

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 24, 1970

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member for Lakeside was on his feet when I left the Chair at 5:30. If it's his intention to continue . . .

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was interrupted in my quiet and peaceful discourse on the affairs of state in Manitoba prior to the adjournment for the supper hour, and with your permission I would like to continue.

As you recall, I was attempting to point out to you, Sir, some of the maneuverings that were going on on the side of the government benches, maneuverings of a highly political nature, which I simply wanted to indicate to them and to you, Mr. Speaker, that they were not above and beyond my comprehension even though the First Minister and indeed the Member from Crescentwood refers to me as a bumbling incoherent member for Lakeside.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other night -- Mr. Speaker, it really bothers me no end that we have to continually refer back to the past, but one can hardly do otherwise when the First Minister refers to the past administration's lack of program or lack of effort in such fields as agriculture, and expects to get away with it without some response from those of us on this side. I note the absence of the Minister of Agriculture here, and I would simply like to ask him, Mr. Speaker -- I hold in my hand a book that was put out, Programs and Policies, the Department of Agriculture, 1968 -- at that time I had the privilege of being the Minister -- and I would have to ask them, you know, and I'm sure my colleagues will ask them, my colleagues will ask them just precisely which of the programs in this booklet are being dropped by this present government, which of the programs of this booklet that I hold in my hand fall into the general ambit of the First Minister's description of "no significant contribution to the agricultural industry in the past ten years."

MR. SCHREYER: I never said that.

MR. ENNS: You said it last night, Mr. First Minister. And, Mr. Speaker, whether it's coincidence or not, but I read from the DBS figures that in Manitoba, and indeed throughout the west, for the years that we had the benefit of a Conservative administration both in Ottawa and in this province, that there was a most significant and steady rise in the net disposable income to all our farmers across the Prairies and in particular this province.

MR. SCHREYER: Only after '63.

MR. ENNS: Now Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to take up too much time on discussing the agricultural matters. They're going to be dealt with in a great deal of detail by colleagues of mine when we enter into the Minister's, or the Department of Agriculture's estimates. Let me simply say, though, that the reaction of this government and of this Minister to the wheat reduction program is one of tremendous disappointment to me and one of tremendous disappointment to most farmers, because farmers, believe it or not Mr. First Minister, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, want to be useful people, and when there are people starving in the world they do not want to be told not to grow, not to produce food.

But what have we today? With the leadership of that great agrarian Pierre Elliot Trudeau, followed in his footsteps by none other than the Honourable the First Minister and his government, we are actively embarking on a program of reducing food production in this province -- of reducing food production in this province, Mr. Speaker, and that's a fact.

Now Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the theme that I was on prior to the supper hour. I see the Honourable Member for Crescentwood is back in his seat and really he is in his seat so seldom, perhaps his other duties at the University, for which I assume he's getting paid, take him from this Chamber from time to time, so that I like to utilize the opportunity that I have in speaking in this Chamber in his presence; and let me tell him, Mr. Speaker -- you know, Mr. Speaker, in the Soviet Union out of a population -- that frightens; that frightens him -- I'm coming back to economic planning and all this -- in the Soviet Union out of a population of 200 million plus, where you have some 47 percent of the people engaged in agriculture, on more arable acres than for instance the United States, comparable figures that Americans see, out of roughly the same population with only 7 percent of the population actively engaged in agriculture, we produce an abundance of food that sometimes creates problems for our legislatures, for our governments to deal with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the windfall sales that we reaped to the Socialist bloc of countries. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you now and I'll tell the farmers of this

(MR. ENNS cont'd) province, that with the knowledge that the agriculture in these countries is in the hands of fumbling, bumbling bureaucrats, that plan the agriculture from A to Z, that take one leap forward and three leaps backward, as they did in China a few years, one leap forward and three leaps backward, where from one decade they have the office workers and the farmers creating inferior cast iron products in little foundries, the next minute we decide that they are going to get into agriculture and everybody tries to produce rice, Mr. Speaker, I can with virtual certainty guarantee the farmers of Manitoba, the farmers of Western Canada, that within 18 months or two years the countries of this world will be crying for our grain, will be crying for our production, and Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to my Minister of Agriculture, I agree that the interference of government, and at that time whether it was Conservative Alvin Hamilton or Liberal, it doesn't matter, that it was essentially wrong for them to go about this country or to lead us to believe, the politicians to go around making statements, "you grow wheat, we'll sell it," because Mr. Speaker, it did induce some of the problems that we now inherit. It did induce some of the cattle owners, some of the livestock people to plow up that last 30 acres and get into grain production, which possibly never should have been done. And so I accept that responsibility as a person in public life. I accept that responsibility if indeed some of the experts within the department that I had management of or control of at that time, if they in fact gave that advice; but Mr. Speaker, if that description of that situation was true then - and I suspect it was - then it is also true now that in this hell-pell rush to get into livestock, to convert millions of acres into forage, to convert with free and easy interest money an artificial increase in the livestock situation on the prairies, that we are simply repeating the same errors that essentially were made at that time, if indeed those were errors.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . permit a question?

MR. ENNS: Yes certainly, Mr. First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my honourable friend if he would accept that if this government makes one or two mistakes in agricultural policy, just as his government did, we will accept responsibility as well?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm always magnanimous in my approach to any reasonable suggestion the First Minister desires to make. I would have to point out that I at no time in my speech indicated that this government in itself was primarily responsible for any mistakes in agriculture. We followed along a line that was being led to us perhaps through the national government at that time, but I certainly accept the premise that the First Minister suggests.

But the point that I want to make, Mr. Speaker, before I leave my honourable friend from Crescentwood to his studies and meditation, because, you know, this really worries me, and if you look deeper into some of the figures of the Socialist, collectivized communal farm and you find that in those few acres that are left in the hands of private incentive, private domain, that those few acres very often produce more than the whole collective acres do, then Mr. Speaker -- no, I'm not an economist and I don't prefer to have the kind of education that my honourable friend from Crescentwood has, but I have eyes, I have ears, and I hope a little bit of common sense. And this is, in fact, the situation. This is in fact the situation as we see it.

For my honourable friend, the Member for St. George, who made a fine contribution to the Throne Speech a little while ago and suggested - I grant him the leave or the privilege of the situation that he has not been in the House that long - to suggest that now, with the advent of the NDP government, we're going to see action around Room 165, the kind that we've never seen before, Mr. Speaker, has the decade dulled the memory so fast of what kind of action took place at the time that George Hutton, the predecessor in my office when this government was around this province? Has the memory dulled so fast that COMEF Report suggested a doubling of the cattle population of this province back in 1962 and '63 and that this government at that time, particularly the Minister that I referred to at that time, Mr. Hutton, went through the width and breadth of the province and advocated that program, and was of course severely condemned for that program because it happened to coincide with the reduction of cattle prices...?

MR. SCHREYER: Condemned by whom?

MR. ENNS: By many of the people that were in the industry.

MR. SCHREYER: Oh no. Oh no.

MR. ENNS: By many of the people who were in the industry. I'm not suggesting that members opposite condemned it. I'm saying within the industry. This was a kind of a natural reaction. I'm sure the members opposite had the benefit of a meeting with the Stock Growers Association the other day who expressed some fear, some concerns in this general direction,

(MR. ENNS cont'd) and I can anticipate the same kind of fear being expressed that we in our rush into diversification, that we do not upset the existing industry as it is now. It happens to be in a buoyant situation.

