

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, July 10, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I want to table the Preliminary Financial Report for the Province for the year ending March 31, 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, this is to ask the Government House Leader if he can say whether it would be the government side's inclination to call Bill 25 with the understanding that it can be relatively expeditiously dealt with right after the Question Period, and that, in the event that a concurrence is given to the meeting of the Standing Committee on Statutory Orders simultaneously after the Question Period with the House, but only for this afternoon? We feel it an undesirable precedent but agree only in the context of tentative notice having been given. Can the House Leader indicate if that is the procedure that he would be inclined to follow?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank my honourable friend for giving agreement to having the committee meet this afternoon. It is . . . —(Interjection)—

MR. SCHYER: If Bill 25 is called on the understanding that it will be expeditiously dealt with this afternoon, that for that period of time and on the understanding that that's the Order Paper, that concurrence would be given, and it requires unanimous consent, to the convening of the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations which is, I believe, what my honourable friends desire, but that after Bill 25 has been advanced to committee stage then the only activity would be in Standing Committee, Statutory Orders, and any other committee that my honourable friends may be in a position to convene, if any, today.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, it is possible to call the Committee of the Whole House on the tax bills that are currently on the Order Paper, or simultaneously with the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations. I don't know of any other committee that could possibly sit at this time. The Agriculture Committee can only meet when the bill is passed, and I wouldn't want to call it on that short notice. I'm sure my honourable friends would not agree to that and I wouldn't agree to that myself, so if my honourable friends are not prepared to have the House deal with legislation this afternoon, at the same time holding the committee, then I presume then the only alternative is to continue in the House until this evening. .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that the Government House Leader had given an indication that it would be much desired to be able to deal with Bill 25 today and advance it one stage to Committee, and also to have the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations meet this afternoon. We are willing to agree to both being done this afternoon, but we are saying,

Monday, July 10, 1978

in response to the question put to us this morning as to whether or not we would be agreeable to having this Chamber meet simultaneously with the Committee, the Standing Committee, the answer is that we are not, with the exception of this afternoon. And also, a second reason is that not only is the precedent, we believe, not a good one, but also the problem becomes academic in that if Bill 25 is passed, we realize that because of the meeting of Ministers of Agriculture the Committee dealing with Bill 25 would not be able to convene tomorrow, but it could on Wednesday, presumably, and House business could be conducted with two Committees meeting simultaneously, but not a Committee and this whole House meeting simultaneously. With the exception of this afternoon, we do not wish to be party to that kind of precedent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: When the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders were informed that it was our intention to hold meetings simultaneously with the sittings of the House that was with agreement of the members of that Committee. But I did have the background knowledge of my honourable friends enough to know that that would still be contingent upon unanimous consent of the House, which apparently is not forthcoming. So obviously the two cannot meet, but I want to proceed with Bill 25 for the reasons that were outlined by my honourable friend. So I will be calling Bill 25 first, and I would like also to be able to accommodate at least a few of those out-of-town delegations who are here to present briefs and which I indicated that we would like to accommodate. If that can be done this afternoon then the Committee will be meeting this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the Honourable Attorney-General. I have been advised by the Minister of Education that the program at Shaughnessy School, which provides a day care program on a continuing basis, was financed through the Department of Municipal Affairs under the PEP Program. I wonder whether the Honourable Attorney-General can assure the people concerned that there will be found financing for the continuation of that very worthwhile program in the Shaughnessy Community School next year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I will accept that question as notice and enquire into the present status of that particular matter.

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

MR. SAM USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture just what position he is putting forward to the Ministerial Conference in Yorkton with respect to the questions of price stabilization and supply management?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JIM DOWNEY (Arthur): The subjects mentioned by my honourable friends opposite, as far as the price stabilization I would hope that there will be programs discussed that would work under the umbrella of the Federal Government instead of having a lot of individual provincial programs that were such a mix-up as the one that we took over from the last administration.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, the Minister neglected to give us an idea of what his policy is with respect to the issue of supply management.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in regard to supply management, I would have to thank — and we could use, for example, the dairy industry, of which my Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet was a part of signing the Supply Management agreement under the Federal Government Program — we would be far better off without it in Manitoba right now because we're unable to produce enough milk for the people of Manitoba.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would tell us that his policy position paper to the conference will be that the Federal Government along with the provinces discontinue all Supply Management Programs with respect to all agencies that now have supply management as part of their system.

