



Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Harry E. Graham  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXVI No. 81**

**2:30 p.m. Thursday, July 6, 1978**

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, July 6, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, I did want to ask the Minister of Finance, on two successive days now, a question with respect to the rather important announcement of policy in Ottawa, relative to energy. I know that the matter has been taken as notice by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, but I assume the Minister of Industry and Commerce is not in a position to reply as yet. I think he took it as notice on behalf of his colleague, in any case.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

**HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister is at a federal-provincial meeting today and hopefully we'll have something tomorrow.

**MR. SCHREYER:** I'd like to ask a question then with respect to the Ministry of Health, and I would assume that the Acting Minister would attempt to reply or take it as notice on his behalf, and that is, to ask, with respect to the last — the Minister has now entered, so I can pose the question and he can assimilate it even while he walks. The question flows from the last annual report just tabled of the Department of Health, and in that report there is statistical data relating to the number of acute care patient-days, hospital care days in Manitoba on a per-thousand population basis. There is a remarkable consistency with respect to the statistical average on the part of five of the regions of Manitoba, and an equally remarkable deviation from the norm or the average on the part of two regions, and I think it merits some very specific attention and specific reply on the part of the Minister as to what explains this phenomenon. It would be the Health Services Commission Report, rather than the departmental report; the Minister may wish to take it as notice.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, it would be the Manitoba Health Services Commission Report. I would request the indulgence of the Leader of the Opposition in taking it as notice, and I'll try to provide him with an explanation as quickly as possible.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. It relates to the Shaughnessy School program of day care, breakfast, dinner and after-school program. I previously asked the Minister whether funding for this program would be cut off, and he indicated that he didn't believe any ongoing programs would be discontinued. In view of the fact that the parents at the school say that they are not going to be receiving funds, I wonder whether the Minister can find out more particularly from his department, the actual status of that program, the places where they did receive the funds, which funds are being discontinued, and the possibility of them being able to obtain funds to operate this parent-children oriented program which has worked very well in a community sponsored school in that area.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and check into it a little more completely.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Culture and Recreation. Could he confirm to the House that the Provincial Government has cancelled support for the annual Royal Winnipeg Ballet Dancing in the Park Festival that takes place at the end of July?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

**MR. BANMAN:** No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm it, I'll check into it for the member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Labour responsible for the Civil Service Commission, and ask the Honourable Minister whether she has had any recent discussions with the Manitoba Government Employees Association respecting the matter of civil servants being brought under The Labour Relations Act?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** No, I haven't, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. EVANS:** A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Has the Honourable Minister or the government received any indication from the MGEA that they still wish to achieve this objective which was such a vital matter for them last year, that is, being placed under The Labour Relations Act?

**MRS. PRICE:** We did have some dialogue with respect to the subject that the member has just asked about, however, that was back in about last November and we haven't discussed it any further since that time.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, on another matter of the same Minister, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister when she might be able to table the report from the director of her mechanical engineering division respecting the frequency and degree of inspection at the Simplot Chemical or Simplot Fertilizer plant at Brandon. On June 15th, in the Estimates of the Department of Labour, the Honourable Minister indicated that she would provide members with a copy of that report.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I will have it in a few days for the member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, on reflection, in view of the magnitudes involved, I think it appropriate to ask the First Minister whether he can indicate with respect to the Federal government's announcement of yesterday, with respect to \$400 million approximately, \$400 million alternative energy development program, if this program is to follow even approximate regional or provincial distribution of effort and infusion of capital — it could mean in the order of \$20 million for Manitoba, or for Manitoba industry more precisely, or government and industry together — can the First Minister indicate if it's been brought to his attention, whether the province was consulted in this process and whether there is anything in the way of an assurance that there will be an approximation of provincial population distribution of these funds?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, I know that along with my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, the announcement from Ottawa yesterday with respect to the new grant system, and I would have to take his question as notice on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Finance, who is in charge of energy matters, who is otherwise engaged today with his colleagues from across Canada. As to the specifics of the question that he has asked, whether or not there has been dialogue or was dialogue between him and the federal authorities on this specific point, I couldn't say with any accuracy at all, but I would be happy to take the question as notice.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Health and Social Development but I'll preface it with a brief piece of information. I asked this question of the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission when her Estimates were reviewed. I don't have an answer yet so I'll ask the Minister of Health and Social Development directly.

Will the Minister confirm that Manford Kyle, a former employee of the Conservative Party caucus, is now with the Department of Health and Social Development in some official capacity?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kyle is under contract to the Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch of the Department of Health and Social Development working for the committee appointed by me to examine the whole question of fitness and amateur sport under the chairmanship of Mr. Jim Daly.

**MR. PARASIUK:** A supplementary. Does the Minister feel that Mr. Kyle's qualifications in this respect are somewhat better than the 115 laid-off civil servants who are waiting to be redeployed as part of the government's redeployment process?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I don't feel that way at all. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Kyle has some qualifications for the type of work he's doing in connection with the field of fitness and amateur sport. It was a short-term arrangement, a short-term contract, which is now rapidly nearing its termination date.

**MR. PARASIUK:** A supplementary to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission. Would the Minister undertake to investigate this concrete case immediately to determine if the 115 civil servants who were laid off by the Conservative government and who are now on the redeployment list which the Conservative government has set up, whether she would investigate this case to determine whether in fact the government's redeployment process promised for these 115 people isn't in fact being subverted by the Conservative Party trying to bring their party hacks in through the back door, through the back door, and thus subvert the official Civil Service procedures?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, about a month ago —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet. The Honourable Member for Transcona on a point of order.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I gather that the Member for Lac du Bonnet has yielded to me and I think it's in order that since I'm the only one standing that I could be recognized to ask another question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Do I have the floor, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission whether in fact she heard my question or whether in fact she has heard my question and is refusing to deal with this very critical matter regarding the merit principle within the Civil Service Commission.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I heard the Member for Transcona's question. No, we are not subverting the system that the Redeployment Committee has but there are still some instances where people that are highly expertise in some areas are needed. It would be at a minimum, but there are still times that this happens.

**MR. PARASIUK:** A supplementary question to the Minister responsible for an objective Civil Service. Would the Minister undertake to look into the qualifications of Mr. Manford Kyle, to determine whether in fact he has any qualifications whatsoever that would qualify him to act as an advisor to the Ministerial Committee on Fitness and Amateur Sports, and, secondly, would she investigate to determine whether any one of those 115 civil servants who were laid off by the Conservative Government, whether in fact any of them had any better qualifications to more suitably fill that particular function, and will she undertake to report back to the House?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I might perhaps be permitted to answer that question on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Labour, since I am more closely connected with that particular appointment.

I would confirm to the Honourable Member for Transcona, that the individual in this case was considered and is considered by me and by the government, to have particular qualifications, since he worked, in fact, on developing the government party's position on fitness and amateur sport, when we were in opposition. In any event, he is more qualified to hold that position than the former secretary of the Planning Secretariat.

**MR. PASIUK:** Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, the Minister must have wax in his ears or holes in his head, because he didn't understand the particular question I asked him. I asked him whether any of the 115 civil servants who were laid off by his government haven't more qualifications than some party hack that they brought in through the back door to fill a civil service position, while creating unemployment in the Civil Service.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, not that the question is deserving of an answer, but for the edification of the House, I might say that the number of contract employees, according to the latest figures that I have seen, in Manitoba, have decreased from 1,200, when we took office, to about 400 today, which says something to all reasonable people about the state of patronage in the Manitoba Civil Service.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister with respect to his answer just now. Can the Minister confirm that last year there were not 115 bona fide civil servants who had gone through boards and examinations, who were not on a redeployment list because they were not laid off? Can the Minister confirm that that list didn't exist last year, but now exists and is being subverted by people brought in through the back door through the contract process? Can the Minister confirm that?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I can certainly confirm that there was no list of party friends of my honourable friends unemployed, because the government was employing most of them up until the 24th of October, 1978.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona with a seventh question.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the First Minister if he would answer the question rather than editorializing with respect to a red herring, when he gets up to answer a question. Is he prepared to answer my previous two questions, and confirm that there are now 115 civil servants laid off, who are on a redeployment list, who weren't there last year, and who are being subverted by the Conservative Party bringing in contract employees through the back door?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that repetitive questions are not in the best interest of this Chamber.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHYER:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and flows from his last reply to the Honourable Member for Transcona. When the Minister of Health refers to the lack of qualifications of the Member for Transcona, I would like to ask the Minister of Health, since he

has put himself in a position of judgment, whether he was ever selected as Manitoba's best qualified applicant to represent Manitoba at Oxford?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister, in order to complete his answer, would he add the words "nor ever likely."

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister in charge of Housing whether he is able to tell us today the results of his inquiry of the Right Angle Farms, whether they are prepared to take back the properties that were expropriated by the previous administration, or in the process of expropriation, as he indicated that he had instructed legal counsel to pursue.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I'm not able to give the honourable member that answer today. As I informed him earlier, our legal counsel is pursuing it. We haven't really gained much more ground than we were when the member asked the question before. We are still working on it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. George.

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service and ask her if she has yet unconfused herself and is able to provide the figures that she promised in the committee about the records of the numbers of individuals who had left the Civil Service and figures of that nature.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, they'll be ready in a couple of days.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to also ask the Premier whether he has had an opportunity to look at the file dealing with his office and the Village of Arborg, whether he's prepared to table the letters in the House today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I have had that opportunity and the staff have prepared a photocopy of the letter in question. I'm happy to table it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister reporting for the Civil Service Commission. The honourable lady will recall that it is now a few weeks since she took as notice a question relative to the actual numbers of persons employed in the public service of Manitoba today as well as the number of positions that exist, permanent positions that exist, under the Civil Service. At the time when the question was asked, the Minister took it as notice for two reasons: One having to do with a newspaper report which she was going to double-check on as to accuracy, and also to find out the differentiation between the numbers of positions existing or the number of positions abolished and the number of persons, actual persons, employed that are in the employ at the present time.\$

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, that's part of the report that I will have as I mentioned to the Member for St. George.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

Thursday, July 6, 1978

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Earlier today at a demonstration on the front steps of the Legislature, the Minister indicated to the demonstrators that she and her government were encouraging a 6 percent settlement in the Safeway strike and lockout. My question to the Minister is, then in what specific manner has she and her government been encouraging that 6 percent settlement in that set of negotiations?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the Honourable Member for Churchill. I did not say that we were encouraging a 6 percent settlement with Safeway; I said that we were encouraging a 6 percent settlement with all people that are negotiating for settlements. I didn't mention anything about Safeway and a 6 percent settlement.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, having been there, I know that the Minister was replying directly to a question in regard to the Safeway strike. I am wondering if she has had any negotiations with that company, any talks with company officials, or talks with the negotiators, to specifically encourage them to hold out for a 6 percent settlement.