But Mr. Speaker, I could go on for the remaining 20 minutes and talk about agricultural policy and imagination in agricultural policy - you know, that we have yet to have some inkling from this government as to what they are going to do. Now the First Minister very cleverly has us at odds because he suggested the other night, "Wait for our estimates. There's going to be a tremendous input into agriculture." Well, Mr. Speaker, how can we now intelligently make any suggestions, make any reasonable comments on that short paragraph in agriculture in the Throne Speech until we see in fact what this new injection is comprised of? I know for a fact that just off the bat the natural increase in the rise of pay to the people working in the Department of Agriculture is going to increase the estimates this year. I know for a fact that just the additional number of studies that the Minister of Agriculture has instituted is going to increase the agricultural estimates this year. I know for a fact the Executive Assistant the Agricultural Minister has is going to increase the agricultural estimates this year, but beyond that we have yet to hear whether this government is committed to carry on with a two or three million dollar agricultural complex involving a veterinary lab, diagnostic lab, which was a committed course of action by the previous administration. All we have talked about is an extension of some of the programs that the previous administration had on the books and were active.

Mr. Speaker, let me leave that subject of agriculture for a moment and I know that you would be disappointed, Mr. Speaker, I know that you'd be disappointed, Mr. Speaker, if on occasions such as this I arose in this Chamber and had occasion to speak and somehow or other didn't get into the question of the development of hydro resources and hydro power. I know I would be disappointing some of my colleagues opposite if I didn't do that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into that debate in its ramifications that we've had for the past several sessions. All I want to do, Mr. Speaker - and it's indicative of the government that we have today, in their whole attitude towards the economic development of this province - is point out to you how sad the situation has really become; how sad the situation has really become from a position, pre-NDP position if you want to call it that, (it kind of sounds good, like pre-de Gaulle position, or pre-this or . . .) from a pre-NDP position, of enthusiasm, of confidence, of using the God-given natural resources of our rivers and streams to produce abundance of power for the benefit of all Manitobans, of using the surplus of that power to help keep power at a reasonable price in this province, to help encourage high-powered industries into this province, from that kind of a position we in fact were committed to building a line to the south, which in its initial phases would import some power here but thereafter, with the full development of the Nelson scheme, would enable us to be somewhat in a position that our sister provinces of Alberta, or indeed Saskatchewan enjoy where we have a resource to export that can help our coffers, that means we don't have to lay the burden of taxation quite that heavily on all our citizens, that would be of benefit to all of us.

Now, you can't store energy. If the turbines are turning and we don't use it, we don't need it, make a deal with Minnesota or with our sister provinces for it. This was the position; this was the Roblin position, Mr. Speaker, when he envisaged the use of the great Nelson River for power development. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the position today? The position today, Mr. Speaker - and this is the tragedy of it - the position today right now, Mr. Speaker, is we have come right down to a debate as to whether or not in 1973, or maybe '74 or perhaps '75, when we turn on the light switch, will the light flicker or will it not.

MR. SCHREYER: Oh nonsense!

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, what do I read? The big debate is, you know, "When will Manitoba be short of power?" That's what we're debating now; that's what we're debating now. Mr. Speaker, that is what your appointed General Chairman of Manitoba Hydro is telling us. -- (Interjections) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, unless I am completely incapable of reading news accounts, unless I'm incapable of reading the position of government today, this is precisely the case. The whole argument of power has been reduced to the fact of "when are we going to run out?" And the assurance is from them that no, we won't run out; it won't be '73; we'll have enough for '74; we may be in trouble in '75 but by then we'll have something going - you know, this is the whole argument. You know, compare that to that kind of enthusiastic buoyant position of using our resources, you know; of providing jobs. Mr. Speaker, it's

(MR. ENNS cont'd)incomprehensible and this really saddens me, because it's from a government that I would like to believe, would like to believe has some pizzazz, you know, or has something going for them. But then, Mr Speaker, I should not be disappointed because essentially, you see, Socialists are awfully dull people; they're unimaginative people; they're unexciting people. Have you seen the latest Socialist beauty queen, Mr. Speaker? You know, I can't remember one.

So Mr. Speaker, I make this -- in fact I'll go one step further. The position of this government on hydro-electric power development is similar to - in fact they'll like this comparison - is similar to the reactionary position of the D. I. Campbell regime on the flood of 1950. Mr. Campbell said, the Premier of this province at that time after the disastrous 1950 flood said, "Well, it won't happen for another 100 years; we'll take a chance." Right now, Manitoba Hydro is saying, "This won't happen for another 54 years - we'll take a chance."

MR. SCHREYER: Nonsense, nonsense.

MR. ENNS: Well, I'll tell you what this administration did about it. We had the imagination to build a \$64 million ditch. Not only that but we transfigured the whole, the entire Red River Valley. Thousands of homes were moved from low-lying lands, with grants from the government, to high-lying lands. Every major community in the Red River Valley was suitably protected, dyked throughout this program, and we hear this kind of gibberish from these people about no concern for people. No concern for the lives of people, something like that.

We talk about shifts, we talk about -- Mr. Minister, I'm in full steam and let me go. Mr. Speaker, the First Minister the other night referred to the dramatic \$24 million shift in taxation. Mr. Speaker, he held it up as if this kind of shift has never occurred before in the history of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, just last year, admittedly it wasn't 24 but it was 15 million that was shifted. The per capita grant increase to the municipalities counted for \$5 million, infusion into the Foundation Program for another \$2 million dollars, and Mr. Speaker, the records - and the Minister of Finance knows it - the records will indicate there wasn't a single year of the last administration that went by that a shift of 15 to 20 million dollars wasn't made - wasn't made - either into the educational program, or health program, or into any other area -- (Interjections) -- Mr. Speaker, these are facts that they can argue about all they want, but Mr. Speaker, we did not make, I grant you, the kind of continual, political hay on it that obviously this government is trying to do, and Mr. Speaker, it worries me a little, if this is what they want to hang their hat on for the rest of their duration, well, God Bless 'Em. Maybe that's a pretty good peg to hang your hat on.

But even in that statement that the First Minister made there were some inaccuracies, although to my own personal satisfaction not enough consideration was being shown under our premium structure for the low income, for the fixed income person, but to suggest that there was none is also wrong. There was, as the first Minister will acknowledge, an exempting factor of 17.50 per individual or 27.50 per family. Anybody in that area paid no premium at all. So that when you say, members of the government, when you say that the premium structure hit all communities -- and you better watch this, because there were people under our heavy premium system that were not paying the premium either, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind admitting that I as an individual in my government would have pressed for an extension of that, would have pressed for a further alleviation, a further concern for the ability-to-pay principle which I have no specific argument with, but I point out to the members opposite that to make the blanket statement that they are so fond of making in every reference when we refer to present tax problems, that the exemption on the medicare premium embrace all, that that in fact is not quite true. Not quite true.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't really leave my friend the Member from Crescentwood and those of his group, when he -- I had the occasion to listen to him on one of the favorite programs that so many members of the opposite side like to get on, the By-line programs and so forth, and they had a great debate going on the free enterprise system.

MR. SCHREYER: Would you permit a question on hydro?

MR. ENNS: . . . and Mr. Speaker -- not at this moment, Mr. Minister -- and Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest to you and to make it evident to the members of the House what in fact really is going on. You see, the free enterprise system as a developer is quite okay by our friends the Socialists. Now why not establish another second, you know, International Nickel Mines? I can stand in this House here with assurance and tell you that within the next ten years there will be a major mineral discovery somewhere in the North. The mineral is

(MR. ENNS cont'd) there - it's waiting to be developed. Why don't you develop it? Why doesn't the Minister of Mines and Resources come in here with a . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: You want an answer?

MR. ENNS: . . . 15, 20, 30 million dollar -- (Interjections) -- let me finish please, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, you asked a question.

