

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, August 21, 1969

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, when I left off at 5:30 I was dealing with the price per bushel and the total return that a farmer could get, and on the basis of a five bushel delivery quota this gives the farmer only \$7.50 per specified acre for his entire year's production and sale - not the production but the sale of his year's production. This return on the basis of the costs which are rising every day places the farmer in a very precarious position. Indeed, with the spiralling education costs, the rising government administration costs, the costs of medicine, the costs of health, the costs of welfare and the costs of all the other social services which are becoming apparent with every government administration, it leaves the farmer in a position in which he cannot carry on much longer. Indeed, very few farmers will have any income whatsoever to report next year. Not only is the farmer's own personal income jeopardized, but also the income at the national level and at the provincial level and also at the municipal level is also jeopardized, to the point where many municipal taxes might not be collected this coming year.

If municipal taxes are not collected, it necessarily follows that provincial revenue will be down also as well as affecting the gross national revenue. The failure of the Federal Government to realize that agriculture is still the No. 1 industry is serious and the loss of revenue from this segment of our society is also serious. Only now is our prime minister realizing how serious the situation is, as was evidenced last week when he went on a national television network advocating cutbacks in federal government spending. I feel that this government should take heed of the warning of the federal government and do what they deem necessary in the field of agriculture to rectify this problem. Again, I would like to repeat what our leader has already stated, that if the federal government is unwilling to act, to do what we think is essential for a major section of our economy, then we as a province, or jointly with other western provinces, must act either singly or jointly to do something for the agricultural economy. So much for the picture; now what can we do about it?

Firstly, let me state that the two-price system advocated by the New Democratic Party, and to some extent by other provinces in Western Canada, has not proven to be the success which we all hoped it would be. I am sure that they are every bit as disappointed as every western farmer is in the program announced by the Federal Government. But what can we do about it? -- (Interjection) -- What other alternatives are there to assist the farm and the farmer in this crisis that faces him today. I am not one who normally advocates government assistance to any segment of our society, but if a subsidy form of assistance is necessary - and every day it becomes increasingly more apparent that such is the case - then I for one would advocate that such subsidy should be applied to the operational costs of a farm operation, rather than to the selling price of the product. I repeat that again: that if such subsidy form is applied, it should be applied to the operational costs rather than to the selling price.

First let's take a look at some of the other segments of our economy. Transportation is subsidized. The textile industry is subsidized. The automotive trade is subsidized. Indeed, even our financial institutions have been subsidized by an increase in the allowable interest rates to be charged.

If subsidies are then the answer for these and many other segments of our society, why then not for the agricultural industry, which is still the No. 1 industry in our country. If we can rationalize the subsidy for the agricultural industry then the only question that remains is how is this subsidy to be applied. If we apply a subsidy to the selling price as advocated by the New Democratic Party and other governments, then we have to look at what the effect would be on other markets and other marketing agencies in other countries throughout the world.

We all know what has happened in France in the past few weeks where the subsidy system has been so great that the subsidy paid to the producer of barley has exceeded the selling price of barley as advocated by the Canadian Wheat Board. We also know what has happened in France on the financial market. What would happen here in Canada if we had to heavily subsidize the agricultural industry? Would we in turn have to reduce the value of the dollar? Now I'm not sure of that answer to that one, nor do I think does anyone in this House to have an answer to such a problem. If subsidies are to be paid on the selling price then we in our internal affairs and to protect the domestic market would naturally have to raise tariffs to prevent the import of foreign grains to our domestic market.

Now we all know in the Kennedy Round on the general agreement on trades and tariffs that

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . this is one point that they do not advocate. The Kennedy Round advocates a lowering of tariffs, and if we had to raise tariffs then it would be a most regressive step. What would be the effect to our neighbours to the south if we prevented the importation of American grain to the Canadian economy by such a tariff. I feel sure that our American friends to the South would retaliate. To what measure and in what form that retaliation would take I'm not prepared to answer. For this reason, and I suggest it is a valid reason, I would feel very much inclined to reject a two-price system. What about an alternative then? I believe it must come as a subsidy on the operational costs. Whether we sell a bushel of grain for \$2.00 which costs us \$1.50 to produce, or whether we sell it for \$1.00 and it costs us 50 cents to produce, doesn't matter too much as long as the operational costs are in relation to the selling price that the farmer gets.

Furthermore, any subsidy placed on operational costs allows a farmer to diversify, to change his methods of operating; perhaps to change his entire setup into different varieties of grain, into different methods of production, and even into entirely new products whereby our marketing problems would be greatly reduced. If the farmer, for instance, could be assured that 50 percent of his labour costs would be subsidized either by the Federal or Provincial government he would in all probability feel more inclined to diversify to a product which requires more manpower hours to produce than he would if that subsidy was not in effect. In essence, he might be more inclined to switch to a product such as sugar beets rather than growing wheat. He might be inclined to switch to corn. He might be inclined to switch to special grains, beef, pork or poultry, and a greater variety than he is now producing today. If the farmer knew that the machinery which is so necessary to change from wheat to potatoes could be subsidized and the cost to him would not be as great as it is today, he might even be more inclined to switch to potatoes. And now that the Minister has guaranteed that he cannot lose he might be even more inclined.

