

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, June 5, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

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

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary to hold you here a little while longer. I find it necessary to go on a matter of grievance affecting my constituency, and myself personally. It was not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to go into a matter of grievance at this Session, but there was a number of members who spoke on my Resolution last Thursday, and I have been very, very taken aback that the government does not appear to have any policy whatsoever on rail abandonment. The Member for Rock Lake was particularly critical and made some remarks which I feel I cannot allow to go unchallenged.

I believe he was referring particularly to a — what he took exception with was a news release that I send out every week, Mr. Speaker, and he took exception to some of the remarks that I had made in my weekly report from the Legislature. The member was quite critical, and in fact he did say that, if it were parliamentary, he would have called me a liar, and he also made allegations that I had been spreading false comments in my reports. Mr. Speaker, I know that the member did not actually call me a liar because it was unparliamentary, but of course that did not deter the Member for Pembina, who believes that he knows it all, that he knows everything, but in fact he was yelling, "He lied. Liar", from his seat as he usually is prone to do, making comments without rising in his place to be recognized. The member is a great fountain of knowledge, Mr. Speaker. He's a great lake of knowledge. At least he wants us to believe that he is. And I say that, if one was to wade in that lake of knowledge, one would not even get his feet wet, let alone get in trouble of drowning, Mr. Ap Speaker.

And the member hasn't found out yet that, if you can't improve on silence, you should keep your mouth shut.

MR. BARROW: Now there's a good thought, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ADAM: And the Honourable Member for Pembina has not discovered that. Mr. Speaker, he is so densely doctrinaire as to be shallow, like his lake of knowledge.

But Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address my comments primarily to the comments made by the Member for Rock Lake and I intend to demonstrate that the comments I made in my report, Mr. Speaker, were correct and factual. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rock Lake introduced a letter written by one Mr. Jack Murta, M.P. for Lisgar, and he used that letter to attempt to refute the comments that I had made. Mr. Speaker, the letter was written, I believe, on the 26th of January of 1979. Mr. Speaker, on the front page of The Brandon Sun of January 17th or roughly 9-10 days prior to the letter written by Mr. Murta — and incidentally Mr. Murta's letter referred specifically to one complaint of the Prairie Rail Action Committee Report — the only complaint was the abandonment of the Hartney-Miami-Carman to Hartney subdivisions, and that is primarily what the letter addressed itself to, that was sent to Mr. Benson of The Canadian Transport Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put into the record the article in The Brandon Sun, because the letter has already been tabled and I think the Member for Rock Lake did read it into the record anyway. But I wanted to put in the record, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Mr. Murta has reported and I will

read that "Jack Murta, a Manitoba farmer and Progressive Conservative M.P. for Lisgar said the report is a credible job, but many westerners would quarrel with some of its recommendations."

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Murta here is on record of saying that the Prairie Rail Action Committee Report is a credible job insofar as he is concerned.

So I put that to you, Sir, that when the Member for Rock Lake gets up and is criticizing the fact that I said in my report that Conservative M.P. Jack Murta of Lisgar constituency has indicated that he commends the Prairie Rail Action Committee. Almost identical and almost verbatim as what had appeared in The Brandon Sun, Mr. Speaker, on January 17th.

A MEMBER: Who wrote that for you, Pete?

MR. ADAM: So who's integrity is being questioned now, Mr. Speaker? The Member for Rock Lake was questioning my integrity. Mr. Speaker, I will go further than that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is on a matter of grievance that is of his choosing. I also want to point out to the honourable member that it has to fall within the guidelines of what is parliamentary and what is not parliamentary, and I ask other members to allow the Member for Ste. Rose the opportunity to carry on in a relatively undisturbed atmosphere. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for trying to keep the Conservative members in check, and that's quite difficult to do, particularly the Member for Pembina.

Mr. Speaker, I will go further to my comments that I made in my press release on May 4th, in which I mention that Mr. Murta was commending the Prairie Rail Action Committee for its efforts. Apparently there are others that know that Mr. Murta was supporting the Prairie Rail Action Committee because I have here a copy of some of the remarks, not in its entirety, but some of the excerpts from an address made by the Honourable Edgar Kaeding at Radville, April 6th, of 1979, in which he mentions, and I will quote, Mr. Speaker. "In the opinion of Mr. Jack Murta, Member of Parliament for Lisgar, Manitoba, the committee did a very credible job on the whole issue." And this is Mr. Kaeding that's making these statements back in April. I see the member wants me to table, I'm not going to table, I'm not reading a letter, a signed letter — I'm reading an excerpt

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I point out to the honourable member that if a request has been made and he has quoted from a document, it is the tradition of this House that he must table it when he's completed it. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, on that point of . . .

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

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the point of order would be that the Member for Ste. Rose was definitely reading from an article and we would request that it be tabled.

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

MR. ADAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. I am not reading from a public document, I'm not reading from a letter, I could be reading from a news clipping, and it would not be tabled, Mr. Speaker, it would not be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has been requested that when he has completed his statements to table the document, and I would ask him to comply with the rules. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

The Honourable Member for St. Vital on the same point of order.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, when a request is made to table, it's usually determined what it is that the member is reading from. If he is reading from his own notes, it is surely not required that a member table his own speaking notes.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for St. Vital for his information on this particular point of order. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose may continue.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, we know as well as Mr. Murta, we know that a Mr. Don Mazankowski

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

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: On the same point of order that we were dealing with a moment ago, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose now has refused to table the document. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that he is opposing your wishes and your rules, so I ask you, Mr. Speaker, again, he's been reading from it and is making certain allegations and charges, I suspect from a certain person that's not a member of this House, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he should table it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the Honourable Member for Roblin that I'm sure the honourable member will table it, but I think it should be his prerogative to use the material during his speech, and when he has completed I'm sure the honourable member will table it.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose may continue.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly table those excerpts from my notes that I put into the record for the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member was quoting from a speech of a Minister of Agriculture from the Province of Saskatchewan, and the honourable member has been asked to table it when he has completed his remarks. The honourable member may continue. The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of order.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was not aware that a public document of a speech made anywhere is a matter that has to be tabled. If members want to get it they can get the reference and find out what it is. But I understand that a private letter written to a person quoted in the Legislature has to be tabled, but certainly, I am not under the impression that a speech, a public speech, made anywhere, is a matter that has to be tabled. It's a public document, surely.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is purporting to quote from something, and if it's his own notes he's taking quite a number of liberties, because he's making direct quotations; and if those are his notes, then one can only assume that they are statements that are manufactured by himself. Now, if he wants to take the responsibility for manufacturing those excerpts, that's fine. Otherwise, I suggest, Sir, if he's not quoting from a letter, that he identify the source or the documents from whence he is quoting.

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

MR. ADAM: The Transport critic of the Conservative Party at the federal level is on record, is reported to have said — he is reported to have said . . . well, the same as what I've just read in The Press —(Interjection)—

A MEMBER: That's what we're asking for. What article are you reading from?

MR. ADAM: Well, if he wishes to deny it . . . if the member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. JORGENSON: Well I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have a right to know what my honourable friend is quoting from. If it's from a newspaper article — what newspaper article, and what date? If it's a speech — then who made the speech, and where, and when? I think we have a right to know that if my honourable friend is purporting to quote somebody else.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I'm speaking from the notes that I have before me, Mr. Speaker, and I shall continue to speak from the notes that I have before me. I will . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of

order.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, then if my honourable friend claims that he is quoting from his own notes, we can only assume that the statements that he is attributing to others are manufactured by himself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order, if my memory serves me correctly, the Member for Ste. Rose indicated that he was quoting from a speech given by Edgar Kaeding, Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan on the subject of Jack Murta's comments.

Now, if he's quoting from a speech of the Minister of Agriculture from Saskatchewan, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he table that document as they are not, as he said two minutes ago, notes of his own making. They are words of another person that he should table as a document to this House.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will table one of the statements that I have just made that I'm quoting from, and you could . . . I just have the one copy except for the two copies, and I will repeat it for the edification of the House Leader, in which Jack Murta, a Manitoba farmer and Progressive Conservative MP for Lisgar said the report is a credible job, but many westerners would quarrel with some of its recommendations. So Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: My honourable friend is attempting to purport or to say that the statements that he is now attributing to somebody else are statements that were made by that person. I note that in the document that is not even necessary for him to table is from The Brandon Sun, and it is simply a newspaper report, not letters or anything of that nature, and so we —(Interjection)— what I was asking my honourable friend to do was to identify the article that he was quoting from.

Now, he is trying to create the impression that those reports, and my honourable friends opposite on many occasions have not accepted newspaper reports as gospel, and we're not going to accept those newspaper reports as gospel either, Sir, so we can fairly well then assume where my honourable friend gets his information from. He manufactures it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose may continue.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will not take away from my time all the interruptions that have been made unnecessarily, Mr. Speaker.

