

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 17, 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I must apologize. I left the sheet in my office where we have a number of guests up in the gallery. I hope those who are listening will send it in to me and then I'll properly recognize all our gallery guests. In the meantime I think we may as well proceed. We are on Resolutions 4 and 6. I have three members standing, I can't recognize them all.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed let me first of all introduce the guests. We have 30 members of the Cross Golden Age Senior Citizens' Club under the leadership of Mrs. Audley. They are in the centre gallery.

We have also 65 students of Grades 10, 11 and 12 standing of the Melita and Hull, Quebec, Schools; Melita in Manitoba and Hull, Quebec, as their guests. They are under the direction of Mr. Beaumont and Mr. Demers. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur.

And we have 23 students of Grade 9 standing of the Aberdeen School under the direction of Mr. Selver. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members I welcome you here today.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. My point of privilege is - and what's reported in the paper today and I know that one of the papers have shortchanged me two years but that's not why I'm getting up. Yesterday during the debates on a private member's resolution concerning the football league there's reported in the press that I stated, "NCAA has barred Canadian hockey players from its team in the United States" which means the National Collegiate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATRICK: . . . the National Collegiate Athletic Association in the States barred Canadian hockey kids. Mr. Speaker, this is incorrect and I don't want the statement left uncorrected because there are many many Canadian kids playing hockey that are going to colleges on scholarships in the United States and I didn't want the statement left. What I did mean to say, or what my statement was, that the NCAA barred Junior A players and the reason they were barred because the Junior A players in Canada receive some remuneration, they're I believe to be classified as professionals. So I just wanted to clarify the statement.

CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a few remarks in connection with Hydro. I wish that the Member from Fort Rouge would be here because he's Mr. Stop, Look and Listen as far as I'm concerned. He's been on to this kick about stop, look and listen ever since he took a notion to run and he hasn't got over it. However, I think maybe that there has been some serious mistakes made, but the mistakes were made because the plan that was drawn out in the beginning by the engineers wasn't followed. We've had studies and the Premier of this province very proudly piled them on top of his desk here last year until he had books this high all over the desk and there was all sorts of studies. And those studies showed that we should have went ahead with the flooding of South Indian Lake. And where we went wrong was when we didn't follow those and we took on Mr. Cass-Beggs to do what I would consider is a political job for the government. And for the government to accept statements by Mr. Cass-Beggs that a man of the calibre of D. L. Campbell was only doing boy arithmetic and he didn't know what he was talking about shows that that really had to be political, because D. L. Campbell was respected and still is respected all over Manitoba and stands up for the things he believes whether you like them or not.

It's something like when you build a building and it's set up by an architect and there's certain things in the design. And suppose you think you can cut an archway into it just because you think it could be put there. But the fellow that designed the building maybe had some of the heating system or some of the plumbing system coming up in that part so you can't start changing the design without interfering with the whole structure of the building. And that's what happened when they brought in Mr. Cass-Beggs who quickly glanced over the reports thinking that he could summarize them all and come up with something that was better.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) --(Interjection)-- I am sure that the Member from Radis - son is just squawking out of his seat and that he really don't know. I really feel that he has been brainwashed, but he really must know deep down that a man like D. L. Campbell who followed Hydro like he did and others in the department knew what they were talking about. We know that we had people resign from the board --(Interjection)-- Yes, and Mr. Kristjan - son when he quit because he couldn't associate himself with the things that were published in those reports. You must really know it was a snow job, it was a snow job.

Now I'm just really concerned now as to whether we've gone so far that we can't go back somewhere and correct it before we get into more trouble because often that's the best thing to do. I think now that we're going to be spending over \$400 million, it's going to cost each family in the neighbourhood of \$1,600 per family over the next number of years on account of this foolishness, you could call it. Our hydro rates at the rate they're increasing, and we see no reason but what they won't because they're getting into more trouble all the time will have doubled. It's going to cost everybody that's using hydro, everybody, more money than it should in the next few years. It wouldn't be so bad if it was costing them more money but if it's money that should have been saved then it is wrong. And it's in the sequence of the way these structures would be put on the river that made the difference when they made the diversion, and this is where the NDP have gone wrong. And it was very ably explained here last night - on the diversion, yes. And it was very ably explained last night and the Member from Riel explained it again this morning and he give the data which was already in the surveys by the engineers which they have.

I think it's a very unfortunate thing that this has all happened. I feel that it was just plain politics on the part of the NDP at the time they were elected and afterwards. It's something that's going to cost the people of Manitoba so many millions of dollars with what's been wasted in Churchill Forest Products by way of possibly being maneuvered out of them by some con artists from other countries which they weren't guilty of, they maybe should have caught on to it. But they weren't guilty of going into something that they knew was wrong and the Churchill Forest Products is proving out to be working out and giving employment and using up products. But I don't know how we're going to get out of hydro. And if there's a single thing that one man done well in this country it's when Mr. Campbell brought in hydro, and if there's a symbol of what any one government has made a real botch of it's the way the NDP have handled hydro.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to debate Concurrence on the matters of the Executive Council of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the Executive Council of the Province of Manitoba, in my estimation anyway, is expected to provide for the people of Manitoba the leadership that is so necessary in today's society. But, Sir, I find that leadership in this province is lacking. And it may be academic, Sir, but how do you discuss something that doesn't exist in this province. I think, Sir, that it's the proper time to discuss matters of that nature and following on the heels of the debate of previous speakers on this side of the House, I think that the leadership that we have had so far to date in the Province of Manitoba has been zero. We heard the Prime Minister or the First Minister in this province last night, Sir, rise in his place in the House in reply to the remarks of the Member for Lakeside, and what did the First Minister say at that time, Sir? He said that the Manager, Mr. Bateman, of Hydro, was the one that was responsible for the problems we're in today. Sir, we have never seen the First Minister of this province stand up and take the responsibility that is rightly his and the people of the province expect. When the occasion arises he will slide it off on someone else . . .

A MEMBER: That's play number three Harry, the St. Johns shift.

MR. GRAHAM: . . . and blame someone else. Sir, I think it is time that the people of Manitoba knew where the First Minister in this province stands. The people of this province expect leadership; they expect the First Minister of this province to spell out in clear terms what the people of this province can expect. When I say that, Sir, I say it as a farmer, a member of the Legislature who has been elected by people in rural Manitoba, elected to express their concerns; and, Sir, in the last two or three days, today, yesterday and the day before, we have witnessed increases in the price of gasoline and fuel. Those prices have varied, they varied anywhere from 11.2 increase down to increases of lesser nature, and the

CONCURRENCE

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) farmers in Manitoba, the people of Manitoba have been looking to the First Minister in this province to tell us what is going to happen. We don't know.

Sir, it was 45 days ago that the Energy Conference in Ottawa put a freeze on the price of fuel. At that time I don't think that the interests of the people of Manitoba were properly represented at that conference. I think that the First Minister of this province presented a very weak position. Sir, Canada is a large country, but there are a million people in the Province of Manitoba and those million people were not properly represented at that conference. The needs of the people of this province in my opinion, Sir, were not properly represented. Sir, inflation, cost of living are the primary concerns of the people of Manitoba today. We don't know what the price of fuel is going to be tomorrow, the next week, next month or a year from now. Sir, the First Minister has promised this Legislature that he is going to bring in some form of appeasement and; Sir, I use that word after considerable thought and I say it is appeasement because it is not going to satisfy the oil producers in the Province of Manitoba, they are unhappy. It's not going to satisfy the consumers in Manitoba, they are unhappy. Who is it going to serve? But we do know that we're going to face a real increase in the costs of production in the agricultural industry; in the business industry we are going to pay a real increase in the cost of doing business and communication and the First Minister has told us, he has promised us but he hasn't told us anything, Sir.

Sir, the next meeting of this Legislature is going to be facing speed-up; we're going to be facing long extended hours of sitting and very shortened hours of debate because the bill that is brought in in the morning they will expect us to discuss in the afternoon and possibly pass in the evening session. And yet the problems that we face are real problems that in my opinion Sir, demand careful scrutiny, problems that invite public representation and problems, Sir, that I suggest to you do not lend themselves to an expedited form of treatment. I would think, Sir, that whatever measures are introduced - and we don't know what they are - should be given proper consideration. Every avenue of debate should be allowed. The public should have the right to assess the remarks of those that are involved in debate and in their opinion make their presentation at Committee. And, Sir, I suggest to you that that is not going to happen. Leadership, Sir, under the Executive Council and under the First Minister of this province, does not appear to me, Sir, to be evident anywhere on the political scene in Manitoba today. The government has not told us, they have promised but they have not revealed and, Sir, that is not good enough for the people of Manitoba. We don't know who the real leaders are in the Province of Manitoba. Is it the Minister of Finance? Is it the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources? --(Interjection)-- Is it the member for Winnipeg Centre? Who are the leaders in the Province of Manitoba? Sir, I have just received the information that I have long waited for -- it is the Member for Point Douglas. We now find out that it is the Member for Point Douglas who is the leader of this province. (Applause)

And so, Sir, maybe I should direct my remarks to the Member for Point Douglas, and I don't know what union he heads, or what particular group in society he represents, but, Sir, I suggest to you that if he indeed is the leader of the Province of Manitoba, then quite obviously he has to be influenced by those around him.

