

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 26, 1973

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake, you have 13 minutes.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, having commenced at 5:30, it's always a bit difficult to have the supper hour breaking up in comments one has to make. So I'll continue with the comments that I was making just about 5:30 and I think we're dealing with the funds that this government is going to allocate for land acquisition and I think it's worth repeating that I hope this government doesn't have the thoughts in mind which I was explaining that is the policy that is going on in British Columbia, namely, that if they're going to establish land controls and from what is going on in the mining industry, as I indicated, the possibility of the farmer losing his rights insofar as the mineral rights are concerned and also the example I gave insofar as a farmer who is seeking assistance to establish himself in the farming business. I'm given to understand that there are a few who are not that secure and it's a risky business insofar as the department is concerned when establishing to loan funds to someone who doesn't have any security, or doesn't have any money in the business to start with.

There's another area, Mr. Chairman, that I noticed that the Minister completely overlooked and that is the AI Program that has been -- we had hoped we would have heard about long before this. This is an area in which I have had a number of complaints from farmers not only in my own area but my colleagues have had complaints from their constituents in their respective constituencies, and I want to remind the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that when we were government we thought we'd established that program and had it ready to go. Namely, Mr. Chairman, the people concerned were the beef cattlemen, the farmers who were in the business of producing pure bred cattle, the farmers who were in the business of producing dairy cattle, were all pretty well unanimous insofar as the policy of the AI program was concerned in Manitoba. And to date we've heard nothing about what is going on in the Minister's department. I don't know why nothing has been -- no announcements have been forthcoming from him. I'm wondering whether there's some problem in the setting up of the administration of the AI Program. I don't know but I'd certainly be interested in hearing from the Minister. But I'm wondering here again whether he is trying to dictate policy to this group or just what is the problem. It would be interesting hearing from the Minister on this matter.

Another matter, Mr. Chairman, is his coarse grains boards that he established. We didn't hear anything on that particular part of his agricultural program. I have talked to a number of farmers who are in the market for selling oats and barley only to find that they don't all have trucks large enough to haul oats and barley, say a hundred or two hundred miles because say, Mr. Chairman, if a farmer at the west end of the province finds that he has a market say down in the area of my good friend from La Verendrye and if he wants to hire a trucker to haul barley or oats, the maximum amount that trucker can charge is 10 cents a hundred, which would be roughly 5 cents a bushel on a bushel of barley. And this, Mr. Chairman, is just impossible for any trucker to provide a service to farmers at that rate, and I am given to understand through the regulations that's the maximum amount that he can charge. I would like the Minister to answer to those farmers who are in that predicament. If they don't have a truck of their own how are they going to get someone to haul it for that kind of money?

I also want to say that in this regard I can recall over the winter months I have seen advertisements in the farm papers where the commission has been advertising asking the farmers to use that facility and, Mr. Chairman, the advertisement was such that I was given the impression that the commission was just pleading with the farmers to use that utility. In other words, I don't think they thought very much of it. I know, Mr. Chairman, there are farmers who are in the market for buying grain and are very concerned and very angry about the compulsory aspect of that particular bit of legislation. They don't like it and I don't know whether anyone is breaking the law but I must say, Mr. Chairman, that if the Minister is going to enforce this particular part of his program, he'd have to have police officers all over the province to see that it is enforced. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that when we have to resort to that sort of thing our agricultural industry becomes in real serious jeopardy insofar as this government is concerned.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I realize that certainly things have improved for our agricultural industry in the recent months, and I want to just make comment also of the comments the

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) Minister made in regards to the publicity that our meats have been receiving over the past number of days and he suggests that he hopes that we wouldn't get caught in the bind by going along with the pledges that certain people have been asked to sign in order that they might bring down the price of red meats. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I can assure the Minister that I won't be caught in that bind, but I had hoped that he would have made some statement on behalf of the farmers. I would have hoped that he would have made some statement on behalf of the farmers before this.

And you know, my colleague the Member for Lakeside asked a question of the First Minister today in regards to this very matter and the First Minister indicated, he suggested that farm prices had a good deal of catching up to do, and he agreed that the farm prices have been long overdue in reaching the proper perspective in order that farmers could compete and pay the prices of commodities and things they had to buy. But he suggested it was because of past farm policies that the farmer -- where the situation was as it is today. Now then, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Minister of Agriculture I recall him saying, and he did not deny this to be a fact, and I believe it was in November of 1971 when he made a public statement and said, that if his party were in power in Ottawa at that time, he said things wouldn't be one bit different today. And so I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there's a conflict of interests between the Minister of Agriculture and his Leader, the First Minister. When the First Minister replied to my colleague from . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. A point of privilege has been made. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I don't believe the honourable member is right in imputing and alleging certain things that may or may not be accurate. Unless he has documentation to back up what he is suggesting, I would suggest that he restrain himself.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I see the Minister of Agriculture is not very comfortable when I make these comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. EINARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have this document in writing. I hope I can trust those people that I do get information from, that they are reliable, I think in the same way that the Minister of Agriculture will do. And so, Mr. Chairman, while he might say he might -- he can stand up in this House and deny it because that's his right and that's his privilege. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that he's got to get out on a public platform sometime and deny those charges. That's a challenge that he will have to face and I want to say to him that I'm prepared to accept that challenge as well.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the whole thing is a matter of political philosophy here, Mr. Chairman. And just to recap some of the things that I said in my original comments about marketing boards, and I want to clarify this because I know the Minister of Agriculture can take words that we say on this side of the House, twist them around, misinterpret in a way that he's going to get the people in the country to believe what he wants them to believe. And so, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Minister of Agriculture and to the farmers of this province that as far as I'm concerned, and I know my colleagues in the Conservative Party and I say again and I won't add one word, so that the Minister cannot misconstrue my comments, that I am not in favour of compulsory marketing boards as such; and I also want to qualify my position because when we were government we did develop, or at least there were marketing boards developed, but on a voluntary basis. We don't have that situation today, Mr. Chairman, under the Minister of Agriculture.

A MEMBER: That's not true.

MR. EINARSON: I also want to say, Mr. Chairman, and make it abundantly clear to the farmers of this province that if a certain commodity group whether it be egg producers, whether it be pork producers, or cattle producer, or what have you, if they want to establish a marketing board I will not stand in their way, but it must be done on a voluntary basis, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to make one other comment, Mr. Chairman. A little story I'd like to tell the honourable gent on the other side. A story that a free enterpriser was having a friendly visit with a socialist friend of his and they were discussing a number of things and of course it got into the political sphere and this free enterpriser, who was a Conservative, said to his socialist friend, he says, "You know, if you had a couple of million dollars," he says, "what

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) would you do with it?" "Oh," this socialist friend said, "I'd probably keep a million and give the other million to some poor people." So this free enterpriser said to his socialist friend, "If you had a couple of houses what would you do with them?" "Well", he says, "I'd probably have one for myself and give one to some poor family." And you know, Mr. Chairman, he asked a third question. He said to this socialist friend, "If you had two pair of pants what would you do with them?" He said, "I have two pair and I'm keeping them both."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I simply want to pursue a couple of questions that the Honourable Member refused to yield to earlier. (a) He made some ado about knowing prices that producers receive, and I'm wondering whether he can tell me what price he is going to get for his wheat, oats, or barley, in the current crop year? Whether he can give me that information. And the second point has to do with the Marketing Act. He had alleged certain things about the powers that the government is using under the National Products Marketing Act and that he didn't think it was right for the government to ask for information from the processing industry. Does he know -- I would like to know whether he realizes that that Act was on the books for many many years, even during the time that his government was in office, and I'm wondering whether they intended to use it.

