



Third Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



VOL. XXXII No. 23 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 16 MAY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	IND
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 16 May, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I have a statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the creation of an International Technical Assistance Office within my department to promote the use of Manitoba training skills and resources in developing countries.

I also wish to announce that the first project has been negotiated under this newly created office, and it's a \$5.5 million contract using Manitoba educators to enhance the development of a network of institute of technology in Kenya. The project is being developed in co-operation with the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

Manitoba has highly trained educators and a broad base of human resources. One of the most pressing needs in developing countries is for technical, managerial and human resources. Through the creation of the International Technical Assistance Office, we will now be able to co-ordinate requests for assistance and seek ways to benefit the province.

The project is funded entirely by \$5.5 million grant from CIDA and a \$1 million contribution from the Kenyan Government. Technical assistance by Manitoba will represent a large portion of the budgeted \$2.5 million for consultative services. The project gives our province the chance to assist a developing country which is also largely agriculturally based.

Mr. Speaker, our involvement in Kenya will help raise our profile in relation to other marketing of Manitoba goods and services and it establishes our province as a source for future projects and funding through CIDA and other developing agencies.

Under the Kenya agreement, alone, Manitoba businesses will be given first opportunity to tender for \$1.3 million in contracts for equipment and other goods.

Under the agreement, the International Office will co-ordinate Canada-wide efforts to recruit and place 17 community college educators for two-year periods in Harambee Institute throughout Kenya.

Our involvement will help raise our profit in marketing Manitoba goods and services, and it establishes our province as a source for future projects and funding through CIDA and other developing agencies.

The Harambee Institute of Technology are community-based, post-secondary training institutions designed to provide young people with technical skills and entry into local and regional based employment.

Objectives of the project are: to provide technical assistance in agreed upon areas; to assist, through capital acquisition and planning consultation, in the upgrading and development of the Harambee Institutes; to provide consultative assistance to the Association of Harambee Institute in their long-term development plans.

An advisory committee to the International Office comprised of Manitoba businessmen interested in international markets and other Manitobans involved in international development, will be established shortly. The International Office, with the advisory committee, will provide focus for information on international opportunities and act as a resource for businesses who require technical training assistance to fulfill their international contracts.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other projects in which the International Technical Assistance Office is involved:

The first is the Chengdu Management Training Centre in China.

Through the Association of Canadian Community Colleges, the department has been providing assistance to the Chengdu Management Centres in Chengdu, China. The Centre trains educational managers in post secondary education, as well as business managers.

Henri Bures from Red River Community College will be lecturing at the Centre this fall. Bill Porter, Chairman of the Business Department at Red River was on the feasibility study team that examined the Chengdu Centre.

The second project involved the Seychelles Polytechnical Institute, in the Republic of the Seychelles.

Al Loveridge, former Director of Assiniboine Community College, is completing a two-year consultancy as Director of the Seychelle Polytechnical Institute.

And very importantly, Mr. Speaker, two Manitobans from the private sector have just returned from a three-month consultancy in the Seychelles where they were assisting the government in establishing a crafts marketing and projection system.

Tony Berezoweki, former head of the Communications Department at Red River will be heading the new International Technical Assistance Office. He has extensive overseas experience spanning 20 years, including four years residency in West Africa.

The costs for establishing and operating are entirely cost recoverable through the international funding agencies.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this initiative reflects our government's commitment to open international markets for Manitoba business. It shows our commitment to work with the private sector through establishment of an advisory committee. And, Mr. Speaker, it shows that assisting in the meeting of real needs in developing countries can be done in a way which provides benefits to both the developing country and the economy of Manitoba.

I want to commend members of my staff for taking this initiative. It demonstrates how a government like

ours can respond to opportunities in assisting other countries by providing to them the highly developed skills and services which they recognize Manitoba possesses.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My reactions to the statement just offered by the Minister are three.

First of all, I thank her for providing the information. I see our nation as a whole is continuing its commitment in providing educational assistance to the nation of Kenya. There's been a long-standing association between Canada and the African nation.

I'm also glad to see where the expertise within our community colleges, in the sense of educational instruction, has been recognized and if it will represent or cause a business to occur in the future because of the direct input we have in helping some of the developing countries, one can only offer praise for that type of program.

