

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, May 12, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

MR SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I would like to introduce to the members, 30 students of Grades 9, 10 and 11 standing of Garden City High School under the direction of Mr. Kaban. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

We have 25 students of Grade 5 standing from Belmont Elementary School, under the direction of Mr. Bruce Craig. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education.

And we have 34 students of Grade 8 standing from La Porte High School, from La Porte, Minnesota, under the direction of Mr. Robert Evenmo.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that my privilege is one that the House should take great cognizance of. It's based on the report that was printed in today's newspaper, that the Attorney-General of Manitoba intends to investigate another member of this House, namely myself, in terms of sources. I consider that to be a serious breach of the privileges of a member of this House, Mr. Speaker, and I would like the Attorney-General to concur whether in fact he did indicate outside the House that he intends to investigate another member of this House as to his sources, and if so, then I would then ask this House to take the proper action against that particular form of intimidation or witch-hunt that the Attorney-General appears to be on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if I have indicated anything, all that I have indicated is that I wish to determine from the Minister of Justice why he has deemed it necessary or advisable to provide the Member for Fort Rouge with information prior to my having received that communication from him.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the statement by the Attorney-General shows a basic misunderstanding of the facts. No information was received before him; it may have been read before him, but I received a copy of a letter that was dated April 30, sent to the Attorney-General after I had made enquiries on behalf of constituents who are also concerned about the implementation of the Unified Family Court, about where and how it was going to be implemented. I contacted people in the Justice Department; they said that they had written to the Attorney-General and they would send me a copy; I received a copy; after receiving that copy and reading it, dated April 30 — which is almost close to 15 days ago — then was in contact by phone and they said that they had been in touch with the Attorney-General. Now, the fact that the Attorney-General may not read his mail, or does not receive his mail on time, it was a public decision that had been communicated to the Attorney-General on a letter dated April 30, which is close to two-and-a-half weeks ago. And to suggest, and have the Attorney-General suggest, that he is now going to undertake this kind of investigation, using the powers in his office, I think is a direct and serious breach of the privileges of a member of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I hope that the information provided by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge satisfies the Attorney-General, and I hope that the explanation given by the Attorney-General satisfies the Member for Fort Rouge.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have indicated at any time that I am going to carry out an investigation using police officers or RCMP or anything of that sort. My point is that I simply wish to make an inquiry of the Minister of Justice along the lines that I have indicated, because I think it is in the interest of being able to discuss and negotiate with another government — I think it is important that we at least, in the provincial government, have the opportunity to receive the correspondence before the federal government releases information to the Liberal member in

this particular House. That letter was received in my office yesterday morning. I had been meeting all morning with members of my staff and others with respect to the family law legislation, which we expect to introduce into the House shortly, and it was for that reason that I had not yet read my mail from the morning. That is why I had not opened that letter. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is important that we should be able to carry on serious discussions and negotiations with the federal government on any particular matter, and I don't think that the federal government should be placing politics above those discussions. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I will take the matter under advisement. If the member has further information that he wants to give me, I'll be quite at liberty to listen to what he has to say. Have you any further information for me?

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, just to add to it, I think that the Attorney-General is simply compounding that privilege. He keeps suggesting that someone is playing politics. I was simply requiring information; if anyone is playing politics in this House it's the Attorney-General of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: I will take the matter under advisement, and report back to the House.

Dealing with the Order paper, we are on the Bill No. 25. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to speak to Bill 25 at this time for several reasons. Perhaps the most important one is that it continues in what has to now be recognized by many Manitobans, if not most Manitobans, and certainly should be coming to be recognized by members opposite, as simply a carrying out of another promise that was made to certain Manitobans, in this case the cattle growers in Manitoba. A promise was made to them in 1969 for reasons known best to honourable members opposite . . . that don't always get carried out at that particular time.

But I am pleased that the Minister of Agriculture has chosen this early occasion to carry out that promise, providing a major commodity group of our primary producers, namely the cattle growers, with a means of organizing themselves, with the means of providing the necessary funds to run that organization, and with the means of carrying out that function that they have demonstrated on several occasions that they wish to do that themselves.

Mr. Speaker, what worries honourable members opposite most is that they may just do it, that they just may do it without the heavy hand of government guiding them, without the heavy hand of government directing them, without the heavy hand of government intervention. You know, their objections now are so contrary to what the Member for St. Johns just spoke prior to the luncheon hour adjournment, chastising us that we're giving into these hands of the independent cattle growers powers that are distinct from government, powers that aren't there. —(Interjection)— No, the Honourable Member for St. Johns knows what I'm speaking because what now is being heard from across the ways is just the opposite.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me pick up where the Honourable Member for St. Johns left off. One of the reasons why this bill is before the House . . . Mr. Speaker, I've had concerns from time to time about the amount of power vested into various forms of marketing boards and agencies of government, and I would like to read, you know, as the Honourable Member for St. Johns took exception to Section 7 under the regulations of the proposed bill, and, Mr. Speaker, I intend not to deal with the bill in sections because I believe that at second reading we deal with the broad principle of the bill. But let me, for the honourable members opposite and in particular the Honourable Member for St. Johns, recite to him the powers under the parent Act, the Natural Products Marketing Act which says, —(Interjection)— Now, Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Honourable Member for St. Johns; let him listen to me. It says that without warrant, at midnight or after, enter any place or premise other than the dwelling in which any regulated product is being marketed, in which has reason to believe any regulated product is being marketed, and search the place or premise without warrant. Without warrant stop any vehicle, any truck, any car in which a regulated product may be transported. Require any documents, books, or records and so forth and so forth, Mr. Speaker. So forth, so forth, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that Act, or the modified version of that Act, was passed in 1964 under the direction of one George Hutton, the then Honourable Minister of Agriculture, under a Conservative administration — under a Conservative administration. But, Mr. Speaker, it took that Act in the

hands of the previous NDP administration, to tell the cattlemen why they feared that legislation and why they have imposed upon the Minister of Agriculture and why the Minister of Agriculture of this province has responded to it. Because it is under that Act — it is under that Act, Mr. Speaker — and we talk about democracy, because it is under the provisions of this Act, the provisions of this Act, Mr. Speaker, (a) that that administration, under the authoritarian hands of an NDP administration, without vote, introduced the compulsory hog marketing board. That's right, a compulsory hog marketing board. And without vote and without question changed the voluntary contribution by hog producers that existed since the time that the Leader of the Opposition was part of a hog marketing commission of inquiry that set up that voluntary commission with Harry Shewman, the late Member for Morris, and set up that voluntary commission and indeed imposed by resolution of this House that no change should be made in that marketing structure other than that there shall be a vote amongst producers. That resolution was supported by all members of the ND Party, the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party of that day. But, Mr. Speaker, that kind of guidelines by this Legislative Assembly had absolutely no restraints on the former Minister of Agriculture. He introduced a compulsory hog marketing board; he introduced a massive increase in the levy from the straight 35 cents to 1 ¼ percent, I believe, of carcass value without ever going to the producers and asking them.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker — and I could have asked some research people to dig me up the necessary Hansards — furthermore, the Minister of Agriculture said, "If they do not vote in the right directors, we will not have voted directors on the board," and he went one step further, Mr. Speaker. He went one step further, Mr. Speaker. He wrote a letter to a legitimately elected director of the hog marketing board and demanded his resignation. Demanded his resignation. And the Minister of Agriculture of that day stood up and answered in this House and explained why he had demanded his resignation because the director wasn't pursuing the policies that he, as Minister, thought ought to be pursued.

Now, Mr. Speaker, now let's talk about totalitarianism; now let's talk about authoritarianism; not let's talk about it. And, Mr. Speaker, none of this was done with any consultation of the people involved. Was there a vote when the hog producers' board was made compulsory? Was there a vote, gentlemen? Do I see a nod anywhere? No. Were the hog producers consulted when their levy from a voluntary levy of 35 cents per hog went to 1 ¼ percent of carcass which meant a raising from 35 cents to about \$1.50 or \$1.70 per unit sold? Was there any question of asking those people from whom you were taking the money? Not a one, Mr. Speaker, not a one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that pales into insignificance when you take the next example. You know, Mr. Speaker, the then Minister, operating under this Act, and it is a powerful Act — quite frankly an Act that I have some difficulty with — but operating under this Act, the then Minister of Agriculture and the New Democratic Party administration said, "We will impose a compulsory milk marketing producers' board on this province." Was there a vote? Did any dairymen have an opportunity to vote on that question? Not a single vote. Mr. Speaker, and because the Minister of Agriculture at that time had some fuzzy-brained thing working in his mind, firstly about developing a whey plant because it was going to solve a pollution problem, the disposition of whey. That's the way it was first introduced. Well, we smoked them out. Because of the efforts of the Member for Rock Lake, the Member for Morris, because of the efforts of the combined opposition at that time, we smoked them out and we found out that he had intentions of building a \$9 million processing firm in Selkirk called Crocus.