But first, Mr. Speaker, let me digress for a moment on the costs of agriculture equipment. I've been in touch with some of the leading manufacturers of farm equipment and they have informed me that there exists today a serious possibility of unemployment in the major production plants. In fact one major supplier of farm equipment told me that their production of combines for example is down 50 percent over previous years and they do not expect to increase production through the remainder of this year and all of 1970 and possibly even further than that. At the same time, as they have decreased production 50 percent they have only laid off 20 to 25 percent of their work force. This in itself adds a burden to the financial picture of these companies. Furthermore, those members of their work force who have been laid off will be drawing 80 to 85 percent of their regular take-home pay through a funding project set up over the years under union negotiation to cover such emergencies. But if the problem exists for some time no doubt these funds will eventually be depleted. Men with 15 to 20 years experience and 15 to 20 years of seniority will be laid off, and indeed now today some of them are being laid off. This is not healthy for any economy. Funds will be depleted and eventually they will have to increase prices, the selling prices of their products. This in effect will be a two edge sword aimed at the farmer when he is facing declining markets and a very low income. Eventually he could be asked to pay a portion of the unemployment costs which are a direct result of the decline of his own income. In effect he will be subsidizing the labour movement. Is this fair? Is this fair to ask a man who is barely eking out an existence to continue in such a manner? Mr. Speaker, I think not. This is another factor which lends support to the idea of a subsidy placed on the operational costs of farming rather than on the selling price.

And now, Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of our economy which concerns me, as I am sure it concerns many others in this province of ours. This lies in the field of transportation. Now I have no argument with the Minister of Transportation in his policy statement which he has issued from time to time whereby he has placed a high priority on northern development, transportation development. In fact I commend him for it. His policies have always been the policies of this party. Check back through the records, you'll find that when this party was in government they also advocated northern development. In fact it was the Conservative Government in Ottawa that advocated Roads to Resources. I would urge the Minister to continue these programs, but at the same time I would like him to look at a larger picture, larger than just the province of Manitoba. In fact an area encompassing western Canada. And here, Mr. Speaker, I refer to a northern alternative to the Trans-Canada Highway, namely the Yellowhead Route. This route, starting in Manitoba and travelling through the province of Saskatchewan,

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . Alberta and British Columbia is an alternative to the Trans-Canada Highway and offers many advantages over the present Trans-Canada Highway and the high altitude of the Roger's Pass with its many avalanches and heavy snowfall. The increase in mileage from Winnipeg to Vancouver via the Yellowhead Route as compared to the Trans-Canada Highway is minimal but the other advantages of lower altitude and practically snow free year round offers the traveller a much safer route from Winnipeg to the West Coast. The saving in time, the saving in fuel and the added safety factor I think cannot be minimized. All one has to do is to talk to some of the major trucking firms who have used both routes and they will tell you the advantages of the Yellowhead Route. So I would urge the Minister to work in close touch with the other western provinces in promoting the use of the Yellowhead Route as soon as possible.

I would also urge the Minister to continue the upgrading of No. 4 Highway which was started by our government, to bring this road to a standard befitting such a highway. I urge the Minister to complete the Portage By-Pass as quickly as possible. The Minnedosa By-Pass is nearly completed and now the upgrading of No. 4 from Minnedosa west to the Saskatchewan boundary has been started with shoulder widening and resurfacing from Minnedosa to Shoal Lake. This is under way at the present time. I ask the Minister to continue this program west to the Saskatchewan boundary. At the same time, I would implore the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Minister of Tourism and Recreation to co-operate in the program of the development of the Yellowhead Route. Private industry and local communities are already actively promoting this highway. There are tourist attractions second to none along the Manitoba portion of this highway. The crossing of the Birdtail River and the Assiniboine River offer great scenic advantages to our tourists and I would urge the Minister of Tourism to assist the communities that are already embarked on programs which are of benefit to the tourist. I urge the Minister of Industry and Commerce to assist the communities that are actively promoting the use of this route. Not only Manitobans but Canadians and our American friends to the south would benefit from such a program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while the Minister is encouraging transportation in the north, I would urge him not to forget the rest of Manitoba. There are many communities that have patiently waited for priorities in road programs, because we all know we must establish priorities. These communities cannot be forgotten completely and I ask the Minister to consider many of the programs that are presently under way and plan for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I know I have been somewhat lengthy, but I feel that any comments I have had to make this evening have been constructive and I would urge the government to consider them seriously. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election to the Speaker's Chair. During my long association as a member of the Winnipeg Public School Board, it's been my opportunity to observe and to become aware of the capabilities that you exhibited as a teacher and as a guidance counsellor within the Winnipeg public school system. You have made a very significant contribution to the education of young people of the City of Winnipeg; and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the qualities that you have exhibited as a teacher and a counsellor will manifest themselves here in this House and that you will carry out your duties as a Speaker in this House with justice and impartiality for all members of this House.

I would like to at this time also, Mr. Speaker, offer my congratulations to the Honourable Member for Osborne and the Honourable Member for St. George for their moving and seconding of the Speech from the Throne, and I want to commend them on a very excellent job.

The constituency of Logan, Mr. Speaker, and honourable members of the House, is a constituency that has been recently re-distributed, its boundaries now go westward and the constituency of which I have the honour of representing, Logan, now includes a portion of what are now farm lands. These people within the next decade, or perhaps even less, are facing a transition from a rural to an urban society. Logan constituency is situated in the heart of Winnipeg North Centre, and Winnipeg North Centre to the old ILP, the Independent Labour Party, the CCF in its turn and the NDP, has historic significance. From this seat in 1922, elected to the Canadian House of Commons, was J. S. Woodsworth; followed by the sitting member, Mr. Stanley H. Knowles, and it is significant in this fiftieth anniversary of the great strike of 1919, that Mr. J. S. Woodsworth, Mr. Abe Heaps, Mr. John Queen, the fond dreams that they had have now borne fruition and the New Democratic Party, which is the successor to the

(MR. JENKINS cont'd.)... movement that was founded by the late J. S. Woodsworth, is now the government of Manitoba.

I would also be remiss, Mr. Speaker and honourable members of the House, if I did not pay tribute to the former member who preceded me in this House, Mr. Lemuel Harris who sat in this House from 1959 until this last election. Mr. Harris - I had the honour of being his campaign manager in the last two previous elections.

