

And the Minister in his early remarks said one of the problems was, before this we never knew. And I agree with you. You don't know, Mr. Minister, because (a) you don't like to be privy and you don't like to be associated with the board room meetings of companies. You of all Ministers, you of all governments, will never know what investment dollars you have scared off and out of this province. So I accept the fact, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister doesn't know. I also accept the fact that he cannot tell me, cannot stand up and tell me, that \$100 million of exploration money has been lost to this province. — (Interjection) — That's right. But at least you can't throw any wild punches at me and say that I can't, because you have shown a bias you have shown hostility, your Premier loves with smugness to talk about not wanting to be associated with any decisions made around any polished tables in any board room of any business corporation of this province. That's what he has told the people.

I'm telling you, Mr. Minister, that you have not shown me in your Estimates where you have had the guts to come to the people of Manitoba, never mind to the Member for St. James' constituency or my constituency, and tell them that, "I am going to raise the necessary taxes", but it's got to be an awful lot more than \$500,000. It's got to be an awful lot more than a million dollars. I want to tell you it's got to be at least as much as you were prepared to buy off the beef farmers with, forty, fifty million dollars a year. If you thought 15,000 beef farmers votes were worth forty or fifty million dollars a year, then, Mr. Chairman, this Minister comes off pretty poorly in that kind of a political context, but Mr. Chairman, that is of course precisely the point that I was making, you see.

I started the conversation by saying that we are dealing' and we are still dealing in a free and open society. The Minister of Agriculture is subject, and indeed the whole government, even all those fellows from St. Matthews and St. Vital who don't really have that much concern for the beef farmers — but they are politicians first and foremost — and so their Minister of Agriculture can tell them that, "Look, if we are ever going to make any inroads into rural Manitoba, we have to respond to this need in this particular industry. We are going to have to respond." Well, you couldn't stop them. You may well have voted against it. The Member for St. Matthews, I am sure, has voted against many measures

that his Ministers have put forward in this Chamber, but the fact of the matter is collectively, as politicians, you went along with it.

I say that that of course is natural and that of course is correct, because we are a representative government. We represent, even over and above those particular ideologies that from time to time we bring to this House, but in a free and open society we can't help but respond and represent those people that put us into office. You bring in labour legislation because you honestly feel that it's a responsibility to represent labour people when you bring in that legislation. Now, surely you cannot deny that. We bring in farm legislation because we think that this is farm legislation that the farm community wants. We bring in education legislation because we collectively think, and we listen to our educators, we listen to our teachers, and we say that this is the best thing that we want to do for our children, even though it costs tremendous amounts of money.

We have all accepted the responsibility of the fact that in a country like Canada, in a province like Manitoba, that we can look after our aged, that we can look after the sick without means tests. It is a particular program that this government has reason to be proud of and has brought in, and you remind us of that often enough. So we build the hospitals. We review the whole medical health delivery system to do that.

But what your Minister of Mines is saying, that you can do all that. But anytime he finds a mine somewhere; he doesn't want any of this filthy Esso money or Sherritt-Gordon money or Hudson Bay money. What is he going to do? Not build a road. Not maintain a road. Is he going to close the hospitals? Is he going to close the schools so that he can pour money in the ground in the hopes of finding gold, or copper, or zinc.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if we were not in a free and open society then of course that is precisely what happens. Consumer demands are not high on the list in the USSR. If refrigerators aren't available and don't work into the five-year plan, then they are simply not there and it is of no concern to the government because they don't respond to the kind of pressures that we have to respond to as politicians in a free and open society. But we do in this kind of a society and I'm suggesting to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, that that is the reason why the public will suffer. These dollars are available to us. The climate has to admittedly be right. I will not lend the Honourable Member for Flin Flon \$10 or \$100 unless I think I am going to get it back and perhaps, if he wants it for an extended period of time, he may even pay me some interest. Now that isn't an unreasonable request.

The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources says, and points out, that the whole enterprise system has undergone major changes since some of its basic flaws and weaknesses have been pointed out by such catastrophic and cataclysmic happenings as the '29 situation.