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I have had absolutely no dialogue with the management of Safeway or any other management that are negotiating.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, in light of allegations recently that Burns Company has refused to hire any worker on strike or lockout with Swifts or Canada Packers, will the Minister undertake to investigate what may well be an unfair labour practice, one commonly described as blacklisting?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the negotiations that are taking place between the Allied Food Workers and the food packing plants, the negotiations are all taking place down east. My first liaison with anybody was one of the workers outside today that asked me if I could do something in that regard; I haven't been approached by either side previously. And I did tell him at that time that I would contact the management down east today. I have put in calls to all three companies and I have not heard from them as yet.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. A few days ago I asked him if he would investigate the question of whether there has been a substantial increase in the number of defaults on mortgage payments and the foreclosure of mortgages in the Province of Manitoba. I wonder if he has that information as yet?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West):** Mr. Speaker, not as yet.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, a further question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister on a different topic. Could the Minister indicate whether the report that's been issued by one of the cable companies in the City of Winnipeg, indicating that the Manitoba Telephone System is threatening to take over the total hardware and circuitry of the cable companies of Winnipeg, is in fact true? And has the Manitoba Telephone System been acting upon a policy position taken by the Manitoba government?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen the report to which the Member for Fort Rouge refers. I would hesitate to comment on it in a specific way until I have read the report.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps when the Minister is examining that issue, he would answer for the House whether Manitoba Telephone System has initiated, or is contemplating initiating, any actions to change the fee or contractual relationships with cable companies in Manitoba, with a view to taking over greater control or greater supervision over the cable lines?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, there has been some rate change proposed, but to my knowledge no change in the degree of supervision, as the member puts it, of the Winnipeg Cablevision Company operations in this area. If the member is referring to the policy which the Government of Manitoba is adopting in respect to the ownership of hardware for rural licensees, then that, Mr. Speaker, is

a different area, and we have, as has been explained in the House, indicated that the position of the government would be that the common carrier — in this case, the Manitoba Telephone System — would own all the hardware in the delivery system of cable signals to the rural areas of Manitoba.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister clarify then, whether the rate increases that are being appropriated to the Winnipeg cable companies, are being used by Manitoba Telephone System to develop and buy, purchase hardware for the rural system, which, I believe, contravenes the rulings of the CRTC?

**MR. MCGILL:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the only rate increase that has been proposed is not in any way related to the rural development of cable television, it relates to the price per hundred feet of delivery system in the Winnipeg area, and that rate is under review and has been referred to the Public Utilities Board for approval or otherwise, but the cable companies have chosen to appeal to the courts for a ruling in that respect.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Since the Minister of Labour is urging the striking employees to accept a 6 percent wage increase, would she consider urging her Cabinet colleagues to make it a 6 percent increase in the minimum wage in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that the Minister of Labour says her department is encouraging a 6 percent wage increase for employees, which is one of the issues in a work stoppage by employers and employees in the Province of Manitoba, would she also have her department encourage a continuation of the hiring practices in the construction industry, which the companies are demanding be changed, and which has resulted in a strike of over eight weeks' duration and a work stoppage in the construction industry?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I am leaving that up to the negotiating at the free collective bargaining table, which is a system that the people have wanted over the years, and I'm not going to interfere in their practice.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister explain how encouraging a wage increase of 6 percent, and saying that maternity leave by a husband to see his wife who is in the hospital, is saying that those are bad demands, how that is non-interference, but saying that the practice in the construction industry which has been carried on for years and years, a comment on that would be interference? Can she explain how she can take those two completely equivocal positions?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster is twisting things, as he is an expert at doing. I didn't say that it was a bad demand, having two days' pay while their wife was having a baby. I said that I had three children and my husband hadn't needed two days' pay or two days off in order to see me through it.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister confirm — or do I have to read it to her from Hansard — that she said a request of that kind could well be left out of bargaining at this time? Will she confirm that she said that, as it's recorded in Hansard, or is she requesting that Hansard be corrected to put the remarks that she said out of it, because she regrets having said them? Is she saying that Hansard is incorrect with respect to her remarks, that that kind of provision could be well left out of . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The honourable member is repeating his question.

**MR. G. IS EN:** I'll put the question the Minister saying that she was wrongly quoted in Hansard when she said that that type of demand could well be left out of bargaining at the present time?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, in this day, when we are trying to establish some restraint and some



orderly economics back into this province, I do not think that that is a necessary demand at this time.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister, now that she has indicated that she will express her opinion, vis-a-vis unreasonable demand, will she express her opinion vis-a-vis the unreasonable demand of the Builders Exchange, that hiring practices that have served this province well for years and years, is an unreasonable demand which has brought the construction industry in this province to a standstill?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General accepted an order for return in the latter part of April dealing with the costs of the Family Law Review Committee, the Houston-Anderson-Bowman Committee, and as we are now proceeding tomorrow night to deal with that particular law and receiving briefs, can the Attorney-General provide that information now to this House?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General. **HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I will accept that question as notice and inquire into that matter.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to either the First Minister or the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the Minister been informed by the Federal Government of any projected or impeding removal of 35 Armed Forces' personnel and their families from the Community of Churchill?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I will have to accept that question as notice and inquire into that matter.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs then. In light of the profound and negative impact that rumours of a complete removal of those Armed Forces' personnel from that community are having on the people of that community, will the Minister undertake immediately to contact the Federal Government in order to clarify the situation as soon as it's possible, and if the removal is imminent, will the First Minister please make strong representation to the Federal Government to cease and desist any such action immediately?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in fact I wrote to the Federal Minister of Public Works, Mr. Buchanan, some three weeks ago, requesting a meeting with him to discuss the situation in Churchill. I have just received a reply indicating that he is prepared to meet and it's a question of establishing a satisfactory meeting date.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the First Minister. I would like to ask the First Minister whether it is under his direction that the Province of Manitoba has now a labour policy which encourages the Labour Minister to comment favourably on the positions taken by the employer against the employees, but not to make any comment when the employer is taking an unreasonable position vis-a-vis his employees.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, in the case of my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, as is so often the case, has devised out of his very active mind a policy which doesn't exist, so I can hardly take responsibility for something that is a piece of mythology extracted from his very active mind.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to hear that the policy doesn't exist. Given the fact that the policy doesn't exist, will he tell his Labour Minister to stop breaking government policy, or to stop engaging in practices which comply with a policy which he says doesn't exist.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure what my honourable friend is getting at — whether we're getting near the end of TV time, or what it is — but I am not aware that the Minister of Labour is breaking any policy of this government at all with respect to free collective bargaining which is going on in various areas where there are work stoppages and/or lockouts today, which this government doesn't like any more than my honourable friend. But, this government does subscribe to what my honourable friend subscribes to, and this is free collective bargaining.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, does the First Minister consider it free collective bargaining without intervention on the part of his Labour Minister, to say that the employer position of six percent is one that she subscribes to; the employee demands of the right of a husband to go and see his wife when she is in the hospital is something that should not be bargained for; and to remain completely mute with regard to a demand by the Builders Exchange, which has caused a stoppage of work in this province for a period of eight weeks, the demand of the Exchange being that we change hiring practices that have served this province well for a good number of years — does he consider that to be non-intervention on the part of his Labour Minister?

**MR. LYON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to my question of yesterday to the Minister of Tourism, Parks, and Recreation, regarding the cancellation of the Actors Showcase Theatre for Children, can the Minister inform the members of the House whether in fact he has been able to find the \$5,000 required in order to get the tour launched so that some 30,000 children can benefit from performances of this group?

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

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I undertook to get the answer for that particular question. I understand it is the Manitoba Arts Council, and not the Department of Tourism that was involved, and I have contacted them to get the facts.

**MR. PARASIUK:** A supplementary. In view of the fact that the Manitoba Arts Council's funds have been cut back by the department, and in view of the fact that the Conservative government has cut out the provincial employment program which used to fund this program in the past, I am wondering if the Minister of Tourism might not sit down with the Minister of Education, and see whether in fact any of this \$60,000 fund that has been set up for organizations serving youth, could in fact be allocated to the Actors Showcase in order that this very worthwhile program could get under way this year during the summer months, when children are in a position to make use of that type of entertainment over the summer. Would the Minister consent to sit down with the Department of Education and see whether in fact \$5,000 couldn't be drawn from this fund?

**MR. BANMAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, as soon as I sit down I will talk to the Minister of Education.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. George.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the First Minister for tabling a copy of the letter that his office wrote to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Village of Arborg, and I would like to ask his opinion whether the sentence in the letter : "In light of Mr. Chyzy's interest in this matter, I suggest it may be appropriate for you to forward a copy of his letter requesting that the hearing be postponed to the Municipal Board" has an input of something greater than just a suggestion from his office indicating that his office is directing the Council to comply with that request after, as I read in this letter, they have already communicated with the individual who wrote them the letter.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, in response to my honourable friend, he may have a different interpretation of the English verb "may" than I have, but it seems to me that that is merely a suggestion that is being put forward. I see nothing untoward about that kind of suggestion.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In light of the Premier's answer, would he be prepared

Thursday, July 6, 1978

to table a copy of the letter that was written — and he has a copy of it — that the village Council wrote to the individual requesting in January 12th, 1978, for the edification of members in the House.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, relating to letters that come from other sources of course, the usual requirement has to be obtained to obtain the permission of the other people. Subject to that permission being obtained from the village, I would have no objection to that letter being tabled.

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like the Premier, if he could, to inform me whether a letter was sent to Mr. Chyzy from his office and whether he would be prepared to table that letter because it appears that a letter would have gone out to him.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, in endeavouring to satisfy my honourable friend, I don't think that I'm going to put the staff through all of the correspondence that they have written to his constituency. I'll take a look at the file or have the staff take a look at the file and see if it's convenient to do that and if the letters indeed are properly callable and would not be creating a precedent by setting or placing the letters on the table of the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. Would he confirm that since October when his government took power an additional 80,000 square feet of space has been leased?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I suggest that kind of a question is more properly in the domain for an Order for Return. I returned to the House, in the absence of the honourable member, the Order for Return that he requested earlier but I would ask him to look at that information.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, just in regard to that question, I am reading from the Order for Return that he answered so I assume that he has read it. I'm just asking him to confirm that figure.