Mr. Speaker, not only that but that was just on the drawing boards but that didn't prevent that authoritarian government from extracting — and that's the only word you could say — \$96,000 from the dairymen — \$96,000, Mr. Speaker. Were the dairymen ever asked did they want the plant? Were the dairymen asked did they want the board?

And we have this unctuous, you know, this hypocrisy coming from the Member for St. Johns who admittedly, you know, properly identified himself of not being among the first and foremost to totally identify with the agricultural community. But he had the audacity to stand up here before lunch and suggest to my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that what we were proposing in suggesting and providing the vehicle for a group of independent cattlemen to run their own affairs, was somehow contrary to the democratic wishes, was somehow contrary to doing those things and merely in fact responding to a very legitimate expressed opinion on the part of the people for which this bill is being passed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if honourable members opposite want to argue this point, all they are doing is enshrining, graving in stone forever, the lack of knowledge, the lack of empathy, the lack of

that will forever remain — will put them into a rump group in terms of rural Manitoba's concern. And I would like to, at this particular point, at least make one appeal, to one member at least — you know, the lone Liberal member of this party — to choose . . . There's been no occasion yet, since the September session, since this session, for him to disassociate himself from his socialist colleagues, and I recognize that the Member for Fort Rouge isn't precisely the manifestation of liberal agricultural hopes in this province, but I do ask him to choose this occasion . . . Look, it doesn't involve his high rental people that are living in rental accommodations that he is concerned about; it doesn't involve street improvement; doesn't involve zoning; doesn't involve his housing study — he can surely, on this occasion, just let reason prevail and say, "Look, there has to be a reason why rural Manitoba is represented on this side of the House by the Member for Swan River, by the Member for Gladstone, by the Member for Emerson, by the Member for Portage, by the Member for Rhineland, from Minnedosa, from Rock Lake; there has to be some reason." And even if down in Fort Rouge he is too busy to fully understand the agricultural needs and problems and concerns that legitimately are within the immediate concerns of those members representing those constituencies, I appeal to him that even on just plain political reasons he would choose this occasion to perhaps identify with the majority for a change, and perhaps identify with what a majority . . . And I don't say that lightly, Mr. Speaker, you know over 70 percent demonstrated that majority as late as last fall. But if the Liberal Party wishes to identify themselves, and hide behind the skirts, as does the New Democratic Party, of one Jackie Skelton, and if they are suggesting that she represents the cattle growers of this province, well then, Mr. Speaker, God bless them! If they actually think that that's where the thinking and that's where the feeling of Manitoba cattle producers lie, then they will be doomed to oblivion, and they will be doomed to a position of minority, and they will not be considered as being spokesmen, or even having the capacity of understanding the legitimate needs of the cattlemen in this province.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind honourable members opposite that firstly . . . And again, the Honourable Member for St. Johns says some of the regulations as envisaged under Item 7 are severe; he says even more severe than those in the Income Tax Act. Well, let me remind the honourable member, I haven't, nor can any other Manitoban, nor can any other Canadian, opt out of the Income Tax Act, but every cattle producer can opt out of this Act; every cattle producer can opt out of this Act, and if the Honourable Minister hasn't made that plain, we will make that plain and we will change whatever regulation that doesn't make it plain. But I want to make it plain that every cattleman — the Minister is nodding, the Minister is nodding consent — that every cattle producer can opt out of provisions of this bill. —(Interjection)— Fine. Mr. Speaker, of course, that again represents the big difference. You see, it is inconceivable for members opposite that we would introduce a bill where there's a voluntary feature in it. They don't understand that. They have to be compulsory. And, Mr. Speaker, I make you that holy commitment, that if that isn't crystal clear in this bill, we will make it crystal clear in this bill, that any producer can opt out. We will take the checkoff from him and he can decide to opt out. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will return the question to it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the Honourable Member for Inkster a point of order?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was asking the honourable member whether he would permit a question. Would the honourable member permit an opting out, not merely of the payment of dues, but of the power of the association to demand information of a producer? Will he make a solemn commitment that a producer can say, "I voluntarily do not wish to give the information that is demanded from me by this association, by regulation punishable by going to jail, if I don't do it." Will he tell us, give his solemn commitment, that every producer can opt out of that provision?

MR. ENNS: Without consultation of the Minister of Agriculture, but knowing that he is a fellow Conservative, and knowing that we think alike, I can give him the consideration that we will take a look at that, and that that is entirely possible. Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with this bill on second reading. —(Interjection)— You see, honourable members opposite have demonstrated how they have used legislation without reference to producers. This Manitoba Natural Products Marketing Act wasn't used; it was on the books since 1964, but was not used that way. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, to fill out the history a little bit, you know, honourable members and the former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the Minister of Agriculture, will remember one of the first problems that I faced as a new Minister of Agriculture in 1966 was the fact that within the vegetable industry there was a great deal of controversy, a great deal of antagonism, with respect to the compulsory features of the then Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission. There had been several votes taken,

inconclusive in the sense that the votes were 49-51, 51-49 kind of situations, and Mr. Speaker, I took it upon myself, as a Minister of some six weeks' experience, to take away the compulsory powers of the Vegetable Marketing Board at that time, with the exception of potatoes, and I saw nothing wrong with letting carrots being sold to Manitobans when they wanted to be sold; I saw nothing wrong with people being able to go up to a roadside stand and buying a little bit of beans or vegetables. I think there's nothing wrong with that.

And Mr. Speaker, of course, early on, and that's what started the confrontation with my honourable friend, the Member for Lac du Bonnet and myself, he found himself in the position of defending the multi-national conglomerates of the vegetable industry in Manitoba, you know, the Mr. Quakers and the Ed Connery's of Portage, and I was fighting the Conservative Party; Duff Roblin was fighting for the small vegetable producers that made their living along the riverbanks in Charleswood, so we had —(Interjection)— Oh yes. Mr. Speaker, what this bill guarantees is that beef will continue to be sold at the best possible price to consumers, Mr. Speaker. What this bill means, is that in the case of beef, you're not going to all of a sudden find 28 million dozen eggs going rotten. What this bill means, is that you're not going to be finding 46 million eggs disappear, as they disappeared this last year. What this bill means is that we are not going to be taxing your constituents in Selkirk or in Fort Rouge, or in Inkster, the average working man, to pay a government inspector to go around counting the chickens that by government order we have been ordered to kill.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we regularly, every once in awhile under the Supply and Management Programs of my honourable friends opposite, we put tractors and cars, and trucks, carbon dioxide exhaust into the chicken barns, and we see how many chickens we can kill. Then you pay us, then you pay the farmer and inspector to walk around there with a cane and count chickens. Out of every chicken that you kill, the farmer gets 50 cents; for every chicken you kill, and that's why poultry is 60 cents in the United States and is a dollar in Canada. That's why eggs are 49 cents in Minneapolis and they are 85 cents in Manitoba.

Now Mr. Speaker, all that this bill does is provide, make it possible for the cattle producers to run their business, and that's what disturbs honourable members opposite. But, Mr. Speaker, the point that obviously honourable members opposite are going to try to harp on most, and that is the point which happens to be they are weakest on, and let me repeat them.

In the question of the democracy of this bill, Mr. Speaker, the appointed board as recommended in this legislation has no authority to do any of the things that are recommended as a potential power of that board. They cannot impose the levy; they cannot impose the regulations; that will only come when we have an elected board. Mr. Speaker, for the former Minister of Agriculture to say, he who writes threatening letters to legitimately elected members of producer boards if they don't toe the line, he who stood up in this House and said, "And if the producers, in this case hog producers, don't elect the right members, then I think we should not have elected members running these boards," and that's on record, Mr. Speaker. And that's not going to happen in this one.