Sir, the people of Manitoba want to know really who is the leader in this province. We have heard the First Minister, and really he tells us nothing, he qualifies his statements, he presents the other case, and when he is pushed into a corner he puts the onus on someone else. Sir, there is a lack in today's political field; there is a vacuum there that I had hoped the First Minister would fill. The people of today's society are looking for leadership and if this government cannot provide it, then we have to wait unfortunately until the next election, until the next election that the future will unfold. I don't know who the next leader in this province is going to be, but I would sincerely hope, Sir, that he provides more direction, more leadership, more clear cut decisions than we have ever received from the present government.

I can well recall, Sir, the time when we had the Autopac debate, and the problems and the concerns that were real for those that were interested in the insurance industry. At that time we had the First Minister assuring those that were directly involved in the insurance industry that they would be consulted before any decision was made, and that assurance was given to the insurance industry, Sir, the day after the First Minister had already brought forward his plans. Talk about consultation, Sir, it doesn't exist in this province today. There is no consultation, there is no leadership on that side of the House. But, Sir, I suggest to you that probably there is leadership in this province but it exists outside of this Legislature.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd)

I suggest to you, Sir, that the members on that side of the House are the slaves rather than the masters of the trade union movement. (Applause)

Sir, I have seen the actions of this government; I have heard the prognostications of the Minister of Labour in pious righteousness claiming to all on high who are willing to listen to him the great things that he has done. But, Sir, I suggest to you that when he did those things he did them with the big whip behind him. He didn't do it in the light of enlightened vision, he did it because he was driven to it, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe we are on Executive Council not on Labour matters.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your admonition here and I accept it. The problem that I am looking at, Sir, is the question of leadership in this province, and leadership as far as I can find in any concurrence motion has to fall under the Executive Council which we are presently discussing.

Mr. Speaker it was a couple of days ago that I got a phone call from a member of my constituency who expressed to me some concern over what is happening in the Province of Manitoba, and I said to that individual, I said, well what grounds have you got for that concern? So he sent me a copy of a letter that has been received in my constituency, and with your permission, Sir, I would like to read an excerpt from that letter --(Interjection)-- and, Sir, I have no compunction whatsoever about tabling anything that I want to quote from. And this is a letter dealing with the 1974 rate recommendations of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Sir, every member of this Chamber knows the Manitoba Health Services Commission has the right to establish the rates that they will pay to any health body that is providing service to the people of Manitoba. This relates to a personal care home, which . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance state his point of order?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said that he would accept your admonishment, or was it your admonition, when you pointed out that you were dealing under Executive Council. Now of course, if the Honourable Member is referring to a matter that comes under the responsibility of the Premier, then you know I would agree, but he is apparently talking about Hospital Services Commission, and that surely comes under the Department of Health. Surely he would want to deal with the proper matter under the proper resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Sir, I respect the remarks of the Minister of Finance, but I think, Sir, he is jumping the gun because I want to point out by the contents of this letter that the leadership which is paramount in the Province of Manitoba should rest with the Council rather than with any particular trade union. This is the very point in bringing this letter into the debate, Sir, to point out that leadership in this province is something that is lacking, and in fact Sir, this government is knuckling under to the trade union movement. --(Interjection)-- And, Sir, for that reason I want to read into the record this very letter, and so, Sir, with the consent of the House, and if they are prepared . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . he insists that he is in order to speak as he is, that's up to him, but I would not give consent to his speaking or dealing with a matter which is not within that. So that he said with the consent of the House; I must indicate that he does not have my consent.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: On the point of order, Sir. I don't blame the Minister of Finance for objecting. He has every right to object because what I want to tell him hurts him, and if he can protect his hide . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GRAHAM: . . . he'll do everything he can to protect it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege. The last thing the Member for Birtle-Russell says that is, he said, and I quote; "if he wants to protect his hide, he will do anything to do so." Now, Mr. Speaker, if he stands behind that I would like to know clearly if that is exactly what he meant to say. I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, now the Leader

CONCURRENCE

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) of the Opposition has come in, we are graced with his presence, does he wish to interrupt me. I am making a point of order, and then of privilege. Now, he did say with the consent of the House and I stood then immediately to indicate that if he is speaking in order then he has a right to proceed, but if he requests the consent of the House he doesn't have it. That's all I said.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, speaking on the same point of order, I suggest respectfully to you, Sir, that you are being put in a somewhat difficult position by having to attempt to adjudicate on a point of order that has been raised by the Minister of Finance without, Sir, you having the benefit of having at least listened to the context of the subject matter which the Minister of Finance objects to on a point of order. And all I'm saying, and the only reason why I rise, Sir, is for you to give yourself a fair opportunity to in fact listen to the subject matter that is about to be raised, the subject matter that is about to be raised by the Member from Birtle-Russell, and then, Sir, for you to be the judge.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let me indicate - order please - that the points of order that have been raised, the first one by the Honourable Minister of Finance was in regard to a rhetorical consent. He didn't need one, because he was still debating properly as far as I could assume. Secondly, that it's not the points of order that give me problems, it's the darned interruptions, and I apologize for saying darned but that's how much they are starting to irritate me, and I want to indicate to the honourable members I would like to have them behave like honourable members because my tether is getting short and I'm going to ask a few of them to leave. I do like to listen to the debate but it's most difficult to hear when there are people just chattering around and howling across from one side of the Assembly to the other. I think it's very unfair in respect to the debate. I will give every member the opportunity to speak for his full length of time on every resolution, but I don't think they should interrupt continually. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just in case I would offend anybody I won't read from the letter then. Sir, the contents of the letter in essence, and I'll paraphrase so that I don't have to offend anyone. The contents of the letter in essence say this, Sir, that anybody that contributes to the health care of the people of Manitoba will have their budget approved on the basis of two basic principles: No. 1, if you have your membership, all the workers in your organization under a contract, then we will approve your budget on the basis of the figures of that contract; and secondly, if you don't have them under a contract, we will give you just the normal rate of increase that we the people of Manitoba through the First Minister and his officers will set.

What does this mean, Sir? This means that those people that are in the Health Services field, even though they want to pay their employees at the highest rate that is going in the Province of Manitoba, will be denied that right by the leadership that is provided by this government. They say you can't do it, Sir, even if you want to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm going to ask the Honourable Member for Lakeside once more to kindly co-operate. This is his last opportunity. I am serious. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Sir. I appreciate the assistance I'm trying to get, or that I am getting from the Member from Lakeside, and I know the concern that he has about this particular matter, because it is the concern that every person in Manitoba should have. But, Sir, I want to point out that if you subscribe to a collective agreement in the Health Services field, you will be given a special privilege in this House, the Province of Manitoba; but if you don't, you don't get that special privilege. Now what is the result of this, Sir? Sir, we know that the majority of those that are working in the Health Services field are organized under CUPE. We also know, Sir, that Cupe has a commitment to the NDP Party. . .

A MEMBER: A thousand dollars a month.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Vital state his point of order.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I really fail to see what this particular debate or these remarks have to do with the Executive Council. The member seems to be more concerned with the Department of Health or the Department of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Sir, I appreciate the concern of the Member for St. Vital. The reason

CONCURRENCE

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) I raise it now, Sir, is because I want to point out to the Member of St. Vital and every other backbencher on that side of the House where the leadership in the Province of Manitoba is today. And, Sir, it is not, Sir, in the office of the First Minister. Sir, the leadership in the Province of Manitoba today rests with the trade union movement and I suggest to you, Sir, that that trade union movement has bought, bought this government and the health, Sir, of every individual in this province could very well be jeopardized by the under table dealings that have gone on between the Executive Council which is supposed to provide leadership and those members of the trade union who, in essence, Sir, in my opinion are providing the real leadership in the Province of Manitoba. And CUPE says that we will give you - if you give us the chance to organize the extra 10,000 hospital workers or those workers in the health field - we'll give you \$1,000 a month into your NDP fund, because they have a commitment to the NDP that they will pay them so much per month per member. So you give us an extra 10,000, we'll give you \$1,000 a month. Okay. --(Interjection)-- The Minister of Agriculture says it's too cheap. Maybe it's higher than that. Is it \$2,000 a month, Sir? Or is it \$3,000 a month? Still not enough. Is it \$5,000 a month then? You tell me how much they put into your coffers. But for the sake of political expediency, Sir, this government has sacrificed and placed in jeopardy the health of every single Manitoban under the proposals that they are putting forward. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I am going to ask the Honourable Member for Lakeside to take a walk voluntarily. Thank you. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Sir, I won't belabour the point any further. The fact is that there is no leadership in this province. The First Minister and his Cabinet have knuckled under to the trade union movement and the union today, Sir, in Manitoba, is all power. I was willing to table letters in this House, which the Minister of Finance objects to, which would prove my point. I regret, Sir, that the Minister of Finance took that point. I don't blame him for trying to cover up. In no way do I blame him for trying to cover up. But the fact remains, Sir, that leadership in this province does not rest with the Executive Council that is outside this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the honourable member to table this letter that he keeps referring to?

