

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, July 6, 1978

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 28, I tabled the 1977 Annual Report of The Manitoba Human Rights Commission. The report I tabled at that time was a mimeographed version prepared by the Commission and was filed with the Clerk. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago, it was brought to my attention that this mimeographed version of the report contained an error; this error dealt with some incorrect statistical data and a subsequent narrative portion based upon that statistical data. I gave notice of this error during the Estimate debate of the Department of the Attorney-General and indicated to Committee members that the error would be corrected in the printed final version of the Annual Report. The report is now being distributed to the members, and I would simply confirm, Mr. Speaker, that the incorrect portions of the mimeographed copies of the report have now been corrected.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the questions I had principally in mind, the appropriate Ministers — I will wait until they are here. But I would like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources and ask him, perhaps more specifically than I did a couple of weeks ago, whether he can say whether there is any change in policy or program relative to the encouragement of those oil producers in southwestern Manitoba that have to engage in the extra effort and extra cost of secondary recovery methods. Has there been any change in recent months, or are any changes being contemplated?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, there have been no specific changes to date; certainly there are changes being contemplated in terms that regulations are being reviewed and comments being solicited on draft regulations, and the possibility of making changes in the taxation situation is also being looked at, but to date those changes have not been made.

MR. SCHREYER: Well then, Sir, a related question. In view of the extra flurry of excitement in northern North Dakota with respect to the recent discoveries of oil and different formations that have been considered to be oil-bearing formations in North Dakota and Manitoba, can the Minister clarify whether there is any action afoot, any program or policy change afoot, insofar as the government of the Province of Manitoba is concerned, in order to ensure or attempt to ensure a more elaborate program of drilling exploration in southwestern Manitoba relating to other than the oil-bearing formation that has been concentrated on in the past. Or, to put it another way, can the Minister say whether there is any effort by the province directly or indirectly by program to encourage exploration drilling at the Devonian and Mississippi formations?

MR. RANSOM: Policy changes have not been announced; when the policy decisions are made,

they will be announced. In terms of activity, and the deep drilling in particular, certainly the industry has been extremely active in southwestern Manitoba on leasing of rights on freehold land, and I am advised this morning that one of the companies is back in the area again, actively trying to put together a substantial block of land, and that there is every intention on the part of that company to carry out some drilling within the next year or two. I am advised that it's unlikely that there will be substantial drilling within the next year, but that exploration activities, seismic activity, will be substantially stepped up.

MR. SCHREYER: When the Minister says that the companies interested are extremely active, or becoming so, could the Minister say whether by that he means that there are two drilling rigs in operation, three, four, or more than that? Or is there only one?

MR. RANSOM: Well, I think I have stated, Mr. Speaker, that we did not expect to see a substantial amount of actual drilling activity in the immediate future. The steps, naturally, that the companies have to take is to acquire some rights and do their exploration activity in terms of seismic work, and that much of the work that was done 10 or 15 years ago is not considered adequate any more with the new technologies that are available; they are re-doing a substantial amount of the seismic work, and at that time they will decide where they will do their drilling. At the moment I understand also that there is a shortage of drilling rigs available, and even if there was some activity and someone did want to undertake some activity immediately, there might be difficulties in that regard.

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

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Yes. I don't know whether I should address this question to the Minister of Education or to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, respecting the matter of withdrawal or proposed changes in tariff items as they affect various materials, equipment used by universities in hospitals and other institutions. Apparently these items can now come into the country duty free and there is a move afoot to make adjustments in this, and this could add approximately \$20 million to the cost of operating universities in Canada. I wonder if either the Minister of Consumer Affairs or the Minister of Education is aware of this and whether they would be prepared to investigate it if not, and register opposition inasmuch as this will add to the cost of operating universities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Member for Brandon East bringing this to my attention. If there is anything that will increase the cost of the operation of our universities, certainly we would be prepared to take a very close look at it and see what could be done to oppose any move in this direction.

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

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is the Minister doing any follow-up monitoring on the operational and economic effectiveness of the use of Saunders ST27 aircraft for scheduled airline services anywhere, wherever they may be used for that purpose?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, there has been a court appointed Receiver appointed to disperse the assets or try and sell the assets of the Saunders Aircraft Corporation. As the member can appreciate, we had to repossess a few airplanes because the payments weren't being made, also we had a few returned from lease and right now we are trying to wind down that corporation so that we don't have the problems of ongoing maintenance costs and ongoing product support.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Honourable Minister consider making contact with Otonabee Airways Limited based in Peterborough, Ontario, which use Saunders ST27 aircraft for scheduled airline service between Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Syracuse, New York, Peterborough, Kingston and the like, as to the effectiveness of the use of that aircraft for that purpose?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe there are two airlines that are using the ST27s. One is Otonabee and one is On Air. I believe that those two companies. I know at least one of them, has

been talking to the Receiver to acquire and purchase some more of the stock and maybe some more of the aircraft that are involved in this particular receivership and once the Receiver has made a recommendation on that, we will be moving on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. It having been approximately two weeks since the question was last asked, I would ask the Minister if he could indicate to the House the current status of his department's efforts to sell the Pakwagan operation in Wabowden.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased with the arrangement that is being made. Just while I'm on my feet, I think I should endeavour to answer to a degree some of the questions that the Member for Churchill raised in this regard. He asked about the criteria and some of the terms and conditions which we were looking for when we were attempting to dispose of the particular operation.

One that was foremost in my mind was the continuance of employment in the Wabowden area and I believe that when the final arrangements are made that that will exactly be the case, that there will be continued operation in the Wabowden area. Agreements, I would think within a day or two the final agreements will be signed with the parties involved; then the next step, of course, before the member asks the question, will be that I'll have to take it to my Cabinet, and I believe the next Cabinet meeting would be next Wednesday. I should be reporting on it, hopefully, next Wednesday afternoon or evening in the House.

But I think the concern with the member, and certainly with myself, was the continuance of the operation of the particular plant in the Wabowden area, and continuous employment of people, and I think we'll all be happy with the results.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture would be willing to indicate to the House the contents of a letter sent out to all of the cattlemen on the contract, under the Beef Income Assurance Plan, dated last week, over which some questions were asked, but the Minister has so far neglected to clarify for us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I can see no problem in tabling the letter, along with a lot of other material as related to the Beef Income Assurance Program, that letters have been circulated to the producers over the past few years which totally confused the individuals in the program and will open up much more of a horror story than the member would like to see, I'm sure.

MR. GREEN: They don't want the money, that's all. It's only \$38 million — give it up. They're so happy to take \$38 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Orders of the Day.
The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister whether he would be prepared to tell us the contents of the letter. There were three conditions, three options that were offered to the producers, and I'm wondering why the Minister chose not to indicate those options to the Legislature when the questions were put to him. Certainly that's a matter for the Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the contract that was drawn up with the farmers, those are the individuals who we are dealing with at the particular time; I have no problem in tabling the letters that were sent from the department, it was a department letter that was sent to contract holders in the community.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, since the Minister has indicated three options to producers, which is a variation from the present agreement — at least one of the options would be a variation from the present agreement — my question to the Minister is, is the Minister in a position to indicate

whether he is prepared to sue for moneys that are found to be uncollectable at some point during the course of the term of the agreement?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, there are many things, as I've indicated, to do with the Beef Income Assurance Program, many changes that the Member for Lac du Bonnet is quite familiar with I am sure, and as I have indicated, I will table the letter. I'm sure the part that he's relating to is the buying of the livestock by the province, we've indicated in the letter that we are prepared to buy them. They market in the normal marketing matter and we will pay them the support price when they market them, which the contract reads, that the province will act on the option. So, I have no problem in tabling it, and as far as suing for the moneys, at this particular time that would be an assumption that the people aren't going to pay. We have individuals — some thousand or more — that the last Minister of Agriculture in the province forgave, let them off the hook. So he was irresponsible to the taxpayers by letting them off the hook, so really we have a multitude of situations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In the light of a newspaper article here which indicates that the Supreme Court has turned down a request of appeal hearing regarding some 1,000 tenants who are owed something in excess of \$100,000 in rent rebates ordered by the Rent Review Board, could the Minister tell us what is happening to that money now in the event that tenants have moved between that order being required by the Rent Review Board and the Supreme Court finding deciding not to hear the case? What happens in the event that tenants have moved from their apartments? Is there some way that these tenants can be tracked down so that they can be paid that money which is legally owed them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Would the Minister also tell us how much money in rent rebates ordered by the Rent Review Board is presently still not paid out to tenants? There is a case here of \$100,000 — how much all told is outstanding to tenants that has not been paid yet by the landlords?

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

MR. PARASIUK: A final supplementary to the Minister. Could the Minister tell us if he has changed the composition of the Rent Review Board? Are there any new additions to the Board?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, that matter is under review and when changes are made they will be made in the usual manner, and that information will be available to the member.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to move, seconded by the Attorney-General, that Bill No. 40, An Act to Amend the Provincial Judges Act (2), be withdrawn from the Standing Committee of Law Amendments, and referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that this bill has a bearing on Family Law matters that would be best dealt with in conjunction with The Marital Property Act and The Family Maintenance Act, etc., in the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations, and it is for this reason that I make this request.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 25, please.

BILL NO. 25 — THE CATTLE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading on the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and the amendment thereto moved by the Honourable Member for St. Vital — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Member for Inkster.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to explain my position with respect to this amendment. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is an amendment that the bill not be now read but be read six months hence. That, to me, Mr. Speaker, is another method of killing the bill. As far as I am concerned I am not moving this amendment because I want it to be read six months hence, or that I want it to be further considered, or any other suggestion that the parliamentary meaning of a hoist is other than what I understood it to be when I first entered the Legislature, and was counselled by seasoned parliamentarians, that a hoist is to kill the bill.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, we moved a hoist, or we at least supported a hoist, on the sales tax legislation, not because we wanted to consider the sales tax legislation, not because we still had misgivings about it or had considerations with respect to it, but we wanted to kill the bill and I said so at the time, I make no change now. As far as this hoist is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it has been moved for two reasons. One, that we express great dissatisfaction with the bill, that at one time we were of the opinion that the best way of expressing dissatisfaction was to vote against the bill and not have any further motions. There is, however, Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary use of a motion of this kind and that is that it permits debate to continue so that issues which could have been missed in the first go-around can be dealt with as a result of the amendment.