Another matter that was raised by the Member for Rock Lake, and which I believe he referred to as falsities or falsehoods — it appeared in the Friday news anyway, I believe the Free Press — it had to do with my suggestion that the position of this government and the Conservative Party was to tamper with the Crow Rates that have been given to farmers over many, many years —(Interjection)— well, he read into the record that I had said that the Premier was more interested in seeing an interest in the Crow Rates rather than be concerned about rail abandonment.

Mr. Speaker, we know where this government stands on rail abandonment. They do not have any policy, and we know that they want to increase the Crow Rates, Mr. Speaker, we know that. The Premier, in his contribution at the Western Premiers Conference, made that very clear, Mr. Speaker. While he did say that he would like to see the benefits of the Crow Rates accrue to the farmers, he would not want to see the Crow Rates change unless there were other benefits, if it could be shown that there would be other benefits accrue to the farmers.

So we know, Mr. Speaker, where the position is, and if I need more substantiation to my remarks, Mr. Speaker, let me read from another press release, and this one is not so old, Mr. Speaker, it's brand new. It's hot off the press.

Mr. Speaker, this one is June 1st, from the Financial Post. And I will quote from it, Mr. Murta, they're quoting Mr. Jack Murta. "Murta says the PCs will likely establish a freight-rate system for grain movement which will require both government and prairie farmers to pay more to the railways." Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, Sir, am I correct when I say that this government intends to increase the Crow Rates?

Mr. Speaker, there is much more to this article, there is much more, but I just wanted to show

that the statements made by a number of Conservatives last week, that I was embarked on a sensational trip, and grandstanding, it is they who are grandstanding, Mr. Speaker. They have no policy on rail abandonment — no policy whatsoever. We have not been able to find out in the last four months, and we have questioned the Minister of Agriculture at length during Agriculture Committee to find out where this government stood, and we still do not know. Yes, he says, oh we'll do whatever the communities want to do, we will assist them to set up retention committees and whatever they do that'll be fine with us, they'll get all our support, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Agriculture, of all people, when he got into debate on my resolution, opposing rail abandonment, he used almost his entire time limit to criticize the Wheat Board. He went on a tangent, Mr. Speaker, viciously attacking the Wheat Board. He used most of his time to lash out at the Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, we know of another minister that tried to tamper and undermine the Wheat Board. A minister from Saskatchewan, who was in charge of the Wheat Board, who tried to tamper with the Wheat Board, and the people of Saskatchewan told him where to go. Mr. Speaker, they are going to tell this minister, if he tampers with the Wheat Board where he's going to go. He made an unjustified attack, unwarranted attack on an institution that is strongly supported in Western Canada by a vast majority of the farmers. And we know that he wants to undermine the Wheat Board, but I say to him, he had better take note what happened to the member whose name is two four-letter words —(Interjection)— yes, Otto Lang, Mr. Speaker, two four-letter words.

The farmers in Saskatchewan told him where to get off at with his feed grain policy, and his Wheat Board policy, his undermining of the Wheat Board. He knows, he got the answer, he got the word. And you are going to get the word too, I advise the minister. If he keeps on the way he is, he's going to get the word before long, I assure you.

So this government does not have any policy on rail abandonment. Today we heard an announcement from the brand new fledgling government in Ottawa. I didn't hear it myself personally, I apologize. But I am told by one of my colleagues, who heard a statement today, that there's going to be a freeze on rail abandonment. And it's going to be left up to the elevators, to the elevator companies, as to where this rail abandonment is going to take place. Now I haven't been able to verify that statement yet but we heard supposedly over the news media today that rail abandonment is going to be frozen depending on the elevator and grain companies. So again you see a government who is sloughing off their responsibility, Mr. Speaker. Now they're going to throw the ball into the ballpark of the grain companies as to where the rails should remain or where they should be abandoned.

And that's what I said, Mr. Speaker. Ottawa now, since Joe Trudeau and Pierre Clark got to Ottawa, Ottawa has become a zoo. It's become a zoo, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— No, no. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would hope that all members here give the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose the opportunity to make his remarks. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to, you know, to me the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party are indistinguishable. I've never been able to find any difference and I can't find any difference between the two federal leaders that we had in the two major parties, and that is why I just changed their first names, because to me they're just like windshield wipers; they're all over the place, you never know where they are. Mr. Speaker, that is the impression that I get from the position that was taken by the leader of the Conservative Party with his restraint program. He saw what happened here in Manitoba. He saw that a government was elected on going around the province, telling the people how much money they were going to save them. We know now that they haven't saved them not even a penny; that we're spending more money than we ever did in the last two budgets that they've introduced. But he said, "Well, I'd better get on the bandwagon; maybe I'll get elected too". So he started on his restraint binge and Mr. Trudeau did the same thing. He was going to jump the gun on Mr. Clark and he was going on this restraint binge. So that's why I never know where they are; just like windshield wipers on my car.

But, Mr. Speaker, we know that this government has no policy. We don't know where they're at insofar as rail abandonment is concerned and I have here also a . . . I have supposedly the part of the Agriculture Program — it's supposed to be, I don't know if it's correct or not — they commit themselves, show you where they are; they're all over the place, Mr. Speaker. One of the things that they say is: "The Crowsnest Pass be maintained for the grain producers". That supposedly is a Conservative policy. But I ask you, Sir, where is that policy now? Going out the window when we have statements made by this Premier, that he wants to look at these rates. He wants to increase them.

And then we have the Member for Lisgar saying that we're in trouble. He thinks they're going

to be in trouble because we will likely establish a freight system for grain movements which will require both government and prairie farmers to pay more to the railways. So this contradicts the Conservative policy of maintaining the Crow rates. It's been a change of policy now, Mr. Speaker. It seems to be that the PC policy statement commits itself; it commits itself to maintain the Crowsnest Pass freight rates for grain producers. However, in the policy, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Conservative Party is quoted as having said: "It will be fundamental to the PC policy that the benefits of the statutory rates will remain in place". And now, Mr. Speaker, this is quite a different thing. When you talk of statutory rates and Crow rates. That's quite a difference from the rates themselves remaining in place. That's not the same thing, Mr. Speaker, so we know that they wish to temper with these rates, and I want to warn these fellows at the back that are jumping up and down like jack in the boxes from time to time, and make speeches without knowing exactly what their own policy is. I doubt whether you know what your policy is because you don't have a policy. How can you know? If you don't have a policy, how can you know? You backbenchers who represent farmers like I do had better pull your socks up in your Caucus and find out what's going on. Your Minister here is taking after the Wheat Board, and I'm telling you that that's going to be something that you'll have to answer in your own constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, you know, they talk about many other things that are too lengthy to go into, Mr. Speaker, but I say that the policies that this government is proceeding with is not conducive to the viability of the farm community. We've been trying to get a concrete policy on agriculture from this provincial Minister, and we haven't anything yet, and I don't know whether we ever will.

Mr. Speaker, it was obvious last Thursday when the Minister of Agriculture — he didn't speak last Thursday, but prior to that — when he spoke it was obvious that he had not read the Hall Commission Report because he was criticizing the Resolution that I introduced, on certain things that it lacked that were not included in the Resolution, Mr. Speaker. What my Resolution said, was to implement the Hall Commission recommendation. That's all it said. Whatever they said in their recommendation, that is what my Resolution was calling for. And here's the Minister saying, "Well, what about if a railway is abandoned and there's an elevator there with no trackage, no front. How's the grain going to get out?" Or then the Member for Pembina, I believe, said, "Well, what happens if there's a rail there, and the elevator is closed?" So it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that none of those fellows that were standing up here and supposed to be making great contributions to the debate, hadn't read the Hall Commission's Report, because all those things are in that Report.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has four minutes.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the member is concerned in regard to where the rail was abandoned and there would still be an elevator. The recommendations of the Hall Commission was that they would provide the transportation of grain on all those lines that were subject to evaluation re-evaluation. They would be in charge of the transportation of all grains from those points whether there was any rail left there, whether they were taking out or not, until the year 1990. They would hire the trucks to haul the grain out. They would upgrade those lines. The Member for Pembina says, "Well, you know, his Resolution didn't say anything about upgrading the lines." Well, Mr. Speaker, that's in the recommendation, but the member never read it. It's too big. It's too lengthy. It's too much trouble. He's not going to read it. And there's four of them — three or four of these. And Mr. Speaker, in this one here there's about 600 pages, or 550 pages. No, that's too much trouble to read, eh? He didn't take trouble to find out what the recommendations of the Hall Commission recommended.

And I was happy, Mr. Speaker, just after I finished my presentation here when I presented my Resolution; I went out, the Federal Campaign was on, and there was a television on, and here's Mr. Walter Dinsdale on television, and he was saying — somebody had a microphone there on the television — he said, "If a Conservative Government is elected in Ottawa we're going to implement the Hall Commission recommendations." So here, Mr. Speaker, we have five members who got up and condemned the Resolution that I introduced in this House, and the long time, respected, Conservative member for Brandon-Souris was on television saying that if the Conservative Government is elected in Ottawa they're going to implement the Hall Commission recommendations. So where is the policy? They can't put their act together, Mr. Speaker, they can't put their act together.

