

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 22, 1974

BILL 34

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pursue with my comments from where we left off before lunch and continue, Mr. Speaker, with a matter I think is of utmost importance to the rural communities and that is the farmers in this province. I have a letter that I would like to read and it relates to the ballot that the Minister of Agriculture sent out to some 35,000 farmers a week and a half ago, which included a letter and accompanying that letter was a ballot that they were asked to sign, to give the Minister some indication as to how they felt about - I think more the Minister's own feelings on this matter than how they felt themselves. Well, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Agriculture the other day if he had consulted with any farm groups or individual farmers before he decided to compose this ballot and the letter that was sent out, and the answer he gave me, Mr. Speaker, that he has had an ongoing process of consultation with the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board in Ottawa for the past two years.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the answer I was looking for. I was certainly fully informed as to his contacts with the Department of Agriculture or the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board in Ottawa and I do not feel that the answer the Minister gave me was the one that should have been forthcoming. But rather I was referring to a specific matter here, Mr. Speaker, namely the letter and the ballot that he sent out and I felt that it had no relationship to the ongoing discussions that he had with the Minister, Mr. Lang. Because, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that was a case where the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba was trying to reason and negotiate; it was rather more or less - to me it was a confrontation that he was carrying on. I think I said once before, and I think it bears repeating, that because of his Coarse Grains Commission that he established in Manitoba a few years ago, has not worked out as he hoped it would do. Because, Mr. Speaker, I can recall not so many weeks ago that he was advertising in the paper, begging the farmers to use that facility, and about all it is is a board that's established to provide jobs for a few of his friends and also to collect one cent on every bushel that any one handles through that board.

We've never been told, Mr. Speaker, how much money the department's collected insofar as the responsibility of that board is concerned. It would be interesting to know just how much money has been collected, would indicate how many bushels have been handled through that board that he's established. And because of that fact that I had asked him this question about who he had consulted, I'm going to read a letter into the record, Mr. Speaker, that probably speaks for itself, and say to the Minister that it's most unfortunate that once again he has decided and embarked upon a path of trying to determine his policy in this area. So, Sir, I want to read a copy of a letter that was sent to the Minister's office by the Manitoba Farm Bureau and it reads: "Dear Mr. Uskiw: Your March 15th letter to the Manitoba Grain Producers and the accompanying poll regarding feed grain marketing methods came as a surprise to the Manitoba Farm Bureau. We believe that you have put Manitoba grain producers in an extremely difficult position. Firstly, your statement that eastern Canada has traditionally been the largest market for western feed grains is both misleading and inaccurate."

A MEMBER: Inaccurate to say the least.

MR. EINARSON: "In recent years the eastern Canadian market has consumed only about one-tenth of the feed grains produced in the Canadian Wheat Board designated area. Secondly, many proposals regarding the marketing of feed grains have been advanced and we are of the opinion that at this stage in time no one really knows what the Federal Government's feed grain policy for '74-75 will in fact be. Our assessment is that none of the feed grain marketing proposals which are seriously being considered even suggests complete removal of the marketing of feed grains from within the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board.

"Thirdly, your questions are worded in such a way as to leave them open to many interpretations. For example, does your first question comply the continued selling of wheat, oats and barley by the Canadian Wheat Board under the circumstances which existed in '72-73, or as they presently exist in '73-74? Anyone familiar with the details will realize that these situations are vastly different.

"Your second question is framed in such a way as to further compound the confusion. There is little doubt that the vast majority of Manitoba farmers favor having their export grains,

BILL 34

(MR. EINARSON Cont'd) that is wheat, oats and barley marketed by the Canadian Wheat Board. Your letter provides no information regarding the kind of provincial agency you are proposing or any indication of its proposed jurisdiction. It would appear therefore that you are asking for a blank cheque and ammunition to use in fighting possible federal policies. Furthermore, farmers do not appreciate being asked a question and then being threatened if the reply is not satisfactory as is the case in the suggestion that the Provincial Government will repeal the Coarse Grains Marketing Control Act leaving farmers to fend for themselves.

"We draw these important matters to your attention in the hope that we will be able to have discussions with you and to offer our recommendations at such time as policy decisions are necessary." Which is signed, "Sincerely, George E. Franklin, President."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the letter that the Minister has received from one of the official farm organizations in Manitoba. I think it lends a degree of very constructive criticism in that that it points out -- and you know, Mr. Speaker, the interesting part of this thing is before I ever saw this letter and had any idea that it was coming to the Minister, we in our party have been making similar comments to the press insofar as this ballot and the letter that was sent out to some 35,000 farmers in Manitoba.

Now I've heard nothing from the Farmers' Union of this province, it's national and of course they have their branch within the national organization, and here again I have no way of commenting on their behalf other than to say, and I said once before in this House, Mr. Speaker, that I am very concerned as to where the President of the National Farmers' Union is leading the farmers of western Canada and particularly those of Manitoba, when he talks about taking complete control of the industry. You can talk to any commodity group you like and this is not the wishes of those commodity groups in the Province of Manitoba. And I have also questioned -- because I qualify when I make that statement -- that I have concerned reservations that many of the members who are members of the Farmers' Union agree with their national president. I think, Mr. Speaker, we're heading on an extremely dangerous path when a ballot is sent out to farmers to cast in the way that this one was worded and the design of it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it won't be long before we'll know the results of that ballot because apparently the Minister is not going to heed to the suggestion from this side that we extend that deadline. I don't know whether the response is going to be as good or worse than the cattle check-off one was but however, Mr. Speaker, I become very concerned as to what decisions the Minister might take after knowing the results of that particular ballot.

And the other thing is we're talking about the amounts of money that are being spent in the Department of Agriculture, and I use this case, where this Minister is using the taxpayer's money, and I think the members of his colleagues who represent the City of Winnipeg should be asking him questions of how much he is spending to advertise and try to promote his own type of ideology, his own kind of socialism as he wants to apply it to our agricultural industry. And also may I add, Mr. Speaker, to try to control the lives and the way people live in our rural communities.

I am concerned also, Mr. Speaker, about the people in the cities, because as I said this morning it's a shameful thing when they have to bring home economists to come into the City of Winnipeg and help people decide ways of planning their own lives. And the Minister of Finance asked me what was my suggestion. Surely they can find some other method if this is the response that they're getting from the people, from citizens in the City of Winnipeg.

There's one other matter, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring in for the record, and we saw in today's paper where the Federal Government is talking about nationalizing the Canadian Pacific Railway.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. EINARSON: Yes, I hear a response of agreement, Mr. Speaker, when I make that comment, that Mr. Marchand as I understood, I heard it on the news this morning that he indicated that they haven't established a policy but they're definitely going to do this. I think they are serving notice to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

But let me say to my honourable friends, Mr. Speaker, if they want to help the farmers of western Canada, I suggest to them they're not going to help them by nationalizing the Canadian Pacific Railway. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I hear from the Minister of Industry and

BILL 34

(MR. EINARSON Cont'd) Commerce, "that's how much I know." Well I'd like to tell the Minister of Industry and Commerce in the past four or five years, in the past four or five years I've dealt with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian National Railway, Mr. Speaker, and I've had problems with both of them, when it comes to getting cars for the farmers to get their grain out to the elevators whether it's on the C.P. line or the C.N. line . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . added what the Minister knows and what you know, Henry, it will be about the same.

MR. EINARSON: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Industry and Commerce should get out to some farms and listen to what the farmers have to say. I talk to my honourable friends opposite who believe in nationalizing and you know the only reason they want to nationalize the Canadian Pacific Railway is because they think they're making too much money. But they're not concerned --(Interjection)-- We're in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends want to detract and try to camouflage their thinking, because you know, Mr. Speaker, we're getting to a point where it's just touch and go with them; because of the fact as I said this morning, you know the Prime Minister really is David Lewis, not Trudeau, this, Mr. Speaker, becomes a very grave situation. I'm sure that Mr. Marchand in his headlines that he makes in the paper today was wholly endorsed by David Lewis. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in no way are we going to solve the problem of the railway boxcars what have you by nationalizing the Canadian Pacific railroad, because the Canadian National is a Crown corporation, Mr. Speaker, and it's not operating any more efficient than the CPR. I speak from experience, Mr. Speaker; on many many occasions having to make calls to the offices of both railway companies, ask them why are cars not getting out to the various elevators. So, Sir, I think experience has a much greater value than theory that some of my honourable friends want to espouse across the way which has no meaning whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, we have a letter here also that I want to refer to on this matter ourselves. I want to read part of it where the Minister has stated in sending out these forms, his ballot to the farmers for giving their decision, and I want to quote here, Mr. Speaker, "the Minister of Agriculture has once again demonstrated" - and I'm using this from what I've just said - "the capacity to mislead and to distort. He is not able to handle his own responsibility here in the Province of Manitoba but continues to interfere in the area of federal jurisdiction that his colleagues in Ottawa apparently support." This comment, Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say to support my thoughts that I have just expressed, that what is going on in Ottawa is as important to us as what is happening in Manitoba, because they do have a relationship. Because of the fact of the peculiar political situation we have in Ottawa certainly doesn't lend itself - while some people might think that a minority government is good for the country, there are many people probably who cast their ballots for other than the NDP that must be very disappointed.

So, Mr. Speaker, with these few comments that I'm making this afternoon I sincerely hope that the Minister of Agriculture will take a change in his paths and directions that he is going to go in trying to solve the problems in the agricultural industry, because I want to say, Sir, that it's not just good enough to hand out a few dollars here and a few dollars there to farmers as grants and give the impression that he's doing so much and that they should be satisfied with that. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, this opportunity provides me in fact enough time to respond to my honourable friend the Member for Rock Lake. The Minister of Finance suggested that 10 minutes should suffice based on the kind of input that we got from the other side. But, Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the Minister of Finance that I have much more positive things to say and it will likely take a little more than ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the presentation of this afternoon and the discussions that we have had in this House in the last few days with respect to domestic feed grain marketing is something that my honourable friend is going to regret - and I'm talking about the Member for Rock Lake, the Member for Morris and all of the other members on that side, because they challenge the authenticity, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. USKIW: They challenge the authenticity of the statement that I issued to the farmers of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rock Lake would have not got up in this House this

BILL 34

(MR. USKIW Cont'd) afternoon had he listened to the farm broadcast at noon today, had he listened, Mr. Speaker. Because there, Mr. Speaker, it was announced - not announced by any official but reported by the CBC that there were indeed major changes to take place within the Canadian Wheat Board system, along the lines that I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, along the lines that I have indicated. (Applause)