What bothers the honourable members opposite is they keep looking for fixed positions on our side, and we haven't got them. I know it bothers you. See, the fixed positions are all on that side. The fixed positions are on that side and that, of course, is a plus. I consider that a plus. You know, what makes me a Conservative? But, Mr. Chairman, I am being diverted by honourable members opposite.

The Honourable Minister indicated early on in his discussion that his geologists walk straighter these days. They are happier with their work. Well, of course, why should they not be? My understanding is the sweetheart deals that have been made perhaps exceed those deals that they had with private companies — bonuses on any mines found. What is the arrangements for the Chairman of the Manitoba Minerals Corporation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I was referring to the geologist in the department, not the geologist with the mineral exploration company. The mineral exploration company geologists have an agreement with the company. The geologists work on staff salaries with normal Civil Service benefits.

MR. ENNS: I accept that answer; then I'll confine my remarks to the geologists working for his people's company. Now, there is a very funny distinction, I understand. I wasn't at the Committee meeting last night. The people's company says that we may go into partnership with the province. I think it's awfully fuzzy, you know, for those of us on this side of the House. I mean how does a Crown corporation — a people's government — decide to co-operate with the people? I mean they already are the people. But then, of course, there is that difference. And my leader pointed it out so astutely earlier on and it slips out so often.

You see honourable members opposite are government. They are government. They're not there to represent the people. They look upon themselves as under themselves. And it's quite possible for them to set up a corporation to deal with this. Because, as far as they are concerned

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly speak into the mike, please, because the recorder is going to have problems if you are going to be speaking all over the place.

MR. ENNS: Oh, Mr. Chairman, my remarks, if I choose to make them to the Honourable Member for Morris, then they're meant for him. Not for posterity or for the record. I appreciate your concern.

Mr. Chairman, it's an old speech. I have made it on other occasions in a similar vein on this particular issue. I say "on this particular issue" to let me summarize. No, I do not approach this question from an ideological approach; I could but I do not. I simply say, and my argument is based

solely that neither this Minister nor any Minister in a free and open society will be able to muster the sufficient amount of dollars to provide an acceptable level of exploration and activity in this field. That really is the genesis of my remarks. I'm saying that because of the nature of the economic development, because of the risk involved, that it is a small premium to pay. And I put it down to a small premium to pay when you consider the employment factor, when you consider the taxation factor, and when you consider the other activity that enables us to enter into as a province and the help that it does to our overall economic, you know, health in the province. Then it is a small premium to pay the private sector a reasonable reward for their risk-taking.

Now that definition of reasonable reward can be argued with and obviously, in all your arguments, your position will be different than mine and it will perhaps change from time to time and under circumstances, depending on the kind of risk, depending on the kind of effort. That can be debated and will be changed and will be . . . it's a flexible situation. But what I am suggesting is not debatable and what should not be negotiable is the fact that we jeopardize that development to the point that in a significant part of our province, namely northern Manitoba, the general feeling is, despite the Minister's rosy assurances, that things are not well in the mining industry; that people living in the community such as Flin Flon worry about it, it's on their minds constantly, and I will tell you, it will be reflected, for instance, in the next vote.

I will name you at least two seats that we will win for sure in the north. They are Thompson and Flin Flon, the two mining towns, because the mining communities — and it is not the mining managers that will elect a Conservative in Thompson or Flin Flon; it is the workers, the people that are working in the mines that have got an investment in those communities, that have lived there for 20 years, that have got their houses there, and are dedicated to the north. They are going to vote Conservative next time for that only reason because this Minister has made them nervous, this Minister and this government has made them nervous about their future and they don't know whether or not they have a future in the north. And I would ask you to remember those prophetic words, Mr. Minister, as you watch the returns whenever they are — next June, next February or this June. But those two seats in northern Manitoba are going to be taken from the NDP and, Mr. Chairman, that will be a direct and wilful refutation of this Minister of Mines mining policy. And I want to lay that on that Minister as hard as I can because this Minister should be made aware of when and how he is hurting his party's chances for re-election. Those two particular seats will be lost to the New Democratic Party because of this Minister's mines policy.