MR. ENNS: I want the Minister of Mines and Resources to come in here in his estimates showing how he dropped the first two million dollars into a dry hole, the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth, and maybe at the thirty-fifth found oil or something, or mineral. He's smiling, Mr. Speaker, because he knows darned well, he knows darned well that that's the kind of entrepreneurship, for that kind of development the free enterprise system is all the way okay. That's fine. It's only when the initiative, the imagination, the risk of the free enterprise system has made something successful, that the economic planners and professionals crawl out of the woodwork ready to take over.

MR. GREEN: . . . Nova Scotia. What happened to the steel mill in Nova Scotia?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I support the Honourable Member for Crescentwood's suggestion that he will sponsor a bill on Churchill Forest Industries to negate all the past contracts. I like that, because Mr. Speaker, I've heard enough of this nonsense about Churchill Forest Industries -- (Interjections) -- and I said it to the Minister of Finance publicly recently that if they don't like the deal, change it. There's no screaming rush on the part of the -- no screaming rush to master mind that particular industry because Mr. Speaker, oh no, our friends can get very selective when it comes to nationalizing industries. You know, when it comes to nationalizing an industry where the government, either through distribution or other ways, has control, and that's all, it's not too difficult to talk about setting up a Manitoba Drug Company and then by regulation stating in the Medicare Act that only Brand X, manufactured by the Manitoba Drug Company will be applicable, you know, as far as Medicare coverage. -- (Interjection) -- This is fine, and there's reason for that, so there's nothing wrong with that, you know, Mr. First Minister. I can understand that, you know. That's the area that they like to do. But Mr. Speaker, in the area, the highly competitive area of newsprint and pulp, they're only interested really in making as much politics out of it, certainly not interested in sending members from the Planning and Priorities Committee or anybody else to run up there and establish, and run successfully, a pulp mill. And Mr. Speaker, I really suggest, I really suggest that unless they're prepared, unless they're prepared to consider this seriously, we should be done with that question. I know the Minister of Finance's answer to this. He says, "Are you suggesting that we buy them out?" Well, I don't buy that. Until this government has made a serious attempt to negotiate with the companies involved.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . you suggesting that we buy them out?

MR. ENNS: No, I'm suggesting that you start negotiating with them.

MR. CHERNIACK: To buy them out?

MR. ENNS: . . . if you seriously think it's a bad deal, and you haven't done that and you won't do that. Don't tell me what it's going to cost to buy them out. If the price is too high, fine; that's another ball game; but you haven't tried it and you will not try it. You will not try it.

So Mr. Speaker, I leave that particular subject.

MR. SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member he has five minutes remaining.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm at the end of my speech. I want to remind my friend there though, the Socialists like to reap the hard work and the initiative that the free enterprise system can develop, and you know, keeping in that vein, I came across a short, very short poem by Goethe which is apropos to the situation and I conclude my speech with that.

As a man soweth, we must not hope to be mowers and to gather the ripe gold ears,
Unless we have first been sowers and watered the furrows with tears.

It is not just as we take it, this mystical world of ours.

Life's field will yield as we make it, a harvest of thorns or of flowers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I also add to the remarks of all the other members, to your office, to the First Minister's office, indeed to every member in this House, since I haven't rose in the Throne Speech debate since we all went to the people and had our own problems I'm sure in getting to have a seat here. But I think one member of this Assembly that was

(MR. McGREGOR cont'd) greatly missed at our fall session was the chap to my rear here, Mr. Sly, and I think we all must remember last fall when many people were up speaking, the switch was quite often being put on when that gentleman was sitting down, and I hope and pray that good health is part of you and it might be a good idea to have a good second man to back you up.

I won't try to cover my constituency because I have before. I could probably easily take out Hansard of '68 or '69 - '68 I guess - when I moved the Speech from the Throne, and my thoughts are no different now than they were then. There were some areas that I was critical of my government and I'm no different now. I don't change because my position in this Legislature changed. I am quite jealous, I think, of a rural member's position and how unfair it is in comparison to a city member. We see this here each and every day when the House is sitting. We're slugging it out and quite a few of our city colleagues, whether it be on the government side or the opposition, are home looking after their business, making some side money, and I have a lot -- (Interjection) -- Well I know.

A MEMBER: It's the truth.

MR. McGREGOR: I'll just leave that as it is. I had some thoughts on the resolution or Bill that the Honourable Member for Churchill had presented and later withdrew, because I think that there was a lot of meat there that would have been to the benefit of all Manitoba.

I would like to just touch a few things. We have a gun museum in my constituency on No. 1 Highway at Hargrave, a small town west of Virden, and an automobile museum that I haven't seen the equal in Manitoba, at Elkhorn, still on No. 1. There's many other things and many other events going on. We have an international convention in Virden that I'm international president of a particular highway association, but I'll probably mention that when those estimates are up.

We read much between the lines in the Speech from the Throne what's going on in the north, and I think we're all happy about this, especially in the area of Transportation, what we used to know as Highways. I hope that this is so, it isn't a continued neglect by the same department in western Manitoba because while we have pretty good highways, and over the last many years have had our little corner of the expenditures, we have some real problems there yet of short bits of highway that is on both sides of blacktop.

I think I have been proud to be a Manitoban, to be a member of this Assembly both through our nation's hundredth birthday and now our own province's, and I think back on the last year or two, probably when my Premier and my leader at that day was at Ottawa, he made an impression everywhere across Canada, and he set up priorities for the following one, and as all good men sometimes overshoot the runway, he and we either overshoot the runway or else got our political ship out in pretty heavy storms and we just haven't really got the rudder going right since. However we did see another, when time was come, a new Premier to go down there, and I was just as proud of Manitoba to see our new Premier, and he hit one thing that I haven't heard anyone mention yet and this is tariff, and this is a whole evening's talking or thinking, because over my years of being interested in politics I've been very jealous of those multimillionaire magnates in eastern Canada who not only influence that part of Canada, but influence our entire political society. I'm sure that I could say to most of the Liberal Prime Ministers, they've been in the hip pocket of that big business. We've seen a Premier from this province go down as national leader of this party over here; he didn't buck to those terms of reference and he was long into political oblivion. We've seen a premier of Ontario, a very fine appreciable guy; he was right in their hip pocket. He comes out west and we must really recognize that he politically didn't draw the sweat off a mosquito because of this. -- (Interjection) -- George Drew, the Conservative. And we've seen this go on, and to see my new Premier stand up and bring on the question of tariffs, I was just really thrilled because we talk about, members say we can cut taxes, everybody likes anybody's . . . , slash taxes, but we've got to replace that and if ever we think as a farmer, the things that we buy and how many big big nuts do we have to fill their pockets with bucks before we get that, and this is, you wouldn't say a direct tax, but it is because we as citizens are paying that tax. -- (Interjection) -- Well, you might say free enterprise, but it's a problem and it's not an easy one because we've seen many fine national leaders try to buck this system, but one day somebody will and whoever that one, anyone tries to, he's got my full support regardless of what political group he is leading or heading or being part of, because that is right for all of Canada. And I think in that same field we've seen John Diefenbaker not only become national leader but become Prime Minister of Canada, and he did buck that system. He was scared of nobody and we know what happened to him. Right within

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) his own ranks got out the knife; sling, sling, slash. I was in Ottawa when the old Camp -- (Interjection) -- Well, possibly -- (Interjection) -- and I know the people that voted different than I do when the Camp-Malone . . . on. I couldn't see why they were doing it but they were honest men and women, but they did it and I'm sure that their conscience must bother them today.

