

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 13, 1975

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 31 students of Grade 11 standing, of the Murdoch McKay School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Heindl. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Transcona, the Minister of Labour.

We also have 17 students of Grade 9 standing, of the Andrew Mynarski School. These students are under the direction of Miss Wiseman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

And we have 14 Grade 11 students of the Rivers Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Popoff. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Virden.

On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions. Reading and Receiving Petitions.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK: The petition of Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare a list of members to compose the Standing Committees ordered by the House.

MR. CLERK: Your committee met and prepared the following list of members to compose the Standing Committees ordered by the House:

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: (12) Hon. Messrs. Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Paulley, Messrs. Axworthy, Brown, Einarson, Henderson, Jenkins, Malinowski, McGregor, Petursson.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS :(12) Hon. Messrs. Schreyer, Toupin, Turnbull, Messrs. Blake, Cherniack, Craik, Graham, Johannson, Johnston (Portage), McGill, Osland, Walding.

PUBLIC UTILITIES AND NATURAL RESOURCES: (12) Hon. Messrs. Bostrom, Green, McBryde, Schreyer, Uruski, Messrs. Blake, Craik, Dillen, Enns, Johnston (Portage), Shafransky, Spivak.

AGRICULTURE: (12) Hon. Messrs. Bostrom, Burtniak, Toupin, Uskiw, Messrs. Adam, Derewianchuk, Einarson, Ferguson, Gottfried, Johnston (Portage), Jorgenson, McGregor.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS: (12) Hon. Messrs. Doern, Miller, Pawley, Messrs. Axworthy, Derewianchuk, Gottfried, Johannson, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Moug, Osland, Sherman, Watt.

LAW AMENDMENTS:(30) Hon. Messrs. Boyce, Desjardins, Green, Hanuschak, Miller Paulley, Pawley, Turnbull, Uruski, Messrs. Adam, Axworthy, Bilton, Brown, Derewianchuk, Dillen, Gottfried, Graham, Henderson, Jenkins, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McKellar, McKenzie, Minaker, Moug, Osland, Patrick, Petursson, Spivak, Walding.

PRIVATE BILLS: (12) Hon. Messrs. Burtniak, Hanuschak, Toupin, Messrs. Banman, Cherniack, Craik, Dillen, Ferguson, Patrick, Petursson, Walding, Watt.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS:(12) Hon. Messrs. Green, Paulley, Messrs. Barrow, Dillen, Enns, Jenkins, Johannson, McKellar, McKenzie, Patrick, Shafransky, Sherman.

STATUTORY REGULATIONS AND ORDERS: (12) Hon. Messrs. Boyce, Evans, Hanuschak, Toupin, Messrs. Bilton, Enns, Johnston (Portage), Malinowski, McGill, Osland, Petursson, Sherman.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: (12) Hon. Messrs. Bostrom, Evans, Green, McBryde, Turnbull, Messrs. Axworthy, Banman, Barrow, McGill, Minaker, Shafransky, Spivak.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Urban Affairs, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT - WINTER ROADS

HON. RONALD McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a brief statement in regard to the winter roads. With one exception, the roads within . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member have copies?

MR. McBRYDE: The winter roads statement is as follows, Mr. Speaker. With one exception, the roads within the Northern Affairs winter road transportation network are essentially complete. Companies transporting supplies to Moose Lake, South Indian Lake, Norway House, Cross Lake, Berens River, Bloodvein, Ste. Therese, Waasagomach and Gardenhill have essentially completed their freighthauls with only a few loads still to be taken in. These, the main roads within the network, are in good to excellent condition. At the present time, hauling is under way to the communities of Oxford House, God's Narrows and Little Grand Rapids. The Oxford-God's road is in fair condition and the Little Grand Rapids road is passable by medium weight trucks.

The one road that has not been completed is the road from Island Lake to Red Sucker Lake. The road has been broken and the necessary airport construction equipment has been taken in, but freight for Red Sucker is still being held at Gardenhill. As the attached summary will show, the first road was officially opened to heavy traffic on January 6, 1975, and the last road to be opened was ready for heavy traffic on March 8, 1975. Construction and maintenance is done by contractors or by the Department of Northern Affairs with its own equipment or private equipment rented on an hourly basis. Roads built by Me-Ke-Si Company Limited are cost-shared by the Federal Government on a 50-50 basis. Other roads are constructed at Provincial Government expense. To date, 57 million pounds have been hauled in and over 4,000 small vehicles have used these roads. With the one possible exception, we see no difficulties for the freighting companies being able to deliver all goods that are ready for shipment to the communities on the winter road network.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We thank the Minister for his statement and we sincerely hope that contingency plans will be made to serve the Red Sucker Lake area if the road system is not completed in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Services.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer Corporate, and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report of the Public Utilities Board for the year ending December 31, 1974. Copies of this report will soon be available for all members.

STATEMENT - NURSES' STRIKE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our rules are quite specific that a Minister should have a written copy of a report if he wants to make a statement in the House. Now I've received some information just before leaving my office that I would like to share with the House, if I receive leave, because I haven't any written copies.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that the nurses stated that they will go on strike on Monday. Of course, the Grace Hospital will not be affected but the other three hospitals will be, and I'm told that they will leave one nurse in emergency, one in the operating room, and two in intensive care. The hospitals are meeting this afternoon to take inventory and they will meet tomorrow with the MHO and the Manitoba Health Services Commission to see what they can do to serve the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

STATEMENT - NURSES' STRIKE

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): In all probability the question period will be the more logical period to ask the questions but a comment has to be made. I take it from what the Minister is saying in the House right now that this is the emergency contingency plan that will be furnished for health service in Manitoba in connection with those hospitals that will be on strike. And I must, at this point, suggest that what appears to be provided without full explanation or more detailed explanation would appear to be inadequate for what is required. Now if that was not intended in the statement that was given, I think it should be clarified, and the question period, Mr. Speaker, may not present itself as the real opportunity; and because this is in the nature, or could become in the nature of an emergency situation with respect to the province and to the provision of health care, I think it's essential that it be clarified as to the statement that the Minister made as to whether this really is the contingency plan, the emergency service that will be provided when or if the strike intention is followed through on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry that the rules do not allow a debate at this time and therefore there is no point in pursuing the matter any further. The question period will offer some opportunity for further exploration of this matter. Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion, Introduction of Bills.

Before we go into the question period, there has been an inquiry to my office in respect to the two flags that used to hang in this Chamber here. Some members have missed that. I want to inform the honourable members that I took it upon myself to make sure that these flags will be preserved. They have now been ensconced in the Archives and will be on display there as soon as the Archives are totally moved over into the new building. They were deteriorating too much in here and nothing could be done to preserve them in here.

Questions? The Honourable Minister of Health.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if I may. What I said is that the nurses announced that they would be ready to leave these four nurses. This is as far as they want to go. And I am saying that there will be meetings with the different hospitals, the MHO and the Manitoba Health Services Commission, to see what they can do for a plan in case that there is a strike on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question then is to the Minister of Health. Are they satisfied that the provisions that have been announced for contingency plans with respect to the provision of health care services in the hospitals that will be on strike, or could be on strike, on Monday, is that going to be sufficient to provide sufficient health care for the people of Manitoba?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't think my honourable friend understands me. I am saying that this is what the nurses are ready to do, are saying that they're going to do, and I'm also saying that the Health Commission, the MHO and the hospitals are looking at the situation now and are meeting to see what else they can do.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Minister of Health. The nurses having announced their plans of what they're prepared to do, is the government satisfied that this plan meets the needs of the people of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let's proceed orderly. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: I will answer that on Monday when and if there is a strike, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the nurses have announced their strike intention for next Monday, can the Minister assure the people of Manitoba that there will be adequate and sufficient vital services provided with respect --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker, the strike intention was announced by the nurses. The strike intention was announced by the nurses, Mr. Speaker, and I now put the question to the Minister of Health.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must indicate to the honourable member that an intention is not necessarily an act. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health assure the continued operation of the vital services affecting the hospitals that now are in

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . negotiation with respect to certain nurses who have announced their intention to strike on Monday?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, to what level I can't say at this time, but we are monitoring, we are looking at every possible way to keep on looking after the people of Manitoba and we will accept our responsibilities.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Can the Minister assure this House that the government has determined the level to which they are prepared to agree with respect to emergency and contingency services to be provided by the nurses?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this will be discussed with the Health Services Commission, with the MHO, and with the hospitals after they tell us what is needed, what they are ready and able to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Has the Minister of Labour or his department, in the last 24 hours, attempted to get the negotiations again going between the nurses and the hospitals?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, there was a 6-hour meeting yesterday afternoon between the conciliation officers, the hospital boards and the nurses, and despite the gloom portrayed by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition we are ready and willing to continue negotiations at any time. Negotiations haven't, in fact, broken down completely. There is always an opportunity and the possibility that the matter will be resolved to the satisfaction of each party, and I would enjoin my colleagues here in this Assembly to be a little patient and let the due process of collective bargaining come to its ultimate before hypothetical situations are considered.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer to the first part of my question. Would the Minister be prepared to make sure, to take it upon himself to get the parties negotiating again before Monday if the talks should break off?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable . . . Again, it's hypothetical. If the honourable member hadn't stated the last phrase we would have been okay. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Ft. Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister advise the House whether any talks, further talks, between the two sides is scheduled at this time?

MR. PAULLEY: Not precisely scheduled for any particular hour, Mr. Speaker, but, as I indicated a moment or two ago, the Department of Labour, in its normal effective way of operation, stands ready to meet with parties in order to resolve industrial disputes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Department of Labour, in its normal, effective, constructive way, stand ready to advise the House whether efforts will be made to schedule specific talks between the two sides during the next 36 hours?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared, in answer to any specific question, to inform the House of what is knowledgeable to me precisely.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Health and relates to the statement which he made in respect to the nurses' notice of intent. He mentions specifically certain Winnipeg hospitals. Would he tell the House if the notice of intent to strike includes hospitals outside the City of Winnipeg, specifically Brandon General Hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister confirm that admissions to Winnipeg hospitals are being scaled down because of the pending strike?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I can't confirm that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWN: My question is to the same Minister. There are some anxious people in the province and can he give us the assurance that maternity cases will be looked after?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that babies will keep on being born.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question also for the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister say whether it is a fact that the Provincial Government has decided to close the municipal extended care hospitals of King George and King Edward, and replace them with extended care wings at the Seven Oaks Hospital and the Hospital Service Centre?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, no, this is not the case, and an announcement will be made fairly soon.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate exactly when that announcement would be made and could he tell us exactly what the nature of the cabinet's discussions or consultation with the City of Winnipeg has been on such a discussion?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'll do better than that and tell my honourable friend that there will be a press conference in my office at 1:30 tomorrow, and I would like to invite him and the health critic of the Conservative party to attend, on the understanding that that is for information.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for the invitation and will make a point of attending. Could the Minister indicate, though, whether this decision that will be announced will affect the operation or the kind of operation that the Seven Oaks Hospital has been; if they're going to take from a care hospital for the north end to an extended care hospital?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if I say too much today my honourable friend won't visit me tomorrow and I wouldn't want that. I'll wait till tomorrow.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister in charge of Urban Affairs. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise the House if the government has agreed to share, proportionately, with the City of Winnipeg, in the growth taxes which have become known as the revenue income tobacco and gas taxes.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, no, the Provincial Government last year introduced a first in Canada, where it shares with the municipalities the growth taxes in the corporate and personal income tax field, and we are continuing to do so.