Let me again reiterate, Mr. Chairman, and if there should be any doubt, it should be obvious to all — there aren't enough mine owners, there aren't enough mine directors or mine managers to make that happen. The Minister's open scorn for anybody in management is understandable and acceptable, but I also understand and accept that there is just not enough of them to elect anybody, a dog catcher, never mind an MLA in Thoson and Flin Flon. To make that happen, the fellows that are going underground, the fellows that are working in those mines, they are going to vote differently, and when they do, then I would ask the Honourable Minister to remember this particular speech.

Well, Mr. Chairman, let me conclude simply by saying that I am disappointed. I chastise the Minister for the fact that these Estimates aren't triple to what they are because without that kind of money, without that kind of input, the Minister is going to lead us into a situation where the public will suffer from lack of development, from lack of exploration, from lack of long-term dollars going into place that will ensure a future for our northern communities. The Minister has not indicated or shown us that this government has the same kind of will to respond, in this particular instance, where they are — whether the particular activity is up or down or stable or, in fact, as far as the private sector is concerned — but the fact of the matter is decisions are being made daily that are detrimental in terms of the private sector's willingness to carry on in Manitoba. Let me put it that way. The Minister has not shown us by virtue of these Estimates that he is, in fact, prepared to replace those private dollars with public dollars. I don't see enough of it and from the reports I heard from the Committee last night, the \$500,000 — between \$500,000 and \$1 million — certainly doesn't come close to replacing it.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that in that instance, the policies that are being advocated by this Minister as well as they fit into his ideological concept of resource development, as well as it fits with his concept of maintaining tax integrity, but as sure as I am standing here, the people, the citizens of Manitoba are going to be the poorer off because of it, because of the management that this Minister has had over this department for the last seven or eight years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I can't satisfy my honourable friend with the 30 or 40 million, at least not until an ore body is discovered, but I can tell my honourable friend, in order to try to satisfy him, that he's not looking at the right figures when he is looking for the replacement of public dollars by private inactivity. First of all, there has been relatively the same private activity and the public dollars which have matched it are contained in the Capital Account, have been contained in the Capital Account for the last two years and amount to roughly \$5 million a year. Now, I haven't given the exact

figure but the exploration program which we have participated in under the departmental regulations which came into effect a year and a half ago, are under those regulations. We have expended over \$7 million — \$4 to \$5 million in the previous year and a similar amount this year and we will reach a total of \$16 million this year and those are located in the . . .

MR. ENNS: . . . where we have difficulty and I don't want to fall into the same difficulty. I know that's probably because we are not dealing with the Estimates in the same thing but, for instance, I notice that in the specific item in the Estimates, that the dollars allocated for exploration is less in these Estimates than it was last year and last night in Committee, I understood the Manitoba mineral company expending in the neighbourhood of \$1 million so, you know, this is where I take my very

MR. GREEN: I have tried to indicate to my honourable friend that it is in the Capital Account and the Manitoba Minerals has a budget of roughly one-half million — perhaps \$600,000 when we took into account inflation. In the Capital Estimates, there is an additional, roughly \$4 to \$5 million under various headings to deal with mineral exploration so that the mineral exploration features that you see in the current Estimates deal with the administration of the mineral exploration program and do not deal with the programs that we are involved in. Now, I can't tell my honourable friend that I succeeded in exacting, as he says, 30 to 40 million but we have succeeded in getting the government and the members of the Legislatures to commit roughly \$4 to \$5 million a year to be matched by private development dollars in mineral exploration in the Province of Manitoba so that last year we had over \$10 million in mineral exploration and this year, we are projecting between \$13 and \$16 million which is more than took place prior to the enactment of these regulations.

If my honourable friend still, in the face of that, wishes to insist that the exploration dollar has gone down, I can't do anything other than to say that it has not gone down; that it has kept apace with what it was and I further have committed the Government of Manitoba to the objective that if there is any diminution of activity— in other words, if the private sector doesn't come up with 50 percent which they have and I am neither jumping with joy nor am I regretting it — I say that it is a natural outflow of our policy that we are quite willing and happy to have the partnership of the private sector on the basis of our existing program and that the amount that we are investing in mineral exploration is that amount, that there has been no diminution of activity. I can't do anything other than to tell the honourable member that.