A MEMBER: That's not the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. USKIW: . . . no answer.

A MEMBER: . . . he asked a couple of questions.

MR. WATT: I'll give the Minister the answer right now. Mr. Chairman, before I start my speech I'll give the answer to my honourable friend. The Canadian Wheat Board . . .

MR. USKIW: . . . is to answer a couple of questions and I would hope that he would undertake to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member has voluntarily vacated the floor and I have already recognized another member. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

A MEMBER: Shame.

MR. WATT: Before I start my speech, and it's just a few remarks, Mr. Chairman. The Minister should know, the Minister should know that the Canadian Wheat Board that is handling wheat, oats and barley, there was a referendum held and the farmers voted at that time to give the authority to the Canadian Wheat Board to sell their wheat, oats and barley. This is not the case of the Pork that is going to Japan.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I really made my remarks on agriculture during the debate on the Throne Speech but the Minister has prompted me to make a few remarks tonight particularly when he opened his remarks by pleading with the Opposition to go along with him in his farm programs which are in effect, the continuation of the farm programs which I have pointed out, and my colleagues have, programs that were started by the Conservative Government.

You mentioned your new programs today -- I'll have something to say about what really . . . in a moment. But the Minister in appealing for a non-political debate, and using agriculture as a political football, this I am quite in agreement with but I want to go back, Mr. Chairman, a few years, which the Minister did and he talked about conditions as of and from 1968, and I recall, Mr. Speaker, in those two years, parts of those two years that I was Minister of Agriculture, that probably no Minister of Agriculture ever faced the problems that Manitoba did at that time with low prices for our produce, and with tough and damp grain, millions of bushels of it in the province, and with a pile-up of wheat in Vancouver, where the Deputy Minister and I went to have a look at and where the Minister ridiculed that trip. He didn't go to Vancouver, or any place else in Canada, to find out about markets or the outlets, or the transportation of our grain, but he ridiculed that trip at that time, as did the Senator in Ottawa now, Senator Molgat, who was then the leader of the Liberal Party, and as did Ken Singleton who was then at the head of what was then the Manitoba Farm Union, and none of them at that time realized, and the Minister today I don't think realizes even though he has talked about the co-operation with the three prairie provinces, that the fact is that when you take a pail of water out of a trough that it doesn't leave a hole at one end insofar as the marketing of our grain through the Canadian Wheat Board, and I'm sure that my honourable friend, my educated friend over there, should be able to see through that. He has known --

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. WATT cont'd) (Interjection) -- I think my honourable friend heard what I said.

But anyway, at that time, I remember the criticism and I recall, I recall bringing in the leaders of all farm organizations, the agri-people -- who are the terrible group that these people on this side of the House, the Socialists, think are taking a rip-off from everybody but themselves -- and the railway people, to try to arrive at some conclusion of what we might do to alleviate the situation at that time. And I remember very well, Mr. Chairman, the problems that I faced at that time, and I recall coming into this Legislature one morning puzzled, and I must say distracted to some extent as what should and could be done, and I stopped for a moment and I had a chat with Moses, and it so happened, Mr. Speaker, that he was pointing in the same direction that day that he is pointing in tonight, towards where the Brokenhead member used to sit, and he says, "You know it took me 40 years to lead the Egyptians out of the bullrushes, why talk to me? Why don't you go over and talk to the Member for Brokenhead, he can do it overnight." Four years later, Mr. Chairman, I said -- I'm telling my honourable friend through you, Mr. Chairman, what Moses said to me that morning. He said that it took him 40 years to lead the Egyptians out of the bullrushes. -- (Interjection) -- Maybe my honourable friend knows more about it than I do, I'm just saying what Moses said to me that day. But I'm also telling my honourable friend that after four years that we are now deeper in the bullrushes than we ever were . . .

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. WATT: . . . and that we have an organization now within the Department of Agriculture, 83 new ones last year, and I don't know how many the year before, or the year before that, but there's probably a couple of hundred, -- (Interjection) -- I'm speaking at the moment, if my honourable friend will just sit down, I'm speaking at the moment. There's probably a couple of hundred of them or more in the Department of Agriculture headed by, what's his name, is it Bill Janssen, or some such person, a school teacher I believe, who is throwing, shovelling with his new group, carrots into the bullrushes where the farmer still remains. -- (Interjection) -- Political carrots, my honourable friend, political carrots.

A MEMBER: And a few turnips too.

MR. WATT: I'd like to come up for just a moment about some of these carrots that are being shovelled into the bullrushes where the farmers still are insofar as the Minister of Agriculture and his government is concerned. Let's talk for a few minutes about items, policies that my honourable friend is talking about, \$100.00 for each farmer -- I believe that was one of the first policies; that hasn't carried on. That just carried for the one year. I believe that was the year of by-elections wasn't it? \$100.00.

We have further new programs now; programs to give jobs to those people who are either out of work or are on welfare or are on unemployment insurance. These people that were supposed to have jobs after four years, these people that the government on that side of the House when they were in opposition said, when we get the reins of government we will see to it that our industry is expanded and that our people are put to work and that there will be no unemployment. This is what they said when they were on this side of the House, and after four -- my honourable friend says it's nonsense, but it's in the book. Do you want me to stop and go through Hansard and find out some of the ridiculous speeches that they made at that time. My little friend up there wasn't in the House at that time so he wouldn't know. But I recall. So that after four years we now have programs to give jobs to people who have not got work, who expected to get work in the industry that was supposed to have been developed and expanded in the Province of Manitoba, that has not moved in four years. And how are we employing these people? I'd like to commend the Minister for what he is doing at the moment because of the fact that there are unemployment, there are more people on welfare, more people unemployed, more people on -- (Interjection) -- more people in the bullrushes, my honourable friend says. So here we have now this group of people going out and working at the expense of the taxpayer, of 90 percent of the taxpayers, to do work for those people who will be paying for it, who are getting the work done for them now at no expense but through the taxes will be paying for it. My honourable friend can disagree with me if he likes, on this point but it is a fact. I said to my honourable friend that I am not objecting to him doing it at this time, what I am objecting to is of the fact that they are here now, are unemployed, there are people on unemployment insurance, and there are people on welfare that were not supposed to be there according to those who are sitting over there now that were sitting over

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. WATT cont'd) here four years ago -- political carrots, no programs,

Again as I did on the Throne Speech I have to commend the Minister on the developing or the further developing of the Crop Insurance Program, and of the Veterinary Services Program, which I did at that time during the Throne Speech, programs that were established, and were established as such that the Minister could do no other than develop them. They just naturally fell into line.

As far as the Credit Corporation is concerned we had forced the Federal Government into that time into offering a better deal than what Manitoba was offering then, or are offering now, to the point where naturally my honourable friend is phasing out long-term loans for the purchase of land in an effort of course to convert into diversified farming. That is no new program; that program was developing and has developed as a direct result of the Credit Corporation that was set up by George Hutton and carried on by my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, and through my time as Minister of Agriculture, into the time of the Minister of Agriculture at present.