I thank the Minister for her comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery.

We have 21 students of Grade 6 standing from the Montrose School. The students are under the direction of Mrs. Hanna. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

There are 50 students of Grade 11 standing from the Warren Collegiate. They are under the direction of Mr. Weibe and Mr. Shadlock. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

There are 12 students of Grades 4 to 6 standing from the River Elm School. The students are under the direction of Miss Enns and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Legislation - appearance of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, before we commence further in the question period, you, Sir, read the item on the Order Paper now for the last month - a little over the month - the Introductions of Bills. I ask the Government House Leader, when can we expect some government bills to be placed before us? Mr. Speaker, I ask it particularly because this is a group, this is a government, that has chastised us about getting on with the business of people. We've been sitting here now for over a month and we haven't seen a bill yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is the honourable member asking a question or rising on a point of order?

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. When can we expect some government bills to be presented before us?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat the answer I gave the House on Monday last, just 48 hours ago, and that was that I expect our legislative program this Session to be much less than it has been in previous recent Sessions, to be a very light legislative load. I expect the majority of that legislation to be introduced for first reading and distributed to the Legislature by the end of May. If the honourable member will be patient, the end of May is approximately two weeks away.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it was only a few months ago, back in February, where this same Government House Leader asked us to get on with the particular matter that was keeping the attention of this House and indeed all of Manitobans from what they said was pressing and urgent business of the day. Where is that urgent, pressing business? Mr. Speaker, we now have to wait until the end of the month before we see legislation.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat aghast that the Opposition House Leader thinks that the only pressing business before a government is legislation. Mr. Speaker, there have been a whole series of dynamic initiatives announced by this government over the last month. Those initiatives have been very much a part of this legislative Session.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the member, whose party's unofficial position on legislation is that less is better, now thinks that we should be bringing all kinds of legislation to the House and if his view of the Legislature is that its only purpose is to pass bills and he doesn't think the Estimates and all the other government initiatives that are being taken under the Jobs Fund, under the Minister of Energy and Mines, are not important, then he should say so in debate, but I'm not prepared to debate that during question period.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I think you could have admonished the Government House Leader for putting words into my mouth which I didn't utter. I asked the Honourable Minister, the Government House Leader, will he not now consider doing away and dropping that silly motion that we have, having to do with bell ringing and rules, a motion that he is bringing into this House without consensus, and bring in the legislation. I'm not suggesting how much it should be. You have the legislative program, bring it in.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that it's appropriate during question period to debate a matter for which a time for debate is appointed on the Order Paper. Members will be free to debate that. We'll be calling that matter today and I don't propose to engage in debate in question period.

I do, however, expect that there will be bills on notice for first reading both this week and next week. There are none today; I hope there will be some tomorrow.

There are a number of bills that are ready for first reading, and I expect that the majority will be done within the next two weeks. I did not, for a minute, suggest they would all be done on the last day of May.

Brandon University

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll address my question to the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, there is an article in the Brandon Sun, dated April 27th, indicating that the University of Brandon has a surplus of about \$118,000 from the last fiscal year. I am wondering if the Minister of Education can confirm that figure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that figure.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, given that the report seems to indicate that that is the figure, I am wondering, in view of the fact that the Board of Governors of the Brandon University has earmarked that surplus for the fiscal year ending March, 1984, of some \$118,000 for possible legal fees to defend their action against Dr. Perkins, is the Minister taking any steps whatsoever to bring forward a just settlement between Brandon University and Dr. Perkins so that potentially horrendous legal costs, plus damages, can be avoided.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think that matter is before the courts and therefore is not appropriate for discussion in this House.

MR. C. MANNES: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, many things are in front of the courts that this government has an involvement with these days and the only people doing business are legal people.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll ask a question of a more general nature, then. Is the Minister concerned at all that \$118,000 of scarce dollars that have been directed towards universities may be used for legal purposes?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Minister's concern is not a proper topic for a question. Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information rather than opinion?

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister be doing anything to universities or colleges or any institution under her responsibility that may be using scarce funds for the purposes of fighting legal battles?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, boards of governors are responsible for determining the expenditures of the universities, the money they are given for the university. I think I did talk before about one of their major responsibilities being to make sure that the funds were

being spent appropriately, were being accounted for, and were not being misused; and that any question in their mind about whether or not that was being done was a very important responsibility that they would have to decide how to carry out.