I would ask the Minister how it is, why is it, that you are leasing 80,000 square feet additional of space when you have reduced the Civil Service, according to various estimates, from thirteen hundred-and-something to 1,750, probably the equivalent of some 200,000 to 250,000 square feet, the equivalent amount of space that they would occupy? Why is it that you are leasing an additional 80,000 square feet when you have reduced the equivalent Civil Service in terms of space to some one-quarter of a million square feet of space?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice and subject to the manner and way in which the wording of new leases. If I recall, the question on the Order for Return was space leased since October 24th by this new government. I would suspect that the number of buildings that we have emptied out and the space that we are no longer leasing is not contained in that Order for Return and therefore you are reading only one side of the picture from that Order for Return.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, the question again, Mr. Speaker, is why, since there has been a reduction of civil servants, is it necessary to lease additional space? Surely you could have rationalized the existing space and moved people into it, otherwise this government has an additional amount of space 300,000-plus feet more than we did. At \$7.00 a square foot, that's \$2 million a year.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Elmwood is playing with my very honest attempt at giving him the information for the Order for Return that he asked for. I do have problems, you know, we haven't disposed of the art collection that he has acquired over the last eight years and that requires space. I do still have space in the Provincial Garage and that takes care of 270,000 square feet of space, but I can assure the honourable member that in association with the overall reduction and contraction of staff, there has also been a consolidation of space and it hasn't always been possible simply to leave one sole person on a floor of the Lakeview Square Building, or elsewhere. There has been some reshuffling, some readjusting for convenience, for purposes of better administration, some additional space has been leased in that way but not at all in the manner

and way, the impression that the Member for Elmwood is trying to leave.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for questioning having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader — continue with Bill No. 25?

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

### ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READINGS

#### BILL NO. 25 — THE CATTLE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. George has 13 minutes.\$

**MR. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we broke for lunch, I was ending my comments with respect to Bill 25, and the matter of the hoist on this bill. As I indicated, the members on this side wish the bill to be killed and the government not to proceed with that bill. It appears that some of the items that we have raised have certainly fallen on deaf ears by members on the government's side and the Minister of Agriculture, along with his colleagues, especially the Minister of Agriculture who got up and spoke for 30 seconds, in that range, to one minute, did not at all answer any of the questions and points that were raised on this side. No, it appears that all members on the government side have been muzzled, that no one is going to speak and give the members on this side and the public of Manitoba their intentions as to what amendments they wish to make, what amendments they wish to propose to this bill. They are just going to ride this out and ram this legislation through.

Mr. Speaker, on those closing remarks, I wish to indicate that there is no doubt someone from the government's side, if it is not the Minister of Agriculture, who I have termed this morning his performance as being very dismal, that someone from the government side, should it be the Premier or some of his colleagues, should get up in this House and indicate their intentions as to what amendments they propose to this bill and what their intentions are in terms of proposing the checkoff rights, what their intentions are with respect to the opt-out rights, all those intentions with respect to the regulations, whether they will give this authority, this body that they propose to create, the authority to make their regulations without the government having any right to cut off some of these regulations if they are so autocratic as they do have those rights in other legislation. If they are not prepared to answer these, Mr. Speaker, it just appears that the democracy and the freedom that that party, that the Conservative Party who were elected on October of last year, the word to them is just a sham. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I'm prompted to rise and not by virtue of the suggestions from the other side of the House that the ministry on this side of the House have refused to participate in this debate, but simply because of some of the ridiculous and outlandish statements that have been made from honourable members opposite. The most ridiculous and the most outlandish of all is the suggestion that honourable members opposite are the guardians of freedom in this Chamber, the guardians of freedom in this province? I simply cannot think of anything more ludicrous and more ridiculous. I ask you to remember, Mr. Speaker, that they are the same people, the same people that brought in a compulsory hog marketing board without any reference to the hog producers whatsoever. Is there anything more ultimate than a compulsory hog marketing board or a compulsory milk board? The same Minister, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture, who was going to build a milk processing plant in Selkirk, that would have been a compulsory enterprise as well. —(Interjection)— My honourable friends sound ridiculous on many occasions, but they never sound more ridiculous when they pose to be the champions of freedom. In the light of the kind of legislation that for eight years they brought into this Legislature — a compulsory automobile insurance plan. Was there any consideration for those people who wanted to take care of themselves insofar as automobile insurance was concerned? None whatsoever. And they have the supreme audacity, Sir, to come into this Chamber and purport to be the champions of freedom. What sanctimonious hypocrisy.

What is this argument all about, Mr. Speaker? What is this argument all about? It is the long-standing request on the part of the cattleman for an organization that would enable them to

run their own business, that would enable them to have an organization that would take care, in their opinion, not in the government's opinion, but in their opinion, the problems that have afflicted the beef industry from time to time — and there haven't been that many. Of all the industries in this province, and particularly of all the aspects of the agricultural industry, the livestock industry has had the least problems. Do you know why they have had the least problems, Mr. Speaker? Because they have consistently advocated that the government stay out of their business, that the government do not interfere in the running of their own affairs. That's really one of the reasons. Because they have not asked —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Speaker, I am in the midst of my. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I am in the midst of my speech, and I would like to continue my remarks.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a very legitimate point of order. My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the honourable member has not mentioned that he is voting against the hoist, and you have not brought this to his attention.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader on that same point of order. Order please.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** On that same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I know that you've made some valiant attempts to get honourable members opposite to stick to the terms of the amendment that is before us, and you failed, you failed miserably, because the honourable members opposite chose to speak on whatever they wanted to speak, including matters not related to the bill at all. And because, Sir, my honourable friends opposite refused to obey your direction, then I feel, Sir, that you're compelled to allow the same kind of latitude to members on this side of the House that was extended to honourable gentlemen opposite. And if it makes my honourable friend any happier, and if I have to stay within the rules as dictated by my honourable friend from Inkster, then let me say right now, that I intend to vote against the sub-amendment that is before the House. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

On the point of order that was raised by the Honourable member for Inkster, and the point of order that was addressed by the Honourable Government House Leader, I would like to point out to all members of the Chamber, that we are dealing with an amendment to Bill No. 25, and I would hope that all members will address themselves to the amendment, and carry on in the good tradition that has existed by all members of the House in the debate up to this point.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in keeping with your ruling, then it is my intention, and I expect that the Honourable Member for Inkster, from time to time if I fail to do this — I will make some oblique or passing reference to the amendment and the fact that I am going to vote against it, and if that is sufficient to keep me in order, then I will do it.

**A MEMBER:** Once every ten minutes.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take a great deal of time. I do want to make reference to the reasons for this debate at this particular time, and it is because of the long standing request on the part of the cattlemen of this province, in association with the cattlemen of Ontario, of Saskatchewan, of Alberta, and British Columbia, who have similar organizations, and who are contributing, through a checkoff similar to what is being proposed here, to a national organization that has as its purpose the interest of the beef industry in Canada. That's what it's all about. That's all.

The labour unions have similar legislation, through the Rnd formula, the labour unions have the right to deduct from each worker, from each worker, and he contributes whether he likes it or not, belongs to the union or he doesn't get a job —(Interjection)— Well, my honourable friend . . . Now see, this is an indication, this is an indication of the kind of thinking that permeates the mind of the former Minister of Agriculture, he says voluntary.

What's this legislation? This legislation specifically spells out, and if it isn't clear enough, and I'm going to repeat what the Member for Lakeside, or the Minister of Highways, said earlier in this debate, that if it isn't clear enough for my honourable friend now, we'll make it clear enough to

ensure that those who do not want to participate, those who want to opt out are going to have that opportunity. In my opinion, in my opinion that is clear enough in the legislation right now. But my honourable friends, they don't have an issue. —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not one . . .

**MR. USKIW:** Would the member yield to question?

**MR. JORGENSON:** No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not one that feels that when a member is on his feet, that I want to interrupt him with questions, and I don't like to be interrupted either. In most cases they are inane questions that have nothing to do with what I'm speaking about in any case, and I've had enough experience with my honourable friend, the former Minister of Agriculture, to know that any question that he may ask is one that I will be answering in any case during the course of my remarks, and if he will contain himself long enough, he will discover that I'll make my case clear enough. And if there's still some doubt in his mind at that time, at the end of my remarks, then I'll be happy to entertain some questions from him.

But the whole purpose of this legislation is intended to provide the vehicle for the cattlemen of this province to finance an organization that is voluntary in nature — and that's what sticks in the craw of our honourable friends opposite.

You know, the Minister of Agriculture when he had the cattlemen before him a few years ago, made the observation to them that before he was finished with them he would have them on their knees begging for a Marketing Board.

**A MEER:** Without a vote.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Without a vote, Mr. Speaker, and he would do that, and that's exactly what he attempted to do, and that's what his plan was. That's what his plan was, Sir, and that was the reason why he so generously came to the assistance of the cattlemen a couple of years ago; that was the reason why he introduced his so-called Beef Stabilization Program. It was intended to place the beef producers of this province in the debt of the government; that was the whole intention. What did they ask it for, Mr. Speaker? I'm glad that my innocent friend, the Member for St. Vital, asked that question, because when that beef program was announced, less than 10, 15 percent of the cattlemen opted into the program. And at the end —(Interjection)— Well, if my honourable friend will just contain himself for one moment, let me tell him what happened. —(Interjection)— He says 65 percent. At the end of the time that was allocated for those people to enter into the program and to sign up for it, less than 15 percent of the farmers had entered into the program. And then what happened, Mr. Speaker?

**A MEMBER:** A massive PR campaign.

**MR. JORGENSON:** A massive selling campaign; every ag rep in this province recruited to sell the program, to bludgeon farmers into joining the program. They even recruited people off the streets — \$40 a day, they were paying them, to sell farmers this program. That's the kind of campaign that was waged by my honourable friend in order to get the cattlemen coming into —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

**MR. USKIW:** No, on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of privilege.

**MR. USKIW:** The Member from Morris indicated that I had indicated to a group of producers that before I was through with them, they would be begging for a marketing board. Mr. Speaker, that is an absolute lie.