I want to advise my honourable friends opposite that in a working document that is now in circulation in this city and within the grain trade that it is proposed that there shall be no quota for the domestic grain market, starting next August 1st. I want to point out to my honourable friend that the proposition is that any buyer in Canada will be able to buy grain from anyone in Canada and that there will be no Wheat Board controls in respect to those transactions. That's what my honourable friend ought to know, Mr. Speaker. The report indicates that the Canadian Wheat Board is in for great change and that its importance, Mr. Speaker, is going to be reduced. The importance of the Canadian Wheat Board is going to be reduced. That's the report of today. And the importance of the Canadian Livestock Feed Board is going to be enhanced, and in fact the Canadian Livestock Feed Board it is reported is going to have control over the Canadian Wheat Board. That is the report of noon today, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend now wants to say I heard it, he didn't. He will hear more of it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the rumour has it - and it has been reported on the CBC today - that not only will the Canadian Livestock Feed Board have maximum control over the movement of grain and over the Canadian Wheat Board, but the Canadian Wheat Board will not be allowed to sell grain anywhere in Canada to Canadian consumers, that the Canadian Wheat Board will only be allowed to sell to the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange. Mr. Speaker, the letter, the letter that the Honourable . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. USKIW: . . . Member for Rock Lake presented to this House this afternoon is disgraceful, because here you have - and I have a copy of it, it was sent to me - a letter presumably from the Farm Bureau, because it's on the Farm Bureau letterhead. Mr. Speaker, signed by the President of the Farm Bureau, Mr. George E. Franklin, disputing all of those things, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend tried to dispute with me the other day, and questioning my role, Mr. Speaker, But who is this gentleman? This gentleman sits on the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange presuming to represent the farmers of this province. It's a shameful, a disgraceful approach in representation of our farm people of this province. --(Interjection)-- You're darned right I'll . . . (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd thank the Minister if he would allow me to ask a question. The gentleman in question who he refers to, who does he represent when he says he sits on the Commodity Exchange?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would never presume that any farmer that sits on a Commodity Exchange is there to represent the farm community. (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I repeat the question, I would hope he would answer me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the antics of the gentleman that signed this letter bring disgrace to what is supposedly a farm organization as far as I am concerned, and certainly, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, I in my office could not lend any credence to any submission provided for this government or my office from someone that has an absolute conflict of interest, an absolute conflict of interest.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day when members opposite while never coming out in the open and saying, never saying let's abolish the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker, they have never really said it, but I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the activities of the Member for Morris when he was the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture for Canada some years ago, when the first crack in the Canadian Wheat Board was brought about, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Canadian Wheat Board told me then - well not then, since then, that their fear was that that was only the beginning of the dismantling of the Canadian

BILL 34

(MR. USKIW Cont'd) Wheat Board system. And they alluded to me, they alluded to me, Mr. Speaker, that it was a sorry state not only for the Canadian Wheat Board operation but for the producers whom they worked for and that in the long run it is going to hurt western Canada. And it was the Member for Morris, Mr. Speaker, that had something to do with the first crack in the Canadian Wheat Board system that was brought about in 1961.

Now I want to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to another event, another event. The sequence is very obvious, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Lisgar I believe, Member of Parliament for Lisgar, who enunciated Federal Conservative Party policy on the feed grain question a few months ago, indicated that he was in general agreement with the way in which Otto Lang was proceeding in the marketing of feed grains, in general agreement. So, Mr. Speaker, last week he took issue with me because I have put the question to the people of Manitoba, but the question that came here, "well who said there was going to be any change? How do you know what the change is going to be?" Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions with the Government of Canada and the ten provinces now for over two years on this issue and the power struggle is between the grain companies and eastern interests who want to bring down the Canadian Wheat Board in order that they can enhance their own position -- at the expense, Mr. Speaker, of the grain producers of western Canada.

The other day we had a real sham here, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Morris got us and questioned my statistics. And you know he talked about the volume of grain produced, Mr. Speaker, while I talked about the volume of grain marketed. And of course he knows and depends, Mr. Speaker, on the idea that people are ignorant of these facts and therefore there's an opportunity to mislead the people of Manitoba. And I'm sure there is that opportunity. But let the record be straight, Mr. Speaker, that when we talk about the role of the Canadian Wheat Board we talk about the marketing aspect of the Canadian Wheat Board. We're talking about volumes of grain that they actually handle. We're not talking about the grain that is produced and consumed on the same farm as my honourable friend for Morris tried to do yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board, Otto Lang, took a strip off of me in the -- according to the media at least -- in a lengthy article in the Free Press the other day. And, Mr. Speaker, this is the Minister of Justice of Canada, the Minister of Justice of Canada said, we are not going to take anything away from the Wheat Board. All we're going to do is give the farmers another opportunity to market in another market. What nonsense, Mr. Speaker! That Minister of Justice of Canada stooped so low as to try to play on the ignorance of people, Mr. Speaker, by trying to suggest to them that somehow there's another market for grain in Canada. There is only one market for grain in Canada, and you either market that grain through the Canadian Wheat Board or you don't. There are not two markets. Mr. Speaker, they are playing on the fears of the farm people who recollect, who recollect the quotas and the stockpiles of grain of the last four or five years and who would like to have a second market, because the Wheat Board wasn't able to sell all of their production during those years. They were not able to sell all of their production in those years, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Lang and members opposite are trying to say there's another market some place. You can fill your quota to the Wheat Board and then you can sell all you want off board. And for every bushel you sell off board, Mr. Speaker, you reduce the quota of the Canadian Wheat Board to that amount. My friends opposite know exactly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. USKIW: . . . know exactly what they are up to, Mr. Speaker. They are trying to bring us back to 40 years ago, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. USKIW: Imagine, Mr. Speaker, imagine eastern Canadian feed buyers are going to have the power to tell the Canadian Wheat Board what they must do with our grain. That's not to be an insult to western Canada. (Applause) The traditional concept of board marketing, Mr. Speaker, provincially, nationally has always been the concept that a board is set out to do a marketing job for the producers. They have no concern about consumers; their job is to market for producers. It is somebody else's responsibility to worry about the consumers, whether the consumers be livestock producers or whether the consumers be the general populous of the land. And if the market conditions are such, Mr. Speaker, that there is need for governmental intervention, that intervention should take place for the benefit of the

BILL 34

(MR. USKIW Cont'd) consumer - not in such a way as to reduce the benefit of the producer. This, Mr. Speaker, has been a well-established principle in all of our marketing schemes that we have in this province and all provinces and indeed nationally. That's the purpose for which national marketing agencies have been established, that's the purpose for which provincial marketing agencies have been established - to bring stability in price, to equalize opportunity in delivery - to bring stability that's right, that's right.

My honourable friends are displaying, Mr. Speaker, not their ignorance because they know better, Mr. Speaker, but they are trying to suggest that the general public doesn't and they will use their influence to convey them to their point of view.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . that country publisher somebody - that country publisher.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Livestock Feed Board is alleged, is alleged, it will have power to tell the Wheat Board that notwithstanding the fact that you have a good market in Japan for barley at \$5.00 a bushel, or three or two, you must assure us that we will have supplied here in Canada, without any guarantee of what the price is going to be or who is going to pick up the difference. We don't know that, Mr. Speaker. They are saying no you cannot operate in the domestic market, your job is to look after the exports. But if we run short of grain, if the Canadian Livestock Feed Board, who by the way, will be a banking agency, they will be banking grain, if we run short you must always assure us of supply, so they want to use the Canadian Wheat Board as an insurance policy at the expense of the grain producers of western Canada, Mr. Speaker. That is the kind of proposition that it is reported on the media of today and I'm sure that we will have amplification of that particular report and the document on which it's based fairly soon.

My honourable friends opposite may think that we can get close enough to the end of this crop year, Mr. Speaker, so that any changes that are brought about in national marketing policy will not allow an opportunity for any provincial government to intercede to prevent a disaster. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the current referendum is to get an opinion of the producers of grain in Manitoba soon enough so that the province will be in a position to intercede if it deems that it can, in whatever way it is advisable at that point in time. We do need, Mr. Speaker, lead time, we do need, Mr. Speaker, lead time to make sure that if the vote is positive, that we will be able to set up the machinery to pick up from where the Wheat Board leaves off, if in fact that takes place on August 1st next.

I should like to remind my honourable friends opposite that many, many years ago - I don't have the date here before me, I was not equipped for this particular speech, Mr. Speaker - but many, many years ago when the Wheat Board was first established, there was controversy as well. The Federal Parliament brought in the Wheat Board system and asked each province to pass complementary legislation. Mr. Speaker, this province -- you know what happened? It's an embarrassment on the history of this province and the government of that day. Do you know what happened, Mr. Speaker? The government of this province wouldn't sponsor a bill. The government would not sponsor a bill to give validity to the Canadian Wheat Board when it was established. I believe it was the Campbell administration. You know, Mr. Speaker, that a private member had to introduce the motion because the government would not do it. Subsequently there was a six month hoist --(Interjection)-- oh God I can't remember that year. Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, there was a six month hoist and after that, at another session a Bill was brought in. And by the way there was a referendum held, Mr. Speaker, a referendum was held to determine the wishes of the people of - the producers of grain in this province, and the results of that referendum were overwhelmingly in support of the Canadian Wheat Board, some 88 percent, some 88 percent of the producers voted to have their grain marketed through the Canadian Wheat Board. So the government of the day while not being sympathetic to the concept realized that they had to bend to the wishes of the vast majority of producers of this province. So we had had tinkering with it over the years and 1961 was an example that I illustrated this afternoon where the Member for Morris and a Conservative Party tried to bring the Wheat Board down then, Mr. Speaker, and now we have the second chapter wherein the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party of Ottawa are now together on the scheme - are now together on the scheme, Mr. Speaker. I will submit, Mr. Speaker, I will submit, Mr. Speaker, if there's a vote in the House of Commons on changing the Canadian Wheat Board Act that will reduce its powers, that the Conservatives are going to vote with it; and I will tell you that Lewis and his group will vote against it.

BILL 34

(MR. USKIW Cont'd)

So, Mr. Speaker, let the people of Manitoba know what the noises are all about, the noises of the last few days, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the current referendum. There is a group here at the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange that want to get a handle on more of our production, Mr. Speaker. They want the free market again; and they want it, Mr. Speaker, at the expense, at the expense of the grain producers of this province. And their allies are sitting opposite, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my notes are extensive and I'm not going to refer to all of them, I will reserve that for another opportunity as I know there will be. But I want to remind my honourable friends, I want to remind my honourable friends opposite, that their position is on the record, it's clear, but I will be governed by the result of the referendum. And I want to remind my honourable friends that they are very quick on the draw, Mr. Speaker, to chastise me or the government where we have not had referendums to determine public opinion, and then, Mr. Speaker, when we have one, and when the vote is administered through a Board that they established and we inherited, they say but who's counting the votes, you know; is the referendum honest? You cannot win, Mr. Speaker, with that group because if you don't have a referendum you're attacked for not having one, and if you do they say it's rigged in some form. Their position, Mr. Speaker, is very weak. And it will be found out by the people of this province before very long because the decisions that are to be made with respect to this particular issue are going to be made fairly soon and the effects are going to be felt fairly soon as well. Let me say again that the results of the referendum, which will be known to us at the end of this month, will determine the future course that this government is going to take on that particular issue.