There are other constituencies in the Province of Manitoba that face similar problems that we face in the constituency of Logan, and this is a changing trend from a rural to an urban society, and I was quite interested in some of the comments that the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell speaking and asking if the First Minister would prevail upon the union members in Vancouver, the dockers, if they would, even though they have extended the hand of friendship, will not delay wheat shipments from the west coast port. I wonder if he would also include the First Minister's speech to the grain operators, because an argument is not one-sided.

The people of my constituency, Mr. Speaker, are wage earners and producers in our economic structure. It is basically a family oriented constituency and therefore my constituents are very much concerned with the high cost of living, high cost of Medicare, transportation, the cost and availability of housing and of other matter affecting the day to day living of the average Manitoban - the minimum wage and the workmen's compensation.

It is therefore of special significance, Mr. Speaker, to my constituents that these problems will be dealt with as set forth in the Throne Speech during the First Legislative Session of a New Democratic Party Government in Manitoba.

Another feature of the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, that will meet with the approval of Manitobans, is the proposed Consumers' Protection Act. This piece of legislation is long overdue and it will also be implemented in the present session. Opposition charges to the contrary that we are not presenting our program. This is not quite true, Mr. Chairman, because we are presenting part of our program, but after all in three weeks we cannot prepare and legislate the full program of our Party. There are certain pieces of legislation - and I'm talking now of the old age pensioners and the reduction of bus fares that could have and should have been passed in the last Legislature.

The dawning of Manitoba's second century has been marked by a change and it must be admitted it's not the kind of a change that was expected by the originator of the phrase "Growing to Beat '70". The New Democratic Party took this to heart and we made the change and did it in 1969. Manitoba's first 99 years as a province, Mr. Speaker, has seen a see-saw administration of conservative and liberal government that has led to a failure of Manitoba to achieve its potential within the community of Canada. Manitoba's second hundred years, Mr. Speaker, will have a better vehicle for progress than the development of a social and economic growth with a new government chosen by the people to develop its human as well as its natural resources. I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that the spirit of Kelsey and LaVerendrye our early Manitoba explorers manifests itself today in the proposed development of Manitoba's northland, and we intend to see that it is developed. The same determination to challenge and conquer the unknown is part of Manitoba's heritage.

Manitobans will note with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure the honourable members of the House will also note, that the invitation has been extended to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth and His Royal Highness Prince Philip, the Duke of Edinburgh, to visit and participate in our centennial celebrations in 1970 and I welcome them most heartily as a citizen of Manitoba. Our other distinguished visitors, Mr. Chairman and honourable members, will see at first hand the economic opportunities and diversified natural beauty of our fair province.

In an age when air and water pollution, Mr. Speaker, are rapidly becoming number one problem all over the world, Manitoba's blue skies and clear waters emphasize the need for stringent measures to preserve them for future generations to enjoy. And in tune with the spirit of this House which I think we want to not take up too much time as a new member, I want to thank you for your kind attention and thank you, Mr. Speaker and honourable members of this House. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, Honourable Ministers and Gentlemen: I'm still slightly in awe of being the only lady elected to this auspicious Assembly, but I want at the outset to assure you that I will be very much a part of this group. You will be hearing from me regularly and I am certain that this will make you men feel quite at home. I note

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.) . . . there are three bachelors present but the rest of you I know will be lonely for the resounding echoes of a feminine voice and it is my intention not to disappoint you.

I should like to extend to the First Minister my congratulations on his party's success in the elections in June and also in securing the co-operation of various other parties that has enabled him to form this government. I think N.D.P. in this instance may mean "no definite party". I hope this heterogeneous mixture will prove to be a stable one.

The mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech are to be congratulated on their scholarly dissertations and I know we'll all look forward to hearing from them again.

Mr. Speaker, it's not an easy task that you have undertaken. I applaud you for assuming this position of responsibility which you grace with dignity and élan.

The constituency of Fort Rouge which I have the honour to represent was newly created by the Boundaries Commission. Because of its numerous high-rise apartments, it is population-wise, the largest constituency in the province with over 13,000 voters.

When I was first elected an alderman to serve this area I determined that I would learn the derivation of the term "Fort Rouge". Historical information on this fort is vague and not readily available.

A historical paper dated 1885 presented by George Bryce of Manitoba College describes this Fort Rouge as "this small station of French Explorers, so named probably from its being on the Miskonesipi or Blood-red River of the Cristenaux Aborigines, was hardly built and named before it was given up." R. P. Antoine Champagne of St. Boniface, within the past few months has published in French a book "Les La Verendrye et le Poste de l'Ouest." Microfilms of the original La Verendrye papers and maps, housed in Canada, were available to him. These indicate that Fort Rouge was situated on that small triangle of land at the confluence of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers bordered by Main Street on the third side. At present it is crossed by two C.N.R. railway lines. Fort Rouge was completed and occupied by La Verendrye on October 15th in 1738 - 231 years ago. Sieur Varennes de La Verendrye was the first white explorer to reach this part of the country and therefore this was the first settlement known in this area. It must be regarded as the birth place of what is now Winnipeg, a city bustling with commerce and inhabited by people of diverse ethnic origin.

In 1974, when the City of Winnipeg celebrates its centennial, it is intended that we recognize the site of this original Fort Rouge. The actual site because of erosion, however, may long since have gone down the Red River but will come as close as we are able to do. Our people living in this constituency come from every ethnic origin and all walks of life. There are many nursing homes for the aged, mostly in large - to quote the Willard Report "old, renovated residences which pose a fire hazard and offer little scope for the services and the activity programs that are needed." The service given to the elderly infirm ranges from housing to hostel, to personal care. Previously the government has given capital and operating grants to non-profit homes. It has been estimated that this community needs another 2,500 nursing home beds. To the elderly who must turn to these institutions for alternate care at \$9.50 or so a day, it seems unfair that having paid for many years into the hospital insurance plan that they are now unable to secure any benefits. Again, it is disappointing to me that there has been no recognition in the legislation before us of the problems surrounding the aged people.