Monday, July 10, 1978

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, until I have discussions with the Federal Minister, it will be difficult to see the position that they are taking as a Federal Government, and that is not the position at this point that we are taking as far as Manitoba is concerned.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Agriculture misunderstood my question. I asked him what his policy proposals were, not what the Federal Minister's proposals are going to be.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that perhaps he might want to rephrase his question, keeping in mind repetitive questions are not considered to be in order.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, just on that point. I asked the Minister of Agriculture what his proposals are going to be with respect to Supply Management. His response was dealing with what the Federal Government might be doing not with what he is doing. I repeat: What is the proposal of the Manitoba Government with respect to Supply Management?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that to take any other position than that the Province of Manitoba should be allowed to have a larger quota available to them to increase production in Manitoba, to take any other position would not be fair to the farmers of Manitoba. I think that that is one of the things that we have to request, the opportunity to produce more because of the advantages that we have in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Education. A report was made public on the weekend from the Canadian Association of University Teachers saying that government policies were jeopardizing the research standing and teaching standing at the University of Manitoba. I wonder if the Minister has had an opportunity to read that report and make any reaction to it, particularly in response to that kind of bad publicity or recommendation that seems to be issuing from the national body dealing with university teaching in the country?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I haven't had an opportunity to examine the report and until I do, I would not be prepared to comment.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister if he intends, once he has been able to find some time to read the report, if he intends to take steps to meet with university officials to determine exactly what is the damage or difficulties being faced in the development of research in the university systems, and if the government is prepared to take steps to begin correcting those deficiencies so that we can maintain a research standing in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to meet with the people from the university, at any time, when they have completed a study and listen to what they have to say in regard to that particular study.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to know that the Minister will meet at any time, but I would like to know whether the government, as part of its overall approach to economic development in the province, and part of its approach to insuring that we're able to stimulate growth, intends to introduce any specific program to encourage university-based research, applied development, and to assist or work with universities in developing a proper program as a basis for jobs and economic development in the province? Does he intend to take the initiative, not just simply respond to someone's call for a visit?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, certainly this is an area that we're looking at. We don't have a particular program in place at this time, but it's an area that has to be carefully studied before we do make a particular move in a direction on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to attention that there is an error in the answering of a question posed by the Honourable Member for Inkster way back on March 17th, and I would like to correct the error, and correct the insinuation in the answer. The Member for Inkster had asked — he was talking about Mr. Steward Martin's role as a solicitor for Manitoba— and he had asked me at that particular time if he had been consulted in relationship to the clause. Hansard reads that Mr. Mercier answered the question, not myself, and that's the one correction I'd like to make. And the preceding questions had been dealing with background, and my answer was meant to mean that he had been consulted in relationship to background, but the way I read it, and I'm sure the way others might read it, it sounds like the Attorney-General said that he had been consulted in relationship to the clause, and I would like to correct that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, is the correction that Mr. Steward Martin, who was employed by the government and Hydro in negotiations for three years or so, was not consulted with respect to that clause?

MR. MacMASTER: The background material that he had, we certainly consulted him to get the material, the material was reviewed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could tell me whether Mr. Steward Martin was consulted with respect to the clause that finally appears in the agreement, the change to the agreement that was made? Was he consulted with respect to the effect of that clause?

MR. MacMASTER: Not specifically by myself, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Member advise me whether Mr. Steward Martin was consulted by the Government of Manitoba, that is by any person representing the Government of Manitoba, with respect to the meaning of that clause and its effect on the agreement, or effect on the future policy of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. MacMASTER: I'm not trying to be difficult, Mr. Speaker, but I can't answer for all bodies that were involved at that particular stage. The answer as far as myself, is concerned, is no.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am also not trying to be difficult. Would the honourable member take as notice the question as to whether Mr. Steward Martin was consulted by the Manitoba Government, anybody representing the Manitoba Government, with respect to the effect of that clause on the agreement and on the Province of Manitoba?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll take it as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, since his meeting with the Federal Minister of Agriculture is to take place tomorrow, whether the Minister of Agriculture could tell us now whether it is the intent of the Province of Manitoba to continue its participation in some three or four market-sharing agreements with Canada on agricultural commodities — and the other provinces — or whether the Province of Manitoba intends to opt out, in which case two years notice is required.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, that's a matter of policy that our whole government will be involved in making the decision. I will be meeting and discussing with the other Ministers, and the Federal Minister. Hopefully, if the proceedings of the House go well this afternoon, I will be able to report back to our government, and that policy decision will be made at that time.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, then, a supplementary. I take it the Minister can confirm then, and I am asking if he can confirm, that thus far Manitoba's continued involvement in the Federal interprovincial market-sharing agreement with respect to eggs, turkeys, broilers, and milk, that no notice pursuant to the two-year notice requirement has been given by Manitoba thus far.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, no notice has been given thus far.

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

HON. ROBERT (BOB) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Several days ago the Member for Selkirk asked me several questions, and the Minister of Labour reporting for the Civil Service Commission, about the recreation director and staff in Selkirk. I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that the recreation director had left employment; the one secretary left employment about a month ago, and the other secretary had been driving from Winnipeg to Selkirk and is currently commuting from Winnipeg to Gimli. She does not receive any expenses, or we don't pay any travelling costs. We will be transferring a recreation director from another part of Manitoba into that particular facility and will be operating out of Gimli.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister confirming that, with respect to a change in location or venue, that the government policy is that there will be no adjustment in wages and expense by virtue of the fact that the commuting distance from home, for this employee, to the place of work, has been changed by some 30 miles or so?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has happened in trying to get the delivery of service of different operations closer to the people in the particular area is that we will be moving offices to different areas. The same thing happened when the Beausejour office was opened up and a lot of people were then commuting back and forth to Winnipeg, and the same thing as in that particular situation will happen here. We thought that because Beausejour is the centre for the Eastman Region, out of which one of our recreation directors works, we thought it would be better service in the Interlake Area if we did have that recreation director along with supporting staff working out of Gimli.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't necessarily disagree with the arrangement or the practice, but then I would like to ask the Minister if that is the arrangement and the practice, would he undertake to explore for consistency sake why it is that The Legislative Assembly Act is being amended so as to provide MLAs with extra consideration in the event that they have some distance to commute from the Legislature to their home.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question this morning dealing with the cabins that the province owns at Camp Morton. My staff has checked with the group of campers that were utilizing that particular facility, and I am talking now about the cabins out there, and they were in touch with the people who had used them and have not received any complaints from those particular people. A check as far as the cabins is concerned, we found that there was a screen door missing on one of the cabins and that there was a window cracked in another one, and those will be replaced today. Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I can report that after the weekend's usage there is a clean-up crew that is going in and once they are finished, I have asked for a more detailed report.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can give us the rate of occupancy of the cabins and also report on the — the information that I have was that the grounds also were being neglected.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can try and get those figures. I understand that Cabins 6 and 7 have not been opened because there are some landscaping problems. Maybe that is what the member is referring to, but that is underway and I understand will be done very shortly. But other than that, I can try and find out what the occupancy rate of those particular cabins is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health and Social Development. About a month ago, during his Estimates, I brought to his attention the problems being faced by elderly people where one is in hospital and now has to pay the \$7.00 per diem, that is \$210 a month; and the other elderly, in this case a gentleman, is paying rent geared to income, based on the total

income of both. They are still getting bills. I have now received a second similar case.