Another thing I hear through the news medium. You'd think I was trying to bid for the other side of this Legislature - it's not so. I just believe that I'm not here to be dictated to by anybody. My dictates are the 16,000 people in Virden constituency and I bring the message that they are giving me to bring, and when I hear of my new Premier and many areas of the news media, say I will not go to the people until defeated in this House. And I think over the last 20 years that we have had a weakness here in Manitoba; it is in allowing our First Minister to run to the people whenever the whims and whams of a particular situation arose, and I think -- (Interjection) -- All right, I've been watching myself for quite awhile. I'm down in the middle row. I was over there where I didn't have to look behind but maybe I have to look -- however, I think with that I just tried to bring my own thoughts, my thoughts for my constituency, on behalf of the Throne Speech. I wasn't up last fall and I wasn't up last winter but I thought we should give much room to the new boys around. And with that, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I want to follow in the tradition, time-long tradition, to address to you my kind respects. It's certainly much easier for a New Democrat to reflect objectively on your role in this House, and I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that you are doing exceedingly well. You are obliged from time to time to cope with the errors of a legislative novice such as I. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the introduction of the Report of the Committee on Statute Law Revision on opening day was not a personal endeavour on my part unilaterally to change parliamentary tradition. It was an honest error on my part, based on a misunderstanding as to the arrangement which I thought had been understood by the committee. It may be that some of the traditions of this House as manifest by the rules ought to be changed, and I want to assure the Honourable Member from Rupertsland that he has some support. However, I shall not deliberately endeavour to change the traditions, the rules, by deliberate error. I apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, for any embarrassment or concern occasioned to you arising out of my eagerness to respond and to acknowledge in fitting manner the excellence of a noble piece of work completed in our Centennial year.

The honourable members from The Pas and Point Douglas, as expected, added immeasurably to the social significance and import of the message to His Honour. Their words, sincerely conceived, articulately conveyed and warmly appreciated by members particularly on this side of the House, will form part of the historical tribute to the citizens of Manitoba who elected you, Sir, and all of us on June 25th, 1969. Mr. Speaker, this is a great moment in history for the Province of Manitoba. A New Democratic Government holding office in the Centennial of our province, to me, is a tribute not only to the dedicated efforts of those whose efforts culminated in our election victory but is also a tribute to the dedication of our social democratic predecessors. In their honour and in tribute to them I would like the indulgence of this House to reflect briefly on previous members of this House whose idealism and zeal for the improvement of our society provided the heritage and foundation of our movement in Manitoba.

The annals of this House, Mr. Speaker, record that Frederick John Dickson was first elected to the Manitoba Legislature in the year 1914. Frederick John Dickson was born in England; he was a Labour candidate for Centre Winnipeg in 1910 but was defeated by some 75 votes. He was first elected in the Legislature in 1914, re-elected in 1915 and 1920. Mr. Dickson was one of the most celebrated early members of the Legislature. I would like to refer you, Mr. Speaker, to some of the comments, the only annals that are recorded in respect to the proceedings of this House in the brief session of 1914. In his first speech in the special session -- I want to indicate to you the nature of the session. "The annals of the House indicate that the Manitoba Legislature yesterday," - this article was written in 1914 - "The Manitoba Legislature yesterday began and ended the debate on the Address" - that's a one-day session - "and discussed at considerable length the two measures which the government has introduced with respect to the bill under which a suspension of payments on real estate will be possible, and there was a sharp divergence of opinion between the speakers on opposite sides of the

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) Legislature. Both sides agreed as to the object desired, namely the protection of the poor man against the pressure of conditions over which he has no control, and the discussion arose out of the means to attain this end." Times haven't changed too much, Mr. Speaker.

The annals record that "F. J. Dickson, Winnipeg Centre, delivered a vigorous speech on the subject in the short time remaining before adjournment. An unlimited moratorium he said was bad. Its influence and credit would be most harmful. He nevertheless believed it would be necessary for the government to take some action along the lines suggested on account of the altogether unwarranted behaviour of the loan companies which were shamelessly pressing their clients." Mr. F. J. Dickson, the forerunner of me in this Chamber on this side of the House, was a vigorous exponent of the rights of the small man in our society.

The annals of the House next record the election on the Labour side of the House of George Armstrong in 1920. The annals record that George Armstrong was a carpenter. He was elected, first elected in 1920. His political affiliation - socialist.

One of the most famous legislators in this province from the point of view of the social democrats was William Ivan who was elected to the House in 1920 as a member of the Independent Labour Party. He was a Master of Arts, a Bachelor of Divinity, he was a Methodist minister and chiropractor, he was the founder and pastor of the Winnipeg Labour Church. He was a member of the Independent Labour Party and he was re-elected after the election in 1920, in 1922, '27 and '32. He was sentenced to jail on a charge of sedition arising out of the Winnipeg general strike in 1919, and many of you will recall the famous trial in connection with that strike when Mr. Dickson conducted his own defense and was acquitted of the charge that was levelled by the establishment of his day against the social democrats in Winnipeg.

The next famous social democrat elected to this House that I want to refer to is Arthur Ernest Moore, who was elected from the constituency of Springfield in 1920.

One of the next famous legislators, famous not only for having participated as a member of this House but also as a distinguished Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, was John Queen. He was elected an alderman of the City of Winnipeg in 1916 and served until 1921. His political identity - socialist. He was first elected to this House in 1920, re-elected in 1922, '27, '32, and '36. One of the significant points about his historical reference was that he was sentenced April 6th, 1920, to one year's imprisonment on a charge of seditious conspiracy arising out of the same Winnipeg general strike in 1919. While he was still an alderman in the City of Winnipeg - pardon me - he was sentenced while still an alderman in the City of Winnipeg.

One of the noble names in the history of the social democrats in this province is James Seymour Farmer who was a former Leader of the C.C.F. and was Minister of Labour in the coalition government of 1942.

James Aikin - a member of this House in 1936. James Aikin lived at 409 Winchester Street in my constituency. He was a member of this House as a member of the Independent Labour Party.

The annals then record the name of Marcus Hyman who was elected in this House in 1927 as a Labour representative.

And the rolls go on - Morris Grey. Most of you -- some of you at least had the pleasure of being in the House with him during the years 1941 through to 1962.

The Honourable Mr. Evans' predecessor from Brandon was Dr. Johnson who served in this House, a very distinguished representative who was elected in 1943. This man was distinguished not only for his work as a legislator, served as a medical missionary in the Philippines and was a distinguished citizen of this country.

And so the records go on, Mr. Speaker: Barry Richards, Wilbur Donyleko, Ernest Draffin, Edwin Handsford who was a Leader of the C.C.F. in this House, George Olive, Mike Sawchuk, Lloyd Stinson - a former Leader of the C.C.F. in this House, Donovan Swailes, Gordon Fines, John Hawryluk, Tony Reid, Peter Wagner, Mike Kawchuk; and these gentlemen served in this House with the same idealism and spirit that has culminated in the election of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, in this Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature the Throne Speech, to my way of thinking, does reflect to a remarkable degree the social consciousness of the New Democratic Party pioneers and predecessors in Manitoba. The Throne Speech indicates the concern of this government to move as quickly as possible to introduce legislation to ensure the fullest development of our human and economic resources. Development of a program for

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) the enrichment of the quality of life in Manitoba requires planning. Planning today requires consideration of all of the complexities, of program effects on every aspect of society including our physical environment. For far too long, Mr. Speaker, has our society tolerated and acquiesced in single purpose exploitation of both our human and material resources. For decades in this country society was seemingly prepared to accept the view of the exponents of industrial enterprise at any cost. Today, modern society can no longer tolerate single purpose planning of resource utilization and social programming. We no longer live in a society where cheap labour and a give-away resource program can be tolerated. By cheap labour programs the development of higher skills is frustrated. Our technological school graduates will be trained for use in a higher wage environment. Expansion of low wage industry may be desirable if the purpose is to create jobs, if that is the sole criteria.