It's true, it's a fact -- (Interjection) --

A MEMBER: No more phasing out than you're phasing out right about now.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, the, and this has been mentioned by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and my friend from Rock Lake, in regard to the possibility, the probability of takeover of our land which is happening up in British Columbia -- I believe the bill has been passed now and I believe that it is law -- that the whole Province of British Columbia has become a green belt under the direct control of the government, and the land will be divided and sub-divided as it is in India for instance where they have socialism a little bit more advanced than it is here at the moment. It has come slow but it is coming. The takeover in India has already taken place and now what they are doing in India is they are delinking, they don't use the work "takeover" there in India, they delink. Once they have taken over, then they start to delink, and as it applies to agriculture and as it applies now apparently by legislation in British Columbia, a farmer in India under the present legislation could own 30 acres of land. Those farmers who were progressive and were providing what little food is provided in India, were holding up to 200 acres -- that was a large farm -- so in order to keep that viable unit together they were forced not to disregard the law but simply to divide their land up between their sons and their cousins and their wives and their girlfriends or concubines, or what have you, in order to hand onto the 200 acres, but there is legislation now that is going to -- (Interjection) -- did I say concubines? I thought it was girlfriends. Legislation now is before the Parliament of India which will provide 30 acres of land per family. This is what they call delinking and I'm sure that the Member for Rock Lake is perfectly right and the Member for Lakeside when we can see under socialism that this is exactly what is coming, we are going to be delinked.

I want to speak just briefly on water conservation. I spoke on this briefly when the Mines and Natural Resources Estimates were up and the Minister at that time didn't seem to know too much about dams or drains or what have you, and referred it to probably the Estimates of the Minister of Agriculture, and I see headlines in the Tribune "Water Storage First -- Uskiw" and then a story about water conservation as it applies particularly to the area south of us. But he says Water Storage First and we have the Water Resources Program on our desks now which lists 40 major water programs in the Province of Manitoba, and there are 40 programs of drainage -- either drainage or directly in respect of drainage, a bridge over a drain, or dyking along a drain, or a new drain, or further construction, or directing of a drain, but 40 drainage programs -- no water conservation but the Minister says, "Water Storage First."

I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources could get together and decide what they are going to do. Like everything else, are they going to drain all the water out of the province or are they going to conserve some? They are draining our business out of the province; they are draining almost everything out of the province that is productive, almost everything, except of course the expansion of the Civil Service, political appointments -- they are not draining that. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should have some statement from the Minister if there is going to be and when, any water conservation programs in the Province of Manitoba besides the regulation of Lake Winnipeg.

-- (Interjection) --

The Minister wouldn't know whether they are draining or not. Mr. Speaker, I want to

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. WATT cont'd) . . . talk about a few more carrots in a moment. --(Interjection)-- Yes it's agriculture but I'm talking about political carrots, and I'm talking to vegetables, not vegetating them, just talking to vegetables and I might, probably just as well to be talking to, well maybe to Moses up there, I might be getting more response I wouldn't. --(Interjection)-- no not right now, I'm sorry.

The Minister of Agriculture has pointed out another major program, and this program is water and sewage disposal in the Province of Manitoba. Now I don't know if you would call this Water Conservation or not, but he's talking about grants to communities, and I suppose that he's talking about grants to towns and villages throughout the province, and I'm wondering what his position is going to be with those towns and villages, and there are many of them, who have for the past, and as far back as 12 to 13 years ago, put in their own water and sewage into their towns and villages, and they paid their own shot, and they still are paying. Can the Minister tell us if those towns and villages now that are going to be given outright grants to put in water and sewage, if they are going to be subsidized to taxation by those towns and villages that have already put in water and sewage and paid for, paid the shot themselves, undertook a capital expenditure under debenture issue, some as high as 35 years debenture issues, or if he's going to say to these towns and villages that we will adjust your water rates in according to the water rates that will be charged to those against those towns and villages who are getting outright grants. Now I'm not saying that I think it's not right that a town or village should get a grant to put in water and sewage. It's a nice program. It's a nice political program in those areas. But what I want to know from the Minister is if those people with initiative to go ahead and put in their own water and sewage, if there is going to be any adjustment on the water rates that they are being charged in order to amortize the cost of the water and sewage that they have paid part of and part of as against them at this time.

These are a few things that I did not mention in the Throne Speech, Mr. Chairman. I could go on into some other areas and take some time.

I'm wondering, when the Minister made his remarks he talked about the takeover and the handling of insecticides, chemicals, and he indicated that those farmers -- pardon me, those business people who presently were handling insecticides and pesticides and chemicals for farm use, that those businessmen presently handling these commodities were going to be allowed to continue to handle them. Now is it going to be the case that that business will continuously handle this produce, the two-way government central distributing area, or is it going to be another Autopac deal where the agents that existed at the time that the bill was passed were allowed to carry on and handle Autopac but who would be phased out if the business changed hands? Is it going to be the same deal? Is it going to be a deal like Autopac whereby eventually if this government were to stay in power long enough that every insurance agent in Manitoba will be phased out because of the fact when he sells his business Autopac doesn't go with it? Is it going to be the case with insecticides and pesticides and other chemicals, when a business is sold in my home town where they handle pesticides or chemicals for farm use, when he sells that business is the sale of this produce going to go with the business or is it going to be like Autopac? Can the Minister answer? Is the matter a case of delinking, of simply wiping out gradually and slowly all the small businesses in the Province of Manitoba? The honourable members opposite talk about decentralizing. Are they decentralizing the Autopac industry? Are they going to decentralize the chemical industry? Are they going to decentralize the drug industry insofar as veterinary services are concerned? This is what I'd like to know. The Minister avoided saying, said since that they were going to offer drugs . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Five minutes.

MR. WATT: Thank you. That they were going to offer drugs at a lower rate. I naturally assumed that probably the people who were selling drugs for animal use throughout the province would be allowed to continue to sell the drugs through their agency but are they going to be phased out as their business is phased out, as businesses are being phased out all over the Province of Manitoba? Or again, is it going to be the same case as Autopac insurance? What I want to know, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister, from the government, eventually, if such should happen, if we have another miscarriage in the Province of Manitoba and this government should be re-elected provincially that the industry in the whole Province of Manitoba is going to be delinked and phased out and centralized in the City of Winnipeg under the direct control of a Socialist government. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Thank you. I couldn't hear you, Mr. Chairman, on the first instance. I was indeed delighted to hear the Minister make the opening remarks of his department. Agriculture is close to my heart and I think too many of the members on this side are actually engaged in the business of farming, if we get around to it when we're not in session.

First of all, I would like to compliment the Minister on his nice picture in the report, it's quite nice and in fact -- too bad he didn't include all the members of this House in the report especially those that are involved in agriculture. I do wish to congratulate those that are working in the department. Probably I don't get to see them as often as I should and do not know all of them because we've had a number of changes, if I am correct, and therefore I feel actually that we should have a practice whereby at least the senior officers in the department would be introduced at some kind of function where all members would get together so at least that we would get to know the senior officials in each of the departments. I think this should be arranged for in some way, so that we would know the people that are working at the top level of the various departments.

I was hoping that the Minister would give us an account of farm income in Manitoba the last year. When we look at the report it's almost a year old and certainly we would like to deal with more current matters than some of the listings in the report. I did get a copy of the Farm Cash Receipts October 1972 and I notice from this report, this is only for a nine month period, but we take a look at the year '68 we had 61 million; in '69 there was 59 million; in 1970 - 62 million; in '71 it was 61 million and in '72 it was 81 million, almost a 33 percent increase over the year before. This is very good indeed and I don't know, in some way the government just has it thrown in their lap that they seem to end up with a very good year just before election. -- (Interjection) -- the Member for Thompson says this was planned that way. Well I don't think you can plan a matter of good crops and marketing, it's not all done by governments. -- (Interjection) -- Well, when you look at some of the other crops such as barley, 31 million last year, or in '72 and 25 the previous year. Flax, flax we had a we had a lower income though it was 10.4 million for the nine months of '72, where it was almost 13 million the year before. But on the whole the 1972 figure shows \$376 million where it was 303 million the year before. So there is a very considerable increase and I'm sure that the farmers of this province no doubt are feeling it because I hear from certain people who want to buy new farm machinery, new tractors, that some of the companies are sold out and that they can't get any new tractors. But at the same time while it might seem very good for the moment, I just wonder whether at this time when things are better that we shouldn't be preparing for an occasion where it could not be so good; and mind you, that could happen even this year if we don't get sufficient rainfall. Certainly we could have a very small crop because we already are experiencing a year where we have no reserves, no moisture at all, especially in my area.