I wonder if the Minister, who undertook at that time, could tell us whether a policy has been determined and how he is going to deal with this kind of situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that I appreciated his bringing those cases to my attention and both have been looked into, both are being pursued by my department personnel. I don't have a specific or final answer from the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation yet as to a readjustment of the rental category of the first elderly gentleman in question, but I am very hopeful that they will be providing me with a satisfactory answer and solution imminently. In fact, as recently as Friday I checked again to see if the answer was available. It still isn't conclusive, but it looks optimistic. With respect to the other particular case, the other situation, that is also being pursued. I will try to hasten the decision in that case as well, and provide the honourable member with answers to both this week.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his reply. I wonder whether he could make sure that somebody from his staff contacts these people to ease their minds, because there is a great deal of fear because of the uncertainty of the matter, and the feeling that their wives, and this is a wife in one case, might be simply discharged from the hospital, even though she is not supposed to be. The fear is very real. These people have never been contacted. They don't know what is going on and apart from my advising them of perhaps at age 84 they should divorce and resolve the problem that way, I am sure there can be another answer to the problem that the Minister can come up with.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I share the honourable member's determination that a solution be found short of divorce, and I will undertake to ensure that they are notified as to what is going on and that a solution is extracted from the bureaucracy as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 4th, the Member for Fort Rouge asked a question with reference to the number of mortgage defaults in Manitoba, whether there was a measurable increase in the number of mortgage defaults in the province during recent months. As a result of that question, a survey was undertaken by the Registrar of The Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act. He contacted a number of the lending agencies in an effort to determine or get a reading on this situation. Unfortunately, none of the lending agencies that were contacted keeps a record of the actual number of mortgage defaults, so that it appears to be practically impossible to cite figures which would reflect, with any degree of accuracy, the current situation regarding those defaults. This perhaps is understandable when you consider that there is a relatively low ratio, approximately three-quarters of one percent of mortgage defaults to the total mortgages outstanding. But the indications are, Mr. Speaker, that some lending institutions are experiencing an increase in the number of mortgage defaults this year over last year. They relate these increases chiefly to marriage break-ups and to employment problems.

In February of 1978 the Mortgage Loans Association of Manitoba, whose numbers account for about 80 percent of the mortgage business in Manitoba, conducted a survey among its members to ascertain, if possible, the situation regarding mortgage defaults. Of the 35 members who responded to the survey questionnaire 21 indicated no change in the default rate, while 14 reported a slight increase.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Minister's reply and the effort that his department has gone to to gain that information, and I respect the difficulty it may be to get accurate figures. I was just wondering if the Minister in making this investigation or enquiry with the mortgage lenders determined whether the defaults or foreclosures were occurring in any particular areas of the province or in any particular category of mortgage. I am thinking particularly of The Assisted Rental Program that was being offered to families at marginal incomes for the purchase of homes, whether there was any difficulty being experienced in those areas which would require or could require some assistance or compensation to ensure that they don't lose the mortgage or the home in doing so.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the kind of a breakdown that the member suggests might

be useful to him. I can tell him however that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation reported that arrears are up this year compared to last year in respect to their mortgages, and also pointed out that the default rate in Manitoba is low in relation to most of the other provinces in Canada.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just ask the Minister one further question. While he indicates that the ratio is only three-quarters of one percent of total mortgages that still could add up to substantial numbers, actual numbers of units, that would be affected. Without adding to his burden of work I wonder if at some point his Department of Consumer Affairs, particularly the Consumer Bureau, could discuss with mortgage lenders and the banks; first, if there should be any more extensive information supplied to those applying for mortgages to determine what kind of protections they may need and to the kind of guarantees they would have, and secondly, if there is any advantage in introducing some of the notions of mortgage insurance, which has been introduced in some other jurisdictions, that people can apply for, particularly if they are in a marginal limit so that if there is a default due to loss of income through job or something, that the foreclosure wouldn't take place immediately but there would be some grace period of six to eight months in which people would be able to maintain their payments without losing their mortgage.

I wonder if the Minister could see if the Consumer Bureau could initiate that kind of action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member that we'll certainly consider his suggestions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Housing and Renewal Corporation. In the review of his departmental Estimates the Minister indicated that a review of the performance of the private company, Oldfield, Kirby and Gardner, on property management would be undertaken before any further attempts were made by MHRC to have private companies take on the task of the non-profit Greater Winnipeg Regional Housing Authority. Can the Minister indicate whether that review has been completed and what its conclusions are?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, the review is going on continually. Oldfield, Kirby and Gardner were given a contract to manage two buildings, one that has been open for two months and another one that will be just opening. So as far as being able to say that there is a complete report as to how they're operating is impossible at the present time but we will be reviewing it and we will be getting a report.