This Chamber is not a court and I am not a judge, nor are the members opposite. If there are serious matters that should be resolved by a court, then it's up to them to decide whether or not to proceed.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the Minister can tell me where she draws the line as to who is safeguarded and who is not protected by tenure or due process, specifically regarding heads of universities or as I indicated the other day in question, the two teachers that were fired from the Peguis Indian Reserve. Who is protected by this new law that we passed last year and who is not? Where does the Minister draw the line?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That's an extremely wide question which might be better brought up at Estimates time. It would, in my opinion, tend to provoke a debate between the members.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

Peguis Indian Reserve

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Minister indicated she would take as notice the situation regarding the firing of two teachers on the Peguis Indian Reserve. I tied it into that time on a question of tenure. I'm wondering if you will allow that question and whether or not the Minister could answer it now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I did take the question about the firing of two teachers in the Peguis Indian Band as notice and I do have the answer.

Presently the law requires that tripartite agreements be signed for delivery of educational services between the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the Indian Bands. What has happened lately is that the Federal Government has begun to turn over responsibility for the school system to the Indian Bands which is something that we all want to see happen and that we agree with.

Manitoba, last year, brought in a piece of legislation that allowed contracts to be signed directly between Indian Bands and school divisions. It now requires alike change at the Federal Government level in order for those contracts to be legally binding.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that because the Federal Government has not changed their legislation, people like these two teachers are really caught between the devil and the deep blue sea, because they are not now covered under the Federal Government, and they are also not covered under the contract of the school division because they are not allowed to have legal contracts.

To his point, I suppose that firing may have to be resolved by the courts, and the Federal Government has to take full responsibility for those teachers not being protected under the contract. They have given

over the responsibility, but not the legal authority for the contracts between the two.

To his question of due process, I have always said, and I suppose this a clear demonstration that due process does not protect teachers from being fired, it would, if they were under the school division, give them a right to a fair hearing to find out the reasons, to find out if they were just, but they are not entitled to that protection right now.

Aboriginal self-government

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs. I was pursuing this line of questioning yesterday at the end of the question period having to do with the government's commitment to Native self-government. My question to the Minister of Northern Affairs is this, is the government negotiating in any way with the Metis Government of Camperville?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: No, Mr. Speaker. In response to the Member for Turtle Mountain, there is no negotiation with the Metis Government of Camperville. I have met with the mayor and a couple of his councillors a little more than a week ago and we discussed the particular concept that has been announced by Mr. Guiboche.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Northern Affairs has made it very clear on a number of occasions that the department's relationship with the community council is paramount. There is a duly elected mayor and a duly elected council. The Department of Northern Affairs, under The Department of Northern Affairs Act, has jurisdiction and authority to deal with a community council. That is the body with which we are dealing and with which we intend to deal. I have said on a number of occasions that particular conceptual framework that is being discussed as Metis Government at this time has no legal or constitutional basis and that has been our position.

I have said as well that I understand some of the frustrations that have been expressed and those have been expressed to the government and to the Federal Government and I think relate, as I've said yesterday, to the lack of activity at the First Ministers' Conference in March.

To answer the member's question directly, there are no negotiations with respect to the particular conceptual framework that has been expressed by Ferdinand Guiboche from Camperville.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker.

Has the government's relationship with the community council changed in any way as a consequence of the declaration of self-government?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, all I can indicate is that as far as I am concerned and as far as the Mayor of Camperville is concerned, as a result of our discussion

some week ago, it was agreed that there is no change in relationship whatsoever.

I will indicate to the member that some two or three weeks ago the department did conclude a block funding agreement with the community of Cross Lake. I don't know that it was widely reported in the press in southern Manitoba; it certainly was in northern Manitoba. At that time, the Mayor of Cross Lake, Mr. Smith, indicated his pleasure at the progress that the department was making in conjunction with Northern Affairs communities towards improved and enhanced local self-government.

I will indicate, as well, that discussions have been ongoing with a number of other communities, had been going on with the community of Camperville . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Questions in the House should be short, concise and to the point; and answers should also be short, concise and to the point and not be used as an excuse to make a speech.