MR. MINAKER: A supplementary question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Would the Honourable Minister advise the House if the government will be giving any increased grants of any nature to the City of Winnipeg this year?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that should wait for the budget.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the Minister can indicate if the Department of Industry and Commerce has a committee studying the possible regulation of gasoline marketing.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we received representation from the retailers of gasoline in Manitoba with respect to problems that they foresaw, and they presented this as a matter in the way of a general problem to the Manitoba Energy Council, and the matter is being studied by my department along with the Department of Consumer Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I understand the Minister has a committee of ten studying this problem. Can the Minister table the terms of reference of the committee and its membership?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I will obtain some further detail on this and advise the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if he can indicate whether the Manitoba Health Organization or the Manitoba Health Services Commission have indicated, or communicated at least, to the government the minimum standard of service that must be provided in the hospitals that are now negotiating with the nurses.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I've said repeatedly that the Commission and the MHO and the hospitals will meet, they'll see what needs to be done, and they will communicate with me, and I can inform - if there is a strike - I could inform the House on Monday.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet I'd like to reply to a question that I took as notice from the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge, and this was the question I was asked: "Could the Minister inform the House whether the adoption registry authorized under the amendments of the Child Welfare Act of last year have been implemented, and could he tell us what size of staff complement is working on that registry?" The answer: The registry has been implemented, and as to the staffing of this . . . are in the estimates but there's enough staff to provide the service.

Second question: "Could the Minister tell us whether the Director of Child Welfare or the registry have in fact undertaken programs of child placement or the allocation of children to individual families against the responsibility that is supposed to be assigned to child care agencies themselves?" The answer: Under the Act, responsibility for deciding on which home is to receive a child varies according to the age of the child. For children over the age of two, it rests with the adoption agency. For children under the age of two, the Director of Child Welfare has this responsibility for giving prior approval. Because infants are in greatest demand by applicants and because a central registry has been established to provide equity for applicants throughout the province, this authority has been given to the Director of Child Welfare so that no single adoption agency in a particular area is given a virtual monopoly over the location of the placement of infants in Manitoba. And I'm told that all the -- I think there are nine child-care agencies in Manitoba, four Children's Aid Society and five Regional Office -- they're all playing ball; they all think it's very good except the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society.

Third question: "Could the Minister also provide an answer as to whether the Director of Child Welfare or the adoption registry have sent out policy guidelines indicating that couples who already have two children are no longer eligible for adoption procedure or processing?" I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge for bringing this matter to my attention. It is true, I'm told, that such a directive was issued, apparently as an interim measure, and this was drafted without my prior knowledge and I've now asked that the directive be rescinded. I don't think that this could be done. There is no doubt - and I want to be honest here - that that might be a factor when you look at the people and there's a question of supply and demand, but that is certainly not a condition. We will accept all equal. And I would thank my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether the Provincial Government has made any representations this calendar year to the Federal Government concerning the construction of a Pan-Arctic pipeline through Manitoba to carry the Arctic gas from the Arctic Islands to central Canada.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, this has been a matter of continuing communication with the Federal Government and with the people involved with promoting this particular project. I can advise the honourable member that we will be meeting with this particular group within the next couple of weeks, hopefully - to debate it -- not debate it, to discuss it and consider it in some considerable detail.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder how he can reconcile his answer with the announcement by Mr. Macdonald today in the Parliamentary Committee . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The question is argumentative. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): My matter of privilege is that the last statement is incorrect, because I communicated personally with Mr. Macdonald. I don't think there can be any doubt about that.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition state his matter of privilege.

MR. SPIVAK: The information I communicated to the House is the information that's contained in both news broadcasts and communicated directly from the people who were present when Mr. Macdonald indicated that there has not been communication from Manitoba of its intention to participate or assist in the final decision that will be involved in the carrying of the pipeline through Manitoba or through Ontario or Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Then, sir, I simply indicate that that is an inaccurate statement.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister would advise the House if Manitoba Hydro has negotiated a new transfer-of-payment agreement with Winnipeg Hydro to cover the Manitoba Hydro users in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there is no need for any change in the method of transferring any funds that will result from the rate adjustments. My honourable friend perhaps wishes to elaborate on the question, but insofar as he has stated it, the answer is no, there is no need for any change in method.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister would advise the House if Winnipeg Hydro has approached Manitoba Hydro requesting that the present transfer-payment agreement be re-negotiated.

MR. SCHREYER: There has been no such suggestion brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, and in fact I doubt if such a suggestion has been made formally to anyone in the Manitoba Hydro. I might add that whatever funds accrue to the City of Winnipeg Hydro as a result of the rate adjustment, will no doubt be used by the city either for sinking fund purposes for future repair or future construction of additional energy capacity, or will be used by the City Treasury to meet part of its problem - which I understand they indicate they have, budgetarily, at the current time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a question of the First Minister following on his statements on Hydro. Has the First Minister asked the Manitoba Hydro to change its policy allowing, or insisting upon single-meter licensing in apartment blocks and allowing bulk-metering, in order that the costs of heating and utility can be cut down for apartment dwellers in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would dare say that it would be a matter of standing policy with Manitoba Hydro to use the more expeditious of two ways of doing something. On the other hand, there must be some problem as between consumer choice and preference, some problem in that connection that attaches to the suggestion made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. I'll be happy to check it out more specifically.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R.(Bud) SHERMAN (FORT GARRY): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister elaborate for the members of this House on a statement carried on news broadcasts today and attributed to him, with respect to a White Paper being issued by him in the field of labour relations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, some time ago I caused ads to be placed in the news media, mainly the press, inviting concerned associations of management and labour and interested parties to submit to me briefs indicating what they felt may be desirable changes in our Labour Relations Act, Employment Standards Act, etc. At that particular time, I indicated to those who were submitting briefs that I would give consideration to issuing a White Paper or a documentation of suggested changes in labour legislation for their consideration prior to the meeting of the Assembly.

I was delayed somewhat in receipt of some of the briefs, and was not able to do that prior to the meeting of the Assembly. However, I did give the assurance to those parties

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . that, rather than presenting a precise bill for their consideration and the consideration of the Assembly, in order to be fair and carry through my previous commitment, that I would cause a White Paper - to use that name in its broadest context - indicating suggested possible changes in the area of labour legislation so that they would be knowledgeable of what we may contemplate. That is the intent of the statement that I made and the purport of that statement, to give a fair opportunity to those concerned to consider possible propositions to be considered by the Assembly.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for his information. Can the Minister advise the House of any particular or specific time frame when that White Paper may be ready?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with political tradition, I'm hopeful of having certain suggestions cleared by the government caucus within a few days, following which there would be the compiling of a so-called White Paper, and hopefully, as a result of further communication, that legislation may be prepared for consideration of the Assembly, say within four to six weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, last week the Honourable Member for Riel asked as to the availability of the Letters of Intent exchanged as between Manitoba Hydro and Northern States Power. I undertook to check that out, and I can inform the honourable member that it's available as Order-in-Council 778/74 which has been on file since June, and he may wish to peruse it at that location.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the announcement of Burroughs Machine Company that they may be forced to leave or abandon plans to settle in Winnipeg because of delays in site approval, has the province undertaken to negotiate with the City to facilitate that process and to ensure that they would have approval by the time that the DREE grants extension is . . . ?

--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that this question may also be an example of basing a question on a hypothesis, a rather doubtful one at that. I've been advised quite recently today that, in fact, the president of the company disclaims any such intent in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Mines in connection with his duties as responsible for flood control. Can the Minister inform the House as to whether or not the Portage Diversion is fit to carry overflow waters this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Portage Diversion is fit to do what it was designed to do in the same way as it was fit to do what it was designed to do last year. The honourable member is aware that after, I believe it is 15,000 cubic feet per second, the Portage Diversion is designed to over-spill at locations closer to Lake Manitoba. There's been no change in design.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister; in connection with the failure of the Portage Diversion last year, which caused the flooding of several farms, have the flooding claims been satisfied and has the compensation been paid?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member refers to the failure of the diversion, let me just clarify that there was a break in a portion of the dike where the overflow capacity that I'm referring to takes place. I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that a failure of a flood control measure, or a break in a flood control measure, in every case indicates a failure of the measure itself.

With regard to the compensation claims, I have communicated with each of the people who forwarded claims to me. There's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we gave a commitment that anybody who had a claim by virtue of the dike failure would be compensated 100 percent. There is disagreement as to whether in fact all of the total amount claimed by each person results from that failure, and although departmental officials have in some cases rejected

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . the amounts, I've indicated that if the claimants themselves are not satisfied with the decision of the department, they will be entitled to a third party arbitration by the Flood Control Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Management. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can explain the difference in compensation formula to the Portage farmers or the farmers at The Pas that were flooded also.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can well explain it because I've had to repeat it on many occasions, particularly to the farmers themselves and to members on this side who have shown equal solicitude to those farmers.

With regard to the Portage Diversion, the water that they were flooded by would never have been there if we had not constructed a diversion to take water from the Assiniboine River to Lake Manitoba.

With regard to The Pas farmers, the water would have been there if those flood control works were not constructed. The Province cannot accept responsibility for compensating people because the flood control works, which were designed for protection, didn't happen to give that protection. Isn't that clear?

ORDERS OF THE DAY - THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Thompson, and amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The honourable member has approximately 18 or 20 minutes left.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAMS (STE. ROSE): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. When I rose yesterday at approximately 5 o'clock to enter the debate on the Speech from the Throne, I had been notified approximately five minutes prior to that, that I would be on the roster, the speaking roster for the evening. I wasn't actually prepared to speak and, in my haste to proceed with my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I omitted to congratulate the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and I would like to congratulate the honourable member at this time for his brilliant election. It was certainly a personal victory for the member.

Je . . . , M. le président, féliciter mon collègue, l'honorable ministre Laurent Desjardins, pour sa victoire à St. Boniface.

In some ways my constituency parallels what happened in St. Boniface, and my election in 1971 in Ste. Rose was somewhat similar to that of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Ste. Rose constituency had been held for 42 years by the Liberal Party, and I'm not sure how long the St. Boniface seat has been held by the Liberal Party, but nevertheless it was a tremendous victory. I would also like to congratulate him on being appointed as the Minister of Health.

I want to congratulate the honourable new members who have been appointed to the ministry, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre and the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. I'm sure that they will make a worthwhile contribution in our deliberations here.

The Honourable Member for Morris was anxious to adjourn debate last evening and I realize that he's stamping on the floor and champing at the bit to lash out with those verbal barbs and that vicious cat-of-nine-tails tongue of his, but if he'll be patient for a few moments I will conclude my remarks very shortly.

I would like to go back for a few moments and speak about our Liberal friends. Mr. Speaker, it was reported in the press some time ago that it may be necessary for the Liberal group to vacate their office, their caucus room, and the Premier is reported to have said that this may not be necessary. Later on, it was reported that the Leader of the Official Opposition had said, well, the Premier has no right to take that upon himself and that it has to be a House decision, a unanimous decision, in order for the Liberals to keep their office. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it's difficult enough for representatives to operate from a group caucus room let alone operate from in the hallway, and I would like to go on record as being in support that the three Liberal members retain their caucus room. So I'm keeping my word, Mr. Speaker, when I mentioned yesterday that I would like to spread out a protective

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . wing and protect our Liberal friends, and that's what I'm doing now in asking that they be allowed to keep their office, because it's certainly very difficult to operate without any office.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that silence is golden, and, you know, I believe that the most difficult thing for a representative to do is to improve on silence. It is very difficult to improve on silence and many of us do not, when we get up to speak, improve on silence. I'm always concerned when I stand up to speak that maybe I would be better to remain seated. But last night, Mr. Speaker, I was congratulated by I think three Conservative members after we adjourned. This is the first time since 1971 that I've been congratulated on a speech, and even the new Deputy Leader, the Member for Brandon West, shook hands with me and congratulated me on my remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: On a point of privilege, it was completely the reverse. I shook hands with the member and suggested he had been too hard on this side in his speech.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Well anyway, Mr. Speaker, you know, the Member for Lakeside the other day -- what do they call the Member for Brandon West? Bulldog McGill or Mad-dog McGill? You know, Mr. Speaker, who would ever believe that a suave, debonair and cultured gentleman like the Member for Brandon West could turn into a vicious animal or something? I just can't believe it. It must be just a nickname in caucus. Well, apparently he was vicious enough to demote the former Deputy Leader anyway.