**MR. JORGENSON:** That is not an absolute lie, Mr. Speaker, because I will give the evidence; I will get the producers that were before him to say that, because they've told me so. My honourable friend has been known before this occasion

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

**MR. USKIW:** The Member for Morris, or the Minister without Portfolio, tried to interpret my remarks to a group of producers, which were incorrect. And I didn't make those statements, as the Member

for Morris has indicated here in the House, and that is a matter of privilege.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, the record speaks for itself. My honourable friend has been so adamant, so insistent in his attempts to get the beef producers of this province to succumb to his blandishments for a compulsory beef marketing board, that he would stop at nothing. He paid for an advertising campaign on the so-called Beef Referendum; the beef producers themselves had to fight that with their own money while he used taxpayers' money to fight the campaign. And what happened, what was the result of that campaign, Mr. Speaker? A 77 percent vote against a beef marketing board — a wipe-out. And my honourable friends have now the audacity to stand here and say that they —(Interjection)— . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

**MR. USKIW:** On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Morris has alleged here that I, as Minister in charge of the Department of Agriculture, used taxpayers' money to launch a campaign in favour of a marketing board. I want to advise him, Sir, and everyone concerned, that that never occurred during the last eight years that we were the government.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder who paid the NFU \$20,000 a year? I wonder who paid for the advertisements that appeared in the rural weekly newspapers? Not only on this program, not only on this one, Sir, but on the Rapeseed Referendum as well. Who paid for those? I ask my honourable friend to tell me who paid for those, if it wasn't the taxpayers of this province? Did he pay for it out of his own pocket? It's not bloody likely, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. This is not the time for the member to enter into debate, when another member has the floor.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of privilege.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris, the Minister without Portfolio, alleges that moneys were improperly used by my department in the promotion of a plan. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that that is a proper procedure, to use the services of the Manitoba Marketing Board to inform people of the question being put to them. Now, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member has no point of privilege; he is misinterpreting the words of the Government House Leader and has no point of privilege.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, methinks my honourable friend protests too much. He must have a very guilty conscience, because I didn't say that the money was improperly used; I simply said that he was using taxpayers' money to advertise in the newspapers; who was paying the Farmers' Union \$20,000 a year? Who sponsored the meetings in every place? Who sponsored those meetings? My honourable friend sits here and has the audacity to try and tell this House — and of course, from his point of view, it was proper, because he is the same Minister that said, "one danger about democracy is that the right people," — the right people, according to him, not according to the people who do the electing, but the right people, according to him, "may not get elected." This is what he said about people who got elected on the Hog Marketing Board. And he nods his head in agreement. That's his idea of democracy, Sir. If that's his idea of democracy and how it works, then it's not surprising to me that he will use the taxpayers' money to promote his own twisted philosophy, his twisted, perverted idea of how farmers in this province should operate.

It doesn't surprise me in the least, Mr. Speaker, because we understand the Minister of Agriculture. We understand the Minister of Agriculture, who used every technique that he could possibly think of, every technique he could possibly think of, to railroad farmers into organizations, whether or not they had any inclination to go into those organizations. He did it on the Hog Marketing Board, he did it on the Beef Marketing Board, he attempted to do it with farms themselves. He attempted to do it with Crocus. The dangerous thing about this, Mr. Speaker, is that the former

Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues opposite, don't think they did anything wrong. They don't think they did anything wrong. They were the government, and because they were the government, they could do as they pleased. They could impose anything on anybody, and that was characteristic of everything they did when they were in government, without any regards to individual freedoms, any regard to individual liberties, and that's what makes their attitude today in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, so damnably hypocritical. Talking about freedom. I have never heard anything more ludicrous in all my life.

"This bill," says the Member for Inkster, "deals with freedom." Freedom of what? The Minister of Agriculture, in his remarks the other day, talked about the continued acrimony in the beef industry. Mr. Speaker, there is no acrimony in the beef industry that wasn't generated by my honourable friends opposite. It was because of it that the difference of opinion has arisen. If they had been allowed to select the kind of organization to represent them, and to give them some assistance —(Interjection)— nothing, nothing, Mr. Speaker, except that this bill will help. It will do for the cattle producer of this province. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet that he allow the courtesy to the Honourable Member who is speaking, the freedom to express himself without constant interference.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your suggestion. I simply would like to point out however, that it is probably no more than occurs from the other side and perhaps of some assistance to the Member for Morris.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, it is on very rare occasions that I interrupt anybody on the other side of the House, on very rare occasions. I have to be motivated somewhat in order for me to do that, and I am not asking for courtesy from the Member for Lac du Bonnet, because I am familiar enough with the Member for Lac du Bonnet to know that he possesses none. He certainly didn't in the years that he was on this side of the House.

The former Minister, you know, during the course of his remarks, made a rather interesting statement when he said that the NFU, and I suppose this was intended to disassociate himself from the farm unions who he funded for a number of years in order to promote, because everybody in this province knows that the NFU are nothing more than the spokesmen for the leftists on that side of the House and the rural wing of the New Democratic Party, and he had the audacity to say that they came to him and asked that they introduce legislation which would make them the legal spokesmen for all farmers in Manitoba. And then he stood up proudly and said, "But we turned them down on a matter of principle."

Well, they turned them down on a matter of principle, Sir. They turned them down because even the Minister of Agriculture, notwithstanding his twisted mentality and his ideas about how the farmers in this province want to operate, couldn't even conceive the audacity of the Farmers' Union purporting to be the spokesmen for the people of this province, or for the livestock people or anybody else.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what does the legislation say? The legislation provides that there will be a checkoff, but it also provides that there will be an opportunity for anybody to opt out of the program, to get their money back —(Interjection)— My honourable friend says, "Show me." The whole thing is inherent in the legislation. Their first suggestion, Sir, was that there was no referendum and they made some rather interesting comments about how the farmers were not given an opportunity to have a referendum in determining whether or not they wanted this piece of legislation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friends are thinking in terms of a referendum, the bill provides that within a certain period of time, there will be a board of directors that will be elected. They'll be elected by the producers themselves and I will tell my honourable friend right now, there's going to be no taxpayers money involved in the setting up of ads in weekly newspapers, controlling and encouraging farmers to take one position or the other. We're going to leave it up —(Interjection)—

Yes, as my honourable friend, the Minister of Highways, says, "We'll even allow the ag reps to carry on their normal responsibilities."

And when that election is held, those people, I would presume, Sir, those people who are opposed to the kind of legislation that is inherent in this bill will be running candidates.

Oh, you see, my honourable friend shakes his head now. Why wouldn't they, Sir? Why wouldn't they run candidates? Why wouldn't a cattleman who is opposed to this referendum, if there's so many of them, if there's as many as my honourable friend says there are, why would they not, logically, run a candidate on a platform to say, "If I get elected, I'll do away with this legislation."



well, if you elect a board of directors . . . Let me read my honourable friend a section of the bill and I'm going to read it, Sir, because I have to respond to my honourable friend. I hope he'll forgive me for referring to a section of the bill, but I think it's important at this point that I do that.

"No regulation" — and that's Section 7(2) — "imposing fees under clause 1(b) shall be made; (a) until the election of the members of the association is held within the time specified under subsection 11(1)." In other words, there can be no imposition of fees, whatsoever, until the election of that board, and that's a freely conducted election; and, "(b) unless it provides and sets out the procedure for the refund of fees to those producers who apply therefor."

Now, if my honourable friends are so opposed to this legislation, then I suggest there is a course of action open to them. And my honourable friend, the former Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, is not a stranger to these tactics. Then I would suggest that he goes to his friends, that he's contributed \$20,000 a year to over the past number of years, and invite them to run candidates for election to the board of this beef marketing agency. And if they get elected in sufficient numbers — (Interjection) — or beef association, and I'm glad for that correction from my honourable friend — and if they get elected in sufficient numbers and at their first meeting, do you know what they can do, Sir, they can say we don't want any beef from the association. And it's over, that's it. What more do my honourable friends want in the way of a referendum? What more do you want? — (Interjection) — All right, then I encourage my honourable friends to do that and do you know what my prediction is, Sir? My prediction is that the vote again will be about 77 to 23, if not more. And that's what they're worried about.

My honourable friends are not concerned about freedom. I've lived with eight years of my honourable friends on this side of the House, and I know what their concept of freedom is and they're not concerned about that. They've got one concern and that concern is simply that they wanted desperately — the former Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Lac du Bonnet — wanted desperately, those cattlemen to come grovelling to him on their knees to beg them for a marketing board.

**A MEMBER:** Who talked them into giving them \$30 million?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** He paid them \$38 million to bribe them into that situation so they would come begging on their knees. Now, he sees that dream dissipating. That's what is bothering my honourable friends. They want a compulsory marketing board and, Sir, I don't know what motivates the economic thinking of my honourable gentlemen opposite. I don't think that it's economics. It's straight, pure partisan political politics.

**A MEMBER:** Power.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** A dream of a society that is dictated by the government, by the state. State control from one end to the other. That is the only thing that motivates them. What they're looking for is an agency that will not allow the beef producers to look after their own interests. Oh no, they want a beef marketing board in the Province of Manitoba where there is none in any other province and I ask my honourable friend, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, how in heaven's name does he expect a beef marketing board to operate in one province in Canada?

**MR. USKIW:** I'll explain it to you afterwards.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Oh, my honourable friend is going to explain it to me. It's going to be the same way that the Leader of the Opposition when he put the words into the Lieutenant-Governor's mouth shortly after the Hog Marketing Board was brought into being. It left the implication that because of the Hog Marketing Board in Manitoba, the prices of hogs went up in Omaha, St. Louis, Chicago, Kansas City and all other places in the North American continent.

Well, you say it's ridiculous. It was in the Throne Speech. It was in the Throne Speech.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** And I might add to my honourable friends that I . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of privilege.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris refers to the Throne Speech and to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. I think he should be a little more careful with the truth.

If he can show us anything in the Throne Speech or anything said by His Honour that pertains to the U.S. market, let alone specifically Omaha or Kansas City, let him produce it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Well, it's very simple, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend is a little bit sensitive on this, I know, because we chided him about it at the time and he blushed somewhat at the time and . . .

**A MEMBER:** He bit his lower lip.

**MR. JORGENSON:** . . . he bit his lower lip and I know that —(Interjection)— Yes. And I know that although the clear reference was not there, certainly the implication was. What the words in the Throne Speech read were, that the Hog Marketing Board has been introduced in the Province of Mani the next sentence was: "The government notes with pleasure that prices of hogs, have risen." All I said at the outset of my remarks before the Leader of the Opposition rose on a supposed question of privilege, was that the clear implication in the words of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor were —(Interjection)— Oh no. That was the implication that was intended to be left, Mr. Speaker, and my honourable friend knows it. That's what was intended, Mr. Speaker, and my honourable friend knows it.

And you know, another strange thing about — well, it's not a strange thing, Mr. Speaker — another interesting point in connection with this Beef Board, my honourable friend, and he indicated during the course of his remarks the other day, he referred back to the Shewman Commission Report and let his mind dwell for a while on the virtues of marketing boards and again suggested that this legislation is not dealing with what he considers to be the inherent problems of the beef industry, and that is instability of price.

Well, my honourable friend — and he'll probably be on his feet on a question privilege when I make this statement again — very clearly indicated that what he wants for the beef industry is a beef marketing board. Well, I wait for him to rise to his feet. Aha, see, my honourable friend doesn't rise, so I will continue. He then admits by his silence that he wanted a beef marketing board for the producers of this province. —(Interjection)— My honourable friend says, "What's wrong with that?" Nothing, from my honourable friend's point of view, except for one thing, the beef producers don't want it. But whether the beef producers want it or not, my honourable friend was determined that he was going to impose it on them. —(Interjection)— As he did to the Hog Board. Was there any referendum on the Hog Board? I ask my honourable friend that. Was there a referendum on the Hog Board? No.\$

He trumped up an excuse to impose a hog marketing board. —(Interjections)— Oh yes. Let me recount the events for you, Mr. Speaker. Labatt's-Ogilvie had made two announcements: one that they were going to build a feed mill at Otterburne, which is now owned by the Co-ops; and the second announcement that they made is that they were going to build a hog breeding station in Steinbach. The purpose of that station was to produce quality animals for breeding purposes. That's all. That was the purpose of it. And what did my honourable friend do, the Minister of Agriculture, he screamed bloody murder. He went across. . . It just so happened — I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that this was a coincidence — that he set up the agricultural committee to race through this province to get the producers' views, ostensibly to get the producers' views on the question of whether or not Labatt's-Ogilvie should build those two plants. Of course he fanned the fires, as he is so capable of doing, and then when the report of that agricultural committee came back here, much to our surprise, those of us who sat at the same meetings that my honourable friend sat at, we found no great evidence or great support for a hog marketing board, but my honourable friend saw it. He saw it, and he had it included in the report that the committee finally submitted to this Chamber. It was a majority report, it is true, because my honourable friends were in the majority and they were able to get the report passed, over my objections and objections from the Conservative Opposition at that time.