So, Mr. Speaker, let there be no misunderstanding as to my position in this connection or our position. We are in principle diametrically opposed to what the bill says and what the bill does. We have moved a hoist because that is a way in which we can kill this bill if the hoist succeeds. It is also a way in which some of the government members may get out from under a bad bill without actually voting against it. The bill is an unsatisfactory bill to the government. I am completely satisfied with that, Mr. Speaker, and as proof of what I am saying, if that bill goes to committee, which we say it shouldn't, one of the serious principles of the bill, the most serious, that is the power of this private organization to pass regulations is going to be deleted. I make that prediction, Mr. Speaker, without any hesitation whatsoever because it is a bad provision and the members of the government won't vote for that provision and, therefore, it will be deleted.

But the main principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, that is, that the government is going to legislate a private organization as being the organization for cattle producers rather than letting cattle producers work out their own organization and maybe go to the NFU, and maybe go to the Farm Bureau, and maybe go to a third organization, which is the normal way, Mr. Speaker, for organizations of this kind to be formed, that we oppose.

The former Minister of Agriculture made a very strong point yesterday. He said that some farm organization wanted to be recognized by the government as the organization that represents all the farmers in the Province of Manitoba and they were told, "No way will the government do that." In the same way, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the government would not recognize the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians as the spokesmen for all Ukrainians any more than they would recognize the National Ukrainian Association as representing the Ukrainian people. Because the fact is, despite what my honourable friends say, there are differences of opinion amongst farmers. Mr. Speaker, they talk as if the farmers are a monolithic group and think one way. Well, that's not my impression, Mr. Speaker. When they talk about the Farm Bureau as representing the farmers in the Province of Manitoba, I've had some experience with the Farm Bureau or the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture. What we did know is that that organization which claimed to represent all of the farmers didn't have the guts to try and sell a single farmer a membership, didn't have the guts to approach a single farmer and ask him, "Would you be a member of the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture?" What they did, Mr. Speaker, is got the establishment of various organizations to say, "Our organization will affiliate," but they never got a single member. That is right — not a single member.\$

Mr. Speaker, this Act — (Interjection)— that's the truth, Mr. Speaker, and I was involved in the court action where they defended themselves on the fact that they didn't have to get a single member,

so don't say that that is poppycock. That was their position, not my position, their position. So this Act, Mr. Speaker, solves that problem. The Cattle Association that has been set up by the government to speak for cattlemen — and I wouldn't care if it represented 75 percent of them, I wouldn't let them say that they represent all cattlemen anymore, Mr. Speaker, than we let a union, by legislation, say that they represent all employees. Do you know what we do with unions? We say that every year of their agreement there is three months when the employees can choose to have another union and the checkoff then goes to the other union. There is no union that's legislated for the members of the employee group, they can choose any union they want. They can choose the "Canadian" union; they can choose the International union; they can set up a third union that has nothing to do with these unions. And every year of the collective agreement there is what we call the hunting season in the labour trade, where anybody can say, "We don't like this union; we want to change it and we want to substitute for it another union."

But, Mr. Speaker, this Act makes it easy to have membership. There is an association, it is recognized and sanctioned by the government. There is a compulsory checkoff and you belong. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the farmers in the Province of Manitoba have some guts and revolt against this imposition of an organization which they are told they are members of, and they are told that there will be a checkoff from, by legislation, if they don't belong to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to, and I am sorry that I got carried away, to repeat many of the things that I said in my original submission. The reason that we felt that it may be necessary to go around again on this issue is because of the startling and disquieting attitude of the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the deficiency payments which were made to cattle breeders. I was indicating, Mr. Speaker, that this is a special Act with regard to this group. I was given the impression the other day that the Minister of Agriculture was going to try to weasel out, and blame it on the Opposition, of collecting from people who received money from the government during periods of low prices on the understanding that when the price changed they would repay, which is something that I think that every farmer would consider to be fair. But the Minister of Agriculture gave the indication that he was going to try to figure out a way for those people not to repay the money. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do now say that the Minister of Agriculture has said that this will not happen, that he is going to make every effort to get back the amount of subsidies that were paid during period of low prices. And if he did not say that, then I am going to speak again. I understand that yesterday he said that he is going to try to get back the moneys that were paid in periods of low prices, that he is going to pursue —(Interjection)— Yes, to the extent that they are now getting prices which are beyond the price fixed at which the deficiencies were paid. That he will make every effort, that he will use all legal means that are available to him to re-collect that money.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as far as the comments by the Honourable Member for Inkster that I said that I was going to pursue the matter, I believe I made the statement that I was going to carry out the contract as it is written between the department and the farmers, that there is no indication in the contract or anywhere that stipulates that the \$38 million has to be recovered. The contract reads at the support price, and anything over the support price on the contract cattle would be moneys that would be recoverable by the province.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that's all that I expect. Mr. Speaker, that's all that I expect. I hope that this difference of opinion is only imaginary, and from what the Minister has just said, I am going to say what I understand will take place. That the price at which the farmer was guaranteed recovery was 48 cents unfinished cattle, that when the price fell to 32 cents, or 35 cents, the farmer was given a deficiency between 48 and 35 which is 13 cents, I believe; maybe we can agree on that, whatever the figures. That the contract provides that when the price reaches a certain figure, the farmer is to indicate . . . well, not when the price reaches a certain figure, but that the farmer was to indicate his marketing program and that if the province saw that the price was going to be beyond 48 cents, they could stipulate that they would own the cattle and they could recover then for everything that was sold at 48 cents to recover their amount that was previously paid at subsidy. That what the Minister is going to do, is to use that procedure or equivalent procedure, to get back as much of the subsidy payments as are available within those terms of the contract.

I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that I have outlined it exactly but I have outlined it generally. And, Mr. Speaker, if there is some legal technicality, and I suggest that, you know, if you're looking for them the other way, lawyers are able to try to dream them up. But if there was some legal technicality which resulted in a problem, then I would expect the Minister to correct the technicality which he has the power to do, and if he wants to prove that he has the power to do it, Mr. Speaker, yesterday they passed the bill, you passed it, you all voted for it unanimously, third reading. You

know what the bill said? The bill said, Mr. Speaker, retroactively, without any doubt whatsoever, because there was a legal technicality raised by certain people as to orders of the division of the Department of Labor. Did you people say, oh, the money is lost, bang your desk, aren't you glad there's a mistake; the money is lost? And I don't agree that that happened here, and I don't agree it will happen, but I look at the members of the opposite side who say that \$38 million have been . . . in subsidies, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister indicates that there may be a problem and they bang their desks and they cheer. And the Member for Rock Lake, he points over, "Yes, it's not there, it's not there".

You know what you did, do you know what you did —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, here we are again. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please.

MR. GREEN: Do you know what you did, yesterday, the Member for Rock Lake. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he make his remarks pertinent to the bill before us.

MR. GREEN: Yes, I certainly will. We are now dealing with the bill relating to cattle producers, and I am discussing cattle producers and the amount that they get and the amount that they pay, and I am suggesting that the government is adopting special procedures for cattle producers which put them in a preferred position which nobody else in our society has, and as proof of it, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to you that the government has even indicated, and members have indicated, some happiness that they can find out a way for these cattle producers that are setting up as a selective organization to avoid repayment of \$38 million to the people of the Province of Manitoba, that they got during periods of low prices.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what you did yesterday? Mr. Speaker, if that is —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if that is absolute garbage, I will cheer, Mr. Speaker, I will be the happiest man if the Member for Pembina will tell me that the \$38 million will be repaid out of higher prices that the cattle producers get; I will be the happiest man in this Chamber, because I don't like to lose \$38 million. Well, I want to indicate to the Honourable Member for Pembina what he voted on yesterday to correct a legal technicality. He stood up and said "Aye". Excuse me, there was no standing vote on this —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's with some trepidation that I remind the Opposition House Leader, who really needs no reminding, that we are dealing at Second Reading of a bill having to do with the setting up of a cattlemen's association, having to do with certain ramifications of that, and in particular, the reason for the amendment that he is speaking on is the six-month hoist that was moved by another member of his group. What we are now talking about is an entirely different matter, a beef stabilization program, and I would humbly suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that on occasion, on occasion, the speaker ought to address himself to the desirability or the advisability of giving Bill No. 25 a six-month hoist. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The remarks from the Acting Government House Leader are indeed very wise remarks, and I suggest the honourable member listen to them.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill should be given a six-month hoist. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, in case it hasn't been occasional enough, I believe that this bill should be given a six-month hoist. Mr. Speaker, do you know what you passed yesterday? This is what it says. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he address his remarks to the bill before us and not make any reflections on what happened in the Chamber yesterday on another bill.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, you can stop me if you like. I haven't seen. . . Mr. Speaker, I have been in the House for the last eight years; I have never seen a debate on relevance on Second Reading, which dealt with the general principle of a bill, I have never seen a debate ruled out of order. But you have the privilege of doing so, Mr. Speaker, you have the privilege of doing so. I am suggesting to you that the House is being inconsistent in its attitude with regard to this group, and I want to indicate, and I am not making any reflections on the decision, we all passed it, and I am going to deal with this, Mr. Speaker, in connection with another bill.