A MEMBER: Harry is a good fellow anyhow. I like him.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, when I closed my remarks for the adjournment last night, I believe I was speaking about housing and the request from the University students that we expand the University facilities, and I mentioned something of the housing in Northern Manitoba. And I just want to say that I think we in Manitoba can be proud of the strides we have made in increasing public housing for the people of our province. I know that in my constituency there has been a lot of construction going on. We have a new senior citizens housing in Ste. Rose, a 30-unit; a new 12-unit senior citizens housing that's just been recently completed in McCreary. There is another one projected for Winnipegosis. There's family units and family housing. There are 16 family housing units that have been constructed in Winnipegosis. There's six that have been constructed in Ste. Rose. There's six in the works for McCreary. There are 30 remote housing units projected for Crane River. There's some in Mallard, there's some at Amaranth. And I'm certainly very very proud of the advances that we've made insofar as public housing is concerned. Throughout the province, I understand that we have approximately 8,000 units. --(Interjection)-- Well, you know, let the record show that in the prior ten years that the Conservative Party was in office, not one unit was built out of Winnipeg. Not one unit. In spite of the fact that we have proceeded as fast as possible, in spite of the fact that there was a very serious cutback from the CMHC last year of something like \$17 million or a \$13 million cutback which will curtail further construction, nevertheless I am very very pleased with what we've done to date, and I hope that the Opposition will join us so that we can proceed with further construction throughout the province not only in rural areas, but also in Winnipeg as well.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the land hearings. I want to talk also about conservation. I want to talk about the livestock situation in Manitoba. But unfortunately, in the amount of time that I have allotted to me now, I will not be able to do so, so --(Interjection)-- seven minutes? Well, I could perhaps say a few words about the land hearings and get that out of the way.

As you know, we've held several meetings throughout the province to hear views from the people on the land policy for Manitoba, and we have received many good briefs and we have received some that were not so good. Nevertheless, I'm sure that all those who presented briefs were sincere in doing so. But the part that disturbed me most in the hearings was that, in the main, the organized groups are primarily the people who come and present briefs at hearings, for instance the Farm Bureau, the Chamber of Commerce, the Bank of Nova Scotia. These are the groups that really come in and present the briefs. We have difficulty in getting to grass roots. There isn't enough people that are able to come out and

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . give us their opinions, although we did have quite a few. I think we should continue having these meetings. You know, at every meeting there was some information that was given out that some of the people didn't know or were not aware of, and I think these meetings will serve a good purpose to get some communication going so that the people are aware of what, for instance, the land leasing policy is for the Province of Manitoba. You know, in Dauphin we had one gentleman who presented one of the major briefs - and a very good brief - but he was unaware that there was a purchase clause in the land lease agreement, and after he had finished presenting his brief and during the question period, he was asked if he was aware that there was a purchase clause and he said he did not. "Certainly," he said, "I feel a lot better now, knowing that there is." So I think these land hearings serve a very very good purpose and I hope -- well I know that we will be continuing probably after the Session to hold more hearings in other areas in order to familiarize the people with what this program is particularly intended to achieve.

I'm also pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this year those people who are being hard pressed and are caught in a price squeeze, and that is the livestock producers - and I happen to be a livestock producer myself, as is the Member for Lakeside. I'm not sure whether there are any other livestock producers here - but nevertheless, I'm very pleased that even the Honourable Member for Lakeside will not have to pay anything for his Crown land leases this year except for the property taxes. So on the close to 1,800 acres that is under lease to the Honourable Member for Lakeside, this, I hope, him along with others, will benefit by the fact that there is no more rental, at least for this year, and that we certainly hope that things will improve for him and for other ranchers - including myself, of course. Unfortunately, I don't happen to have any leases and I wish I had - my land is all privately owned - and I realize that if I was able to lease land from the Crown, I could operate at a much lower cost. I could produce at a lower cost.

I have one particular quarter in mind that I was renting from a neighbour for four years on a third share for the hay crop, and about a year ago he came to me and he said, "Well, I am going to sell this quarter. If you want it I'll give you the first chance. You'll have to buy it. I'm retiring and I want to sell it." So the price was approximately - it was worth about \$3,000. It was a raw quarter with about 40 acres of native grass on it. I would consider it would be about a Class 4 lease, if it was a Crown lease. Mr. Chairman, I had to pay \$4,000 for that quarter. Had I been able to lease that particular quarter from the Crown, it would have cost me \$68.00 in 1974, which is the highest rate that that particular quarter would have ever been. Now it is costing me close to \$500 a year to take the hay off that quarter. I now own the quarter. I would have much preferred to have leased it, to have rented it even from the private owner; nevertheless it was in close proximity to my land. I'm just saying this just to give a demonstration of the difference between leasing and owning, and I can say, with experience, that in this particular case it's much more expensive for me to own this particular quarter of land than when I was leasing it either from the man who owned it before me or if I had been leasing a similar quarter from the Crown. So I hope that the livestock producers in Manitoba will benefit from this. Mr. Speaker, I realize my time is up so I will just say thank you, and we'll hope that we have constructive debates as the House proceeds in session. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, it is always a little bit difficult to follow the Member for Ste. Rose. His pungent and cogent remarks leave little to criticize, but one thing that struck me was, although he represents an area that is very badly affected by the crisis that now exists in the livestock industry, there was nothing more than a tip of the hat to those people who are suffering from the present crisis in livestock. I thought that was rather significant, because the honourable member did have an opportunity on the floor of this Chamber to demonstrate that on the other side of the House, at least on parts of the other side of the House, there is a concern, not just for the livestock producers who are affected in that area right now, but a concern for the welfare of the people of this province, who could in relatively short time be suffering from shortages of beef as a result of the problems that are currently affecting the industry.

But, sir, I don't want to deal at length with the Member for Ste. Rose. I want to turn to the more pleasant parts of the Throne Speech Debate in offering you again my congratulations

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . for having again been appointed to this position, and I'm sure that with the passage of time you are beginning to learn that a somewhat more mellow attitude towards the members of this Chamber produces results that cannot be achieved by a heavy-handed method.

I want to also - and I do this very sincerely - welcome the Member for Logan back. We all know the difficulties that he has experienced in the past few months, and we say with gratitude that we are pleased to see him back in his seat and we hope that he will be conducting his responsibilities as Chairman in the vigorous way that he normally does.

It's traditional, sir, to move the normal messages of congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne, and the Member for Thompson makes that task a little bit difficult. He occupied his time hurling invectives at all and sundry and perpetuating that class war that seems to be part of his mentality and part of his character. One thing I suppose that the economists of this country would want to pay particular attention to in reading the remarks of the honourable member. I was somewhat struck by his reference to inflation, I was always under the impression that inflation primarily was caused by government spending and the printing of money in excess of the capacity of the country to match it with productivity. The Member for Thompson came forth with a brand new theory. The inflation that we are now experiencing, we have learned, is caused by the opposition in conjunction with corporations. That, sir, must go down as one of the more profound observations that the honourable gentleman has made, and one that I am sure will be looked at very carefully by the economists of this country.

I want to congratulate the Member for St. Matthews, who in his usual erudite manner acquitted himself very well in seconding the motion, and coming forward with a very stout defence of that which is indefensible. I presume sir, that that effort on his part, was one of those efforts such as we saw on part of the Minister of Corrections when he clutched, very frequently, on the precipice of power, and finally, by sheer perseverance, was able to make it into the hallowed circle, and I congratulate him for that. I think that the Member for St. Matthews is attempting to emulate that performance and I would suggest to him that a repeat of that kind of performance will bring him much closer to the circle of power that he envies and watches so covetously.

The Member for St. Johns in his contribution to the debate following the speech of my Leader and that was a -- I'm not sure whether it was a precedent but it was certainly a break with the tradition of this House, but I have no objections to that because once the debate starts it is a well known fact that debate can continue, so he carried on what was certainly his right. But there seemed to be something desperate about that particular move on the part of the government. Something desperate in pleading on his part for constructive criticism.

You know, sir, this whining for constructive criticism that we are hearing from honourable gentlemen opposite can best be described, and was described as a matter of fact by William F. Buckley. He said "the demand for constructive criticism has become one of the pat phrases of the day. Most whining for constructive criticism is a demand for unqualified praise. And insistence that no opinion is to be expressed or course proposed other than the one proposed by the speaker is a dreary phrase avoided by all fair-minded men." And I find that the clamour for constructive criticism emanating from the opposite side of the House is a rather novel idea now and repeated by the Member for Fort Rouge who has joined that circle of those who require that this House only offer constructive criticism.

Well, sir, you know, that kind of a performance reminds me of a little story that I picked up just this morning. It was very opportune. About the representative James Johnson who is a republican for Colorado, when he was elected he walked over to the defeated candidate and he handed him three numbered envelopes and he said you're going to find times when the job of being a representative is a very tough one and when you run across those situations, he says, open one of those envelopes, each in order one, two, three. Well it wasn't very long before he was being assailed on all sides by every faction of his constituency because he hadn't been able to solve all the problems that had confronted him, and he suddenly remembered that he had one of those envelopes. So he opened it, and the message in the envelope said "blame me", so he did. He blamed his opponent for all the troubles that the constituency had been confronted with. And it worked. It worked. Soon everybody was pacified. Then it wasn't much longer that the troubles rose again, so he opened up the second envelope. And

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . the second envelope said "blame the other political party." And so he did. And everything went fine. That worked too. Then finally it was getting close to an election, and I think that maybe this is the situation my honourable friends are running into now. He said things looked so bad that nothing seemed to work. Then he remembered a third envelope. So he opened it up and inside was this message: "Prepare three envelopes."

I suggest that the intervention of the former Minister of Finance, the Member for St. Johns, could have been better directed towards the preparation of three envelopes rather than the kind of speech that he delivered in this Chamber that night. You know, constructive criticism as proposed by the Member for St. Johns must be somewhat difficult when you hear the observation that was made by the Minister of Labour in response to a suggestion that was made by the Member for Fort Garry the other day. He said we don't want any suggestions from you, we've got all the answers. I'm paraphrasing him I admit but I think that was the gist of his suggestion when he spoke in that Chamber.

Then we had the Member for Gimli, who in one of those very infrequent interventions in the debate in this Chamber, delivered of himself a smashing address, he rose to great heights of oratory in attempting to defend his reasons for being in this place. And I daresay that it needs some defending. I agree with the Minister of Mines and Resources who said that it was the kind of a speech that only can come from one that is greatly exorcised, and indeed he was. So exorcised, as a matter of fact, that he uttered some words that I thought I should check up, and I did. I looked them over and it was exactly as I heard them, when he said that the purpose of a government is to "exercise control." Exercise control. And that is their concept of government. And that was fortified some time later by the Minister of Mines and Resources himself, who spent a great deal of time castigating the Leader of the Opposition, and that's fair ball, I'm not going to quarrel with that. But when he came to the end of his speech and suggested that they on that side of the House were fighting for the same kind of freedom that we were on this side, I was wondering you know, if finally the Minister of Mines and Resources, we're going to go marching together, philosophically, until I looked at the interpretation or the meaning of the word freedom in the dictionary and I find that the Minister is over there and I'm still over here. But I don't know where he gets his interpretation of the word freedom because in the dictionary it has specific meanings. "A quality or state of being free. The absence of necessity, coercion, or constraint in choice or action. Is that true in Autopac, sir? Is that true in a good many other things that they've done? The power or condition of acting without compulsion. Does that apply to the direction that these honourable gentlemen opposite are heading? Not in my view. Freedom may imply total or moderate absence of restraint or merely an awareness of being unduly hampered or frustrated. And I'm telling you those people who have been buying Autopac are unduly frustrated in the last few months.

Now then, we come to the Throne Speech itself, sir. I have never had the belief that a Throne Speech is a document that has to dot every "i" and cross every "t" and has to contain every reference to every bit of legislation that comes before this Chamber. A Throne Speech can be anything that the Government wants it to be. And I was a little bit suspicious that this was another one of those sneakers where it didn't do anything but indulge in a great deal of self-congratulation over deeds done in the past. But you know the proof is going to be when before this Chamber is placed the legislative program for the coming year. I felt that the speech itself was an attempt on the part of the government to leap that chasm between their shattered idealism and reality. What I had the feeling they were attempting to do was to leap that chasm, but like Evel Knievel they find out they can't do it in two jumps. It has to be done in one.