Although there was provision in The Natural Products Marketing Act for the election of officers to that Hog Marketing Board, I asked my honourable friend, the former Minister of Agriculture, and the Member for Lac du Bonnet, how long did it take him before he elected anybody to that Board? I ask my honourable friend to tell me — he is so fond of rising on his feet on questions of privilege — I ask him now to tell me, how long did it take before he had anybody elected to that Board? It wasn't certainly, not before he was sure that the person that he appointed to direct the operations of that Board, had that thing well on its way before he allowed anybody to be elected at all. Then when they did get elected, and it was over two years before he had any elections, then he says one of the great tragedies of democracy is that, "In my opinion," he used that phrase, "In my opinion sometimes the wrong people get elected." There were some people who did not agree with his

idea of how that Marketing Board should operate and he demanded resignations, Sir.

That's the idea of freedom that my honourable friend has, and he expects the cattlemen to believe him? He expects the cattlemen to trust him with a Beef Marketing Board? No way, Mr. Speaker. The cattlemen knew better. The cattlemen rejected his proposal for a marketing board, for a very good reason. —(Interjection)— Oh, my honourable friend said, "It wasn't my proposal." I wonder whose proposal it was. All the cattlemen have ever asked my honourable friend for is a checkoff for a beef agency. That's all they have ever asked for. Well, the people that he has contributed to, the Farmers Union, might have asked for more, yes, they might have asked for more, but not the cattlemen. —(Interjection)— He is again referring to a document that again, Mr. Chairman, was concocted by my honourable friend, was engineered by my honourable friend, as he was so capable of engineering everything else.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that there is nothing I like better than when I am speaking in this Chamber, is to have musical accompaniment.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I was singing, "Land of Hope and Glory," land of the free, the cattlemen and me.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are somewhat taken aback by the attitude of my honourable friends opposite, the sanctimony, the hypocrisy of purporting to be the champions of freedom in this province and in this Chamber, in the light of their record, Sir, is one of the most difficult things to comprehend that I have ever been able to do in this Chamber. They talk about freedom. They purport to say that this bill is taking away the freedom of the cattlemen. No, it isn't, Mr. Speaker. It is providing a vehicle for the cattlemen of this province to run their own business. That, and that alone, is what bothers my honourable friends opposite. They don't want the cattlemen to run their own business; they want the cattlemen to be subservient to the government. I suggest to you, Sir, that, and that alone, is the only reason why honourable gentlemen opposite are opposed to this legislation. They stand up one after the other opposing this bill, not because they have any concerns about freedom — we have seen enough of my honourable friends to know that those are the last things in their concerns — but because they see that there is just a possibility that the cattlemen, if this legislation gets initiated and they have an opportunity to finance their own organization and run their own business, my honourable friends opposite may not have the opportunity to do as the former Minister of Agriculture wanted them to do, to come begging to him on their knees. Mr. Speaker, if I know the cattlemen, they will never do that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** I would like to ask the Minister without Portfolio if he would be prepared to answer a question. Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member support similar legislation if it was requested by the Manitoba Federation of Labour that they have the kind of jurisdiction over all workers in Manitoba, as this legislation is going to give this association?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the honourable members that questions must be to elicit information on what the member had brought forward in his speech. It has nothing to do with the Federation of Labour or anything else. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** You may be correct, but if you will permit me, I would like to answer that question. I would be happy to encourage that kind of legislation, providing that it provided for right to work laws, that it provided for the right of anyone to opt out if they did not want to belong to a particular organization, that they had their freedom of choice as to what kind of an organization they belonged to, and that they could withdraw their union dues when they were not happy with the union leadership. I would be happy to support that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I have no objection if someone else wishes to speak, but in order that I have time to consider the ostensibly profound remarks of the Government House Leader, I would like to move adjournment.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday that we were not accepting any more adjournments on this legislation. I regret to tell my honourable friend this, but I had indicated that the debate now, from when it took place, started today, it would continue.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** We have speakers prepared to speak, but quite frankly when the Government House Leader gave that indication, he did not indicate that he was going to be speaking. I'm saying this not facetiously. He has just finished making a speech. I, for one, am not prepared to be coerced into speaking extemporaneously without having an opportunity to contemplate his remarks and therefore I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and declared lost.**

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

The question before the House is a motion by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that debate on Bill No. 25 be adjourned.

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

**YEAS:** Messrs. Adam, Axworthy, Barrow, Bostrom, Boyce, Chorniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Miller, Parasiuk, Pawley, Schreyer, Uruski, Uskiw, Walding.

**NAYS:** Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Cosens, Domino, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, Lyon, MacMaster, McGill, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Spivak, Wilson.

**MR. CLERK:** Yeas 21, Nays 26.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I declare the motion lost.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** As I recall it, Mr. Speaker, and I stand to be corrected, but in my memory I believe that very seldom, if ever, other than I believe on one occasion in the last eight years of NDP government, was there a forced debate on a given issue. I believe the only time that occurred was on autopac after a long filibuster.

In particular, if I may err to a slight degree on that statement, Mr. Speaker — and I may be in error but if my memory serves me I don't think I am — but I don't believe we ever denied the Leader of the Opposition an opportunity to adjourn debate in order to make his proper contribution to the debate on any issue that was introduced. I don't believe that ever happened during the eight years of NDP administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, this again tends to reflect on the definition of the freedoms and the democratic process that the people on the other side seem to see . . . —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, because of lack of substance in his mind, is now resorting to name-calling and other sorts of things, and that has been typical, Mr. Speaker, of members opposite whenever they are stuck in their position, unable to move one way or the other because of their embarrassment.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture is not with us here this afternoon to hear the debate, to participate in it in whatever form he may or wishes to, because this is indeed his legislation, although it was not properly thought out, it is nevertheless his responsibility. And that is perhaps one of the reasons why the Member for Morris, the Minister without Portfolio, decided that he had to respond, because he was trying to divert the attention from the position that they are in by introducing a few red herrings and some analagous propositions that the Member for Morris — non-analagous, rather — propositions that the Member for Morris tried to introduce as being analagous to this situation.

Mr. Speaker, in my earlier remarks on Bill 25, I had indicated that this legislation would serve not those people who believed in freedom of choice, not those people who believed in fairness, equity and integrity but rather that this bill would serve well the racketeers, the cheats in the system, the dishonest groups in the industry, the exploiters within the industry.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of that period in debate I was not in a position, due to lack of time, to further elaborate on that very point. And Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with that because, as I mentioned in that last debate, Mr. Speaker, there were many commissions of inquiry, federal

and provincial, of different governments that have dealt with the problem or attempted to deal with the problem of the beef industry. Not only the beef industry but agricultural commodity groups as a whole, but in particular the beef industry has been the subject of inquiry many, many times by both levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, I have to rise to support this motion because this legislation is lacking in that it doesn't deal with the problems that have been illustrated by various inquiry commissions, and that in fact it takes us in the opposite direction, away from the resolution of those problems and that is a very good reason why we must kill this bill.

The second good reason why we must kill this bill is that the government knows, Mr. Speaker, that it is an embarrassment to them. The government knows that it is a document that isn't properly put together. The government also knows that if such a bill was going to be brought in, it should have been brought in by a private member, not as a government bill. They all know that over there. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if not all of them, members of Cabinet know that you don't bring in measures of that kind through government legislation. Members of Cabinet know that, Mr. Speaker. The longstanding practice, tradition, etc., that would indicate so, Mr. Speaker.

I don't recall ever seeing a government introduce that kind of legislation into this Chamber during my period of years here, and I don't believe that there was one prior to my term. And so I'm sure that it is an embarrassment to the Cabinet Ministry, who didn't take the time to know what they were doing, but rather delegated their responsibilities to one or two people within their Cabinet, and perhaps even support from caucus, and allowed a private sector group to overly influence what they were doing, for their own vested interests.

That's really what happened, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that there is probably even a privilege of the House involved here. I believe that that legislation was probably viewed by people outside of this Chamber before we got to it, Mr. Speaker, because the way it was drafted, Mr. Speaker, no responsible elected politician could have introduced such a measure into this House. No responsible elected person could have introduced that measure in the form that it's drafted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate that the Minister of Agriculture is new and perhaps was unaware of the implications, and perhaps got taken in by this group, but where were the rest of his colleagues, the people who have had experience in government in years gone by, Mr. Speaker? Where is their expertise? Where is their contribution, based on their experience in government before? And there are a number of them that have had experience in government during the 1960s.

And so it was a bit of neglect on the part of the more experienced people in Cabinet and in caucus for allowing this bill to pass through and to be introduced into the House for second reading in the form that it has been.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the inquiry commission, the Manitoba Livestock and Meat Commission, in its research report No. 3, dated June of 1976, had a lot to say about what is wrong with the beef industry. And I think it's worthwhile to remind members of just what the problems are in the beef industry.

I'm going to read parts of that document, Mr. Speaker. On Page 25 of that report, in the summary section, I quote the following: "An equitable pricing system should ensure that all producers selling cattle of a given carcass, grade and weight class on any one day will be paid approximately the same price after allowance is made for transportation costs. The results of the price analysis," and that's the analysis of this commission, "are not very comforting to either of the producer groups. The analysis of a large number of cattle purchase transactions by a number of major packers over a three-month period, clearly shows that prices paid for a given carcass grade and weight class on any one day, varied quite substantially between killing lots. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is indeed a condemnation of the present marketing system. On Page 27, the Commission has this to say: "The analysis also shows that price differences among producers are quite similar, whether cattle are sold through local auctions, to the Winnipeg Stockyards live, direct to packers, or rail grade. In the case of cattle sold on a rail grade basis, the price differences were the result of price discrimination."