Now I want to take exception to a statement that the Member for Rock Lake presented to us here this afternoon on the issue of the subsidy of beef. He stands here as a cattleman as well as an MLA, Mr. Speaker and he says, we don't want any subsidy. Mr. Speaker, they went to Ottawa on bended knee, they went to Ottawa on bended knee, Mr. Speaker and they said give us tariff protection. Mr. Speaker, the Cattlemen's Association of Canada has been refuted in a number of areas; (a) that they are free enterprisers, they don't want no government interference whatever.

A MEMBER: They told you where to go.

MR. USKIW: Oh, yes, they are always clear on that point, Mr. Speaker, always clear on that point. They also assume the distinction of having convinced the Government of Canada to abolish the Estate taxes - they think that was a big achievement. Those are the big things that they have done. But they marched down to Ottawa asking for tariff protection because their free enterprise system can't compete with American beef.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not one that is opposed, I am not one that is opposed to tariff protection; don't misread me. But let not them take the other position, let them not present themselves as people that want to be completely free of the public sector and then come back and ask for a handout. What is the effect of their posture, of their position, Mr. Speaker? If we go along with their request for a tariff against American beef, the effect of it is that the consumers of Canada will be directly subsidizing the cattlemen of this country. By providing a subsidy out of the federal treasury, Mr. Speaker - and I agree with the concept, I don't agree with the methodology - by applying a subsidy to the federal treasury we can spare the hurt that that increase will do to the consumers of this country. And it makes sense, it makes sense. But let not the member for Rock Lake tell me that he doesn't want subsidies because a tariff, Mr. Speaker, is a direct subsidy from the consumer of that product which is protected, to the producer of that product.

A MEMBER: He doesn't understand that.

MR. USKIW: My honourable friend for Rock Lake should know that.

Now I want to take exception, Mr. Speaker, to the rumblings from the other side about changes that were made in the Department of Agriculture, because, Mr. Speaker, they missed their opportunity to debate those changes. Not one of them rose, Mr. Speaker, during the Estimates debate in my department, and questioned Mr. Speaker, the role of the home economist, the 4-H program. Mr. Speaker, if their position is right they have let the people of Manitoba down as an opposition. If their position was right, Mr. Speaker, they didn't do their job.

BILL 34

(MR. USKIW Cont'd)

Let me now tell, Mr. Speaker, tell the members opposite, let me tell the members opposite a story about the home economics program. You know, Mr. Speaker, when the budget grows and grows, the members opposite say this government hasn't got control of its finances, it's spending more money than it's bringing in, and all of these arguments are brought about; they are careless; they've got too many staff; they hire too many people. In fact they've been snickering for years, Mr. Speaker, that the reason employment is good in Manitoba is because the government hires them all. And now they say, you have let one person go, there's got to be an emergency debate. There's got to be an emergency debate, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell my friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Manitoba has taken a good look at the Home Economics Program and has decided that it was worthwhile and therefore it should be available for all of the people of this province. But the Member for Rock Lake says no, Winnipeg shouldn't have that service. That's what he said, Mr. Speaker. Winnipeg doesn't need Home Ec. services. Northern Manitoba doesn't need them either, Mr. Speaker. Only the traditional area that has had them should maintain them, and even if the program is good we should not broaden it. That's what he is saying, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Home Economic Program is a good one. It has to be applied efficiently and it has to be applied to everybody in this province, to all areas of the province. And therefore the north, which has not had anything of the kind, is for the first time going to enjoy those services. The problem areas in the south, in the urban communities, are now going to receive those services as well. And I project, Mr. Speaker, that that program will grow even beyond what we would feel comfortable about in the years ahead, Mr. Speaker. I will project that that program will grow, because it has now taken on a very greater importance, but it will grow in relation to the need areas, Mr. Speaker.

And here I want to now give my friends opposite an illustration. We have the Farm Diversification Program - and I want my honourable friends to know what I am talking about when I talk about efficiency. We have a farm diversification specialist in charge of 20 clients. A very intensive program, high cost program. And I've had this debate with my own staff and I know some of them are not happy with me either; and then we have a brochure that goes out explaining the program. The brochure says, "Do you want a Home Economist to also call at your home?" Mr. Speaker, that is wasteful. We have a farm adviser that goes out; he counsels 20 farmers. My position is that he should be able to counsel the farm wife in the process, that there's a home economics course in the local high school once a month or once a week or whatever it is, and that it would be worthwhile for that housewife to participate, and that group action should be pushed and individual action should be pushed and individual action should be reduced, so that we can broaden the role of the Home Ec. program. And so, Mr. Speaker, in bringing about that efficiency we are able to allow five people or six to be transferred over to other areas of the province who also will undertake programs in a broad approach, try to assemble group programs to better inform the people in urban areas in Northern Manitoba as to how they may better their human condition. And this is a move, an efficiency move, Mr. Speaker. I don't want my farm adviser operating a government car, running out to 20 farms a month, and then behind him having a home economist driving a government car, running to the same 20 farms. That is nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and it is an efficiency move that has been able to bring about the broadening of the program which, Mr. Chairman, will be enlarged as the years go on. It's efficiency and it's non-political, that's right.

The question of the position for the Women's Institute -- and I don't know why members raised that because they know better than that. They were the ones that were involved in the administration of government. There is no such thing as a position. There is not even a staff man year provided, never has been in the history of this department provided for the Women's Institute, not one staff man year, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Rock Lake rises in his place and says, "Have you eliminated the position?" There has never been one. We have had a part-time term person filling that role, but which is now going to be filled by a full-time person, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- My honourable friend says that a position has been removed. We have a full-time person that is taking on those responsibilities, not full-time in the sense of that person's relationship to the W.I., but half-time there and

BILL 34

(MR. USKIW Cont'd) half-time on 4-H or something else. And all we have done is drop one term person, Mr. Speaker. So while the honourable friends scream, Mr. Speaker, about the growth of the Civil Service, listen to the screams because we dropped half of one man year. It's ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. They don't want growth, they don't want efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I ask of my friends opposite what the heaven they do want -- I should have said the other. So, Mr. Speaker, members opposite had their opportunity to debate my estimates fully and they chose to forego those opportunities because they thought they had the goods on the Minister of Agriculture in another department.

And, Mr. Speaker, in that context I want to now take issue with the Member for Morris, because he rose in his place and he said, "Mr. Speaker, there has been a trick pulled on the opposition." The Department of Co-operatives was supposed to be debated, it is not now being debated, and that we were very unfair to him. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member had the list of departments that were to be debated; there was an agreement that we would not be debating Co-operative Development right after Agriculture. I was not aware that Co-op Development was to go

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I hate to interrupt my honourable friend when he's in full flight, but, Sir, there was no such agreement. Let that be very clear.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, let my honourable friend know that he was supplied with a list of departments and how they were going to be called, and Co-operative Development was not even listed.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise again on a point of order.

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

MR. JORGENSON: I would hope that the Minister of Agriculture would not try to distort the facts. Part of the Minister's responsibility is the Department of Co-operative Development, and in previous years that has been taken in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture, just as the Civil Service has been taken in conjunction with the Department of Labour. They've been taken as one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That's not a point of order, that's a difference of opinion. Order please.

MR. USKIW: Let me conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by telling my friends opposite that indeed they have not been a good, honest, fair opposition, because they knew, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance stood in this House and indicated to them that one of the reasons that Co-op Development was not going to proceed now, is because we want to try a new procedure in the presentation of our estimates with respect to that department. We want to present it in the form that Ontario presents their estimates, in the form that Quebec presents their estimates, and our own, and the Department of Co-op Development was going to be the guinea pig in this experiment; and the Minister of Finance was not yet ready to have me proceed with it, Mr. Speaker. So my friends ought to have the record straight - ought to have the record straight. And let them not continue to mislead the people of this province, because it isn't going to wash, Mr. Speaker. We have had nothing but absolute nonsense coming from that particular group for the last two weeks, Mr. Speaker, and it's at a point where one has to at some time get fed up with the whole procedure.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I've said what I wanted to say. Thank you.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult for me to not respond to a money bill in the way I've indicated I intend to respond, where any vote is required to be taken which will vote Supply in any form to the government. Last night's budget makes my observations even more relevant, because any vote that will put an approval of this House for any funds to be delivered to this government, puts that money at risk of joining the millions of dollars that have already been squandered in what has become and what will evolve to be the most serious crisis of confidence in the financial capacity of this government to observe even the most elementary kind of control, protection of the public purse, that the public is entitled to.

I've started to say several times in this House that the last seven weeks have been one of the most incredible parades and most unhappy parade of financial irresponsibility, badges, evidence of incapacity that has ever been paraded before in any Legislature anywhere in Canada. Mr. Speaker, you have the Leader of the Official Opposition making the point that a judicial

BILL 34

(MR. ASPER Cont'd) inquiry should be held because \$500,000 of public tax dollars have obviously been misplaced - to be very kind about it - in the northern co-ops. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you multiply, if you multiply the kind of squandering and bungling that is going on in other areas of government financial management, then the Leader of the Opposition, the Official Opposition's call sounds like more of a trumpet call, or should become a symphony call for some sort of Royal Commission, some sort of public inquiry or scrutiny as to what the government is doing and what controls they're exercising, whether it's northern roads or the incredible news of I believe yesterday, that Hydro escalation in costs had in one short session of the Legislature moved by \$1 billion, and not an eyelash batted by government.

When the First Minister was asked in this Chamber: what does he intend to do to inquire into the specifics, the details of how you could get a \$3 billion cost estimate last year, you're under way, you're in construction, and you get a \$4.3 billion estimate this year -- and if you go back to the six years during which we've had an estimate by government, this government, of that project, well, Mr. Speaker, we've gone from the \$1.6 billion estimate to \$4.3 billion, and, Mr. Speaker, that is a 300 percent, approximately, rise in cost estimates of a project that is already under construction. Mr. Speaker, that is madness; that is fiscal irresponsibility on a scale unknown. And I listened to the Premier, I listened to the First Minister explain it by saying, well, everything's going up, and he said -- we tried to raise it yesterday in the House, in the Question Period -- he said, "Even the McKenzie Valley Pipeline figures have gone up."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that betrays the First Minister's lack of understanding, because in the same period that the Manitoba Hydro-Nelson River costs have escalated by 300 percent in six years, well, Mr. Speaker, the McKenzie Valley estimates have escalated by 14 percent. And that is the difference. The First Minister hasn't the faintest idea of what cost escalation's all about, and he said in this House or implied to us in this House that he had no major plans for inquiry. What's a billion? That was the impression he left. What's a billion? Mr. Speaker, I can remember a government of 1957 that was reported to have fallen because a Minister cavalierly alluded to the possibility, "What's a million?" Mr. Speaker, inflation hasn't changed things that much. But if it was just that, then we could say all right, all right; in another area the government's incompetent, the government can't handle money, the government has no control. But it's not just that area. It's wherever you touch, wherever you scratch, wherever you dig, you find mismanagement, you find bungling, you find incompetence, you find waste, you find extravagance, It's on a level that is not acceptable any longer, and Mr. Speaker, by trying to focus attention on this issue I'm hoping to appeal to government to recognize that it's got a serious problem in its control structure somewhere, and nowhere is it more paramount that we stop it or at least recognize that it's happening, than in the Manitoba Development Corporation, where money is just spewed out and down open sewers. Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that the Bobbsey Twins of bungling - the Minister responsible for the MDC and the Minister who started the mess and was relieved of the opportunity of creating a further mess, the present Minister of Industry and Commerce - aren't here when I make these comments, because I'm sure they'll want to respond. But Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, we require in this province an investigation of some sort, whether it's by Royal Commission, whether it's by judicial inquiry, or whether it's by select committee of this House, but Mr. Speaker, we cannot, we cannot accept the kind of management, mismanagement, lack of management of the purse as it's occurring in the current operations of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, only a week ago we had paraded before us information which a government should have been ashamed of, and Mr. Speaker, maybe we fail as an opposition - it's entirely possible - maybe we fail to communicate to the public, because, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand. Are we so rich, is the public so wealthy that the kind of information that's pouring out isn't enough to start the parades, the protests, because, Mr. Speaker, there is I concede a deafening silence in the media, in the public, and in discussion of the fiasco that has become the Manitoba Development Corporation.--(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Corporate Affairs says maybe they think we're wrong. They don't have to take our word; they can take the audited, certified statement of the Provincial Auditor. Don't take our word for it - read the numbers that were put before the Economic Affairs Committee.