The Minister of Mines is introducing a bill that he says he won't pass retroactive legislation. Am I not able to show that it is done? It is done readily, it is done eagerly, it is done enthusiastically, and I want to show that that's what happened yesterday, just yesterday. —(Interjection)— The honourable member will call me on it; Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill should be given a six-month hoist; every time the member raises it, I will say it, so that he will not be disturbed that I am not referring to the bill. Yesterday you said every decision, order or thing, or made under this Act by the Employment Standards Division of the Department of Labour, or by a person designated by the Minister, as it stood prior to the coming into force of this Act, is hereby ratified, validated and confirmed. It is hereby ratified, validated and confirmed, and Mr. Speaker, to make sure that those words are sufficient, not only is it ratified, but in case ratification is not good enough, it's validated. In case validation and ratification are not enough, it is confirmed, and in case ratification, validation and confirmation are not enough, it shall not be challenged or declared invalid. And that, Mr. Speaker, refers to every order that was made at whatever time. So, Mr. Speaker, when an obvious injustice occurs, when there is a clear difficulty — and you don't draft these bills, nor do we; they are drafted by competent legislative counsel. But competent legislative counsel sometimes disagree, and where the problem is a manifest injustice, there is a way of clearing it up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill should be given a six-month hoist; I am going to tell the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that I accept what he said yesterday and today, if he is using lawyer's language to try to sort of steer the debate away, I tell him that he won't steer it away; we are going to watch this. We are going to accept the fact that he says that the money will attempt to be recovered under the terms of the contract and therefore one of the reasons for the hoist, I feel, has been satisfied. Therefore, although I will support the hoist for the purpose of killing the bill, I more readily and eagerly await the motion — unless you pass the hoist, which will be fine — but we will vote against the bill, as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that I would like this bill to be given a six-month hoist.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A six-month hoist as proposed by my colleague, the Member for St. Vital, I believe gives the government an opportunity to get out from under what I believe is a very embarrassing bill, to the government. There has been, obviously, an embarrassment on the part of especially the front bench. We haven't had more than one Minister of the government stand up and give support to this bill, and this, as far as we are concerned here, appears to be an utter embarrassment on the part of the front bench, to have to get up and support this kind of legislation. We have had one Minister from Lakeside, the Minister of Public Works, stood up and supported the bill and obviously, having not perused it thoroughly, or at all for that matter — and all we have seen, up to this point in time, is, I believe, five backbenchers who appear to be quite right-wing, quite inexperienced, do not understand the democratic process —(Interjection)— They're still talking, they're still trying to ramble away from their seats, as they are prone to do. They do not understand what the import of this bill is doing to thousands of producers, depriving them of the right, the freedom of choice, which they speak so highly of from time to time. So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is an obvious embarrassment, and I expect that the Minister is going to have to make some major changes before he gets this bill through third reading. There's no doubt in my mind.

We will be anxious to hear what representations are made in Committee of Agriculture when this bill goes to that Committee, but we do hope that they will support the six-month hoist, because it gives them an opportunity to delay this bill. Let's discuss it, let's bring it to the people, let's have hearings on it, if we must. We think it's too important a bill to allow to just be slipped under the rug without getting more views from the public at large.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the groups that are very much affected by this piece of legislation are the merchants, the storekeepers, because they are involved. They may be required to keep books for this association, without any remuneration, and I am sure that many members of this House are aware that the independent businessmen have been complaining for years about being overburdened with paperwork of one form or another, whether it's compensation forms or income tax collections or sales tax collections, and whatever. They have been overburdened, and here is another bill that may impose an additional burden. And by the way, they claim that the larger business firms, in order to keep all these books, it's costing them approximately \$5,000 a year. To a smaller merchant, it is costing them much more. They claim that it costs them up to \$8,000 a year to keep all these books. Now we are going to bury them with another additional bill which they'll have to keep books for, this association.

Now, I am almost sure, Mr. Speaker, that they are unaware of this provision in this bill. They are unaware, and I understand that the Minister of Agriculture has received a letter from the

Businessmen's Federation asking serious questions on the intent of this bill, and I hope that the Minister will table that letter and give assurance to the businessmen of this province, and there are many, that they will not be compelled to again be buried in paperwork by the actions of this Minister. I believe that there could have been — and I believe that there will be — a lot of opposition to this bill when it goes to Committee.

However, there have been a few things that have happened. For instance, when we were in Agriculture Committee, I posed a question to the Minister of Agriculture relating to the rental fees of Crown land. The way it is set up is that it's based on economic rent and when the economic benefits from Crown land do not return the cost of production, there is no rental fee for Crown lands, but when there is economic rent accruing to the lessee, then there shall be rental fees.

Now the Minister assured us, and I asked that question purposely to find out what his intentions were, and he assured the committee that there would be rental fees for Crown lands this year. Later on he issued a press release, a news bulletin that there would not be a rental fee this year. I believe, Sir, that he was trying not to rattle the farmers into raising more opposition to Bill 25. I believe that that was his intent. Let's keep things quiet, let's not disturb the farmers with another payment, even though the prices of livestock had increased up to over 70 cents for finished slaughter steers, and perhaps a rental fee should have been reasonable in this period of time. Now we find out that the Minister has been lax in setting into motion the mechanisms available to the government for a payback on the Beef Assurance Program. Now we have assurance from the Minister, yesterday and today, that he has notified the producers that they will have to notify the government before they make sales of any livestock.

But now we question the reason for the delay? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they should have been notified last spring. What was the reason for the delay? Was the Minister again trying to pacify the producers? If he would have introduced this last spring, he would have had a lot more opposition to his Bill 25 when it goes to committee.

I have spoken to a large rancher from my area, and incidentally a very strong supporter of the Conservative Party, a very prominent person in the province in other areas, not only as a producer but in other areas of society today, and he doesn't know anything about the bill. He doesn't understand, he doesn't know what's happened. I had a discussion with him for about 20 minutes yesterday morning and I brought to his attention exactly what the intent of this bill was and he is a little bit disturbed himself. He says, "You know, I really don't know too much about this bill." So I said, "Well, you had better get in touch with some other strong Conservative supporters and start talking to them." And I gave him a few names — I gave him a few names of strong Conservative supporters who are diametrically opposed to this legislation. —(Interjection)— So I'm sure that those two fellows . . . in fact, I'll give them a hint. I'll give them a hint, I'll give the Conservatives a hint as to who these people are. They both tried to obtain the nominations to run as Conservative candidates, so I'm saying to you that they are quite prominent in the Conservative Party. You can judge for yourselves who they are.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister doesn't have all the support that he claims to have, not by any stretch of the imagination. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is trying to buy support. He's now in the process of trying to buy support for Bill 25, he has forgone the leases, rental fees for this year, and he has delayed the implementation until it became an embarrassment to him, the implementation Of the mechanism whereby the paybacks on the Beef Assurance Program would be made, and he is now waffling, he is waffling and I'm sure he's going to try and weasel out of it. He wants to get his Bill 25 through. He wants to get that passed before . . . and then I'm sure after that he's going to try and weasel out of it.

Mr. Speaker, he has brought letters of support which he claims he has for this kind of legislation. Now, I believe that the letters of support that he received supported the principle, they supported the principle of an organization of trying to get the producers together to have some kind of a voice. I don't think anyone objects to that on this side of the House or on the government's side of the House, but these letters that were written, were written without knowledge of what the content of this bill would be, or are. And they only supported the principle, which we support as well, but we don't support that bill, and I say to you that these people who have written in support do not support the way this bill is set out. They support maybe the principle, and I question even . . . There was a letter read by the Minister when he made his introductory remarks from the grain growers in support. They only supported the principle and they have written to me and indicated that.

Now, I question, Mr. Speaker, whether a grains group should even be making recommendation on what affects the producers. This is a grains group, it was not a support from the grassroots of the United Grain Growers, but it was from the board, who, in my opinion, don't represent the opinions of the grassroot membership of the United Grain Growers, any more than Manitoba Pool represents my views. And I am a member of the United Grain Growers, and I am a member of the Manitoba Pool. I'm saying to you . . .

MR. FERGUSON: How much grain did you deliver last year?

MR. ADAM: Well, that's none of your business. The Member for Gladstone asked me how much grain did I sell last year, I say to him that it's none of his business. It's none of my business how much grain he sold and it's none of his business how much I sold.

But I say that last year, to prove my point, Mr. Speaker, last year there was a vote on a checkoff by the grain people, by the grain producers. There was a referendum asking them whether they approved of a checkoff. There was Grain Grower members, there was Manitoba Pool members, there were farmers — all grain producers that voted on this referendum, whether there should be a checkoff to improve the lot of the grain producers. It was rejected, Mr. Speaker. It was rejected by the Grain Growers who now claim, the board claims that, "Oh yes, we recommend a checkoff for the producers." I question whether livestock producers, legitimate cow-calf bona fide producers who do not produce grain — I question whether they had a right to vote on that referendum last year on the grains checkoff. I say to you that they did not. They did not have a right to vote.

A MEMBER: Sam decided to vote.

MR. ADAM: So I question whether we should be accepting support from a grains group on what is good or what is not good for the livestock producers.

So, Mr. Speaker, the more we discuss this bill, more information comes to light and I strongly suggest that we delay this bill, we delay this bill and give . . . well, it should be killed, because I don't think that we should ever, we should never pass this kind of legislation. I don't want to be repetitive on what I said in my previous remarks about the loss of freedoms, but I think that this is very serious and I think that especially those young fellows at the back that don't know too much about the democratic process and what it means. There is a point of no return, let me remind you of this. You can go so far over right that you can't get back. Don't forget that. And you can laugh, you can laugh all you want. The Member for Portage can laugh; the Member for Emerson can laugh about it. I'll tell you there are some people in some countries that are not laughing because that is what has happened to them. They're not laughing and you can joke about it all you want but this is very serious business that we're dealing with today.