We have Conservative members going all over the place, making all kinds of statements, and we have a bunch of characters here that don't know where they're going. They're just like a bunch of chickens without any heads.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the very controversial speech that the Member for Ste. Rose made I cannot let, Mr. Speaker, some of his comments go unnoted.

Now, first off, Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Ste. Rose has failed to realize is what he proposed in his Resolution. He keeps on talking about saying that he recommended that we follow the Hall Commission recommendations to a T. What, in fact, he did recommend was "request the Minister of Transportation of Canada to cancel any further abandonment hearings of the Canadian Transport Commission and to transfer the lines in question to the permanent network, or," and then he goes on to mention the Prairie Rail Authority and the Hall Commission. What each and every one of us said the other day in debating this Resolution, is that that is an unrealistic approach, to cancel all abandonment hearings, because we have got, as I mentioned the other day, de facto abandonment in place in a number of rail lines. Regardless of what we recommend, or what anybody recommends, they will not be used for grain service. And he wants to leave them in service, collecting subsidies, costing all taxpayers and grain producers dollars to maintain a line that isn't going to be used. That's what he's suggesting. That's what he's suggesting in the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, and he failed to come to grips with what he proposed in his own Resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Ste. Rose also accused me of making several comments across the floor whilst my colleague from Rock Lake was making comments as to the veracity and truth of remarks that the Member for Ste. Rose, in a very unbecoming way, put in the Dauphin Herald, attributing remarks to my Federal Member of Parliament, Mr. Jack Murta. Now, what the Member for Ste. Rose indicated, Mr. Speaker, was that Conservative MP, Jack Murta, of Lisgar constituency, has indicated that he commends Prairie Rail Action Committee for its efforts. Now what, in fact, the Brandon Sun has said, is that Conservative M.P. Jack Murta said the Report is a credible job. Now, there's a world of difference between that, Mr. Speaker, and I don't expect the Member nor Ste. Rose in his mental capacity to understand the difference of what he said in the paper, and what was said in the Brandon Sun.

Now, Mr. Speaker, upon many occasions, I've said to the Member for Inkster, who is a great debater, that he has made a credible speech, a tremendous speech. Now, does that mean that the Member for Ste. Rose is going to turn around in the Dauphin Herald and say, "The Member for Pembina has agreed with everything the Member for Inkster has said."? No, Mr. Speaker, of course he can't say that. I commend the Member for Inkster upon occasion on making a good presentation, a forceful presentation; I don't agree with what he said. —(Interjection)— I don't agree with what he said, but he made a good effort.

Now that's what Jack Murta, the M.P. for Lisgar, said, is that the PRAC Report is a credible job. He didn't say he agreed with what it recommended, as the MLA for Ste. Rose would put words in his mouth. That's what the Member for Rock Lake was objecting to the other day. The Member for Ste. Rose didn't realize that he was perverting and twisting words. And it's normal, it's normal, in his newspaper articles, to take an alleged fact, twist it around 180 degrees, and then say, "This is what was said"; and use it to try to beat down the government, etc., etc. —(Interjection)—

Well, you know, the Member for Ste. Rose is out in left field, as usual.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Oh, pardon me. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question; and I think he knows what the question is. Will he read for me where the Member for Ste. Rose said that Mr. Murta agreed with the Commission Report? Because that's what you said that the Member for Ste. Rose has said.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: The Member for Ste. Rose has, in the House just a few minutes ago, said that he agreed with it, and it's on the record, and it's reported in Hansard, that Mr. Murta agreed with the Report, etc., etc.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Ste. Rose has pulled a "twisty Dick", and is turning the facts around to suit his own particular political philosophy. And we can't blame the poor man for that.

But now, the one thing that really irked me out of the grievance that the Member for Ste. Rose went into tonight, which was in effect pointless, but he starts to read at one point in time from a speech. He said that . . . now this is . . . the Brandon Sun's not the only place that has understood Jack Murta agrees with the PRAC recommendation now. But, there's another place. Edgar Kaeding, the Minister of Agriculture, has said this and this, and I'll quote from his speech.

Hansard will show whether he was reading from a speech of Edgar Kaeding's, when Hansard

is reprinted, or whether they were his notes, as he tried to tell us a little later on. The truth will come out in the end, the Member for Ste. Rose. The truth will come out in the end. And if we find out that the Member for Ste. Rose was once again turning things around just slightly, to oil it a little bit, to get it the other way — we'll remind him of it in this House, Mr. Speaker, we'll remind him of it.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Ste. Rose also went on to berate our Minister of Agriculture for some comments that he made about the Canadian Wheat Board in the course of his Throne Speech Debate. Now, I didn't happen to be here that night, but I heard a bit of reporting on that, and read a newspaper article on it.

Now, what the Member for Ste. Rose is trying to tell us is that it's political suicide to criticize the Canadian Wheat Board. Well, Mr. Speaker, since when, in a democratic country, is any organization which has the economic well-being of millions of people in this great country of ours, when it has the economic viability of those people within its grasp — since when is that organization beyond reproach, as the Member for Ste. Rose would have them?

All we are saying, and all the Minister of Agriculture is saying, and a number of people are saying across western Canada, despite the fact that the Member for Ste. Rose, and other members of his caucus, and the NFU, etc., don't want anything said about either the Wheat Board or the Crow's rate — that does not, Mr. Speaker, solve some of the problems we have in the grain handling industry today. That doesn't solve the problem that right now we're a million tons behind in our this year's grain commitments, through some combination of problems. That doesn't make that problem go away, Mr. Speaker.

That doesn't solve the problem that last year, each and every permit holder in western Canada lost \$3,000 of hard-earned income because of deficiencies in the grain handling system, a combination of problems in the grain handling system. Anybody, in this day and age, with the modern agriculture that we have with us today, who is bent and hiding in the corner, saying, "You must not mention the Canadian Wheat Board; you must not question them; you must not criticize them; you must not suggest methods of how they can improve their operation" is simply not doing his job as an elected representative of a rural community.

And if I could suggest something to the Member for Ste. Rose, after his demonstration of the last couple of days in this House on dealing with his resolution, and other matters in agriculture, I would suggest to him, as a friend and a colleague in this House, that he best not run next election, because he's going to get his pants whipped off.

The farmers of his constituency aren't going to put up with the gobbledegook that he's handed us the last few days. It's not solving any of the problems in agriculture nowadays, Mr. Speaker. But what he wants to do is have it all sovereign; have the Wheat Board beyond criticism.

Mr. Speaker, if we tried to do that in this House, and made this government of ours beyond reproach, beyond criticism, we would hear the greatest hues and cries of evil intentions from the opposition that we were out to ruin the democratic system. How can he translate criticism — not wanting criticism of the Wheat Board, pardon me, and yet, wouldn't allow us to do the same thing?

Mr. Speaker, he's trying to walk on the edge of a coin, and it's going to flip over and give him the wrong side. He can't do it, Mr. Speaker; he can't have his cake and eat it too.

He went on a little further, Mr. Speaker, to mention the Crow's rate — that horrible, horrible thing that anybody, any responsible politician dare not mention because it's political suicide. Well, Mr. Speaker, how much longer must we, in western Canada, live with a freight rate, which was given to us circa 1890? How much longer must we, in western Canada, live with that kind of a freight rate, which a number of investigations, Mr. Speaker, have indicated does not cover the costs of handling grain? As a matter of fact, it falls far short. It probably covers one-quarter of the costs of hauling the grains to the railroads.

How much longer, in western Canada, are we going to force the railroads to live up to an agreement which was made in times when the rate was probably a profitable rate? And if you follow the development of the rail system, Mr. Speaker, they had an abundance of rolling stock in the boxcars that were available to them, because the methods of freight handling in the 30s, the 40s and the 50s took boxcars out of such service as lumber delivery, and went into specialized containers. That released boxcars, Mr. Speaker, for the grain trade.

When that happened, there was no capital investment required for rolling stock for grain deliveries. And the system moved along fairly smoothly, fairly smoothly, Mr. Speaker, even at the Crow's rate. But we are at a much different system today, Mr. Speaker. We have fast-loading elevators which require hopper cars. We've got fast-unload terminals which work much best on hopper cars. Those hopper cars have to be built at a cost of some \$45,000 each to service the grain industry. Who pays for it? Mr. Speaker, right now, the Government of Canada owns, I believe, some 10,000 of those cars. The Canadian Wheat Board was suggesting that the farmers,

through a deduction from the final payment pool, buy an additional number of them. How is the problem being solved? We are skating around the issue and we're not solving the problems and don't you think, Mr. Speaker, that in the time of 1979, approaching 1980, agriculture is modernizing beyond any other industry in the country. The productivity is increasing beyond any other industry in the country. Why should we stick to an outmoded handling system, grain handling system, which the record will show in times of good markets has failed to give the farmers the marketing opportunities that were there. We are losing sales; 1 million tons this year. Value that at \$200 per ton, Mr. Speaker, and you have \$200 million. That is all a direct reduction from this nation's balance of payment — a situation that even Socialists will admit is a dire need, that we bring our balance of payments back to our favour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we cannot as responsible politician representing a modern, a highly technological, highly advanced, highly productive agriculture skate around the issues of what is the problem with our grain handling and delivery system and why, Mr. Speaker, are we that 1 million tons behind our commitments this year? Why, Mr. Speaker, did each and every permit-holder in the western grain industry lose \$3,000 last year? Why, Mr. Speaker, are there boats waiting for grain cargoes on the west coast? — and unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, some of these boats are going to American ports for their cargoes and not taking on Canadian grain cargoes.