Mr. Speaker, in this Act there is leadership shown in an area. Beef, Mr. Speaker, is one of the few commodity areas that has not for some reason or other, partly because of the diverseness of the people involved — it covers a wider spectrum of people in a bigger area of geography — that they have not been able to on their own come together in an association in the same way some other commodity groups have done.

Mr. Speaker, let me acquaint the honourable members that there are many commodity groups that have done an excellent job without the heavy hand of government. Perhaps the most noble one is the sugar beet organization. They've never raised any great debate or controversy in Manitoba. The sugar beet growers of this province get together; they have a very good, very strong association; they have a very good, very strong constitution; they negotiate every year with the sugar factory; they come to an agreement and all of this is done without the heavy hand of government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, fine, there was the legislation. We're prepared to show a bit of leadership because we recognize a little bit of a unique situation here, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, I caution the honourable members opposite. —(Interjection)— Well, the honourable member says freedom. What freedom did the dairy producers have, or the hog producers, or the vegetable producers that were put back in the Act? —(Interjection)— Never mind, never mind, under the Act. I ask the Honourable Member for St. George, did you write the letters, did you protest to the Minister of Agriculture, your Minister at that time, when compulsory levies was imposed on hogs? No. Did you object to the Minister of Agriculture taking \$96,000 from your dairy farmers without a vote? No.

Well, come on now.

Gentlemen, I do believe — I see one member sitting back there that is taking this in and recognizes the validity of my arguments — that is the Member for Ste. Rose. He has sat back; he has now reconsidered his whole position in this debate and he now recognizes it because he comes from cattle country, and he knows that given an opportunity — you know, if I come to Rorketon or Ste. Rose and get on any platform and make the same speech, he knows that 90 percent of that audience will be at the door shaking my hand, and understanding, and he'll be applauding the legislation that's being passed. And he has to start thinking about that; he has to start thinking about why he feels so lonely with the members opposite there. Well, you know, he's got the company of a few other fellows.

But, Mr. Speaker, the most damning evidence of their position and the most supportive evidence of our position was in fact the recent vote that was held just last fall, after a pretty well controlled, pretty well funded government effort to stage a vote the cattle producers in overwhelming fashion — I mean, Mr. Speaker, we speak with some pride about our mandate which is 49 percent, highest that any government in recent memory in Manitoba has received — but the cattlemen, Sir, gave the proposition of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture a mandate of 70 percent plus for what he is introducing.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no problems; I invite the kind of serious look at the clauses of the bill that we will be doing at Committee stage and, Mr. Speaker, knowing the way we are approaching the bill, if there are deep clauses that ought to be modified to make a position clear or understood, that will be acceptable or at least be considered by the honourable member and by the Honourable Minister. But, Mr. Speaker, as to the general acceptability and as to the general need of this bill, and speaking as a cattleman, let me say that I congratulate the Minister for introducing this bill, let me congratulate the department and the government for having the courage to doing it at its earliest opportunity. Because I remind all members that this was a commitment made by the Conservative administration back in the sixties, one that my — not with us in this House — the then Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable Member for Arthur, had every intention of bringing into this House. But we said, fine, we'll put it off for when we come back in 1970, after the 1969 election, except we didn't come back. But I want to tell you something, it adds to the list, the very impressive lists of promises made and promises kept by this administration. You may not like us keeping the promises; you may not like us doing away with estate taxes, but we promised the people of Manitoba we would do it. You may not like the fact that we are reducing income taxes, but we promised the people of Manitoba that we'd do it. You may not like the fact, ideologically speaking, that we promised to reduce the corporate taxes, but we did it.\$

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is another bill, this is another measure and, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about integrity of government, when you talk about integrity of government, and when you talk about credibility of government, this, Sir, is simply another measure that adds to that integrity, that adds to that credibility and I'm very proud to support that bill.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would answer a question.

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. USKIW: Would the Minister tell us — and I put this question seriously in light of his comments — did he read the legislation that is before us now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows that I have been involved for two and one-half weeks in my own Estimates. I am satisfied I have read the portent of the bill, I have discussed certain aspects that I was concerned with with Legislative Counsel having to do with the bill. But I go one step further, Mr. Speaker, it is not possible — that much faith I have in my Minister of Agriculture — it is not possible for my Minister of Agriculture to introduce anything in this House that isn't acceptable to me and to the vast majority of the cattle producers in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— that's a very significant remark that the honourable member is making, a very significant remark that's now being made by the Member for Roblin,

probably the most significant remarks that have been made in the entire debate, that the two people who thus far, from this side of the House, who have got up and spoken on this bill do not keep cattle. And there is something, Mr. Speaker, that is very significant about that because I thought that the Member for St. Johns made one of his best presentations on this bill because the bill does not deal with cattle; it deals with freedom and although, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— That's correct— although, Mr. Speaker — Well, let's develop; let's let members sit and listen and see why a Member for St. Johns who has nothing to do with cattle and a Member for Inkster who has nothing to do with cattle can make the kind of a presentation on this bill that calls to his feet the Member for Lakeside in important rebuttal to what has been said because it was a significant presentation and this will be a significant debate.

Mr. Speaker, I've been in this House for 12 years. I have never seen the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, so sensitive about supporting a measure as he has been about this bill except for one, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, looked today like he looked when he had to deal with that vegetable marketing legislation. Well, the Member for Lakeside was handed a vegetable producers' marketing board which had in it the kind of stipulations that are required when you are economically gathering and putting under a legislative roof in a compulsory way, all of the people who are engaged in a particular industry and saying that they have to abide by a group control. The Member for Lakeside ' did not like that. The Minister of Highways did not like that but it was his legislation and he defended it and he looked today as he looked then because, Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Lakeside has to get up and say, "You know, I've been busy," — and that's the same with all of us — and "I've had lots to do but I've spoken to people and I have so much faith in the Minister of Agriculture that I would know that he would not bring in a measure that would be a problem."

Mr. Speaker, once the Minister says that, he stands on very weak ground because the Minister of Agriculture has got a bureaucracy too and if the Minister of Agriculture is trying to satisfy a group of producers who don't — for some reason — have the support that makes it possible for them to engage in a voluntary organization and an association which would appeal to enough producers as to make them strong and credible, then he is bringing in legislation which the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, of all people should fear.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to deal with this question, not on the basis of cattle. I'm going to deal with it on the basis of the promise made by the Conservative Party because they keep talking about these promises. Mr. Speaker, I haven't yet found anybody in my constituency who said that they voted Conservative — and some did — not a great number, a significant . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, the total change in Inkster constituency was relatively small but I don't want to go into that. The fact is that I have not found anybody who voted Conservative so that there will be less estate taxes, so that there will be income tax breaks for the rich, that they will repeal the mineral legislation. But if that's what honourable members think gave them their mandate, then fine, Mr. Speaker. I've been told today that somebody said that the people who were polled who voted Conservative that one-third of them now say that they won't vote Conservative. I only wanted one out of every ten. I only needed one — well wanted. I say we needed one out of every ten Manitobans; that's one out of ten Manitobans. But if they think that those are the things — and I have my own ideas of what changed government, it was more what we did than what you did or what you promised. You also made a promise about freeing Manitobans.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how should all legislation be judged? What does this legislation do? I tell the honourable members that I had a habit when I was a Minister of saying when people brought me legislation, "What can I not now do which this legislation is going to change?" On that basis, Mr. Speaker, and members can go to the record of any Minister with a portfolio which involved bringing in legislation, I brought in less legislation than any Minister of the Crown, less legislation than any Minister of the Crown. Because legislation — I'm talking about legislation that involved a portfolio where legislation is a necessary thing — yes less legislation. And the reason is, Mr. Speaker, the reason is —(Interjection)— well the member won't listen, the member is in a bit of trouble. The reason is that if it is not necessary for the government to impose rules by legislation, if the government can accomplish its objectives through its spending authority and through involving itself as a corporate body in those things it wishes to involve itself in, it doesn't need legislation.

What is unable to be done by the Cattle Producers' Association that this legislation enables? Mr. Speaker, the Cattle Producers' Association can be an association; it doesn't require legislation. The day that we have to have legislation to be an association of people is the day when freedom ends in this society. There are numerous cattle associations, there's not one. There is, Mr. Speaker

there —(Interjection)— All right. Mr. Speaker, is no legislation at all that gives organized labour more rights than it has without the legislation; the legislation that is passed for organized labour I indicated — when the Farmers' Union came in and opposed this legislation I said that if there was a cattlemen's group that wanted to bargain collectively with an organization, wanted to get an agreement with that organization, have the group pay \$1.00, register for the organization and, Mr. Speaker, register the organization, do what a trade union has to do — which they don't have to do now — I would be prepared to give them the same kind of check-off. That's not what this organization does. This organization is made by legislation. Mr. Speaker, let's start again because my honourable friends have interrupted me.