MR. PASIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since no complete review has been made and since there are no conclusions to be drawn regarding the performance of Oldfield, Kirby and Gardner, can the Minister explain then why MHRC is now calling for tenders for property management, for private companies to undertake the property management of public housing which is normally carried out by the non-profit Greater Winnipeg Regional Housing Authority?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I expect that the question — and I'm prepared to answer it, Mr. Speaker — the properties that the member is talking about are limited dividend properties that are not completely under the Winnipeg Regional Housing Authority. They are under the other housing authority, the Winnipeg Housing Authority that operates some of the other buildings or properties that we have.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether the whole matter of tenant representation on private companies that are going to be managing public housing is being looked into or has been looked into already before we continue with this practice of having private companies manage public housing that normally was managed by non-profit corporations with tenant representation?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's being looked into.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Environmental

Management. I wonder if the Minister could give us any update or report on the question I asked him some time ago regarding the possible pollution problem on the south end of Lake Winnipeg which is affecting, or seems to be affecting, the fish catch in the south basin?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that that question was answered in the House the other day and repetition, in my opinion, should not be condoned in this Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase the question then. In view of the fact that no action has been taken on this matter to date, at least no report has been given to myself on this matter, I wonder if the Minister could have his department analyze the sample taken by a fisherman from his net on Lake Winnipeg and report back to the House as to whether or not this is a pollution problem and if something can be done to alleviate the problem. I will supply him with a sample from a net on Lake Winnipeg which has been taken by a fisherman and delivered to my office today, and I would hope that the Minister would have his department check it out this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, we seem to be having some difficulty in getting together with the fishermen that are having a problem. A few days ago I asked the honourable member to provide me with the name of a gentleman that we could contact, that my department could contact, and he did provide me with a name and my staff have contacted that person and as far as I know, to date they have not been able to pin down any kind of difficulty. They are particularly interested in finding out if there is a difficulty but they haven't been able to determine that yet and I would suggest that perhaps the fishermen in question that are having difficulties, if they would contact my department directly, rather than the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, then we might get directly to the problem.

Before I accept the sample that is being sent over, Mr. Speaker, I would like the assurance of the honourable member that it has been collected in a satisfactorily aseptic manner.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the member is suggesting, it seems to me, that a citizen of my constituency should not have the right to contact him through his or her MLA. I believe every citizen in my constituency has a right to come to me to ask questions regarding problems that they are having and this is one particular problem that I brought to his attention which he apparently is not doing anything about. My constituents have decided to follow this route to bring a concrete example to his attention of a problem that they are facing, a very serious problem, regarding their fishing which is their livelihood in the south basin of Lake Winnipeg.

MR. RANSOM: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, naturally every person has the right to contact their member and my department and I have been attempting to co-operate with the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, as has the Minister of Northern Affairs, in trying to track down this alleged pollution that is taking place. But when my departmental officials contacted the person that has been named by the honourable member, we're having difficulty in finding that in fact there is a problem. All I'm suggesting is that if the individual who specifically has the problem would contact the technical people that are able to provide him with some advice we would be happy to provide that.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Minister then to check with his department to make sure that they are following out his instructions because the fishermen in Lake Winnipeg are definitely concerned about this. Their catches have been very drastically decreased in the south basin this spring and I fail to see how he and his department do not know that this problem exists and are not taking action to check it out before this date.

I also ask the Minister of Fisheries to do the same thing, to check out why the fishermen are having such a difficult problem this particular spring having a decent catch, giving the same fishing efforts that they've been giving for the past 50 years or more. Mr. Speaker, I would ask both Ministers to undertake to investigate this situation to see if this pollution problem is in fact a serious one and if it is in fact the cause of the fishermen's reduced catch this spring.

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

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General confirm that he has issued instructions to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to refrain from enforcing the laws pertaining to the interprovincial transportation of beer from our sister

provinces into Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the instructions that have been issued through my department with respect to this matter have emanated from a large number of complaints from citizens who have been delayed for long periods of time at border cross points. The intention is certainly to continue to enforce the laws that presently stand, but not to continue the long periods of delay that have occurred at barricades or check points.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, can the Attorney-General then confirm that the existing laws are in fact being enforced by way of prosecution in the event that there appears to be a breach of the existing laws discovered by the RCMP?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, last Friday, indicated I understand — again to the Attorney-General — in a radio announcement, that this law possibly could be tested. Is it the Attorney-General's intention to test the constitutionality of these provisions?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have requested an opinion from my department as to the constitutionality of the law as it has been questioned.

MR. PAWLEY: I would ask the Attorney-General if the particular timing of his request to the RCMP that there be any alteration from the normal process on their part, insofar as the enforcement of these laws, the particular timing, if in view of the fact that there is presently a labour strike in the province involving brewery workers and the very breweries that are supplying the beer from outside this province, if his instructions would not, in fact, tend to favor one side of the dispute over the other side of the dispute.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, if anything, the fact that the Liquor Commission are making very large orders of American beer, that the party that is being hurt is the breweries.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for questioning having expired, we'll proceed with Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable, the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable, the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Estimates of further sums required for the services of the province for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1979, and recommends these Estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health and Social Development, that the said message, together with the Estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MOTION presented and carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would like to note a change on Law Amendments. The Member for St. Vital to be replaced by the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. SPEAKER: Change on the Law Amendments Committee. Is that agreed? (Agreed)
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Call Bill No. 25 please.