MR. GRAHAM: Sir, I will table it if the page boy would take it and I'm sure that the Minister of Health, if he is at all concerned with the health of the people of Manitoba, will take action after he has read it.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolutions 4 to 6 passed? The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on these resolutions dealing with Executive Council and I won't be very long because we have other concurrence motions we have to deal with here in the next week or so, hoping that many of us will be able to get out on the land in the next ten days and get the crops in. Mr. Speaker, I think I should deal with Autopac and hope -- I'll deal with Autopac and I hope the Minister is around, I don't seem to be able to see him in his seat but I'm sure that he's somewhere in the building, anyway. When we were told some time ago when we were in the committee on Autopac, dealing with Autopac, that we had a chance under Executive Council to deal with the Minister's salary at that particular time, and I notice under 1 (f) they're dealing with Minister's compensation, salary and representation allowance, \$15,600.00 dealing with the Minister of Autopac's salary at that time, and that's the only place in this estimates that we can talk on this particular Minister and criticize him, or criticize the government for the action, inaction or lack of action that we as members of the opposition see in that particular portfolio.

We remember so well, Mr. Speaker, of all the promises that were made over the last three years of what this government was going to do for the people of the Province of Manitoba, when the people ran the business of insurance, ran the business of insurance. And we were told - but I don't have to tell the people of Manitoba of what was said at that time - because they were told, the people were told that this government could run the business better than any insurance company could run it. And they were told, they're going to run it cheaper and they were going to save the people money, they were going to save the people 15 percent.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to tell you, I don't have to tell you the experience now. What happens after about 2½ years - a little over two years' experience? What has actually happened to the records of the government of the day and their lack, their mistrust, the mistrust that - and all the - I shouldn't say it - going around the people of the province, even last June, and saying what they're going to save for the people of the province. Well, now, what has actually happened? Well, now what is actually happened. I don't have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that you're going to pay a devil of a lot more premium next year. You're going - you should have paid 25 percent more this year that you actually paid, but the Minister said we saved you \$10 million worth of fenders we saved you that much, but who's paying the \$10 million? I'll tell you who's paying it. The taxpayers, the people of the Province of Manitoba, and that includes every man, woman and child, man, woman, and child. All those who are not driving cars, they are paying the \$10 million. Mr. Speaker, it's a great experience and I'm sure that when this government who says they are going to give leadership and go into the fire insurance business, and general insurance - and I don't know when that bill is coming into legislature - but I can assure you the House Leader is waiting for the last day of the session before he brings that one in.

We've already seen the first notice of getting into the banking business, the Treasury Branch Bill is before us now. The first reading of that bill, they are going to tell the bankers how, in the Province of Manitoba, how much more efficient they are than the bank and the credit unions. And I want to relate that Mr. Speaker. The credit unions, one I thought were the friends of the government. I thought they were. But lo and behold, what's going to happen? The government is going into competition with the creditor unions. Going to destroy the credit unions. They say they're only going to give them competition, trying to help them, but I tell you, the only ones that are going to be hurt by the government going into Treasury Branches, will be the credit unions. I'm giving you warning right now. You'll hurt them. You're bound to hurt them, and I say, if you have a friend, don't lose your friends. You haven't got many left in this province right now. You're destroying your friends, little by little, little by little, I'll tell you. You're chipping away at them, you're chipping away at them. And don't lose that last friend, that credit union, the one you, the one you had on your side.

And now they are going into the fire insurance business. They're going to take those big bad boys on from Toronto. The big bad boys, the ones they always talked about, the big bad boys, the ones, the boys in the east that make all the decisions for the boys in the west. Let me tell you, that the lot of the insurance industry people, the top people, are right here in Manitoba, right in Manitoba. We don't have to go out, but I guess they're going to tell them over the fellas in Great West Life, they're going to tell the fellas in Monarch Life, they're going to tell the fellas of Wawanesa Mutual, they're going to tell the fellas in Portage Mutual, all Manitoba-based companies, both in the life and the general insurance field, how the business of fire insurance should be run in the Province of Manitoba, and life insurance. And this is the one experience I'm waiting on.

And I only hope, Mr. House Leader, that if you're going to bring that bill in, if you're going to bring that bill in, then if you will listen, bring it in tomorrow, bring it in Tuesday, I mean, bring it in Tuesday. Let's have lots of time to study this bill. Let's give it the proper debate it deserves, and let's decide then and there before we finish this session whether you're doing the right thing or not. Now I suppose it won't really matter because it's strictly a numbers game anyway. But I say that the First Minister of the day, who is hardly ever in this House, when a debate like this - and I would think when Executive Council is being debated or any department on Concurrence, that it's right and proper for that Minister of that particular department to be in his seat. How do you expect to debate on Concurrence unless you're going to - and it would be far better if he was in his seat at this period of time debating this particular department, in order that the debate could be carried on in a fair and just manner.

Mr. Speaker, during all that debate on Autopac, I don't know where that Minister is - I guess he's out collecting \$15,600.00 which he will be paid when we get this Concurrence motion passed, - all during that debate - and I'm sorry the former Minister isn't in here, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Attorney General, because he's the one I want to speak to right now, he's the one I want to lecture, and I don't see him. --(Interjection)-- No, I don't need to lecture you. I don't need to lecture you. I know where you stand.

CONCURRENCE

A MEMBER: Tell him how to grow potatoes . . .

MR. McKELLAR: I want to deal with a particular page in this annual report, and I mentioned this when we were in committee, and I moved a motion, even though I knew I couldn't move it. I moved a motion that this page be stricken from the report. And why did I do that? Because never in history have you ever heard of a statement made, an annual report congratulating a minister on having a \$10 million deficit, congratulating a minister on having a \$10 million deficit. And I don't for the life of me - I'd like to know who is responsible for putting this in this report. I'd like to know who the author was. I couldn't get these answers when the committee was being, when the questions were being asked in committee, but I think it was ridiculous and I was kind of amazed at the government of the day when they voted up and supported this page to be included in this report. Because what did it do? It made the Minister look more ridiculous than ever, and I'm talking about the former Minister, the Minister who's responsible for the introduction of Autopac, along with the government of the day. I think it was most unwise for to have that page in this report, acknowledging the Minister of the day, the Honourable Mr. Pawley, for what he did for the people of Manitoba by the introduction of Autopac. Well, mind you, if he had been, if the whole thing had been fair and they'd said we'll try and do as good a job as the companies did in the past, but at no time did they ever - all they ever did is belittle the companies of the day who had been in business, many of them, as I mentioned before, since early 1884 as is the case of Portage Mutual and 1898 in the case of Wawanesa. Experience that they gained over those years must have been of real benefit to them and no man like the Minister of Municipal Affairs should come along and tell the people of Manitoba at every election, at every election saying that he could do the job better. Now experience is a great teacher and we have that experience now, and I'm glad to see him come in the door, because now I tell you, the people are a lot wiser today. They're a lot wiser on the seventeenth day of May, 1974, and I tell you they're going to be a lot wiser a year from now. Because I tell you what the experience is going to be next year. You're going to be worse off next year, financially, a lot more than \$10 million, then the deficit, bigger deficit than you were this year, because I know that's an actual fact.

And why is the deficit greater? One of the reasons is because of the governments of the day. And it's not only your government. Governments at Ottawa. Any time a government brings in over 20 percent increase in their budgets which you did and which Ottawa did, you're going to have trouble in business and you're having the same trouble in your business as the other companies are having. Inflation. Sooner or later government is going to have to spend within their means, but governments of the day have never, they haven't been told. And as long as that tax money, income tax money and sales tax money keeps flowing in, you think you have to spend it. Did you ever think of a day that comes that you put a dollar away? We're trying to spend our way into prosperity. Borrow our way into prosperity - \$700 million this year. Is that the kind of leadership we expect?

A MEMBER: . . . million dollars.

MR. McKELLAR: Is that the kind of leadership we expect?

A MEMBER: Be correct.

MR. McKELLAR: Every week our interest rates are going up, and my leader was mentioning today, borrowing money at 10 percent to build Hydro plants is something even three years ago people would have been saying 'you're crazy, borrowing money at ten percent.'

But is that the kind of leadership, is that the kind of leadership? Why don't you try to save a dollar? Try to cut back in your spending? But no, you're spending like drunken sailors, you're spending like drunken sailors. 1958 when I was first elected our budget was \$80 million. Current current expenditures, total - we had as many roads - and I want to repeat that again. As many roads being built, milewise, as there is today. More things were being done then, more schools were being built, more - just as many hospitals.