BILL 34

(MR. ASPER Cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation, we have a company called Alphametrics. Alphametrics has got \$100,000 of your money and mine, and we, the public -- the public didn't really know it -- but the public owns 25 percent of this company. Another of the great Manitoba Development Corporation experiments in the board room.

Mr. Speaker, Alphametrics and I'm going alphabetically -- was proud to come into our committee and say, "We lost \$77,000." Well that's not the whole loss, Mr. Speaker. Yes the loss will grow. It's a growth company all right, like the rest of them. Mr. Speaker, on top of that we lost interest on the \$100,000 that we had invested, because we are borrowing that money -- this government borrows that money -- to lend or to invest in Alphametrics.

Mr. Speaker, there's another one -- this one is even more entertaining. Micro-Com Electronics Limited. Now, Mr. Speaker, Micro-Com Electronics Limited, I'd love to know who owns it because this company had the great distinction of being able to start up, get 80 some thousand dollars of public money, go broke before it even had a chance to be reported to us that we'd been into it, and Mr. Speaker, that's got to be a new record. Mr. Speaker, not only to we lose the \$80,000, but we suffer the loss of interest on borrowed money twice.

Mr. Speaker, then we come to Phoenix Data Limited. Now, Mr. Speaker, this one is really a winner. You've got to go back to the time it came up. When it came up, you may recall that I pleaded and led a charge against the government buying this. I pointed out at that time that over 200 people had looked at this white elephant, this computer, and said, for heaven's sake, its only use is as an experimental device in universities and high schools, and it was called "the White Elephant of the computer industry." That's why its predecessor company, Symbionics Limited, had gone bankrupt. Everybody knew that. The government even knew it -- couldn't understand it, but knew it -- and the government in its passion, in its zeal to go into industry, to become business people, not with their own money but with public money -- now Mr. Speaker, they ignored that advice and they paid the staggering sum of approximately \$1 million for the white elephant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after two years what have we got? Well, we've got a \$600,000 loss. We've lost our million. We have put in, not just the million that I feared originally, but we've put a \$1.5 million into this one, because heaven knows we can't concede that the government made a mistake, so rather than make the mistake public we prop it up, and we flush another \$500,000 into Phoenix Data. Now, Mr. Speaker, last year when this came out in the committee, I said to the Minister -- it was, I believe then, the Mines Minister who had taken over from his colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce -- I said that we had lost \$600,000 in the Phoenix Data operation and he flared, he foamed, he became violently angry. He went on television on "24 Hours" and passionately denied that we were giving responsible financial information. Impossible.

Well, Mr. Speaker, now he produced an audited statement, a financial statement, that same Minister who denied, who said we were financially ignorant, and he shows his loss \$550,000. I apologize, Sir, it wasn't \$600,000; it was only \$550,000. But, Mr. Speaker, it was more. It was \$700,000, because on top of the loss on operations, they have the great distinction of being able to say they lost the interest that they paid on the million and a half dollars, and that's another \$150,000.00. And what does it do in order to carry on the charade, the mockery? The government says, ah well, we're going to develop it -- it's going to do a little thing for the school. It's going to keep the attendance, it's going to make report cards. We used to be able to do that by hand with little scribblers, but now we've got a computer doing that sort of thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you look at where Phoenix Data -- and I remember the bulletin, the Telex that Phoenix Data and the MDC sent out to the private sector saying, "Hurrah. We, the government, are going to start up a computer facility; bring us your business -- we'll give you the business . . ." (boy, they gave us the business) "we'll give you the business." And I believe it was 30 percent off what the big companies are charging.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Phoenix Data in this spectacular year of success was able to pull in \$190,000 of business, of which \$154,000 was prop-up money from government departments, notably the Department of Education. The private sector, responding to this great generous offer, to be allowed to go through the guinea pig experiment of the white elephant and come out the other end of the elephant, came up with \$36,000 of business, \$36,000. For this we

BILL 34

(MR. ASPER Cont'd) invested a million and a half dollars and the government wants supply.

Mr. Speaker, then we come to William Clare (Manitoba) Limited. Now I expect fully, having heard the Mines Minister's announcement yesterday, that we'll soon have William Clare (Manitoba) Mines Limited, because I don't know what we're going to do with this thing, unless of course we're frank - unless of course we admit that we've pulled another boner, unless we say, "Let's get out of this thing." --(Interjection)-- Oh well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from Swan River makes the point it's not we, it's they. Mr. Speaker, when there's a success it's "they" but when it's a failure, Mr. Speaker, somehow it becomes "we politicians," "we government", "we in the Legislature" and that's why I speak out, Mr. Speaker, because the profession of politics takes its reputation and takes its credibility from the successes and the actions of all politicians, all government, and I deeply regret, as a member of that profession, that this kind of activity is taking place in the name of the art of politics, because this is not what governments exist to do and this is not what we believed the Manitoba Development Corporation was established to do.

Is it established to set up William Clare Limited, who can find 2 percent of the \$1,350,000, but somehow get 20 percent of the equity and we the public, through our agent, Her Majesty's government, come up with \$1,350,000 and get 80 percent of the action - and Mr. Speaker, we are really getting the action, I must say. The action is not a job created in Manitoba, \$1,350,000 down the drain --(Interjection)-- Yes, all in order to save the Canadian publishing industry when we were under the impression that that's what the Industrial Development Bank had been set up to do and we were staggered in committee to find that no approach to the Industrial Development Bank had even been made, and there were no personal guarantees for the money. And, Mr. Speaker, I look around, I see some very talented men in this Chamber, and I wonder if they would qualify for that kind of financial assistance if they went to the Manitoba Development Corporation with a great idea, such as Mr. Clare was able to do.

And then we drew attention to the government that Mr. Clare, aside from costing us \$130,000 in interest per year in perpetuity for the million three we've so wisely seen the government put into this venture, Mr. Clare doesn't even have the feeling of necessity that he should live amongst the people who are giving him the million three, and so he lives in Vancouver and we pay him \$25,000 a year; and he takes the \$25,000 a year and he pays income tax to the Government of British Columbia not even to the gentlemen, the geniuses who gave him the million three. Mr. Speaker, that's only part of it, --(Interjection)-- Macey Food.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on another of these outstanding records of achievement - with the money we're voting to government. Misawa Homes. Now, Mr. Speaker, this one is unique. Mr. Speaker, you and I, we the public, we own 50 percent of this, because Her Majesty's government saw fit to take something of our money, a million five, one and a half million dollars. You know what they did, Mr. Speaker? Misawa Homes had a great idea. They said they would locate their plant from Japan in British Columbia because that's where the lumber was, and they would chop down the trees, fashion it into lumber, make it into prefab homes, and voilà! Across the ocean back to Japan. That was the market. But we have this genius, this great industrial mind, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Evans. The Honourable Minister was able to persuade them not to locate where the lumber is, not to locate where the water is so that you can push the ships and the barges back to Japan, but right here in Manitoba. Great move. When we have the biggest house-building industry of any city per capita in Canada, we bring in this one.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Misawa Homes said to the Government of Manitoba, "If you're so sure, then you put up your money," which our Minister happily did. But he didn't just put it up, Mr. Speaker; he put it up, and he put it up, and he put it up, and he put it up, and it's really up now, Mr. Speaker. Because in November of 1972 he went in with one toe, \$350,000.00. By July of 1972 he was confirmed in his wisdom so he put in another \$400,000.00. But not content with the wisdom of those moves, the commercial results of those moves, in December of 1973 only this government would have failed to notice that Misawa Homes was closed. But only this government would have failed to notice that while it was closed it should lend it another \$600,000 even though it was closed.

And then, Mr. Speaker, that brought us up to about 1.3 million and so the government

BILL 34

(MR. ASPER Cont'd) then, having noticed that the 600,000 that was gone in in December had disappeared and the place was closed, couldn't resist the temptation in February of 1974 of putting another \$200,000 of our money to keep company with the million three that was already down the drain. And they ask Supply. They ask us to vote money to this government.

Mr. Speaker, I wait for somebody to explain to me why you advanced \$600,000 to a company that has closed. I wait for some economic financial wizard, some czar of the business community, to come forward and explain to me why, after you lose that money, then in February, weeks ago, while we were questioning this, another \$200,000 finds its way into the company. Mr. Speaker, we have got a million five in; we are losing \$150,000 per year on the interest cost of borrowing that money to put in there. But we knew better, because the company then doesn't even have the decency to make money. Mr. Speaker, before the magic touch of this government came in, this company was doing relatively well. But as they pumped more money into it the magic touch produced losses, and it lost \$874,000 last year alone. Every house-building company in this province is doing extraordinarily well. Mr. Speaker, you know how they minimized the amount of the loss? Well, Mr. Speaker, Misawa Homes, in order to not show a million dollar loss, found a sucker, it found a customer. Who? Why, Her Majesty, Mr. Speaker. Her Majesty's First Minister bought homes from Misawa at inflated prices which he then gave to Iceland or to Greenland or somebody who was having flood problems, and then, Mr. Speaker, in order to mitigate the loss further, the Government of Manitoba bought some more homes from Misawa Homes and with all of that pump-up and profit and phoney arithmetic, we still had an \$874,000 loss shown on the books. But the real loss is \$1,228,000 minimum. A prediction: final loss, over two million dollars. And, Mr. Speaker, we're asked to vote Supply to this stupid, to this irrational, this irresponsible use of money.