The area also contains one of the largest concentrations of people living on social welfare assistance. In the City of Winnipeg, approximately 50 percent of the families on welfare are those of self-support mothers - often they are women who have been deserted by husbands who couldn't stand the pressure of family living and simply walked out. Many of these women would prefer to be self-supporting if they could arrange for proper low cost day care for their children. There are a few day nurseries available, they are often at some distance and cost as much as \$7.13 a day. Often the children from low-income families haven't a level of learning which enables them to benefit from grade school or even kindergarten. Their experience in nursery school activities helps to prepare them for the public school system. The mothers function better and are more loving having had periodic relief from the pressures of their children and from the unpleasant experience of being totally dependent upon welfare. Family life is actually strengthened.

I am disappointed that the party that pretends to be the friend of the working man seems unaware of the problems of the working mother. Ways in which the formation of more day care centres might be encouraged are through capital and operating grants to non-profit nurseries,

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.)... per capita grants to all day care centres, by payment directly to families for meeting day care costs or by payments to meet the costs of specific families, that is families on welfare.

Most of us have misgivings about state run nurseries, which along with the school systems of Socialists and Communist countries bear the stigma of being used as instruments for political indoctrination. In fact, many people feel that in this country the school system has been infiltrated at all levels by teachers whose principles don't prevent them from presenting a biased political and ideological picture.

There are many reasons why women work outside their homes. In these days of high taxes and compulsory deductions, it frequently takes two salaries in order to buy a home, to give children a university education or just to enjoy some of the wonderful products in the market place. At present the Canadian Welfare Council is conducting a nation-wide day care survey which should reveal the scope of the problem as the number of women in the work force are expected to increase to 35 percent in the 1970's.

A review of The Landlord and Tenant Act should be most welcome to my constituency as apartment living prevails. As a member of the committee of the City of Winnipeg which held public hearings on the problems of landlords and tenants under this archaic act, I'm very much aware of the problems which are faced on both sides. I'm delighted to see that action such as a review of this Act is to be undertaken.

There are many retired couples living on fixed incomes in this constituency. Many of these are wealthy. Estate tax rebates would probably help to keep the capital resources which these people represent within this province. Within Fort Rouge there is little land set aside for green areas and recreation. Probably there has been little planning as the area developed. Among the citizens of the community there is good leadership and a serious effort is being made to rectify this shortage of recreation facilities. There is nothing that could not be achieved if the public purse were able to bear the cost.

One of the most urgent problems confronting the community stems from the multiplicity of government and conflicting jurisdictions within Metropolitan Winnipeg. When a government tries to carry out the task it was elected to do, it is frustrating to be obstructed by the sort of struggle for power that's going on between Metro and the municipalities. In trying to assume the mantle of authority Metro becomes dictatorial and arrogant. A recent example before us was Metro's preparation of a re-development scheme for downtown Winnipeg, involving expenditures of many millions of dollars from the public purse and important policy changes, but the City of Winnipeg learned it first from reading the newspapers. This sort of lack of consultation and co-operation results in quarrelling which can only damage the image which the city would like to project. The present situation is intolerable to the municipalities and I expect, to Metro as well.

The Targets for Economic Development Report states that Greater Winnipeg is not a big city in the modern sense and could easily be administered efficiently by a single central administration, even at the 1980 target population of 775,000.

The TED Report also recognizes the difficulty where a parent level of government, that is the province, would be faced with a city larger in population than the rest of the province. Those of us who have been part of civic government look forward to the report of the Boundaries Commission, as perhaps presenting a solution to this vexing problem of mixing jurisdictions. If it recommends a degree of consolidation of municipalities short of total amalgamation, a revamped Metro could better be composed of elected representatives of the city council appointed to serve on a Metropolitan Commission, as is the case in Metropolitan Toronto and in the London County Council in England.

I would hope that the present government, after looking objectively at the experience with a metropolitan form of government to date would resist political pressures as well as those of civil servants who might be empire building and take courageous political action to resolve this problem which afflicts our community. There are good examples to be observed in St. John's, New Brunswick where the provincial government said "amalgamate" and set a date for its achievement. Similarly, Ontario ordered the amalgamation of Fort William and Port Arthur to form what is now "Thunder Bay".

There is one more matter with which I would like to deal briefly - the housing crisis which Winnipeg faces. The most recent Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation apartment vacancy survey is dated, April 1969. In the downtown area, the vacancy rate was .1 percent. In the

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.)... Metropolitan area it was 2/10 of one percent. If a house burns down there is no other available.

Now in May of this year, the Federal Minister responsible for housing recognized that there were more families than there were dwellings and that too many dwellings are inadequate. He said, "It also means that many people are living in sub-standard housing and face the resulting threat to health, comfort and self-esteem." He further said, "To clarify the immediate long-term intentions of the government, let me state clearly that we support in principle, and will give high priority to the continuation of federal assistance for increasing the supply of housing for low income groups." Three months later, federal financial aid has been withdrawn in this province, and I quote "due to the need for a more definitive policy, a new and refined approach, arising out of many considerations, not the least of which are the rigid financial constraints presently imposed on the federal Treasury."

The City of Winnipeg, at federal insistence, has been negotiating with the Midland Railway for the past two years for its purchase and relocation. This was considered a first and most important step in renewing that part of the core of the city. Much of the land to be acquired from the railway was to be used for housing. This would be a most progressive step in the renewing of our city. Agreement on a price is so close that it could be a matter of days. But this exercise has been futile unless the city and the province together can persuade the Federal Government that it must stand by its responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that I have not spoken too long. We're allowed just 10 minutes at city council debates and I feel a little uncomfortable when I speak longer, but no doubt I will change my habits as is a woman's prerogative. I'm sorry there are not more women among the elected members of this House for I feel that they do have an important contribution to give. However, I expect to enjoy very much my association with this honourable Assembly and serve notice that I will ask no quarter and give none.