BILL NO. 25 — THE CATTLE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On Adjourned Debate on Second Reading on the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, on The Cattle Producers Association Act, and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for St. Vital — the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order. Do I understand from my discussion with the House Leader, that the Committee on Statutory Regulations will now start meeting, and that after Bill 25 is debated in the House and brought to a conclusion, as I believe it will be, that then the House will adjourn? Is that the procedure that the honourable member is intending to follow?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: No way of insuring anything to my honourable friends, but it is the hope of the government that we can deal with Bill 25, and that at the same time the people who are from out of town to appear before Statutory Regulations and Order will have an opportunity to appear before that Committee this afternoon. That is my intention, and when the —(Interjection)— Yes, well, I say now, that's entirely up to my honourable friends, in the final analysis we require unanimous consent for that to happen. If I can't get the unanimous consent it can't happen, but if unanimous consent is available then that Committee will meet now and we will proceed with Bill 25, and when Bill 25 is completed then the House will adjourn for the rest of the day.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to my honourable friend, and I will confirm his last remark, that we unanimously consent to Statutory Committee on Regulations going into session now, on the understanding that when the debate on Bill 25 is completed the House will adjourn. Now I think both sides have said it and we are agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 25. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make my comments brief in this respect as I do wish to deal with the matters pertaining to the Committee on Statutory Orders.

Mr. Speaker, what compels me to comment are comments respecting the Bill 25 by the Minister of Highways. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I hope the honourable members that have to attend Committee will leave as quietly as possible so that we don't interrupt the speech of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Dealing with an alleged farmer a, b, and c, and in the process of the discussion the Minister of Highways had insinuated that a stabilization program, a stabilization program which in fact was being a subsidized program, was one which was bad, and then led from there to a criticism of the legislation and the program that was instituted by the present Member for Lac du Bonnet.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand The Agricultural Stabilization Act, and agricultural programs of various forms, there has consistently been a process of subsidy; there has been a program in the area of milk in which moneys have been paid out by the Federal Government over a period of years for stabilization. And I was interested in that the Minister of Agriculture saw fit to disassociate himself from the inferences that were left in this House by the Minister of Highways, and I would think that the Minister of Agriculture was on quite sound ground in his efforts to erase the impression that was being generated in this Legislature by the Minister of Highways, in attempting to leave the impression that he was opposed to the basic agricultural stabilization programs, not only in Manitoba, but throughout the length and breadth of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us is a bill which the Minister of Agriculture should be anxious to withdraw. There is nothing to be said for this bill. It is wrong in fundamentals in that it provides to a small group of individuals — an elite group of individuals, which are not necessarily representative of the cattle growers in general — tremendous powers, tremendous powers — the powers of government, and Mr. Speaker, as well as the authority and the power to pass their own regulations, and, Mr. Speaker, not to have those regulations even reviewed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. So what we're being asked to do is to delegate tremendous power to an elite group, an elite group

of possibly 14 or 15 individuals, representing thousands of producers, responsible not to the public at large, as government would be subject to the public at large through the democratic process.

So we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, through the development of this legislation, the unfortunate beginnings of what could very well be the way insofar as other forms of legislation pretending to represent various interest groups within our society.

Mr. Speaker, we've noted in past debate a lot of comment from members opposite, but most of it has been from their seats. The Member for Rock Lake is excluded, he did make some comments not only from his seat but also in person in this Chamber. Certainly the Member for Sturgeon Creek has had a great deal to say from his seat, as my colleagues were speaking the other day, as has the Member for Gladstone. But I believe that it is unfortunate, that members like those from Sturgeon Creek, those from Gladstone, and certainly members like those who represent areas where there are many cattlemen — Gimli, Emerson — have not addressed themselves to this legislation. —(Interjection)— This is legislation, Mr. Speaker, that should warrant their attention, and they should be calling upon their Minister of Agriculture, if in fact their Minister of Agriculture is intending to serve the interests of the cattlemen within their constituency. They should be calling upon him to withdraw this bill, and withdraw it posthaste. —(Interjection)— It is a bill which erodes the very fundamentals of the democratic form of structure, that we do feel is paramount and essential within our society.

The Member for Morris made a number of comments dealing with this legislation as being comparable to legislation, the Labour Movement, the and Formula. Mr. Speaker, those comments unfortunately, by the Minister without Portfolio, indicates his really basic lack of knowledge as to the fundamentals of The Labour Relations Act.

First, Mr. Speaker, no union is recognized by government, by way of legislation — no union anywhere recognized by legislation. Secondly, in order for a union to be recognized it must be certified by a Board of Government which is established for the purpose of assuring itself that that union meets certain requirements, such as a majority, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, this Act that is before us makes no effort — no effort — to ascertain whether the majority of cattle growers in the Province of Manitoba support this legislation. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture is afraid to find out whether —(Interjection)— or not the majority of Manitoba cattle growers support his legislation, and it's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that he's afraid to take this bill to hearings. He's certainly afraid to take this bill to a referendum. And I want to say, at least the former Meer of Agriculture, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, had the guts on two different occasions to take his legislation to the cattle growers of this province. That Minister of Agriculture doesn't have the courage to take Bill 25 to the cattle growers. —(Interjection)— And I would challenge him to demonstrate that courage. But anyway, if I could revert, a group of working people must have their union certified before the Labour Board, and meet certain requirements.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, it is important as well that the union obtain a collective agreement from management. No requirement for that in this instance. Mr. Speaker, many unions in fact that have been formed by the Labour Board, have later found that their incorporation as a union was in fact meaningless because they were unable to obtain an agreement from the employer which they were dealing with. Two examples come to mind: Dick's of Swan River, and Tudor House, a nursing home in Selkirk, no collective agreement. And that agreement is required, Mr. Speaker, before the union can even commence to collect fees — not in the case before us. No, no fees are collected as a result of the legislation that's imposed upon the cattle growers by the actions of the Minister of Agriculture.

Thirdly, a union can be decertified every year — every year, Mr. Chairman, by what is referred to as open season upon unions. Either another union can obtain certification of the workers that are covered by the first union, or the workers themselves can proceed to decertify the union and choose no union at all.