Oral Questions.

The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I had just been concluding with what I believed was a very important question and something that I did not have an opportunity to answer yesterday when asked by the member.

The community of Camperville had been party to discussions with respect to block funding going back as early as December last year. That would have resulted in increased local autonomy in terms of the allocation of the administrative budget in the community, and there are other activities going on with respect to improved local autonomy as well.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister.

Are the activities of the Metis self-government of Camperville being financed in any way with provincial tax dollars?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, no.

Labour legislation

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour.

Can the Minister of Labour inform the House as to how many outside consultants have been brought in to draft labour legislation, and at what cost?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I will take part of the question, the cost, as notice because I don't have the figures with me today and I wouldn't want to make an error on that; but the number of people brought into Manitoba to assist with the drafting is two. There is a person in Manitoba that was also a part of the contractual hiring to assist in this very detailed drafting.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that answer and her undertaking to provide the House with an estimate of the cost.

A supplementary question to the Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the fact that we have no legislative program before the House, why is it necessary to use outside consultants at some undetermined cost and not use Legislative Counsel?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the member's question should be appropriately addressed to me as Government House Leader. Perhaps it's more appropriately addressed to the Attorney-General. However, I think it's fair to say that the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, not having seen the legislative program does not know how much work Legislative Counsel currently has on his desk.

A MEMBER: Who can believe him?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Lottery licence - Liberal Party

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, from time to time the leader of the Liberal Party sits in the gallery of the Legislature, and does not have the privilege of asking questions in this House. Perhaps I could ask one to the Minister of Sport, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister of Sport indicate whether or not he intends to approve the application for a lottery licence by the Liberal Party; or does he intend to withhold approval of that lottery until the Canadian Sports Pool is withdrawn from Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's a very tempting suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Speaker, could he indicate whether or not he intends to approve the application for a lottery licence?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I was expecting to have the recommendation because I pay a lot of attention to the recommendation I get from the other side. I want to make sure.

Mr. Speaker, I don't approve or disapprove licencing. I read in the newspaper that the Liberal Leader wanted approval for a lottery that she would sell in Ottawa. Good luck, but that's against the law, I don't think that she'd go very far selling that in Ottawa. The situation is that so far for a political party, bingos or casinos haven't been allowed, but special lotteries have been allowed so far.

Aboriginal self-government

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the House whether he has received any complaints in the forms of letters,

petitions from local residents of the Camperville area complaining about the self government of that community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I recently received a petition from approximately 130 individuals from Camperville who had indicated some concern about what formation, the concept that was being discussed by Mr. Guiboche and a number of other people meant for the people of Camperville. There was some concern about that particular statement and how it would relate to the assistance that was provided through other government departments.

The department is in the process of preparing a response to indicate to those people that there is no change and to reaffirm the relationship that exists between the department and the community. So while there has been some concern expressed, it has generally been formulated in terms of a wish to understand further what implications would be forthcoming with respect to self government. I have attempted to make it clear that there is no change in the relationship.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you to apply our rules. The question was, how many complaints had the Minister received. He has answered, he said 130. He could have sat down thereafter. I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, to try to keep, particularly this Minister, within reasonable confines of the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I'm sure that the House appreciates the full answer that has been given by the Minister, however there should be no abuse of the rules during question period.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, in view of the Minister's answer that government funding is not being used to finance the self-government of Camperville; I wonder if the Minister could indicate who is financing that self-imposed government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I'm not sure that the finances of one particular area is within the administrative competence of the government. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wonder if the Minister could indicate if the Department of Northern Affairs is providing funding at the present time to the community of Camperville.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, the normal quarterly funding has been provided to the community for the operation of their administration for water and sewer and the normal undertakings of our community council.

MR. D. GOURLAY: How can the Minister be assured that the money that the government is providing to the

community of Camperville is not being spent on the self-imposed government?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, as the member ought to know, as the former Minister of Northern Affairs, the department does have co-ordinators in the communities who review and audit the communities' expenses and spending and in that way keeps in touch with all of Northern Affairs communities.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I direct a further question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and ask him how many Northern Affairs communities he anticipates will be incorporated under The Northern Affairs Act this current year?