The speech contained a reference that I think bears repeating. It said "never have the responsibilities of provincial legislators been greater and never have the questions before them been more complex or more challenging than they are today." And that's fact. But why? They're suffering from self-inflicted wounds. They are the ones that are assuming greater and greater responsibility over the direction in which people's lives in this province are being conducted. They are the ones who insist on taking more and more control and thereby saddling themselves with greater and greater responsibility. Sir, if you want the difference between philosophy of members on this side of the House and that which is being practised on that side of the House, it lies simply in our belief that the individual is best

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . capable of looking after himself, given the opportunity and given the freedom to do so. This constant attempt on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite to control the means of production and the means of distribution, and that's a well-documented intention on their part, is nothing more and will ultimately lead into the regimentation and the control of men's minds. Government has, in my view, one responsibility, and that's the preservation of the individual freedom of the citizens within this country. And what do we find? And what do we find, sir? There's been a great deal of comment about the lack of respect being held for parliamentarians these days, and is there any reason why there shouldn't be? Is it any wonder that people of this country are showing less and less respect for those that are elected to govern this country. Because instead of piloting the ship of state as governments are supposed to do, giving the assurance to the people of this country that there is somebody at the helm, and somebody that will bring the ship safely into port or to harbour or wherever it rests, they are now realizing that instead of that pilot being there, he's in the economy section boozing it up with the passengers. Sir, how can you expect people to have respect for a government when they have to, with their own money and with their initiative and with their desire to look after themselves, and every day, in every way, compete with the government. A government becomes nothing more than another competitor. Is there any reason why there shouldn't be a loss of respect under those circumstances? None at all. So, day by day we see the lack of respect for politicians, and it's not just because debates in this Chamber become exorcised and insults once in awhile are hurled across the floor. My God, if you read the debates of the House of Commons in England, we're tame compared to some of the things that go on there, and yet they've survived and parliament has survived. That's why they're in trouble, and I tell you that's why Margaret Thatcher, that's why Margaret Thatcher is the leader of a party today, because the people of that country have suddenly awakened. You know I always have had a great deal of respect for the British and their respect and their knowledge of the parliamentary institution, and what they have recognized is that what we may belatedly recognize, and that is that there comes a stage where the drift to the left has gone so far that you cannot recover, and every attempt that is made to destroy our institution, every attempt that is made to downgrade our established institutions, and parliament is one of them, is a move to destroy democracy. And we've had a few examples in this Chamber.

Not so long ago the First Minister, when the question of Autopac came up made an astounding statement when he said "he regrets the 1973 Autopac rates." What is the import behind that, what appeared to be a simple observation? Well, you know his offhand dismissal of that self-admitted deliberate attempt to deceive the public during the election campaign strikes at the very roots of our concept of responsible government. Now we're beginning to understand what he meant when he said he was going to discard all the traditions that outlived its usefulness. That's one of them that apparently he is attempting and willing to discard.

Are we now to assume, sir, that deliberate deceit by government can now be condoned simply because after it has been discovered it is admitted. That's what the Premier did. He did something else in those same remarks. He said, that in the debate that took place in Cabinet he was opposed to it. He was opposed to it. And what a strange admission on the part of the Premier who is supposed to head a responsible government. What is the meaning of responsible government if the Cabinet cannot demonstrate that they're all behind a particular decision. Does he now say or is he just attempting to cover up his own image, to protect himself in the eyes of the public so that he can parade forth at the next election as a knight in shining armour while the rest of the Cabinet take the blame? What a queer attitude towards responsible government, sir.

You know the whole question of Cabinet solidarity is an important issue and time after time we've seen honourable gentlemen opposite demonstrate, not just a casual but a crass disregard for that principle of government. We've sat here hours on end while members of the front bench fought their battles right out across the floor of the House. And then, sir, they have the audacity to cheer and to laugh when we disagree with one another in opposition. That's not to be permitted in opposition. But the very basic principle of responsible government demands that the Cabinet act as one when a decision has been made, regardless of the difficulties and the fights that go on within Cabinet.

The Premier has on more than that occasion demonstrated his casual disregard for

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd). . . his office and for the responsibility that he holds as Premier of this province.

Then what is the direction that this government is heading? Well, sir, we only have to look at the Guidelines for the Seventies to get our answer, and I don't refer to that version that was publicized. I refer to the unexpurgated version, the one that contains the real thrust of honourable gentlemen opposite.

We know what's heading, and bit by bit; it's just like Hitler's Mein Kampf, every move that is being made is in fulfillment of the promises that are contained in this manifesto, every one of them. You know they sound innocent enough in their own way and you know the planners and the theorists who write the papers for the honourable gentlemen opposite, touts them in phrases and words that sound as though they're very innocent indeed. But behind every move is the one single direction that they're heading in. That direction is state control. The hearings that were held during the last few months are an indication of that direction, I don't want to comment on that now, I'll wait until the report comes in.

But it does indicate a direction, and it did also indicate one other thing; that the people of this province are very concerned about that direction, very concerned. And the letters that we get, the conversations that we have with people who now are learning what is happening lead us to believe that concern will be expressed more vigorously than it has in the past. But I want to - and I'm sorry he's not in his seat - I want to deal before I close briefly with the remarks made by the Member for Fort Rouge.

The honourable member I know has not been in this Chamber very long. He's spent practically all of his life in the classroom. I wish I could have spent more time in the classroom myself, or I wish I had of, but, you know, one thing that he must learn in this Chamber, that there is a role for the government and that role is to govern. I've said this before, I will say it again even though he's not here, I'll say it for his benefit. The role of the opposition is to oppose. There's nothing that says that we have to act as an alternative as long as the government's in power. There's nothing that says that every program that the government comes up with that we have to provide an alternative for that. We do.

A MEMBER: You're not a cheering section.

MR. JORGENSON: That's right, we're not the cheering section. Our job is to expose them, and the way you expose is by questioning, by being critical and by examination. If there are weaknesses, if there are mistakes, or worse than that, fraud, that will come out, and you don't do it by standing up here and apologizing every time you criticize the government. --(Interjection)-- Oh, yes, and worse still as my honourable friend from Lakeside says, and worse still, nailing the opposition for daring to criticize. Which is what he did.

All right I don't care. If he wants to play that role let him play it. Let him be a weak appendage to the government in power if he wants to play that role. We intend to fulfill our responsibilities as opposition. (Hear, Hear) And if that means we're going to get rough, that's the way it will be. And if that means that we're going to persist in questioning and insist on answers, so it will be. It makes for better government. And when you look around you today, sir, pick up the papers and see most of the headlines that you see today, scandals, fraud, corruption, almost in every level of government. And to a large extent, sir, in the House of Commons, one of the reasons why that's taking place is because they have denied members of the Opposition the right to question the government by taking the estimates out of the House.

There is only one short time, forty minutes a day, that the Members of the Opposition, and they stand up one after another like puppets trying to get a question in and then getting an evasive answer from the Minister. That, sir, is not the House of Commons. That is a complete farce and a caricature of what the House of Commons is meant to be and what it was.

Sir, until the estimates are brought back in that House and we have done what we thought is the right thing to insure - I don't often give the government much credit, but I want to say that in the Rules Committee when we discussed this issue of Estimates in the House, the attitude that was taken by the members of that committee, I commend them for.

It's going to be a little more difficult for the government, I know, but it's also going to be a little bit more difficult for the opposition. But in the final analysis it's going to provide members of this House an opportunity to do the job that they're sent here for.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd)

I hope that I'm not advancing the debate too much, but I do hope members of the House will see fit to adopt that rule change for this year to see how it will work out. My prediction is for the people of this province, it will provide a much better system of examining governments; it will give members of this Chamber a greater opportunity for self-expression, and who knows even for the members of the press gallery it might give them just a little bit more to write about. I don't share with my honourable friends opposite the view that the press prints nothing but lies. You know sometimes the interpretation that you'd like to place on a statement is not contained in a press report and you're unhappy about it, but I have found on many occasions that when I've read over my remarks maybe I didn't quite explain it the way I meant to, so it's the fault of mine in many cases.

I don't agree with the Minister of Autopac that the problem that exists, exists in the press gallery, not at all. The problem that exists, exists with that Frankenstein monster that they created, and if that thing isn't working properly don't blame the press. --(Interjection)-- No, what you should be doing is just preparing three envelopes, that's what you should be doing, because there's where the fault really is.

A MEMBER: I haven't opened the first one, yet.

A MEMBER: The first one says "Blame him."

MR. JORGENSON: Sir, the debate on the Speech from the Throne has not I don't think lived up to the kind of expectation that we had for it for some reason or other. It has not come to grips really with the singular problem that we're facing in this country today, and that's the question of inflation. That's our number one problem. And I don't care what kind of measures that the government brings in to alleviate the effects of inflation, at the very best they're nothing but temporary. The measures that are brought in to help those people who are suffering from the effects of inflation today will have to be reintroduced another year from now in order to offset the effects of inflation that are created by that measure that was brought in today, and you're chasing yourself around and around this vicious circle.

Notwithstanding the comments of the Member for Thompson, inflation is caused by government. They're incapacitated to maintain the integrity of the currency of that country. And I don't blame any honourable friends opposite for that, although they make one heck of a contribution to it, and the worst - or shall I say the best, I suppose it depends on which way you look at it - that at least the party of my honourable friends opposite made to inflation, was in 1972 when they decided to keep that bunch of clowns in Ottawa. Sir, \$6 billion the budget was in 1963. Today it's almost \$30 billion. And if anybody can tell me that that does not make a contribution to inflation I don't know what does.

My honourable friends here have done the same thing -- three and a half -- or \$350 million when they took over and now this year it's going to be a billion. You can't tell me that that does not contribute to inflation, because productivity, because productivity has not increased correspondingly; and as long as it hasn't increased correspondingly that requires the printing of more money and the creation of more inflation. And unless we are honest enough to come to grips with that problem we solve nothing at all. I suggest, sir, that we give some very serious thought to how we can control that menace which will destroy us all and perhaps much sooner than we think. And I said last year that if I had to have a choice between totalitarianism and a depression - and I don't know whether it needs to be either one of the two - I would prefer the depression because I can recover from that. I did once already. I'm happy in the knowledge that it's not near as bad as a lot of people claim it is because I grew up during the depression years, and sure it was not a comfortable experience, but we survived it. And we came out of it a stronger nation and stronger people.

Sir, unless we take steps to ensure that our currency can maintain its value, unless we take steps, and it will require some rather radical steps and some rather painful steps, but we've got to have the courage to do that or it will destroy us all. And I hope that if this House can do nothing else, I hope that this House can recognize that problem, and if we recognize it then we have taken the first step to solving it. Thank you, sir.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak this afternoon but, since the grand finale hopefully will arrive before another day is out, perhaps I shouldn't miss the opportunity.

Let me first, sir, express my appreciation of your service to this Chamber, the fact that you have again been selected to conduct the affairs of the Assembly, as you have so well done in the past, Mr. Speaker. I think because you have done so well in the past, I think it's a very appropriate approach to have you continue in that capacity. I think that the members, as the Member for Morris has expressed, have come to know your ways and appreciate the points that you try to make with respect to the conduct of the House, and I think nothing more should be said in that connection.

I should like to also congratulate the Minister of Health on his re-election to this Chamber, a gentleman that was missed for a short period of time, but the political process did correct the situation and did indeed reflect confidence in the Government of Manitoba.

I should also like to congratulate the new Ministers who have joined us since last year. To the individuals that are involved, I think it's somewhat of a new experience, certainly a challenge, and I'm confident, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to perform very well.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has so far provided us with a very lack-lustre debate. We haven't had the constructive kind of criticism that one should normally expect, and that is not a new pattern for the members of the Conservative Party. I should like to make the inference at this point that I don't suggest that all of the Opposition behave in that way, but certainly the Conservative Party are continuing to behave in that way, in that they are not attempting to indicate to the people of Manitoba through the debate in this Chamber as to the alternatives that they would propose with respect to any subject matter, any program, or any department. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, they have attempted to discredit government programs, new or old, and in fact in doing so, one can demonstrate almost at any day that they are in fact criticizing some programs that really haven't changed since they themselves left office, in terms of the philosophy of those programs and so on.