A MEMBER: Not on . . .

MR. McKELLAR: Just as many senior citizens homes.

A MEMBER: Not on \$80 million.

MR. McKELLAR: And everything right down the line. What have we got today? \$834 million, plus other \$700 million. And we're not getting any more for our money than we were then. Migosh all you have to do drive over and you've got a lot more holes, that's one thing we've got more of right now on our roads. You got more red flags. We got red flags like you

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) never saw, they're going out of style.

MR. ENNS: They like the color of red flags.

MR. McKELLAR: Is that the kind of leadership . . .

MR. ENNS: They like the colour of red flags.

MR. McKELLAR: Well, maybe the colour's good - they like the colour, but I tell you we're not getting the leadership. When we left the government in '69 our budget was \$329 million. All the way up to 834. Five years, five short years, \$329 all the way up to \$834. Just a stroke of the pen. And I don't have to tell you where the tax is coming from because we only got about 20,000 more people than we had maybe five years ago. The same people are paying twice as much tax, twice as much tax. And I want to deal with that topic. The Minister of Finance says we're rich. I want to tell you that people are harder up right today than they ever were - they're harder up right today than they ever were before.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Did the honourable member not hear me correctly stating that he personally, the honourable member, is richer than he ever was?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: I'll speak of that right now. I had a capital asset; they took it away from me. They took it away from me with a stroke of the pen, with Autopac.

A MEMBER: He had a capital asset.

MR. McKELLAR: I had a capital asset - my insurance agency. They took it away from me. They took it away from there, they took it away from there.

A MEMBER: . . . you can't live by farming.

MR. McKELLAR: But I need politics, you know, at the farm. Mr. Speaker, I don't have to tell you, I don't have to tell the other - everybody else in the Province of Manitoba, this government has the attitude and the philosophy that they're trying to drag the "haves" down to the "have-nots".

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. McKELLAR: And I tell you, I don't always want to be a "have not". If I want to work a little longer, a little harder, a little oftener, that's my business, but all they do - and they got the attitude - we'll take a little off and we'll give it to property tax credit; we'll take a little more off and we'll give it on this - what - this new deal, now, you're going to get \$77.00 if you have no money. And they give a few more, Mr. Speaker, I tell you, I tell you their philosophy will not work, it will not work. And this type of leadership that the First Minister is trying to give us through the Minister of Finance and through the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who is the power behind the power, the power behind the power - is influenced I'm sure is - is influencing all the other Cabinet Ministers over there, including the First Minister. And this is always what concerns me as a member of the Legislature, is the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, because I've seen him operate too long, both over here and over there. And I tell you, if anything ever frightened me, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. McKELLAR: Is the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The only thing I'm always happy that he isn't Minister of Agriculture. As long as I'm a farmer I hope he never gets that portfolio, because I'm sure he'd nationalize it he'd nationalize it. The hired men would be running against us, he'd have everything in reverse. But as long as he isn't Minister of Agriculture, the farmers of the Province of Manitoba still have a little confidence even though it's only still a little bit of confidence in what we have now, even though it's just a little.

Mr. Speaker, the leadership which we have had both in many aspects is not good enough, it's not good enough. And one of the things that always bewilders me about the First Minister, if the debate gets going, it's something if the debate gets going, you never see the man, you never see him. I remember so well Mr. Roblin, Mr. Campbell when he was over there, they always sat in and got in on the debate. That's one thing they --(Interjection)-- like our leader he was here too. He was here a minute ago. Yeah. Well, where is the First . . . We're debating \$16,600 right today, that's what I'm talking about, \$16,600, of money that's going to be contributed to the First Minister when this concurrence motion is passed. And it's rightly so that he should be here, it's rightly so that he should be here, if he wants to get paid.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

He gets paid once a year, once a year when we pass this concurrence motion. --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm not saying it's not enough, he should be paid a lot more, he should be paid a lot more than \$1,000 more than the Minister of Autopac. If there ever was an argument for the First Minister, he should be worth more than \$1,000 more than the Minister of Autopac anyway for the work he does for the people of the Province of Manitoba. But that's all he's getting paid. One thousand dollars more.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to continue because we want to debate, we want to debate Agriculture here this afternoon, so I guess it's a lot more important to get at the . . . and the Minister of Agriculture is here and we want to tell him some of the - I'll just close by saying that one of the worst problems we got and one of the problems which the government of the day is the high cost of operations on our farms, and I'm dealing with a subject matter I know which is a borderline here. But one of the problems which we farmers met yesterday is our 11 percent increase in our farm fuel, which the government of the day have not seen fit to even mention whether they're going to get a subsidy. And the Minister of Finance has never mentioned whether the farmers are going to get a subsidy on their farm fuels or not, and I doubt very much if they are. But I tell you this is pretty darn serious to the farmers of the day. Everything the farmers are buying is going up and their grains, the prices are starting to go down. And I would suggest, Mr. Minister of Finance, and the First Minister, that they better take a second look at this, because I tell you, Saskatchewan did something for their people, Alberta's done something for their people, Saskatchewan lowered the price by seven cents, Alberta by five, and I think you fellows better get down to business, because the farmers are buying a lot of fuel right now. Where'd the money come from? Property tax credit, \$8 million the other day, you have property tax credit. Change that eight million, it's not going to help; if you got eight million, lower the price of farm fuel.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Is the honourable member not aware that in Saskatchewan and in Alberta they are exporting provinces and that we are paying for their reduction in gas prices and that we intend, contrary to one of his colleagues, to try to get a little money from our oil so that we can lower our gas prices. Does he agree with that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKELLAR: I know that. Yeah, that's right. All I'm saying is do the same as Saskatchewan, do the same as Saskatchewan, at least you should be as good as your counterpart in Saskatchewan anyway . . .

Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to say that I'm just going to close now, other than saying that I don't think that what the Minister of Mines of Mines and Natural Resources is saying is good enough, is good enough. We passed his darn property tax credit no end, we passed the other forms of - and it isn't doing the job. Use this money to lower the price of fuel, you'd help your economy out a lot more by handling it that way rather than going through the property tax credit, far better. You might think so, but I tell you the truckers in the Province of Manitoba, the farmers of the Province of Manitoba and other people who are going to be purchasing fuel in the next six or eight months are going to tell you in no uncertain terms what they think of the government unless you do something for them.

Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to close now by saying that the First Minister should be paid a lot more than \$1,000 more than the Minister of Autopac, a lot more. And I don't know for the life of me how that got down to just \$1,000 more, but I think Mr. Roblin if I remember right, lowered his salary at one time when he was Premier of the Province of Manitoba, down to \$1,000 more than . . . but I think that that should be readjusted somewhere. That's all I have to say at this time, I think.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do have a few comments as much as the Minister of Finance leaves the room with great disgust, because when I usually rise to my feet he takes off. Again he takes off today with all the money, and all the legislation that deals with matters that we'd like to speak on today.

But my comments will be very brief this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I just want to put a few comments on the record regarding the way the Public Insurance Corporation has been handled and the way they presented their annual report to the Legislature. And I see on one of

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) the early pages of this document that the Minister says he has the "honour" to submit the annual report. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why he would use the word honour. If I as a businessman running a small little business or a corporation came in with a \$10 million loss, it sure wouldn't be an honour to bring back to the people or the taxpayers in this case the document and say I'm honoured. I'm surprised that he didn't use the word "regret", that I regret, with deep regret, that the corporation has ran into all these kind of problems and we did lose certain moneys. So I wonder why the Minister would sign his name as chairman of the corporation and the Minister in charge of Autopac and say that I have the "honour" to submit a financial statement which advises us of some \$10 million loss.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that maybe this will likely end up as one of the largest corporations that we have in this province, the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, and if we're going to have this kind of financial mumble jumble or documentation which he says he's honoured to bring in a financial statement that's got a \$10 million loss and he's chairman of the Board, then I say, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the House, we better get ourselves a new chairman real quick, because that's not an honour for any Minister of the Crown to bring in a financial statement where you're losing \$10 million loss. If he was running my business or if he was running your business or anybody's business today and you came in with a \$10 million loss you know how quick that man would be clipped off from the head of that corporation.

So I suspect, Mr. Chairman, he's bringing it in as an NDP and that is one of the dreams of this government to take over the corporations which they have, implement the insurance and now they're honoured, they're honoured to bring back a financial statement to us and the people of Manitoba and accept the \$10 million loss. That's not the way business is conducted in my books. No way. I say the man should be either removed as chairman, or give us some fact of what - did he inherit the worms of the former Minister who created this jungle; and if in fact he's the one that inherited this mumble jumble and this tremendous loss then let him stand up and blame the former Minister, the sitting Minister of Municipal Affairs. I suspect that maybe the new Minister wasn't the author of this \$10 million loss, and why doesn't he stand up and blame the former Minister who is the one that piloted this legislation through?

A MEMBER: That's nonsense.