HON. J. STORIE: I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, if I understand the member's question. If he's referring to the movement of communities from self-administering to incorporated status; the prospect is for moving approximately five communities in the next couple of years. But that of course depends on the strengths of the communities and their willingness to move because, while it is an advantageous thing for them to do, there are some risks as the member well knows in that with increased responsibility there is increased risk and other inherent dangers but there are a number of communities that are interested in preparing to move in that direction.

Payroll tax

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister or Co-op Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Member for La Verendrye asked me a question regarding alleged refusals to pay the health and education levy; I indicated to him I'd take the question as notice and respond back to him with an approximate number. He is aware, of course, that details can't be given out, but I can tell him that I am advised that there is no significant refusal on the part of business people in this province to pay their fair share. That includes payment of the health and education levy.

Winnipeg Stadium

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health who's responsible for Sport and ask him if the Winnipeg Enterprises has had the courtesy to contact him and discuss with him their plans for an expanded stadium and the possibility of a domed stadium?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker.

Winnipeg Jets

MR. W. STEEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister; could I ask the Minister of Health, what was the

Provincial Government's share of retiring the capital debt against the Winnipeg Arena when the Winnipeg Enterprises granted the Winnipeg Jets Hockey Club free rent.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Very close to \$2 million was the provincial share. Let's remember also that when there was a change in the construction of the arena there was, I think, a few million dollars committed and we just finished paying that this year also.

Prisoner escape - Health Sciences Centre

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services. Can the Minister tell me how it was possible for a man accused of murder to escape from the Health Sciences Centre, when reportedly, two guards from Headingley were in attendance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, such an incident did occur yesterday when a person sent to Health Sciences Centre for psychiatric care, did elude the supervision of the security people which are hired to provide the extra security. However, he was relocated within two hours and found to be in a rather confused and dazed condition.

Again, I've asked for a report on the procedures followed and if there's any tightening of procedures to prevent such a recurrence, we'll see that takes place.

Headingley Jail Security

MR. A. BROWN: To the same Minister, we have had many reports of inmates escaping from Headingley. Will the Minister launch an inquiry into security measures being taken at Headingley?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the member has made a reference to attempted escapes. I would appreciate if he could give me the information that he's referring to and if there is, in fact, something that can be remedied by tighter security, I'll certainly look into it.

Labour legislation

MR. SPEAKER: Oral Questions.
The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I took a question as notice. I have the answer now for the Member for St. Norbert. I try to respond as quickly as possible.

The hiring of extra personnel to assist in the drafting of labour law amendments, the costing of that, the expense of that is \$21,000 in salaries, \$6,500 in expenses, which includes the flight to this province of two of the people that I mentioned to the member.

It should be recalled that there were extensive consultation meetings set up with business and with

labour and those meetings are, for the most part, completed, but what that did was really telescope the time for drafting; so rather than have a person or two work for a number of weeks on the drafting of the legislation, it was necessary to have a number of people work for a shorter time. It seemed to us - and certainly seems to me - that it's far more important to the people who were assisting us in drawing up these recommendations and in reacting to them that they have the time to speak to us and help us with this so that the legislation will come in with the greatest degree of consensus possible.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate for what period of time did these two people work on the legislation in order to earn \$21,000 in salary?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, these three lawyers - of course, they are legal people - and we all know that lawyers do command a good price and I must say that the work involved is quite detailed and demands a knowledge of legislation as well as the legal knowledge and I'm sure that the member, a lawyer himself, would understand this.

The work has not been completed. I wouldn't want anyone to think that it has been completed, because I'm telling you that the drafting has to take place after the consultative process is complete; and so the drafting now is really just getting into high gear.

The two lawyers that are working for two weeks are receiving \$6,000 in salary each. The lawyer who worked for one week, \$3,000.00. This is lower than their usual fees.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister identify these two or three fortunate individuals?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think that this kind of detail is properly in an Order for Return, but it's no secret. I would ask for your direction. Should this be Order for Return or shall I give the answer? I can go either way. If they want the answer, all right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: David Shrom, who I believe is also the lawyer for the MMA; James Dorsey, originally from Prince Edward Island, I believe, now a resident in B.C. — (Interjection) — I think we would have to pay the trumpet player a great deal more and Bob Mitchell, of a firm in Saskatchewan.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate whether she sought out persons in Manitoba to do this work, before retaining outside consultants?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we certainly did search out people in Manitoba and in fact these names

were recommended to us by people in Manitoba; but I'm sure that members opposite understand that those who have the greatest knowledge of Manitoba labour legislation are pretty much lined up, in a sense, of their actual work activities on one side or the other and did not feel that they should be involved.