What cannot the Cattle Producers Association do if this legislation was not passed. It can be an association. There's no law against it. It can even apply for a charter and it will be given a charter as a right. It can charge its members dues. It can advertise and promote the cattle and beef industry in such manner as it may deem advisable. It can initiate, sponsor, and encourage research into the production and marketing of cattle. It can do all of those things, Mr. Speaker, and more. It can do anything which is not against the Statute Law of the Province of Manitoba or the Statute Law of Canada, or against the Common Law as set by judges, none of which this regulation relieves them from.

It can have a Board of Directors. It can have an election which elects that Board of Directors. It can tell farmers that don't belong to it that you don't have to pay dues to our organization. It can do it even much more conveniently. I heard from members of the other side so many times, "Why collect the taxes and then give it back? Why just not collect it in the first place?" So here you have a bill which collects the dues and gives it back. We could make it much easier for them. They can just say, "Those people that want to pay the dues should pay them in the first place."

So then we look through this bill, Mr. Speaker, and ask, "What can they do that they cannot do before?" And there are two things, Mr. Speaker. 1. This organization, as distinct from anybody else who wanted to do the same thing, is now named as the government organization of cattle producers. If there was a farm union of cattle producers, if there was an independent cattlemen producers association, or any other cattlemen's group, they are now told, "You do not have the same rights as this group." Even if you get a majority of cattle producers to join your organization, which another union can do and displace a union, we are saying that it's the Cattlemen's Producers Association that is the association to which you will pay your dues and then, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a way in which you can get them back.

And when we get to Committee — I won't deal with that now — but this bill is going to Committee, I'm certain, because it was promised by the Conservative Party to the Cattlemen's Producers Association, and what better reason can there be for sending a bill to Committee according to the Member for Lakeside?

A MEMBER: No matter how bad it is.

Well, Mr. Speaker — yes, no matter how bad it is — no matter what they promised, no matter what is said about it in the House, it's going, and we'll say something about what should be in this Act about the dues at Committee.

But that's not the worst feature of this legislation. The worst feature of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is that this legislation says that this association can go to every cattle producer and demand whatever information they want with regard to that man's operation and if he doesn't give it to them they can put him in jail for refusing, that's what this legislation —(Interjection)— The honourable member says no? If the honourable member says no, then I should ask him to read before him Section 9 which says that you cannot convict somebody unless the regulation is valid and effective and enforceable, but the penalty for violating a regulation is — I tell the honourable member — fine or imprisonment.

A MEMBER: Where, where? Show me. Where?

MR. GREEN: Section 9.

A MEMBER: Read it. Read it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend — I don't know whether now he really wants to listen to me or he wants to try to make it appear that nothing is being said. Under Section 7.(1) they have the power to make those regulations — to ask you how many cows weigh 100 pounds,

how many cows weigh 200 pounds, how much you paid for feed, how much you sold, and if you don't give it to them —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I would stake my legal reputation on what I am now saying and that if you don't give it to them they can lay an information against you and if you are found guilty you can go to jail, and I am now telling the Member for Lakeside that in discussing this I am defending him as a cattle producer.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if it doesn't do those two things — and that's the most nefarious because, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between my learned friend and myself on just what is necessary with regard to orderly marketing and the protection of a market. I will concede right now so that he doesn't have any problem with me that in certain circumstances, and where a case is well-made, I will say that there has to be a universal — with everybody having to belong — marketing system, not necessarily by vote of the people, but by Act of the Legislature and under the natural products marketing legislation, that everybody has to be in it, and that for the well-being of the economic delivery of that product that it will have the force of law, the heavy hand of the state. I agree that that has to happen.

Why do I agree, Mr. Speaker? My well-being has come from it. How do you think lawyers make money? How do you think doctors make money? How do you think dentists make money? How do you think, Mr. Speaker, the professional organizations maintain the integrity of their economic marketing system?

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't argue with my honourable friend. If he wants to accuse me of being authoritarian on that score I say, without a vote, by act of the Legislature, in a proper situation it is necessary for the orderly marketing of a product and for the protection of all the people who are involved in it, even if a majority of those people may, for one reason or another not want the system, and you know when you talk about a marketing system and you talk about a majority, are you talking heads, are you talking acreage, are you talking volume? Well, Mr. Speaker, that's why I say that it is not the appropriate way of establishing a marketing system, but I believe that in an appropriate case it is not only necessary but it is desirable.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, if this was a marketing system my learned friend would have an argument. I might agree with him 100 percent. This system markets nothing. This is, if one wants to compare in the legal system the Law Society is given the heavy hand of the state to see to it that its members comply. The Law Society can discipline its members. It can throw them out. It can pass regulations. It can enforce those regulations by discipline against a member and the state will approve of what it is doing and support what it is doing, and it will require me, and it's well worth it, to pay dues to the Law Society and I can't opt out, but it's well worth it. I don't want to opt out, it's a good system. But the Bar Association — a friendly association of lawyers, the same with the MMA and the college — the Bar Association has to dun me for my dues, and I'm telling you something, they don't get them now, and I don't have to get them back. They don't them in the first place, so I don't have to ask them to opt them back, because they made a statement that the Bar Association is in favour of the Conservative position with regard to the family law. They didn't hold a meeting; they didn't go for the sub-section on it; they just politically decided that they were going to prostitute themselves for the Conservative Party, and they don't get my dues. And no state, Mr. Speaker, no state will force me to pay my dues to them, unless we embark on the path to serfdom that is laid out by this type of legislation. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, yes, yes, the party that talked about free Manitoba, the party that is talking about state control and authoritarianism and dictatorship, is the party that brings in this legislation which the honourable member says, the Honourable Minister of Highways, and I was being a little kinder than the former Minister of Agriculture, he says, "Don't be so sure, they're going to make me pay dues to the Bar Association."

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are times when the Member for Lakeside and myself will not submit to any state authority, I have no difficulty in saying that, there are certain things I will not submit to, there are certain things that the Member for Lakeside will not submit to. I don't care if it's the law or it's not the law, and I tell you that if I was a cattle producer and they came to me for this information I would tell them to go to hell, and if that is against the law so be it — the gauntlet is down.

But I was being much kinder to my friend, the Member for Lakeside, when he said, "Don't be so sure." I thought he was standing up with this solemn commitment again, that if that's what this legislation says then he won't pass the legislation, that he will withdraw the legislation, because, Mr. Speaker, that's his true feeling. He doesn't agree with that, and I was giving him the credit, when he said, "Don't be so sure," as sort of trying to assure me that this kind of legislation is

not going to go through, that we will undo this in committee.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's say you undo it — and by the way it really is very necessary that it be undone — because this Producers' Association is not an association that would involve all the members, and only one of them has to pay dues, or a very few, and then they can go around and get information from all the producers who are not members of the association, and be able to govern their activities accordingly. At least, Mr. Speaker, when you have orderly marketing of the product, at least you then say what happens, you then try — and there is argument about it, and there is always argument about it. To this day the Wheat Board has arguments that there is bootlegging of wheat, and no doubt there will be problems, but according to this legislation, Mr. Speaker, it is the most insidious form. It gives these people the best of all worlds. They find out what everybody is doing, but they are not bound by any system of marketing because there is no system of marketing in the legislation. And is this what you promised?