MR. McKENZIE: He says it's nonsense. Well, somebody's gotta assume responsibility. Somebody's got to assume the responsibility for a \$10 million loss. You as a businessman, I as a businessman, somebody's got to be responsible to the taxpayers of this province.

Let's move over again to the second page of this document. And I see, Mr. Speaker, that this great man, Mr. Leipsic has resigned. Can you recall that the document and this great presentation that he made to the people of Manitoba some 12 months ago, Mr. Speaker, about how this corporation was functioning so beautifully, and all the wonderful things that are going to happen by the . . . (inaudible)

MR. USKIW: . . . to answer one question. --(Interjection)-- Oh, well then - all right, that's fine.

MR. McKENZIE: You'll have your chance to speak on concurrence the same as I have. --(Interjection)-- You certainly have, by the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, he's got the same rights to make a speech the same as I have. But this member, this man, and now he's no longer on the board, Mr. Leipsic, but I just would like to refresh the memory of the members opposite, and especially the former Minister, who some people say was the author of this document that Mr. Leipsic put into the daily papers of this City, and praising this corporation for all the wonderful things that it was doing and how we're going to get the great benefits. I suspect that that's why Mr. Leipsic is no longer a member of the board, because that kind of skeleton in his closet will likely haunt him for the rest of his life. It certainly will. Did you ever read the statement he made last year? I recall it as well as anything, word for word the way he spelled it out. That this corporation was the most wonderful thing that ever happened to Manitoba. But unfortunately he's no longer a member of the board, no longer a member of the board. No doubt he gave the government and Ministers . . . but I'm sure he was a businessman. And my understanding as a businessman no way could he justify as a member of that board a \$10 million loss, and then further losses this year. So the easy way out for him is to resign, and I respect him for what he did, resign from the board and let the people know that the thing is not functioning properly. And it will not function unless you get some expertise in there to hopefully run this corporation the way that it should be run

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd). . . . and not stand up and say because of a hail storm you lost \$10 million.

MR. USKIW: We didn't say that.

MR. McKENZIE: You sure did, it's right in here. Do you want me to read it?

SOME MEMBERS: Read it. Read it, Wally.

MR. McKENZIE: "The claim frequency was further compounded by the unusually severe hail storms which occurred in 1973."

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. McKENZIE: Does it say of any other reasons? Hail storm. Migosh, if you were to run my insurance business and go back and tell your policy holders or the people that are putting money in your company because you didn't project into the future nor did you have the knowledge or the ability to run insurance business, because of one hail storm you're wiped out of business, or you go back to the well for more money.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the agents of this province and I have many years of service, a good 25 years an agent of this province, and I never had one insurance company that I ever done business with tell me their losses was due to a hail storm. Certainly there's been hail in this country for years; historically we are a hail country. There's hail storms happen here in Manitoba basically every year. But because this gang over here under this Minister or that Minister they did happen to have a hail storm and they blame \$10 million worth of losses on a hail storm. Mr. Speaker, that's not fair. If you didn't have the expertise of the background knowledge or the ability to get into the insurance business, and that's what we told you in the debate in those days, don't get in unless you know how you're going to run this corporation. We find out now not only did they not know how to run the corporation, they haven't got the people that can head the corporation; not give the wisdom of the people - so we're going to try and tell the people next year - we don't know what the losses are but your rates are going to go up. And surely with all the knowledge of the NDP and the years they've been in the insurance business in Saskatchewan, our neighbors to the province, did you ever hear the Public Insurance Corporation in Saskatchewan screaming about a \$10 million loss about a hail storm problem?

Mr. Speaker, no, they'll carry on with a Minister that was sitting there heading the corporation whose background is law; the Minister now that's in charge has got a background historically as a farmer, what does he know about insurance, Mr. Speaker? Why didn't you ask the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the Member for Souris-Killarney who had 25 years? But no, they said they'd go it their own way. So those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I know what we're going to have to tell the people - why not tell them now that you're going to face a 50 percent increase in your premiums next year? And that's what's going to happen. --(Interjection)-- Yes, that's right. And your losses are going to be - what's the loss going to be next year? Have you got that calculated? It's going to be a lot more than \$10 million. It's going to be a lot more. And why hide the thing? I'm here as a legislator to - this is law, the law of this province, and let's try and make this corporation work. It's law, it's been passed in this Legislature, it's the insurance philosophy of this province, but why sit over there and withhold all this information from us in opposition who maybe can help you get out of this dilemma that you're in. That's the reason I want to raise my comments today, that surely the NDP will recognize that there's some people in this province that have an insurance background, have some knowledge of insurance and we can help you get out of the dilemma.

MR. SPEAKER: On the motion for concurrence, is it agreed? The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Yes, the member agreed to answer a question at the end of his comments. I simply wanted to get him to confirm whether I heard him correctly that he alleged that the Minister in charge of Autopac was responsible for a \$10 million loss. Was that a correct statement?

MR. McKENZIE: The Chairman of the Board. Who else?

MR. USKIW: Then can I put this question . . .

MR. McKENZIE: If I was running my business as a corporation and the Chairman of that Board and my corporation showed me a \$10 million loss, I'd say remove him immediately.

MR. USKIW: Then I ask him this question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

CONCURRENCE

MR. McKENZIE: The other question - who is responsible, the Premier or - we can't even discuss this matter in the House cause it doesn't belong in the Legislature, so we have to do under Legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Minister intends to ask a question, I suggest he gives the member a chance to answer it. If he intends to enter the debate I suggest that he do so.

MR. USKIW: No. Now that he's confirmed what I thought I heard, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask him how he could suggest that the Minister in charge of Autopac, whether it was the previous Minister or the present one, was responsible for \$10 million worth of extra claims which were the result of accidents?

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I can answer that real quick, Mr. Speaker. If you with your knowledge and your expertise, are operating a corporation, which is one of the largest corporations in this province, if you haven't got the expertise and the knowledge in the back room to project those things, then you shouldn't be in the business: you should be out of it.

QUESTION put. MOTION carried.

. continued on next page

CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in this particular item on the estimates except for the intervention on the part of the Minister of Agriculture who displays an abysmal ignorance of the whole concept of responsible government. What he has done in that intervention is simply to point out a state of mind that is characteristic of the Minister, and some of his colleagues - I don't say all of them - who seem to think, Sir, that by setting up a corporation or a Board that their responsibilities then end, that there can be no questions asked in this House, that there can be no criticism levelled at the government, who set up the Board in the first place. It was this government that insisted on getting into the field of automobile insurance over the protest of most of the people in this province, and because they set up the automobile insurance corporation, they assume responsibility for it, whether they like it or not. There's just no way that the Minister of Agriculture can stand in this Chamber and say, 'are you accusing us, us innocents, of causing the accidents he says?--(Interjection)--No. What we are suggesting is that in the setting up of the Public Insurance Corporation they assumed the responsibility that is theirs. They take the credit, and they have no hesitation in doing that when things go right, but the Minister of Agriculture does not want to take the blame if anything goes wrong, then suddenly it becomes somebody else's responsibility--(Interjection)--he and the Minister of Finance. You can't have it both ways, Sir:

The Minister of Agriculture displays that kind of an attitude of a person who is afraid to take responsibility, of a person who hides behind people that he appoints, and then criticizes us because we have criticism to offer of those people. The Minister attempts to suggest that because they have turned the matter of automobile insurance over to a Crown Corporation, that their responsibility has ended. Sir, there's only one way if there are criticisms, there's only one way that we as members can register them, and that's in this Chamber, and the Minister who reports to this House for the Automobile Insurance Corporation has to answer those criticisms, has to answer those questions, and he must not try to hide behind boards that are set up, like the Minister of Agriculture attempts to do.

Well the Minister of Agriculture mumbles very softly, it's not true. How can we get questions answered on the - I don't want to get into the realm of agriculture because that's following - but how can we get answers to questions on the Hog Marketing Board? He denies that he knows anything about them, and he may be right because we've come to the conclusion on this side that the Minister of Agriculture doesn't know very much about anything, let alone his own responsibilities. But, Sir, the only point I wish to make in rising at this juncture is to refute the suggestion of the Minister of Agriculture that the government have no responsibility in this matter. It is their responsibility completely and solely, and they must answer the criticisms; they must answer for those corporations that they have set up, they and no one else, and they can't avoid that responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 4 to 6 pass.