Now, the Minister of Agriculture is in the House, Mr. Speaker, but he is not attentive to the debate because he is not interested in making sure that the laws that he is introducing and passing in this Chamber are equitable laws, and for his benefit, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to repeat that last point in the Commission report on Page 27. It says here: "The analysis also shows that price differences among producers are quite similar, whether cattle are sold through local auctions, through the Winnipeg Stockyards, live, direct to packers, or rail grade. In the case of cattle sold on a rail grade basis, the price differences were the result of price discrimination." Now, Mr. Speaker, bear in mind that this report is not a report of someone's opinion, this is a report after a great deal of research into the records of the sellers and buyers of cattle in Manitoba over a three-month period. This is taken right out of the files of the meat packing companies, Mr. Speaker. And it says that there is price discrimination as between producers, on the same day, the same class of product,

the same grade, same quality, and there is massive price discrimination, each day.

Producers who received significantly higher prices than others, did so because packers were prepared to give them preferential treatment. That's an indictment of the system if there ever was one, Mr. Speaker, because they preferred to give them a better price. These producers might argue that the higher price was due to better price bargaining on their part. This is not the case, the report continues. "Packers net profit margins on beef is so small that they can give some producers significantly above average prices only by getting other producers to pay for this." This is what this report says, Mr. Speaker, that the packing industry has been playing Robin Hood. They have been robbing from one group and giving in to another group. That's what this report tells us, that farmer (a) receives five cents a pound more, or two cents more, or ten; farmer (b) receives five or ten cents less on the same quality of product, the same grade of product, on the same day those cattle are marketed.

Mr. Speaker, this is evidence taken under oath, and the Member for Gladstone may call it whatever he wishes, but this information was gleaned from the records of the industry and this particular commission had the benefit of The Evidence Act to work under in order to ascertain the authenticity of the information that they were compiling.

So Mr. Speaker, here we have a situation where two farmers, delivering on the same day, cattle of the same grade and quality, may receive a price difference of ten or fifteen cents a pound. —(Interjection)— Well, the Minister in charge of Housing thinks that's crazy. He thinks that's crazy. I agree with him that's crazy.

**A MEMBER:** Sure, it's crazy.

**MR. USKIW:** That's what's wrong with the system, and Bill 25 does nothing about that, Mr. Speaker. . Bill 25 has nothing to do with that, and that's the whole problem, Mr. Speaker. Bill 25 doesn't do very much at all, except to force people to belong to an association that they don't wish to belong to, and that is all Bill 25 does.

The report continues to say that , "The distribution of prices paid clearly confirms this. It is quite deceptive to talk of average, since only a relatively small proportion of producers get paid the middle of the range prices." This is all based on evidence gleaned from the industry, Mr. Speaker, from their records. "Average price differences between marketing methods, as shown here are not particularly useful in guiding producers' marketing decisions. The likely price differences to which a producer is exposed, whatever method of sale he chooses, are much larger than the average price differences between marketing methods. Moreover, most producers are not really in a position to assess prices offered or received, yet the current marketing system operates in such a way that each producer is expected to seek redress when he feels he has been significantly underpaid. A considerable number of such producer complaints were brought before the Commission, and in a number of blatant cases, packers were prepared to make very substantial adjustments in prices paid. By this action, packers admit that under the current selling methods, some producers will be seriously underpaid for their cattle, while those who successfully seek price adjustments are helped. Unfortunately, this is done at the expense of producers generally, and particularly those are seriously underpaid, but who do not seek price adjustments."

So here you have a situation where, if you have a relationship between the seller and the buyer, where it's a first name relationship, where the operation is fairly large and perhaps the seller knows some of the people at the top in the packing plant, perhaps they have lunch on occasion, that kind of person, Mr. Speaker, receives a bit of a premium for his cattle, over and above its true value. But if it's some anonymous person who shipped a load of cattle in by the Arborg Transfer, or the Swan River Transfer, or from wherever, and does not have any real personal linkages with the buyer, they are not on a one-to-one basis, the buyer has to make up the losses that he has suffered in overpayment to his friends by forcing a reduction in the payment to those people that he doesn't seem to have a linkage with. That's what this report says, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— You have a report, 8,000 copies were mailed to farmers, Mr. Speaker, of this report. And this report was tabled in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker.\$

So when I used the argument in debate the other day that Bill 25 continues to perpetuate the inequities of the past, and will continue to service the elite, Mr. Speaker, this is the evidence. It is well known. And it is not new evidence. The Shewman Report dealt with this problem, the Federal Report dealt with the same problem, but Mr. Speaker, action was never taken to deal with it. And the only way you can deal with this problem, Mr. Speaker, is if you had some mechanism of authority to control the marketing system, in order, Mr. Speaker, that there would be fairness in the marketplace as between one producer and the other. That is the only way in which it can be achieved, and Bill 25, in fact, tries to insure that we will never get there. That's right, it does bother me, Mr. Speaker. It does bother me. Because Bill 25 denies the producers an opportunity to do something about that, by law.

Could I imagine, could you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what this Minister of Agriculture is going to do to a group of farmers, a year down the road, five years down the road, or two years down the road, or whenever, Mr. Speaker, another group who don't agree with this association, who make a request of him that he set up some marketing mechanism to take these inequities out of the marketplace. You know what he will say, Mr. Speaker, he will say, well, but we have an association representing cattlemen, and they speak for all the cattlemen in Manitoba, and we know it because we put them there, we created that association. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, of course they will be elected. Mr. Speaker, there is no other association that is established in that form. Mr. Speaker, I will get to that in a few moments.

The report continues, Mr. Speaker, on Page 29: "In conclusion, the price analysis clearly indicates that most producers using any of the current selling methods cannot be confident of receiving equitable prices." I know that the Minister of Agriculture has a problem with that, and do you know why he has a problem with that, Mr. Speaker? Because in his own background, his own history, he happens to have owned and maybe still owns, an auction yard, and perhaps he doesn't like a critical analysis of the method of buying and selling livestock that exists in the Province of Manitoba. Perhaps he doesn't like criticism. That may be his difficulty. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that that isn't what motivates Bill 25.

The report continues to say, Mr. Speaker, "Only a small proportion of cattle of any one grade and weight class purchased each day by packers is purchased at almost identical prices. The vast majority of cattle are purchased at modest to considerable premiums, or discounts in relation to the average." So you have extremities on both sides, you have overpayments on one side, and underpayments on the other side, each day. That's what you have in the market system, Mr. Speaker.

Producers do not know how prices they are offered by, or did receive from packers, compare with those offered or paid to other producers on any one day. And Mr. Speaker, the other day, yesterday, I had a phone call about that. I had a phone call from a producer, who said, you know, if you people lay off the government, maybe they won't ask us to pay this money back. —(Interjection)— Oh yes, I received such a call, yesterday, Mr. Speaker. I received such a call yesterday. But you know what he went on to tell me, he says, "I know that there are problems in the industry." I said to him, "Well, you know, you should sort out the problems in your industry if you want to talk about price stability and so on; don't ask the taxpayer to come to your rescue because you haven't done your homework." We're on a friendly basis, Mr. Speaker, I know this gentleman, and I'm sure the Minister knows this gentleman. And he said, "Yes, you're quite right, there is much to be corrected in the industry." He said, "As a matter of fact, I learned, after shipping a lot of cattle, and when I got my returns, that there was something wrong with it. But I was told confidentially that if I would phone this number, I would get an adjustment." And he did. He phoned that number and he spoke to someone in management, and out came another cheque to satisfy that grievance.

This is the kind of marketing system we have in this province today and have had for decades, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— I notice that the Member for Lakeside has brought in a halter, Mr. Speaker, I presume it's to enshrine the dictatorial legislation in Bill 25. He's going to strap the beef growers into that association whether they like it or not.

The report continues, Mr. Speaker, that, "In the case of rail grade sales where a reliable price comparison could be made readily, there is a total lack of public information on rail grade prices paid or offered. Prices reported each day for sales on a live basis at the public stockyards, are incomplete and not very reliable. Prices are quoted regularly only for the main grades. The quoted price range for the bulk of sales, moreover, suggests that prices vary far less than they do in fact, as shown in packers' cost data. The usefulness of these reported prices is also questioned, since most producers are not in a position to relate accurately prices quoted to or received by them to the reported price range at the stockyards. Mr. Speaker, those are the problems that we must deal with with respect to the beef industry.

Bill 25 does not address itself to those problems, Mr. Speaker. Those problems will continue. The government hopes that Bill 25 will camouflage to some degree their lack of responsibility in dealing with those particular problems that have become known to many producers in Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you think in terms of this particular statement that there is price discrimination in the marketplace as between producers, and then you couple that, Mr. Speaker, with the three options that the Minister of Agriculture has outlined to the producers on the Beef Income Assurance Plan as to how they must carry forward with respect to their contract on any recovery of moneys to the Crown on prices received beyond the guaranteed price — the three options, Mr. Speaker, what are they? The Minister doesn't want to tell the Legislature what they are, but, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worthwhile to go over them very quickly.

The options that the Minister has outlined in his letter to producers are these: One, that they

can opt out of the contract and pay back the money plus an interest of 9 percent.

Well, that's reasonable; that's in their contract. They didn't even have to receive a letter to do that. That's in their contract; they know that.

The other is that the producer sell his contract cattle in the name of the Minister of Finance, in which case the government will recover any margin over and above the guaranteed price. That's in the contract, Mr. Speaker. They didn't have to be informed of that either.

But he added a third dimension, Mr. Speaker. The third dimension is the dimension of irresponsibility on the part of the government, complete incompetence and irresponsibility on the part of the government. The third dimension is that the producer will carry on as he has to date; he will market his contract cattle in the way that he has in the past and he will merely report after the fact to the department as to his marketings and the prices that he received.

So what kind of a situation does that put the Minister in, Mr. Speaker? It puts the Minister in a position of having to seek out, if the producer fails to file these documents, to seek out from these producers who failed to comply with that requirement, how many cattle they sold that were contract cattle, what price they received, and why it is that they aren't sending the difference to the department or to the Minister of Finance. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that in pursuit of that, he may be forced to decide whether he is going to drop the issue and ignore the fact that moneys owing to the Crown are not being collected and perhaps will never be collected, or perhaps he would have to make the decision to take the individual to court in order to recover the moneys that have not been paid back. That is the position he has put himself in with that third option, which is not in the agreement, not in the contract, Mr. Speaker. That is the position he has put himself in.

So that is why I asked the question, Mr. Speaker, during Question Period, whether it is his intent to pursue a matter to the courts, if necessary, in order to recover what is owed to the Crown with respect to any person under contract, and which he wants to skate around, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't want to give us a straight answer. And I think it is becoming a historical fact that we have not had many straight answers from the Minister of Agriculture to date. He tends to skate around or not to answer, and that has been the style of his performance.