So we want to know why the lease rentals were foregone this year; we want to know and we want to have better reasons than what the Minister has offered up to this point in time. We want to know why he has delayed six months before notifying the producers of the option of the government to purchase their livestock in order to recoup some of the \$38 million that had been paid out to them in support. When they were in dire straits, they were in financial problems, 65 percent of the producers quickly came in for assistance. We've had demonstrations of at least 2,000 farmers in front of the Legislature, not asking for \$38 million. The first time they came they wanted \$40 million in the first year. That's what they were asking, \$40 million, the Cow-Calf Association when they came in and presented briefs to the previous administration, they wanted \$40 million in the first year. At least the \$38 million has brought us through into three years. They wanted \$40 million in the first year and that is how serious the situation was.

Now I'm sure if the scale is balanced over on the other side, I'm sure that many of them will not object to pay back according to their contracts. But the Minister again has failed, he has failed the people of Manitoba, he has failed the taxpayers, the people who are not involved directly in livestock but who have had to put up the tax dollars and I don't think they objected to that. I don't think that when they were told that the industry, the producer, the primary producers were in dire straits, they didn't object to come in with the bucks.

I believe what happened there, Mr. Speaker, is that we went in to the housewives — in a sense that's what happened. We went in to the housewives and we said to them, "Look, we know you are paying through the nose for beef at the meat counter but we have to come in and ask you for \$40.00 apiece to keep this industry afloat, \$40.00 per head, to raise \$40 million. And that's what we did. We came in and they were right there to the rescue and they didn't object but I'm sure that now they will want to have some of their tax dollars back. So there is much much more to be said before this legislation is passed.

Now I should maybe discuss some of the bill and I don't want to go into section by section because we'll be doing that in committee if this bill goes to committee and I hope it doesn't. Some of the things that disturb me greatly is the wide powers, so wide indeed that I'm not sure yet whether this group may not have the power to restrict the number of producers. Now they're not allowed to go into production. The bill indicates that the Association may not go into production, but it doesn't say, it doesn't spell out clearly whether or not they can restrict the number of producers. They may just do that. It doesn't say who will be eligible to vote.

How many head of cattle will you be able to have? It doesn't say that. — (Interjection)— I want it on the record that the Member for Pembina says, "One head." He points, he raises his finger.

To me he indicates that one head of livestock will give a producer the right to vote. I believe that I interpreted his indication as that. That's what he did. He raised his finger and said, "One," to me, that's what he meant.

I want to know whether a producer who has only 50 head will be allowed to vote. Will he have to have 100 head before he's allowed to vote? Will only the elite custom feeders be allowed to vote? Will they be allowed to be registered in? Will custom feeders who feed 6,000 head a year have a right to vote? Will they be members? Is this a producer association or is it not a producer association? Is it a hodge-podge of everything?

I question whether a producer who no longer owns the cattle, as soon as they've left his gate, whether he should be paying a fee. Why should he be paying a fee? He no longer owns the darn thing. As soon as it's gone through the auction ring, that material, that commodity no longer belongs to him. It's somebody else's product. It belongs to the processor; it belongs to a buyer somewhere. Why should the producer be saddled with this for the entire industry?

It is only the producers that are going to pay. The processors won't pay a darn thing; the auction mart won't pay — and I don't think they should — if they want to, they can on a voluntary basis, that's their business. But I don't think that they should but if they want to, let them do it. I think that if the producers want to do it, let them do it, let them do it. I don't think that this Minister should be telling them that they've got to do it. He's nothing but a dictator, that's what he is now. He is telling them that they're going to pay whether they want to or not. They're not going to be recognized from now on.

A MEMBER: That's a terrible tongue lashing you're giving them, Pete.

MR. ADAM: They're not going to be recognized unless they belong to the Association. If the Farmers Union come in, if the Independent Producers come in, after this bill goes through, if the Canadian Agricultural Movement come in and want to talk to this government, this Minister will say, "Well, look, do you belong to this Association?" "Well, we don't." "Well, sorry, goodbye. Don't come back, don't come back."

I would like to know whether there's going to be any discrimination on the setting up of , districts again. We want these things spelled out. The producers have a right to know right now; not later on when a small group, who are appointed by the Minister, all Conservatives —(Interjection)— There's the proof; there's another backbencher who says, "hopefully, hopefully they will be all Conservatives". Well, there's the democratic process, there's the democratic process — dictatorship — all one mind. You better watch out, because you're getting deeper and deeper into trouble —(Interjection)— Doesn't know what he's talking about most of the time.

I mention that the independent businessmen have written to the Minister — I have a copy of the letter. Did he notify them when he introduced his bill; did he send copies to the auction marts? Did he send copies to the — there's another business association representing merchants in town — did he send them the bill? I phoned them and they said, "No, we haven't had the bill, we haven't seen the bill." I wrote and sent a copy of the bill to the independent businessmen; they wrote and thanked me and sent me a copy of the letter they wrote to the Minister. They thanked me for bringing this to their attention.

This bill has been on the Order Paper for what — a couple of months? He hasn't notified all the business people of this province that they are going to be affected by this legislation. What's the matter with this Minister, anyway? What is he trying to do; pull the wool over their eyes? I suggest that that's what he is doing.

You know, what he is doing there, and I believe the Member for Inkster made that point very clearly, that there is no way that you can legislate everybody into one organization. And let me say — to give you an example of the government — you know, we do not even let the government represent all the people of this province. There is an opposition, there is an opposition here. The government doesn't represent all the people, but what the Minister is doing here now is saying that this association will represent all the producers, and I don't think that that is right. There will be opposition within that group, and we know that there is tremendous opposition, even though the Minister has been able to probably subdue some of it in trying to buy off support, and that's what he is doing.

You know the position, the position of the Conservative Party is, in collective bargaining, that no one should be compelled to belong to a union in order to obtain employment. That is the position of the Conservative Party in my opinion, and that we have made provisions, we have made provisions in labor legislation whereby those people who are compelled to make a checkoff or a contribution to a union may donate, we have made exceptions, that they may donate to a charitable organization, where on conscience grounds there are some provisions I believe that they are able to do that, to a charitable organization. So, you know, what about the checkoff here? I don't think that there should be a 25 cent checkoff in the first place, that is far too high. Alberta, with the cost of production

being lower than the production in Manitoba, only pay 20 cents per unit for a checkoff, and in Saskatchewan it's 10 cents, why 25 cents here? Whether you sell a thousand pound steer, or whether you sell a veal calf that the mother died and you've got a 40 pound or 60, 75 pound calf that you bring to market, you have to pay the 25 cents. All the registered producers will be exempt, and they are the elites of the industry, they will be selling their prized animals between farmers and they will be exempt because it's a transaction between two private farmers. They won't have to pay; they will be exempt. I say this is unjust. Here you have the group who are selling the highest priced cattle and they will be exempt from this provision.

I think that this compulsory checkoff, you know, you can't have it both ways, you can't have it both ways and that's what you are trying to do now. So there should be some provisions, not for opting out, not for opting out from the association, but there should be a provision for opting in. Now that would be democratic, and if the Minister is correct when he indicates that he has over 80 percent of support, he has no problem whatsoever. If the opt-in provision is there he will soon have 80 percent of the people opting in and the small minority that he claims are in opposition to this bill — and that still has to be proven as correct — but the small opposition would not have to go through the procedure of writing at the end of the year to get their refund. And I kind of suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the large producer who ships 4,000 head, the custom feeders who feed 4,000, 5,000 head of cattle a year, it will worth their while to write in and get a rebate. And I would think that they would do it; it's a lot of money.

There is no provision to prevent the association from increasing the fee from 25 to more money, to a higher fee, there is no provisions there. It's a very easy procedure for them to do it; they can do it at an annual meeting regardless of whether — or a referendum. But there could be an annual meeting with a dozen people there and it will go through, they could increase the fee to whatever fee they want and there would be no appeal; there is no mechanism for an appeal board or a commission or an appeal to the Minister, and I think this is very, very wrong and you are going to hear about this when we get to Committee I am sure.