And when I see that we're increasing the minimum wage from time to time in Manitoba, I think we should also provide for a minimum income for the farmer, that we should have floor prices and I see no reason why we couldn't have a floor price for wheat in Manitoba. For the amount of wheat that we're producing in Manitoba we could have a floor price of \$2.00 any day, it wouldn't be all that costly. Because our production I think -- I read somewhere was around -- yes I had the figure, I think it was 70 million bushels the year before and the year previous to that it was way down, it was I think 30 million. So that the cost of a floor price for Manitoba farmers -- and this could be in conjunction with the payments that are made by the Canadian Wheat Board to supplement the income so that the farmer would be assured of at least \$2.00 a bushel for his wheat.

We find that the Ontario producer has over all these years has received \$2.00 and more for his wheat. I certainly would like to hear from the Minister of Agriculture who must be conversant with the Ontario Wheat Board which is a provincial thing the way I understand it, I would like to hear from him what he thinks of their operations and whether we should not -- well should we divorce ourselves from the Canadian Wheat Board and have a provincial wheat board and then we could probably reap some of the benefits of the Churchill Port so that we would benefit directly as Manitoba farmers from the development of that Port; whereas now this is not the case. I too feel quite strongly on this because labour, not only

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. FROESE cont'd) farm labour, where those people have the minimum wage, everyone else's wages are increasing year after year. Six percent is very often not being acceptable to many people. You find that the teachers are striking, when six percent is offered they want more. And that's with many teachers who are already receiving \$15,000 - \$20,000 a year. I'm sure that when we heard the Member for La Verendrye saying that the farmer's income was \$5,000 or something like that, \$5,200, that we're way under many people's income. I feel that we should be looking for some way of increasing the farmers income and stabilizing it too.

We had a stabilization program proposed to us by the Canadian Government at one time and I think our government here at that time had a counter proposal. I would like to hear from him whether any negotiations have been carried on in the meantime. Are there any further proposals going to be made? Are there any changes envisioned at the present time? What is the score on this? Certainly I think we should be brought up to date on this important matter too.

I would also like to have the Minister provide us with the report on the ARDA programs. I think these are centered in his department and in other years, in past years we've had a special report of the various ARDA programs and how we're coming along on them. I notice that the Water Services Program which is one of the ARDA programs and is financed 50/50 with the Province and the Federal Government and I feel that we could probably do more in this particular program than we are. I think we should be using the amounts that we are making available to farmers for this purpose because \$300 certainly doesn't go very far, I think, as the Minister has pointed out, it's a program that is being accepted by the people and I feel that we could increase the amount that is presently available to them under this program.

He mentioned that the Agriculture Credit Program was being revised and that they were changing the program. In my opinion, I'm not ready at this point to have the government completely discontinue making loans to farmers for the purpose of purchasing land. I think as long as we're in there as well as the federal organization there's a certain amount of competition and once the farmers will not be able to realize under this program they will just have to go to Ottawa and then they are completely at the mercy of the Federal program. Personally I feel that we should have an option, we should remain in there so that those farmers who are more readily able then to get a loan from our corporation even though it might be more costly, still why should we close it out. If I look at the report I find that on the last sheet of the report it says that loans approved but not disbursed at March 31, '72 amounted \$3.4 million. No doubt this will have changed since then. I would like to know from the Minister just what the situation is at the present time. Are most of them taken care of by now or do we have still a block of applications on hand that are requesting funds for those purposes?

Then, too, he mentioned the land lease arrangement. Here I certainly would like to have some more information on this program. Just what do we understand by land lease. When I looked at the amount of acreages I think that they repossessed or took possession of under the program it is very small and I wonder if the Minister could not inform us as to what kind of process they have, when they lease it back are the people just put on salary or is it on a crop-share basis or on what basis is the land leased back to the farmers where the government is taking possession of or taking control of the lands in the loans that are in arrears.

Then no doubt the Minister -- Oh before I leave that, maybe he could give us an overall explanation of the direction of this policy and also probably could give us his ideas of the Saskatchewan Plan, because no doubt he's full conversant with that, and whether they're proposing anything of that type or planning anything of that type for Manitoba.

I happened to be at the Paliser Wheat Growers Convention earlier this year and there they had the Minister of Agriculture appear before the conference and he had to defend himself. He had quite a lot of opposition, stiff opposition at the meeting thrown at him in connection with their program. Apparently it wasn't all together finalized and that there were still areas that they hadn't finalized and were thinking of probably amending or so on. So that certainly it would be of interest to hear from the Minister on this very thing.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

I would also like to hear from him when they meet as agriculture Ministers with other provinces, what are the concerns and are we in agreement with other provinces when meetings of this type take place? Certainly they must have a wide range of programs that they will be discussing. I'm sure that we would be interested to hear from him on areas where we disagree or also areas where we can agree and what are the trends, what is contemplated for the future?

I notice from the report that the Crop Insurance has done very well indeed for the year '72 -- year ending March 31, '72 I should say, I don't know what the situation is for the last year but certainly we had a surplus of a million and a half on the general operations and even the hail insurance had a surplus of \$163, 000; so I think both those programs are on a sound basis right now or at least were at the time. I wonder if the Minister could bring us up-to-date on those as well, if he has the information available by this time. I'm sure he must have a rough idea of the situation.

Then, too, I notice from the report that the ag reps have been quite busy on the Regional Analysis Program. I note from the Central Region that includes the area that I represent, 120 days I think were spent by the ag rep on that program. This seems very high to me for the value that has come out of it -- or at least I have heard very little value coming out of that program. Could the Minister tell us of anything of real value that has come out and that can be useful in the future, out of this whole program? When we spend that much time, and if 120 days were spent by the ag rep of my area, I am just wondering whether this was the case in other areas, and what are the proposals, how can the information be used to advantage in the years to come?

There is mention made of a study of a vegetable oil plant at Pilot Mound. This is more than a year ago, I imagine nothing came out of it because I haven't heard of anything since. However last year there was mention of another vegetable oil plant for the northwest part of the province and for awhile I think there were people in our area that owned a vegetable oil extracting plant at Altona. I think, well I don't know whether I should use the word "irrigated" but at least they were probably concerned as to what was happening and I wonder if the Minister could also bring us up-to-date on that, whether this is the business of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Most likely the two departments work together on this. If the ag reps are working on such a thing in one area, I am sure that the Ministers concerned of the two departments must be conversant with the situation.

The member for, I think the Member for La Verendrye mentioned the migration off the farms. Is the government giving serious consideration to this whole thing? Certainly when we look at the program that was put out by the National Grain where the receiving points for grain delivery are supposed to be reduced from 1, 900 points in Western Canada to 280 this must be of concern to the government and to the people in the Agriculture Department.