Agriculture: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$24,739,200 for Agriculture. Resolutions 7 to 9 separately and collectively. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: I want to say a few words on these Agriculture resolutions and deal with - I know other members here, and there's other members that want a say. I'd like to just mention here now that the problems of a home economist is related before. The problem of the home economist was related at the start of the session, and I think that the Minister at that time related to us in no uncertain terms that there was nothing being done that was going to change the position of the 4-H Clubs, the leadership of the 4-H Clubs in the western part of the province, but he did relate that there's five home economists going to be replaced, one at Boissevain, one at Virden, one at Minnedosa, and . . . the loss of these particular people would not hurt the basic formation of the 4-H Clubs and their leadership within that given area. Now we received, many of us, literally hundreds of letters with hundreds of names, relating to us their concerns, and the Minister said that that didn't really matter, he got copies of these letters. But there must be some concern when the people will take time to write us and write the Premier, and write others who are in authority, top civil servants who receive the same letters. There must be some concern, but the Minister in turn did not express that same concern.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

Now what has actually happened? The Minister is putting in semi-professional people, as he mentioned, or people who are supposed to take their place. Time will only tell I suppose what the actual loss will be in our many communities but it's strange, it's strange when three of the home economists who are from the western part of the province, serving all that general area - now I don't know what the Minister or the Deputy Minister thinks of the people in the western part of the province, but I would imagine because of the votes at the last election, that he doesn't think very much of us. One of the ways he can get at us is by doing something like this, the loss of the home economists. It's not very much, it's only the loss of one civil servant. But I tell you, to the people of the Province of Manitoba in our part of the province it means a lot, it means a lot.

To the people who were working in the Women's Institute, I hear through the paper or what I read in the paper, they're going to be given a grant of \$20,000 to provide their own executive secretary. I suppose that's one way of compensating for the loss of an executive secretary, direct loss, Mrs. Parker, but I don't think it's the right way to approach that problem either. Now I don't know what you've got against Mrs. Parker of the Women's Institute, but it did create some concern among all the Women's Institutes around the province, and they in turn wrote us, and wrote you, and wrote the Premier, and I don't think that's the kind of leadership that we need. I don't think you did the right thing. I don't think you did the right thing for the Women's Institute. I tell you, as I mentioned before, that if you want to create a real storm, all you want to do is get a few women mad at you, and you've got them mad at you, and they're still mad at you, and they'll continue to be mad at you for some time. I think that if I was the Minister of Agriculture I'm sure that I wouldn't want to take that approach, that's not the type of leadership that you give.

There's just a few other things here I want to talk about. One is about hogs, and the problems that we have in the hog industry at the present time. You know, when I'm talking about the problems of the hog industry I'm talking about the grain industry because one is affected by the other. I as a grower of grain, hoping to always to sell some of my grain for feed, I have problems right today. I'm being told by the Wheat Board that I'm only going to be able to sell a 20 bushel quota on my barley this year, 20 bushels, and I tell you that's not very good, that's not the way the people in the City of Winnipeg are being told. The farmers are in for real trouble in the feed industry in the Province of Manitoba.

One of the problems that's created, because the Minister of Agriculture brought in a Feed Grain Commission and thought he was going to help the people selling feed grain, and he set a price, and he changed that price every week in the Manitoba Gazette, thinking that he was doing the right thing. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Minister of Agriculture that he should have stayed out of that business of setting prices for feed grains, because the feed grains will find their own level anyway, even though he thinks maybe it's a little cheaper at one time, or a little more expensive another. One of the problems that governments have to learn is they got to stay out of the business of the farmer, they have to stay out. A good lesson was learned by the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa, if there ever was a lesson to be learned, when he tried to subsidize the cattle industry. What did he do overnight? He practically destroyed the industry, he practically destroyed it. He put on a 7 cent subsidy on cattle, on Class A1 and 2, A1, 2 and 3, but it meant that nobody would buy cattle for about three or four days, then in turn he changed the subsidy 5 cents on everything. And that didn't help because in any case the price to the packers only dropped by that amount. Then he dropped it to 3 cents, and I don't know whether this last while, whether he's phased that out or not. But it was a lesson to be learned by government, a lesson to be learned that any time they think they are going to help the farmer, through a method of subsidy of that nature, it works in reverse.

The same thing applied to the Feed Grains Commission that the Minister of Agriculture thought he'd brought in and thought he did the right thing last year, trying to help the people selling feed grains. What has actually happened? What has actually happened? There's confusion galore, confusion galore right now, both in the livestock industry with depressed prices for hogs, and I tell you, loss of sale of grain sales to the farmers of the Province of Manitoba. And things as I mentioned before, that you cannot help the farmer by trying to deal with the problems that way. Supply and demand will always rule. Supply, and even though we think it won't, supply and demand will always rule. I tell you, it's worked out pretty good over the

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) years. But the lesson we've learnt over the years that any time government tries to help in a method of subsidy, that usually it works out to the disadvantage of everyone, disadvantage to the consumer, disadvantage of everyone, so in the end result we're worse off.

So what's happened today in the feed grains industry? The Minister of Agriculture can hold his prices up, the grain prices up, but I can't sell it, so what difference? We have no more dollars in our pockets, we've less dollars in our pockets. I don't have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if you ate your breakfast in the hotel this morning, you found out the price of wheat dropped a dollar. And it's going to drop more than that because the American price was \$2.00 a bushel lower than ours, and the prices are going to go down, the grain prices that we have to sell, and I tell you the price of oil went up 11 cents yesterday, and the price of lubricating oil's going up, fertilizer's gone up, sprays have gone up, everything we're buying has gone up. So the farmers are in for real trouble this year, real trouble, unless they can sell their grain off their farms at an average price.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to tell you that the farmers have always had the governments to be, and I tell you right at election time right today, I'm sure the farmers are listening to what each of the political parties have to offer them. I would only hope that the political parties would use a little caution, use a little caution, because the farmers have to contend with many governments, both the municipal and the provincial and the federal levels, and any one government can do a lot of harm, a lot of harm. How is the farmer going to plant his crop for this coming year, which he has to sow in the next two weeks? How's he going to plant? How's he going to know what to do if governments are going to continue to interfere, both in the grain industry and also in the livestock industry? How's he going to plant? It's only with some idea of what governments are going to do, can the farmer know what to do this coming spring and coming summer. The farmers got a big undertaking this year, they've got one of the biggest undertakings, most of the granaries are empty; and I tell you, if ever we need the bread basket of western Canada filled up again it's this year, but they're going to have real troubles, real troubles, unless the weatherman co-operates.

Mr. Speaker, we have other speakers here and it's 4:00 o'clock in the middle of the afternoon, and I'm sure - there's just one other subject matter that I want to speak on before I complete my remarks. It deals with the milk control, Milk Producers Board that was just recently established, recently established by the Minister of Agriculture on the first day of May. Another example of where the Minister of Agriculture thought he was going to help all the industrial producers, and all the fluid milk producers, by forming this new board, and pouring \$100,000 a month of provincial moneys into this particular subsidy, \$100,000 a month, \$100,000 a month he's pouring into this to subsidize all the consumers in the Province of Manitoba. I have nothing against that if that's going to help the consumers of the Province of Manitoba. But I often wonder about these subsidies, Mr. Speaker, if they ever get to the consumer. I often wonder if they ever get to the consumer, how much of them ever get to the consumer. I've seen a lot of them never ever make it to the consumer. The price of milk, even though the subsidy is there, both at the federal and the provincial level on milk, the price of milk continues to go up, and I wonder if this \$100,000, how it relates. Does it relate to fluid milk? Does it relate to industrial milk, or manufactured milk, or where does it relate? Who gets this \$100,000 a month that you're putting in there, 1,200,000 over the 12 month period? Mr. Speaker, I've had people come to me, I've had lots of them come to me, fluid milk producers, industrial milk producers, don't know where they're at; they don't know what they're going to get this month for their milk. The Minister of Agriculture won't even publish or won't give us the regulations. He won't give us the regulations; he won't tell anybody else the regulations.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Souris-Killarney has been here long enough to know that when regulations are passed by Cabinet that they are open to the public, and to him in particular.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: . . . that they weren't passed by the Cabinet, that's the trouble, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I want to give the Minister a lesson, before he brings in regulations, and before he makes laws tell the farmers, tell your industrial producers, tell your fluid milk producers, tell the members

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) of the Legislature what it's all about, and I mentioned before in my speech, give them six months lead time; at least you could have done that. Why was all the rush? Why was all the rush? That's what the farmers are asking me. Why was all the rush? Would you like to milk a cow and not know whether you're going to get paid for that milk, Mr. Speaker? Would you like to do that? That's what the farmers are doing this month.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. McKELLAR: They don't even know whether they're going to get paid. And they don't even know whether it's going to be classed as fluid milk, industrial milk, manufactured milk. There's about six different categories I understand. Would you like to milk your cow, Mr. Speaker, would you like to milk your cow and not know you're going to get paid? That's what the Minister of Agriculture is asking all the farmers to do. They haven't even got a board, they haven't even got an elected board yet. They got an appointed board.

A MEMBER: Why do you need a board?