Mr. Speaker, my position here has been likened to that of a rose among thorns, but there's a little song, a little tune that runs through my mind - "I'm just a little petunia in an onion patch". Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your indulgence.

MR. PAULLEY: Since the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge made reference to a very famous song, "I'm a little petunia in an onion patch" I wonder if she would be kind enough to sing the song for the edification of the members of this Assembly. -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHERNIACK: I wanted to ask a question of the honourable member, if she would permit it. Would the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge permit a question? Would the honourable member permit a question, please? I'm under the impression that I heard her say something about the infiltration in our school systems of people who were teaching something contrary to what is believed by her to be the correct form of teaching. If I am correct in what I understood her to say, does she have any concrete evidence to offer us for that statement?

MRS. TRUEMAN: Not at the present time. I'd have to try to remember names of people.

..... continued on next page

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier and Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, it takes some amount of courage to be the one to follow the only lady member of this Assembly but I thought that the time was appropriate to make some remarks relative to all that has been said in the Throne Speech debate up to the moment.

I want to begin Sir, by offering congratulations to you on your ascension to the highest office of this Assembly. And I hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that I really wish that you will believe that, although according to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition it would seem that you were only my third or fourth choice, or whatever. The fact of the matter is that as a matter of ability Sir, I have no doubt - never had any doubt that so far as ability and competence is concerned that you will be able to exercise the responsibilities of that office in a way that will satisfy everyone.

I would also like to offer congratulations to the Member for Osborne and the Honourable Member for St. George, the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Never having had a chance to exercise such an exalted function, I must take my pleasure vicariously from the fine way in which you carried out that task.

I would also like to thank the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for the kind words - some of the words which he expressed in his speech of August 18 were kind words and I thank him for that. I would like to say to him that I'm sure he will believe me when I say that I bear him, as I'm sure he bears me, no personal animosity. There may be, if rumours from the election campaign are true, it may be that the Leader of the Opposition has no similar feeling of goodwill toward one or two defeated candidates in Charleswood - Tuxedo, but insofar as the two of us are concerned, I do hope and believe that there is no personal animosity. But I must confess that I was a little surprised to see his reference that he hoped that our short time in office would be successful. If it's to be successful it will not be short. If it's short, one presumes it will not have been successful. But in any case, however long we occupy the Treasury benches on this side and behind, I sincerely hope that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition stands ready in anticipation of being called on some day by His Honour to take the responsibility of government. But if the analysis of Mr. Diefenbaker is correct it would seem that the Conservative Party has a particular problem when it comes to leadership because one stumble and the knives are out, so we're told. I really hope that that's not the case here in Manitoba. Perhaps this is true only in Ottawa. I hope so. But I would caution my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition that it appears to me that only three short weeks in Opposition and beside him and behind him there are one or two or three that are potential Brutus. And immediately behind -- (Interjection) -- and immediately behind my honourable friend sits one who already has the countenance of Cassius, lean and hungry, and ambitious, perhaps, perhaps too ambitious. So I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that if this government is to fail to receive the confidence of this House at some future date, or of the people, that it will be my honourable friend, the Member for Minnedosa that will be called upon. With the help of his colleague, the former Minister of Mines and Resources, however, that will be a pretty difficult and unlikely prospect.

It is with some frustration, Mr. Speaker, that I turn next to the matter of the Speakership and look at the references made in that connection by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. He seems to fault me for taking a course of action, he says, that has resulted in us failing to make progress toward permanency of the Speakership, and I, Mr. Speaker, cannot understand just precisely what it was that he or anyone else would have wanted me to do differently. It is a matter of conviction with me now that there is no way that one can proceed toward permanency of the Speakership except to first solicit an undertaking from the person most directly involved and that is the one that is likely to be the Speaker; and if I could have got an undertaking at that time I certainly would have proceeded quickly, very quickly, to consult with leaders of the other parties to get their views, hopefully their concurrence. I don't know of any other way in which to proceed. But since the Honourable Leader of the Opposition raised the matter in his contribution to the Throne Speech, I want to add that it seems to me one of the most tangible and concrete ways in which we can proceed toward permanency of the Speakership is for whoever is the incumbent to take the decision and make the announcement that he or she would be prepared to contest at the next election as an independent. This is what has happened at the federal level and I believe it can be said, and I believe members of all parties in Ottawa will now agree, that Mr. Speaker Lamoureux in making the decision to run as an independent in the last federal election has done more than

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . all that was done in previous years and decades to move toward the permanency of the Speakership, and the respect which he enjoys in the Chair today is something that far exceeds what any previous Speaker enjoyed in the federal House, largely because of the important decision to run as an independent in the election, and until we do that, I'm afraid that thinking about permanency of the Speakership is wishful thinking.

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition let us know when he was speaking on August 18th that since the election, since the defeat of the previous government he has had time, time in which to relax and meditate and think about the finer things of life, and for that I am very happy. I'm sure that it must be a very real compensation, an off-setting compensation after losing an election to be able to have leisure which you couldn't even dream of having while you were occupying the position as Premier. But I want to say to my honourable friend that if he is going to have more time now for recreation and leisure, I do wish he would use that leisure time to think meditatively about profound things, about first principles and politics rather than wasting his time conjuring up visions of half-blind horses and geese. This vision that came to him while he was relaxing at his home near Minnedosa about a half-blind horse and a goose - not very profound. The analogy I guess has to do with, in his mind, with the Member for St. Boniface and the New Democratic Party. I'd like to say quite a bit about that but my friend and colleague the Member for St. Boniface is quite capable of looking after himself and I'm sure he will have something to say about that. Speaking of half-blind horses, Mr. Speaker, speaking of half-blind horses as was the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, brings to mind the question of impaired vision, and if there ever was a case of impaired vision it was the vision demonstrated by this previous administration when they called the election for the 25th of June in such a way that could not help but do damage to the well-being of Manitoba. And what I mean specifically, Mr. Speaker, is that anyone with unimpaired vision couldn't help but see that to call a snap election in such a way as to abort a Legislature that had only five days to go toward completion of its work, that this was indeed a case of operating under impaired vision.