Then too, with the migration off the farms, what does the Minister envision ten years from now? Where will we get the necessary farmers to do the work? And would he also give us some information as to the farm labour supply. In past years there was part of the report, at least there was mention made in the report of the situation. I don't find anything in the report to date. I checked the Minister of Labour's report and I didn't find anything on farm labour in his report. I stand to be corrected if he will say so later on, but on going over it, I didn't see anything in it. I don't think it concerns the Minister of Labour so much -- (Interjection) -- it does? -- (Interjection) -- I see. But I feel that this is a serious matter. Certainly we wouldn't want to see our province a desolate province with probably 4 or 5 big centres and no farmers in between. I certainly would not like to see this, and if we are going to follow the course that they are presently one by closing down these . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 9:00 o'clock, according to our House Rule 19 sub (2) the last hour of every day shall be Private Members Hour. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply directs me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour Monday night. The first item is Private Members' Resolutions. We are on Resolution 4. The Honourable Member for Thompson has 16 minutes to go. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, when I left off speaking I think I just was on the resolution for four minutes and I had not looked at all the resolutions closely and on checking I find that Resolution No. 8 proposed by the Member for La Verendrye is fairly close, except it's got a little more teeth and a little more specific. I hope before we deal with them that there will probably be a merging of the two or perhaps somebody will incorporate one into the other, because I believe that it is essential that some such resolution be dealt with in this House and that way we can draw the government out and let them state their position. We've heard the Minister of Labour's position but I think that the only way we'll find out what the government's position is, is by having a vote on it.

Before I go any further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter into the record which will probably answer a lot of questions of those who are concerned about this matter. It's dated July 17, 1972 and this was an ad in the Tribune, "Civil Servants Opposed to the Right to Strike". It's addressed to the Honourable Edward Schreyer, Premier, Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, and the letter goes as follows: "Dear Mr. Schreyer: At this time when labour legislation is undergoing legislative scrutiny and probable change and when the question of strike privileges for public servants is a matter of public discussion, it is appropriate that our Association which represents the public service of the province clearly define its position on this issue and disclose its related concern."

"We have clearly indicated to the Minister of Labour in previous communications that our Association does not seek, nor does it want the right to strike. A survey of our members taken in 1970 showed clearly that the greater majority are of this opinion. To reinforce this decision the governing body of our organization recently instructed the executive members to take appropriate action to make this position emanently clear to the government. We were also instructed to insure that the people of Manitoba were equally informed since they are in the final analysis those whom we serve.

Our Association after close examination considers the strike in the public service to be ineffective, destructive and philosophically unacceptable as a method of dispute settling. We have provided your government, through Mr. Paulley, with recent evidence to support this assessment. While the proposed legislation specifically exempts civil service, it has been stated that your government intends to extend this right to strike to public servants next year. Obviously this is clearly in opposition to our stated desires. However, the mere granting of this right would not pose a critical problem to us since the legislation did not at the same time destroy our right to choose binding arbitration as our elected method of dispute settlement. On our initiation compulsory binding arbitration was negotiated into the Civil Service Act some four years ago. There appears to be a clear threat to this privilege in the present legislation." That was bill 81 section 70 subsection (2).

"Should the government even with some exemptions use this vehicle to confer the right to strike on civil servants as a whole they would inevitably force strikes in the public service of Manitoba. We submit that such a course of action would be severely destructive to the morale of the service and the image of government and to the related trust and confidence of the public at large. Sincerely yours, The Manitoba Government Employees Association, signed J. S. Howden, President."

Mr. Speaker, there is one group that doesn't want the government's benevolent help and we have had a great deal of discussion on what are essential services. I don't think one has to be an intellectual heavyweight to realize what is essential, what is not; there may be some fringe occupations which we can discuss, but surely there are some services in this province that all of us can agree that should be placed in that category.

Here we have an example of employees that are serving the public, whether it's snow

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) ploughing highways in a snow storm or the farm bureau, or the medical bureau, whatever it may be, all of them saying that we want to have binding arbitration. That may go against the grain of the trade unionists, and I as a trade unionist certainly understand that, nevertheless the employees have certain rights and if they indicate they do not want the right to strike then certainly the government must respect it. It shouldn't be forced on them by an over-protective mother hen, as the Minister of Labour sometimes likes to cast himself in that role. I think that it's important that we at some point, and perhaps this is a good one, since we are going into an election, this is perhaps a good session to deal with the problem of what essential services are.

I regret again that the Member for Emerson who put in the resolution did not specify, perhaps someone will amend it and will specify; I have not been shy or ashamed to indicate that I feel that there are at least three categories of groups in our province and in any province who are absolutely essential to life and death -- that is the doctors, the policemen and the firemen. I believe I have given my reasons for it and I'm sure if we took a roll call in this house there are other members that may consider other services essential, but surely on these three groups of people that I have indicated there shouldn't be very much discussion as to whether they are essential. We all remember the chaos and anarchy and terror by the criminals and the irresponsible groups in Montreal when they went on a one or two day strike a few years ago.

I'm sure that the people of Manitoba do not want that to occur; I am sure that the Minister of Labour would not wish that to happen in Winnipeg or in Thompson or any place else. We don't want strikes on demand for any reason, at any time. We don't want Manitoba to become a Las Vegas type of operation where you have divorces on demand. We don't want a situation where you can have strikes on demand in any industry at any time. The essential services must be protected.

I recall reading an article recently where someone said if you are going to do something you should do it in style, and they were referring to a person who was going to sail. He said, if you are going to go on the Titanic you should go first class, and I think if the Minister wants to sink then he should go first class, he should have the courage to get up in this House and indicate that it is going to be wide open and he's prepared to sink with that legislation. And if that happens, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to shed many tears, but I am concerned that he may sink the civil service and the people will suffer in the process because he wants to show labour and he wants to show all of Canada what a great progressive minister he is. And I must say, Sir, that he is a very progressive person but he gets carried away with his own oratory and his own sense of importance perhaps, and it's unfortunate that a person can get carried away to the point where he wants to re-make labour legislation in Canada which took 100 years to evolve to this point, to re-make it in four years. I hope that the Minister will have second thoughts and I hope that the government, some of the ministers will get up and indicate their position on essential services. Thank you.

. Continued on next page.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR
Resolution No. 4

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, following the words of wisdom that I have just listened to from my friend from Thompson I feel that I must say a word or two in regard to the Resolution that we have before us suggested by the Honourable Member for Emerson.

I think what I should do first of all, Mr. Speaker - and I know that we are limited in time at this moment and on this resolution to 20 minutes - but I think what I should do first of all is establish and put the record straight as far as the attitude of the Manitoba Government Employees Association and the ad that they placed in the paper that my friend referred to. I have that ad in my office. I also have evidence to the effect that the previous executive of the Manitoba Government Employees Association had also suggested to me that they did not desire to go on strike, and I want to inform the House that I have no desire for anyone to go on strike. I am firmly convinced that if you have a proper basis of employee - employer relationship that is the only way in which you will abolish strikes, be they legal or illegal.

In previous discussions and in discussions with the previous executive of the MGEA the matter of the right to strike was discussed in my office on a few occasions -- and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend the Member for Thompson and also other honourable members in this Assembly would only take the time out to take a look at Bill 81, they would find in there that there is a provision in any collective agreement for a section in that collective agreement to have either the right to strike or the right to have contained within the collective agreement a different methodology of resolving disputes. I pointed this out on a number of occasions to other people; I pointed it out to the representatives of the government employees, that if within their collective agreement, indeed in any collective agreement in our Labour Law of Manitoba, there is a clause for the final settlement of industrial disputes, that that particular provision in the collective agreement supersedes the law. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, that should be sufficient. Why should we as an Assembly legislate citizens into a position of being second-class citizens. Should a man or a woman who simply by their vocation undertake to be a worker on Hydro, a worker as referred to by my friend from Thompson on a highway patrol, be deprived of the same rights that my honourable friend the Member for Thompson when working as a steel-worker had the right and exercised his right to belong to the United Steelworkers of America? I have a union card too; although I am now retired I still pay my dues to the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, an essential service, the Canadian National Railway, and it went on strike at one time and it was ordered back to work by the Supreme -- (Interjection) -- to work, thanks. It was ordered back to work by the Supreme governing body of Canada, the Parliament of Canada.