The way this is being brought in I think is a shame. The Minister is bringing in this bill without a referendum in spite of the fact that he does know there is a lot of opposition even from his own supporters, even from members of the Cow-Calf Association, from the Canadian Agricultural Movement, from the independent producers. I told the Minister that I have yet to have one person come to me and say, "Well, at last; thank you, we've got — we're in support of this bill." I haven't seen one yet. I might be talking to different people, but I'm talking to Conservatives as well, and I haven't had one person say, "We support this bill," not one. So, I say that the Minister should go for the six-month hoist, and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I can complete my remarks in less than that. But I say that the method that he is going about bringing in this legislation gives a subsequent government no choice. We will have no choice in 1981 but to throw this out the same way as you're bringing it in; we don't have any choice. If you go to a referendum, make the necessary amendments that this bill should have, give the civil rights to those producers, civil rights to those merchants, civil rights to the auction marts, civil rights to the processors, give them the rights and make those amendments; have a referendum. If you get the support for this kind of legislation, no other government that comes in in the future will throw it out or rescind this bill. But I can give you warning right now that if I have anything to do with it in 1981 this bill is going to go out the same way as it came in.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, on the amendment, I would like to speak briefly. I feel that individuals have had quite an opportunity to debate the bill; I appreciate the debate on it; I think it's been healthy and I appreciate their input and would like to conclude my remarks and have the question on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, we learn about the democratic process and one watches it operate, and Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways was the only other Minister of the Crown that spoke on this bill. And Mr. Speaker, he spoke on the first day; he spoke after . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): I don't think that the honourable member should be allowed to get away with that kind of a comment. There has been at least a half-a-dozen members on this side of the House who have spoken on this bill.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would you . . .? No, I can't suggest that you instruct, but I will instruct the House Leader that when I said the Minister of Highways was the only other Minister who spoke on the bill, I was correct. And for the House Leader to break every rule I can think of by standing up and interrupting me, not on a point of order, not on a point of privilege but with complete nonsense, is typical of the autocratic attitude that this government has.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I find that people like the Member for Morris who are upset by something that is said can only respond by insults, can only respond by name-calling, and that that, to them, is an intelligent use of the democratic process. And he, as I say, broke the democratic process by interrupting when he knew very well that he was out of order so to do.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I started that was that I sat through part of the — well, I sat through all the debate this morning on this bill and I was waiting to hear from the Minister of Agriculture. There have been some very serious accusations and insinuations about his attitude to the cattle producers and to this bill, and to the contract to which he has referred. And Mr. Speaker, I was waiting for the Minister of Agriculture to make use of the democratic process and the rules of this House to respond, to speak when he did not have to close debate and in that way to respond in some way to the statements that have been made and suggested. And when he stood up to speak a few minutes ago, I thought, well, he is now going to respond, he is now going to clarify. And Mr. Speaker, before we turned around, he had already sat down. And that is his privilege; it was his privilege not to speak at all, but to have gottenuup and made the statement he did was, I think, meaningless. —(Interjection)— The Member for Minnedosa made his usual type of contribution, but I didn't hear it this time, but it had to do with something about looking after the cattle.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like the Minister of Agriculture to look after the affairs of the Province of Manitoba and the moneys of the Province of Manitoba, and the effort that he must make to protect the taxpayers' funds that come under his responsibility. The reason I mentioned that the Minister of Highways was the only Minister who spoke on this bill is because he spoke on the same day that it was introduced, and it has been suggested that he had not read the bill because of some of the statements he made. I want to remind the Minister of Highways — and I appreciate that he has returned, and possibly because I was referring to him — I want to remind him of some of the statements he made. I refer to Page . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he deal with the motion before the House, which is a six-month hoist?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I am looking at Hansard, May 12, Page 2128, the speech of the Minister of Highways, on what matter, on what subject? On Bill No. 25. It is my impression that I'm speaking on Bill 25; it is my impression that I'm speaking about The Cattle Producers Association Act, and Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to understand how I have to be reprimanded by you for not speaking to the subject matter. We are now dealing with a proposal for a six-month hoist and I believe there should be a six-month hoist.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways said, on the page I have referred to a few times already, and I quote: "Every cattle producer can opt out of this Act. Every cattle producer can opt out of this Act." Mr. Speaker, he said it twice; I am repeating it twice. ". . . 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 the provisions of this bill." And he went on to say a little further, "And, Mr. Speaker," he says, "I make you that holy commitment, that if it isn't crystal clear in this bill, we will make it crystal clear in this bill that any producer can opt out." Mr. Speaker, that's one of the important points that I wanted to make. The only other Minister who spoke on this bill made a pledge, a holy commitment, to make it possible for every producer to opt out of this bill. Mr. Speaker, he said "out of this bill," he did not say out of payment of the checkoff; he said out of the operation of this bill, and I wanted to know whether this was going to

be the case. And when I understood that there had been a motion for a six-month hoist, I thought, here is the grand opportunity for the Minister of Agriculture to take advantage of his right to speak and to honour that commitment, so that, Mr. Speaker, the debate could continue on the basis of the change in the bill and not what the bill says, as it is before us. Because we now know, based on the "holy commitment" of the only other member of the Executive Council who spoke, that there will be changes made. And if there were that intent, then we could have discussed the changes. But Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture had the opportunity; he didn't tell us what changes would be made. The Minister of Agriculture passed it by.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster is complaining, he stepped out for a second and learned when he returned that the Minister of Agriculture had made a speech. —(Interjection)— Not a second, but it didn't take much more than a second, Mr. Speaker.

Let me read to you a section of this bill that we are discussing, Bill 25, Mr. Speaker, The Cattle Producers Association Act, and it reads: The purpose and intent of this Act is to provide for the establishment and financing of an organization to initiate support or conduct programs for stimulating, increasing and improving the economic well-being of the cattle and beef industry in Manitoba by developing improved marketing methods, grading standards, quality standards, research and educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, the previous government made an effort to do much of what is the purpose and intent of this Act. It advanced, I gather, some \$38 million to cattle producers to assist them when there was a troublesome marketing period, and they did it under certain terms which ensured the opportunity to government to regain all or part of that \$38 million. Mr. Speaker, what troubles me is that this Minister has listened to several very direct questions about what effort he was going to make to recover as much money as he could, which is his obligation. I have listened to his responses and I have come to the conclusion that we do not have an outright commitment that the Minister and the government will make a strong effort to recapture the moneys, or as much as possible, under the formula which is available to it and under the powers it has.

And Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— The Member for Sturgeon Creek is again making a speech from his seat, and I would think, Mr. Speaker, that he would, at least, stand up and make the commitment on behalf of the government, clear-cut, concise, without question, that the government will make every effort to recapture as much as possible of the moneys that were advanced to the cattle producers of Manitoba under the formula that was devised to assist them in time of need. And I wish he would do that, because I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture, who had the opportunity just minutes ago, did not make that commitment, but talked in a roundabout way about going along with a contract. Mr. Speaker, the contract provides that the government has the option of buying cattle at a set price in order to protect its investment and if they don't exercise the option then they're clearly answerable for their failure to do so. And if the Minister responsible for Housing accepts the fact that as a Minister of the Crown he shares with other Ministers of the Executive Council the obligation to regain and protect all the moneys possible on behalf of the taxpayers, then if he accepts that responsibility, he should be prepared to say so. And if he is not prepared to say so, he should make sure that the Minister who is responsible says so, clearly, without question. And had the Minister of Agriculture done so when he had the opportunity, I would certainly not have had occasion to rise, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek has made another speech from his seat saying I was responsible when I was there. The fact is that I was a member of the Legislature, as he was, at the time this program was developed by the Executive Council, and I tell the Minister without Portfolio that responsibility of an Executive Council nature is different from that of an MLA; he should know it, and if he doesn't know it, it's high time, after about seven months of being in that position, to know that he has a greater responsibility than the backbench behind him.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, when I started to speak and I referred to the fact that the Minister of Highways was the only other Minister who had spoken on this bill, I did it advisedly because the members of the Executive Council have a greater responsibility than the people behind them. If the House Leader became so indignant at the fact that I did not recognize that people from the Conservative caucus spoke, it was only because he did not realize, or only could be because he did not realize, that I place on the members of the Executive Council a much greater responsibility than I do on the backbench of the Conservative caucus or the backbench of any government.\$

That's why, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Minister of Agriculture would honour his position and his title by being forthright in speaking and answering the questions raised in this bill. And he didn't do it. Mr. Speaker, I guess what I'm hoping is that the Minister of Highways, who did deal with this, and who did make a "holy commitment" that there would be changes made to enable cattle producers to opt out of this bill, who still has the right to speak on this debate, will exercise his right and will now be able to speak not off the cuff as he did on May 12th, but with knowledge

and responsibility on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture who did not do so when he had the chance, to be forthright and straightforward and to say two things that I would expect of him.

One is, I now know that there are changes that are made and I know what the changes are and these are the changes that there will be, so that we can actually discuss the bill as it is in the minds of government, not as it was in the minds of government on May 12th, because of the changes that he committed himself to carry out.

Secondly, on behalf of his colleague and maybe on behalf of the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Housing who shares the same responsibility as the Minister of Highways, to make that pledge, that commitment, to regain as much of the \$38 million as they legally can do in accordance with the principles of the policy that they inherited. That's a pledge we're entitled to hear. We did not hear it from the Minister of Agriculture. As a matter of fact, I think I heard more casual response from members on that side than any forthright statement about attempting to regain \$38 million of moneys of the taxpayers of Manitoba.

It may be they didn't agree with that program, I don't know if they did nor not. It may be that they felt that it shouldn't have been advanced, I don't know, maybe they felt that. But, Mr. Speaker, they do have an obligation that when there is a contract, clear or unclear, but a clear-cut intent to give the government the opportunity to recapture moneys of the Province of Manitoba when the price of beef rises above a certain figure, that they have to pledge themselves to honour that obligation to recapture money. I'm appealing to the Minister of Highways who, I believe, is frank and is prepared to stand up for what he believes in . . .

A MEMBER: No, no, no.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . I believe he is. He and I know that there are occasions when I have doubt about some of his statements but I think that — and I said this carefully — I think he is a frank person and I think that he is prepared to stand up for matters he believes in and I would ask him to now enlarge on what happened on May 12th when he made that holy commitment, on May 12th. —(Interjection)— Well, I would think that the Minister is frank about many things but he did make a holy commitment that every cattle producer will be able to opt out of this Act. I am not aware yet that we have been shown how and to what extent they will be able to opt out of this Act. There will have to be changes made to this bill. The Minister of Agriculture had the opportunity, stood up and said nothing. I have to ask the Minister of Highways: Is he prepared to do what his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, failed to do? Is he prepared to tell us what is the intent of government on this bill and is he prepared to tell us the extent to which he and his colleagues in the Executive Council are prepared to do to attempt to get back for the people of Manitoba as much as possible of the \$38 million?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by addressing the Honourable House Leader who walked into the Chamber very shortly, I think, before I started to speak and who barely heard what I said but immediately rose in indignation at the fact that I referred to the Minister of Highways being the only other Minister to speak. I took the trouble to look at the list of the people who spoke on this bill, and when the House Leader rose to interrupt me, I thought he rose to correct me, to say that I had overlooked the fact that maybe he spoke, or maybe another member of the Cabinet spoke. But that was not his intent. His intent was to righteously indicate that I had ignored the fact that members of the backbench had spoken. I know they had spoken and I know they made a contribution, but I point out again, to him particularly, that their obligation is not that of his nor is their obligation that of his colleagues on Executive Council. That's the reason I made mention of the fact that only the Minister of Highways had spoken. There are now 2,4,6,8 Ministers of the Crown in the Chamber at the present time. I would like, since the Minister of Agriculture dodged the opportunity to make a commitment, I'd like to see what other members of the Executive Council, sworn to carry out their responsibilities, are prepared to tell us and the people of Manitoba about their intent, whether they like the program or not, but their intent to recapture the moneys that are owing to the province under a certain formula. Therefore, I would expect that the House Leader, too, can take advantage of his right to speak either before or after the vote on the six-month hoist and to ensure that we are not left with that uncertainty which I believe is our position now because of the failure of the Minister of Agriculture to speak.