They recommended these people as being involved and able to draft legislation, work under pressure and have the legal background to know, in fact, what they were talking about. There are actually people from the Attorney-General's office working on this as well; it's not just these three people. They are assisting the Attorney-General's staff in drafting the legislation. They are not doing the legislation on their own.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate whether Legislative Counsel, Mr. Tallin, recommended that outside consultants be retained, that they were unable to do this work in-house?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tallin is not my employee; he's the Attorney-General's employee and I would think that question should be directed to the Attorney-General.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tallin is Legislative Counsel to the government and is the best Legislative Counsel in this country. I'm asking the Minister whether or not he recommended that she hire outside counsel and advised her that this work could not be done in-house?

Tuberculosis in cattle herds

MR. SPEAKER: Oral Questions.
The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a brief question for the Minister of Agriculture.

I wonder can the Minister of Agriculture assure me and the Rossburn Community that the tuberculosis infection in cattle there has been cleaned up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and provide the information as soon as I can.

Labour Law Review Report

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Labour, and I wonder if she is now in a position to table the Smith Report with regard to the labour review that has been conducted by her department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, the second question from the labour critic is exactly the same as the first question from the labour critic.

I have answered the question with regard to the tabling of the Smith Report and I'm sure he will find that answer in Hansard.

MR. R. BANMAN: In light of the fact that the Minister is refusing to table the report, one which the public has had input into and deserves to see what kind of a report the particular individual has put forward, would she now be able to tell the House what that particular report has cost?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, that is definitely the material for an Order for Return. To explain to the member, I said that the report will be tabled, will be made public when it is complete. It is less than half completed at this point, because what was received in the first part of the report by the government was not entirely dealt with and is still under consideration.

The entire report will be made public at the time that we have completed our deliberations over it, and that involves a two-year span, not a one-year span.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the same Minister. I wonder if she could inform the House whether or not Ms. Smith is on an hourly or a daily per diem.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Ms. Smith is on a contract.

Moisture Monitoring Report

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I note in the Throne Speech one of the dynamic thrusts of the government and I would quote, "My government is aware of the problems that Manitoba farmers may face as a result of low soil moisture levels and recent dry weather conditions. My government will be monitoring moisture conditions across the province on a continuing basis and will be reporting regularly to the House."

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Manitoba now have over half of their crops in the ground. We have seen rain, sleet, hail, snow. The farmers are anxiously sitting on the edges of their tractor seats waiting for the Minister to table his report.

Could the Minister indicate when we are going to get his moisture monitoring report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I believe the farmers of Manitoba have much more on their minds than the Honourable Member for Virden, Sir. They are working as hard as they can to get the crops in, notwithstanding the gratuitous comments from the Member for Virden, Sir. He knows as well . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite know well that they can laugh about the Throne Speech, but, Mr. Speaker, the thrust that this government has made in supporting agriculture, no government in the history of this province has supported agriculture more than we have.

Sir, that is one of the main reasons that members opposite feel as difficult, they want to nitpick, be negative on all aspects that we have attempted to support agriculture going through difficult times, especially in the grains industry, Sir.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I realize there is no compulsion on the part of the Minister to answer a question if he doesn't want to, but I think it's only courtesy if he doesn't want to answer the question that he refuse to get up on his feet.

Is he prepared to tell us when he's going to table his report on a regular basis?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honourable member's comments and he will be getting his answer in the course of events.

Loss of livestock due to storm

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Government Services, following upon the comments made by the Minister of Agriculture to the effect that this government has done such a great deal for the agricultural community.