The honourable member makes a prediction and he wishes to be dramatic, you know, everybody will try to make his speech as interesting as possible and he says, "Here are two seats, here are two seats that you are going to lose." Now, that's a prediction; that is not certain. Even the honourable member will not say that it is certain. He can say that he's pretty sure but I can give the honourable member a certainty. Of this there is no doubt, that in the last election we won those two seats; in the last two elections we won those two seats and we won those two seats on the basis of our existing mining policy, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the policy we are now pursuing. Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the policy that we are now pursuing and there has been no diminution of activity. If anything, Mr. Chairman, and the honourable member says that it's the worker in Flin Flon who is going to beat us — well, if we are beat, it will have to be by a majority of workers' votes — but it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that I have had something to do with the miners in Flin Flon and in Thompson, that I acted for the miners in Flin Flon as a legal representative and I acted for them — insofar as Flin Flon is concerned, I don't think that anybody calls me back to their community more than the community of Flin Flon. If I have any problems with the representative from the area for Flin Flon, it's not that I am pushing the industry too hard, it is that I am not pushing them hard enough. If the honourable member wishes to proceed on his supposition as to what will happen in Flin Flon and in Thompson, he can go ahead and do so but the fact is that I don't have to predict — I have the advantage over my honourable friend. The fact is that the people of Flin Flon and the miners of Flin Flon and the people of Thompson and the miners of Thompson have sent into this Assembly two representatives who are fully backing the mining policy of the Province of Manitoba.

You know, I prefer to deal with that mandate rather than the attempt, Mr. Chairman, of the honourable member — (Interjection) — Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's attempt to put fear into my heart on the basis of losing two seats and therefore dissuade me from filling the mandate that the people of those communities have asked us to proceed with. Mr. Chairman, if those two communities decide that they don't want a New Democrat, better they should decide it on the basis of our program being implemented and pursued rather than us adopting the Conservative program because I will tell you something, if we adopted your program, then I say that they should defeat the two members from Flin Flon and from Thompson. If the honourable member wants to say that the future is with him, that is like a person whistling in a grave yard because the honourable member full knows, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member knows full well, Mr. Chairman, that despite the fact that every once in a while there is a step backward, in the long run, Mr. Chairman, it is three steps forward, one step backward; four steps forward, one step backward; uive steps forward, one step backward. The world moves closer, Mr. Chairman, and never achieves, one I will

acknowledge that, that the world moves closer and closer and never achieves and that's really the secret of what the spirit of man is imbued with. It moves closer and closer to a form of society where we are each other's keeper, where there is a brotherhood of man and where the society moves along a course which makes it more and more possible for the individual in society to realize his potential, and that's the kind of society that I think my honourable friend would like. That's the kind of society that we on this side would like. and the methods of achieving of it are whether it is done by suggesting that there is only one incentive which will cause human beings to exert their efforts for the purpose of realizing good things and that that incentive is basically greed.

The viewpoint that man can be stirred by the highest motivations to do greater things than he can be stirred to do by the lowest motivation, really those are the issues that divide us. I have not noticed amongst my honourable friends opposite that they are motivated by one thing only and that is the achievement of personal gain. Exactly the reverse is true. They are motivated in the public interest. And they make great sacrifices in the public interest. They think the public interest is their dedication to seeing to it that individual free enterprise economy is maintained but their own personal motivation is not that at all, it's the public interest. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that can be as strong if not stronger — no I have to be quite frank. I believe it is the strongest motivation under which man will achieve the greatest things. And this is what we are at.

The honourable member wants to scare me with two election defeats in northern Manitoba — (Interjection) — Well, that's okay. Mr. Chairman, whether the honourable member agrees with it or not, and I don't agree with it, but he thinks that he is personally responsible for the defeat of the Tories in 1969. He has borne that for the last eight years and he is wrong. He is wrong, dead wrong. The Tories did not get defeated in 1969 because of the Churchill River Diversion and the problems that were associated with it by my honourable friends. But he has had that for the last eight years and he wants to make sure if this government gets defeated that I will have a germ some place that it was my fault. It has never bothered me, Mr. Chairman, it has never bothered me. I am quite willing to accept the decision of the electorate on my position. What I'm not willing to do — I'm quite willing to accept that position and even to lose — what I'm not willing to do is not give the position a chance either by implementation or by argument.