To demonstrate their weakness, Mr. Speaker, I think one has to recall that the Leader of the Opposition took issue with the fact that the Deputy Minister of Agriculture speaks at political meetings, that that somehow has to be the tragedy of our times, and I think I should like to respond to that because I don't believe that I would want to deny a Deputy Minister from attending any particular gathering on invitation, to give information on governmental programs and whatever else it is that that group wishes to hear or to find out. And I think that I would recommend to the Conservative Party, in particular, that they might invite him to address their annual conference, or a constituency meeting, so that they may gain some appreciation of the expertise of the individual, the way in which he can explain the programs of government over which he has administrative responsibility. It would do them well, Mr. Speaker, because they obviously have missed the point in every debate in the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture since I've been here. --(Interjection)-- Well I have a commitment now that there will be a better approach to the Estimates review of agriculture this year, and I look forward with a great deal of anticipation.

One of the things that bothers me, however, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that members opposite somehow have not learned from these past errors and continue to conduct themselves in the same way, and I now allude to the remarks of the Member for Birtle-Russell, who the other day suggested that there was something very seriously wrong with affairs in Manitoba based on the auditor's report, and wherein he tried to imply that the reason that the auditor reports on certain problem areas to the Legislature is because he has not been able to get the co-operation of the government or the ministry in question over which he is reporting. And I would like to take a moment out, Mr. Speaker, to quote from Page 113 of Hansard, dated Monday, March 10th, 8 p. m. wherein - and I quote the Member for Birtle-Russell, saying, "That is that any time he finds any trouble" - and he's referring here to the auditor - "he reports first to the Minister of that department, and if the Minister takes remedial action, that is about the end of what we hear. If the Minister doesn't, then we expect that it should appear in the report and, as far as I know, it does." And that is his whole assumption as to the value of an auditor's report.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell my honourable friend that that is not the way in

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) which the Provincial Auditor functions, and just so that he doesn't have to believe me, Mr. Speaker, I undertook to discuss the question with the Provincial Auditor and he subsequently sent me a memo dated the 13th of March, and I want to read that into the record as well. And I quote, Mr. Speaker:

"Further to our discussion yesterday concerning reporting procedures to the Legislative Assembly, Section 13 of the Provincial Auditor's Act requires the Provincial Auditor to report, in addition to specific matters, such matters as he desires to bring to the attention of the Assembly. The matters which I consider as reportable under this section are:

"(1) Significant problems which have been reported to the Ministers and are not being effectively attended to.

"(2) Significant problems which have been reported to the Ministers and are being effectively attended to, but in my judgment warrant the attention of the Assembly as information; because they were raised either in the Assembly or a committee of the Assembly, or for reasons of maintaining public confidence in involvement in the system, the problems and corrective actions are reported.

"(3) Extreme difficulties which would be so serious that the stability of an administration could be questionable, the seriousness of the situation would be fully reported.

"Matters reported this year generally fall into category (2). I hope the foregoing provides you with the explanation you require. However, if it does not adequately clarify our procedures, please do not hesitate to contact me."

Now category (2), and I want to repeat it for the benefit of my friends opposite, is as follows: "Significant problems which have been reported to the Ministers and are being effectively attended to, but in my judgment warrant the attention of the Assembly as information" and so on. So, you know, I should like to tell the Member for Birtle-Russell that, while I know he likes to indulge in innuendo and misinformation, for whatever reason I don't know, that is perhaps his style, that at least one should draw to his attention that if you were to undertake to reform his ways, that we indeed would have a much more genuine contribution to this Assembly on problems of government, its administration, delivery of programs. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we do have many problems in the delivery of programs, and any administration does, whether it's public or private.

I should like to also point out to the Member for Birtle-Russell and others, that the particular problems as they may relate to the administration of government support services to Northern Manitoba, are such that they cannot be overly simplified. I think it has to be said that for many years to come a sort of rule-of-thumb approach that we adopt in southern Manitoba just doesn't apply in the North. Many risks have to be taken, public funds have to be advanced for the good of the community, for the good of the province, and there are going to be problems resulting in the delivery of programs. And I should like to point out to the Member for Birtle-Russell that when the Co-operative Loan Fund was expanded -- and here I should like to remind him that it is not a new Loan Fund; we have always had one even when the Conservative Party were running things in Manitoba, only at that time it was not very meaningful in that sums of money allocated for northern development were very small, a limit of \$100,000 in any one given year. But the program was there and what we have done is expanded it to give greater opportunity.

But it is on the philosophy, and I think this is important to recognize - the philosophy of the program was and continues to be one where the province expects to lose money. One where the province expects to lose money. These are very high risk ventures. They are social economic development projects. They are not necessarily expected to repay in terms of dollars and cents, but rather in terms of the learning experience of those people that are involved in those programs, and therefore they cannot be run on the basis of a financial statement or an audit, but they have to be run on the basis of what is the long run expectation in the development of those communities through that learning process. And that is not something that is new, Mr. Speaker.

Again I want to remind members opposite that this particular area of government involvement was an area that was inherited in 1969. It was part of a program of the Department of Agriculture but merely expanded, and the staff who were in charge of that program did not change, Mr. Speaker. The very same people that were there continued to function in a much more significant way, and continued to advise the government as to sums of money that should

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) be allocated and the kind of delivery program that we should be promoting. So if those people have made some mistakes - and I'm sure they may - you know, I think it's fair to say that it wasn't because there were inexperienced people in the field of northern development, because they were there many years before 1969. Many years before.

It should also be observed, Mr. Speaker, that when one has to hear the criticism of the failures of private enterprise -- and here I want to say that the co-operatives are indeed private corporations. The debate with respect to those co-operatives was on the basis -- at least the Opposition tried to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these were government operations over which there are administrative problems and over which there are financial losses, and that is not the case at all. These are private organizations wherein the government tried to assist them in their own economic development. And so it has to be expected, when one allocates any amount of money towards that kind of frontier development, that we have to be prepared to take substantial losses from time to time, and I'm not apologetic, Mr. Speaker. I would worry that if we retrenched and if we decided that we want to take a look at the dollar side of the question only, and have our books balanced only in the monetary sense, that, Mr. Speaker, would worry me terribly and I think I would question the ideals and motivations of this government if we were to retrench that far.

I think we have to give people who don't have the usual opportunities that we are so accustomed to, the benefit of doubt; we have to give them an opportunity, and that is part of their development and their learning process which is going to cost money. And it's going to cost money, Mr. Speaker, whether we do it that way or whether we want to fund those communities through welfare programs. The dollars will be spent regardless, but I think it's worthwhile in the long run to try to get some productivity for our dollars, not 100 percent productivity, perhaps we should be satisfied with 30 or 40 percent productivity for every dollar that is expended in that part of the province.

And with respect to one of the largest investments of public funds - and here again I think the Opposition has tried to bring discredit to the government, hoping that the public would miss the point that these indeed are private companies that we're involved with by way of loan, loan guarantees - but one of the main ones, the largest companies that we have difficulty with at the moment, has to be the one in South Indian Lake where it does involve somewhere in the order of \$700,000 or \$800,000. But I should like to remind my honourable friends opposite that approval for that particular loan never came to the Province of Manitoba before the construction commenced. That was a private loan arranged between the local co-operative and the Manitoba Credit Union, or the Credit Society. It was not a loan arranged firstly with the Province of Manitoba. It was not until that agency got into deep financial difficulty did the Co-operative Loan Fund come to the rescue, and it is another example of public funds rescuing a private organization - another example, and we've had many of those. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that it should be recognized that when that private organization ventured into the construction of the fishery at South Indian Lake, that the Department of Indian Affairs and the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion at the federal level were committed to funding 80 percent of the cost of that project by way of cash grant, and which later decided to change the rules of the game after the construction was under way to provide for only 50 percent of capital grant. And the co-operative was always led to believe that the feasibility of that project would require almost a total grant for that facility, that there was no feasibility in fact without that kind of direct government input. So let's not bemoan the fact that we have some difficulties in that part of the province, but let's also understand the way in which we have arrived there, and let us not misinterpret the intent of the program and the role that the province is playing in that respect.

Now I know that the members opposite have attempted to mislead the people of Manitoba in a number of areas and therefore it's not shocking. All I am saying to them is that their own credibility is suffering. Because the people of Manitoba at some point, Mr. Speaker, are going to come to know, are going to come to know that a lot of the things that they were hearing is not just quite so.

I think the members opposite demonstrated in the last two years - well, since the election of 1973 - how they would attempt, and so far unsuccessfully, Mr. Speaker, the big lie approach - and again it's going to haunt them for many many years to come - the big lie approach with respect to the motives of this government on the question of land ownership, and

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) I think that one ought to be put aside once and for all, Mr. Speaker. I think it should be remembered that the committee that had the hearings throughout the province presented its report wherein it recommends that the best way in which we feel ownership of land should be maintained in this province is through the private owner-operator system, but that there should be an option for those people that can't afford to buy their own farm. And that, of course, was also in the Throne Speech, which I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you will recall. And for the members opposite to keep pounding on the theme that somehow this government is bent towards a policy where all of the land should be owned by the state is ludicrous, to say the least, Mr. Speaker. And members opposite know it, and they think, for the moment, Mr. Speaker, that they can somehow, somehow put it over the minds and over the heads of the constituents of Manitoba, get them to believe that there is something very sinister going on in the Government of Manitoba through its policies on land ownership.

I think it has to be said that there is a problem in the area of land ownership. If we allow only the methodologies of the past to prevail into the indefinite future, then we know, Mr. Speaker, that there will be fewer and fewer and fewer farm operators, and farms will be larger and larger and larger. So, of course, I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that Manitobans as a whole want that to develop in that way. I believe that they want to have opportunities for people who can't get in in the normal way, who can't have access to land through the mortgage system, and that's where the option to lease fits in very well.

I should like to tell members opposite that our experience to date indicates very much the fact that it facilitates primarily young people who don't have any equity, who buy their farms from their parents or their neighbours, and existing farm operators who are not viable, who don't have a large enough land base but who are so heavily in debt that they can't afford to encumber themselves any further. So you have some farmers who already own a half a section, or three quarters, leasing another half or another three quarters to make their operation viable, and you have the entry of young people into agriculture without the barrier of an unmanageable mortgage. And I think this is an opportunity that every young person should take a look at if they have a serious interest in agriculture. And I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, to support my argument that the Opposition is trying to mislead the people of Manitoba, I should like to point out that the Member for Lakeside has not yet revoked his lease with the Crown, which he's had for many years, Mr. Speaker -- --(Interjection)-- He has, and his philosophy of private ownership of land as being the only way in which we should function in Manitoba, has not put him into the position of revoking his lease

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his matter of privilege.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): I can anticipate the kind of attack he may now want to make, but I do wish, at least from this point of view, to be correct, that I would suspect that nowhere in this Chamber or in the public arena have I ever indicated any opposition to the leasing of land or that the leasing of land was in any way an undesirable feature of farming, and particularly cattle raising in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what it is that has come over the members of the Opposition. I suppose it's because there's a leadership question underway. Mr. Speaker, I can only deduct from the statement of the Member for Lakeside that he now has a new position, that he now does not reflect the position of his party - of his party - who have gone out into the countryside and have indicated to the people of Manitoba that land leasing from the government is a bad thing. Because, Mr. Speaker, you have just witnessed here a moment ago that the Member for Lakeside certainly doesn't share that point of view. And I knew, Mr. Speaker, for years that he didn't share that point of view, because if he had been totally committed to a system of land ownership where he would have access to land only through a title, then he surely would have revoked the lease that he now has with the Crown, and a very substantial one, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to go beyond that and I don't begrudge him that opportunity, I think it's a great thing. I think it's a great thing. But at least it demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency in the debate emanating from that side of the House.