MR. PAULLEY: Who's sorry now?

MR. SCHREYER: And it's not exactly all a laughing matter, Mr. Speaker, because one must say that having aborted the last session of the last Legislature is tantamount to taking 500,000 bucks and throwing it out the window. That's really what's involved, and therefore I'm afraid that I cannot accept any advice from my honourable friend about the need to exercise thrift and care in the expenditure of public funds. We shall, as a new government, exercise great care and restraint in the spending of public money. I'm sure that any government is conscious of this need, but I will not take advice from a government that takes \$500,000 and puts it to non-productive use by aborting a session of the Legislature.

And there is another point, the other point being that perhaps some of us here would have a greater feeling of sympathy for our friends opposite if it were not for the fact that by calling the election - the snap election last June - they threw to the winds a very long-standing tradition of British parliamentary practice, and that is that no government acts in a way that is simply unfair to Her Majesty's Opposition. The tradition is well understood, it's well known and it's long standing, that is that a party in power does not call an election when another major party is undergoing a change of leadership. I have never seen it done before but it was done here in Manitoba in 1969, and so we find a long-standing tradition has been violated and now the temptation is for the new government in office to retaliate in kind at some future date, and if we did it would be a pity.

MR. GREEN: It wouldn't do for them what they did for us.

MR. SCHREYER: But it was incredible to me, Sir, that a government should stop short a legislative session, aborted it with just a matter of days to go. You know the amendments to the Criminal Code in Ottawa last session of Parliament liberalized the law on abortion but not to this extent. And speaking of impaired vision, Mr. Speaker, not only was their impaired vision noticeable before the election, there was impaired vision after the election as well - impaired vision in the sense that I am sure that in certain parts of this city, in certain districts of Winnipeg, certain clubs in the Metropolitan area, there must have been a number of people cross-eyed with disbelief and terror, terror at the very thought that there should have been elected to government a political party that some of whose members style themselves as socialists; disbelief that there could come to be as advisors to Her Majesty, advisors to the Crown, a group of men and women that believe in a set of political ideas and principles known in a general way as Democratic Socialism or Social Democracy, but we are here and we will now have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to explain to our friends opposite and to the people of

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . Manitoba just what we hope to do to bring about the kind of changes in our society and economy that we feel will result in a more equitable distribution of the goods of this world.

To my mind this is what the art of good government is or should be all about, to work towards a more equitable distribution of those goods that are essential to well-being, because without that, civil rights or freedom or liberty, whatever way it's described, cannot be meaningful. That's why I was a little disturbed to listen to my friend the Honourable Member for Swan River when he spoke the other day. He expressed surprise, if not a little indignation - perhaps that's too strong a word - he expressed surprise that we should want in the Throne Speech to make reference to the need for expansion of civil liberties in our province for the people of the province. I certainly would agree with my honourable friend if he were to argue that for many many Manitobans there is a plenitude of civil rights and liberties. I agree, but I would hasten to insist that for many, for too many Manitobans, there is still really inadequate opportunity for them to exercise civil liberties and we hope to move in the direction of making their standard of living, making available to them better opportunity for the acquisition of essentials, so that they can begin to exercise liberty in a way that it becomes meaningful to them.

But this can only be done with the understanding and the goodwill of the majority of people. No government can move faster than 50 percent of the population plus one, and I would hope and pray that in Manitoba the new government will have the concurrence of a majority, even if it be only a bare majority, to move toward a greater equality in the human condition, to marshal the capital and the moneys necessary, in large amounts obviously, to start doing and implementing those programs that we have been talking about for so long.

I admit that in the Throne Speech that was put before honourable members just a few days ago that we did not make mention of many of the programs and ideas and principles that we have been talking about for years, but that's only because we have said right from the start that this session is not a regular session. Since when did regular sessions in Manitoba take place in August? Regular sessions here by tradition - we follow that tradition - are held in the winter, and we will have just enough time in which to sit down and systematically work out and formulate the legislative drafts to start work on the implementation of our programs and policies. We simply dismiss as nonsense any contention from the other side that we have to feel under some obligation to do this in three weeks. We will not be pressured into a situation where we have to work with haste. To proceed with undue haste is to make many mistakes and we won't be pressured into making mistakes.

But we will move, Mr. Speaker. We will move north. The Minister of Transport is quite right when he says that we shall emphasize the need for building a basic interstructure in the north, because for all practical purposes there doesn't exist one there yet and we're going into the 1970's. So it's about time and we shall move and it'll involve considerable sums of money. I'm sure that my immediate predecessor, the Member for Minnedosa, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would have felt reluctant about doing so. I'm not so sure about his predecessor. Perhaps it would be best not to speculate about that, but I do know this, that there does come a time when it is in the public interest to move on a dramatic size and scale and we shall move northward in a big and dramatic way. I'm convinced of it, and we shall do so starting with the decade of the 1970's.

I am sure that the Honourable Member for River Heights - is it Tuxedo-River Heights? - the former Minister of Industry and Commerce?

MR. PAULLEY: River Heights - that little fellow over there.

MR. SCHREYER: I know, Mr. Speaker, that he is eagerly awaiting an opportunity to make some comment about the Speech from the Throne and I'm sure that he will avail himself of an opportunity before too long. I just want to take the opportunity now to say to him that I understood that while he was Minister of Industry and Commerce he carried out the duties and responsibility of that portfolio in a commendable way, and so I feel that I have taken on a pretty onerous duty in attempting to succeed him as Minister of Industry and Commerce. It may well be that we shall have disagreement about methods by which a government should proceed in order to try to attract industry. I don't know how great will be the disagreement or difference between us, but I think I can already give my honourable friend notice that there will be some changes of policy in this particular respect. We do have it in mind, despite his apprehension, to extend the work of the Manitoba Development Fund. We do have it in mind to implement

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . . certain of the recommendations of the TED Commission Report, and some reference has been made about this already. But since he was the first to speak out after the election, the smoke had hardly cleared and he was already, Sir, on a path of criticism of the new government, his first reference being about this new government's announced intention to set up an inquiry into certain transactions between the Manitoba Development Fund and private firms.