The Minister without Portfolio responsible for Housing who took offense at some of the things I said, he has the same opportunity to make the same kind of commitment to the people of Manitoba. Not to me, he owes me nothing. But he owes a great deal to the people of Manitoba and to his own pledge, his own undertaking as a Minister of the Crown, to make that commitment about \$38 million of moneys of the Province of Manitoba. Let him not think that just because they have added it up as being part of a deficit which they inherited, that they don't have an obligation to regain as much as they can under the formula and in accordance with the principle behind the contract entered into.

Mr. Speaker, I'm kind of counting that we're going to hear from the Minister of Highways because I believe he will respond. I don't know if any of the others will but I'm kind of hoping they will. —(Interjection)— The Minister of Highways has not spoken on this matter or on this commitment and I'd like to see some members of the Executive Council speak on their obligations under this bill, under the commitment of the Minister of Highways and under the contracts relating to \$38 million of people's money.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I failed. I tried and I failed.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did take my time in rising to my feet because I really did hope, and believe, that some member from Executive Council would take advantage of this opportunity to join in the debate on the motion before us, a six-month hoist of Bill 25. I want to indicate to you at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the motion for the six-month hoist so let there be no doubt as to the relevance of my comments to this particular bill.

There are three or four points I would like to make, Mr. Speaker. The first one, you will recall that for the first few weeks of the debate of this bill, the concern that was expressed by this side of the House is that there is no opting out provision contained within the bill. Well, the Minister in some comment in the House in the debate and certainly outside the House in speaking to the press, seemed to indicate that he feels that there is an opting out provision. But, Mr. Speaker, if you were to read carefully his comments made to the media, if you were to read carefully what he had said in the House, and what was said by the government side in debating this bill, that you will find, Mr. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the honourable member that the only motion before the House at this time is an amendment and I hope the member will address all his remarks to the amendment and not to the bill. The Honourable Meer.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to repeat again, for your benefit. I realize that you were out of the Chair momentarily when I had risen to my feet and I had indicated at that time that I am supporting the amendment before us and I am now in the process of indicating to you, Mr. Speaker, why I am supporting the amendment. So, therefore, I would hope that my remarks . . . I will try to make them as relevant as I possibly can to the bill and that I intend to do.

Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns which has not been answered by the government, expressed by this side of the House, is regarding opting out. The Honourable Minister indicated that if that section of the bill is not sufficiently clear that in Law Amendments Committee amendments will be brought in to clarify it. But you will also note, Mr. Speaker, the manner in which he went on to explain the course of action that he intends to take is that all that he intends to do is to clarify the manner and the procedure for obtaining a refund of checkoff fees. But there is no provision for opting out because that bill does cover and govern the actions of individuals extending far beyond cattle producers, far beyond cattle producers.

It governs the actions, Mr. Speaker, of you and me and I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether you are a cattle producer or not, but even if you are not, it will govern your actions because the Cattle Producers' Association will have the right to demand of you, of me, whatever information it may choose to obtain to satisfy itself that it is obtaining its proper checkoff fees. If you or I should happen to buy a side of beef from a producer and the association wants to satisfy itself that that producer is paying his proper dues to the association it will have the right to request of you, of me, whatever information it requires to determine the exact number of heads of beef that that person sold. And if you or I, Mr. Speaker, should refuse to provide the association that information — an independent association not responsible to government — under this bill, that association will have the right, Mr. Speaker, to send you or I to jail and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I'm supporting . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I am only the servant of the House and yet the amendment before us is the subject matter that should be debated at this time, purely the amendment. Now if the members of the House wish to have a wide ranging debate, then let the House make that decision.

The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your comments. I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House that during the course of the debate we have given the government ample

to clarify its position, to change its position, to indicate to the House whatever changes it intends to make and that, Mr. Speaker, has not been done and hence the motion for the six-month hoist brought in by my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and hence the reason why I'm on my feet at this time to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House why I am supporting the motion for the six-month hoist. Therefore, I do not intend to go beyond the intent of that motion, whatsoever, but to deal with nothing other than indicating to the House my reasons for supporting the motion.

As I've indicated, our concern was that there was no opting out procedure, and we have not received any indication to this point in time of any intent to change, in fact, as I've said, the only indication that we've had, via the media, is that there will be a clarification of the provision dealing with the refund of fees, but not opting out. Mr. Speaker, I've indicated to you that one of our other concerns was, and this the government hasn't indicated any change in its position on the matter, is that the way the bill is written this private independent organization, not answerable or responsible to the people through a Minister of the Crown, will affect everyone. It will affect everyone — you and I, Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether we're producers or are in any way associated with the cattle industry, it could affect us.

Mr. Speaker, the main concern, and this certainly has not been answered by government, was very clearly stated by one of the first speakers from this side of the House, by the Honourable Member for Inkster when he said in response to a comment made by a government member from his seat about the fact that the Honourable Member for Inkster is not involved in the agricultural industry, and his response was, at that time, that the reason why he felt compelled to rise to speak, at that particular time, is because what this bill deals with isn't just a matter related to the cattle producing industry but it deals with the question of freedom.

A MEMBER: How about the Insurance Bill?

MR. HANUSCHAK: And, Mr. Speaker, that has not been answered. What about The Insurance Bill? Mr. Speaker, The Insurance Bill is a Crown Corporation, The Insurance Bill is answerable to the Minister of the Crown, the corporation established under The Insurance Bill reports to the people of Manitoba via the Public Utilities Committee. This organization, Mr. Speaker, is not going to report to anyone, it's not going to report to anyone. This organization is not going to report back to anyone, it's not answerable or responsible to anyone, Mr. Speaker, and that is the difference for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. But I suppose he can't see that distinction, that difference.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about freedom, giving an independent organization, not answerable to the people of Manitoba, the right to send people to jail, that I abhor and detest, and that type of legislation I will not support, and on that type of legislation I will support a motion for a six-month hoist with the intent, the meaning that I ascribe to a six-month hoist as was described this morning by the Honourable Member for Inkster but it is my intention to kill the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if the six-month hoist motion, and I'm speaking directly to the motion before us, if the six-month hoist motion fails, if it fails and if this bill is proceeded with because of the defeat of the six-month hoist motion, then I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that will set a very very dangerous precedent. It will open the door to a government to establish an independent organization, give it whatever - power it wants, for whatever purposes, and give that organization the power to do its thing which as a government they consider to be politically unpalatable, unpleasant to do, would rather have the function performed by an independent organization, give that organization the power to do its thing with the right and the full power to send people to jail if they don't comply with the wishes of that organization. It will establish a precedent, Mr. Speaker, that this government will not be able to refuse, it will not be able to refuse it.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to you now, I want to indicate to you that if the six-month hoist motion fails I would want to approach the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, in my capacity as a past-president of the Manitoba Consumers Association, which we had organized despite the existence of the Manitoba section of the Consumers Association of Canada. But you may recall that in 1966, when there was a Task Force or a commission established by the Roblin Government to deal . . .

A MEMBER: 64.

MR. HANUSCHAK: 64 . . . to deal with consumer issues —(Interjection)— and we felt that there was need for the establishment of the organization to bring to the attention of government matters that we felt were of concern to consumers, and which we did. I think we did it very effectively because eventually that did lead to the enactment of consumer protection legislation despite the fact that

it took some time for the department to come into being because it lay dormant for awhile prior to 1969. But nevertheless the groundwork was laid, and eventually it came into being, and which we now have, and which this government fortunately to this day has not yet scrapped.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to revive that organization, and I want to go to the Minister of Consumer Affairs with Bill 25 and ask him to do the same for the consumers as his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, intends to do for the cattle producers — nothing more, nothing less, Mr. Speaker. I will give this bill to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and I would ask him, in the name of government, as a government bill, to bring in a Consumers Association Act, giving the Consumers Association exactly the same powers — the same powers as the Cattle Producers Association Act. And if the Minister of Consumer Affairs should show some reluctance to do that, Mr. Speaker, I will have to ask him on what basis will he be able to refuse to do that for me when his colleague has done the same thing for the cattle producers. It will be a very simple bill, Mr. Speaker, which even the Minister's Executive Assistant will be able to draft in about fifteen minutes, because all he'll need to do is take this bill and wherever the words "cattle, Cattle Producers" appears insert the word "consumers". The purpose can be exactly the same, to initiate support or conduct programs for stimulating, increasing and improving the economic well-being of — the word reads the cattle and beef industry — of consumers. Objects and powers of the association, to advertise and promote, you know, the interests of consumers instead of cattle producers, to initiate, sponsor and encourage research into consumer matters and so forth. It would read exactly the same, Mr. Speaker, except it will be for the benefit of consumers.

If the six-month hoist motion fails, Mr. Speaker, that is what I intend to do, and I would want to approach the Minister of Education and the Minister of Labour. I would like to approach the Minister of Education and ask him to do the same favour for myself and for others involved in and interested in the practice of the teaching profession, to establish a Manitoba Educators Act, with the same powers, the same objectives as this organization has. Giving us the right of entry, giving us the right of demanding information of anyone, of anyone, and with the power to send those people to jail, "If you don't provide us that information." And with the right of checkoff, you know, for every teacher we'll pay X cents per thousand or X dollars per year, and we'll have a so-called opting Out provision where they'll be able to apply for a refund, but we want the same powers. We want the same powers.