I have stated, Mr. Speaker, time after time that this Assembly is the Supreme body governing Manitoba and that if it becomes necessary for action to be taken to deprive individuals of their collective bargaining rights, then this Assembly should be called in to consider of that.

MR. BILTON: Who decides?

MR. PAULLEY: The Assembly decides, the Assembly decides on the solution of the issue. The government of course, the government of course decides when a session will be called, that's true. But, Mr. Speaker, what's wrong with that? Isn't it true that the government, this government has been responsible for the enactment of laws dealing with auto insurance and many other factors that are important. We had that responsibility, we have that responsibility, and surely my honourable friend that spoke, the Member for Portage la Prairie, would not I am sure on reflection think that we would not face up in the matter of a dispute in the so-called public sector, to face our responsibilities. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, again, again may I ask my honourable friends to take a look at the Labour Relations Act for they will find a clause in that Act which makes it a requirement for the signers of a collective agreement two weeks before the termination of that collective agreement, to inform the Minister of Labour as to the state of negotiations, as to whether they're carrying on or not; for the very reason, Mr. Speaker, that the government through the Minister of Labour is knowledgeable of what the industrial climate is.

But Mr. Speaker, we speak, we speak of essential service, the public service. My honourable friend for Thompson points out that this government and this Minister has been irresponsible in the approach to essential services and their right to strike. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend knows that under the previous administration, the Conservative

PRIVATE MEMBER'S HOUR

Resolution No. 4

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . administration, which now sponsors this resolution, that it was not possible for the Manitoba Hydro employees to go on strike unless they went to compulsory arbitration, but the City of Winnipeg Hydro employee had no such barrier at all.

I wonder if my honourable friend from Thompson, Mr. Speaker, knows that the nursing personnel in the provincial hospitals could not go on strike but had to undergo a process of compulsory arbitration, but the nurses in all other hospitals could go on strike, if they didn't obtain their desires, without any compulsion. I really wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether my honourable friend the Member for Thompson has really given consideration to these aspects. As a matter of fact, I would suggest that the action that we have taken in the field of industrial relations, in this last two or three years by legislation, enhances completely or to a better degree the relationships in the so-called public sector with essential services.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if members of the Assembly would take the time out to read the Annual Report of the Manitoba Labour Management Review Committee, which is normally called the Woods Committee, and also the proceedings of a seminar on the Public Service Industrial Relations which was held in Winnipeg last year, would really read it and analyze it --(Interjection)-- pardon? --(Interjection)-- It was tabled, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, it was tabled here a couple of weeks ago. And Professor Paul Philips of the University of Manitoba, Department of Economics prepared a paper for presentation to the public sector industrial relations seminar that I just referred to. And it's most interesting reading because Professor Philips refers to this very problem of strikes in the essential services, and refers to the Civil Servants particularly. And I note, Mr. Speaker, on Page 22 Professor Philips refers in the second paragraph, and may I quote from his documentation, "The third group are the civil servants. Their collective bargaining and dispute settlement procedures are set out in the Civil Service Act which provides binding arbitration as a means of ultimately resolving disputes. It appears that there has been little demand by civil servants for the right to strike. I might note," Professor Philips says, somewhat facetiously, "that like the doctors in Saskatchewan they might be ill-advised to take strike action. When the doctors did go on strike it was pointed out that the death rate in Saskatchewan fell by 50 percent. One doctor urged that they settle immediately before it was discovered whether people got well because of or in spite of them. Similarly, many civil servants withdrawal of labour would have no visible detrimental affect on the public and therefore would not exert pressure on the public body to settle." That's the end, that was the end of this particular quote of Professor Philips, I thought it was most interesting reading and every member of the Assembly received a copy of this most interesting reading --(Interjection)-- Well we have lots of professors in here. They go on, they go on strike. As a matter of fact they now have the right of being ordinary citizens in the Province of Manitoba instead of second-class citizens as they were previously. --(Interjection)-- Well I would imagine that Professor Philips has not been sued for libel as of yet.

But, I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that from time to time the Department of Labour has given serious consideration to the fears of some in the so-called essential service area. But really, is it not a fact whether by legislation you prohibit a policeman or a fireman or a doctor or a lawyer or any category of people --(Interjection)-- or a farmer because the farmers have spoken of going on strike, and if we legislated against the right of a farmer to go on strike, I'm sure there'd be a few farmers that would certainly condemn us for that. But the point that I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that even if we do legislate as other jurisdictions have legislated, it hasn't meant that there hasn't been any strikes. My honourable friend the Member for Thompson referred to the situation down in Quebec; they were deprived of the right to strike there and yet there was a strike. There was a situation I believe in New Brunswick where the police went out on strike -- either New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. One or the other were prohibited from going on strike, and they both did. --(Interjection)-- Long? Not very long. Not very long.

MR. BOROWSKI: I wonder if the Minister would yield to a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes.

MR. BOROWSKI: I wonder if he would indicate whether he thinks there's a difference between going on an illegal strike and a legal one, and the length or the duration of a strike when it's legal? While if it's illegal would he agree that you can stop it immediately, while

PRIVATE MEMBER'S HOUR

Resolution No. 4

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd). . . . if it's legal you can not unless you call the House into Session, which takes time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, in answer to my honourable friend. A strike is a strike whether it's legal or illegal. You can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink. And if a people, a group of people are determined to withdraw their services, be it legal or otherwise, they certainly will do it.

Now I want to in my few remaining moments, Mr. Speaker, refer to the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Emerson because he's only got half of the resolution that was proposed by the Conservative Party at their convention on November 17th and 18th of last year at Brandon. --(Interjection)-- No I wasn't there but I believe there is some competence somewhere in the Conservative Party of documenting their resolutions. Sometimes we wonder that. The resolution read, That

Whereas the rights of the majority must be preserved and protected(the public at large):

Whereas the rights of a minority (the parties involved in a labour dispute must be protected and preserved):

Whereas with regard to vital services the right to resort to strike action does not accomplish these ends; and

Whereas involuntary binding arbitration is often mistrusted, feared, or resented by the parties to a dispute since it places their future well-being irrevocably in the hands of third parties who may or may not be astute, well intentioned and completely impartial persons. " --(Interjection)-- Yes.

"Therefore, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall be given the power to declare at any time that the uninterrupted operation of the whole, or any part of a business, or function is essential to the public interest because it constitutes a vital service."