Venture Manitoba Tours, Mr. Speaker. Venture Manitoba Tours. Mr. Speaker, when we in the Liberal Party publicly said, "You're going to lose a million dollars," the government scoffed at it, and within months, two years ago, they wrote off a million dollars. Then, Mr. Speaker, when we said, "For heaven's sake take your loss, recognize what you've got, this is not what governments exist to do," this government couldn't admit it. Besides, the mania, the passion for the board room must have gripped it some more, and we said then in November of 1972, I said that this company is going to lose money. And Mr. Evans, the prince of the board room, was able to then say that he could find it in his economics bag somewhere to say that once we write off the million dollars, once we admit we've lost the million dollars it'll be jake, it'll be A-okay, it'll be great. Mr. Speaker, reading from a transcript of what Mr. Evans said at a news conference, the Honourable Minister for Industry and Commerce said on November 9th, 1972--in response to my complaint that this was a loser he corrected that. He said, "This failure was a failure unfortunately but it was a failure as a private enterprise operation, not a government-owned agency." Fair enough, Mr. Speaker, fair enough. Private enterprise ran it and lost money, but not government. Well, Mr. Speaker, thank heaven the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce was able to correct the situation because he made it a loser of a government-operated corporation, and its loss now, its loss now aside from writing off the million dollars, we now have \$642,000 invested, \$642,000 invested, costing us approximately \$65,000 a year in interest, the accumulated deficit is \$165,000 and its loss last year was \$42,000. Mr. Speaker, we've written off our million dollars; we've got \$642,000 of hostage, and we're still losing \$40,000.00.

BILL 34

(MR. ASPER cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, Leaf Rapids Development Corporation. Now there, Mr. Speaker, was where the government was really clever, really shrewd, really astute. They said: we don't like the bad old days; we don't like the way those bad old mining companies used to build company towns. We didn't like the way they were building roads, schools, the hospitals and local improvements, and so, Mr. Speaker, what we'll do is this: we'll do it, we'll build it. Mr. Speaker, the mining companies laughed all the way to the negotiating table. Just as we said then, that if you want to make a deal with the mining companies for heaven's sake realize what you do. You make them build the road, you make them build the schools and the hospitals because that's what we've done and they are used to it. But no. The Government of Manitoba was afraid of a company town, they would rather have a state town. So they set up Leaf Rapids and we've got \$11 million in as of the last financial statement and we haven't got much of a prospect of seeing it come back - and rents and cost of housing and everything. But the Mines Minister - Mr. Speaker, we can only concede that he must have some master plan in mind. Perhaps he intends to retire from public life and run the state owned hotel in Leaf Rapids or take over Venture Manitoba Tours or do something because, Mr. Speaker, who is going to clean up this mess? Millions, tens of millions and we don't have the money, we don't have the money to cut sales tax and we don't have the money to give a better housing program, we don't have the money required for any of the socially useful things, but we do have the money for this kind of garbage.

Mr. Speaker, Morden Fine Foods. --(Interjection)-- Oh excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I must respond. The Honourable Attorney-General says, was I not here or didn't I hear what happened last night? Oh yes I did. I heard, I heard the Government of Manitoba allege that it was going to do something about inflation through this magnificent scheme of rebate. Well, Mr. Speaker, what shallow mockery? In the morning, in the morning that same day they raised the hydro bill of every Manitoba family by two, three, four dollars a month. And last night they found two or three or four dollars a month to give back. Except there's a lot of bookkeeping inbetween and a lot of administration inbetween - and there's something wrong by the way, Mr. Speaker, because unless you happen to be lucky enough, unless you happen to be lucky enough to be making under seven or eight or nine thousand dollars with this government, then there's something wrong with you. There's got to be something wrong with you. We've got to learn to hate the nine, ten, eleven and twelve thousand dollar per year people, because for some reason they can absorb inflation, they can absorb the hydro increase, they can absorb the autopac increase, they can absorb the hundred million dollars of interest charges they're going to have to absorb for the hydro fiasco every year of their lives, but we will not even give them three cents, four cents, four dollars a month back on the inflation thing. Yes, we'll talk about that. There's a Budget debate coming. Yes, I was here last night, Mr. Attorney-General, Sir.

A MEMBER: You'll vote against it.

MR. ASPER: Modern Fine Foods, another in the classic textbook case of government in industry.

A MEMBER: We're leaving that to Jorgenson,

MR. ASPER: We got a monopoly. This government took over and put out of business in effect a private sector operator. And got a monopoly. Your result was a monopoly. And so we have \$600,000 of your money and mine invested in this fine venture. Then we find it is doing so well and is losing so little that we can afford to put another 198,000 into it, and we did that. And then the genius that runs the purse of this province found it wise to put another \$80,000 into it. And in March of this year we decided to guarantee another \$300,000 to that company. The combined, Mr. Speaker, is in what was a very simple operation; we now have \$1,178,000.00. Now I apologize in advance for being wrong because those figures are late, old and perhaps very seriously understated. But that's the disadvantage we work under. We're working with a year-old information I concede, and perhaps the government will see its way clear someday to remedy this kind of problem for us.

But, Mr. Speaker, the annual cost of operating that investment which you and I the public own a hundred percent of is \$110,000 a year that we're losing, because we're paying the interest on a million one and we're not getting anything back. If that were all, that would be one thing, but it's another thing entirely when on top of that the monopoly that was created can only do as

BILL 34

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . well as lose \$75,000 a year. That's this report this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this with the apprehension of knowing that there is that great wondrous report yet to come, of Saunders Aircraft and Flyer Industries. Mr. Speaker, I think I should report to the House and through you, Sir, allow honourable members to know about Saunders. They all know about Flyer, but Saunders is a unique thing, Mr. Speaker, because apart from having an untold number of millions which is probably at this moment at least nine, ten, eleven million dollars and under consideration another five million dollars, which will result in a mini CFI fiasco for this province. And again I say it, and I said it last year, and I said it the year before, and I'm not ashamed to be on the record of this - and I'm delighted if a year from now, or two or three or four the Honourable Minister of Finance or the Bobbsey Twins I described earlier were responsible for this disaster, come and say, "See, you were wrong." But of course they'll have to recapitalize. That's a great word the government has learned. Recapitalize means you write off the \$50 million, so it shouldn't show any more. You write off the \$100 million so no one will remember you lost it. That's called capitalizing. That's what the Minister for Finance is talking about. That's what the Honourable Mines Minister is talking about. Destroying the evidence is really a better word, capitalizing the losses.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Saunders Aircraft can't get a certificate of air worthiness, can't get approval for international sales, but we find - I'm not sure if it's the Gonzales brothers or the Hernandez brothers - I forget their name now - Columbia Airlines. Mr. Speaker, you would think, all of us would think, that if you said, "We have sold an airplane to Columbia Airlines, a South American," you would think it's the national airline of Columbia. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask honourable members to call their credit agencies or their banks and ask them to tell them about Columbia Airlines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as you know, as we all know, the Government of Manitoba asked for international finance on its first sale of Saunders Aircraft to the Gonzales or whatever the brothers are. The brothers Gonzales or Hernandez or something. Well, Mr. Speaker, after international finance checked them out, they said, "Sorry, sorry we wouldn't recommend that you make this sale on the terms you propose." Like a dollar down. Pay us between fiesta and fiesta and it'll be okay. And so the international financier said no. Well that would not deter the avant garde, the imaginative, the bold, I believe, and creative are the words of the Minister for Mines and Natural Resources yesterday. So they found a way. No down payment, pay as they use it. One thing went wrong, Mr. Speaker, on the hedge-hopping, hippity-hop down, something happened and it cracked up so payments weren't required because under the clause in the contract apparently you don't pay when you don't use or something. But now that the plane was injured, of course they needed another airplane and so we sold them a second one, same terms. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to committee, I pray that committee will give us enough time - and it won't, it never has in the four years I've watched these proceedings. Never. And that's why I'm saying some of these things today and I'm going to say a lot more in this matter, because I don't believe we'll get to say it in committee or learn about it in committee. The third aircraft, Mr. Speaker, that was after they'd had all this experience, Columbian Airways; they had phoned the Saunders Aircraft, they knew how to handle it, except when they were landing they made one mistake, they forgot to put the wheels down. So, Mr. Speaker, the third plane was now out of commission. And now, Mr. Speaker, the accident report which is a classic in aeronautics history, Mr. Speaker, it says --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: That could go on.

A MEMBER: I have to go.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, yes, Mr. Speaker, and I have to go too. Mr. Speaker, I'm unable to compose myself as I consider the report of the accident. When the navigator, I believe, being interviewed said, "Oh yes, I saw the light flashing that the wheels weren't down, but that's not my job, that's the pilot's job. How could I interrupt the chain of command to make him put the wheels down?" Mr. Speaker, that's what happened. Now I'm busting to know how many more we're going to sell to Columbia who by the simple device of cracking up our aircraft don't have to pay us. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there'll be responses. I look forward to those responses. The reason I say what I have said today is that it is a travesty, it is a tragedy and it is not possible for me to bring myself and I'm sure others in this House to vote five cents to a government that has such a cavalier, such an absolutely irresponsible approach to the public purse. The extravagance, the waste, the mismanagement will haunt

BILL 34

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . generations to come. And I do not want a record to show that I voted five cents to the government on the premise that they will use it to squander as they have so much before.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, so far we've had a very interesting end to the afternoon. I think we've all enjoyed the speeches that have been made and especially the speech of the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party. I think it is possibly one of the finest speeches he's given since he came into the House. I don't want to flatter him because I don't want him to ever think that I'm that fond of him but . . .

A MEMBER: He did a good job.

MR. FERGUSON: But getting back again to the Minister of Agriculture and his remarks this afternoon, his version of the facts and ours I think are something altogether different. He is a farmer I guess in his own right, he and his advisor that normally sits above him, I guess taking notes or trying to tell him what is going to go on the next time. I think that possibly that they are just a little off base in many instances. And what prompted him today to get up so tight I really couldn't say, except that possibly it was the fact that all of a sudden some of the information and some of the things he is doing is coming back to sit on his shoulders. And I think that this week of course would have to be his feed grain marketing ballot which again is a misleading ballot, it's a misleading piece of information to the people whereby he is inferring that wheat will be taken out of the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, and no one at any time has said that this will happen. And this could easily have been overcome by inserting one little word, which would have been utility or feed wheat - but in his usual manner, the Minister of Agriculture is out to twist things, to try and razzle-dazzle his way through, but I think that farmers and the rural people of Manitoba have come to know and to distrust anything that the Minister of Agriculture attempts. His attitude and his method of doing things have certainly done nothing to instill any confidence in the rural people. We've had several speeches the last couple of days about the removal of home economists, even the Secretary of the WI is being taken out of the rural districts, and there was an article in the Free Press stating that this was one of the prices that the rural people were going to have to pay for voting Conservative last time. This may be a fact, I don't know, but until such time as we have more information on just what actually is happening in regard to the home economists, why we'll leave that sit.