Mr. Chairman, anybody who is prepared to do that is defeated before he starts. You know there is a — I don't know how many here have read Little Big Man. Little Big Man is a story about the Indians. — (Interjection) — Now I'm going to try to improve your repertoire. In Little Big Man the Indians that — I forget the tribe, it wasn't Chippewayans, no, I forget the tribe — but they had to go out and fight and they went out with the spirit that today is a good day to die. They did not go out with the spirit that we are going to vanquish our enemy. They went out with the spirit today is a good day to die because unless they were prepared to do that, they could never be victorious. I say that anybody who is in politics and wants to pursue a position has to pursue it on the basis that today is a good day to die and I am going to go all the way with those things that we are fighting for.

This program, Mr. Chairman, is admittedly an attempt to change the direction of the public of Manitoba insofar as their mineral resources are concerned, I accept that. There will be a dispute as to facts for the moment. The dispute as to facts is whether there has been a diminution of mineral exploration activity. I say that there hasn't been; the honourable members say that there has been — I think the Member for Lakeside would even say that there has been even if I add the public and private sectors. The Member for St. James never said that, he said if you take the two together it may be the same.

That's all I've ever professed and I will acknowledge, without a moment's hesitation that the people in the industry — and I don't know whether I have talked of them disrespectfully because I really like most of them and I don't know that they have terrible hostility to myself as a person as distinct from the policies that we are trying to implement — but that the people in the industry I will definitely acknowledge that they are of the opinion that we would be better off under the previous policy. I don't deny that. What I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, is that they have participated in this policy and not merely retrospectively, not merely to protect their interests, but in the new policy because they don't see anything particularly wrong with it. They would prefer to be a hundred percent and I will tell you something, it's not a secret, I would prefer to be a hundred percent. So we each give up half. We are going 50-50. They have done that and we have done that and things are moving much as expected.

My honourable friend, I believe that in this it's not merely rhetoric, that he really believes that if we found an ore body we couldn't get the money. But I tell him that that is far-fetched. If there was an ore body there would be the money because we would no longer be borrowing on the existing provincial debt financial statement. It's like having an entirely new asset on which you raise money for the development of that asset which is entirely self-liquidating and produces revenue. There it would be easier to borrow on a sound ore body and easier to get money than any of the money that has been advanced so far. So I leave that with my honourable friend.

I don't know whether I'll convince him but I suggest that if there was a good ore body and, you

know, it was proven out not merely by our people but by the private sector organizations that were in, and one of them is Granges, the one that appears to be most favourable, which other people have said more about than I have. But nevertheless, the one that appears to be most favourable is Granges which is a Swedish firm, which incidentally, Mr. Chairman, since 1900 and when I was in Sweden I went to see them. They have had a history of involvement with the public sector, with the government as a partner, and they don't particularly find this to be unusual and they are proceeding.

So the finding of an ore body will be the least of our problems, that if an ore body is found the least of our problems will be financing. I am sure that there will be lots of partners who would like to buy in at our then figures but we would certainly not let them do so nor would any mining company.

So let's leave that particular part of the Estimates to the time, if an when it arrives, when we find an ore body. you know, I accept the Honourable Member for St. James and the Member for Lakeside, I accept their suggestion that they hope we do. It will cause problems if we do for some of their positions, but I really think they hope we do because they would rather that the money found something than it didn't find something, which proves that at the last bottom line we are all socialists because they hope we do find an ore body.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution . . . The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. KEN DILLEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to enter in this part of the debate. Because the Member for Lakeside says that the Member for Thompson is going to lose his seat, doesn't necessarily make it so and if I had any money to bet I would bet that the Member for Lakeside is not going to be here next year because I think there is a greater possibility of an increase in the intelligence of the people of his constituency and I think when that intelligence increases, they are going to determine that the Member for Lakeside doesn't fit in and that they are going to seek somebody with progressive ideas not conservative ideas.

While we're talking about mining, all of the comments that I've heard so far, both in Committee last night and in the House for the past three years, this is the fourth year, I couldn't help but feel that there was an abysmal ignorance of mining on the part of the Conservative Party in Manitoba and in other parts of Canada. Not so much Ontario, because I think they realize where they are the government, that they look at the Opposition New Democrats as the reason why there is no mining exploration or development in Ontario — none. I have here the Winnipeg Free Press article of November 8th, 1976. —(Interjection)— Well you know, when they're reporting from the Canadian Press Wire Service out of Thunder Bay, at that time there was a mining meeting, and in the Province of Ontario they were singling out the New Democratic Party as the reason why there was no new development in Ontario.