Why, Mr. Speaker, is that happening in a day and age where our farmers can produce the grain? We have no problem as a farming community in meeting the 1985 objectives set down in that great grain handling conference called by the Premier, Premier Lyon of this province, to solve the grain handling problems, to start a solution to it. We have no problem, Mr. Speaker, as farmers in this community producing 50 percent more grain but, Mr. Speaker, I will guarantee you that our delivery system will not handle it in its present form.

So, what are we to do, Mr. Speaker, are we to build more granaries to store the grain? Are we to produce grain at a cash flow loss that every farmer in Western Canada may go broke from? No, Mr. Speaker, what we are suggesting is the responsible politicians, who want to see the agricultural community make its full contribution to the Canadian economy and to the western Canadian economy. We want to find solutions to the grain handling system and its problems.

Mr. Speaker, if that involves shaking a few trees, saying to the Canadian Wheat Board, we've got to find out what is the problem, then so be it. That's what we will do and I think that we will do it as responsible politicians, not irresponsible politicians as represented by the Member for Ste. Rose that will criticize us as trying to destroy the Canadian Wheat Board, trying to fatten the pockets of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Balderdash, Mr. Speaker, balderdash. What we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is as legitimate, honest politicians responsible to the western Canadian economy to come up with a solution for the grain handling system, not try to bury our heads in the sand and hide from the problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take personal exception to some of the remarks that the Member for Ste. Rose has made. I shouldn't do that because one should consider the source and write them off as a person who doesn't appreciate what agriculture does. The whole NDP Party didn't appreciate what the Agriculture Committee does for this province. They didn't during the eight years they were in power and there's no reason to expect, Mr. Speaker, that in opposition they would all of a sudden come to their senses, to realize the validity of the farming community to Manitoba. And we, Mr. Speaker, do know the true value of the agricultural community and its impact on western Canada. We know what it means to the western Canadian economy, and, Mr. Speaker, that is why, Mr. Speaker, we are willing, we are willing to shake the tree of the sacred cow of the Canadian Wheat Board. If that's where the problem lies, that's where we'll ask for a solution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is that being unreasonable, is that being unreasonable, Mr. Speaker? I won't ask the Member for Ste. Rose, because he'll say that's unreasonable. But, Mr. Speaker, I ask you in your impartial role, is that unreasonable position to take, that we want to get the \$3,000 that every permit-holder in western Canada lost last year in his pocket in 1980, in 1981 and in 1982? We want, Mr. Speaker, as a party representing the best future of this province to assure that that 1 million tons of grain sales that we have lost already this year, we do not lose that 1 million tons in 1980, and in 1981 and in 1982. Mr. Speaker, that is a responsible position from responsible politicians. What we want to do is solve the problem, not hide from it, not prolong it. That's why we're willing to say, the Crow rate may be a problem. Snavely has pointed out that the rail roads cannot afford to haul commodity.

Mr. Speaker, let's go on another different tack on the whole Crow's rate issue. Mr. Speaker, I worked in the fertilizer industry; now, as a result —(Interjection)— that's something that my honourable gentlemen opposite can appreciate, the fertilizer industry, especially anhydrous ammonia, which the Member for Brandon East thought was hair tonic. But, Mr. Speaker, what the freight rate situation, the Crow's nest rate in western Canada has done, is cost the railroads money and I don't think even the Member for Ste. Rose would be blatantly foolish enough to admit, that the

Canadian railroad system can haul grain at the Crowsnest rate and cover all its costs. I don't even think the Member for Ste. Rose could be that blatant — the Member for Inkster certainly can be that blatant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you have a major commodity such as grain being hauled at a loss in western Canada, the railroads are a business like any other business, and they must strive at the very minimum to break even or to make a profit — and I shudder to use that word in this House, because the Socialist friends opposite don't want profits for anybody. —(Interjection)— No, no profits, but rive to make nevertheless, the railroads are businesses with much st profits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened when they were starved of revenue from grain handling, which by statute they're required to haul? You know what happened, they raised the freight rates possibly — and I hedge my words here, because I don't want to give the Member for Ste. Rose an article for the Dauphin Herald, but they raised the freight rates on other commodities to cover the losses they incurred in the grain handling industry. Now, what did that mean to the farmers, Mr. Speaker? That meant that a farmer in Manitoba, who is enjoying the Crow's rate to ship his grain to Thunder Bay, or to Vancouver, when he bought his fertilizer shipped out of Calgary or Edmonton or Trail, B.C., paid a higher freight rate than he would have paid ordinarily. So indirectly, the farmer was paying, he was paying the cost of subsidizing his own Crowsnest rate on freight rates.

Now, the members opposite won't appreciate that, they don't know what that means. But, Mr. Speaker, that's a fact of life and if you multiply that through, Mr. Speaker, and bring it into play on machinery, bring it into play on lumber, bring it into play on fuel and all the other commodities that our rail lines haul to the farming communities, we may well be in a situation where we've been paying the compulsory rate all along on grains by paying extra freight rates on the input commodities that we are buying to aarry on the business of farming. Now that escapes even the Member for Inkster, by all appearances. And, Mr. Speaker, that is what we are ~~seeing~~ as a responsible government representing the rural community of Manitoba, that we want —(Interjection)— Well, my colleague, the Member for St. James, is quite correct; we also represent the City of Winnipeg, the majority of whose residents fully realize the true impact of agriculture on the province and on the City of Winnipeg, and they are behind is in our efforts to solve the grain problems, definitely they are behind our efforts.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is why we take the attitude that there is a problem. It's easy to identify the problem: Our grain isn't moving. We are losing sales. We are paying demurrage at the west coast; we are paying demurrage at Thunder Bay. We are paying for an inadequate grain handling system.

So what are we doing, Mr. Speaker? What are we suggesting? What did the Minister of Agriculture suggest in his budget debate? He said that if there is a problem and it happens to be in the Canadian Wheat Board, let's find out what it is and solve the problem. He didn't say destroy the Canadian Wheat Board. He didn't say pay the railroads a dollar a bushel to haul our grain. He said let's find the problem; let's identify it, and let's solve it so that western Canada and the farmer, and the total Canadian economy can recover the true potential benefit of agriculture and grain sales in the export market.

Mr. Speaker, carry that one step further, carry that one step further. Our Socialist friend in the Opposition always are berating us for not spending enough money, not spending enough money on the hospitals, etc., etc., when in fact we're spending money than has ever been spent on the hospitals. But what they fail to realize, Mr. Speaker, is that if you have a viable economy in western Canada based on an export market of grains, which may be very vibrant in the next two to three years, by all predictions, if revenues are being generated there, Mr. Speaker, governments — the Manitoba government, the Saskatchewan government, the Alberta government and the federal Treasury — all are going to derive additional tax revenues to fund the much needed social programs in this country, without those kind of revenues which are currently being starved from the western Canadian economy because we're not meeting our sales commitments. We have to curtail programs because you can't operate programs without money, everybody knows that — well, almost everybody knows that; almost everybody knows it. Our Socialist friends don't always appreciate that.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing, what we are saying in this House, let's not hide behind the religion of the Canadian Wheat Board. Let's not hide behind the religion of the Crowsnest rate. If they are part of the problem which is preventing us from realizing our full potential in the western Canadian agriculture, then let's solve those problems. Let's make changes if changes are needed. Let's increase the Crowsnest rate, whether it be from the federal Treasury or a combination of the federal Treasury and the farmer's pocket. Let's solve the problem; let's solve the problem. Let's not hide from it; let's not hide from it.

Even the Minister of Transportation from Saskatchewan has gone so far as to propose to the federal government before the change in election, look boys, we've got a deal for you. What we will do is on the statutory grains of wheat, oats, barley, flax, rye and rapeseed, we will expect you,

as the federal Treasury, to pay the difference between the Crow rate and the compensatory rate. And in return for that, Mr. Speaker, what we will do is we will pay all other agricultural commodities; we will subsidize the statutory rate.

Well, big deal, they are suggesting in Saskatchewan that the federal Treasury subsidize.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We can only have one speaker at a time. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So even the provincial government in Saskatchewan wants to get their hand in the federal cookie jar when it comes to beefing up the railroad revenues beyond the Crow rate to something like a compensatory rate. They're not hiding their head in the sand as the Member for Ste. Rose and other members of his party are doing. They're trying to come up with a realistic solution to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, what's happened in Manitoba? What's happened to the Manitoba agricultural economy? In the event of the last few years where Canadian Wheat Board grains, the statutory grains, have not been moving to the peak volumes — this is going back 10 to 15 years — what has the Manitoba agricultural economy done, Mr. Speaker? It's diversified; it's diversified into sunflowers; it's diversified into buckwheat, peas, beans, lentils, a number of agricultural crops, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, when the member is going to talk about rail abandonment. He hasn't said a word about it yet.