My honourable friend who is no longer present, my honourable friend the Honourable Member from River Heights keeps haranguing about jobs. Oh yes, he's in the backbench there. He keeps haranguing about jobs, jobs apparently at any price. He seems to argue that the ends justify the means regardless -- (Interjection) -- Yes, apparently you have some socialists over there for the rich -- regardless of the cost, CFI will produce some jobs. Well what about these jobs? Where are the people coming from? My understanding is by far the majority of the people who are employed come from Ontario and Quebec. Jobs, jobs at any price. It doesn't matter who we bring, whether we have to fly them in, as long as there are jobs in Manitoba the Honourable Member for River Heights is happy. It wouldn't matter . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. MACKLING: It wouldn't matter, Mr. Speaker, if the jobs produced low wages provided he could show jobs. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the program of this government is being fashioned, and the program that will be created will provide jobs of quality, not jobs for jobs' sake.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that in a significant way my honourable colleague, the Honourable Joe Borowski, has indicated a technique of job creation which the honourable members of the other side apparently - apparently - apparently couldn't conceive of in the many years that they were in office. In a very limited time the program that has been enunciated through his department has seen the provision of at least 450 jobs, and these people haven't been brought in from Ontario and Quebec, they have been people resident within Manitoba whose talents have been used to develop basic resource development - roads in the north, a vital criteria for the development of the exploitation of our natural resources, jobs that have seen the out-pouring of a total of approximately \$750,000 in real wages to people who otherwise would be looking to government for social assistance.

The honourable members on the other side of the House, and I confess even my colleague the Honourable Member from Crescentwood, are anxious to see a vigorous development of this party's program in respect to economic development. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the program developed by this government will be one that will produce jobs, not of token jobs in low wage industry. We're concerned for specific development which will produce a better quality of life in the Province of Manitoba. It is with this singleness of purpose that we approach the question of the economic development in Manitoba.

I want to assure my honourable friend that in respect to the Churchill Forest agreement that there are many complications that apparently they hadn't considered, and not the least of which, not the least of which was the fact that with the Honourable Member from Gladstone's anxiety to proceed with the flooding of Southern Indian Lake, that in all likelihood from my understanding a good deal or a fair percentage of timber that Churchill Forest Industries would look to would be flooded; and compensation would have to be provided. There are many many factors that have arisen from the Churchill Forest Industries agreement which the honourable friends on the other side did not consider. It was certainly an ill-conceived agreement.

Shortly after we were in office, I want to tell my honourable friends the kind of situation that developed from the implementation of that program. His Worship Mayor Harry Trager, the Mayor of The Pas, called in crisis mood, had to have assistance immediately. Why? Because of the fact that many employees, some of whom spoke very little English, coming from campsites at the Churchill Forest Industries construction site at The Pas were creating problems in The Pas. He needed police help and he needed it desperately. Why didn't they have the money to hire sufficient police? Well because of the tax concession that they were induced to give by the former administration. So this government immediately had to send

March 24, 1970

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) assistance to the Town of The Pas, and the story is old now of the assistance that has been looked to by The Pas, to this government, and the pleading that this government has had to make to the Federal Government to provide assistance under the DREE plan for the basic infrastructure of The Pas that has been rendered absolutely vital for the development of that area. This industry has brought terrific problems, terrific problem to the people in The Pas, terrific problem to the Province of Manitoba. Jobs we need, yes, but we have to weigh the social consequences of every industrial development.

My honourable friend and his former administration were most anxious that industry proceed apace regardless of the consequences. He would be prepared, I'm sure, and many of his former administration, to provide the maximum utilization of resources at the least cost. He believes in rapid industrial expansion regardless of the cost to the rest of the country. This is the kind of thinking that has seen tremendous pollution of our resources, our air and our waters, and this is the kind of exploitation that has seen our resources sold for a pittance to foreign corporations. This is the kind of development that is singular significant to them, development at any cost. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the development that this government brings will be measured in the terms not only of its job creation but the value, the social consequences and the value to our society as a whole.

. Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, when I left the House during the dinner hour I met my friend the Member from Lakeside who had made some pretty good accusations against the Member from St. Boniface, and I said to him: Harry, you have just declared war. His answer was: I didn't know that we ever stopped the war. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is quite indicative of our approach to our responsibility here, of our different personalities. I've tried to come in with an open mind at every session to look at the proposed legislation and to listen to what is said from all sides of the House, and I think that I've been known as a fairly independent minded person. But it is obvious that the Honourable Member from Lakeside, who of course is not in his seat at this moment, I think it's quite obvious that he holds a grudge and that he remembers I was the one responsible for his losing his Cabinet post. He had to let go of the power that he enjoyed so much.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the accusations that he made were quite serious accusations. When you talk about Judas you're talking about a traitor, you're talking about betraying, and I think that you must admit, Mr. Speaker, that to say the least this is not quite parliamentary. I think that most of the members of this House would have been up protesting these accusations, but, Mr. Speaker, I do not protest, I feel that if you can dish it out you've got to be able to take it. I've never asked for any quarter and I don't intend to give any. I think that I could well take care of myself. That doesn't mean, Mr. Speaker, that I don't intend to defend myself.

Now the honourable member wanted to justify his accusation by saying, well after all Judas betrayed Jesus Christ; he crucified Jesus Christ. Well before today, Sir, I knew that a few of them thought they were God but I didn't think they thought they were Jesus Christ, because they're the only ones that were crucified. They were crucified and they had to let go of this power. They asked for a mandate; they weren't given this mandate and they had to let go -- (Interjection) -- What's that?

MR. WATT: We're still the same ship.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh sure, you're still in the same ship.

MR. WATT: How did you get over there? Did you swim?

MR. DESJARDINS: All right, I'll tell you why, I'll tell you how, because -- (Interjection) -- Did you ask me a question? Did you ask me a question?

MR. WATT: Sure.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well listen to the answer.

MR. WATT: I'll listen.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. I'll tell you why, because when I entered politics I felt that my duty was to the people of my constituency and the people of Manitoba. I believe in certain principles; I believe in liberalism and I still believe in liberalism, and I do not believe that I was married to any party and I felt that parties were there to serve the people and not to be made the slave of the people. I agreed with the editorial of the Tribune not too long ago and I congratulate them for their courage, and they said that many newspapers and many people in the past have been members of a certain party because their father or their grandfathers were a member of this party. And they felt that this is passe, that now you should judge the people on their actions and on their programs. Certainly I believe in liberalism. I believe in free enterprise; I believe in competition; but I also believe, my honourable friend, that my first responsibility is to the people that elected me here today. And I also believe that the role of a politician, of an elected member is to serve all the people of his constituency and of his province. I believe that you should not try to keep and try to cater to a privileged class. I'm against this and this is what I was told that liberalism was when I entered politics eleven years ago, and I have never had any reason to change my mind on this, not at all.

In the last election my choice was very easy, very easy. In which way could I help the people of my constituency and the people of Manitoba, in which way could I work for democracy and in which way best could I serve liberalism? The choice wasn't very hard to make; either support Weir in office, the man who asked for a mandate, was refused this mandate and whose cronies here tried to influence him to keep power, a man who did not agree with the priorities that I have, a person yet who went to Ottawa and talked and did everything he can to hurt, to work against national unity.

MR. WATT: That's not true and you know it.

MR. DESJARDINS: That is true and you know it. That is true. He made his name then, he made his name then. Where did it get him? His victory was shortlived and my choice was

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.).... between this man who was practically making it acceptable to have prejudice. We were running backwards in this province. All we had gained during the years of Roblin we were losing them in a very few short months, in a very few short months.