Nobody has told me yet — perhaps it's true and I don't know it — that there is a New Democratic Party Government in Ontario. I don't believe that to be the case. I still believe that they are the Official Opposition. But they were making a number of comments, and the way I read this article, it was before they had a speech given by Mr. Leo Bernier, and the Finance Minister of Ontario, Mr. Darcey McKeough. Before they arrived at the conference they were making a number of assumptions. They were blaming the NDP for the conditions in Ontario, saying that the basic policy is a state-run industry.

Let me just read from this: "That there was hostility towards big business in Canada according to the mining executives, and the public was turning towards the NDP as a party of the people. If they, the NDP, continue in the direction they are going, they would discourage all investment in mining projects in Northwestern Ontario." He said, and this is probably the most truthful thing that this person is saying, "that investor confidence was also shaken by high project costs, and by the risk factor and the conservative attitude of Canadian investors. High construction costs and drift in government policies were blamed for discouraging investors by Frank Ablett, Manager of Umex." He goes on to state that there is a lack of definite policy for the industry, which is not the case in Manitoba, and if we invest \$100 million, are we allowed to recoup part of it.

I think it's very interesting to note, that while the New Democratic Party Government of Manitoba is being condemned for the fact that the . . . or according to the opponents of this government, mineral exploration is down in Manitoba; that Natural Resources Minister Leo Bernier, and Finance Minister Darcey McKeough of Ontario — both Cabinet Ministers — have expressed concern on November 8th, 1976 that for the first time since the second world war, there are no new mines under construction in Ontario. —(Interjection)— Right. Mr. Bernier said in a recent interview, that the overall state of mining in the province is worrisome and precarious. What have those Conservatives done in Ontario to make that state of the mining industry so bad? What have they done? He said that there is a need for commitment by the government to continuity in mining policies. Well you know, if there is no longer any mining activity in Ontario, and if it is said that there is no mining activity in Manitoba, and if mining activity in Saskatchewan, Alberta and B.C. is declining, where is it occurring? Where are the mining companies going? Where are they putting their investment dollars, and why are they doing it?

When we're talking about costs, I'll give you the example of the International Nickel Company,

Monday April 18th, Winnipeg Tribune, 1977: "While we complain about government involvement in mining activity" — I've got to tell this Legislature a story. I have been attempting for the past three years to get a small daily bridge established in a place called Cross Lake so that the children will have some way of going to school, rather than on the ice or by boat — one little bridge. —(Interjection)— Well, let's see who got the bridge money.

In a country of 13,000 islands that's spread as wide as the United States across the ocean, communications have been vital just to keep the parts together, and that is why Canadian aid has been directed towards supplying Twin Otter aircraft at the expense of Saunders, navigational aids, and airport designs. The building at present — and this is through Canadian aid — the building at present of 39 bridges on Souliwazy (?) Island, coincidentally, the same place where the huge nickel mine has been built, and an expected involvement in providing rail transport and port development assistance as part of the opening of the Sumatras coal deposits.

You know that Canada extended a \$200 million line of credit to Indonesia last year, much of it aid-oriented towards the development of Indonesia's Transport Communication System. A line of credit of \$200 million. I don't object for one minute. I believe that this country is entitled to it. But let's not make any mistake, because the money is being spent there for the purpose of providing the infrastructure for the development of a mine that will be built and run and operated with the cheapest labour in the world — forget about that — and capital will always follow an area which has the cheapest amount of labour.

As an example, we will be sending people from the mine in Thompson, from the Internation Nickel Company to work in Guatemala. The people who will be going there as electricians will be getting \$10.00 an hour plus a number of fringe benefits, while the people from Guatemala, who have the same occupation, who they will be working shoulderto shoulder with, will be receiving \$1.50 an hour. And yet that nickel that they are producing in Guatemala will be the same price on the world market as the nickel that is being produced in Thompson. Any fool would know why there has been a reduction in exploration, not only in Manitoba by the private companies. They want to maximize their return and they can do that whichever way they wish to but let's not have the opposition try to make a case that it is as a result of the policies of the New Democratic Party whether they be in a minority position in some other province in Canada or in the opposition in some other parts of Canada, in other provinces in Canada, or where they are the government that as a result of that policy that there is a reduction in exploration and development of mines in this country. Make no mistake about it.