So let's not get on a tangent, Mr. Speaker. I think the people of Manitoba deserve a good political structure. They want their government to do things that are necessary - these requirements change from time to time - and they also want the Opposition to be responsible in its criticism or support or whatever, of the programs of government. So I suppose one can --

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) and I have to make the observation since the Member for Morris was not here a moment ago. I want him to know that the Member for Lakeside does not share with him the philosophy that government should not be involved in the land lease program. He had just enunciated a new position for the benefit of the people of Manitoba, and I am sure that perhaps if the Member for Lakeside has come around that far, Mr. Speaker, that we might even find some room for him on this side of the House if he so chooses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments to talk about automobile insurance, because there, I think, Manitoba has something to be very proud of. We have in Manitoba an insurance program that I think is second to none in Canada, certainly in North America, and again I think, Mr. Speaker, it should be observed, it should be observed that notwithstanding that, it doesn't mean that our system is perfect. I think there is improvement to be made, and we are working in that direction. I think the fact that the actuaries guessed wrong on the amount of claims that we are going to have is not a reflection on the system. I think one would have to examine, in terms of assessing whether the system is good, the return on every premium dollar in the form of payments in claims, bodily injury claims, repair claims, and the administration costs, as a percentage of the premium dollar. And there, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have an impeccable record. The administration is efficient, the administration costs are something less than 20 percent of the total premiums collected, and that cannot be compared with anywhere in the private sector, Mr. Speaker. That cannot be compared.

I think it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that we will expect from time to time that our actuaries will err in their judgment as to what will happen in the future. And they have always done so, Mr. Speaker. I recall, during the years where I worked for a private insurance company, that we guessed wrong too. Yes. There were years where the heads of the company would call the agents together and tell them why they had to have a rate increase; that they were wrong on their projections and that we had incurred deficits of several millions of dollars that had to be recaptured. This is nothing new. It's done in every field of business. And I think that has to be accepted as a matter of fact. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, one would have to question why it is the insurance industry across Canada is jacking up the fire insurance rates by about 50 percent. One has to put that question to put things in perspective. Because they are having similar problems, Mr. Speaker. Inflation is a big part of it. So let's not knock a good thing. Let's make it better.

I want to remind members opposite that I am not totally in favour of our present system. I think there is much to be done. I, for example, would like to see the complete elimination of any discrimination in rating as between groups or sexes or whatever. I think we have to get into a flat rating system as soon as it is practical to do so. And, you know, I'd like to talk about this for a moment because I always believed, even when I sold insurance, that it was wrong to assess a charge or a fee against that innocent driver, no matter what age bracket he or she was in. I thought it was wrong for that 16-year-old to pay \$200 or \$300 for an insurance policy because he happened to belong to a group that had a bad record but he himself did not contribute to that record, Mr. Speaker. He was found guilty in advance of even getting his first licence. He was guilty by the system. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. And you can categorize any age group and you will come up with a different rate, Mr. Speaker. But if statistically we find that in the age group 16 to 25, that about 4 1/2 or five drivers are bad out of that group, why are we then willing to penalize the other five? That is just not right, Mr. Speaker. In my opinion it's dishonest. I think we have to do something about that. And I would like to see it move in the direction of eliminating even that \$10.00 difference between the licence insurance of the under-25 and those over 25, and the discriminatory figures as between males and females. We have discussed this, Mr. Speaker. I think as time evolves we will also change the program. So I think there is a long way to go.

But I want to say to the young drivers of this province that they have one of the best deals in the country. "The" best deal in the country, there's no question about that. I know that the tens of thousands of young people driving in this province, that if they were to buy their insurance in any other part of Canada, they would pay a much higher rate, perhaps two or three hundred percent more than they are paying in this province. And I want to say to the parents of those young people that it isn't an argument of whether the parents should subsidize the child. I don't think that's the argument at all, because quite often, Mr. Speaker, the parents are paying the premium for their 16-year-old. I think this is something that has to be kept in mind.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. USKIW cont'd)

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm looking forward to a significant degree of change and improvement in the automobile insurance program, and not at all embarrassed about the fact that there was an underwriting loss last year and the year before, and I won't be embarrassed about the fact that we will likely have future underwriting losses. As long as we are satisfied that we are getting the most out of our premium dollar as it compares with the private sector or any other sector, Mr. Speaker, that is the important thing; and as long as we keep returning 80 cents out of every \$1.00 in the form of payments for bodily injury or property damage, as opposed to about 60 cents in the private sector, then, Mr. Speaker, we should be shouting from the rooftops so that the people of Canada would take a look at what is going on in this province, in the province of Saskatchewan, and in the province of British Columbia, so that perhaps we might have a national universal auto insurance system. That is the direction we should be going.

Mr. Speaker, if members opposite want to be honest with themselves, their conscience, with their constituents, they would at least have to admit that there are many good things about Autopac. Everything is not bad. They would at least have to admit that, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, they are hopeful that somehow they may fudge the argument so that at least half of the people of Manitoba would feel that there is some reason to be dissatisfied. And, you know, every time that we have a change in the cost of something, whether it's in the private sector or in the public sector, I think people are dissatisfied. That's a natural phenomena. And that's the kind of thing that my friends opposite want to play on. They want to play on the fact that when you have an increase in the price of hydro power, that's a good whipping boy; that's the thing we've got to get the government on.

They also want to take an argument on the side of labour when they think that politically that's a good thing to do for the moment, but never have I seen consistency on that side when the tables turn, Mr. Speaker. You know, right now they will argue that we should do something by legislation to force those workers back in Vancouver. They will also tell us, why don't you accommodate the union at Flyer Industry? Because that happens to be a Crown agency and therefore sock it to a Crown agency. We have no loyalty to what the people of Manitoba have addressed themselves to in that kind of economic development.

The Member for Morris, Mr. Speaker, has indicated publicly that if he were to sell his land he would sooner sell it to someone overseas than to the Government of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what an oath of office would mean, but I would think it would mean at least that you would be loyal to yourself. I would think at least, Mr. Speaker, that you would be loyal to yourself, and the Member for Morris doesn't even want to be loyal to himself as a shareholder of the properties of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, you know what that tells us? That tells us that they will sell their soul for a dollar, Mr. Speaker. That's what it says. --(Interjections)--

The Minister for Mines and Resources tells us that unless someone offers him two. Well, of course, that's correct. And that is the kind of opposition, Mr. Speaker, that we have had to put up with in this province and, as I travel throughout the countryside and people put these questions to me, I ask them who told you so? Well, everybody knows that that's the way it is, I mean, we talked to the Member for Ross Lake and the Member for Morris, and that's what they were telling us. Mr. Speaker, that isn't going to work, that only works for a short period of time. But at some point in time, at some point in time my friends opposite are going to come to realize that they cannot use the people of Manitoba as pawns for political motivation. The Member for Lakeside has already come to realize that because he knows that he has a problem. He knows that he was shrewd. If he was to be faithful to the position that the Crown should not be involved in land ownership, that he would have had to revoke his lease, he could not continue leasing 1,700 acres of Crown land. He would have never done that. I know that he rises in this House, Mr. Speaker, and gives me a bit of hell once in awhile about Crown land policy. You know, that's a freedom that he has and I give him credit for taking the opportunity, because I think that's great, that's democratic. And I think that anybody who wants to do that out in the boondocks, Mr. Speaker, who wants to complain to me about the nature of the lease, the security of tenure, I think that's great. That is what the political, democratic process is all about.

And the Member for Lakeside has come around to realize that. That he, in fact, has

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) more freedom through that Crown land lease than he would have if it was owned by someone in Brussels, or someone in England, or even someone in Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, because he knows that he will not impress the landowner, who's an absentee landowner with the fact that he has an economic concern, the fact that he has to raise his children and the price of cattle are low, and so on; he can't impress that individual in that way. He knows that he can impress the Government of Manitoba that way. In fact, he's demonstrated so. He's asked me, and so have members opposite, what am I going to do about the plight of our cow-calf operators? You know, we've had an awful lot of interesting experience in that area, Mr. Speaker. We have had people here in the Legislative Building, Room 254, presenting briefs to this government that, "please stay out of our business, we don't want government involved in agriculture." And, you know, that emanates from the kind of messages that they were leaving behind in the countryside. The very next day, Mr. Speaker, the very man, Mr. Friesen, who happened to appear in Room 254 to tell us that we shouldn't be involved in agriculture, was in my office pleading for a grant of \$100 a head for all the cattlemen. The very next day, Mr. Speaker, a \$40 million tab was asked for roughly. -- (Interjection)-- We haven't calculated it, but it's roughly in that ball park.

You know, it's incredible, Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency of those arguments. I think I should relate to the House, Mr. Speaker, the experience we had in Morden, and there the Opposition did a beautiful job. They made sure that as many people as possible turned out to that meeting, and I give them full marks for that. They even made sure that the right kind of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: That, sir, the . . . talk that I cannot accept. The Minister has suggested that it was through the efforts of members on this side of the House that those people appeared at that meeting in Morden. That, sir, is a patented falsehood. Nobody on this side of the House encouraged anybody to go to that meeting. They came there of their own free will, and I want the Minister to understand that.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I told the House that someone pointed a gun at their head and forced them into that hall. But in talking to the member who represents that area that very day, I made the observation to him, and I said, "George, you've sure done well in publicizing this meeting." He says, "Oh, yes," he says, "a lot of our people are here." And nobody's criticizing that. I think that's great, that is good participation, but let's not deny the fact that it happened.

But I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we had some very interesting submissions, and I want to deal with one, one on land ownership. How can we get that young fellow that hasn't any money to acquire some land in some way? The proposition, Mr. Speaker, was that the Crown should underwrite all of the interest rate on a parcel of land, and the totality of that grant, Mr. Speaker, over the lifetime of that mortgage was going to be over \$106,000. The Crown should forgive \$106,000 so that the constituent of the Member for Pembina would have the right to own some land. And the Crown should not have a capital gains tax if the land appreciates; and then the Crown should remove the estate tax so that he can pass that land on to the next generation without any penalty. That was the kind of requests we had, which is nothing more than public subsidization, Mr. Speaker. And then they tell you, Mr. Speaker, that all we want is to be left alone.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister's time is up. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Well, Mr. Speaker, just having listened to the Minister of Agriculture I thought that his remarks would be the kind that would be most enlightening to encourage me to make a speech that would probably be worth listening to in this House.

However, as I commence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay the usual respects to you, sir, to wish you well, and hope that the debate will be conducted in the manner that is becoming to all members of this Chamber.

I would like to make reference to the mover and seconder that were replying to the Speech from the Throne. I would also like to congratulate the new Ministers that have been added to the Cabinet of this government since the last time we met. And having said that, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but wonder on the day of the opening of this session when I saw the length

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) of the line of the Cabinet extending out, if government continues to expand and become involved in the walks of life of the citizens of Manitoba, probably when we come back another year, the line may be extended to the point where they are going to have to be over on this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to dwell too much on the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, because I have some other matters I think are of real concern to many people of this province. However I do want to relate to one particular paragraph where the government saw fit to make mention of the celebrations that are going to take place this coming summer at Gimli, and being one of those Vikings myself I felt rather honoured. More so, I might say, Mr. Speaker, than the Honourable Member from Gimli himself, and I listened with greatest of interest to his speech. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, and others, seem to comment as to the kind of speech he gave, but I was rather surprised to listen to him in the things he had to convey to this House and to the people of Manitoba, and I suppose particularly to his constituents. He did not make one mention of an event that's going to happen in his own constituency next summer.

I would like to relate one particular instance that happened in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, last September 15th, because it is relevant while I am on this subject. I have discussed this matter in the House last year, the year before, and last September 15th it finally came to realization, fruition, where a church that I had been a part of, associated with for years, became a historical event in that the Historical Society by representing the Provincial Government took part in a celebration on a Sunday afternoon in what is known as Grund Church, and at this particular ceremony the deed was handed over to this government for safekeeping for all eternity. The preservation that I am very proud, on behalf of the Iceland people, of not only the community in which I come from, but who have now dispersed themselves over this entire nation and also into the United States. And as I have said before that it is the oldest Icelandic Lutheran Church still standing in its original form, and was built in 1889. And I would just like to say those few words, Mr. Speaker, for the record, say that I'm very pleased that that has become a reality.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I see the Minister of Agriculture has vacated his seat --(Interjection) -- Oh, I'm sorry, he doesn't look the same, sir, when he turns his back as when he looks toward us. But you know, Mr. Speaker, I think, there are a few matters here, and particularly one matter I would like to get straight for the record, when he was talking about Crown lands and private lands. And I want to come to the defence of my colleague from Lakeside when he said, and I want to put the record straight, Mr. Speaker, that he had no objections to Crown lands being leased to farmers. I want to say to the Minister of Agriculture that there are certain areas of the Province of Manitoba that the Crown owns and has owned for many years, and owned before my colleague from Lakeside and I ever came into this Chamber. I want to make that clear, Mr. Speaker. But the Minister of Agriculture chose to distort something that is just not a fact. He chose to distort, Mr. Speaker, and I think the records will show that what he tried to convey to my colleague from Lakeside, that should not go unchallenged --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture said he didn't challenge it. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Member for Lakeside . . . have that opportunity and he will do it when he has a better opportunity.