I'll want to approach the Minister of Highways, and I would like him to bring a bill, a government bill, for the establishment of The Automobile Owners Association, and I want the same powers, Mr. Speaker. I would want the Minister of Highways to give us the same powers as the cattle producers have. You see, some of the automobile owners are unsatisfied with the quality of automobiles, and we want the right to go down to Oshawa, we want the right to go to Hamilton . . .

A MEMBER: You can't go out of the province.

MR. HANUSCHAK: We can't do it out of the province. So, through the dealers over here, we want the right to go to the dealers over here, we want the right to demand of them whatever information we will require, and if they don't provide us that information, Mr. Speaker, they go to jail. —(Interjection)—

The petroleum industry, of yes, of course, we want the same powers because as automobile owners and drivers we are concerned about the price of petroleum products.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is why I say that if this bill passes it is going to set a precedent. How would they be able to get out of it? How would they be able to get out of it? How would the Minister of Labour be able to say, "No," to a worker, who would approach her and say, "I want the Minister of Labour to bring in a government bill establishing the Manitoba Workers Association. The Manitoba Federation of Labour, giving it the same powers as this group has, Mr. Speaker, automatic checkoff, there'll be a right of refund, giving that organization, Mr. Speaker, the right to demand of any employer they wish whatever information they require to satisfy themselves that they are collecting their proper dues, because the employer might say, "I only employ ten employees." They can ask him more than that because there's no restrictions on this bill on what they could ask. Mr. Speaker, they could ask for his financial statement, or whatever. So, Mr. Speaker, that is what I mean when I say that this will set a very undesirable and a dangerous precedent in our democratic way of life.

But, Mr. Speaker, when I have said that I intend to make such requests to the front bench if this bill is proceeded with, a request for the provision of similar legislation to what is already being provided, or intended to be provided to the Cattle Producers Association, I'm going to ask the Minister to make one change, there'll be one difference. I'm going to ask each Minister, whether it be the Automobile Owners Association, or the Federation of Labour, or the Educators, or the Consumers, I'm going to ask that Minister to reword the last section, Section 15.

Section 15 of this bill — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am transgressing the rules, because

I should not make direct reference to specific sections of the bill so I'll rephrase my statement. Every bill contains a section which indicates the date of commencement of the Act. This Act is to come into force on the day fixed by Proclamation. The bills that I would want to propose to the other Ministers to bring to this House, to set the date of their proclamation that it coincide with the date of proclamation of the Cattle Producers Association Act, that whatever date The Cattle Producers Association Act comes into force, that The Automobile Owners Association Act, The Consumers Association, The Educators Association, The Federation of Labour, and whatever other groups that we may want to incorporate by an Act of the Legislative Assembly in similar fashion for the same purposes, aims and objectives, we would want those to come into effect at the same time, if the six-month hoist motion fails, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated to you, the government has not, and I was most surprised in fact disappointed, that the Honourable Minister, in speaking to the six-month hoist, took 30 seconds to say what it was that he said, which many members have missed, because even some of them may have been in the House, they may have been looking for some material at the time, or happened to just step out the door as one colleague of mine did, and came back and missed the contribution of the Minister responsible for piloting this bill through the House, his contribution, the little bit that it was.mm

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you again, the reason why I will support the six-month hoist is that because this bill allows for the establishment of an independent organization, not responsible to government, the actions of which will affect each and every one extending far beyond those involved in the cattle producing industry, and giving such an association not responsible to the people the right to initiate action that could result in having people sent to jail. Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I support the motion for the six-month hoist.

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, the dangerous precedent that it sets opening the door to a government to establish independent organizations to perform perhaps politically unsavoury functions on their behalf. And then of course, they could hide behind the organization and say, well, don't blame us, it's this organization that did whatever it did that you are dissatisfied with. Go and talk to their president; talk to their board, don't hold us responsible. But the government assumed responsibility for the establishment of that organization and this could lead to the establishment of other similar organizations.

If it's going to lead to the establishment of other similar organizations, then, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this government will be compelled to establish organizations such as I have listed, and others. Not for powers that no one else has, not for any greater powers, not for any different reasons, but for identically the same reasons and with the same powers as the association known as The Cattle Producers Association Act will have, if unfortunately this bill will come into being —(Interjection)—

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We certainly have had a remarkable display in this House this morning with the display of the Minister of Agriculture, and display of all the other members of the Conservative benches, the display of saying nothing. —(Interjection)— Yes, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose mentions to me, they're glued to their seats. I don't know whether they are glued to their seats; they are strapped to their seats, and the one that has put them in their seats is either the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Highways. The Minister of Public Works has provided the straps to all his colleagues and the Premier has done the cinching up. He has cinched them in their seats and there is no one that will get up.

The Minister of Highways purposefully gets up in his seat, but he is one that I would hope would have been one of the members of the Executive Council, who would have gotten up, and at least defended the position that he gave to this House when he first spoke on this bill. Because when he first spoke on this bill, he hadn't read it and he made certain commitments to the members on this side and to the public generally, that there will be changes made to this bill and now he is sitting, mum, quiet, quiet, very quiet. That is the Minister of Highways. He first gets up, lambastes the opposition, blusters all over, makes certain commitments, and then disappears into the woodwork. Is that the commitments that the Conservative Party is giving to the producers and the people of Manitoba regarding this bill? He gets up and speaks once, and now you don't hear from him.

You know, the Minister of Agriculture today, today he gets up after having a number of questions and points posed to him, he says he appreciates the debate and sits down. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, after having many contentious points being raised by members on this side, for the Minister of Agriculture to get up and say that he thanks the members for the debate, although he has undertaken to make certain changes, he doesn't say a damn thing about them. You know, Mr. Speaker, the display this morning by the Minister of Agriculture, I can only say was not only

I believe it was disgraceful to all the members on his side. He is a disgrace to his own colleagues. Even the members of the front bench, except the House Leader, have all left. They really don't want to stay here and defend the actions of the Minister of Agriculture. After coming into the House and listening to the arguments posed by this side, he indicated that he will consider changes, but he gets up today and doesn't even make any mention of what he intends to do, after being given that opportunity. Mr. Speaker, he didn't even want to respond to any of the concerns raised by members of this House.

Is this the democratic process, the free Manitoba party that came into office last October? Is this the party that indicates that we will have a free Manitoba? Let's see how free Manitoba with respect to this legislation, Mr. Speaker, let's see the free Manitoba legislation that we have here, Mr. Speaker, legislation that confers powers to this outside group, the abdication of responsibility by the governing party by giving — maybe the members of the backbench don't realize it, that anyone who contravenes this Act, and that is the reason that we approved this hoist, that anyone who contravenes this Act, members on the opposite side, is liable. I want to read to the honourable members although it is not in this legislation, it is subject under The Summary Convictions Act, they are subject to penalty under The Summary Convictions Act.

The Summary Convictions Act reads, Section 4, of Chapter S230 of the Manitoba Statutes, "Any person who contravenes, violates, disobeys, or refuses, omits, neglects, or fails to comply with," and I will read the whole section, "any provision of any Act of the Legislature, or any provision of any regulation, rule or order lawfully made under and in accordance with power or authority conferred by any Act of the Legislature, is guilty of an offence, and unless another penalty therefor is provided by an Act" — and in this Act there is no other offence of the Legislature — "is liable on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding \$100.00 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month, or to both, such fine and such imprisonment."

Mr. Speaker, this is the legislation that the Member for Emerson who smiles at me, and says, well, this is great legislation. I presume by his smile that he is in agreement with this bill. That is the power that they are conferring to an outside body. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, not only that — there is nothing in this bill to say that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can take away or rescind any regulations made by this group. Mr. Speaker, even in The Natural Products Marketing Act, where the boards are representing the commodity groups in the area of marketing, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council have the power to revoke any regulations. But under this Act, they don't even have any powers. If there are any ludicrous regulations made, they are conferring those powers on this group and they can do as they please.

You talk about a free Manitoba, and a free party. Do you realize that you are conferring dictatorial powers on 14 members who you will be appointing? Mr. Speaker, it's no wonder the Minister of Agriculture gets up and makes a minute and a half speech. He is embarrassed and he is ashamed, and he should be ashamed. He wants this whole issue to disappear and to get under this blue carpet in this Legislature and hope that this issue will disappear, and everybody will forget about it, and we will be happy in this Province of Manitoba, and these cattlemen will have their organization. That's what he is hoping for.

You know, he talked about 4,000 letters. What a bunch of garbage. Even the Minister of Education, in a press release, said that they have received 4,000 letters complimenting the government or agreeing with their position. Even he was stretching, stretching the issue of the truth in the press release that he made in a local Interlake paper about those 4,000 letters. Those 4,000 letters weren't written on this issue; they never existed, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is, this Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is an embarrassment to that government, a total embarrassment. And this bill is an embarrassment to all the other members. The members of the Executive Council now are squirming in their seats, because they never checked, they never checked on the type of legislation that he is bringing in.