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

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, what's happened to the Manitoba agricultural economy since the rail lines have not been able to deliver the grain? What they have done is they have gone into special crop production: Corn, buckwheat, as I mentioned before. And, Mr. Speaker, who has paid the full freight rate, the compensatory freight rate on those? You know who has, Mr. Speaker? The producer himself has, and he has made money by doing it, and despite the fact that the Manitoba economy has been subjected to the lack of movement of statutory grains from time to time the Manitoba agricultural economy has grown because farmers have accepted the challenge, diversified their crops into grains which are moving compensatory and, in the case of compensatory freight rates, cars are there from the railroads right now. You can get a line-up; you can get a unit train of cars, Mr. Speaker, to ship sunflowers in the fall. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the railroads are making a compensatory rate on it. They are making a dollar by hauling that commodity. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Manitoba are making a dollar by having the railroads make a dollar hauling that commodity because the sunflowers, the corn, the buckwheat and the other special crops are cash crops which go directly into the farmer's operating budget in the fall when his cash demands are probably at the second highest time of the year. They cannot afford, in Manitoba, to depend on statutory grains such as wheat, oats and barley to be moved by the Canadian Wheat Board on the quota system and they have diversified and they have been successful at it, and they paid the total freight rate and they have made a successful business of growing, marketing and supplying those special crops to the world market.

Mr. Speaker, I personally believe that Manitoba farmers will likewise do that for wheat, triticale and a number of other commodities. Even if they had to pay more freight rate, they would still grow the crop, market it and sell all of it, and we would be getting service and we would be getting dollars and cash flow.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take any more time because the Member for Ste. Rose has completely scuttled around the issue. —(Interjection)— I wouldn't ask him to resign because he is going to be forced to resign after the next election, when the present Member for Gladstone gives him a lickin' in the new riding.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to speak on a grievance during this session. In fact, I've never spoke on a grievance yet, in my life in this House. But having listened to the Member for Pembina and his vicious attacks, his very serious attacks on my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, I feel moved to say a few words on the question of railway line abandonment and the

position that this government and members of the government side, back benchers as well as the Treasury Board members, seem to take with regard to the Crow rate.

I never thought, Mr. Speaker, that I would hear members who represent the farm community stand up in this House and say, "The Crow rate should go." Because that's what I've been hearing. Really, that's what I've been hearing, that the Crow rate is not sacrosanct and perhaps the Crow rate should go. And this is really strange music to my ears, because I really thought —(Interjection)— Well, what are the farmers telling me? I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of meeting with my colleagues, Minister in charge of Transportation policy for Alberta, Dr. Horner and Mr. Gordon MacMurchy, the Minister in charge of Transportation for Saskatchewan, and indeed the Minister responsible for Transportation matters in B. C. over the years, and there was never any serious debate. The Minister from B. C. didn't care that much about the Crow rate, but I can assure you that our colleagues from the sister provinces, Conservative government — the time Dr. Horner, a good friend, you know, had his —(Interjection)— well, I've known Dr. Horner for many years, and he was Minister of Transport Policy, and we discussed this matter many timeefore the Hall Commission, during the Hall Commission and after the Hall Commission. And Mr. Speaker, there was unanimity on the part of the western prairie provinces that the Crow rate is sacrosanct, that we should not allow Otto Lang and the federal government to even open the book to start looking at the statutory rates as laid down by the Crow rate.

Now we know, of course, that that is being done or has been done through the Snavelly Commission, and indeed our Chief Justice Emmett Hall has looked into the matter and has produced the matter of grain handling and the matter of branch line abandonment in western Canada and has come out with a very important document. The only trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Transportation at that time wouldn't even look at this document. The Minister of Transportation, the former Minister of Transportation, Otto Lang, would not even discuss the matter with Chief Justice Emmett Hall, and this I think is incredible. The Hall Commission was laid down, the Hall Commission was appointed by the previous federal government, by the Minister of Transportation, Mr. Lang, at the time, the Minister of Transportation at the time, Mr. Lang, having worked for two years with some very good people, including Mr. Reg Forbes from Brandon who worked very long, hard hours on this report. After two years when the report came out, the Minister would not even give the courtesy to Mr. Hall, Justice Hall and the members of the Commission to discuss it with them, and I don't believe they've discussed it to this day, and I think that's incredible.

The reason why, Mr. Speaker, is because the Hall Report is really very pro-western Canada. It is very pro-farmer, it is very pro-western agriculture. It is essentially, as my colleague from Ste. Rose indicates, it's essentially a commission that is dealing with the question of branch lines. In his resolution the Member for Ste. Rose made reference to this, deploring the establishment of the Prairie Rail Action Committee, otherwise known as PRAC, which Otto Lang, the former Minister of Transportation, established while he at the same time ignored all of the recommendations of the Hall Commission report. I think he ignored every one of them.

And my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, has indicated that he is satisfied with many of the recommendations of the Hall Report, and that he is concerned that the Prairie Rail Action Committee, which the former Minister of Transport set up, was about to do a hatchet job on rail lines across the prairies. And I don't know whether members opposite realize. They keep on talking about these retention committees, fair enough. We had retention committees too, but now I say presumably, presumably, Mr. Speaker, I hope we've got a new ball game. I really hope that the new Minister of Transport will take a fresh look at this and will look at the Hall Commission Report. And that really is what my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, really wants. He wants the federal government to take a good honest look at this report. I'm afraid that some of my friends opposite haven't studied the report. I'm not even sure whether they know the main recommendations of the report, because it goes well beyond the matter of branch lines per se in Manitoba or Saskatchewan and Alberta. It goes into some very fundamental recommendations pertaining to the grain handling system.

The Member for Pembina talked very glowingly about the need to upgrade the grain handling system. Well, of course we want to see the grain handling system in Canada upgraded. Of course we want to have more exports of Canada's grain to world markets. Of course there is need for greater efficiency. And that's recognized in here. There are all kinds of recommendations on the improvement of the grain handling system. It says "Grain and rail in western Canada."

MR. GREEN: Would you call it a creditable job?

MR. EVANS: I'd call it a very creditable job by Chief Justice Hall and his commission. There are all kinds of excellent recommendations in here, and one of the key recommendations is the establishment of a Prairie Rail Authority this is ' a Prairie Rail Authority. Now a very unique idea.

It would have to fit in with the Canadian Transport Commission, but nevertheless the idea of the Prairie Rail Authority was to ensure that the subsidies that were to be paid by the federal government, as indeed they've been paid for many a year, would go to the branch lines, that they would not be allowed to be disused, eventually to be grown over with grass, bushes, trees and so on, while at the same time the railways were able to receive a subsidy. That was to cease, that the railways were now to be accountable for the subsidies they got from Ottawa and that they were to be allowed to have some abandonment. Hall agreed to a certain amount of abandonment, more than the province of Manitoba would have liked to have seen, but nevertheless we didn't think he was

But that those branch lines that would be maintained would be maintained under the aegis of the Prairie Rail Authority which would look very closely at the utilization of subsidies to ensure that we had a branch line system that was worthy of its name, to assure that that branch line system would be upgraded, that it could handle the modern hopper cars, that it could be in use most of the year instead of just part of the year as has been the case in years gone by. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, that very fundamental recommendation, in my view, has been overlooked. I'm not even sure that the Minister of Agriculture in this House realizes that that recommendation is in there. —(Interjection)— Well, I think the Member for Ste. Rose understands it too. He realizes that the Prairie Rail Authority would ensure that those subsidies were directed properly.

Now the Minister of Agriculture wonders, you know, what do you mean about this? Well, the fact is that the railways receive subsidies, without going into too much detail, the railways of Canada, CP and CN, received subsidies from the federal treasury for branch line upgrading, but they somehow or other, miraculously I presume, somehow or other they were able to channel these subsidies into other purposes and the Hall Commission, Justice Hall in fact indicated this to us personally when he met with the western provincial ministers concerned with transportation policy. He said: "If you or I, gentlemen, received funds from the government for one purpose and then proceeded to spend it for another purpose, we'd be thrown in jail for misuse of funds". —(Interjection)— Well, he said we'd be thrown in jail. I'm just quoting. His attitude was that the — not his attitude, but his opinion was that the railways had greatly misused the subsidies that were given to them for the adequate maintenance of a branch line system.

So I say that it's not because the Member for Pembina and others opposite seem to think it's because the railways aren't receiving sufficient funds through the Crow rate. There's no question that the Crow rate is a low rate. It's a statutory rate going back many years, based on an agreement made between the CPR and the federal government because of a federal government cash grant that was made, and other considerations made to the CPR about 75 or 80 years ago or thereabouts.