But there are many quarter sections of Crown land that were owned by the Crown and leased to farmers 10, 15 years ago. The kind of land that was not suitable for anything other than possibly grazing for cattle, and we have no quarrel with that, Mr. Speaker. But, you know, talking about the hearings that the Minister said he took around the province, that crusade he went on and because of legislation or, that is, resolutions brought by my honourable friends in the Liberal Party from the extreme left, and they were concerned about foreign ownership of land. You know, Mr. Speaker, this government chose to distort again something that is very fundamentally important insofar as our principles are concerned, and those are the things that we want to discuss in this Chamber. My colleague, or my friend the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources made an excellent speech I thought when he was debating philosophy and ideology, and I agree with him; so he has his views and I have mine. You know, and speaking of the Minister of Mines and Resources, I want to thank him for the compliments he did pay me in the way by recognizing myself instead of the terminology he used, I think last

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) year, when referring to a blackbird socialist. However, Mr. Speaker, . . .

A MEMBER: A redwing blackbird?

MR. EINARSON: I would like to say, sir, that when the government started out on their hearings throughout the province - and not being a member so therefore I only attended a couple of the hearings here in Winnipeg, - they were concerned about foreign ownership of land. They were concerned about foreign ownership of land. Mr. Speaker, they can deny it all they like, they can deny it all they like. But the purport and the references that were made in regards to what they now classify as land use, and that's the pretext that they used in going around and finding out how farmers and others thought about this program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines state his point of order?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a legitimate point of order. The resolution setting up the committee indicating the uses and the concerns was passed by every member in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the impression I had. Mr. Speaker, I'll use this as an example that I am going to speak briefly on on the Minerals Acreage Tax Act, which I stated that I didn't agree with and on third reading I wasn't sure that the Minister who was responsible for that knew himself what it was all about.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I for one did not influence my constituents to attend those hearings, and I want to say to the Minister of Agriculture and I am going to convey to him the message that my constituents passed on to me. They said they had to go to the hearings and listen and see the performance to believe it. But they were given the understanding that a citizen could come before the committee, present their views as to whether they agreed with the government getting into the business of buying land or whether they did not. The way some members on that side of the Hoose used this opportunity when questioning them was an insult to many of the citizens of this province. That, Mr. Speaker, I convey to this Chamber is exactly the feeling that they had out of it. And some of them said, "You know, what is the use of trying to convey to this government our feelings on a particular matter so important as that, if that's the kind of respect we get for it." And, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what happened in about 80 percent of the hearings. I ask the Minister of Agriculture of all the people who presented their case, how many were in favour of what they were trying to pass on or bring possibly in future legislation into this House? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is one issue that particularly the farmers of this province are very concerned about because they know now and they have seen and experienced the areas that government has become involved in.

I want to tell honourable gentlemen opposite when they talk so much about our policy convention over the past weekend, that a young lady, whose ancestry comes from Yugoslavia, and that's like getting it right from the horse's mouth, informed us as to the experience of her grandparents under Communistic rule. She indicated to us exactly what happened over there is happening over here. And she says, "For God's sake, fellows, fight it as long as God gives you breath to fight it." Well, Mr. Speaker, I have discussed with my constituents in what way and manner do we have to start debating in this House to get the message to the people of this province so that they really understand and are serious and know what is going on.

I said earlier I wanted to make mention of one other particular matter that is a concern of my own constituents as well as many parts of the Province of Manitoba, and that is the Mineral Acreage Tax Act. I am given to understand that this goes back a number of years when oil companies went around leasing property, that is leasing the mineral rights, pardon me, from individual owners, that was fine. But, you know, a second company came along some time later and took up the option on that particular lease, but when those people signed the lease the second time, they were not aware, Mr. Speaker, that they had sold half their mineral rights. And I'm further given to understand that this having happened they are now in the situation where, in those particular cases, they have an undivided interest with the company that took up the option and in effect did not lease but bought. And because of the structure of the legislation that the ex-Minister of Finance brought into this House a couple of years ago in regards to the taxing of minerals in this province, the company has an undivided interest which they pay five cents an acre. But, you know, the private individual, Mr. Speaker, I say to the ex-Minister of Finance, who has the other undivided interests of mines and minerals, but he

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) has 100 percent of the coal. The oil companies do not have any portion of the coal. And as a result of this, Mr. Speaker, that citizen who owns the land and owns the mineral rights - that is half the mineral rights, pardon me - plus the coal, is paying ten cents an acre.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we were given to understand that the government is collecting ten cents an acre from both the citizens and the company who have that undivided option. In other words what I am saying, sir, is that they are collecting not ten cents but 15 cents an acre in all of these cases. The ex-Minister of Finance shakes his head and says 'no'. Well, all right sir, I challenge him to say otherwise, if he can prove me wrong then that's fine.

--(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, yes, I don't have any documentation cases here right now, but then I will pose the question when the time arises to the proper minister and ask if it is correct. So I say, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important item; while it's small it's a very important one. And here we're talking about freedoms. There's been so much discussion about freedoms, as they understand the word 'freedom' on that side and as we understand it on this side. That's an area I think that is significant and is relevant. So, Mr. Speaker, as I'm given to understand, that being correct, the Act needs to be changed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture was talking about, and I want to discuss the problems of the one segment of our agricultural industry, namely, the farmers who are engaged in the cow-calf operations. You saw the demonstration that was displayed here in the first week of the opening of our sessions. I want to say, sir, for the record that I was very pleased and proud of the group of farmers who came in here and in the way they performed themselves and their conduct. (Hear hear)

I think, Mr. Speaker, that they understood what democracy meant, but I want to say, sir, that they're still very concerned by the fact that from the time that they met with the Minister on January 21st the action that they had to go through and the exercise in order to get any action from the Minister of Agriculture was very disappointing and disheartening to all of those people.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose was making some real challenging comments in his remarks yesterday and he invited, as I understood him, anybody to come out to his constituency and challenge him on anything that we want to talk about. Well, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to invite me out I'd be more than happy to do so.

. . . . continued on next page

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, state his matter of privilege.

MR. ADAM: My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that I never made that type of a statement. What I said is that that side of the House could get their GG boys and start wheeling and dealing with the Liberals and come out to Ste. Rose and I'll take them on any time. And I'll repeat it again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: You know, Mr. Speaker, I also heard the Member for Ste. Rose, I thought he was talking about the three members of the Liberal Party left there. He said "We'll take you under our wing". I would assume that he meant his left wing.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, I just reply to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that I don't need the GG's, I'll come out on my own, if he wants to take me on. --(Interjection)-- But, Mr. Speaker - no there's a little while before the next election. We have time working on it.

I want to deal with this plight of the farmers who are engaged in cow-calf operations and say to the Minister as I'm given to understand the way he informed us, that the farmers in that particular commodity group don't want government to become involved or DREE. I can understand that, and I agree with the farmers in that particular area that that should be the way it should be. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, then he went on to say, in committee he says when they were expressing their views in this land-use hearings that they said to government, "Leave us alone. Keep out of our business."

But, sir, I want to get back to a situation in 1971 where the Minister of Agriculture saw fit to see and think differently than what he is doing today. You know, Mr. Speaker, we had, I think it was two or three by-elections coming up, and I would like to read for the record some comments that the Minister of Agriculture made at that time, April 16th, 1971, and it was the time when the Minister presented a Bill No. 18, an Act to Authorize the Payment of Special Emergency Grants to Farmers, for Second Reading.

And I quote further, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Uskiw: "I think that members opposite have had some knowledge of what is contained within the proposal. The announcement was made some time ago pursuant to a letter that was sent to Ottawa asking if they could entertain the idea of a cost-sharing program or a cost-share program that would provide a major injection of money into the pockets of our prairie farmers." I don't think that I have to remind honourable members opposite as to the need of our rural people. I think that anyone looking at statistics of the last two or three years would agree that there is indeed a very serious economic situation in the countryside, and indeed one which cannot be dealt with in a short term, and that what we are merely proposing here is some sort of a measure that would help tide things over for a short period pending a long-term solution to the problems for the prairie region.

I want to say that it is not my opinion that a dollar an acre up to \$100.00 is going to solve anyone's financial problem. I want to say that the proposal here is merely designed to stimulate similar activity at the federal level on a much larger scale. And I may indicate to the House, Mr. Speaker, that in August of last year, in fact I believe it was a letter of August 7th and another one on August 10th which I wrote to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture for Canada suggesting that the Province of Manitoba would be prepared at that time to go into some sort of cost-sharing arrangements, and of course we have had discussions and negotiations ever since, and we have had various proposals by both the federal and provincial government, so that this has been an on-going thing, and what we are doing here is simply making good our commitment to the Government of Canada.

Some months ago we would be prepared to inject some moneys into the pockets of our rural people in order that they may use in whatever way they wish but in order to alleviate some of their cash shortages. I think that if you look at some of the statistics you will find that the arrears in their loans are piling up at a very substantial rate both in MACC and FCC. I think you will notice a very substantial increase in tax arrears in Manitoba and I would suggest that the \$4 million which we are providing under this measure could go some way in helping our farm people reduce their tax arrears if that's the way they want to apply the revenue. So it's not really a grandiose scheme.

So, Mr. Speaker, without going any further, I think I have given sufficient information, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. He saw fit in 1971 to do something that these

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) farmers are now requesting -- a similar situation. Do I have to suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that the farmers out in Ste. Rose constituency, out in St. George constituency, move their cow herds into the constituency of Wolseley and Crescentwood? That's just about the size of it, Mr. Speaker. In order to get some regional continuity I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Is the Member for Rock Lake not aware that under the stocker program that the benefits are far in excess of \$100.00 per farm but in fact about \$500 is the maximum limitation of benefits, interest-free money of \$5,000 is equal to about \$500 of actual grant to every cattleman? That's a lot more than \$100.00.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has given me an opportunity to answer his question, and I want to say to him first and foremost that the program - and I don't mean to be a destructive critic, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: Why not?

MR. EINARSON: I'll make it constructive and say why. That the maximum of \$5,000 that you have supposedly made available to farmers . . .

MR. USKIW: Not supposedly, it's a fact.

MR. EINARSON: It's not a fact because I'll tell the Minister why, Mr. Speaker.

There are a number of farmers in the Province of Manitoba who have no obligation to a Credit Union or to a bank. Their cattle herds are free of debt. They can apply and take advantage of that \$5,000, put it in a bank and then pay it back at the end of the 12-month period. And here, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Minister of Agriculture where he fell down and he was grossly in error. That before he ever initiated this program he didn't consult with the managers of the banks and the credit unions in this province. And very legitimately so, sir, very legitimately so, sir, because the farmers who really needed that \$5,000, who still have obligations in the way of debts, mortgages, to the credit unions and to the banks - and there was a condition established here, Mr. Speaker, before they could get that \$5,000 loan that the Minister of Agriculture supposedly thinks is a wonderful thing for the farmers of this province - they had to go to the banker, or they had to go to the credit union and get them to release the mortgage holds that they had on their stuff before they could get that. And I suggest Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of young fellows who the Minister thought he was having good intentions for cannot make themselves available to that program.

And the other thing, Mr. Speaker, I'm a farmer myself and many young people have come to me and asked me for advice. I said in order that I give you advice there are many different circumstances. One farmer is as different as the other, so we can't just set a policy that is going to be equal and satisfactory to all farmers because of this problem.

And I said to them I don't agree with it because for one reason, as I just explained, and the other that we've got a surplus of beef. And the Minister by introducing this program is only prolonging the agony that is still going to be there and I've said myself as a producer of cattle that I've had to take my lickings this year and I'm prepared to do it. But as the Minister said too, and I know there are a lot of young farmers who are not in the same position are having real difficult times. As he said in 1971, they've got the same situations now only inflation has caused and added to their problem, tremendously.