MR. McKELLAR: And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of leadership we don't expect from a Minister of Agriculture. We never had it up till that Minister became Minister. We always had leadership. If you look at all the former ministers of agriculture, Mr. Speaker, the late Premier of the Province of Manitoba, the Honourable Douglas Campbell - one of the best. And we had Errick Willis, former Deputy Premier of the Province of Manitoba. Men of those calibre, men of those calibre that gave leadership. And I want to tell you some of the legislation that was brought in under the later Errick Willis, the former Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba. Agricultural credit, crop insurance, two of the most important programs, they were brought in in this Legislature, brought in at that time. But look at the leadership we're getting today, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned before, the farmers are milking the cows and they don't even know if they're going to get paid. And they don't know how much and by whom, because they haven't got any - no organization. They got a new board set up. Milk Producers Board, appointed, directed to represent all them fluid and industrial milk producers.

And I want to say a little more about quotas. Milk quotas. Mention was made by the Minister the other day there hasn't been any quotas for two years. No milk quotas for about two years. Well as I mentioned, one group around Brandon set up a dairy, 350 cows, West-Man Dairy. Within the last 12 months they paid \$97,000 for quotas. For what? To get in business, because they couldn't sell milk without quotas. And they paid \$97,000. I talked to other people that paid - farmers, industrial milk producers have had to buy quotas.--(Interjection)--For What? So they could get in business. But the Minister says we haven't had quotas. They haven't been recognized. They didn't need them. Well, I tell you, within a year and a half, or at the best two years, there's going to be the greatest confusion in the dairy business you ever saw. And why? Because we wiped out quotas in the fluid milk business. We wiped out quotas in the fluid milk business, and I don't have to tell anybody else why.--(Interjection)--Sure.

MR. URUSKI: The honourable member now is espousing Conservative policy and at least can he tell me whether the Member for Morris agrees with him that we should have quota allocation in production of any kind with respect to any commodity?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: I don't have to speak for anybody else. I know enough about the dairy business. We supported the quota system all the time we were government. In the fluid milk business, in the fluid milk business. And you know why? Mr. Speaker, when you want to buy a quart of milk in December and January, you know you can buy it right now under this quota system, but there's no guarantee without a quota system that any farmer is going to milk a cow in December and January when it costs twice as much to feed that cow, and to look after it, as it does in July and August.

That's one of the reasons why the quota system was set up. Each individual farmer had a quota system, had to guarantee that quota the twelve months of the year. Twelve months of the year. And he did that by keeping his cows freshening the year round. And I don't have to tell - anybody in here who's a farmer knows what that means. A lot more expense, having to go out and buy expensive cows in the middle of winter to keep his quota up. But that's no longer required. No longer required because the Minister of Agriculture, . . . agriculture at his feet. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, about two years from now in the middle of January when you want to go and buy milk, I tell you it might be a little scarce and I'll tell you who's

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) the man to blame for this change in policy and confusion.

And he might think he's trying to help the industrial milk producers because 70 percent of them will qualify as fluid milk producers; 70 percent of them will qualify. I realize that. But I tell you, he hasn't helped anybody. And if he'd only gone out and taken six months lead time, six months lead time and spent some time talking to the farmers, the industrial milk producers and the fluid milk producers, talked to them and explain . . . , But he doesn't do that, Mr. Speaker. All he does, all he does is sit up here in the House and tell the people in the Province of Manitoba that what he's got to offer is the only solution, the only solution. And I tell you, when you get to the point where you can't listen to people, won't listen to people, I tell you you're in for trouble.

And the Minister of Agriculture is in for trouble in many more ways than the home economists and the 4-H Clubs and the milk producers. Each time he tries to take on another organization he just digs a little more dirt out of that grave, out of that grave that he is digging for himself, each day in the Province of Manitoba. The farmers aren't happy. They aren't happy with his leadership. We stood up today and we voted against the bill, and he's going to see a lot of farmers in, if they're able to get in on Tuesday. I'm sure, if that bill . . . the Farm Machinery Bill, his bill, Farmers don't want this kind of help. The farmers all they want to do is to be left alone for a change. Left alone without government interference. And I tell you the day this government decides that the best thing they can do is to keep out of the farmer's business, it'll be the happy day for the farmers in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a few remarks. His first years in here, the Minister of Agriculture seemed to grow in stature, brought out some programs like the livestock program and others that were pretty acceptable, the rural water program, but in this last number of years he's just been going downhill. He's turned out to be - the only ideas that's right is the one that he has. He gets up there and he makes me think of Napoleon that we used to have, Little Napoleon used to stand there and lecture you in his way and that's it and he can't listen to anybody else.

A MEMBER: He met his Waterloo.

MR. HENDERSON: And he met his Waterloo, and I would say that's what the Minister of Agriculture will do because he was shaping up like as if he could have been a leader some time but he's gone down, so as the member said, he's meeting his Waterloo only it's more gradual. --(Interjection)--Yes, Sam's slippin'.

Out my way in particular we're very disappointed with the way he handled the Women's Institute and the Home Economists, and especially the very fact that he tried to do, or his Minister tried to do it in secrecy--(Interjection)--that's right. He tried to do it in secrecy because they were told they weren't supposed to make any comments about it until it was mentioned in the House. And this wasn't the right way and he talks about trying to work with the people and this is the way he does it.

And then he tries to say that the program that he's given them and the way he's handling them is better. Well if it's so much better I don't see why some of them don't recognize it. I don't know how come there's so many of them that don't recognize it.

A MEMBER: We're all out of step but them.

MR. HENDERSON: They're all out of step but our Sam or . . . that's the way that story goes. He came along with his A. I. program when people didn't want it. The people in the country.

MR. ENNS: The cows didn't want it, George.

MR. HENDERSON: Don't get me confused on that. But the people in Manitoba were against that program and yet when they handled a meeting later on, when he had a very good chance to appear, either him or the First Minister and defend their policies, he didn't show up. So he couldn't face up to it. And now when he was blowing about how they were raising the price of pork, they were selling to Russia, they were selling to California and that, now when you ask him a question about the Hog Marketing Board he don't know anything about it now, it's handled by the Hog Marketing Board.

And I don't believe that the Member from Ste. Rose who is a good farmer himself and a successful farmer, I don't believe that he can be wholeheartedly in agreement with the Minister of Agriculture, because . . .

CONCURRENCE

A MEMBER: No way . . .

MR. HENDERSON: . . . I'm sure he's hearing this from his people back home because that's what I hear all the time. I don't have to talk against the farm policies, the people out in the rural areas are. I'm getting phone calls about people that can't market their hogs and if you ask him a question in the House he says they're being marketed in an orderly fashion. Sure that's orderly he says. But before they could always bring their hogs in and they could drop them off and they'd be marketed and that was the way they done it. If it was a wet day and they wanted to get their work done they'd take their truck and take the load of hogs in. Now if they've got to do something like that they can't. They have to phone up and if one phone call don't do it they have to phone the next day and say well can we bring them in the next day and they say well we'll wait and see how many hogs there is here. So they have to kind of - it's like now when you want an appointment with a doctor or a dentist you have to phone up and make reservations - so that's just about the way they have it now with the hogs. On top of that the price is poor. I'm not saying he's altogether to blame for that, but when the price was good he was standing up and almost taking the credit for it being good, when he really - well he knows better but he was creating the impression that the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board was such a service to the people.

Now we have the Milk Producers that are mad at him. I don't think that we as members really need to get too mad at him as long as the rural people - and I'm sure that it's going to come right into the City, because they're going to be mad at him. If he'd of let the fluid milk producers and the commercial milk producers solve it themselves, I don't think they'd have had as much problems as they're having now. Every time he gets a chance to go to the political meetings he's taken time out when he should be listening to them to try to tell them what he believes. He wants to use every opportunity when he's invited some place, rather than to listen he tries to tell them. I remember being at the municipal convention when he was there and he used it to lecture them all how they should vote for putting rapeseed - under the Wheat Board system, and it didn't work out. I think that that should have been like a rap over the knuckles to them.

Yes, I think that the Minister of Agriculture really was going along pretty good and was having the respect of a lot of the people but I see him now as turning out to be a small Napoleon who's lost the confidence of the people, and as the Member from Souris-Killarney said, he's actually now a man that's digging his own grave. I really feel sure that the Member from Ste. Rose as he talks to his rural people must find out from them, and I would appreciate him - of course he wouldn't say it I guess - but he must be hearing it out in the local level. The only problem is, unless he goes right over to the Member from Ste. Rose he hasn't got anybody else who really understands agriculture at all, and that's the problem on that side.