Now getting back to the Honourable Minister's ballot, we find that all of a sudden there's a great deal of hurry. This ballot I think was issued, was got out to the people on about the 15th of March, the deadline on it is the 29th, which is two weeks, and I don't think there's ever been a ballot put out to the rural people expected to be back this quickly. There's only one thing about it, it certainly is going to give no one else a chance to present their views. The farmers are not going to have an opportunity to hear both sides of the story. The questionnaire or the letter that went along with the ballot was a very biased one and I don't really think that it's going to do the Minister that much good. He's had his fingers burnt several times in his messing around with votes, and at each time he's come out unsuccessfully, and I certainly hope that this time he has the same success as he's had in his previous endeavours.

I think also that he's presenting an untrue picture. Under the proposals of the Federal Government, Prairie Feed Grains' producers would retain the option of selling their feed grain to the Canadian Wheat Board or on the off-Board market. And this basically is what the argument is all about as far as we're concerned. We have no hangups on the Wheat Board handling grain, but we do believe in free interprovincial movement of our grain. We're sick and tired of having a bureaucracy handle our produce, sit on their hands and do nothing about it. And we don't have to go back any more than a couple of years ago to have the facts presented to us. I've said this several times this Session, I'll say it again, that barley sold in my constituency in 1972 for three bushels for a dollar and oats sold for 30 cents. And if this is orderly marketing and this is what the Minister is endeavouring to promote with his scare tactics in his second question whereby he says: "If the majority of producers vote 'no' on the second question, the Government of Manitoba will repeal the Coarse Grain Marketing Control Act and farmers will have to fend for themselves." Well I can assure the Minister that the farmers are quite able to fend for themselves at any time; if they would get government off their necks and would let free enterprise and the law of supply and demand take over, we'll look after our own business and we won't require any bloody bunch of bureaucrats to do it.

--(Interjection)-- You bet your boots.

BILL 34

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd)

And we can go to the cattle industry. And he stood up and said, well they went down on bended knees asking for a subsidy. I would like to ask the Minister, if he was in his place, why this collapse of the cattle market came about. It's not too hard to figure. Mr. Nixon, there's one commodity - beef. Well, it's the easiest thing to possibly get your fingers into, it has been uncontrolled, but it's one way that you can get at the consumer market and make a hero of yourself if you happen to be in government. Mr. Nixon put on a price freeze. The producers backed up the product. Mr. Trudeau to make himself a hero put on an embargo, because beef was going into the United States, our price was going up here. So what happened? They immediately removed the price freeze in the United States, American cattle poured into Canada. If the thing had been left alone in the first place, there'd have been no problem and there would certainly have been no necessity of a subsidy. There would have been confidence in the cattlemen to look after their own business. They wouldn't have asked for anything under any circumstances, but they'll take their lumps on the market, but they won't take them when government is messing around in it. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that you're going to see a shortage of cattle in the Province of Manitoba; and Mr. Uskiw, or the Minister of Agriculture can talk about his stay option in the Province of Manitoba, but he's doing nothing but to chase the rural people out of the Province of Manitoba, the young people.

Now I guess, as the Member for Riel said this morning, he was having a hard time getting fired up. --(Interjection)-- No, I have no problem when government starts messing in my business, Mr. Minister, I certainly have no problem getting fired up, I can tell you that. --(Interjection)-- Well, we pay taxes . . . However that's okay, that's okay, we'll see.

But again getting back to our agricultural situation, the big hangup here is again that we are not particularly arguing against the ballot of the Minister of Agriculture. We do believe that there should be a freedom of opportunity to market through the Canadian Wheat Board, market through the Commodity Exchange, if you like, but I certainly do believe that we should have a free interprovincial movement of grain and let people have their choice. Nobody has to get hung up on the fact that you have to have supply-management, as indicated by the Minister of Agriculture everytime he turns around. And we're quite willing to take our lumps. I'm sure the farmers of Manitoba will. They won't ask for any favours providing they have the chance to make their own decisions, up to a degree, and run their own business. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to just make a few observations in connection with this third reading of the Interim Appropriations Act bill. I see the Minister of Mines and Resources is in his seat this afternoon, or almost in his seat, and I thought it might be an opportunity to review with him again some of the concerns which I have attempted to express in a series of questions relating to the danger, which I think gets somewhat more serious every day, in respect to the flood probabilities in the Assiniboine valley west of Brandon. I know that perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to in any way diminish these problems by constantly reminding the Minister and this House that as each day of delay occurs, that is, the longer we have this cold weather the more serious it becomes in respect to the run-off problems.

Mr. Speaker, I am told that while it isn't the best for diminishing our flood problems, it may have some beneficial advantages in respect to the problems that this government is experiencing in northern Manitoba. Nevertheless, the problems which face the area west of Brandon in the Assiniboine valley are constantly becoming more serious. We have above average snow conditions, above average precipitation up to this point, and if we have continuing cold weather it becomes pretty obvious that we're going to have a rather sudden spring break-up and a rather sudden high water situation that we're wondering whether or not the Shellmouth Reservoir and Dam structure can accommodate. Now I know that the Minister's staff are competent, they have had some experience, but since the Shellmouth Dam was constructed I doubt whether there has been a situation that has the problems that we foresee for this spring in respect to the amount of snow and the probable run-off that is going to occur. I know that their problems are engineering problems, in that they can only draw down that reservoir to a certain minimum depth in order to ensure that they have enough water to maintain regular flow throughout the summer. And I understand that they have in the last three or four years,

BILL 34

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . had some problems in maintaining that flow. But I'm wondering whether or not they can adjust and accommodate to a situation as it now exists in Manitoba at this time, whether the extra snowfall, the delayed spring breakup, are going to produce a situation that is entirely new and entirely different to the previous experience of the Shellmouth Dam. I'm wondering if the Minister can assure the House that a maximum utilization will be made of this reservoir this spring. I know that if flooding does occur in the valley, and I'm afraid that it's going to occur, I think that this formula for the draw-down procedure is going to be under examination and people are going to be very much concerned about whether or not it couldn't have been possible to make a better use of the facility.

The other factor involved is one of dyke conditioning in the valley. I think there have been some reports and some communication from Municipality of Cornwallis to the Minister in past years that have indicated that there was a dispute as to who was responsible for maintaining dyking on the Assiniboine river in full state of repair. Whether or not that was ever resolved I do not know, but it may be that this spring if dykes are weak and if repairs have not been accomplished, that we may have some very serious problems just to the west of Brandon.

The third factor I would consider would be that of adequate warning to farmers and the residents of the valley west of Brandon, in order that they may be advised of the need to move grain storage or feed storage and other items of importance to their farming operations from the valley level well in advance of any flooding which may take place.

Mr. Speaker, those were the principal concerns that relate to the Assiniboine Valley. I notice that it wasn't mentioned at all in today's flood forecasting. I don't know whether I should take that as an indication that the danger has somehow diminished, but the flood forecast as I read it dealt with most other rivers in the province - but I saw no reference to the Assiniboine River. There was considerable reference to the Souris River which of course empties into the Assiniboine somewhat downstream of Brandon.

There is one other matter, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to mention at this time. It's a matter that has been referred to by a number of my colleagues in their debate with the Minister of Agriculture. I find it rather difficult to understand the policies of the Minister in many respects and it becomes more mystifying when I read about the decisions which his department is taking to reduce the work of the Manitoba Women's Institute and to replace many of the home economics' representatives in various parts of the rural part of Manitoba. I get the impression that there are other employees of the Department of Agriculture that are now taking over some of these functions, and I just wonder what it is that makes it necessary to reduce an organization which apparently has been functioning in a very satisfactory manner. I'm wondering if this government has some particular objection to the role of women in rural Manitoba. I had some concern about the Minister of Finance's act on Mineral Acreage Tax, and how somehow or other it came out that women were not really farmers. By definition in the Act, women who remain on the farms don't seem to be able to qualify as farmers in respect to the Mineral Acreage Tax Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just would like to ask the honourable member whether he would look at the third paragraph of the Flood Forecasting Committee report, and advise me whether he's still of the opinion that - the third paragraph - there are two reports. The honourable member has seen them both? There are two . . .

MR. MCGILL: I just have one.

MR. GREEN: Oh I'm sorry, well then the honourable member has not been given one copy of the report, and I regret to say that the situation on the Assiniboine is not described very optimistically. But his party should have a copy of the report; I'll have the Clerk take a copy over to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry if I didn't receive a second section of the report. I understood, and I assume that this was the complete report, but if there is another report . . . and I'm sorry, too, that it doesn't contain good news and that there is no reason to believe that the flood danger has been in any way diminished.

But Mr. Speaker, I was engaged in attempting to understand the philosophy and the directions in which the Minister of Agriculture was taking his department, and wondering why

BILL 34

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . it was that employees and home economists in rural Manitoba were somehow being considered redundant and that they were being moved to other parts of the province and it seems that some of the activities and duties of the women in this respect are being taken over by rural councillors. I don't quite understand the full nature of the role of the rural councillors but it would seem to me that there may be some connection, Mr. Speaker, between the diminishing function of the Women's Institute and the increasing function of rural councillors in Manitoba. But I was going on to make the point that there seems to be some general failure to recognize the value of the work of women in rural Manitoba by the Minister of Agriculture. It may be related in some sense to the way in which the Mineral Acreage Tax has manifested itself and the way it's being interpreted, because it seems to me that the definition of a farmer somehow leaves out the role of the woman on the farm in Manitoba - and while the reference is not specifically in that way, it would appear that the Act is being administered that a widow who remains on the farm does not qualify as a farmer in order to avoid the tax - and while the Minister of Finance may not have intended that to happen, nevertheless it would appear that that is the case. And I'm not hearing all of his comments, but I am still hoping that I interpreted the Minister of Finance properly in the original presentation of the Mineral Acreage tax, and they really didn't intend this to happen to his Act and that he still has ample opportunity during the scope, in the rest of the session, that some amendment that will make it less discriminatory in its impact upon rural Manitoba.

But Mr. Speaker, I do have great reservations about the direction in which the Minister of Agriculture is taking his department, not only in respect to the changes he is making in the staffing of his department and their activities in rural Manitoba, but in so many other ways in which the Minister is attempting to impose personal views and personal biases - if the Minister would even admit that he has any biases - in the way in which a number of recent referendums have been presented to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I would not care to use this opportunity to present some of the views and observations which I intend to make in respect to the Budget that was presented last night. I would feel that there might be a more suitable opportunity for that purpose. And before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I should perhaps in deference to the additional information that the Minister of Mines has given me, point out from the press release here covering the flood report, the Flood Forecast Report - it says that in the Assiniboine River basin, precipitation since the last meeting has been above normal, resulting in a somewhat higher flood potential. With normal precipitation from now and throughout the snow melt period, flooding is likely to occur along the Assiniboine River upstream of Brandon. So Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister and his department would consider the remarks that have been made here this afternoon and perhaps give us his assurance that a full use, a full use and the maximum capacity of this reservoir will be made available in the spring runoff period. Thank you.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek that debate be adjourned.

MOTION carried.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill 7, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. GREEN: Apparently the honourable member is not here, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps we can call it 4:30.