Now, let's be reasonable. Does the Member for Emerson back up the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, that that's what he promised to do and that's the mandate upon which he is running? Did the Minister of Agriculture make that kind of promise, and that's the basis upon which he is —(interjection)— My friend, the Member for Rock Lake, the Member for Rock Lake wouldn't promise this type of legislation on a bet. The Member for Rock Lake would be exactly with me, that if this association, which is legislated on top of him, which has no power to bring us all in and make sure that our product is marketed fairly, has the power to come to him and ask him anything they want about his business. The Member for Rock Lake would tell them to go to hell. —(Interjection)— That's right. That's right, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside talked about the Natural Products Marketing Board. That was Conservative legislation, and I tell him that if they didn't act under it I have to admit to him that I would act under it, that I do believe that orderly marketing requires some system whereby everybody who is involved in it knows that if he obeys the rules at least there will be public authority to support him as against those who don't obey. What authority is there in here? And if we take out this clause, which I rather think that the Member for Lakeside would like to see taken out, what are we left with, Mr. Speaker? —(Interjection)— That's right, no, no, Mr. Speaker, I want the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways to listen. What you are left with is a check-off for a voluntary association imposed by statute with the right to opt out, that's what you are left with. You are saying that one of the associations in Manitoba has been given governmental push as against other associations. —(Interjection)—

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the argument is that we supported the Farmers Union, then I'm going to say that that's a good argument. If we did, then I tell my friend, who is sitting beside me, that I resist that kind of thing, and if he would have made a big issue out of it on his side of the House, when he was there, I may have had to concede that he is right, as he is secretly conceding at this moment that I am right, that this is wrong. And his concession is articulated by saying that you did it too.

A MEMBER: But we didn't force anybody to belong.

MR. GREEN: But, Mr. Speaker, does that make it that a new government that is suggesting that it's going to undo some of these problems, and I don't agree that it is, responds by paying back in kind.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on the labour question in 1966, from this side of the House, and I said, Mr. Speaker, in opposition, that what we want to do is have fair laws. Laws which mean that the worker and the employer are both governed in the same way, that I will not ask for an employee anything that I would not ask for somebody else. And that the business of the then Conservative opposition was to try to use the laws to try to help the employer, and I said that if that's the way the law will bounce back and forth, then with changes in government you will find that if you have very restrictive labour laws under a Conservative administration, when the New Democrats come in the wolves will howl for very restrictive company laws, laws favouring unions.

And I said to the honourable members, "And when that happens, you will come to me and say don't do this type of thing." And I stand by my record in government, that when people came and said, "We want you to pass laws against employers," they did not, Mr. Speaker, get the time of day. They did not get the time of day, and the honourable member knows it. The laws that were

asked for under those circumstances, were laws which said that an employer could not hire employees during a strike, laws which wanted the government to interfere on the side of a union during collective bargaining which was never done by our administration, never done.

Mr. Speaker, time and three-quarters is a Conservative concept. It is not an employee concept; it is a Conservative concept. Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says 35 percent. He's really having a problem. I was quite willing, and always have been, to eliminate the labour laws. I have never said that the government should be sanctioning trade unions. Trade unions should be voluntary associations. This government is sanctioning a Cattle Producers' Association by name. I know of no law which sanctions the United Steelworkers of America by name and which says that dues will be paid to that organization whether it attracts the members or not, whether it is able to get certified or not, and which then says that they can never be displaced by another union. —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is in serious trouble. Rand Formula is given to a union that has achieved a majority by both vote or application to a labour board. Mr. Speaker, there's nothing in this bill —(Interjections)— I would like to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside had his opportunity to debate. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I really do. The Honourable Member for Lakeside is in trouble on this bill. And when the Honourable Member for Lakeside gets into trouble, the only way he can try to overcome it is to be so obstreperous as to eliminate the debate. So I sympathize with him and I rather know that what I'm saying is being felt because I told the Farmers' Union as I tell this member that if the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association did what a trade union had to do, that is sign up over 50 percent of the people, get the dues from them, go to a government board, get certified, and then have to enter into a collective agreement with regard to the sale of their product to the association and administer that agreement, I would say that they were entitled to a check-off. And then, Mr. Speaker, it would not be the Cattle Producers' Association Limited because, Mr. Speaker, when it happens to a trade union the members of that group —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, how did we get into this trade union business?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, how do we get into his talking all the time?

MR. GREEN: We got into the trade union business because when I referred to the dues, the honourable member referred to Rand Formula and other issues of which he knows nothing and which I'm trying to enlighten him on. To say that there is no government legislation, that makes the United Steel Workers or any union, the appointed . . . with the exception of the Civil Service thing which is silly but not the labour legislation, not the general labour legislation. And furthermore, doesn't entitle them to a check-off unless they first of all get a majority voting their way, get certified by the government, go to the employer and get a collective agreement. And then they can be undone by the Farm Union three months or six months later by the people saying, "We no longer like the Cattle Producers' Association."

But at least, Mr. Speaker, when we are dealing with a trade union, we are dealing with the marketing of the product in which case I say that it is necessary, it is desirable, it is inevitable — I am not going to try to make a principle against it — that there will some state authority making it possible for people to protect the integrities of their markets. What has this bill got to do with that? This bill will give the establishment of this organization the right to demand information from everybody who is not in the organization and govern their affairs as they see fit.

Now, if you don't want marketing, then, Mr. Speaker, why do we not go back to the law, the survival of the fittest. Why are we giving the fittest a law which will give them governmental authority to prey upon the weakest because that's what this does. Well the Member for Emerson is shaking his head. Read the legislation. —(Interjection)— The member has read it; he says that this is incorrect. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, then I have to tell the honourable member and I'm not a cattleman — you see, the member has read it and two people have spoken who are not cattlemen — but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that under this legislation, and I will say this without any equivocation whatsoever, under this legislation the association may require a cattleman to maintain books and records in relation to the production or marketing of his cattle.

Now, the Honourable Member for Emerson, I think it was perhaps the Member for Springfield, no, I believe it was the Member for Emerson who said, "In order to get your mineral acreage tax, even though you didn't have to pay it, you had to fill out an exemption," and that was a terrible

thing, the farmers couldn't fill out these exemptions. Under this legislation, not the government not people who you could come in here and raise hell with as to what kind of form you're asking them to fill out, but the establishment of the Cattle Producers' Association can require you to keep books and tell you what kind of books. —(Interjection)— Pardon me?

A MEMBER: Who asked for the mineral acreage tax?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the people of the Province of Manitoba, in my opinion by the way, and in 1973, to use the favourite sore of the Conservative Party, in 1973 we went to the public after having passed the mineral acreage tax. It was fought out on the hustings and we won. We won, Mr. Speaker. No farmer, no farmers had to pay the mineral . . .

A MEMBER: That's because there weren't any farms and that's why you're where you're at.

MR. GREEN: The Honourable Minister —(Interjections)—

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, no farmer had to pay The Mineral Acreage Tax Act. No person who was a farmer had to pay the mineral acreage taxation. When the Minister of Agriculture who brings in this nefarious piece of state control, autocratic, worse, Mr. Speaker, than putting it into the hands of a government who at least have to come up and answer questions, who at least have to come up to answer questions. Delegates, state power, to a group of cattle producers to have power over the other producers because he said he promised it to them in an election.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said, "How many farmers voted for the New Democratic Party?" On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I guess what the honourable member is advocating is that we start dividing up the province — he who accuses us of class warfare — that the legislation that is passed for the north end of Winnipeg shall be only that which is advocated by the New Democratic Party, that there will be in the north end of Winnipeg New Democratic Party legislation. We got more than 49 percent in that area and I suppose the way in which we could become a formidable force is ask for separatism for north Winnipeg just as the member asked for separatism for the farmers. We are all here dealing with something, Mr. Speaker, which is of concern to all us, farmers, labourers, lawyers, bailiffs, teachers, because, Mr. Speaker, this legislation doesn't deal with agriculture. I have to tell the Honourable Minister this legislation deals with concepts of freedom. Which, if he says farmers don't understand, Mr. Speaker, then I say to him he doesn't understand farmers and if I go to any farmer, if I went to any farmer in his constituency and said to him, "Do you agree that the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association should have the right to require you to keep their kinds of books or go to jail?" they will vote for me instead of him, on that basis. That's right, that's right. They may encompass it; they may encompass it, vote to support the Tory administration but when he says that their mandate is to pass this bill, I relish, Mr. Speaker, relish in the thought that they really think that that is what their mandate is because if that's the kind of mandate they think that they got from the farmers of the Province of Manitoba and they are going to behave in accordance with that supposed mandate, then that trench as strong and justified and deserved — I'm not going to argue about it — support that they have received from many agricultural people in the province of Manitoba is going to disappear if that's the basis upon which they say that they have been elected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, two things are possible. One is the notion that some bureaucrat drew this legislation, or some group of people came and drew the legislation and without really placing a great deal of thinking upon it, the government has presented it to the House and it's going to change it. The Member for Lakeside indicated that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: The Member for Lakeside indicated that one part of it, if a person can't out he gives his solemn commitment — I believe that they do want an opting out, but boy, I would like to write the opting out in the Act. I'd sure like the opting out to be that anybody, Mr. Speaker, who indicates in advance that they want out, and put it right in the legislation, not that they have to pay the dues and then make an application to get it back. I would like the opting out to be in the Act. I don't agree with the Act at all. But if there is going to be opting out' it should be sensible opting out, that this legislation empowering the organization to set regulation is deleted entirely, it is completely unnecessary to enable the association to advertise and promote cattle. And if they do that kind

Friday, May 12, 1978

of a thing, then maybe we will have one of two things: either we will have scored some type of victory in opposition, or, which is just as easy to take, that the Conservatives did not feel that this is the extent of the Act, or if we think it is, that they will undo it. That's one possibility. And on that basis we will have had a debate and we will accept the democratic process.

But Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that that's the situation. That they could be forgiven, but I say, forgive them not, because they knew what they were doing. Forgive them not, because they knew what they were doing. They were going and paying their debts, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Speaker, they were going, all we've heard in this Legislature —(Interjection)— the Minister of Mines pays debts to the people, the election agent, Mr. Kyle, by jeopardizing the entire Manitoba position before the International Joint Commission, that's his debt. The Attorney-General pays his debt to Ken Houston and Rudy Anderson by enacting horrendous laws, vis-a-vis husband and wife, archaic laws that do not work, that have been proven not to be able to work. The Minister, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General with a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. There has been no matrimonial laws brought forward to this Session of the Legislature.

MR. GREEN: I would have expected more from a lawyer. When the Attorney-General presented his bill to the House, he enacted 300 years of archaic, unworkable, unfair, inequitable law, and he did that, Mr. Speaker, he did that to pay his debt to Ken Houston and that other group of Conservatives, whom he made promises to.

The Minister of Labour pays her debt, Mr. Speaker, fulfills her election promises by trying to give exemptions to Hooker Chemicals and other such hookers. The Minister of Highways pays his debt to the Cattle Producers' Association by enacting slavery legislation. The Minister of Health pays his debt to his supporters by putting one bed per sheet per week on the beds in the hospitals of this province. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health is going to pay another debt, he's going to pay another debt to the doctors —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Kildonan on a point of order.

MR. FOX: I'd like to raise the point of order, that there has been at least 10 minutes of interruption of the honourable member's time this afternoon. There was continual interruption by the Minister of Highways; I agree there was also interruption from this side, and this detracted from the debating time of the Honourable Member for Inkster. I think you should consider it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have considered it very carefully, and the honourable member's time is up. If he has leave of the House to continue, he will have unlimited time. Has the member got leave?

MR. GREEN: I'm asking for two minutes. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for its indulgence in this connection; I may say that I think that they do owe me something, so two minutes is not that much. I say, Mr. Speaker, that I ask the Conservative Party to look at conservatism, to look at the philosophy, to stop imagining promises that they made that have to be fulfilled, on the basis of IOUs that are being requested, which are not conservatism, they're not socialism, they're not any form of "ism." —(Interjection)— Well, the member — Mr. Speaker, the principles of this bill cannot be found in any classical political scientist of any stripe — and it's not necessary. If the Cattle Producers' Association of the Province of Manitoba was strong enough to attract the support of cattle producers, it would not need this bill. If it is not strong enough, then giving them this bill is a crime against democracy in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been rather interesting this afternoon to listen to debate on a subject that I am pleased to hear that is important, not only to the farming population of this province, but also to people who are in the legal profession and perhaps a few others. It was interesting to hear the comments from my good friend, the Member for Inkster. I

have always enjoyed listening to his oration in this House; the things he has to say about the many problems that come before us and the problems that I think we have a responsibility to solve in one form or another.

This one in particular is the checkoff that farmers want to provide themselves with an opportunity to do something for themselves. And you know, I always relish listening to the Member for Inkster, because he — and here again, being a lawyer — is very capable of taking a situation and interpreting that to his liking. You know, the Member for St. Johns, he started it out, but Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about this subject as if it happened just yesterday, or even last October 11, when election day was called, and we were returned to take the responsibility of running the affairs of this province. It's been going on for several years, Mr. Speaker, a request that the farmers have been asking for. But unfortunately, because of the previous administration, the previous Minister of Agriculture made proposals and presented to them, things that they didn't want, and he had a very good knack of incorporating, such as our Land Protection Act, things that farmers in Manitoba, and people in Manitoba didn't want. You know, it's a package deal, that he was always capable of putting before the farmers of this province. And that's what, Mr. Speaker, what farmers objected to, and that's, Mr. Speaker, why they are on that side of the House and we are on this side.

And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I suppose he still has a few farmer friends throughout the Province of Manitoba, and I can tell him, Mr. Speaker, that there were a few of them that were lobbying in here about what? — three weeks ago or almost a month ago — and then they come back came back in again two weeks later to lobby on behalf of the Member for Lac du Bonnet and the rest of his colleagues on that side of the House. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, the few that are still thinking and supporting his philosophy.

You talk about concept of freedom, Mr. Speaker — you know, legislation has been brought before this House on many many occasions in past history. It's not always perfect. And I say, Mr. Speaker, I am always open to make changes, if changes are necessary to meet the wishes of the majority of those people who are concerned, and in this case, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this province, and those particularly in the cattle business, have been asking for a checkoff, an opportunity to establish a fund — and I'm not going to get into the legal terminology and compete in oration in this House with my friend from Inkster, because he is more capable of doing that than I am, I don't mind professing that fact.

I think what bothers the honourable gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, more than anything else, is that they made a contribution to the National Farmers' Union, and those farmers who had belonged to that organization. Did they make a contribution to the Manitoba Farm Bureau? To any other farm organizations in this province? Mr. Speaker, I think this is a point worthy of note as to why they are standing up and why they are so volatile in expressing their opposition to legislation that we have now before them. I think the truth of the matter is that more than anything else, and I think it should be stated as such.

Mr. Speaker, if I am asked to contribute 25 cents for any animal that I sell, and the association that is organized — and the farmers are going to run this themselves, we are not going to run it — if the farmer sees that that association is not operating in his best interests, he can make application ask for his money that he has put into that fund. Mr. Speaker, if that's —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with honourable gentlemen in that respect. If the legislation, or if the opportunity through the association is not going to be in such a way that farmers are not going to be able to do that, I think that after things are organized and they get going, they set this thing up, I think that you'll find when it has been in operation for a sufficient length of time that no farmer will want to ask for a refund on the money that he is contributing to do something for himself.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give some information to some honourable gentlemen here who are not in the farming business, and the ex-Minister of Agriculture, I don't think he knew one end of a potato from another when he was the Minister of Agriculture on this side of the House, let alone knowing anything about marketing a cattle beast. You know, Mr. Speaker, I have talked to many farmers and I have asked them, I have said, when they have taken a load of cattle to market, and if they've sold them on a rail-grade basis, and they have an opportunity — and that's their right and they can do that — to follow their animals through when they've been slaughtered and graded by a government inspector, and to have a look at their cattle to see how they were graded, and then to assess whether they got fair treatment in the grading of those animals.