I don't think I have any - won't take any more time. I think some other members are going to make a few remarks, so that's all I have to say on it now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'll try and not deal with any of the other matters that have been raised. Most of the points of concern I recognize as important. I'm wondering as to my speech the other night on the rail abandonment what was amended by the Honourable Member for Radisson, if the Minister of Agriculture is familiar with the way it was amended, and if that is the policy of this government where basically that they're going to stand up and support the railways in their process of abandoning them in this province, or if in fact they have a policy. I'd certainly like to hear it, and there's an awful lot of rural people, especially in my constituency, that are concerned because next year is the year when these rail lines, as I understand it, are set up for abandonment. With our historical background in this province which is so closely related to agriculture, which is one of the biggest basis we have for our economic thrust, the matter has been kicked around, and I question today who are this transportation committee that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has set up, and who are they, and if in fact we can question them, because if we don't have a transportation system in this province we may as well forget about the Minister of Agriculture because there's no way that we can get our primary products to market by truck. It just is not possible. So maybe when the Honourable Minister rises to his feet that he will give us some insight as to what he thinks about the matter, and if in fact he recognizes a concern.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

The other one again of course that I - and it's one that's been raised as industrial development or place it wherever you want, but I'm quite familiar with the 20,000 bucks that a bunch of farmers in my constituency put on the line just two or three years back to set up and develop a rapeseed processing plant in rural Manitoba. I don't know where it's gone. The last I heard of it the Cabinet had it and they were going to build it in Brandon through the guidance of the Minister of Industry and Commerce.--(Interjection)--Well, I don't know, but I still recognize the intention of those people out there and their concern and their interest in continuing with that type of rural development to process the natural products that are there. This area that I come from and the Swan River Valley are considered to be the better areas in our province for the seeding and harvesting of rapeseed. Maybe in the concurrence motion the Honourable Minister will give me some insight, because I wonder--the Minister of Industry and Commerce has never been out to my constituency, to my knowledge; he may have been there without my knowledge. But nevertheless these people are still there and at the present time we're getting a tremendous interest by Saskatchewan. The co-op at Nipiwana have decided now that they're going to expand their operations which will even come in and include Manitoba. They're in the Roblin area and the Grandview area today trying to sign up farmers on contract that'll grow this rapeseed and deliver it all the way to Nipiwana. Well surely with the feasibility studies that I've seen, which proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that a processing plant is feasible in Manitoba and feasible in that area, I think that the Minister of Agriculture would be as concerned as I am, and would maybe be able to give me some answers when he does respond in the concurrence motion.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that concerns me not so much maybe at the provincial level as the federal level, that we never can be able to find out a government or a minister that can stand up and give us long-range policies for agriculture. We find that they're most hodge-podge type of policies that are cooked up at the last . . . --(Interjection)--I'm talking about the Federal Government today that the problems of agriculture are basically--I as a businessman would like to know a year - I plan myself two and three years in advance where I'm going and how I'm going to get there. I think the farmer deserves that same consideration. But we see examples from the present Minister, the Federal Minister of Agriculture, whereby today there's a certain grain policy that the farmer recognized as one he should pursue - Cabinet meeting held today, and a new policy is announced just like that, without any forewarning or filling the people in that's involved in the industry of why, and I think we don't need these policy changes that fast there. The farmer is historically known as one that can survive most of the perils of every day living. I think that the farm people historically prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that they can meet any challenge by themselves or as groups.

So with those few remarks I would hope that maybe the Minister of Agriculture when he does rise will give me some idea what's going to happen to the rapeseed industry in this province, the people that are growing it, if in fact we're going to produce it, and continue to process it, or ship it out of the province, or let our neighbours in Saskatchewan . . . And the other one about the rail abandonment: Are we going to start building inland storage? Are we going for the big terminals? I see the announcement today where Weyburn, Saskatchewan, is going to start building storage in that area, no doubt due to rail abandonment, but where are we going? I think the people of this province deserve some answers now, rather than have to wait until July 1, 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I was reluctant to rise because I recognized, Sir, that I have, you know, on the odd occasion it has been my misfortune to have taxed your patience, Sir, in the Chamber, and I certainly didn't want to attract your attention unduly. But nonetheless the matter of agriculture is such that it requires my attention, and this particular Minister of Agriculture requires my attention, and his handling of the affairs of agriculture indeed requires the attention of, not myself but indeed all Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, I say all Manitobans because I specifically include those urban Manitobans who all too often, and up to now, have been content to allow the affairs of Agriculture to be left to those who are directly involved in Agriculture. In fact, even in the 70s as incomprehensible as it is, you have a reasonably sophisticated member like the Member for Fort Rouge coming into this Chamber, complaining about the time we spend on Agriculture. Now for his benefit he should at least know that the

CONCURRENCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) root cause and the basis of such relatively unimportant things like the cost of living, sustenance, eating, all these things, lie in agriculture and the kind of laws that we pass, the kind of laws that we allow this Minister of Agriculture to pass, means that the price of bread, the price of milk, the price of meat, the price of a dozen eggs, everything else is directly affected by the actions taken in this Chamber and by a Minister of Agriculture by any Minister of Agriculture. Therefore if we want to worry about those persons living at the lower income level, if you want to worry about those people that are strapped into a, tied down, or a kind of static income level, about their capability, their capacity to cope with the current problems, the current problems of today, of how do you fight inflation, how do you live with a 10 percent increase cost of living, cost of food, then, Mr. Speaker, I do most humbly submit to you in the words of my honourable colleague friend, Wally McKenzie, and I will put my hand where it counts as he is prone to do so from time to time, and suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the matter of agriculture had better be paid considerably more attention by all members, urban or agriculture, in this Legislature, in the House of Commons, and in other legislatures across the country. Because, Mr. Speaker, while we have been buffeted from time to time by the hurrahs and the huzzahs of the big industrial development boys, one of whom happens to be my leader, from time to time that falls into that category, and while we have been kind of out-promoted by the academics in our society, while we have been dazzled by some of the modern innovations of industry, space, nuclear age - I heard the Minister of Health and Social Services tell us that we are now in the age of the nuclear family - and so forth, but, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, and I only wish that I had done, had finished my reading of the prescribed reading course that the Honourable House Leader gave me, Henry George 1878 circa, which I am not yet fluent to quote from as the House Leader is, but, Sir, I know enough, and I have come at least half way through this reading, to know that he knows and appreciates that on the basis of all of our success, the basis of land, agriculture really is, and will continue to be, a most fundamental, economic fact of our well-being that cannot be denied.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin with my critique about the current Minister of Agriculture, who you know, Sir, we have been somewhat hard with during this session, I think understandably, so. But, Mr. Speaker, this government, and this Minister of Agriculture, supported by members from Winnipeg Centre is it, and other agricultural experts on that side, you know, from time to time chastise us for even suggesting to criticize this Minister and his policies. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to let the records stand, you know, the record of the people of Manitoba stand where it stands.

Mr. Speaker, the Member from Roblin, the Member from Souris-Killarney, the Member from La Verendrye, the Member from Morris, the Member from Rhineland, the Member from Pembina, the member, myself, from Lakeside, the Member from Swan River--(Interjection)--well I've got to stop somewhere but surely--(Interjection)--the member that represents the market gardeners from Riel, but surely, Sir, that silently and eloquently says something, says something about a very kind of fundamental fact that this Minister of Agriculture and this government cannot and will not accept. Now, Mr. Speaker, I as a Progressive Conservative may want to put some particular kind of label on the farmer of the Province of Manitoba, as I'm sure do my colleagues to the left of me, the members of the Liberal Party, and I know the label that the Minister of Agriculture wants to put on them, but the fact of the matter is, and that really was the reason for my recitation of the members, the fact of the matter is that the farmer of Manitoba as has any farmer, given the opportunity, has long ago carved out a label all for himself, and that, Sir, is one of the independence, that, Sir, is one of standing on his own two feet, that, Sir, is one of not having anybody tell him what to do, that, Sir, is one that originally led him to the land. That, Sir, is one that originally led him to that opportunity to spread his elbows. Well, Sir, I admit, Sir, I admit, Sir, that a degree of governments, a succession of governments, Conservative, Liberal, and NDP, have tried to take that away from the farmer from time to time. We have tried to wean that farmer independence away from him. I agree to that, wean that independence away from him. But, Sir, to this day they have manifestly managed to withstand that kind of political pressure, and they at least have indicated that given a choice, given a choice, despite the fact of the matter that we, Sir, represent from time to time that group of individuals that dares to attack the Wheat Board, that dares to attack all the holy sacred cows of agriculture, but we happen to be the ones that get re-elected by these farmers. The Member from Morris, who has the audacity of attacking the Wheat Board

CONCURRENCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) from time to time in this Chamber; I, or other members who have had some questioning from time to time about the wisdom of certain aspects of Marketing Boards; Sir, we are the people in this Chamber and in the Province of Manitoba that do, and I say that, you know, with no degree of puffed up pride, but with a degree of humble humiliation and appreciation, we are the ones, we are the ones after 10, 12 years, and after a massive effort by this government, and not a bad effort I might say, and a considerable amount of public money spent, we, Sir, are the ones that truly can stand up, and do stand up, and speak for agriculture in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: I will continue where I leave off, Sir, on the next occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 4:30 we now enter Private Members' Hour. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm advised by all sides that in order to have a truly long weekend, that it should start a little earlier and therefore . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. GREEN: Before we do, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to indicate that Tuesday at 10:00 o'clock is the Agricultural Committee, and Wednesday at 8:00 o'clock Law Amendments Committee, and I'll try and have another Committee meeting scheduled, otherwise we'll be dealing with concurrence and with bills.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.