MR. CHERNIACK: How about calling it 5:30?

MR. GREEN: No, it's up to them. Call it 4:30, we can go to the Private Members'.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: We go into Private Members' Hour? Is that the wish of the Assembly? Very well we're on Resolution 24. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is not present. It drops to the bottom. Resolution . . .

MR. GREEN: That's all right. I believe it's his first time out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order? In browsing through Hansard during the two days that I was absent, I noticed that the Minister of Labour raised a point of order in connection with the question of bills that arrive on the Order Paper for the first time - and there was some confusion in his mind, and he raised the point of order for clarification, and I wonder if we just couldn't clear up that point right now. I believe that it was the intention of the Rules Committee when they suggested - and I don't have the ruling in front of me, but I think I remember it clearly enough, that a bill that arrives on the Order Paper for the first paper and was not dealt with, would drop down to the bottom of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Just on a point of clarification, is the honourable member talking about a bill or a resolution?

MR. JORGENSON: Oh, a resolution, I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. JORGENSON: That it would drop down to the bottom of the Order Paper. Once, however, that particular resolution had been introduced in the House, then it becomes the subject for debate and the debate must be continuous. I don't think that it was the intention of the Rules Committee, and perhaps the House Leader, either one, to deny or concur with my remarks; I don't think it was the intention of the Rules Committee that a bill that came up even two or three or four times and was not introduced, would be prohibited from continuing to remain on the Order Paper and arrive on top of the Order Papers as if it was a new resolution. In other words, the point that the Minister of Labour raised was that after a resolution came up twice and was not introduced, that it should drop off the Order Paper. It wasn't a suggestion, it was a question that he raised. I suggest, no, I think, Sir, that once a resolution has been introduced, then it must be dealt with until it's disposed of, but until it is introduced in the House, it would be deemed to have not been spoken on and therefore would have all of the qualifications of a new resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Member for Morris is probably more than anyone the architect of the principle of the Private Members' resolutions and how they would be dealt with, perhaps with the exception of dealing with some of the last hour of every day which - I mean the entire procedure was something which we had strong concurrence in. And my recollection would have been, and I'm not attempting to challenge here, my recollection would have been that the Honourable Member for Morris said that you should not be able to stand these things; that if the member wasn't there to proceed, it would stand once, but if he wasn't ready to proceed the next time it would drop off the paper, in which case he could introduce it again. And that's the way the rules read, that if he's not there the first time it goes down to the . . . If he was not there the second time, I can almost see my honourable member saying, the man isn't there the second time - and the Speaker has nodded - then it just drops off the paper. And of course, that is not a real prejudice because he can introduce it again. So that is my recollection what he said. And the point is not one on which I am really terribly concerned. In other words, I believe that a private member's view as to how this should operate would take precedence to my view, except that the rule sort of indicates a preference for the position that I am taking and rather than change the rule, if the rule that I am referring to deals with Resolutions - 22, No. 4 says, "Where the resolution of a member is reached for the first time on the Order Paper during Private Members' Hour, if the member is not present or does not proceed with the resolution at that time, the resolution shall be placed at the bottom of the Order Paper." But it says "for the first time." 22(4). And if it was intended that it be a resolution, that where the resolution of a member is reached and has not yet been introduced and the member is not present, it shall drop to the bottom of the Order Paper, then I could accept that interpretation - but the first time, we have in law a statement: "expressio unius est exclusio alterius", it means that if a man is not there when his resolution is called it is not proceeded with. Now, I can almost remember the - if the honourable member wants a translation, that where you express one thing - where you express a specific one thing, then you exclude the alternative interpretation so that it would not occur on the second time.

Now I can almost remember the Member for Morris saying that if the member isn't there the second time, it should drop off the Order Paper, in which case he is not prejudiced

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . because he can introduce it again. I believe that it would be better if we went in accordance with the rule, we haven't insisted upon it. If we went in accordance with the rule and dropped it off the Order Paper the second time, and have the member reintroduce it; and if this is a bad procedure, then the next time Rules Committee gets together we can clarify that, because it doesn't bother me if it stays on the Order Paper and I would prefer that the private members be accommodated on this question than myself, because it really doesn't matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I believe last year we had established a precedence, that last year the resolutions did not go off the Order Paper after they had not been introduced, or went to the bottom for the second time. I think this is what was the case last year, and I'm sure if we can check back the records - and perhaps the Clerk would remember, but I'm sure this is what has taken place last year and I can't see why we should change. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if we're allowed to let it go off the Order Paper and reintroduce it, all we're doing is creating more work for the staff within the Chamber here, and I don't think this is necessary. I think we should proceed with what happened last year, and if this is not satisfactory, then let's change the rule for the next session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, before the Member for Morris takes up, I just want him to also pay attention to 21(1) which says: "Subject to Rule 22(2) (3) and (4)," and (4) is what I read, "questions, notices of motion by members and orders not taken up or proceeded with when called may be allowed to stand and retain their precedence, otherwise they shall be removed from the Order Paper." And then, "Where the resolution is reached for the first time, if the member is not present or does not proceed, the resolution shall be placed at the Order Paper." Now, this particular 21(1) indicates that they shall be removed from the Order Paper if they are not taken up or proceeded with; it says they may be allowed to stand, but Private Members' resolutions are not allowed to stand and if they are not introduced, they are removed from the Order Paper. Now I can almost remember the Member from Morris just sort of being quite hard on the private members if they're not there after it comes up twice --(Interjection)-- Well, the honourable member says that it didn't happen last session. I am certain that it did happen last session --(Interjections)-- well, then we are arguing about our memories, and I suppose it would be better to go back to precedence and ask the Clerk perhaps to check whether this - or perhaps better still, the person who alleges should bring in the precedent that he intends to rely on where last session we did not do it. I know we did not do it this session, because this session there were two that came back up and we let them proceed, but the point was taken at the time. Last session my recollection is that resolutions did drop off and were reintroduced. However, I'd prefer that the honourable member - and I do not rely on our memories - and we look at the precedent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the House Leader has a better recollection of what I said during the rules debate than I do myself, but I'm not going to quarrel with him, because I think my original statement was a good one and he could well be right that that was the case. However I don't rise here to argue this point one way or the other, but I do think that this may be just as convenient a time as any to get a decision on the manner in which we will proceed, because we really don't have that much experience with the Private Members' Hour that it's too late to make rulings that will guide us in the future. And I would even agree with what the House Leader just said, that if a member is not here the second time, that the resolution drop off the Order Paper, because there is no great inconvenience, there's nothing stopping the member from reintroducing it - and now that - now that, I repeat that, now I recall having said it - and Sir, I would think now that it is as good a time as any to make that decision, since it was raised by the Minister of Labour. It seems to me Sir, that the idea of - and if we want to proceed along those lines - the idea of the change and the manner in which we're dealing with private member's business, was to give some organization, was to give some order in the way we're doing it, so members can know in advance which resolution we're going to deal with so that we would know then which members would have to stay in the House in order to deal with it. The way we are handling them, because members introduce resolutions on the Order Paper and then fly away, makes it very difficult for members of the House to deal

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . with resolutions and they come up over and over again. Now that I'm convincing myself, I am going to concur even more heartily with the House Leader, because in the final analysis the purpose of changing this whole system in the first place was to give us some idea what we're going to be dealing with, so the members that are going to be dealing with that particular measure would know in advance. And so, with that as a guide, then I don't know why we can't make a decision here with the concurrence of the House Leader with the Liberal party that these resolutions will stay on the Order Paper first time, after which they will drop off and must be reintroduced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that we proceed that way. And may I indicate to the Member for Assiniboia that nobody will be affected immediately, because these are all coming up the first time; and that they should know that the next time if they are not here it comes off the Order Paper and that it would then come up. I believe that you have concurrence on that, Mr. Speaker, and that that should be the method of disposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. In that case, 24 is being asked for for the first time

MR. GREEN: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The next time . . . Well it doesn't stand, it drops down, but when it comes up again it will be eliminated if it's not spoken on. The other resolution is No. 17, which is open at the present time. Question on it? The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

RESOLUTION 17

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): Well, Mr. Chairman, I've been looking at the resolution and I rather like its wording. As a new member of the Legislature, it seems to me that the standing committees of the Legislature could do with a bit of revamping due to the complexity of politics and due to the complexity of government. The longer sessions that we are finding ourselves becoming involved in, the more government programs and the greater demand from the public to get more services from their representatives - and I certainly think that the responsibilities and some of the things that the standing committees of the House have to do, we'd be well advised to take some look at them and give some consideration to their activities.

What I'm finding, Mr. Speaker, is that the services of the MLA are becoming more and more demanding and more complex in nature, and take more research, more advisement on the activities. It would seem to me that the Internal Economy Committee of the House would be a body to take some look at this, to set some policy and possibly to increase the numbers on that particular committee, and I would think that the opposition parties may have some part to play in that committee. It would seem rather advisable to have a member from each of the opposition parties to have representation on that particular committee in order that they can have some input into the discussions and the procedures of that committee, that would have a great deal to do with the operation of the business of the House.

And it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that whatever committee we decide to improve in that area, that the utilization of the Legislative Building itself could be somewhat improved for the use of the elected representatives. And just from listening to my colleagues talking, it seems that if you desire some space in the building or require some space in the building, that you walk down the halls and open the doors and look in, and if the room's empty you more or less just go in and occupy it and set up your office, and just hope that nobody else has got a claim staked on that particular vacant space; and if it has been previously staked out by someone else, it seems that first there has the first claim on that vacant space. So the Legislative Building has possibly not been used for the purpose of the public representatives in the manner that it should be, because the programs and demands of government have increased tremendously in the last decade, and the branches and arms of government are fanning out into various buildings, and certainly the Legislative Building would seem to me to be the logical place for the elected representatives to be located, to have their offices established in, I would think, somewhat nice work space.

There's no reason that the MLAs shouldn't be afforded the same type of working space and working facilities as what the Civil Service have, and some of the Civil Service have new facilities and lots of assistance, etc. I know that the Speaker himself has problems with things of this nature, and the sessional staff, the pages, etc. could certainly do with some

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) . . . more space in the building, could do with some more facilities, and I'm sure that the Speaker of this House would certainly be in agreement with some improvement in this area, and I would think that he would look on this resolution very favourably. I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Morris, when he presented this resolution, knew what he was talking about. He framed the resolution in a very nice, concise way and left lots of latitude for discussion, and I'm sure he's well aware of the problems of the members of this Chamber. I know that the communications from the building could stand a great deal of improvement and possibly a great deal of control as well. The phone calls, etc. sometimes are unaccountable, and I would think that if we had the proper facilities and the proper staff that a lot of this could be controlled and probably have somewhat of a saving of expense money for that particular purpose.