I have done that, Mr. Speaker, and you know, I want to tell honourable gentlemen opposite one little situation that can be changed and that is, the grading system on our beef today is something that has much to be desired. Something, Mr. Speaker, that has much to be desired. And I want to say that the Cattlemen's Association, as is suggested here, can do that very thing. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, honourable gentlemen can have their opportunity to say how

they feel about this legislation. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when the Member for Inkster was talking about a concept of freedom, I suggest to honourable gentlemen opposite that having been in this place for 12 years, the government before, that if at any time the farmers in this province tell me that their freedom is being endangered in such a way, then I would certainly be cognizant of that and I would be prepared to do something about it.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have the co-operation and we have the support, and also the organizations, as I understand it, took part in establishing this whole concept of a Cattlemen's Association. Mr. Speaker, I think that's a lot more than farmers ever had the opportunity of doing in the past eight years under a socialistic government; that's more than they had in the past years under a socialistic government. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is if honourable gentlemen are so concerned. . . because the same situation has been established in B.C., has been established in Alberta, has been established in Saskatchewan and has been established in Ontario.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, I can think of occasions in the past — and I want to give one example where I think that we do, as farm producers of beef, have to have more clout, and I would hope that the beef growers of this province are going to have more to say and are going to be listened to by Ottawa, and the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa, more than they ever were listened to by the the past Minister of Agriculture, when he was the Minister. I can give you one example, Mr. Speaker. When the Federal Government put an embargo on red meats going into the United States, at that time the price of beef was 50 cents a pound to the producer. In about a month's time, because of that legislation, the price of beef dropped to just about 40 cents a pound. That was on the average of \$100 loss per animal to the farmers producing beef across this country. That is the kind of thing that I think the beef producers are able to try to overcome for themselves. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that when this thing gets going, in a year or so down the road, when we have been able to collect funds, and what is established in here and as the purpose that is stated, I'm concerned about those things, the purpose of this particular bill, and the objects and the powers of the bill is also, I think, important.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the association when it's formed, if the farmers feel that some of it is too stringent, I think they're going to have the opportunity to make changes. I think they'll have the opportunity to make changes, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, that will be up to the farmers themselves. We are setting up the vehicle to give the farmers, particularly those in the beef business, in the production of cattle, to provide a vehicle for them to establish an opportunity that they can help themselves.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lac du Bonnet is so endowed with the fact that he enjoyed for eight years being able to possess power and authority, that he can't visualize anyone else being any different. He can't visualize anyone being any different. As a result, he is taking the attitude that he is at the present time.

So Mr. Speaker, I'm not going espouse any length of time here, but merely to say that I am very pleased that the beef producers of this province, and the biggest majority are going to have an opportunity to exercise and acquire something within their industry that they have been wanting to get for a long time and are now going to get it.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that honourable gentlemen opposite can espouse the propaganda — and they are good for that they have been doing it all along, Mr. Speaker, — and accuse us of dictatorship all they like but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, give it a year or so down the road and we'll prove to them that they are wrong. Mr. Speaker, I welcome, on behalf of the beef producers of this province, the opportunity to do something for themselves and hopefully we're going to see better days ahead for the beef industry in this province.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't anticipated in taking part in this debate today at this time, but certainly I believe that some of the comments brought forward today by members of the government side deserves to be spoken to. If ever I have heard two members bring forward red herrings and stretched them around this House we certainly have had the Minister of Highways and the Meer for Rock Lake bring them forward. You've had the Minister of Highways in his own usual self continually go ahead and berate, and muckrake, and downplay orderly marketing in this province, continually attack orderly marketing of every board by talking about red herrings like rotten eggs, and everything, attacking it in this House, and government control. Then he goes out into the hustings and out into the farm areas and he says, "I support marketing boards; what do you want? I'm all in favour of orderly marketing." In this House, they talk out of both sides

of their mouths.

The meers of the Conservative Party, they go ahead and they totally attack orderly marketing, they attack every method of orderly marketing that they can; they talk about freedom, and then they are going to bring in legislation such as this that takes away freedom, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if they wish to bring in the legislation of orderly marketing for producers, the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, brought forward the Act, the Natural Products Marketing Act which was amended by his administration. If he is opposed so greatly to orderly marketing don't bring this legislation in, do away with that Act, do away with the Natural Products Marketing Act completely and throw it open, completely, for everyone. Let all the farmers go on the open market system that he espouses that is so great for the producers, let them all go on the open market system. But I don't think he will do that, but I would urge him to do that because this bill, if he is really talking about freedom for producers, this bill takes away from it.

I challenge the members of the Conservative Party, the Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Rock Lake, Minister of Highways who was the Minister of Agriculture, not to speak out of both sides of their mouth, to get up and pass the legislation of freedom that they are talking about. Do away with orderly marketing in this province and bring in the open market system that they espouse, that producers can do what they want — they can market carrots in front of their home as the member so eloquently talks about, that producers can go out and put their goods by the roadside. All he brings forward is nothing but red herrings, Mr. Speaker. Nothing but red herrings and attacks on the orderly marketing system, not only in this province, but in this country.\$

And then the Minister of Agriculture, just several weeks ago, goes ahead and announces a Marketing Board for the broiler industry, and the Minister of Highways says we're going to go around and pay farmers for killing chickens. Mr. Speaker, they have brought in a Marketing Board where a half a dozen producers in this province control about 40 percent of the production. For who? They are really closing the borders, the very thing that the Member for Rock Lake was talking about, that the borders were closed to goods shipped the other way, the Marketing Board that his Minister of Agriculture is bringing in is closing the borders to protect the industry in this province. And the Marketing Boards that he talks about freedom, are going to take away freedom from the producers of this province, from the consumers of this province, to be able to purchase their chicken at a lower price because the price of chicken in the States is much lower. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: It's a rather important question because I am prepared to be influenced by his answer and pass on that influence to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the Member for St. George asking the Honourable Minister of Agriculture to withdraw his support for the orderly marketing of broilers and to withdraw the position put forward by the department to get into the broiler plant?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Highways is asking me if I am saying that the Minister of Agriculture should withdraw his support from this kind of a board, yes. That type of a board that he is talking about, the way that he is bringing in that board, and the way it is being set up he may as well withdraw today. But no, the Minister of Agriculture is going further; not only is he going to bring in this bill, Bill No. 25, which is totally undemocratic, he is also going to be doing one more thing, and he mentioned that in his Estimates. He revealed in his Estimates that the provisions of the Natural Products Marketing Act and the provision that beef producers could organize collectively to have orderly marketing in this province, would be removed from that Act. He said that is the freedom that he is going to bring in for producers; he is going to remove the beef commodity because he said, Mr. Speaker, that if that provision is left in the Act and some government comes in, it is a very dangerous provision in the Act for producers, that there would have to be another debate in this House to be able to have producers organize.

That's the comments of the Conservative Party. It is dangerous if someone else is in office and brings in those provisions but it's all right to bring in dictatorial provisions when they are in power.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party, in bringing in this legislation, is certainly curtailing the Civil Rights of all beef producers in this province. They came into this House after an election campaign — they ran big T.V. ads that said, "Free Manitoba. We've got to bring in freedom. There shall be freedom in this province." Mr. Speaker, freedom for whom? Freedom for whom — the 150 people that they gave away \$7 million of Estate Tax to? That kind of freedom, freedom to give away \$12 million in income tax cuts while you raise the bus fares, the health institutions are cut to bare bones, freedom to change bed sheets once a week, that kind of freedom? That's the freedom they came

in with, Mr. Speaker. They said that there was going to be a freedom, that they will build more nursing homes in this province. —(Interjection)— We have freedom, Mr. Speaker, because now we have nothing. We have lots of freedom. Freedom for whom?

Mr. Speaker, they speak of support. They speak that they have the support and the mandate of the people of this Province of Manitoba and especially the producers; that because they were elected with a 49 percent vote majority that they have the vote. Well, they do have the mandate, Mr. Speaker, that they were elected to govern. But they cannot argue that this very same concept was put to a vote in 1974 and was rejected. —(Interjection)—

A MEMBER: Not the same . Not blanket power.

MR. URUSKI: Not blanket powers, but a concept of a check-off, of a voluntary beef check-off was rejected by the producers. They cannot deny that.

And now the Minister of Highways gets up and he berates this side of the House for imposing marketing boards without a vote.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell him that like the Member for Inkster that, from time to time, regardless of who is in government — and I hope to be back in government — that there will be from time to time marketing boards that will be brought in without a vote of producers. There's no doubt about it that there will be orderly marketing brought in. But let's just see what this bill will do, Mr. Speaker, in addition to what comments were made today. We have this legislation that gives the objects and powers to this association in a certain portion of this bill, which says that it is to promote and to assist producers in the production and marketing of cattle in Manitoba. That is one of the objects and powers of this association, and it's a very commendable objective of this bill. But lo and behold, what happens in the very next section of the bill, it contradicts itself because it takes away the very powers that it gives in 6(1). It takes away the powers of producers. It says the association shall not engage in production, sale and marketing, and processing of cattle on its own behalf, or exercise any of its powers in a manner contrary to this Act or administration by-law.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for St. James on a point of order.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe we are dealing with the principles of the bill and the Honourable Member for St. George is reading from the bill, particularly item by item, and I think he is out of order.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I did not refer to any particular section of the bill; I spoke of the objects and the powers of the association and the contradiction in the very next portion of the bill, which on one hand it gave the producers powers for the production, to assist producers in the production and marketing of cattle in Manitoba, and in the very next section it takes away the very powers that it said are the objectives and powers of the association — a total contradiction right within one section after the other. While on one hand it says that producers should band together and organize in marketing and in promotion of their product, on the other hand it takes away those very powers.