A MEMBER: Baloney.

MR. DESJARDINS: Baloney, eh? You might say baloney all you want, but the proofs are right there and my choice was between that man and Mr. Schreyer. This was my choice. I had no alternative. -- (Interjection) -- What's that?

MR. CRAIK: when you made your first decision.

MR. DESJARDINS: What decision?

MR. CRAIK: talk about liberalism before Roblin.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. CRAIK: You made your decision.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. CRAIK: Tell us about that.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. I just finished telling you that I believe -- (Interjection) -- Well are you going to tell me or am I going to tell you? Am I going to tell you or are you going to tell me?

MR. CRAIK: You brought the topic up.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right, I'm going to tell you. All right, when I first entered politics I was told that the Liberal Party had a chance to exercise their own conscience, and this was going on all the time that I was there.

MR. CRAIK: Did you?

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. CRAIK: Did the Liberal Party?

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right, that's right, exactly what happened. Now if you really want to talk about treason and opportunists, why don't you people stand up and tell about the offers that you people made me to go and join you? Come on. Bring it in the open. If you're not a bunch of gutless wonders, bring it in the open.

MR. CRAIK: You seem to be....

MR. DESJARDINS: Tell me about offering me a Cabinet post, about putting all kinds of things that I had wanted that you always were afraid to answer, and you, as Minister of Education, tell me that.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: What's your point of privilege?

MR. CRAIK: On a point of privilege, the honourable member has made the suggestion here....

MR. DESJARDINS: Not a suggestion, an accusation.

MR. CRAIK: to explain the offer that he was made to go into some Cabinet. The only place I've ever heard of that....

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member please state his point of privilege?

MR. CRAIK: Well he's asked me the question, he's made the accusation and it is a very very serious one.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not believe the honourable member has a point of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: The only place that it's ever been heard is from him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. DESJARDINS: It was all right when I was called Judas.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, order.

MR. DESJARDINS: It was all right when I was called Judas. You weren't standing up then on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: So sit down and take it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't believe that the Honourable Member for Riel did have a point of privilege, and I'm sure that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would prefer to continue with a minimum of interruption.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's immaterial to me, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Carry on, Larry.

MR. DESJARDINS: Let's talk about the deal, let's talk about this, because when you're talking about Judas you're talking about betrayal. And who am I betraying? Certainly not myself

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)...or my constituents or Manitoba or Canada, and certainly not democracy. Do you think I want to promote in power a party fighting amongst themselves? A party of two or three leaders? A party of gutless wonders? -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker -- all right, Mr. Speaker, I said a party of gutless wonders. And I'll tell you here, Mr. Speaker, that last year the smart, the politicians on this side thought we're going to trap this Desjardins, he hasn't heard the end, and they brought a terrific resolution on the monarchy. I accepted that; I think an awful lot of the Queen. But I brought in an amendment because I felt that in Manitoba we had to look at everything, look at all the Manitoba mosaic. Now what did these people do? They're talking now about the House Leader taking a different approach on some of these resolutions. They don't like it when they say "we feel that the government should consider the advisability", but they don't want the government to consider the advisability, they want to bring all kinds of things and they want you to vote yes, yes, yes, without taking any priorities at all. All right, let me tell you what some of the people did and you can find this in Hansard if you feel that. . . .

MR. JORGENSON: It's upside down, Larry.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well it must be a Conservative scribbler. Be patient, it's coming. On October 10th, Mr. Speaker, this is what you said: "The proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell."

"Mr. Graham: (that's the Member from Birtle-Russell) Mr. Speaker, I don't think I will say any more at this time, I'll just let this go to a vote."

Then we had a recorded vote. But, Mr. Speaker, the name of Mr. Graham, the Honourable Member from Birtle, is not there because he skipped out of this House. And he was in the House because he said, "I'll let it go to a vote." This is what I call a bunch of gutless wonders.

And now they're talking about tradition. "Tradition," they said, "Let us not break away from tradition." After all, the big-shot politicians out there in the back used to vote not necessarily for or against a private member's resolution because they used to bring all kinds of amendments, most of the time out of order. And now this government is saying this: you ask us to consider the advisability of doing this. They said all right, we're going to treat this like second reading of a resolution. If we're definitely against, if we're definitely against the principle we will say no. Now if we think that it merits a second look we will take it into consideration, but we have the responsibility of deciding what our priorities should be so we will bring in our own program in order. But that's not good enough for them because they love to go and say, Ah ha, they voted against this, and they think that because they were too stupid, I guess, in the past to look at it this way, look at the words, they think that whatever they did that's tradition and you must follow those people from out there and do exactly what they did. I don't think that we have to follow what they say at all. They asked for a mandate and they were refused this mandate.

Now the honourable member who is back in his seat sleeping made some accusations. I was expecting this. And I might tell you that when I refused to give him the support I was threatened: we'll be waiting for you. Well this is fine. They can look at my record any day of the week. They can attack all they want one by one or altogether. I'm not worried a darned bit. But when they've got to try to look at something and bring something in like the honourable member did this afternoon, well he is forcing me to tell you, Mr. Speaker, exactly how much I've profited personally since the last election. You know, Mr. Speaker, that since the Premier named me his Legislative Assistant that I've given at the very least 75 percent of my time to provincial business, the business of the province, without criticizing, without receiving one single cent - without receiving one single cent. I've been shooting off my mouth when I was sitting there because I believe in certain priorities and now I'm given a chance to fight for these priorities, and damn it, I'm going to fight for that.

That's not all, Mr. Speaker. I was asked to represent the Manitoba Government of the Province of Manitoba in Ottawa three times. I might tell my honourable friend that I paid my own plane fare, my hotel and my meals every single time I've been there. Now he's talking about that trip to Africa. Well the party that I betrayed invited me to join the delegation, because it was Mr. Trudeau that invited Manitoba, and in one of his letters even mentioned my name, that I join them. This was a joke, going to Africa. What is the honourable member saying? He says, oh I know he'll say it's a great thing going to Africa. Well it's a great thing, but I'll tell you that once you've been there you come back here in Manitoba very happy of being a Manitoban and a Canadian and you appreciate your country a heck of a lot more, and

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... you realize that if you're in a position to do something for the citizens of your province and your country you should do it because there's a lot of people suffering out there, and mind you, free enterprise is going pretty well, they've got slave labour out there too. It's going quite well.

Now I might say that this government here had been invited by Ottawa to send members of a Canadian delegation to these Francophone countries to discuss health with these underprivileged countries. They ignored this invitation; there wasn't even a reply to the Federal Government, and now they think it's a big joke. Well it didn't cost the people of Manitoba a cent except what they paid in their federal taxes, and I was a member and very proud of being a member of the Canadian delegation. And one of the main reasons that Manitoba wanted to send somebody is because we wanted to show Quebec that we were not separatists, that we believe in a strong Canada and that the province could be part of a delegation. I was there as a member from Manitoba in a delegation of the Canadian Government, the country of Canada. I don't apologize for that. If he thinks, the honourable member, is a little jealous, if he feels that it was a lot of fun, he's wrong. Educational, yes. And I'm awfully glad that I had this chance to go and I hope that other members would have the same chance. But if he thinks I was going to the Follies Bergères and all these things, he's got another guess coming. He's got another guess coming. I made an awful lot of contacts out there with people of other provinces, and I don't apologize a darn bit. It didn't cost the people of Manitoba one thing, one cent, and I was invited by the party that I was supposed to have betrayed.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we talk about Judas; we talk about traitors; because Judas was supposed to have sold his country, or his God, or his Master, not for gold but for silver, as my honourable friend can read in the Bible. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, if I was looking for gold or silver, or personal recognition, I'd be sitting on that side today or maybe on this side with the rest of those donkeys, I don't know. I'm getting fed up with everybody here on that side worrying about the past. They have not forgotten that once they were Cabinet Ministers, and the weakest Cabinet Minister that I've seen in 11 years was my honourable friend from Lakeside. They kicked him out of practically every post - the great friend of the people, the great friend of the north. He gave half the north away and he wanted to flood the other half. And a good friend of them, a lawyer by the name of Buchwald, told them that they had a dishonest government, that it was deception. Well, what did my honourable friends say? "Well, you must admit we're not completely dishonest." That's somebody that's half pregnant, Mr. Speaker. The same thing.