I believe that in Canada, regardless of whether we have a New Democratic Party government or whether there is a Conservative or a Liberal government, that our democratic process is the most stable form of political system that exists anywhere in the world. But you will find, you will find the mining companies don't really care about the democratic process; don't care about a damn thing except profit. They will go to places like Chile. You know, nobody has to gloss over the reports that are coming out from a number of agencies including the churches in Canada who have first-hand information of what is occurring in Chile at the moment, where people are being put in jail without trial, where unions are outlawed, where you can't stand on the street corners, —(Interjection)— Excellent for the mining companies and under those circumstances, and under those circumstances and with the assistance of the Canadian Banks and the Government of Canada, they are prepared to put in somewhere in the order of \$600 million for development of copper in that country.

We had a man before the Committee last night who told us that the extraction of copper from ore costs somewhere in the order of 71 cents and it is being sold on the world market for the same amount of money and that copper companies who are extracting copper in the United States and Canada are losing money doing it. They are losing money extracting copper. They are hoping that there will be an increase in price but there will never be an increase in price as far as I am concerned as long as there is the ability to extract massive amounts of copper from countries like Chile which has an average monthly wage rate of somewhere in the order of \$50.00.

By the way, while we are talking about a wage rate of \$50.00 a month, I want to inform you that a pair of shoes costs \$30.00 in this country. What I would consider, from where I look, it's the same kind of right-wing, ultra-conservative government that would exist in this province if that group of bandits on this side of the House ever had the misfortune of becoming the government. —(Interjections)— Well, if I have anything to do with it and as long as I have got a breath in my body, I will do everything that I can to ensure that none of you come back either. But you don't like to be identified with where the mining companies are going; you don't like to be identified with the countries like Chile. You don't want to be identified with right-wing Conservative governments in other parts of the country. —(Interjection)— Russia and China, my God. You know, we are talking about Chile and we're talking about your attitude —(Interjection)— well, then you get up in your place and you talk about China. You talk about Russia and you talk about other socialist countries; I'm talking about this one. I choose to talk about Chile even though you don't like it and you don't like to hear about it. You are going to hear about it as long as I am standing here and we're going to talk about the torture and the rape and the killing and the imprisonment and the death and the destruction and the removal of

democratically elected governments in Chile with the assistance of the mining companies, with the assistance of the Central Intelligence Agency, with the assistance of the —(Interjection)— Yes, with the assistance of the United States and Canadian capitalists. But, you see, that rankles, that rankles the Conservatives when you talk about that, when you talk about mining in that way.

And the other thing they won't talk about is Canadian mining. They won't talk about the number of people who are killed every year in the mining industry in Canada because to talk about that and to try and force mining companies to clean up their act. —(Interjection)— If people want to continue to be stupid in those other industries and not try to combat those kinds of deaths —(Interjection)— Well, we're talking about mining.

I think it was this same Conservative government when we were introducing some legislations to assist in the protection of farmers — was it last year or the year before? — we introduced some kind of protective mechanism to assist farmers in the handling of some very potent and dangerous chemicals that they were using and I think it was these people in the Conservative Party, on this side of the House, who stood up and refused — I believe they even voted against the legislation for that, for the protection of farmers. Not only that, not only that, when the people were in the . . . If you believe that farming is such a dangerous occupation, you will remember last year, the native farm group from Portage la Prairie came in to the Law Amendments Committee and they requested that protection, Workmen's Compensation, be applied to them as workers on the farm. It was these same Conservatives who promised before the public and before the Law Amendments Committee that yes, my friends, my farmers, you can depend on the assistance of the Conservative Party. We will support you, we'll provide you with Workmen's Compensation from the first day that you start working on the farm . And when they had the protection of the Legislature, when they were here, wasn't it this same group who promised them while they were face to face with the native people, when they got behind their back they said, "We will change the law so that you will be entitled to workmen's compensation only after you have worked thirty days or you have earned \$1,000.00." That's the kind of protection they believe that a farmer should have in what the Member for Gladstone describes as "one of the most dangerous industries in Manitoba." More people are killed in farming than there is in mining and yet that's the extent to which they would provide protection to the farmers in Manitoba. —(Interjection)—