Now, let's deal with the questions of probability here. Now that the farmer knows that he doesn't have to give notice when he wants to sell his cattle and the Minister, if he doesn't give notice, then doesn't have to exercise the option to purchase, and he doesn't opt out and pay back his money, he may decide to sell his cattle. He may decide that he might find a friendly buyer, Mr. Speaker, who understands that a farmer does not like to pay any money that he doesn't have to pay back, if he can get away with it. It could be, Mr. Speaker, that the buyer might be in a position to discount the value of those cattle to the point of arriving at the contract price, after which nothing is owed to the Crown — it could be — and to make up that differential, Mr. Speaker, on a load of cattle that is not under contract. Mr. Speaker, that's the position that the Minister has himself in.

So the Minister may indeed have difficulty in recovering what is due to the people of Manitoba, from those people, Mr. Speaker, who may sharpen their pencil, who may seek some legal opinion on how to get around their obligation and cheat the Crown out of what is their due. That is the position he has put the public of Manitoba into, Mr. Speaker. Now, if I am incorrect, I would be pleased if the Minister of Agriculture would stand up right now and correct me, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Minister hasn't heard my comment. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister would like to hear what is being said. Well, it's obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture is not interested in what is being said. Or perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he is in a position of not being able to respond, because of the embarrassment it is going to cause him.

Mr. Speaker, if I am incorrect, I suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he stand up and tell me that it is not correct. But as I understand the three options, the farmer who chooses to market in the normal regular way and report his marketings, may be in a position to find a way of not paying back what is due to the Crown. —(Interjection)— Well, the Member for Gladstone wants to know who drew up the contract? Mr. Speaker, there is no provision — for the benefit of the Member for Gladstone, there is no provision in the contract for that third option. That is an amendment introduced by the Minister of Agriculture last week that did not exist in the contract. Mr. Speaker, there is no provision in this contract . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona on a point of order.

**MR. PARASIUK:** On a point of order, it is virtually impossible to hear the Member for Lac du Bonnet speak because the Member for Gladstone keeps heckling. If he wants to speak, he has an opportunity to speak after the Member for Lac du Bonnet finishes, but he should at least let the other Members of the House hear what the Member for Lac du Bonnet has to say.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Before I allow the member to continue, may I suggest to all members



that you give the speaker the courtesy of making his speech without constant interference.  
The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that in this particular report from the Enquiry Commission, there is evidence that there are wide fluctuations on any given date, and given the fact that the Minister of Agriculture has given a third option to producers on contract to sell their beef as they did in the past and to convey the overage beyond the guaranteed price to the province, that there indeed could be a possibility of collusion between a buyer and a seller in order to get around the obligations of this agreement. And if that is not possible, I would appreciate if the Minister would tell me that that is not possible, and that he has checked out legal counsel to determine that that is not so. In the absence of him doing so, I have to assume that my interpretations are correct, Mr. Speaker.

I have not seen his letter Speaker. I am only going, Mr. Speaker, by what was read to me on the phone by a member of the Beef Income Assurance Plan who wanted me to know what was happening, and those were the three options that he read to me. I was rather surprised that the Minister would leave himself so open to abuse, not by people who are honest and want to stay within their contract, Mr. Speaker — I'm not talking about people who are honest — but, Mr. Speaker, there may be instances where someone will want to take advantage of every loophole they could find and to the extent, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has provided them the opportunity.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Is the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet accusing the farmers of Manitoba of being dishonest, farmers that he signed contracts with?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister would like to go whether there are dishonest farmers. I believe there are dishonest farmers; I believe there are dishonest lawyers; I believe there are dishonest politicians and we have had some demonstration of that, Mr. Speaker. Yes, in our society we have dishonest people in every field of society, in every aspect of it. Not everyone, Mr. Speaker, is willing to comply with the rule of day, with the order of our times. —(Interjection)— Well, the Member for Inkster wants to know if there are any honest ones.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of the Minister is to protect the interests of the province, of the taxpayer. That is his responsibility, and should we find someone who wants to exploit a loophole that has been provided for him by the Minister's variation of his contract obligations, well, Mr. Speaker, that is something that we have to address ourselves to. That is what we are talking about, the new avenues that have been opened up by this Minister for people to try to get around their obligations. Mr. Speaker, that is something that the Minister will find will come to haunt him at the appropriate time, because we will want to know, Mr. Speaker, just how much money has been recovered, how much money has not been recovered because of that provision, Mr. Speaker. That is something that will come to pass in due time.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister keeps talking about letters of support which we have never seen, but, you know, I have a copy of a letter sent to the Minister by the Canadian Federation of Independent Businessmen and this has to do, Mr. Speaker, with the lack of appeal provisions in Bill 25. I would like to know what the Minister —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister says we are back on Bill 25. I thought we were debating Bill 25 all day today.

Mr. Speaker, this particular organization raises the question of why the bill does not provide for the right of appeal to any person who comes under the jurisdiction of the association, a valid question that we have raised time and again on second reading, and the Minister got up for 30 seconds to respond, without giving us any answers.

Now the Member for Morris, in his remarks this afternoon, talked about the outlandish position of the opposition with respect to their concept of freedom. You know, I don't know how the member can stand up in this House and say the things that he said this afternoon, because all he has to do is go back and read his own speeches on the question of public control, of government control and regulation over society. If he did just that, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how he could arrive at the conclusion that Bill 25 does not interfere with the rights of people in Manitoba as it is now drafted. I don't know how he could arrive at that because in one fell swoop when that bill is proclaimed, every cattleman in Manitoba automatically belongs to the Cattlemen's Association, Mr. Speaker, I think that's what they call it, The Cattle Producers Association, yes.

Now, is that interference on the part of the Crown or isn't it, Mr. Speaker? I say that that is the greatest interference, because it takes away the right and freedom of association and that is an interference that we should not tolerate. He tried to equate that with measures taken by the

New Democratic Party government with respect to the Hog Producer's Marketing Board.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we did have a Hog Marketing Agency, it was a commission and it was a government-appointed commission, Mr. Speaker, and the appointment of producers to that board was a step in the direction of handing to the producers the control of that agency. It was the Conservative Government who set up the commission and who appointed the members, no election, no vote on the issue, and, Mr. Speaker . . . —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet has two minutes.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I only mention that, because that was set up without a referendum and I don't fault the government for it, because sometimes it is necessary to do that. It was deemed to be advisable at that time and I don't fault them for it, but at least, Mr. Speaker, they had the protection of The Natural Products Marketing Act and the members there look at this legislation as if it attacks the individual. This legislation is set out to protect the commodity group and if there is a grievance, there is a means through which it can be redressed, either through the Minister in the Legislature in debate, the government has the right to alter or vary any order of a marketing board. If there's an appeal by the public to the government that the board is not acting fairly, there is a public redress that is available. There is not such a thing in Bill 25, and so The Natural Products Marketing Act, Mr. Speaker, is a true reflection of the democratic process because they have to answer for every Act in this Chamber.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Meer for Morris, the Minister without Portfolio, talked about trade unions having similar powers, not so. Never has been, Mr. Speaker. The trade union movement is subject to The Labour Relations Act, and, Mr. Speaker, it's required that they must get certified. That isn't a requirement of Bill 25. It says that you have to get a collective agreement before you can collect dues. That's the law, that a trade union has to get an agreement before they have the right to collect dues. Before they have a checkoff — If you want to have an analogous situation here — before they have a checkoff, they must have a collective agreement. What kind of collective agreement are the cattlemen going to have, Mr. Speaker? And then, Mr. Speaker, I'll just be one more minute or less and then I'll be through\$

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I am prompted to speak, once again, although I spoke earlier on, not on the particular motion before us which is to delay or hoist this matter for six months, but simply having listened to most of the debate, and I realized people have changed faces, not all have listened. There are one or two faithful members of the Fourth Estate that have listened to most of it, and they will, of course, perhaps appreciate these remarks.

Firstly, on the question that aroused some concern on the members opposite for having forced the debate to continue. Mr. Speaker, you will certainly recall that all morning we were urged, prompted, particularly members of the Executive Council, to contribute and enter into the debate. So, when my colleague, the House Leader, enters into the debate, the immediate response from the opposite side is to adjourn the debate because they want time to digest his remarks. All morning the Member for St. Johns has cajoled us and begged us and did everything else to get a member, particularly of the Executive Council, to enter the debate, and our reward is, further delay of a bill that's been before this House now for some two months. The bill was introduced on or about May 12th, has had an occasion to be debated at least once or twice a week during that time, and surely, you know, cannot in any stretch of the imagination be considered to have not had the full opportunity of all members present in this Chamber to debate.

Yor Leader, the House Leader, suggested that he needed more time to digest this question. When the Government House Leader quite appropriately suggested that we will not accept further adjournments on this debate, that we will want to move on. —(Interjection)— Well, now, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the precedent. I think the honourable member said, "Never in eight years has that happened." On or about the 23rd of May . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on . a point of order.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Hasn't the decision to adjourn or not to adjourn been dealt with or are we debating that all over again, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. JORGENSON:** That was raised by the Member for Lac du Bonnet. He charged that it had never happened before.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ENNS:** It has to do with the six-month hoist and to consider the advisability of it, because among the reasons for the delay was the suggestion that this bill and this amendment should not now be considered but given even just a 24-hour hoist, I think that was the suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition, when he asked for an adjournment on the bill following the Mes, er for Morris, the Government House Leader's remark and then the Member for Lac du Bonnet said, "Closure, it's never happened in eight years. "Well on May 23rd he said — ell right, I'll give you a newer one — May 23rd, 1973, on the motion after Mrs. Trueman, the Honourable Mr. Green, having spoken, Mr. Spivak moved that the debate be adjourned, the question being put and was promptly voted down. That was in 1973. There are other occasions.

But even more important is, we, when we were opposition and when the then Government House Leader at about this time in a Session suggested to us that he would not accept further adjournments on certain bills and certain debates, that the time had come to move, we, Mr. Speaker, by in large, acceded to that request and we did not attempt adjournments.

So, let's lay that little question to rest. There is no real concern about the actions of the House, particularly those of my Government House Leader on that particular question.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks that I really want to respond to and that have been raised probably more so by the Member for St. George than any other member was his — as well as others — his request that the time and the opportune time for any proposed changes to this bill is now. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's one of the reasons why, under our system, the bills proceed through first reading, second reading in principle, and then into the committee stage, out of this Chamber on a less formal atmosphere where traditionally, not because it's a Conservative administration or NDP administration or Liberal administration, that's the way our system works. That in committee we introduce those amendments that we deem to be advisable, either initiated by the government's side, or indeed accept those amendments that I'm sure will be made even if it's a simple amendment that the bill not be reported. At the conclusion of the committee hearing that's the time that you will have the opportunity to look at those intentions, those plans, for the government to change or alter the bill that we are now debating in principle.

So for the Honourable Member for St. George to make an issue that it's not possible for the members opposite to debate Bill 25 in principle. Now, Mr. Speaker, they have studiously avoided in debating the principle of this bill and I can think of nobody else better than the Member for Morris of having clarified that point.