Now a moment or two ago, Mr. Speaker, I was asked the question about the power of the Lieutenant-Governor of the government to call in to a meeting of the Assembly to consider the effects of a strike. And here is this Conservative Party suggesting, contrary to our belief, that not the Assembly but the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council should be the sole determining body as to what constitutes an essential strike, or an essential service for the purpose of strike. The Liberal Party did this, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan. They started out with a dispute, if I recall correctly, in either the hospital area or the public school area, and by jimminy, and by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and by jimminy Christmas, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal administration eventually were using it to be able to prevent even a shoemaker from going on strike because he may be, a shoemaker may be considered as being essential to the well-being of the citizens of Saskatchewan. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall be the governing body insofar as strikes are concerned. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter that my honourable friends opposite haven't really given serious consideration to. They're trying to raise red herrings and they're trying to becloud the whole issue of industrial relations; because unless we have, unless we have mutual understanding and agreement between employer and employee in labour management relations, we'll have strikes, be they so-called legal or so-called illegal; and I suggest that my school teacher representative from Emerson would be well advised to reconsider the type of resolution that he's proposing to us here this evening.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister's time is up. Only by leave of the House may a question be asked. Agreed?(Agreed). The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if the Honourable Minister in his comments was suggesting that in the case of essential services it was impossible to get agreement between the employer and the employee to resolve not to strike or to accept legislation that would prevent the strike. Is that impossible?

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, nothing is impossible if there is a will and the determination to overcome difficulties. Now --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I couldn't understand that part of my friend's question. I wonder if he would mind repeating it. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S HOUR
Resolution No 4.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asked me a question, I just didn't understand one part of it and if he'd like an answer, if the Assembly would like an answer maybe he might be permitted to clarify his question.

MR. SPEAKER: I would allow another or the similar question. I will not allow interjections from their seats. I believe they are not part of our rules and any member that does that is breaking our rules.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the question. I was trying to communicate to the Minister, it is very difficult to negotiate or understand, or work with when we find that kind of barrier on the other side which says we refuse to consider. Is that not what we're asking for, to consider.

MR. SPEAKER: Question - the honourable member is debating the issue. The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in answer to my honourable friend, there's no difficulty to negotiate at all. We're not being dictatorial in any of our legislation in the realm of employee-employer relationships. The suggestion of my honourable friend however is, and this is what I am objecting to. I say that in the field of industrial management relations the spirit of goodwill and determination to resolve their differences is far more effective than imposition by legislation, be it by legislation as contained in the Labour Relations Act or dictation by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, as suggested by the Conservative Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we have before us a reasonable resolution presented by a most reasonable member from Emerson, and I am saddened, Mr. Speaker, that this unreasonable government would not consider the advisability of. Mr. Speaker, it serves a purpose every once in a while to remind ourselves about how we in the Opposition couch the language that we use when we suggest to the high and mighty on the government side - you know we don't tell them what to do, we can't. We don't order them what to do, we can't. All we can do is we suggest to the honourable members opposite to "consider the advisability of" something or other. And that's what we're doing here, Mr. Speaker, we're asking this government and this Minister in particular to consider the advisability of, doing what? Maybe, maybe breaking out of our hidebound traditional approach that certainly is traditional within the labour and management relations sphere for many many decades in this country and this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns on another occasion indicated that, or at least threw out the suggestions, and which I will be happy to respond to at the opportune time on another resolution, that he welcomed the idea in this forum and this Chamber being able to discuss philosophically and without the restraints of fixed and firm party positions or without the restraints of the kind of interests that we find ourselves traditionally representing, to be able to discuss matters of this kind. And I suggest to you that what this resolution gives us the opportunity of doing is genuinely talking about an area that involves our citizens in a greater and greater degree with respect to labour and management and an opportunity to examine just what avenues are open to us, to what seems to be a growing consensus of feeling among the public about the unacceptability of the strike as such as being the only weapon with which we can come to grips with some of the more serious labour problems that we have particularly in our essential services.

Mr. Speaker, I'm disappointed that the Minister of Labour who so often accuses us on this side of being hidebound in our traditions, you know, and when the other side challenges the Conservative Party or the party of business, the party of free enterprise, that we're the mud, that we can't be budged out of our traditional approach from things, I think, Mr. Speaker, this same challenge can be hurled back at the present government, at the present Minister. Not to consider the advisability of, to close your mind to what has to be recognized as a number one concern in our population, not just in Manitoba but across the country, that there has to be at least a willingness on the part of those in responsible positions, labour, management and government, to examine what other avenues are open to us in these very important areas of work and services.

Mr. Speaker, let me just briefly remind the Minister --and I think essentially this is what we're talking about when we're trying to define essential services. In the area of police work - you know, Mr. Speaker, we no longer live in that era when a policeman was next to that

PRIVATE MEMBER'S HOUR
Resolution No. 4

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . . that volunteer officer that patrolled through our little villages or our still small towns and cities, that worried about enforcing maybe an 8:00 o'clock curfew for our youngsters to get them home to bed in time or that worried about the odd infraction that might occur between two buggies as they passed in a busy intersection; or worried about the cow or the steer that strayed on to the highway and should be put back into the farmer's pasture and fence. No, Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about those kind of conditions. We are talking about the kind of conditions, highway conditions that can result in multiple deaths as occurred just last week, twelve persons dying in a highway traffic accident in our sister province. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about that possibility occurring every day and in fact occurring every day in our life, and we're talking about the possibility of removal of all our - just in that very limited scope - our traffic supervisors, traffic controllers in a major city or even dangerous on a major freeway or major highway system. Mr. Speaker, it would be small comfort, small comfort to the family of the bereaved to be told that somebody at some particular time is going to make that executive decision to either convene the Assembly and to pass laws and to convince the striking workers or the striking policemen that in fairness fellows, you have a greater responsibility to the public at large and would you mind now getting back to work.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's in this kind of incidence that the hidebound position of the Minister of Labour becomes evident. Mr. Speaker, in our health care services, notwithstanding the interesting story and report, or paragraph that the Minister of Labour read for us with respect to the situation that arose when the doctors went on strike in Saskatchewan, one could speculate on the possibility that that may reflect on the competence of the medical profession in that province. But on the other hand I don't think one could seriously accept that kind of documentation for the kind of situations that can and in fact did arise in the Province of Quebec when your hospital services as such, your health care services as such were all of a sudden stalemated.

Mr. Speaker, again let's look at the circumstances and how they have altered just in our short, very short period of recall that we are capable of even in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, we've been convinced by successive governments both Federal and Provincial that it's in our collective interests to compulsarily donate through various means, through general taxation, through premium collection and otherwise, to place our demands for health care into the hands of ever growing health complex centres, hospitals and what have you. Again, Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, but the effect that this has had particularly - well I shouldn't single out any particular area, I tend to want to remark about the changing patterns of health services and health delivery as it reflects on the rural area, but one shouldn't do that, it's a general level of dependence that we have come to accept partially because of the money that governments extract from us and partially because we are aware of the kind of health services that we can expect and that we have been privileged to receive by and large in a manner that has been provided with continuity and with no fear of that service not being there when it is required.

Mr. Speaker, to somehow try to equivocate that with the kind of medicare delivery system that is depicted on, depicted on - I'm trying to remember the television program, I am not the best of television program viewers - on a particular doc that was involved in Gunslinger. I guess it is or - who is it?-- (Interjection) -- Gunsmoke, yeah. In his homey way that -- (Interjection)-- what's his name? Doc. Halliday or something. Anyway as he dispenses his remedies, his herbs and his medicines out of a covered wagon and if he can help the patient he helps them and if he doesn't he dies, and at most the services demanded by the patient is that perhaps boiling water will be there when major surgery is about to be undertaken. Well Mr. Speaker, obviously I'm stretching the point to the point of being facetious. But, Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to say is again we have at great public expense wisely dedicated large amounts of effort and money and expertise into the building of our health centers and our health service delivery system. Mr. Speaker, really does that have, does that have no weight when balancing out what essentially is an archaic and hidebound tradition form of settling a labour dispute between what well might be a very small group involved in the total complex, a very minor group of the total work force? It seems to me Mr. Speaker, that any reasonable, any reasonable approach to this subject would say, no that is not the case, Mr. Speaker, this is a blind, a blind holding on to a traditional approach that labour wants to insist upon and

PRIVATE MEMBER'S HOUR

Resolution No. 4

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . . will not let got under any circumstances. Will not let go under any circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not concerned about what they have had the right to do in the past, I'm not concerned with what the present particular situation is right now. My concern and the concern of this resolution, as should rightly be our concern in most things that we discuss in this House, is what are we doing about the future? How are we, how are we molding our laws to prevent possible difficulties. The old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth several pounds of cure surely has not escaped members opposite, that the truth of that wisdom is as true today as it was when it was first expounded.