All right. Let's talk about the number of people who are killed in mines. Already this year, 1977, we have had four people killed in the mine in Thompson. Let that sink in a little bit. But do we ever hear from the Conservative Party that we need a stronger Workplace Safety and Health Act? No. That we need more mines inspectors? No. We'll never hear that about them from the Conservative Party. Do we need more —(Interjection)— I'll tell you what government is in power. It's the New Democratic Party government that is in power in Manitoba. Right now. And you know what? It's going to remain in power as long as they have people on this side of the House that are so ignorant of the mining industry as the people are on that side of the House collectively.

A MEMBER: You stand up and you talk with a closed mind and you don't think about anything else. What do you know about mining?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. One member at a time.

MR. DILLEN: I am sure that we will hear more about the knowledge of the mining industry from the Conservative Party . But, you know, I said already that we've had four people killed. We have had countless numbers up to this point who have been injured and we have another number of people who are being exposed every day to dangerous chemicals and dust, dust that has never been tested on the human being. Chemicals and dust and chemicals in combination that have never been tested on human beings.

I can recall, as the president of the union, coming to the Conservative government and asking them for mine inspectors and I can recall them saying that there are more fish inspectors in Northern Manitoba than there are mine inspectors in Northern Manitoba and the group of fish inspectors are dealing with fish and there wasn't an inspector available except if he came from Winnipeg under that administration to deal with the protection of the workers in the mines and the smelters and the mills of Northern Manitoba. That's all changed now. We have people who are resident inspectors in Northern Manitoba and I think that they are opposed to that. If they were not opposed to it, why didn't they implement it prior to 1968 and '69? That's the kind of deals that you get from a Conservative Party who are subservient to the executives of the mining industry, who polish the shoes and who wear their knees out, you know, so that the mining industry has some kind of political protection. Even the Manager of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting says, We don't know how to deal in this — what's the word you use? — We don't know how to act in the political arena. We have got to change our methods so that we can deal in the political arena. They have never had to deal in the political arena before because they could always put the money together to buy the kind of representation that they wanted.

And that has become more and more evident. At the present time, the mining industry is capable of buying the ruling class in every country that they are operating in at the present time. Every one.

The Conservative Party in Opposition in Manitoba are no exception. They are capable of being bought.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Could I ask the Chair if the member is accusing me of being bought? You know, could I ask that question of the honourable member?

MR. DILLEN: If you consider yourself to represent and be the Conservative Party and if the shoe fits, wear it.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, again, I ask the member, are you accusing me of being bought?

MR. DILLEN: I said, if the shoes fits, wear it.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Then, on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the member that the shoe does not fit.

MR. DILLEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think, we can go on. I have to tell this. I wasn't going to do it but you see — Wasn't it a few years ago the word separation started in Quebec. It didn't start . . . separation didn't start in Quebec. It started with a representative of the Conservative Party when he sat in this House on the side of the government. He said and he was promoting the separation of Northern Manitoba and annexation to the Northwest Territories — that was Gordon Beard — because of the insensitivity of the Conservative Party to Northern Manitoba. That the only way that he could get anything done was to annex it to the Northwest Territories. There are still some people in Northern Manitoba who believe that they would be better off if they weren't connected here with the rest of the province. The Mayor of Lynn Lake is one. And there are others. But it didn't start here; it started with Gordon Beard and everybody knows what happened. You know, he left the Conservative Party because of the insensitivity to the aspirations of the ordinary people of Northern Manitoba because they were so preoccupied with crawling on their hands and knees and polishing the shoes of the mining industry in Northern Manitoba and there is no indication that that has stopped even in Opposition. I can tell you that I will be back in this House next year and there will be many on the Conservative side who will not, including the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 81(a) (2) \$164,000. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, will you call it 4:30?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there are any matters which have not been discussed with regard to next week's proceedings. Tuesday is MDC at the Economic Development Committee; Wednesday is Law Amendments Committee and we will take it from there.

I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 10 a.m. Tuesday next.