But the fact is that that rate has allowed western Canadian grain to get to seaboard, to get to world markets, at relatively low cost. And the argument is, well, we should have higher rates because without a rate that compensates the railway, we will always have an inadequate railway system. And so the answer according to my friends opposite is: "Give the railways more money". In effect, undercut the Crow rate. Throw it out the window, in so many words, or modify it in any way you wish. Whatever terms you want to use. But nevertheless, the long and the short of it is, the western Canadian farmers, the Manitoba farmers, will be paying more for it.

And when the Member for Pembina so boldly gets up and makes a grandiose speech about all the money that's being lost in grain exports and points his finger to different problems in grain handling, he seems to want to solve that problem on the backs of the Manitoba farmers. That's what he wants to do. He wants to solve that problem on the backs of the prairie farmers because the fact is, Mr. Speaker, if the Crow rate is taken away, there will be more than that \$3,000 per farmer in lost sales that the member referred to, there will be more than that loss in terms of farmers having to take less income because they have to pay higher railway rates. There's no question about it. It's a very classic case of where the burden of transportation costs shall lay.

And I'm saying that in this case, the railways are asserting that they're not receiving full compensation but Justice Hall says: "You haven't been receiving compensation you believe. But what about all these millions of dollars of subsidies that you received over the years?" And he documents, or he goes on to indicate that they have not been used adequately for the purposes for which they were given. And therefore, it's a matter of proper administration. It's a matter of seeing that there is some federal authority such as this prairie rail authority that's suggested to ensure that the moneys are utilized properly and that we have a good and efficient branch line system in western Canada.

The answer is not removal of the Crow rate and I believe that Manitoba, if the Member for Pembina is indicating the position of the government in Manitoba, and if some of the comments that have been made indeed by the Minister of Agriculture — because he always hedges on the matter, he doesn't take a firm stand, to wit, here I stand; I am in favour of maintaining the Crow rate because it's in the best interests of the Canadian western farmer. He is hedging, and then

we find and hear his backbenchers are not hedging; they're taking a very firm stand saying the Crow rate has to go. Because that's the only way we're going to get the railways on side and delivering our grain to markets on time, on schedule, etc.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Pembina and others seem to think that the grain handling problem sort of just arose since they came to office. We've had many omissions on grain handling in c Canada, many committees, and —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the latest and one of the finest was the Hall Commission Report, which our government —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture says from his seat that we did great things. The fact is that the government of Manitoba, the New Democratic Party government in Manitoba, along with the government of Saskatchewan, and the government of Alberta, jointly issued a statement, a public statement, endorsing the Hall Report and recommending to the federal government that the major suggestions of the Hall Report be implemented. —(Interjection)—

Well, what else are we supposed to do? Can the honourable minister indicate what else we're supposed to do? The fact is, you have a federal railway system; the provinces were asked to make an input in terms of what we thought about branch line abandonment and what we thought about other matters pertaining to grain handling and we presented these views. We presented lengthy briefs and so on. And I'm very pleased, as was Dr. Horner from Alberta and Mr. MacMurchy from Saskatchewan. We were very pleased, I was very pleased because we had unanimity. All of the Prairie Provinces stood together behind Chief Justice Emmett Hall. We stood alongside Justice Hall, who is a true western Canadian, interested in the welfare of the prairie farmers. And, Mr. Speaker, Justice Hall and his Commission were undercut. Overnight, they were undercut by Otto Lang. As I said, he wouldn't even talk to them, and Justice Hall who incidentally has had experience with some other very important commissions; Medicare, the whole basis of Medicare goes back to the recommendation of Justice Hall many many years back. And Justice Hall has said: "I've never had the experience". I think this is the third Royal Commission, I believe, that he was on, as he was on one with the railway unions as well. —(Interjection)— Okay. So he has had much experience. . . But the fact is, he said: "Gentlemen", and he was talking to we, the prairie ministers involved. He said: "Gentlemen, never have I had the experience where the Minister to whom I am responsible for this won't talk to me about my report. He doesn't want to talk to me and my r commission report didn't go as far as Mr. Otto about the report". Because the r Lang wanted to go in terms of branch line abandonment, so he quickly set up the Prairie Rail Action Committee — and please note, it's got the same initials; PRA, Prairie Rail Authority, Prairie Rail Action Committee, instead of omission of whatever — and the fact is that c the Prairie Rail Action Committee set up by Lang has recommended, according to information given to us in the Estimates of the Department of Economic Development, wherein we debate transportation policy, the information given to us by the Minister there showed — if my memory serves me correctly — that the PRAC, the Prairie Rail Action Committee is recommending 500 more miles of branch line abandonment over and above what the Hall Commission had recommende d, 500 miles. Even the Minister of Highways will have to agree that that's a lot of mileage; 500 additional miles to be ripped.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, we don't want a pussyfooting partial approach to this, a half-hearted approach to the whole matter by simply saying: "Well, we're standing behind the rail retention committees." We think that here is a terrific opportunity for this Minister of Agriculture and other members of the government to go to Ottawa and say: "Look, we have an excellent report here to upgrade the grain handling system in western Canada without taking unnecessary income out of the pockets of Manitoba farmers or other prairie farmers, and let's get on with some of these excellent recommendations".

And, Mr. Speaker, they're recommendations pertaining to a wide variety of matters. They talked about the producer car. He makes recommendations that the Canadian Wheat Board assume total responsibility for a producer car program. He suggests that the Canadian Wheat Board institute a program to increase the producers' awareness of producer cars. And there are other recommendations: Elimination of the eight-hour loading time restriction; changes in the income tax regulations to permit producers to defer income on producer cars; and also the railways to retain abandoned elevator sidings for the spotting of producer cars for twelve months following elevator closures.

And then another very important element in getting our wheat to western ports, getting our wheat to the Pacific Ocean is the so-called Ashton-Clinton link, where, without going into the details, there is a possibility there of reducing the mileage involved in getting western wheat to the Pacific ports. And the Ashton-Clinton link is a right-of-way that could be acquired and a line built between these two places. And the Hall Commission recommended that the right-of-way required for this link be acquired and that engineering plants be completed, so that construction might take place quickly in an emergency situation.

They go on and recognize that there are many many parallel rail lines of the C.N. and C.P. in

western Canada and they recommend that savings could be obtained if joint track usage was undertaken by the railways, instead of them running their railways side by side, running their trains side by side, there could be a great deal of efficiency, a great deal of money saved and reduction in costs if the C.N. and C.P. would co-operate in the utilization of the rail track network that's in place.

The Commission makes other recommendations pertaining to rail car allocations. It makes recommendations pertaining to electrification. And incidentally, the government should be interested in that recommendation, that there should be research into the application of electrification of Canadian railways; this should be undertaken by the Federal Department of Transport. And they go on into all kinds of other recommendations pertaining to the primary elevator site. They deal with the question of off-line elevators. In fact, they suggested that an off-line elevator be established at Fisher Branch, Manitoba. They were prepared to recommend with that experiment.

And they went on to suggest that the federal government, through the Prairie Rail Authority, pay the costs of trucking and additional handling at Arborg, and that the elevator companies and the Prairie Rail Authorities examine the feasibility of similar operations at various points in Alberta and Saskatchewan. They're all named here, I won't take the time to read out each of these names.

They make recommendations pertaining to elevator tariffs; they're suggesting a standardized costing system for use by both the primary and the terminal elevator system be developed. And they go on to suggest that those accounting methods be structured to ascertain separately the costs of cleaning, handling, storage and drying of grains.

They also recommend that the operators of primary elevators and terminals be required to report costs on a regular basis to the Commission — that's the Canadian Grain Commission — for purposes of monitoring such costs and determining tariff levels. And also, they recommend that elevator companies be required to show the applicable tariffs for handling, cleaning, storage and freight on the producer's cash ticket.

They then go on and talk about problems of closing certain primary elevators, and the overbuilding that they see in some parts of the system.

There are some other very important recommendations, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture in this province should acquaint himself with, so that he can go to Ottawa and talk to the new Minister of Transport; talk turkey, if I can use that expression. Talk turkey to the new Minister of Transportation in Ottawa, and say, "Look, let's take a look at the Hall Report," as my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose has said in his Resolution and in debate on his Resolution and this evening on his grievance.

And the fact is that they point out that there are improvements to be made at Thunder Bay; that dredging at Thunder Bay should be resumed immediately. They recommend that terminal switching at Thunder Bay be altered so that switching by each railway closely parallels the country origins of each.

They recommend that a main line C.P. Rail bypass be constructed for traffic through at Thunder Bay. And you see, all my friends opposite glibly talk about improvements in the grain handling system, the Premier of this province has talked about improvements in the grain handling system — talk, talk, talk. As though it has never been studied, it has never been examined.

But here in this one copy alone, this first copy alone, 550 pages of the Hall Report, are hundreds of detailed suggestions, some very major, and some not so major. But very concrete, specific, important suggestions to help get our grain to markets. And that's what it's all about. Not . . . —(Interjection)—

MR. DOWNEY: It's ancient.