Mr. Speaker, but beyond that, what is going to happen to producers, without having it spelled out in this bill that there is . . . At least the Minister of Agriculture got up and he indicated that there would be an opting out provision. Although there is nothing in this bill I hope that they will bring in amendments, they will bring in amendments to indicate what the procedures are, or whether producers will be able to opt out before they pay any levies to this association.

But, Mr. Speaker, as was indicated, the producers, if they want to band together in a voluntary association, don't need this very bill. But, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a complete abdication of power by the government of the Province of Manitoba. They are handing to a private organization powers that they said were dangerous in the powers of a government, as is noted in the Natural Products Marketing Act. They said that the powers contained in the Natural Products Marketing Act are dangerous if a particular government happens to be in office — and they were referring to members on this side — but yet they will give a private organization more power than the Natural Products Marketing Act holds through elected representatives of the people in this Province of Manitoba. That's what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, besides that, besides what the bill doesn't clearly indicate, I believe that producers

who want to opt out will be discriminated against in the marketplace by this legislation. What will happen, Mr. Speaker, is that the producers who opt out will be discriminated against in the marketplace.

Mark my words, Mr. Speaker. What will happen is that the producers who opt out from assisting this association will be discriminated against by the marketplace in the Province of Manitoba. They will be put out of business for some reason. When they will market their cattle, if there is no check-off of dues, somehow, I believe, Mr. Speaker, they will be forced to be singled out by the marketing system and what will happen? It will happen in the same way as supporters of the fight against orderly marketing were singled out the reverse way in the beef vote.

I'll give you an example, Mr. Speaker. When we had very low prices in the marketplace in the last couple of years, we had one fellow, who was in my constituency and I will name him, he was actively involved as the President of the Cow-Calf Association, Mr. Terry Eyjolfson, Mr. Speaker. He was one of the individuals involved actively campaigning. First of all he fought against the Income Assurance Plan, when they visited the Minister of Agriculture, and he actively fought against orderly marketing. But, Mr. Speaker, when the industry knew who their allies were, what really happened? He brought in a load of cattle, well the market was down — completely down for everyone else. Terry Eyjolfson's cattle came on the market and you hear the announcer on CBC —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if it's "A" cattle, it's "A" cattle. —(Interjection)— If it's "A" grade cattle, it's "A" grade cattle, or is there a difference if it's Terry Eyjolfson or Harry Enns if it's "A" cattle? Is the Minister of Highways suggesting that if he sells "A" cattle, he will get more money than John Doe from Arbog if he sells "A" cattle?

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of marketing system he is promoting. That is the kind of marketing system he is continuing to perpetuate in this bill. What had happened? The radio announcer came on the air and said, "Look, Mr. Eyjolfson brought in a load of cattle and you know today," Mr. Speaker, "the cattle commended several cents a pound higher than the market today." All of a sudden he got more. Just Eyjolfson's cattle — can you imagine that, Mr. Speaker? Nobody else can either.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways indicates that he supports that kind of marketing system. If he is saying that this bill will give the producers some strength in their marketplace, what a bunch of nonsense, what a bunch of nonsense. The producers will be serfs to this association. They will be paying money which will be blown out the window to support nothing. What is it going to support? What is this association going to support? How is it going to strengthen the marketplace of the producers so that there will be a better price for beef to the producer? What is this going to do to help that producer? Not a damn thing; it's going to do nothing. Mr. Speaker, it is going to do nothing.

The Member for Rock Lake said that other provinces have this kind of a check-off and it has really helped them. Well, how much has it helped them in the last couple of years if they have had this check-off? The beef prices in this country have been depression prices. The producers have given the beef away completely. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rock Lake indicated that now, because there is a check-off in other provinces, that we should really have a check-off of this nature. What is this bill going to do to assist the producers — the beef producers — to have at least a decent price for their cattle rather than going through the boom and bust cycle that they have in the last number of years or historically, continually, of two or three years of booms and four or five years of busts. What is this going to do to them? Nothing. —(Interjection)— They are going to give away; they are going to pay into an association \$100,000 and it's just going to be blown, frittered away to do what? To promote a few large producers who wish to try and promote some little association which will have no marketing benefits to any of the producers; no benefits at all to the beef producers of this province. That, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Government accused this side of the House of waste and mismanagement for conducting the affairs of this province in a wasteful and mismanageable way in the past years.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is total waste and mismanagement on behalf of all the producers of this province. They are going to frit away in excess, of \$100,000 a year? And those who happen to opt out of this provision will be discriminated against by the marketplace. They will be discriminated against by the marketplace. I'll tell you, it will happen in a similar way if the marketplace happens to do things like that even now — even now the marketplace — I hear all kinds of stories. What happens in a marketplace? All of a sudden a farmer ships beef to be sold — as the Member for Rock Lake says — for slaughter. But somehow that cattle is sold for finishing, yet the farmer doesn't go with his cattle and the beef is sold for finishing when the weight of the carcass is in the slaughter

grade; and yet it is sold. Because there is tinkering in the marketplace, Mr. Speaker, someone picks up those cattle for finishing, turns around and maybe he keeps them a day, a week, and then sells them for slaughter cattle to do what? To collect the federal subsidy. That's the kind of games that are being played.

If the Minister of Agriculture is really serious in dealing with some of the inequities in the marketplace that he says he is, let him bring the necessary amendments in to the Health of Animals Act, into the Natural Products Marketing Act and deal with those inequities; not frit away in excess of \$100,000 of producers' funds on promotion.

He says his government is going to assist producers in marketing and promotion. —(Interjection)— They're going to be paying for it themselves and they will have no control over it, because he is going to abdicate his control and give it to a group of producers that will do with whatever they wish. They will go and tell the Trucking Association — all those little truckers that the meers on the other side say supported the Conservative Party — now that they have given farmers the opportunity to purchase diesel trucks, those little truckers will like you very very much. Those little truckers, by this Act, will have to keep a set of books to report to this organization.

The Member for Gladstone frowns his head. Is that right? Mr. Speaker, who is involved in this? Who will have to produce records for this organization? It says the "Information Reporter." Who is the Information Reporter? It includes producers, buyers, sellers, drovers, auctioneers, even the Minister of Agriculture, shippers, transporters, all those little truckers will have to report and bring in information to this group of people, who can then say, "If you don't produce that information you're in trouble." Mr. Speaker, "you're in trouble."

The very freedom, the very freedom, that the members of the Conservative Party spoke about during the election campaign is now being imposed on the producers of Manitoba, by what? By what kind of means? By a total abdication, No. 1, of responsibility on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture; by a dictatorship piece of legislation which will force all cattle producers in this province to contribute to a plan, an information system, that they do not know anything about, because the bill doesn't spell out.

It will have producers being discriminated in the marketplace who opt out of this legislation because they will be dealt with in a very nice way, in a similar way, as supporters of the free market system were dealt with in the marketplace over the last number of years. The same thing will happen to producers who opt out. That freedom government, Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Emerson, the Member for Gladstone, the Member for Roblin who talks about little people — who talks about little people. . .

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Swan River, member of the Department of Agriculture, should himself realize that his producers and his little truckers will be asking him questions in his riding, what is the information they will have to produce for this organization? And what will he stand up and tell them? He'll say, "I don't know." You know, there's no information necessary, but he'll have no authority. He will not even be able to go to his Minister of Agriculture and complain to him that these people will be dictators because the Minister of Agriculture is abdicating his responsibility and passing it over to this private group.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm interrupting proceedings at this time. The honourable member will have 15 minutes when this next comes up on the Order Paper.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go into Private Members' Hour, though, I would like to announce to the House that I have carefully looked at the newspaper reports that were referred to by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and I find, after carefully perusing the newspaper articles, that the Member for Fort Rouge, in my opinion, did not have a point of privilege.

BILL NO. 25 (Cont'd)

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

MR. URUSKI: Yes. I'd just like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I will not be here when the bill next comes up. So if anyone wants to take the adjournment, the bill is open. I have completed my remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in effect the bill would be open for the call of anybody who then rises.

Friday, May 12, 1978

I seek guidance of the House if there is a disposition to proceed with Private Members' Hour at this time, then we shall so proceed. On the other hand I would ask the House and the Chair to consider a motion moved by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.