Mr. Speaker, the same surely can be said about another third element of what could be singled out as essential services. And let me say Mr. Speaker, I don't feel incumbent at this stage of discussing this matter of trying to define what are in fact essential services. I think No. 1, I would not be dogmatic about it, like my friends opposite are dogmatic about even considering it. I would not be doctrinaire about it, Mr. Speaker, as my friends are doctrinaire about it, to the extent that they will not even consider it. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that as a Progressive Conservative, and a Conservative Progressive, that this is and will continue to be, a fluid changing situation, but I cannot say what is essential, what will be essential five years from now or ten years from now in our society, I suggest to you that there is also a situation where a situation has to be considered that we can't envisage at this particular time in dealing with legislation. So I'm not trying to suggest that we have to enshrine for all time in another traditional way certain basic essential services that could not be talked about, could not be discussed as to their very nature, their very essentiality, if it is in fact an essential service. Although it's been suggested from time to time that the teaching occupation and teachers as such should be considered as essential services. Well I can't buy that, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that you know, a two or three month strike on the part of the teachers wouldn't necessarily be depriving us of any essential services other than it may be an opportunity that we re-examine our whole educational delivery system and it would give an opportunity for administrators, parents and children to re-examine their situation vis-a-vis with their teachers --(Interjection)-- Well university professors I would include even in that grab bag.

But Mr. Speaker, let me come back and perhaps in my homely way of describing the kind of essential services that I'm talking about that should be considered, none fits more aptly to this description than the firefighting service. The firefighting service even to this day we have vestiges of it. The firefighting services essentially stemmed as a volunteer group. Virtually every town, many still have it, began their firefighting services in a volunteer manner, and many do. However, in our more complicated and larger areas calling for more sophisticated equipment, and so forth, we again have said we are going to give this service into the hands of professional people, we are going to equip them with the best that we can. In turn, Mr. Speaker, you know, we hope to get the best fire protection that we can. Mr. Speaker, how can you stop a fire from burning while a labour dispute is going on? How can you, Mr. Speaker, decide, you know, when you're going to send that snorkel ladder up to the 4th or 5th floor of a high rise and save somebody that is jumping out of a window while a labour dispute is going on?

Mr. Speaker, again Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that rather than for the sake of this party, the sake of the NDP's bowing to the sacred altar of collective bargaining and the right to strike and recognizing their political debt that they owe to big organized labour, for goodness sakes show a bit of common sense. Don't preach to me that they are not going to strike. Of course they're not going to strike, we hope they're not going to strike. Then why aren't you prepared to remove even the encouragement that Bill 81 and the kind of statements that accompanied the introduction of Bill 81 gave to those groups of employees that are involved in essential services to the possibility of future strikes, when just the opposite, Mr. Speaker, was being indicated by these very groups, namely the police, the firefighters and the hospital workers - and there is another group, that would be the members of the civil service.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't stand before you and before my honoured friend the Minister of Labour as any expert on labour matters, but I'm disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the government, the Minister of Labour would allow so little, you know, fluidness in his position;

PRIVATE MEMBER'S HOUR
Resolution No. 4

MR. ENNS cont'd). . . . would come down in such a hardrock, you know, hidebound, tradition manner; would not accept the advice that his colleague and friend, the Member from St. Johns offered the other day on another resolution here, that let's take the opportunity, discuss the matter in a philosophical way. Because really that is all that we are doing. Let's consider the advisability of this kind of a resolution. And Mr. Speaker, what is the reply? What is the reply? The reply is, no, we can't afford to shake the boat that brings us the votes. We can't afford to disturb those who are going to replenish the war chest this coming election. We can't consider the advisability of the reasonable resolution put forward by the reasonable Member from Emerson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour have a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I wonder if my honourable friend would entertain two simple questions.

MR. SPEAKER: There is two minutes left.

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I just have a few words on the resolution. I think one of the important points of the Resolved part is the matter of essential services and here as has been pointed out we have had several of them enumerated, but I think one that should really receive some discussion is the Hydro people. Hydro power is very essential these days and we have heard a lot about advertising electric heating and while we have many houses today that are equipped with electric heat, and not only those that are equipped with electric heat, those with other furnaces, certainly they require the Hydro power to fire the other heating units. So I think this is one of the more important ones that we should be considering, and I'm not so sure at this point just where the Hydro people stand as far as the legislation covering them, whether they are required to work or whether they have the right to strike, I forget, but the Minister of Labour surely can inform us of that. But I think from time to time as things go on, that the term "essential services" can vary and will include different matters, not necessarily just be confined to police and so on, that we will be able to include various other services that we will find that are very definitely required by society as a whole and that would fall into this particular category. So that I feel that the resolution certainly is very worthy of consideration and I feel that the Minister and the government should definitely give consideration. This is all that is being asked for by the Member for Emerson. Why not give it consideration; sooner or later we will have to give consideration to some of these aspects of these various services that we haven't even been discussing and which come on the scene and which will be termed such a service that will be required.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's kind of hard to understand that the Minister of Labour or the government on the other side will not accept a resolution on the advisability of. I can frankly, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sorry he's not in the room, because I would not like to misquote the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, but I would say it this way, that I can recall an occasion when he lectured us to something that went like this - He could never understand why the government that was there previous to the government sitting there now would not accept a resolution on the basis of "consider the advisability of". He said, I really don't know why they would never take it, he said, because all you're asking us to do is to consider the advisability of. And he said, we will take resolutions and we will look at them and we will do exactly that, is what he said to this House or in some way or in those words intimated to this House that that was the way that this government was going to handle resolutions. In other words, now, all of a sudden, all of a sudden we have a complete change when we come to the resolution for the Member for Emerson.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK Q. C. (St. Johns): Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Oh yes, sure.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: It seems to me that the motion before us is that the Assembly consider the advisability of - not the government.

PRIVATE MEMBERS HOUR
Resolution No. 4

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is being a little bit tricky in the usual manner for the Member for St. Johns. He is now saying that they have a free vote on the other side to vote on this particular resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the reasoning that the Minister of Labour has given is the fact that he reads a little humorous thing out of something from Saskatchewan that said while the doctors were on strike the death rate went down. You know that's kind of a, you know, passing way of looking at this particular type of thing. If he wants to take that chance, if he wants to put the people in that kind of a situation where essential services are being carried out, if he wants to really believe that we'll gamble, really gamble with what we might call peoples lives, that's up to the Minister of Labour; but we certainly, we certainly on this side of the House really can't take that type of reasoning. You know, Mr. Speaker, when somebody joins an essential service, industry, or take a job which is part of an essential service, he usually enters that with pride, very great pride, and many times when he is interviewed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of adjournment has arrived, but before I do I would like to remind honourable members that I sent a memo to all of them in respect to April 4th. I would appreciate if they would contact my office and give me the information by tomorrow. The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.