MR. EVANS: Well the Minister of Agriculture says from his seat, "This is ancient." It is not ancient. The terminal at Thunder Bay, the harbor at Thunder Bay, has to be improved. It's not ancient. The facilities at Churchill have to be improved; that is not ancient.

Well the fact is that these recommendations are still very pertinent, Mr. Speaker. They are very pertinent and they should be implemented, in my view.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. What the member has said I said; I said what he is saying, giving us, is ancient . . . this speech that he's giving us.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.
The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Well, I'm glad there was no point of order, because I didn't hear what the member said anyway.

I know that the Member for Roblin made a speech last year about the need to upgrade the Port of Churchill; and here it is, there are six specific recommendations on the Port of Churchill. If you want to improve the grain handling system, here it is. Here's one . . .

A MEMBER: You were . . . for eight years, what did you do?

MR. EVANS: What did we do? We did a lot of things. —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows, it's a federal port, and we did everything we could to get the federal government — and indeed it did, at one point, begin to upgrade the facilities. There was some upgrading that took place, and indeed' there's some upgrading of the line.

But the Hall Commission specifically recommended for the Port of Churchill that railway stop-off charge for in-transit storage at inland government elevators be eliminated. They recommended that the Canadian government elevator at Saskatoon be fully utilized in the cleaning, storage and shipment of grain to Churchill.

And that's very important, because, Mr. Speaker, most of the grain that goes through Churchill comes from northern Saskatchewan.

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

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. The honourable member that's speaking from Brandon East made certain allegations about the Port of Churchill. May I remind him and his colleagues across the way, that their former deskmate over there, Les Osland, was on the Board of Churchill Port Development. For all those years, he never attended one meeting. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. That is not a point of order.
The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, you know, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that all the years of Tory government under Premier Roblin, and Premier Weir, there was never a Port Churchill Development Board. There was no such thing. That Board was set up under the initiative taken by the NDP government of Manitoba of the day.

The NDP government set up the Port Churchill Development Board. We set up, and we persuaded Saskatchewan, and then ultimately Alberta, to come into it and indeed we still have today a continuation of a very worthwhile Board, which, let's face it, is a promotional Board, still doesn't have the finances to upgrade the facilities here.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . never attended one meeting.

MR. EVANS: Well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, whether one or other members attended meetings, I'm not familiar with what any one's attendance record was. But the fact is that it's an excellent Board; it was functioning well, whether any one member from whatever province happened to be there or not be there. I don't accept the member's allegations; I don't have that information. As far as I'm concerned, they worked very well, and I trust they are continuing their work.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Hall Commission made some very significant recommendations pertaining to the Canadian government elevator at Saskatoon, because that is the key in getting more grain put through Churchill. They suggest that rates be established from all CP Rail points in the area serving Churchill. These rates — and I'm quoting from Page 531 of the Report — "These rates should be distance-related and comparable to distance-related grain rates on the Canadian National Railways. The Railways be required to interchange cars for Churchill at common interchange points."

Now, here is a specific recommendation, very concrete, very specific, to assist getting grain to a sea port and to get further utilization of the good Port of Churchill.

There are other recommendations pertaining to Churchill; that the Canadian government work with local authorities in increasing the insurance season on grain carriers between Cape Chidley and Churchill, and adjust the rate reflecting contemporary conditions, and they also suggest that a new system for the management of Canadian ports will enhance the influence of local authorities in the development of the Port of Churchill, and the Commission supports early passage and implementation of the legislation. That's a reference to some current federal legislation dealing with

ports at that time.

They made some very specific recommendations pertaining to Vancouver. The Commission recommended a special task force be set up to co-ordinate rail operations in the Port of Vancouver, and that the WesTAC — that's the Western Transport Advisory Committee — be engaged to structure such a task force.

That Committee, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, is made up of representatives of the railways and the trucking companies, as well as the provinces and others concerned about the subject of rail and general transportation.

The Commission also recommended that the Grain Car Co-ordinator at Vancouver should have the authority to allocate and direct grain cars to the terminals, and his orders should be carried out expeditiously and without fail by the railway companies. This Co-ordinator should be an official of the Canadian Wheat Board.

It is recommended that control of traffic over the Fraser River Bridge be placed in the hands of the Canadian National Railways in Vancouver. This is a very concrete, very specific — you might think it's very minor, but you people are interested in improved grain handling; here are the suggestions — very concrete. But, as I said, thus far, no one in the federal government has seen fit to act upon it.

MR. WILSON: I sent them all to Joe Clark, what are you talking about?

MR. EVANS: The Commission went on to recommend that the British Columbia Railway be given running rates over the Canadian National from the southern terminus of the British Columbia Railway to the points where its trains are taken over by the Burlington Northern. And the Canadian Transport Commission should impose equitable terms and conditions for these running rights in pursuance of the powers conferred to it under The Railway Act and The National Transportation Act.

They go on to make suggestions about Squamish. Here too is an opportunity to improve export of grains by upgrading the situation at Squamish — the Port of Squamish — which is about, I don't know, 30, 40 miles, 30, 35 miles, I guess, due north of Vancouver. Further north along the B.C. coast — Prince Rupert, the Commission recommends that the terminal at Prince Rupert be enlarged to a capacity of 6 million bushels, and fully modernized, and that it be operated to its fullest extent as part of Canada's grain export operations.

Failing full utilization by the Canadian Wheat Board, the terminal should be entrusted to a grain exporting concern which would have a financial incentive to use it to its full capacity.

In addition, the Commission has recommended greater utilization of the interior Canadian government elevators, and the establishment of open interchange points to provide C.P. Rail grain access to Prince Rupert, both of which are designed to expand the export capability of the Port of Prince Rupert.

The Commission goes on to deal with other matters pertaining to the processing of grain products in western Canada, which possibly would give more jobs to people in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta in the processing of grains and other food. —(Interjection)— I've just been sent another 20 minutes worth of material.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has six minutes.

MR. EVANS: Only six? Well, I've read this before. I've read it before many a time, and we discussed this matter in detail with Justice Hall. Unfortunately, we never ever could get hold of Mr. Otto Lang to discuss it and to go over these recommendations.

The point that I'm making, and the point my colleague from Ste. Rose has been making this evening and was making in the discussion on his proposed Resolution pertaining to branch lines, is that we have many many ways that we can upgrade the grain handling system of western Canada. It should be upgraded. There are all kinds of good suggestions in the Hall Report. The grain handling system — as members opposite think, there is not the one solution which is to increase Crow rates, to give more money to the railway. Well, that's the simplistic solution that I hear coming from members opposite, the simplistic solution. They don't want to look at the Hall Report. They don't want to look at all these very good recommendations to reduce the costs to the railways. You know, you talk about efficiency, you people are always interested in talking about efficiency. There are plenty of recommendations for improved efficiency of the Railway Transport System without the farmers of Manitoba paying more to the railways to keep on an inefficient system.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, also, if we have a little foresight, and there was some foresight shown by the Hall Commission, and that is that in this day and age of increasing energy costs it's going to become even more critical that we take a very rational approach to the way we transport all commodities, including grain and other agricultural products. There's no question that the rail mode

of transport is the most efficient user of energy of any mode of transport, the most efficient user —(Interjection)— well, overland — overland, the most efficient. I'm talking about inland transportation obviously, and I'm really comparing rail with road because obviously when you have fewer branch lines there's going to be more traffic on the road; there's going to be a greater cost to the farmers, obviously, to operate his trucks over a longer distance; there's going to be a greater cost to the Municipal Governments because they have to maintain roads for heavier trucks; and there's a greater cost to the provincial taxpayers, as the Minister of Highways will tell us, because we have to pay money to upgrade the Provincial Road System to handle this heavier truck traffic that will come, that will obviously come from railway abandonment.

And my colleague behind me, the Member for Ste. Rose, gets up and says, "A plague on Otto Lang and his Prairie Rail Action Committee that wants to abandon 500 more miles of line over and above what the Hall Commission recommends," and he gets shouted down for wanting to do the right thing, for wanting to do the right thing. He says he is interested in the farmers in Manitoba in his own constituency, and he says the Crow Rate is a good deal for western Canadian farmers. But what happens? He gets shouted down from members opposite as though he was saying something that was almost irreligious or what have you. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Ste. Rose is right on when he says that the Prairie Governments would be foolish, utterly foolish, to give in to the Federal Government, or whoever, the railways, on the question of the row Rate. You're foolish.