What are the provisions, what are the provision that the Minister of Agriculture has inserted in this legislation in order to provide for that instrumentality? None, Mr. Speaker, in addition that insofar as unions are concerned there is a whole series of other restrictions that are imposed preventing the average union member from forming organizations of his choice.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no parallel, contrary to what the Minister without Portfolio suggested, between this legislation and the Rand Formula. Mr. Speaker, what sweeping powers the government has seen fit to provide for in this legislation, sweeping powers in which hundreds, in fact thousands, of Manitobans would be covered by this legislation under the general definition of "Information Reporter". Persons engaged in the cattle or beef industry, including producers, buyers, sellers, drovers, auctioneers, shippers, transporters, processors, retailers of cattle or beef — it includes a wide cross-section of occupational groups in Manitoba, and, Mr. Speaker, as well powers are provided to the association which provides that that association may require information reporters — that large range of individuals, occupational groups that I have made reference to — giving the

association powers to require those information reporters to maintain books and records in relation to the production or marketing of cattle or beef, containing such information as the association requires, and submit to the association such information relating to the production or marketing of beef or cattle as the association may require, and then further going on to impose fees, fees which are commensurate right at the very beginning, as I understand, Mr. Speaker, by the appointed board.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation also provides for no provision insofar as opting out is concerned, as far as the elected board is concerned. I would like the Minister to demonstrate where in this legislation, outside of the provisions dealing with the appointed board, would there be provisions for opting out, when the elected board is formed some 18 months hence.

Mr. Speaker, as well, there is provisions of course for this board to create its own regulations, to not subject those regulations to review by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, by its very essence, by its very fundamentals, is basically bad legislation and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture, who is serving his first term in this Legislature, did not really recognize the ramifications of this legislation. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that his colleagues failed or neglected to indicate to him what those ramifications would be. The Minister of Agriculture now finds himself painted into a corner because I believe he is now fully aware of the widespread ramifications of this very very bad legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it would be better for the Minister of Agriculture at this point not to proceed with this legislation than to push ahead, to push ahead despite all the warnings, all the advice that members of the opposition have attempted to provide to him. If he does push ahead, then, Mr. Speaker, then only the Minister of Agriculture will be able to bear the responsibility, bear the responsibility for the consequences of his actions. In the process, Mr. Speaker, there will have been a fundamental change made insofar as our approach and method of handling areas such as this within government. We do not know the precedent that will be formed for other producer groups within the province. I assume that the Minister of Agriculture would welcome the formation of a honey producers' association, a turkey producers' association, a hog producers' association, a vegetable producers' association, which he would relinquish in the same way to an elite, to a small group, responsibility without accountability insofar as all those areas are concerned in the marketing of agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker, all we can do is offer the Minister of Agriculture advice. If he chooses not to listen, then unfortunately it's not just he that will bear the consequences of this legislation, but there will be many many others in Manitoba who will suffer detrimentally, as a result of this very very bad legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I spoke on the subject matter of this proposed bill some several weeks ago, and under normal circumstances I would not be speaking again on what is essentially the same substance. However, the other day, the Honourable, the Government House Leader saw fit to intervene in the debate and came forward in debate with such a strange modification of the Queen's English, that I felt that it was necessary, if not to attempt to get the government to change its mind on this bill which is obviously next to impossible, at least to intervene in order to try to salvage some common understanding of ordinary words of our language.

I start from the premise, and it is well known, that since there are questions of public policy that have to be resolved, and it can only work one way in a democratic system, and that is that ultimately after there has been all due deliberation and debate that the matter must be brought to a vote and those who have the majority and presumably the majority of the will of the electorate, must have their way. So, if that is the starting premise one indeed may well ask why debate it for as long a time as we have. Well, I do so, principally because, as I've already said, the intervention of the Member for Morris, and also the other, late last week, the rather humorous, yes, indeed, the amusing intervention of the Minister of Highways.

So, the first point I want to make is this, that it is well understood that this government is committed to the passage of legislation which will provide for a mandatory checkoff to a voluntary association, which checkoff I know they argue in return, it's open to individual beef producers to apply at the end of a given shipping season or calendar year or whatever, to apply for a rebate. Well, Sir, that is a kind of deliberate way of doing it, so as to maximize inconvenience and to maximize the amount that goes into the checkoff from producers whether they are particularly desirous of doing so or not.

But the Member for Morris, the Honourable the Government House Leader the other day, made much of the rhetoric of the words "freedom, liberty, freedom of choice," and, I think, it's therefore so peculiar and strange that it merits being clearly articulated once again for the record.

They found much to criticize in the previous administration's not only displayed but evident proof

Monday, July 10, 1978

of its willingness to have the matter decided by those directly involved, namely the producers, by proceeding to a referendum. How anyone could describe a referendum as being manifestation of heavy-handedness of the state is something that apparently is possible only in the mind of the Member for Morris and a few others of his ilk.

With respect to beef marketing, we had the matter put to a referendum and we made it very clear, and we were very candid that our policy preference was for a form of orderly marketing mechanism, but that we preferred to have the matter directly determined as to majority will by means of a vote.

My honourable friends who use rhetoric of freedom perhaps more frequently than any other political party and in using it also abuse it more, they are proceeding with a measure here which has no particular provision in it at all in terms of ascertaining directly and so as to minimize the possibility of mistake or misunderstanding by means of a vote, direct vote or referendum, so then they're proceeding to enact legislation using, to use their own expressions now, the heavy hand of the state to enact a measure which in turn will — yes, admit it — the heavy hand of the state will not be involved in the day-to-day administration, but what will happen is, and what is happening by virtue of the legislation itself — indeed that's the whole purpose of it — is to delegate to an association powers and procedures which normally are those carried out by the democratic state. These they are delegating to a private association who in turn will carry them out.