Now he's talking about -- he talked about the Floodway and he talked about all kinds of things, but he's dishonest again, because if he remembers, a member of the Liberal at the time, and Mr. Campbell included, chastized Roblin for flying off the bat and saying, "We will go it alone" and that cost Manitoba an awful lot more money. And Saskatchewan, who wasn't going alone, was getting all kinds of help in those days for projects such as this, and Manitoba got very little because Roblin got mad and said -- You had your chance, Harry, sit down.

MR. ENNS: Just a correction on a matter of privilege. The federal contribution to the Floodway was substantial.

MR. DESJARDINS: It was not substantial. It wasn't what it should have been.

MR. ENNS: The order of some \$30 million.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if he's got a point of order, I'll sit down; if not please ask him to go back to sleep.

This is exactly what happened and this is why the Liberals were not satisfied with the former administration. These are the people that, when they were sitting on this side of the House, what were their programs? "We will go to Ottawa and ask for more money." The former Minister of Industry and Commerce when we had the TED Report, all he said, "We need more money from Ottawa" and he cried and he cried and he cried: "More money from Ottawa." The great defender of the people. And all we hear from this group, oh there's traces of McCarthyism, talk about the Communists, talk about all these people. We don't talk about the Birch Society but they bring everybody that's left of that, and that's practically everybody. It might be this little group in Manitoba and the rest are left of them, and they've tried everything to stay in power; everything to stay in power; and as I said the other night, the Honourable Member from River Heights, who was the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, used to say, "Don't say a word against my department, against our government, because the people will be shaky. They'll be afraid to come in Manitoba. You're working against Manitoba." What has he

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.).... been doing, he and his Legislative Assistant? Maybe we should have an Order for Return to see how much he's paying him, I don't know, or his ghost writer. What has he been doing? Running around, across the province, to try to pin something on the government, try to antagonize the government, trying to force them into making mistakes.

That's working for Manitoba? That's working for the people of Manitoba? Trying to tell them, come on, tell us you're not interested in businessmen; and to him, being interested in businessmen, he'd say, pay as little tax as possible; use people for slave labour. This is progress. You see, Mr. Speaker, the steam roller, knocking everything and everybody down? Water flooding all north Manitoba. But that's progress. That's progress, because my friend, the big business, will be able to say, this is a hell of a place to come; you don't have to pay anything for your employees. You get everything for nothing. You get a blank cheque. You get a licence to steal. And that is the program of my honourable friend. This is the program of my honourable friend. Stands up and asks about 13 or 17 questions every day, always.... Minister of Industry and Commerce. After all, we should notice, he was the former Minister; he was the dictator of the former government. My honourable friend from Riel stood up last week. "Did we sign this when I was the Minister?" That's the leadership — that's being on your toes, Mr. Speaker. Well, let me ask it a different way? "Didn't you sign that deal?" Three strikes and you're out; three strikes and you're out. You knew. You were defending the interests of the people of Manitoba, the interests of the people of your constituency? You didn't even know what was going on? I don't blame you too much because I think the only one who knew what he was signing was probably the Minister out there.

MR. CRAIK: Can I ask a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, no, no. Unless he's got a point of order. Oh, no. I've got a few minutes left.

MR. CRAIK: Don't spoil the story.

MR. JORGENSON: It's the first time I've seen a windmill run by water.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. Let's try it. I don't know all these jokes about the hen and I don't stand here after practising in front of a mirror and try to talk like Diefenbaker, and I don't tell everybody "When I was in Ottawa." The John Barrymore of the Conservative Party.

This is another one that's really — election time he's afraid of everybody — (Interjection) — Your party didn't do too well. What was the reason for that, Harry? — (Interjection) — Oh. Well, this is indicative — they think this is a big game. He wants to look in the other gallery now. Well, I'll tell you something. You'll have your fill of that because you'll be there for a hell of a long time, and you better remember these stories of when you were the Minister. Of course you never kept any portfolio too long; you were kicked out of them so damn fast.

This is it. You know, Mr. Speaker, if you dare say something that you want to look after the interests of the people of Manitoba, the ordinary citizen, you're a Socialist; and if you don't want to say to these big business, well here, what do you want? You want the north? Take the north. If you want us to pay for training some of your employees, we'll pay. How many months? Seven months? This is fine.

This is a great program? This is the leadership of these people on this side of the House, and they're very proud of that; very proud of their achievements. And then all of a sudden everybody's interested in agriculture. Mr. Speaker, I don't know a darned thing about agriculture and there's at least 28 members on that side that know less than I do. I've been here for 11 years; I've seen all kinds of talk about this. I was in the Liberal Party when they tried to bring in resolutions, where they brought a certain member from the west and they said all right, what is it that you want? But it's such a difficult problem — and it is a problem. It has nothing to do with socialism or right-winger. It's try to sell the farmers' wheat. Try to sell their wheat. Now if you don't get a price in a certain place, I read where they're burning potatoes in Idaho. Now the Federal Government, if they were going to try to help you, they're going to pay you money. Now, I don't know — my friend doesn't like that. He says they tell you, go and raise cattle. Well, that's what he's doing. He doesn't want too much competition in that field. He doesn't want that.

MR. ENNS: I'll take all the competition you can give. Go into Shorthorns. We've already got Angus here, Hereford there — try Shorthorns, or maybe better Charolais, the imported breed.

MR. DESJARDINS: Isn't he intelligent? He named three different kinds of cattle, Mr.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... Speaker. That's the former Minister of Agriculture. That's my boy! No wonder he's got the...

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to demonstrate my point.... considerable length on that point. Another 20 breeds, if you want them.

MR. DESJARDINS: Would you mind sitting down? You know what tradition is. You never stand up and interfere with a speech. Then follow that tradition. You know, straighten out your tie and just listen a minute. -- (Interjection) -- Thanks very much. There's the former Speaker that told me I was doing all right so I must be doing all right.

There's the Minister of Agriculture, the former Minister of Agriculture. What did you do last year? What did you do when you were here?

MR. WATT: Do you want me to make a speech?

MR. DESJARDINS: You've got one minute; I'm sure you can say it all in half a minute.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, does the honourable member want me to make a speech now?

MR. DESJARDINS: What did he do? He cried to Ottawa like he's crying now.

MR. ENNS: He went....

MR. DESJARDINS: What's that?

MR. ENNS: He went to Vancouver and got the grain moving.

MR. DESJARDINS: I went to Africa, so there.

MR. ENNS: Did you move any grain in Africa? What did you move in Africa?

MR. DESJARDINS: Great, Mr. Speaker, he went to Vancouver and the province paid for it. Now these people are talking about their programs and all they did was cry that the Federal Government wasn't giving them enough money. They had a propaganda sheet, the Spivak Broadcasting Studio, that was an innovation of the former government. They had more people giving different propaganda sheets, and so on. Now my honourable friend has to do it alone with only two or three different ghost writers.