So that's my answer, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister's question that he just posed to me. That he has done nothing to solve the problem of that segment of the farmers in this province that came in to see him last week. (Hear, Hear)

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the situation is right now but I'm hoping that the Minister will have second thoughts on his stance on this particular matter. I do know, Mr. Speaker, that at a meeting, I'm given to understand the committee that came to see him, he referred to these farmers as a bunch of beggars, as second-class citizens. And he says, you know I understand you are bleeding. But he says, you know, you haven't bled enough. And he says, when you have bled so much that you will capitulate and get on your knees and come to me and ask me for a marketing board, then I'll talk to you.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest, sir, to this government, and they've got the gall and audacity to talk about freedoms, I think they better go back to the dictionary and just find out what that word "freedom" really means. --(Interjection)-- Right. Well, Mr. Speaker, the First

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) Minister said, the First Minister said, you know, and for whom, when we talk about freedom. He has his ideas about what the word "freedom" means and what it all encompasses. I think I have mine. That's what this debate is all about. And we are engrossed here in dealing with the problems of people and here is one example, one classic example. You know Mr. Speaker, I want to make another comment. It was suggested by this government that these farmers instead of coming up and filling the gallery, they should have marched on the stockyards, sufficient numbers to stop the flow of hogs and cattle coming into the City of Winnipeg. And they said, you know, the Minister would be right there with them. The Minister would be right there with them.

You know if this Minister wanted to do something about, and in a constructive way, not only to help the farmer but also to help the consumer of this province whom just about all of them over there represent in this province . . . I haven't heard the Minister - now he could correct me if I'm wrong - but I haven't heard him say one thing and complain, or has he ever had a discussion with the packing houses over in the union stockyards as to why there's a differential of from eight to ten cents a pound on an A-1 carcass steer and an A-1 heifer.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand the Minister has a committee that has been organized now and is looking into the problems of the high cost of beef to the consumer and why the farmer is getting so little. Well, I can understand he's engaged in a very interesting project. I don't know whether his outcome is going to be anything like the Federal Government when Mrs. Plumptre engaged in that very exercise and from what I'm given to understand found that there was really no wrongdoing with the packing houses or the chain stores.

I want to relate another matter, Mr. Speaker, insofar as agriculture is concerned, I recall, I think it's two or three years ago, at the Outlook Conference in Brandon when the Minister spoke to a large audience there, and he intimated at that time there was problems with our packing companies in this province in the way they were operating, and he wasn't satisfied with it. He said to them, "you know you fellows have got to change your ways, and if you're not prepared to change your ways I want to let you know that I got the legislative power and authority that we can take you over".

I have asked the Minister, Mr. Speaker, on other occasions, has he ever invited the presidents and managers of the various packing companies to come into his office, sit down and talk to them, discuss with them the problems related to the marketing of our livestock by the farmers and how it affects the consuming public in regards to their purchase of meat. I suggest Mr. Speaker that he has not done this. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that his entire portfolio has been nothing but an endless run of confrontation rather than consultation. Mr. Speaker, if that is the way it is going to continue I want to say to the Minister of Agriculture in this province we're going to continue to have the kind of problems that we're having at the present time. That is his prerogative and if that's the way his government wants to carry on then we are prepared as an opposition to meet him head-on with it. They can accuse us all they like of what he terms is a big lie - I would just like to make one comment in relation to the comment he just made, is the big lie that I have used. One of the committee hearings on this land-use we had here, after it was over he gets on the television, after listening to many briefs from farmers and others, that, you know, the people aren't really that concerned, they're not sure of just what this is all about. After stating most emphatically their positions. And that's the trouble, Mr. Speaker, with this government, they don't like to be told that they're wrong. This is one of the faults that they have. And so what do they do? They get on a charade, even the First Minister, you know he allowed an exercise to develop here last night where the Minister of Mines and Resources got up and used the normal time for the First Minister to speak in reply to the Throne Speech. Now, I can't help but wonder, we have a couple of by-elections coming up, is it so that the First Minister doesn't want to become tarnished and he's going to relinquish his time to the Deputy, to the Minister of Mines and Resources?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it plain to the honourable member, and it will be plainer as the day goes on, that it was only on a particular motion. The Premier will be using his time on the motion which you are now speaking on. No doubt he reserved himself in order to deal with the positions that you are taking.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake has five minutes.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. EINARSON: Very good, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources for his answer. That's really all I wanted to hear. And so, Mr. Speaker, having made these comments I think they're suffice to say that if we're going to continue this dialogue and continue the kind of management that the Minister of Agriculture is giving, I regret that things are not going to go forward and things are going to get worse. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Morris on a point of order.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could raise one more point of order. I would like to ask the Minister if it is his intention to stay within the 40-minute time limit on this occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct understanding that the 40-minute time rule does not apply to a Minister and applies separately in the case of each substantive motion. Now my colleague, the Minister of Mines, was speaking on behalf of the Crown on the sub-amendment motion and I am speaking on behalf of the Crown with respect to the main amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . my interpretation of the rule I want to first of all draw your attention to the statement that was made by the Minister of Mines and Resources, when he said, now Mr. Speaker, I am moving rather slowly - and this is to be found on Page 163 of Hansard. I do not want to indicate that I'm a bit casual because the Premier has indicated that on this particular amendment, that is the amendment of the Member for Portage la Prairie, that his time will be available to me, and I gathered from that that he was going to be speaking in place of the First Minister who does have unlimited time under normal circumstances.

But then I want to quote to you, sir, our rule which is found on Page 18, Rule 33, subsection 2: "The Leader of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of recognized opposition parties may each, in advance, designate some member of his party to speak on any such debate or any such time as he desires, but in that case the Leader, if he speaks in the debate, shall be allowed to speak for 40 minutes only. Now, sir, I want to draw to your attention Rule 34 which says, "The proceedings on the order of the day for presenting and debating the motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne and on any amendments proposed thereto, shall not exceed eight sitting days." Which means that that particular debate which has been referred to, is the entire Throne Speech debate, not just a portion of it. And, sir, I want to draw also to your attention the fact that now . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wish the honourable gentlemen would listen to me so I can make my case. If they want to offer a rebuttal to that case, that's fine, then they are going to have that opportunity. But the rule provides that the minister who is going to be speaking for the First Minister or the Leader of the Opposition, has to indicate in advance. That was not done. The Minister of Mines and Resources was part way through his speech before he even indicated to the House that he was speaking on behalf of the Minister, which is a violation of that rule in the first instance. And I didn't raise it at that time, sir, because I felt that if it just followed that he was going to speak for the First Minister and that following that the Minister was going to be confined to the 40 minutes then it wouldn't pose a problem. And that's why I raise the question right now.

Now I want to also draw your attention to a reference in Beauchesnes' and I want to read to you Section 124, subsection (1): In order to be allowed to speak more than 40 minutes under Standing Order 31, a member who speaks immediately after a minister has moved a government measure, must speak in opposition to the motion. A member who has already spoken 40 minutes on a motion of non-confidence ought not to speak again on an amendment to that motion, because Standing Order 31 cannot be construed as declaring that more than one motion of no-confidence can be under consideration at the same time by the House. The final decision on the question of want of confidence will only be reached when members have voted on a motion either as amended or in its original form. The right to speak more than 40 minutes belongs to the member who moved the original motion of non-confidence. It

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) does not belong to the mover in amendment with just added reasons why in his opinion the House should vote against the government.

My case, sir, is simply that in my interpretation of that rule that when you're debating the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, or indeed the budget, that that debate is considered as one debate, regardless of how many amendments or sub-amendments are contained therein. And I submit, sir, that having allowed his time to be taken up by the hour and a half that was taken up by the Minister of Mines and Resources, that the First Minister now must confine himself to what the rule states, the 40 minutes which is provided for under the present rule that we have in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the rule I submit, first of all by the readings of the rule itself, secondly, by the precedence that has been established, would indicate that with the greatest of respect the honourable member is wrong. I wish to deal with this quickly because it would be hypothetical if we use all the time that the Premier is allotted in debating this point of order. The rule refers to a debate and a debate is on a motion, and the motion that I was referring to was the motion of Honourable Member for St. Johns. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't say that the member shall indicate in advance, although I believe I did so with unreasonable confines of that rule. It says that the Leader shall designate in advance, which I indicated that he did.

And the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney will recall that D. L. Campbell, at the end of 40 minutes, when he was told to sit down, indicated that he had been designated in advance to speak for the Leader of the Liberal Party, and then was permitted to go on. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if the rule was not clear, which I submit it is, what was done, was done on two occasions by myself last year and the year before, was accepted by the House and is therefore an established precedent. Now, Mr. Speaker, that being the precedent and a motion constituting a debate, notwithstanding the fact that it says that the Throne Speech debate, which includes all motions shall continue for eight days, the Leader of the Opposition, last year, on a motion for non-confidence in the budget debate, spoke twice for more than 40 minutes, using the amendment as his indication to speak additional time. Not only did he speak more than 40 minutes, Mr. Speaker, he spoke for more than three hours.

Now I am not, Mr. Speaker, going to belabour this point a great deal, I see that the honourable member is getting up. All I urge you, Mr. Speaker, is to hear the arguments quickly, rule so that the First Minister can get on with the time that is allotted to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: The House Leader has indicated or has stated previous occasions that members have indicated in advance that they are going to be speaking. Now, I don't know what the rule says unless there is an interpretation placed on it. Is the Minister of Mines and Resources the only one that is going to have that indication made to him, that he's going to be speaking in advance, or is there an obligation on the part of the First Minister, or the one that is going to do the speaking, in advance, that the House be informed that he's going to be talking. The rule in my opinion indicates that the House must be informed in advance that the time that would normally be allocated to the First Minister, which is unlimited, would be taken up by some other person. And in that case, sir, the rule is very explicit, the rule states, then in that case the First Minister shall not be allowed to speak more than 40 minutes. And that applies to anybody on this side of the House as well. If the Leader of the Opposition designates his time to somebody else then he is confined to 40 minutes. If the First Minister had taken his proper place and spoken on the motion, an hour and a half, he would be then entitled to do it again on this occasion. But I submit, sir, that according to our rule, that that does not apply. And, sir, since it's getting close to 5:30 I wonder, sir, if you'd want to take up during the lunch hour, this matter and give a ruling after we meet at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank the honourable members for their contributions to the point of order. The Chair has no problem in this regard. When a motion is made it's a separate entity of its own on the floor of the House. An amendment is a separate motion again and consequently each time all the members have an opportunity to go and make a speech. And if a member has a special privilege because the House rules

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) provide that, then that applies each time that member gets the opportunity to speak. Therefore the First Minister can go ahead and utilize his time.

MR. JORGENSEN: With great regret, Mr. Speaker, I challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. I shall put the question whether the judgment of the Chair shall be sustained. All those in favour please say **Aye**. Against say **Nay**. In my opinion the Ayes have it. Declare the motion carried.

MR. JORGENSEN: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. The motion before the House is shall the . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge walked in a moment late. Shall it be overlooked or shall it not be overlooked?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris on the same point.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . that he cannot vote after the question is put. I don't think the Speaker had put the question . . .

MR. GREEN: Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The motion before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs.	Schreyer	Turnbull
	Evans	Hanuschak
	Green	Toupin
	Uskiw	Cherniack
	Miller	Barrow
	Johnston (Portage la Prairie)	Osland
	Doern	Petursson
	Bostrom	Gottfried
	Shafransky	Walding
	Boyce	Johannson
	Burtniak	Derewianchuk
	McBryde	Adam
	Uruski	Dillen
		Jenkins

NAYS

Messrs.	Enns	Henderson
	McKenzie	McKellar
	McGill	Einarson
	Graham	Jorgenson
	Banman	Axworthy
	Ferguson	Johnston (Sturgeon Creek)
	Blake	Brown
		Minaker

CLERK: Yeas 27; Nays 15.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the yeas have it, declare the motion carried. I am now leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 P. M.