Since he mentioned it, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute or two to simply indicate that when we said during the election campaign that the Development Fund having transacted quite a number - almost 300 transactions setting up enterprises of one kind or another, we said that it was our conviction, our belief based on the evidence available to us, that two or three of the transactions seemed to have something very much wrong about them and that allegations had persisted for so long and the government had been so secretive, completely secretive about the whole thing, that there was no course of action open except to, as a new government, to set out to have a systematic inquiry and this we are still committed to do.

How, Mr. Speaker, can a government sit there month after month, year after year, when one of its Crown agencies is subject to persistent suspicion, persistent allegation of wrong doing without moving to clear it up one way or the other for once and for all, and that is why it is our intention to establish an advisory and review board that will have the powers to look into all documents, papers, ask the necessary questions of principals, etc., so that we can get an adequate report of what actually transpired in the case of these two or three transactions. We shall in fact, Mr. Speaker, try much harder, much much harder; we shall try to get away from this great reliance on secrecy as a crutch for government to take the easy way out. A government must above all else hold itself accountable, and how can it be accountable if it keeps hidden deliberately, in the face of repeated requests by democratically elected members of the Assembly, refusing to table reports documented, written up at public expense, and that is why we are moving to table in this House those two so-called hidden reports relative to South Indian Lake.

And speaking of South Indian Lake, Mr. Speaker, what a disappointment it must have been to the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. Here was a man who I'm sure had had great visions of being returned to power and given the necessary powers to go ahead with the flooding of thousands of square miles in the north and he was thwarted. Perhaps I shouldn't be unkind to the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. It could be that he was being used as a scapegoat by a Cabinet that could not make a decision, or should I say by a Cabinet who took the easy decision, and that is they looked at the engineering costs, looked at them alone and ignored all other factors. This was the way that decisions were made 30 years ago I suppose - single utilization of resources, single purpose utilization of resources, a concept that's at least 30 years old if it's a day. And nowadays when the great emphasis is on multiple purpose resource utilization around the world, can a government -- and I've had enough time to go through some of the reports to feel satisfied already that the decision to proceed with the high level diversion was based almost exclusively on considerations of engineering costs and did not take into account recreation potential value, did not take into account the possible benefits of flood control by alternative control works on Lake Winnipeg and a host of other factors. So perhaps so far as the future of Manitoba is concerned and the conservation of wild life and recreational resource potential in the north, perhaps it is a Godsend that the election on the 25th of June took place for the change in administration.

I do not wish to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the decision taken by my honourable friends opposite was a dumb decision. That's not what I'm trying to imply at all. But I do insist that on the basis of the information we have, it was a decision taken on the basis of single factor consideration, engineering costs and engineering costs exclusively, and that's a very simple way to take a decision but it ignores the requirements of future decades and future generations in terms of recreational needs, in terms of wildlife conservation, as I say, and it's worth repeating, because this particular decision we're referring to was one of the more momentous that has had to be taken by government in Manitoba.

I see my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition has moved quickly to file on the Order Paper, as he said he would in the Throne Speech, a resolution relating to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and I want to think that he has done so because of his genuine and sincere belief in the efficacy of the monarchy and if that's so I'm very happy that he has filed the motion. Coming from the Federal House I'm not so sure that it's that or whether it's some kind of political trickery, and if my honourable friend's offended I apologize. Well

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . perhaps he's right. Perhaps we should have it on the Order Paper and have a discussion about it. It isn't too often that we have a discussion about this fundamental part of British constitutional parliamentary government. I just want to advise my honourable friend that if he is sincere, and I believe him to be, that I concur with him most fully in the advisability and desirability of maintaining this institution -- important part of parliamentary democracy.

But I go on now, Mr. Speaker, to notice something that my honourable friend said that really is silly. And that is on Page 25 of Hansard where he talks rather sneeringly about our reference to the need for an equitable distribution of worldly goods of the society that we live in. My honourable friend goes on to say that "they can disguise it all they like. What they really mean is that everybody will send it all in and they'll decide what the government needs and the government will send back the rest." What an over-simplified view of the democratic socialist or social democratic philosophy. I defy anyone to say that he knows for sure what is the proper balance in terms of the gross national product, what is really the right, the proper division as between government's share and private sector's share. It seems to me that on the basis of the latest figures available, that in Canada approximately 30 to 33 percent of the G. N. P. was public sector. Is that wrong? -- (Interjection) -- It's close. No, but I mean is it wrong in principle? That's my question, Sir, that there should be one-third of the G. N. P. in the public sector and two-thirds in the private. Would there be anything evil or disastrous to human welfare if it were 35 or if it were 40 and 60?

MR. GREEN: It's higher in Manitoba than it is in Canada under that government.

MR. SCHREYER: The point is, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues and I happen to believe, and believe sincerely, in an approach to government that is essentially activist. We don't have to use the word socialist, capitalist. We can put them aside for the moment and talk about whether one's belief in government is essentially activist or pacifist; and frankly we believe in the instrumentality of government, we believe that it should be used more rather than less in a complex world in which the individual often finds himself bewildered and perplexed. This does not mean that we want to move into Crown ownership of production, distribution and exchange. But I'll tell my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce one thing -- the former Minister -- that if it comes to a situation where government has to put in more than 70 percent of the capital to get a venture going, if the proportion in a venture of private risk capital is less than 15 percent I want to ask what the hell's the point.