You know, the principles are very stark and very clear and very understandable to all cattlemen. It means the cattlemen can do their own thing. It means the cattlemen want to have the money to do their own thing and it means that the cattlemen can do these without the daily and constant harassment and interference of government. That's the principle of the bill.

Now, the honourable members don't like that principle, they made it very clear they don't like that principle, that's fine. We're prepared, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. CHAIAN:** Order please. I would like to refer all members to Rule 44(2) of our rules of this Chamber, which says, "No member shall read any newspaper in the House." The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, he undoubtedly was reading the cattle futures market, and as such, likely it was very germane — No. I see it's Penthouse. It's likely very germane to the debate at this time.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the point that I was trying to make was the objections raised by honourable members opposite that because they weren't privy at this particular point to whatever changes or proposed amendments, that have been alluded to the Act, aren't before the Chair, that it was not possible for this bill to be discussed and proceeded with further at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I say that that belies the practice and tradition of this House, and certainly nobody else but the former Minister of Agriculture, who introduced, I think, something like a 60-clause bill on farm machinery not that many years ago and then when we saw it in Law Amendments there were 59 amendments to the bill.

**MR JORGENSON:** 30 clauses to it and 59 amendments. ardon me, I'm corrected, the House Leader says it was a 30-clause bill with 59 amendments. I'm not being critical of my friend, the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that's the place where we discuss the amendments, that's the place we'll see what changes are about to be made, but that's not reason enough to not discuss this bill further.

Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that the majority of cattle producers applaud and appreciate the action taken with respect to this bill. I believe that the honourable members opposite, and I really can't

understand it, because I can appreciate the fact, whether it's my good friend the Member for Fort Rouge, or the Honourable Member for St. Johns, or my friend from St. Boniface, or from Logan, that they don't have an everyday, intimate understanding, working relationship with what touches or what is near to the hearts of cattlemen, that's understandable and that's forgivable. But I cannot understand them digging in their heels on an issue of which they know not what they speak of, and which is politically so damaging to them. And I said that before, Mr. Speaker, there's a rule against repetition and I will adhere to that rule.

Mr. Speaker, I only want to make one further comment, and I make it because I also appreciate the fact that it's probably stretching rules of the debate at this point, but it has been referred to several times by meers opposite, and that has to do with the recovery of the \$38 million which they are so adamant about.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister's actions have been very clear today. A letter has gone out requesting, under the terms of the contract, the terms of the contract be lived up to, but, Mr. Speaker, lest it be engrained and in any fundamental way just what kind of a mess — I'm now speaking not to the former Minister of Agriculture, because he knows what kind of mess he created, but I don't believe that members of his caucus and his Cabinet understand. Let me explain it to you in five minutes this way, particularly the Member for Burrows, who was concerned about making sure that the Minister of Education and others got that money back to carry out their programs and so forth. I'll cite you the cases of three farmers, ranchers. Rancher A, whose gross income is \$500,000 a year, because aside from raising a couple of hundred head of cattle, he has, you know, puts in 2,000 or 3,000 acres in crops, special crops. He had good investments otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, before I enter into this story, let me put it on the record, not that it's necessary, but that neither I nor the Member for Gladstone, nor the Member for Rock Lake, participated in the plan, and as such, we belong to that 40 percent who quite rightly would be very aggrieved if a full attempt of the recovery of the money wouldn't be made by this government. I just want that on the record.

But let me go back to my three examples: Farmer A — modest rancher, his gross income is about \$500,000 — half-a-million dollars a year; Farmer B — his gross income is also only \$500,000 a year; Farmer C — well, he is an Interlaker, he is my neighbour, his gross income is \$7,800 a year. All three of them received \$10,000 from your administration, your Minister of Agriculture, under The Beef Stabilization Program.

Farmer A thinks a little faster, decided to take up the offer made by your administration, by your Minister, to opt into the federal program and as such under the contract has no further obligations to replace the \$10,000.00. No further obligation. Farmer B, who has decided that at age 59 or 62, and he has had enough; he has sold out and he is now living in the Bahamas. He has no obligation to pay back to the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers of Manitoba, one cent of the \$10,000.00. Farmer C, who is my neighbour in the Interlake, whose gross income has never been above \$7,000 a year — poverty-line, you would say — is now being demanded to pay back every cent.

That's the kind of fiscal management, gentlemen, that you left, you put this province into. That's the kind of fiscal wishy-washy, wooly-eyed dreaming, frittering away of public funds and for what? For what, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I am just pointing out the kind of problems that this Minister of Agriculture has inherited, the kind of problems this Minister is going to have to deal with, and the kind of horror stories of the magnitude of \$38 million that were imposed on the taxpayers of this province by the previous administration.

Mr. Speaker, I only make comment of it at this time because there seems to be a deliberate understandable attempt to be made, to be engrained, that it's an automatic thing that \$38 million was paid out and \$38 million is going to be returned. That's not so, Mr. Speaker; that's not so, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Well, then, stop trying it and stop trying to do it. —(Interjection)— Well, that's what we're doing; that's what we're doing. But, Mr. Speaker, what can you say about that kind of management of public funds, other than understand the truthfulness of the comments made by the Government House Leader as to the reason why the talk and the influence of the Minister of Agriculture was so persuasive, that he could convince that administration to spend that kind of money on such a nebulous program.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members say there is nothing wrong with it. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** I wonder if Farmer A and Farmer B, who are earning a half-a-million each a year, which I don't believe any exist in Manitoba, but if they do, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if they are receiving

the same benefits from Manitoba Medicare as does the Member for Lakeside, as does the Member for Inkster, and all other people who earn a \$1,000 a year.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** I won't attempt to follow that convoluted thinking, Mr. Speaker. Certainly they are. I should have said, Mr. Speaker, that I was dealing with hypothetical farmers. You know, I thought that was taken for granted, but I was just in my, I think, understandable way, for purposes of clarity was demonstrating the utter ridiculousness of the scheme that they have foisted upon the province, at tremendous costs to the taxpayer and that we now are left to try to clean up. And it is not a black-and-white situation.

A more direct response to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet as to his question is: Has it also occurred to him that perhaps anybody — individual or corporation — that's earning a half-a-million dollars is perhaps contributing in a somewhat progressive manner towards those same services that he has referred to, but not in this program — not in this program. You see all of a sudden the ability-to-pay principle is completely lost. It didn't matter whether the farmer was raising, on the side, 2,000 or 3,000 acres of cropland; it didn't matter if the farmer had 500 cows or 50 cows, everybody received the flat tariff with a ceiling — true, with a ceiling.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, the ceiling was reached at some \$38 million and I refuse to stand by while my Minister of Agriculture, our Minister of Agriculture, is expected to accept that mismashed mess, that tangled web, that classic example of government interference in supply and management, particularly in a commodity such as beef. And we are being asked to buy more. You know, this example we have created for ourselves ranks at least with some of the examples that we have in the federal arena. When it comes to eggs, you know this is another example. I know it pales in its significance but can you imagine the millions we would have lost if this Minister would have pursued the deliberate policy of supplying black beans to Cuba? As it is, it only cost Manitoba taxpayers half-a-million dollars to send truckloads of beans to Cuba. But you know given another two or three years and we could have had a 20 or 30 million dollar black bean program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to me, really, and this is really the example that I think ought to be — let's leave the partisan side out of it for a little while — but the real and serious misunderstanding, as people responsible for public money, the horrendous traps that we build into ourselves that dissipate public funds when we go into supply and management. It's just unbelievable. It simply boggles the imagination, and particularly when we have such constant and daily reminders of the greatest agricultural machine on this planet earth within a 50 or 60 mile range of us, whose food costs are lower by 30 percent than they are in Canada and whose production is better than ours. They have done it because they have managed to stay away from supply and management.

Well, Mr. Speaker, import-export control. We had all the import-export control we needed on black beans. Nobody was bothering us on that. We weren't putting up tariff walls to keep Cuban black beans out of our market. No, that's a situation that we created all for ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, you know I am stretching the parameters of what is permissible in this debate but, Mr. Speaker, I want the honourable members to use, when they speak or when they refer — and I am now appealing to those people that haven't even got an interest in agriculture but have an interest in how a public dollar is spent, whether it should be spent for other social programs, whether it should be spent in our universities, in our hospitals so we could have cleaner sheets in our hospitals; you know in our universities so we could extend aid to foreign students; medicare, in our day care centres so we could have more day care centres.

If any of you even worried at all about extending some of these kind of services, \$38 million would have covered quite a bit of those services.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we won't learn this lesson. Certainly the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet hasn't learned this lesson. He wants, and continues to preach, what at least the cattle people and that is partly because they are still relatively large numbers of them — 6,000 or 7,000 of them.

It is no great secret why the broiler producers, for instance, or the egg producers, were among the first to embrace supply and management. Because of course what we are talking about is creating a beautifully sheltered, closed shop arrangement for some 100 people, and they have done that very nicely and they are enjoying that. They are enjoying that situation.

Mr. Speaker, the cattle producers don't look to that kind of direction and leadership from government. They have made that plain, despite the fact that several hard to understand votes were carried out.

Mr. Speaker, my time is rapidly diminishing and I would ask to be able to conclude my remarks.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

**MR. USKIW:** I wonder if the Member for Lakeside or the Minister of Highways would at least on occasion mention the subject matter of debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand the honourable member's remarks, Sir. —(Interjection)— Oh yes, Mr. Speaker. My position on the motion before us, Mr. Speaker, if it has not been made abundantly clear, I now do wish to dedicate the next few minutes to making that very clear, because you see the reason why this motion to hoist this bill before us is because honourable members need more time to talk about that problem that they have with the extension of aid to private and parochial schools. And it's because they want time to caucus that matter that they haven't come to agreement with themselves on that matter. They don't want that issue on this floor until they have had their fights about it, and they have mean and long fights about these issues in their caucus room; some can be heard in the hallways of the Legislature. That's why this hoist, Mr. Speaker, is before us and because I'm a supporter for that kind of a move that my cousin — oh, pardon me, my colleague, the Minister of Education — is bringing forward, that's why I am opposed to the hoist, Mr. Speaker. Because I don't want them to have that time to get that position fully strategized and consolidated; I would sooner see them come in as fragmented, as they obviously will fighting, as they obviously will, among themselves and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the hoist on this motion at this time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to proceed or if you wish to call it 5:30.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there any consensus to call it 5:30. Before we call it 5:30 the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

#### **BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**MR. FERGUSON:** I have a couple of changes on committees. I would like to change Mr. Cosens for Mr. Ransom on Law Amendments, and Mrs. Price for Mr. Ransom on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before I call it 5:30, can I get some advice from the Honourable Government House Leader on the proceedings for the evening.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, that depends on the kind of advice that you're seeking. It is the government's intention, to have Law Amendments sit tonight and that's all that we will have tonight.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. (Friday)