Does it make one iota of difference, Sir, if there is heavy-handedness — then I am not conceding that there is, but since the expression is theirs, I ask them in their own terminology — if there is heavy-handedness, does it matter, is it of any comfort or indeed is it not worse to delegate heavy-handedness to someone other than a directly accountable democratically elected forum. That is the gut and sum and substance of what the issue really is.

Now my honourable friends would like to continue to use rhetoric involving the words "freedom and liberty" by talking about the state being too involved in the marketplace. They have vented their spleen on more than one occasion, their opposition to the existence in Canada — they might as well add, by the way, the United States, France, Belgium, Holland, Britain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and any other country of the western world — the existence of producer marketing boards, marketing boards established by the state, some established by the state and delegated to producers to administer policy control by the producers. There is a variety of marketing board mechanisms in existence in this and every other democratic country. There may be some difference of degree as to whether they are producer elected or state or government appointed. We have in this country examples of both.

My honourable friends, now that they are in government, have every opportunity to lay it on the line. If they really believe that it is practical to attempt to do away with one type of farm commodity marketing board after another, they're free to try to proceed. But I know that even though they have expressed themselves in great philosophic opposition to marketing boards, that they will be very loathe and reluctant to actually put their action where their mouth is. Because, in the final analysis, it has been found through the experience of decades now, that it isn't quite that simple and neat, that the real world of farm commodity production and marketing is one that is complicated enough and subject to the vagaries of the economic cycle and the marketplace to the point where the simplistic approach has proven to be not only disruptive from time to time, but also proven to be most prejudicial and injurious to the producers themselves. Indeed, it isn't as though it was a half-century ago, but well within the lifetime of all of us here, that we know of many farm people, many farm organization people, farmers themselves, who referred to the practice which was quite well entrenched 30, 40, 50 years ago of having an exclusive dependency on the free marketplace coupled with a commodity's speculative exchange, that drove many of them to the brinks of disaster and well beyond in some cases, and into the most grievous kind of maladjustment in agricultural production and rural life. The expression isn't mine. It was used by many people years back referring to the commodity exchanges and the commodity futures, as it bore on agriculture and agricultural production, as the gambling helds of this or that place. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Manitoba Pool Elevators, are organizations which owed their very initial establishment to desperate efforts by farmers to try and do something — something — to grapple with the kind of agriculture that was dominated by the ups and downs, the extreme cycles, the vagaries of the marketplace coupled with speculative commodity exchanges and futures marketing.

Times change of course. Every generation, and if not every generation every second generation, has to relearn the lessons learned by their predecessors, their ancestors. I have no doubt that at some time, some Conservative administration with guts will move to do away with marketing board mechanisms and orderly marketing and market sharing and to try and go back to the "good old system," and after the good old system has been put back in place for a few years, there will be a relentless move afoot to try and reverse that in turn, and so the pendulum of history swings. Because who, in his serious mind, could pretend for a moment that it would somehow work well or even work half-well to go back to the kind of system that we had prior to the establishment

of the Canadian Wheat Board, prior to the establishment of the Manitoba Milk Marketing Board, prior to the establishment of the various farm commodity boards that exist here and in every other province of this country with possibly only one or two provincial exceptions. There's nothing new about all this. What is amazing to me, Sir, is that it seems as though the old English adage is so true, that there comes a generation who learn absolutely nothing or who stubbornly refuse to infer any lessons learned by their immediate predecessors and they have to go through the same type of simplistic philosophy all over again. Well, they have a chance now. How often they spoke in this House belabouring the Minister of Agriculture for his, shall I say in their minds, excessive reliance on market sharing and planned and supply management. They have a chance to undo this and we will see the extent to which they do and we will see the extent to which the fruits that follow that are bitter or sweet.

But the bill that is before us, I, in all candour, can't say that I find anything so unusual in this government moving forward with it. They made a commitment. The commitment may have been ill-conceived. The commitment probably squares with their own peculiar philosophy and so they will proceed with this legislation and in the same breath as they talk about heavy-handedness of the state, they are proceeding to delegate heavy-handedness to an association who, in turn, will have to exercise certain powers thereunder that are tantamount to powers that are administered by a government directly. Indeed, people have every right to ask. If a certain amount of enforcement is unavoidable and deemed to be necessary, standards, collection procedures, investigatory powers, let's all agree that it would be nice — wouldn't it be nice if we could just avoid all that. But if we can't, if we deem that it is somehow necessary, then is it better to delegate that to a group that is only partially responsible to a small segment of society? Or if it is unavoidable, is it better then that it be exercised by a group and by a form who are ultimately accountable to all adults, all of adult age, in society? That is essentially the issue. There are those, you know, who are very unhappy with the extent to which there has been, decades and decades ago, delegation of very substantial powers — only one guess where it was delegated from — of very substantial powers to professional and semi-professional bodies who then proceed to exercise those powers and if any individual feels aggrieved, is redress of grievance any the more, any easier, less difficult or more difficult, through that mechanism than through the political democratic parliamentary or legislative process? Well, that's a mute point, and that is essentially what is caught up here.