They've got the power to adjust it if they want, you can't stop it. But you would be foolish to agree to an adjustment of it because it's only going to go one way, and that's up; and when it goes up, farm income goes down. And there's no question, there's a transfer of real income from the pockets of Manitobans, people of Saskatchewan, people of Alberta, and particularly from the farmers' pockets to the pockets of the railways and to the pockets of the Federal Treasury, because when you have more branch line abandonment, what you are doing, presumably is reducing the administrative responsibilities of the Federal Government. And here's a clear classic case, it's almost an historic case, an historic question, of conflict between a Federal authority and its responsibilities and the cost it's prepared to exercise, and a Provincial authority with all its responsibilities and the costs that it has to undertake. And I say, it's incredulous for this government, and for this Minister of Agriculture, to sit back calmly and let the Federal Government, or whoever is in power, exercise changes, or bring about changes in the Crow Rate, or bring about changes in the branch line system, to decimate the system and thereby increase the real cost burdens on the people of Manitoba, and particularly the farmers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, we have found a very tender spot in the Caucus of the NDP, Agriculture, the Number One industry of this province which they don't know nothing about. They have no people over there can talk about agriculture, and those that do stand up and talk about it don't know what they're talking about.

It's very interesting, Mr. Speaker. Could you realize that the Caucus that's in Ottawa is about the size of the Caucus over there, and they're talking about matters international in this country — Dominion matters — and they have no more mentality and ability on agriculture than we heard from the paper farmer over here and the Member for Ste. Rose tonight. And they think, Mr. Speaker, they think that they're going to lead this country and guide western Canada in the destiny of our Number One industry? Man, forget it. Forget it. Tell the Press to forget it. Who are these paperhangers we have over here, Mr. Speaker? Unbelievable.

This academic genius from Brandon. I would like the Honourable Member for Brandon to stand up and give me evidence of one mile — I'll give him one quarter of a mile of rail that he saved from abandonment the eight years they were in office, and for every quarter mile I'll give him a hundred bucks, that he saved from rail abandonment. And let him stand up and put it on the record in this province. What that government did, and what their policies were, and what is the result of that eight years of experience in this province? Absolutely a disaster. An absolute disaster. No policy. They don't understand farming. They don't know what they're talking about in agricultural matters, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I've never seen the Honourable Member for Inkster more embarrassed in all the years I've sat here than I saw him tonight, listening to that grievance from the Member for Ste. Rose, and then have to live through that droning that we've heard for the last 20 minutes from the Member for Brandon. I have never seen the Member for Inkster. . . Mr. Speaker, I saw the Member for Inkster turn around, he slept, he went out and had a drink of water, he came back in. That's not the way the Member for Inkster performs. Normally, he sits in his seat and is a very attentive person. But Mr. Speaker, tonight he wasn't and I tell you it was very difficult for us to

sit over here and listen to that junk, very difficult. Under great stress, I tried the best I could, so I sympathize with the Honourable Member for Inkster. And I now am going to ask my Caucus to stand up and support the Honourable Member for Inkster for Leadership of the Party over there.

And Mr. Seaker, we'll finally have a Leader over there that's always in his chair, and when he stands up we know what he is talking about, and when he talks we know that he means it. And he is factual and he is honest, and he is dedicated. I can't say that about the Member for Ste. Rose, nor can I say that about the Member for Brandon.

And, Mr. Speaker, I know they have got problems. They are running around. They've got a problem: They don't have a leader. If there was, he would be in his chair tonight. But he got a haircut; he is likely down at the beauty parlor getting his hair curled or something.

So they've got that problem. Now they've got the problem of the Member for Churchill. The former Member for Churchill never attended a Board Meeting of the Churchill Port; he never attended one — Osland. But now the new Member for Churchill, he has got a Zuken sign in his window.

Now, the other thing. We, over here, will not only support the Honourable Member for Inkster in leadership, I suspect that our caucus will go with Norrie for Mayor. I imagine our caucus —(Interjection)— I doubt if we'd go for Zuken; I doubt that very much, but we will deal with that tomorrow.

But, Mr. Speaker, let's get back to the stone age agricultural policy of the NDP Party. The Crowsnest rates have been on the records of Canada since 1885 —(Interjection)— Engraven in stone. And is the Member for Ste. Rose or the Member for Brandon East going to try to tell me and the people in my constituency, or all Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia that it isn't time for change. That has not been changed since 1885, or in that period, when the railroads were built. That was the Crowsnest rates, and I say it's long overdue that those rates were examined, checked and surely we can, in our widest wisdom . . .

Now, the Member for Brandon, of course he is an academic; he has never been on a farm and all of his farming is out of paper. I just suggest, as our university professor, wouldn't it be better for you to talk to young agricultural graduates in the university today, that we should look at that 1885 document and it should be examined and it should be reviewed, and it should be updated. At least we've got computers today, which they didn't have in 1885. We're putting a man on the moon today, which they didn't do in 1885. This world has moved on.

We have lots of problems in agriculture, Mr. Speaker. We've got all kinds of farmers in my constituency today who have got thousands and thousands of bushels of grain in store in their bins; why is it not delivered? Why is it not delivered? Did the Member for Brandon answer that? He was the Minister for eight years. He said he was going to solve all those problems. What did he do? Absolutely nothing. What did the Member for Ste. Rose do? He goes around and writes articles in the Dauphin Herald, half-truths and quarter-truths and misleads the people and doesn't tell them the facts. Mr. Speaker, he even went on to mislead the people. I am getting phone calls that the Member for Ste. Rose believes that he is the new rail line abandonment executive of this province and he is going to lead us out of the wilderness of problems of rail abandonment. Read his articles; it's unbelievable. —(Interjection)— It's unbelievable.

Many people from other jurisdictions than Ste. Rose say that they have never seen the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose's farm. I don't know. I have never seen his farm, but he made a lot of allegations and charges in the record tonight and I think it has got to be challenged.

Let me say, first of all, in dealing with the Hall Commission Report, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has hired Mr. Forbes back in the Department of Agriculture. He was on the Hall Commission. If the Member for Brandon thinks that's not positive and that's not moving into the period that we should be moving into, to having one of those that sat on the Hall Commission now as an employee of the province. Maybe some day, Mr. Speaker, we should bring Mr. Forbes here in a committee or in some seminar and discuss and see what he thinks about the future, because without this matter being resolved much better than it's being resolved by the grievance of the Member for Ste. Rose . . .

Mr. Speaker, the new Minister, the new government, Ottawa, I love the Member for Brandon East talking about the days of Otto Lang and his baba and all those things that happened to Lang and Trudeau and those guys.

And how could the Member for Ste. Rose in his wildest imagination stand up and collaborate us with the Liberals? My God. Who did Trudeau put in for Governor-General? It wasn't a Tory. How close are we to Liberalism in this province? We don't have any more Liberals in this province. We certainly have socialists, but we have no more Liberals. But the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in his wildest dream, and I know Ste. Rose used to have a lot of Liberals out there, but they, the Liberals in Ste. Rose, don't vote Conservative. They're voting NDP. But he stands up in their

cute NDP arithmetic and somehow can visualize Liberals being in the same camp as us. It's typical of the mentality of the Member for Ste. Rose. You know, if Trudeau was going to form a minority government it would have been with the NDP, not with the Tories. —(Interjection)— But that's the mentality of the honourable member.

But I say the new Minister of Transport and the Wheat Board, Don Mazankowski — I'm sure most members in this Legislature have had a chance to meet him, had a chance to talk to him. He comes from a Polish background, and that's good for Canada and it's good for western Canada that he has got all the skills and all the ability and I say he's got a lot more on the ball than Otto Lang ever had, and I compare Lang to the Member for Brandon East, who didn't know anything about farming, never was on a farm. They're paper hangers, those kind of farmers. Not at all, they don't know what it is to get their hands dirty and get down and muck around with the farmers and talk farmers' problems. But Mazankowski does.

I suggest to the Member for Ste. Rose and the Member for Brandon East, do like the Member for Wolseley over here, start communicating with Clark and Mazankowski about rail abandonment and agricultural matters, and we're going to move this country, we're going to clean up the Wheat Board mess and we're going to clean up the rail abandonment mess. And if you want to come with grievances at this late hour, and the Member for Brandon East wants to stand up and read records which we've all read hundreds of times and it's not solved anything, and he never solved anything and his party, his government never solved anything in this province. Scrap all that junk and let's move forward into the next decade with Mazankowski and the new Clark government and we will start and give this country some direction and some leadership which has been lacking for a long long time.

But I know, I know, Mr. Speaker, the NDP won't join us, never. Neither will they join the Clark government. They'll sit over there and they'll continue with their knitting and their fighting, but I suspect the Member for Inkster will join us, because he's the only positive guy over there that I know on agricultural matters.

Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the hour is late and the clock is almost finished. There is lot of work to be done, but our No. 1 industry, and not only in Manitoba but all western Canada, is at stake on these matters that we're dealing with tonight and I say, "Stand up, join us with Mazankowski and that Clark government and we'll solve those problems of the transportation problems of the Wheat Board."

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

MR. PARASIUK: I would ask the Member for Roblin if he would yield the floor for a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 10 o'clock the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 . . . Order please. . Order please, there is a question on the floor that we have to solve first before we adjourn. Are you ready for the question? All those in favour of the motion, please say Aye. Those opposed, please say Nay. In my opinion, the Ayes have it.

The hour being 10 o'clock, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Wednesday)