It seems to me that there is nothing wrong with the modern day compromise pragmatic approach of a partnership between government and private enterprise to get enterprise moving. And if it can be done on the basis of private enterprise marshalling the capital, fine. If it can be done by public ownership, fine. If it has to be done by a mixture of two, I would say that's fine. But, there has been something rather disturbing, a disturbing trend in recent years, Mr. Speaker, and that is the kind of strange form of ownership where it's privately owned where the public puts in 80 percent of the capital to initiate and the private risk input is 20 percent or less -- (Interjection) -- I'm talking about secondary industry. Housing is hardly apropos in this. And so we have an agency like the Manitoba Development Fund. If it must be used as a means of providing seed capital or shovel capital or whatever the more recent words are, nothing wrong. But if we must we should not be opposed to the idea of having the Crown agency put in money in the form of equity input so that you have a joint sharing of the equity of an enterprise.

Now I come, Mr. Speaker, to agriculture. And to listen to my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, it would seem that this government had somehow failed the farmers of Manitoba by the reason that we did not have extensive reference in the Throne Speech to the agricultural industry and its problems. Mr. Speaker, I was never aware that words -- the mere presence of words was going to solve a grave problem. And in any case, and I'm saying this sincerely, that never as a member of this Legislative Assembly back in the late '50's or early '60's, and certainly not during the campaign of last June, did I ever take the position that the former government was at fault because it was not doing something with respect to farm cash income. Because I have always maintained, and in this respect I suppose I was a pupil of Douglas Campbell who always said when he was in opposition as well that a provincial government was simply not in a position to act on a massive enough scale to deal with the basic farm problem of western Canada that is one of simply too low farm commodity prices. I've never made that attack; and because I have never made that attack I simply do not accept any

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . criticism levelled to this side that we are failing the farmer because of the fact the farmer is receiving low prices for his wheat. Now I did attack the former government on some of its provincial farm policy and I'll come to that in a moment. But with respect to the major problem, namely that of inadequate farm price -- commodity price, I agree with my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition when he says that the problem still lingers at the Federal Government's doorstep, as he implied the other day when he was speaking. I am not always that critical of the present Federal Liberal Government, but in one respect I am very critical, and that is what seems to be an apparent lack of understanding or lack of interest relative to the grave farm cash income position that our farmers in western Canada face these days.

I don't know what we as a provincial government can do. I would agree that there is need to convene a meeting of the Prairie Economic Council, and it will be convened next month. But I want to say to my honourable friend lest he try to press too hard that the meeting should have taken place in the month of June, and I'm informed would have taken place in the month of June, but you called the election and it couldn't take place.

A MEMBER: They didn't care.

MR. SCHREYER: But it will take place in the month of September and I'm sure that prairie province premiers will commiserate with each other; but it still comes back to whether or not the Federal Government can be impressed sufficiently that they must really do something more than that miserable two-price system that they came forward with a few weeks ago.

The fact that my colleague the Minister of Agriculture was an advocate of a two-price system does not mean that he was advocating the kind of miserable two-price system that the Federal Government has proposed now. What we had in mind was the kind of two-price system that Robert Winters was talking about when he was Federal Minister of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa before 1968, because in 1967 I recall well him saying that the Federal Government was going to price support at \$1.95 1/2 on No. 1 f.o.b. the Lakehead. And then of course the price of wheat didn't fall below that so that promise was a hollow promise, it didn't have to take effect. But the moment that world wheat prices started to go below \$1.95 when the promise should have been exercised, that's when the promise was reneged upon and the two-price system -- I want my honourable friends opposite to believe us -- the two price system that is in effect now is a bastardized form of the kind that my colleagues and I were talking about in previous years.

But there are some things that can be done at the provincial level, Mr. Speaker, and one is to do something to improve the kind of agricultural credit service that is given by the Government of the Province of Manitoba. We had Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and that group over there emasculated it; and like all emasculated things what good is it? Not good for very much. So we either have to restore to the Agricultural Credit Corporation more powers and the authority to go into direct lending as it used to or else we might as well abolish it, because in the present form it's in it serves a very very weak and almost non-existent purpose. Mr. Speaker, I see it's 9:30 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I must interrupt the Honourable the First Minister. In accordance with the provisions of subsection 2 of our Rule No. 33 and it now being 30 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, I am putting the question on the sub-amendment to the amendment to the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne for An Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the Opening of the Session.

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

MR. FROESE: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker. If I get support.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the honourable member has support.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

Ayes: Messrs. Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McGill, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Sherman, Spivak, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

Nays: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Beard, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Ayes: 22; Nays: 32.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the sub-amendment lost. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne for An Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition in amendment thereto. Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, seconded by the Honourable Member . . .

MR. WEIR: . . . to speak this evening; there's still 20 minutes left if they did.

MR. SPEAKER: The question's been called.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we have now run out of the Order Paper for today and I would move the adjournment of the House ahead of 10:00 o'clock. But before doing so, Your Honour, may I remind the honourable members of "Operation Manitoba" tomorrow. The planes leave the International Airport at 7:00 o'clock in the morning. There is a full and heavy schedule put on for the trip. I understand that most of the members of the Assembly do intend to go. I'm sure that they will have a very enjoyable day; but may I suggest that after a long day today that they get there in order that the planes may leave at 7:00 o'clock in the morning. And of course this particularly applies to the Honourable Member for River Heights.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Health and Social Services that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: If I may, before the motion is put, I have also received a message to remind the Assembly that the bus leaves for the Airport at 6:00 a. m. tomorrow morning.

MR. BILTON: So there will be no misunderstanding, that is in the front of the building, this building, tomorrow morning at 6:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Moved by the Honourable Minister of Labour, seconded by the - I'm sorry, I missed the seconder. May the Honourable Minister tell me . . . Minister of Health and Social Services.

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