That is certainly one of the important features. How the Member for Morris, the Honourable Government House Leader, could interpret this bill as somehow avoiding questions of heavy-handedness and powers of enforcement inspection is beyond me. It's a question simply of who is exercising those powers. Is it by delegation? But let us not pretend that they don't exist. Then too, he chastised us for being somehow, by implication, less democratic than they were, less freedom conscious and less democratic. You know, rhetoric sometimes can be I admit used effectively. If one were to listen passively, one to listen, would very soon get the impression that somehow the Minister of Agriculture was less than democratic, the previous Minister of Agriculture, and all his colleagues, because we had it in mind that a beef marketing board would be beneficial. Not a word, not a whisper about the fact that it was put to the ultimate democratic test without prejudice and making it clear in advance that the determination of this clear and direct method of determining the wishes of the producers would be respected, which is exactly what happened. The essence of democracy and freedom consciousness they have somehow twisted around and stood on its ear. In the meantime, they do the opposite and they make it sound as though it is somehow more democratic and more freedom conscious.

These things never come to an end, Sir, these things merely run in cycles. The problems of agricultural production change over the years, but the essence of them repeat in cyclical pattern, and I'm sure that we haven't heard the last of the debate with respect to farm commodity marketing or the relative preferability of orderly marketing by a marketing board mechanism, versus reliance on the free market and on the commodity futures exchanges.

This problem reoccurs too in its philosophic essence in every other country in the free democracies, every single one of them. I can't think of any exception. A different form in the United States, but farm subsidy by the public purse of certain farm commodities is something that has been an inherent feature of U.S. agriculture for at least as long, and indeed longer than here in Canada.

This is a related issue to the bill before us, and it is one which, at this point, it is just as well that I hark back now to the words of the Minister of Highways, because to take a synopsis of what he said it is as though he was pulling the rug out from under the existence of public policy or government policy to provide various subsidy programs and price support programs for agriculture. He would either have them done away with completely or, I'm sure he was facetious, he would tie them to some kind of a means test or needs test. Now, we know, Sir, if that's how they really feel,

there is a very simple avenue open to them for bringing that about.

The Government of Canada is involved, since 1958, with The Agricultural Product Stabilization Act and under The Agricultural Product Stabilization Act there is provision there for both shallow and deep subsidy of various farm commodities, anything from beans and peas to livestock items.

The whole concept of this legislation, which is 20 years old and on the books, under which subsidies have been paid out by the millions of dollars — I would say it's been such a replete and fully flushed out program, but nevertheless it has been substantial. It is inconceivable that it could work practically if it were tied to some notion of needs or means testing. There is one feature in farm commodity price support which I have always believed was practicable and could be attached to any program of that kind, and that would be to have some maximum or upper limit on volume of production to which any support formula would attach, in order to avoid some of the excesses that have been evident in some of the U.S. farm support programs, which have resulted admittedly in subsidy support cheques in six figures going to one unit of production. That however, is an issue quite different from saying that it should be means or needs tested.

We know that rural depopulation has slowed down. That is good. That's a value judgement, but I would be surprised if many, if not most, legislators whatever their background, rural or urban, would agree that it is not good, it is rather destabilizing to have too rapid an exodus from rural areas and agricultural life.

Well, certainly a farm commodity support program properly conceived and administered could, certainly if not perfectly at least significantly, play a role in slowing any excessive exodus from rural communities and agricultural production. As to what the fine tuning should be on any program that attempts to wrestle or grapple with the problem of rural depopulation that admittedly is a complicated question. But in basic principle it is to my mind inconceivable that any government, any sophisticated government in this day and age, in the last decades of this century, knowing what the price of inputs is in agriculture, knowing what the price acceleration has been in the cost of production, knowing what the past pattern of the past 30 to 40 years has been in terms of rural depopulation, knows that we cannot return to the simple days of yesterday. And even if it were possible it would be, in my opinion, absolutely disgustingly a repetition of the mistakes perpetrated in the past, to go back to a simplistic system that had no place in it for orderly marketing, no place in it for stabilizing occasional intermittent commodity price supports. To have a Minister of the Crown, albeit of a different portfolio, talking about farm commodity price support programs as being inherently subject to abuse, as being inherently biased or prejudiced on the side of waste, being such as to tie them to need or means, is to miss the point entirely.

For these reasons we look upon Bill 25 before us as being misguided on two counts. One, it delegates — if my honourable friends are pre-occupied with heavy-handedness it delegates it, it doesn't remove it. And secondly, the bill really will do nothing in terms of grappling with the fundamental problems of stabilization of price. To merely have promotional advertising is viewed in this context rather a — well, so as to be not too unkind, it is certainly at best an ineffective approach. And for these reasons we just don't find it possible to support Bill 25.

My honourable friends of course have the right to pass it. There's also the right to make changes a few years down the road.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 25, The Cattle Producers Association Act, and the proposed motion of the Member for St. Vital in amendment thereto, that Bill No. 25, The Cattle Producers Association Act, be not now read a second time, but be read this day now six months hence.

QUESTION put on the amendment and lost.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. JORGENSEN: Ayes and nays, Mr Speaker. N

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is Second Reading of Bill No. 25.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Anderson, Axworthy, Brown, Cosens, Craik, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson, Kovnats, Lyon, MacMaster,

Monday, July 10, 1978

McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Spivak, Steen, Wilson.

NAYS: *Messrs. Bostrom, Boyce, Cherniack, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Malinowski, Miller, Parasiuk, Pawley, Schreyer, Uskiw, Walding.*

MR. CLERK: Yeas 30, Nays 20.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there could be some understanding with regard to tomorrow. I imagine the House will sit at 10 o'clock. If Committee is still sitting, would they sit at 2:30?

MR. JORGENSON: The House will sit at 10 tomorrow morning and I will advise my honourable friend how much further it will sit later on tomorrow morning.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.
(Tuesday)