MR. ENNS: The propaganda machine is still there, isn't it?

MR. DESJARDINS: Don't need propaganda because you did all the damage you could; the people turned you out. The people turned you out. The people turned you out, Harry. Too bad. I'm sorry.

MR. ENNS: But it's still there.

MR. DESJARDINS: The Minister said -- you can see how they keep talking about ghost writers. This is really something. My honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose adjourned the House on a matter of vital importance. The Minister of Industry and Commerce was afraid to talk. The Leader didn't say anything. Now two days after, when his friend furnished him his speech -- and you did a poor job of reading that...., they decide all of a sudden they'll have another way, they'll have another kick at the cat, they're going to come in in another way. -- (Interjection) -- And aren't you sorry I am, eh? Aren't you sorry because there's only a minute and you won't stand up. -- (Interjection) -- Is that not tradition? Thanks very much. I'm glad you appreciate that, my honourable friend from Lakeside.

Now this was the excuse of bringing another vote of non-confidence. Now you remember, Mr. Speaker, the day we opened the session, the members of the Conservative Party were asked what they thought and they thought well this was a great speech, and all of a sudden they add I think three or four different votes of non-confidence, and this is just a chance to cry and to prevent this government from bringing any programs. Now they seem to think -- and I'm awfully pleased that I heard the Member from Virden, I think, speaking. I must congratulate him because he spoke on his own and he said what he had to say and I'm sure he didn't caucus his speech. Not more than the honourable friend from Crescentwood.

I'll tell you something. I don't mind about people speaking freely, and you're not going to get under my skin by calling me names and so on because I'll have the guts to stand up here and speak for what I believe in.

MR. ENNS: I didn't caucus my speech either, Larry.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I don't know; by some of the things I saw I could detect help from some of your colleagues. No, because I think, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to catalogue myself and say there's three holes, I must get in one of them; I'm a Socialist, or I'm this, or I'm that. I'm ready. I've accepted to support this government. It was only then that I was invited into the caucus. I don't agree with everything that was said and not all the members agree with me. I can tell you this, though, Mr. Speaker, that to believe in liberalism, as I continue to do, I haven't found it hard to be part of that caucus at all. So far I have found it

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... quite easy, quite easy, Mr. Speaker, and the day that comes that I can't support certain things, they'll be the first ones to know and the members of this House will know also. There's no deep dark secret there. There's no deal. It might be that next election I'll have opposition from the New Democratic Party. That's fine. There's no deal.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 9:30 and our rules provide that a certain question be put at this time. Moved by the Honourable Member for The Pas, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, that an humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows: We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address us at the opening of the present session.

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be engrossed and presented by such members of the House as are of the Executive Council, and the Mover and Secunder of the Address.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates of sums required for the services of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971 and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the said message together with the estimates accompanying same be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I intend to introduce the next motion and I ask leave to make a brief statement, as has been done in the past two sessions to my recollection.

MR. WEIR: Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Agreed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the estimates of the expenditures for 1970-71 now before you, call for the appropriation of a record sum of \$448,043,500, being an increase of \$49.6 million over the amount of \$398,437,087 approved for 1969-70 at the last session of the Legislature. To compare one year with the other, the increase of 49.6 million in estimated expenditures should be reduced by 19.1 million, representing the increased payment to the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Corporation. The 1970-71, the payment will be provided for on a twelve month basis for the first time. In the year closing, only four to five months had to be provided for. On this comparable basis the projected increase in estimated expenditures amounts to 7.6 percent.

While the form of the estimates, which are now being distributed to honourable members, have not been changed for fiscal 1970, the members of this House will be interested to know that a new method has been used this year for the first time in arriving at the figures now before you. This system is properly called P.P.B.S. meaning Planning, Programming, Budgeting System and is more commonly known as program budgeting. The system lays much more emphasis on the over-all planning function, the setting of program and departmental objectives, and consideration of alternative methods of achieving those objectives at least cost to the public. The amounts finally approved by Cabinet after a series of intensive reviews were approved on a program basis. For this year the approved amounts were then translated by departments back into the customary form of appropriations and sub-appropriations that we've all been accustomed to to date.

The concept for estimates review has been to carry it out within the context of a five-year forecast of revenues and expenditures submitted by departments for the first time in 1969. A beginning has been made. The beginning was actually made under the former government and is still in the process of being carried out as a trial basis. We are finding certain areas where we have to expand or improve but we do hope to carry on with these new procedures, refining and improving them in order to approach the problem of allocating funds in an informed and responsible manner. As a result, we expect that the form of these estimates will probably be

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)... changed in the future to reflect the program type of evaluation and control now being carried on. The estimates would then carry additional explanatory information regarding the objectives of each program.

The members of this House will also be interested to know that as a result of the previous government's reorganization, the financial accounting functions formerly performed by the Comptroller-General's Department have been assumed by the Provincial Accounting Branch of the Department of Finance. The new system of expenditure voucher control will be instituted in all departments effective April 1st, 1970, known as computerized voucher accounting. This system will provide continuous information to departmental and central management, and will permit more efficient and effective control in the disbursement of public funds. Allied with this system will be the assignment of more financial responsibility and accountability to departmental managers.

Now I'd like to say a word on the subject of shared-cost programs. I must again alert the House that the Federal Government continues to pursue withdrawal and disengagement actions in respect of their direct financial involvement in major joint programming with the province. The Federal Government has said specifically that they wish to renegotiate in a different manner all programs which they classify as open-ended. Federal legislative provisions for certain shared-cost programs such as ARDA, hospital construction, health grants and post-secondary education have expired or will expire within the next two fiscal years, and the future of these programs is most uncertain. Other programs are operating within restrictive ceilings on federal amounts, or within arbitrary allocations based on stringent federal cost control measures. These include CMHC funds, health resources funds and capital assistance for occupational training facilities for adults. Special problems are also being encountered in respect of the cost of providing services to our Indian people. Given these circumstances of uncertainty, and quite possibly conflict in the federal-provincial shared-cost field, it is most difficult to plan future expenditure programming in these areas of joint endeavour.

Mr. Speaker, may I just for a moment mention that the preparation of the estimates was an onerous task. The Management Committee and the Budgeting Branch of the Department of Finance worked hard because the time was shortened due to the lateness of the summer session, and I do feel that they are entitled to recognition for the hard work, the dedication, the overtime which they spent in getting the estimates together in such a form that they could be reviewed by Cabinet -- by Management Committee first, by Cabinet, and have ready and printed to present to the House this evening.

These estimates now tabled total \$448,043,500.00. They reflect this administration's view of the proper allocation of financial resources to best serve the varied needs and interests of our province and its people at this time. Inherent in our approach is a desire to provide social justice for all Manitobans and to provide an economic climate conducive to expanded growth and diversification of this province's economy. Detailed review of these estimates and legislation to be introduced later in this session will illustrate more adequately than anything I can say at this moment what this administration has in mind, what we hope to accomplish with the cooperation of all members of this House. I look forward to presenting to you in the near future our proposals for ways and means to meet these proposed expenditures. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I commend these expenditure estimates to the study of the Committee and I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that this House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Before we act on the House Leader's motion to adjourn, can the House Leader advise the House as to the order in which the departmental estimates will be considered?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I advised honourable members by note that the first department that will be called will be the Department of Labour, the second department called will be the Department of Agriculture, and I will be giving my honourable friends further information by tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNLACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just add, I've already notified the leaders of the two opposition parties that it is my intention to bring the Capital Supply bill and the Interim Current Supply bill in as quickly as I can because they should be dealt with this month.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House was adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.