He indicated finally after being bombarded by questions and comments of members on this side, that he was going to make changes. Where are those changes? He gets up and —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister without Portfolio says, "Let's get to Committee and find out." The Minister of Agriculture gets up and makes a half minute or a minute and a half speech, and thanks members on this side, he enjoyed their comments. No indication whatsoever, as to what the position of the government is. Are you flipping and flopping, or you don't know what you're doing? —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister without Portfolio, I tell him he is full of baloney when he makes that statement, that it's the same place you got the information as in the other Acts. I tell you, you're full of baloney. I just quoted from an Act that gives the government power of authority to rescind regulations of a marketing board, and the powers of The Marketing Board, they have the full right to market under legislation a certain commodity. But even if the government is not satisfied with those regulations —(Interjection)— Sure, I will.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON(Sturgeon Creek): I wonder if the honourable member could remember when he was on this side of the House, the government, on The Farm Implement Act, where there was 52 amendments on a 48 Section Act, and all of the other Acts where we had those type of amendments, where did we get the amendments, in Committee or in the House?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the Honourable Minister raised that matter. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Honourable Minister raised that matter on the question, and I hope that you will allow me to respond to the question that he raised, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— Yes, the fact of the matter is, if there is going to be amendments to that legislation whether it be one, ten, or how many, the Minister responsible should indicate that he has accepted the concerns raised by members on this side of the House, and he will be making amendments in these kinds of areas because of the arguments proposed by members in Committee. And if there will be additional representations made by the public, then even certain further amendments would be made in Committee; that is the procedure. But what did we hear from the Minister of Agriculture? Nothing! We didn't hear a word. All he did was thank us for the comments, and that was all.

We had a commitment made by the Minister of Highways that there would be certain amendments made; we haven't heard a thing, we haven't heard a confirmation. The Minister of Highways now hasn't denied it, hasn't confirmed it, hasn't done a darn thing. They're falling asleep; their ears are closed; they are mum, Mr. Speaker. That is the reason why we have moved the six-month hoist, because we cannot get an answer, a commitment, from the members of the government side. Even the backbench now, the Member for Pembina and the Member for Emerson, who got up and vociferously supported this legislation, they are now wondering in their seats as to what they have really supported.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Pembina on a point of order.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Yes, I would like to correct the Member for St. Johns. He mentioned that I had spoken to this bill; I haven't to date spoken to this bill, or St. George.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Member for Pembina has spoken on the bill. Is that what he mentioned? You didn't speak on the bill? Well, you certainly have supported this legislation from your seat if you didn't speak. Now, I would have hoped now that you have the opportunity to speak because you certainly made some of your points known right from your seat, so get up and put it on the record. Are you afraid of your Executive Council colleagues, that they're going to muzzle you as it appears that they have done? Get up and say your piece.

Mr. Speaker, — I would hope that some of the amendments — the Minister of Agriculture, maybe he can talk to the House Leader or the Minister of Highways, and let one of them indicate what the amendments are going to be and what changes they intend to make in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we want the producers to have the right to opt in, not the right to opt out. Mr. Speaker, they can opt out if they wish, they can have the right, but they should have the right to opt in so they are not forced into this legislation. I want to see what the Minister of Agriculture has to say with that kind of amendment, whether they will allow all producers to voluntarily join this organization, or they will force them to join this organization and only if they should happen, by whatever regulations. We don't know what regulations will be proposed and the government cannot change those regulations. The only regulations that the government can change are the regulations limiting the checkoff, the amount of checkoff. That is the only regulation that the government can hold back, indicating that no regulation imposing fees in excess of 25 cents for each head of cattle sold by a producer is valid or enforceable unless approved by an annual or special general meeting of registered producers, or a referendum among registered producers. That's the only one that the government can enforce if there hadn't been that vote, and if there has been a vote held and a referendum, they can't even do that. This group can handle it by themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Burrows raised the issue of consumer groups. Will there be consumer groups represented on this board? Because this board is not empowered to deal with marketing; at least, it initially mentions that every — in the objects and powers of the association, the group was given to assist producers in the production or marketing of cattle, and then of course, that right is taken away in the very next section of the legislation, indicating that this group has no powers, shall not engage in the production, sale and marketing, so this legislation contradicts itself. As well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Agriculture, in this legislation, will have to make some further changes, even though we have had accusations by the Conservative Party

about the technical and the — as I quote the Premier — “dog’s breakfast legislation of family law,” indicating that there had to be hundreds of changes, and they wanted to redo the legislation. Well, we have a dog’s breakfast here, Mr. Speaker; the Minister of Agriculture in his drafting instructions can’t even put down the right numbers in the legislation. He misquotes the sections that are referred to in the legislation. We have a dog’s breakfast in relating one section to another, within the same bill. —(Interjection)— I’m hoping, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture will get up and indicate, rather than from his chair, whether he has at least received the authority from Executive Council, that the Minister of Agriculture will bring in the amendments that he has talked about, even before he has read that bill, rather than talking from his seat.

Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that the move in the last several days dealing with this legislation and relating to the Income Assurance Plan, that the government has finally written a letter to producers indicating that they are to live up to the contract. But what did he do in this letter? And I stand to be corrected — I haven’t read the letter, but I’ve heard other members mention that there are now two options in the letter, or three options given in the letter. The Minister of Highways says three. One of those options is, as I understand it, that the alternative is that the producer can pay back after he sells the cattle. But I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that this move, this alternative, will really be played with by large producers, by producers who have cattle in excess of the amount that is registered under the plan. And I’ll tell you how, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the Member for Lac du Bonnet will really zero in on it — but they will play with the legislation dealing with the Income Assurance Plan. You know what will happen? Those members, those farmers who have large amounts of cattle, and this is the reason why the present Minister of Agriculture is probably trying to get around it, and what he is doing, he is really giving a loophole to the large cattle producers. We know in past history that there have been deals made between cattle producers and packers, whereby one price for cattle is paid on one day and a differing price is paid on another day, or a bonus is paid in. So I can venture to say that if the producer, the large producer, sells his cattle under the program and says, “These are the cattle sold on it,” his bonus, his cattle will be sold for a very low price and his bonus will be paid on the next load of cattle that is not marketable within the plan, that is out of the plan. That’s what will happen, Mr. Speaker. The alternative that they have now given is really a sop to the large cattle producer; that’s the reason that they have put this. They have the clear alternative right in the contract — no, they are now playing around. The average producer who hasn’t got cattle more than is eligible to be within the plan, he has no alternative. All his cattle have to be marketed through the plan, so that he cannot play any games. But the producers who have several hundred head of cattle are the producers who will be able to play those games.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the reasons that we have moved this hoist, and we have not heard from the Minister of Agriculture. We have not heard as to whether or not the government will have the power to repeal regulations made by this autonomous body. Mr. Speaker, we don’t know, even in legislation that this Legislature has confirmed through The Natural Products Marketing Act, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council has the authority; even if the producer-elected Board that is strictly there to deal with marketing, even if the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is not in agreement with their regulations, it can order, revoke, may amend or revoke any regulation, order or directive made by the Board under that legislation. There is nothing in this bill; the government has tied its hands completely, has abdicated its legislative and executive authority to an outside group. —(Interjection)—

Now, now, now, I hear from the Minister of Highways, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways doesn’t realize that he or some of his neighbours and trucker friends who haul cattle, if they do not provide information that is requested by this Board, may be subject to conviction, prosecution, under The Summary Convictions Act. And you, as a Minister of the Crown, will not have any authority to revoke anything that may be idiotic and autocratic that this group may put in. You don’t have that authority; you have that authority under The Natural Products Marketing Act, but you don’t have it under this legislation. Are you going to bring in those amendments? Some amendments dealing with this? I don’t know, we don’t know. We have the Minister of Agriculture, he gets up for 30 seconds and thanks us for the remarks that we have made. —(Interjections)— Why don’t you get up? Let the Minister of Housing get up and make his speech as to the intentions —(Interjection)— Yes, I’ll answer a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Does the Honourable Minister responsible for Housing have a question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Does the honourable member not agree that if there are no amendments, and they still disagree, that they can come back in third reading? And would the honourable member also answer why they are playing games right now and they don’t want to get into Committee?

MR. URUSKI: I guess the Minister of Housing doesn't realize the essence of this legislation and the diametrical opposition of members on this side to that legislation. We are totally opposed to it; we want to kill this legislation, Mr. Speaker. We do not want it to go to Committee, whatsoever. We don't want this legislation; we have not been given any indication by your colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, who has displayed not only a disappointing approach to the members on this side, but to all the producers in Manitoba who want to know what the intentions are of the government. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways wants to keep talking from his seat; I am hoping that he gets up and makes his position clear because he has also, as I've indicated before, made a very disappointing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. George to read Standing Order 34 regarding repetition in debate.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, it appears that members on the government benches have deaf ears today, and that they have been muzzled, and I'm hoping that one or two comments that I have made — and maybe, Mr. Speaker, repetition to members of the government side might be the mother of learning, and maybe we will get some response from some of the members. Even the Member for Pembina who is a Legislative Assistant to one of the Ministers, who indicates he has not spoken, I'm sure he has some views to relate to members on this side about the comments that I have made, and the Member for Inkster, the Member for St. Vital, the Member for Ste. Rose and the Member for Burrows. All we get is 30 seconds from the Minister of Agriculture saying, "Thanks for your comments, boys; you were great." That's all that we hear from him. We don't have any indication as to what amendments, what changes they're going to make, what areas that they have accepted in terms of criticism that we have made, in terms of representations we have made in the House; nothing. We have heard nothing from the Minister of Agriculture, and those are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that we have opposed and are continuing to oppose this legislation. I'm hoping that some of the members on the government side, even the Member for Roblin, who I haven't heard from, who believes in a free Manitoba, will at least indicate his position on this legislation and say, "Look, let's hold hearings on this legislation; let's take it to the producers and see whether they like it, and let's bring it back, if they want to bring it back, in six months' time." But Mr. Speaker, they don't want to do that. They want to ram this legislation through. They don't want to indicate any of their amendments that they intend to make on this legislation; they have tied and muzzled all the backbench — I can't speak for the executive — and the front bench just took off. The Premier doesn't even want to stay around and listen to members —(Interjection)— Yes, yes, yes. The Minister of Agriculture gets up —(Interjection)— I'm still waiting; I'm still hoping.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 12:30, we have reached the hour of adjournment. The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.