Also, a committee set up in this particular regard could certainly take a look at the expenses of the members of this Legislature and especially the rural members, because to me the rural members are suffering an inequity that the urban members aren't faced with. I would think that the rural members should have an accountable expense account. If they travel x number of miles, they should get the going rate; the going rate is 15 cents a mile, I believe nowadays for automobile expenses, and if they travel by air they should just have to present the air ticket and it would be paid the same as hotel and meals, and certainly the members in the rural areas in my view have been vastly underpaid on their expenses to represent the constituents out in the rural areas, and if a committee was established just for that particular purpose alone, one committee to deal with the problems of the rural members, then I would support the particular committee of that nature, because the people of this province nowadays are expecting more representation, more frequent representation and more detailed representation, and unless the MLAs from the rural areas have the wherewithal to give that representation, then the people are not getting fair return for their tax dollar on representation.

Now I think that the Rules Committee of this House should be a permanent committee and it could consider many items, advise on my items, maybe work in harmony with the internal economy committee. Now I'm not particularly hung up on which should be the predominating committee, but there seems to me to be the two committees in writing at the present time and just how they function and where they function I'm going to be willing to learn about that, and hopefully that some of the veterans of this House can draw the lines clear and straight on that. But whatever it is, if it's going to be the Internal Economy Committee that's going to handle this particular type of problem, then I think they should be handling it on a regular basis and should comprise all parties in the House, and certainly have some guidelines and a pretty free rein to operate as far as the matters concerning this particular House is concerned. So we'll see what happens in that regard and just how the members of this Legislative Assembly decide to saw-off on the particular committee that's going to be the predominating committee in bringing about the things that Resolution 17 is talking about.

Now I've heard some comment about a Committee on Health and Social Development that is some particular -- they have something to do or work in the Legislative branch of this Assembly, and I'm not really sure what they're all about yet but it seems to me that they're not much more than a committee on paper and they don't seem to have too much autonomy, but I could be vastly misinformed on that particular aspect of the thing, and it seems to me that they get a low priority and they sort of operate on loan personnel from other departments or borrowed personnel or whatever you have but . . . And I may have the committee, that particular name wrong, but that is what I was in discussion with some of the honourable members, that I got that impression. --(Interjection)-- Well my whip usually gives me my advice so he's going to have to take the blame in this case. You see, you can always see that a whip sometimes leads a new member astray.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Radisson state his matter of privilege.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I did not advise the Honourable Member for Crescentwood on the matter that he just brought up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. PATTERSON: I didn't say he did. I just said I had the indication that he did. He advises me on so many things that I would think that he advised me on this one too.

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd)

In the debates on this resolution, there has been quite a bit of talk about the Chief Electoral Officer, and I would concur with the sentiment of the comments that have been made, that the Chief Electoral office should be an independent, more independent, particular person in this House and more or less be off by himself and . . .

A MEMBER: Which resolution are you talking about?

MR. PATTERSON: We're on 17. I'm just getting around to the . . . Don't worry, Harry. We'll get there. I think what the honourable members think, it's been quite a while since we debated this resolution and they forget some of the debate that has taken place on it, but I guarantee to my honourable whip here that if he goes back in Hansard he'll find that we were talking about the Chief Electoral Officer on this particular resolution. At the time I wondered myself what it had to do with the resolution, but as I could see, the Honourable Member for Morris, he drafted this resolution with very wide guidelines, and I give the members credit for taking the opportunity of expanding on those guidelines and certainly getting in all of the little points that they have on their minds about the things in the House.

I notice that the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party he gets very frustrated many many times with the proceedings of the House and how the committee should operate, and what they should do and how they should do it. I would think that maybe some of his frustration is valid because maybe the committees aren't structured the way they should be. Maybe they haven't got all the freedom that they should have.

A MEMBER: This is the one that he spits on.

MR. PATTERSON: Well I don't know what committees the Honourable Leader of the Liberal party sits on . . .

A MEMBER: Spits on.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, there's my honourable whip giving me advice again and I won't repeat it to you because it is unparliamentary. I just want to mention that because his frustration sometimes really is overwhelming, and it may be that this is the problem with a lot of the members in the House where we can't really get on with the job that's intended to be.

Maybe the drafter of this resolution, and I know he has had some experience on the federal scene and possibly he was bringing some of that experience to this House in this resolution. and he probably drafted the resolution with the background knowledge that he had from the Federal House and he realized that the job that was being done by the elected representatives in the federal House was maybe not much more demanding than what we're finding ourselves here today, and he was trying to get this across to us that here we are, faced with a full time job, and we need more facilities, we need more space, and we need more research help.

Now in a particular report that has come out of our sister province to the east, the people of that province in the surveys, a great percentage of them rated the MLA, the position of an MLA, to be around the third level in society, in our structure of society today. So giving that type of thinking from the populace as a whole, the role of an MLA is to be taken rather seriously and not so lightly as maybe a lot of people tend it to be. The results of that report are showing that the elected representatives in the rural areas show more relevance to their people. They're better known and they have a closer contact with the people, so in that area once again we come to the member from the rural constituencies where they need probably more help and more funding to do the job that the MLAs do in the urban areas.

It's also shown that the MLAs are in general well respected and well-known throughout their constituency, whether it be urban or rural, and this would seem to indicate that a committee has quite a job to do in making the position of the MLA more prestigious in the community. It is also shown that the vast majority of people consider their elected representatives to be honest people with high integrity, very sincere people, and they also respect them for being law makers and operating within the framework of democracy. And you know, after viewing all of that in the report, it's rather odd to note that a very small percentage of the people really take advantage of the services offered by their elected representatives. You know, a lot of them do but the percentage is small. But those that do, certainly should be getting more representation for their monies, possibly, than what they're getting at the present time.

So it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that we should take a look at some procedure in this House of establishing, I would think maybe two committees. I would think we should have

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) . . . a committee on procedures and a committee on administration, and the numbers could vary depending on whatever the consensus would be of the members in the House. I would think the committee on procedures, this would encompass a continuing process rather than the present style of occasional massive revamping. It has to be a continual thing in order to have any real solid impact on what we're doing from day to day. A committee on administration - that could be to publish and review the members' expenses, allocation of partisan space in the Legislative Building and secretarial and administrative services, and advise the Legislative Librarian on members' requirements. Now Mr. Chairman, I would think that we should take a very serious look at establishing some committees along this line and hopefully they can bring about the things that the elected representatives really require.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris will be closing debate when he speaks on this, I believe. Correct.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief comments. The debate, particularly in the last twenty minutes, has taken a turn that I never anticipated when I first introduced the resolution. I had not intended that the resolution be a launching pad for someone to plead the cause of the rural members. That was certainly not the intention, but I welcome the honourable member's intervention and we on this side of the House will, since there are so many rural members, will take his words very seriously and try to impress upon the government the wisdom of his pronouncements.

Sir, it had another odd twist at the beginning of the debate and, as the Minister of Mines and Resources said, it was one of those resolutions that one would expect would provoke debate on the merits of the resolution itself. However, the Leader of the Liberal Party chose to use that as a launching pad to launch an attack on the government and, more particularly, the Minister of Mines and Resources. We had some very unkind things to say about the committee system in this Chamber, or in this House and I couldn't help but get the feeling that his concept of parliamentary democracy requires some edification. I think that and I regret that the Leader of the Liberal Party is not here because I think I should put on the record and perhaps he just may choose to read them on some occasion, that committees in this House are not intended and could not operate as the committees in the United States House of Representatives or the United States Senate. Committees in this House are not decision-making bodies. They are committees that are set up to do specific purposes that are assigned to them by the House. They do not launch investigations of their own, they simply carry out the instructions of the House. Now insofar as the governing of their own affairs are concerned, the calling of witnesses, who will be the chairman and things like that, they carry out that responsibility. They're directed by the rules of the House and are able to conduct themselves with regard to their own internal operation.

Insofar as a decision-making body is concerned, Sir, they simply carry out the instructions of the House and report back to the House. There is no obligation, although I think there is a strong inclination on the part of the government to want to at least read the reports and maybe take into consideration some of the recommendations that are made therein. But primarily they carry on the function that is being carried on in this House, and that is the function of investigation and examination, the calling of witnesses before the committees to examine certain facets of government, or to carry on investigation into certain areas that the government want some investigation carried on. So I hope that that distinction is made.

Sir, it was with some alarm when I was in Ottawa earlier in the week, that a continuation of that debate that went on between the Minister of Mines and Resources and the Leader of the Liberal Party reached Ottawa and we heard, much to our dismay, that the only thing preventing the Minister of Mines and Resources from leaping across and punching the Liberal Leader in the nose was the desk and some self-restraint. What I want to say, Sir, what I want to say, is that that gave rise to an idea that I have and perhaps I can get the concurrence of the Liberal Leader and the Minister of Mines and Resources.

On May 1st, the party which I have the honour to represent will be holding a fund-raising dinner at the International Inn. Now we have invited, we have invited the Honourable Claude Vogner as guest speaker, and I spoke to Mr. Vogner when I heard of the incident in the House and he said, "Well, I'll be prepared to forego the honour of speaking at your convention if you can make other -- you know, if you prefer to make other arrangements." And what I would

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . like to know is if, in lieu of Mr. Vogner speaking at that meeting, if the Minister of Mines and Resources and the Leader of the Liberal Party would agree to put on the gloves for ten rounds. That would appear to me to be a far greater attraction, and instead of selling tickets for \$25.00 a plate which us peasants can afford - we can't afford a \$100.00 plate dinner - I'm sure that with that kind of feature attraction we'd have no trouble selling tickets for \$100.00 a plate, and instead of selling just a thousand we would sell five thousand. And so far be it --(Interjection)-- We could, you know, with the extra money, we would be able to provide some kind of a purse. We would make sure that whoever was the winner would be suitably rewarded. And I make this suggestion to the Minister of Mines and Resources who is here, and I'll have to make it on another occasion to the Leader of the Liberal Party, because it seems to me that here is a splendid opportunity to settle the differences that seem to crop up from time to time between them, and at the same time raise money for a very worthy cause.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to the resolution, I am pleased to have had the debate that did take place. Although it strayed somewhat on many occasions from the real intent of the resolution, nonetheless I hope the government does give consideration to the suggestion that was made that the Rules Committee will be set up this year and that the matter of restructuring of committees is one of the terms of reference that will be given to that Rules Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

QUESTION put; Resolution carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Should we carry on? The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I note that the next two items on the Order Paper, the honourable member is not here. The following one is being held in the name of a member who is not here. It would probably be unfair to try to debate something which would not reasonably have been expected to come up so that it's probably not properly caucused or speakers assigned, and therefore notwithstanding the hazards of this type of motion which I intend to make in a few moments. I would like to suggest that next week, of course, we are involved in the Budget Debate which will take precedence, and if items of non-precedence come up they will be dealt with by dealing with the third reading of the Interim Supply motion and then Capital Supply, plus such bills on second reading as we are able to deal with given the nature of precedence that has been established, plus the committees that have already been announced. Other than that, the manner of House business will be dealt with earlier in the day. Now unless there are questions relating to the conduct of the House. . . ? Seeing no takers, I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Morris, that the House be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion, motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.