A couple of days ago the Minister of Government Services indicated that farmers who had suffered livestock losses during the recent storm should get in touch with their municipality or with the government, that the government would give consideration to some compensation. Has the Minister been able to make any assessment at this point as to the seriousness of the losses to farmers, to livestock growers during storm?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. A. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the member for his question. We have more information now than we had last week. We have received information, I believe, from 13 municipalities - I just say 13 off the top of my head, it could be 11 or 12 - indicating that there has been some damage in the municipality. The estimated amount of damage to this point in time that we have received is somewhere around \$300,000 in the public municipal damages.

As far as damages from individuals, I'm informed by my staff that there has been very few claims coming forward and, of course, they should notify their first responses to the municipality or to the ag rep and make any damages that they have sustained known to the elected people and they will be reviewed and dealt with in the usual manner, Mr. Speaker.

As soon as we have been able to accumulate a little more information, I will be able to make recommendations to Cabinet as to whether or not the extent of damages constitutes a major disaster.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY
ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RULES
OF THE HOUSE - BELL RINGING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, would you call the first item on the Order Paper, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion standing in the name of the Honourable Government House Leader, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, but if any member was to speak I have no problem with that.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to have this matter stand? — (Interjections) — If it not the will of the House to have the matter stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, I will then put the question.

The Honourable Member for Roblin Russell.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Nobody's got the Hansard from the honourable member that spoke yesterday and I wanted to review that Hansard before I get a chance to address that House, but if you're not going to grant me that privilege then, Mr. Speaker, I regret that very much.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would hope the Government House Leader reconsiders the position. The honourable member has requested leave to allow the debate to stand in his name. It is his intention to participate in the debate as soon as he gets the Hansard from the last speaker.

We have another speaker that's prepared to move the debate along and wishes to do so this afternoon and I don't think that can be called in any way obstructionism, but simply giving all my members who wish to participate in this debate an opportunity to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is not leave, the honourable member will lose his right to speak if the debate moves to another member.

Is there leave to have the matter stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. McKENZIE: . . . address this very very important resolution. Mr. Speaker, all I'm asking today

is for the Government House Leader to grant me a chance to scrutinize the Hansard that the honourable member spoke yesterday. Mr. Speaker, that Hansard was only delivered on my desk a matter of five minutes ago. I just received the Hansard. I would like very much to have the opportunity to gather what information or advice I could from the Honourable Member for Inkster, but unfortunately that's not going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I'm shocked today, because we were led to believe that this was an open government, that this was sincere government, that this was a government that wanted to listen to the people of this province, that want to have an understanding of how we're to deal with the rules in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the arrogant hand of this big government who now are going to irregardless of - we've had consensus and rules all the years I've been in this Legislature. The rules were always settled by consensus, the consensus of all parties in the House. Now we have the big heavy hand of this government going to intervene and they're going to set the rules for this Legislature. I think it's a dark day for Manitoba and it's a dark day for the people of this province.

Why can't we, Mr. Speaker, all members of this House sit down and set the rules so that we get a consensus from all parties and we don't have to come here with a bill or resolution saying that the big government of this province is going to dictate the rules by which this House operates? It has never happened before in this province, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's a regressive day for our province.

The second thing I'm annoyed about, Mr. Speaker, why can't the Government House Leader and the government grant me a couple of hours, at least, to scrutinize the Hansard for the honourable member that spoke yesterday, because I want to speak to some of the subjects that are in that Hansard. I'm not even granted that privilege out of this Government House Leader and his government.

So, Mr. Speaker, who is kidding who about rules? This government, Mr. Speaker, is the worst government that this province has ever seen and we have another classic example of it today. They are not prepared to listen to the opposition. They are not prepared to let us prepare ourselves. They are not prepared to let us scrutinize the Hansard of other members. They are just going to use the big heavy hand of government and ram this thing through.

Mr. Speaker, why couldn't I have leave today? It is a very very important matter that we're dealing with, so I'd like to prepare myself properly, Mr. Speaker. I think it's an insult to the opposition that this government who promised and made all these pledges and promises to the people of this province, that they would be open, they'd listen to us, they'd consider points and opinions that we care to offer, today say, no dice. No dice, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to listen to the opposition.

So what kind of rules are we going to have? The rules of a dictatorship type of government? Because once they start setting the rules and the precedent they are setting here by this resolution, they will not only have the government, Mr. Speaker, they are going to set the rules. That is a setback for Parliament, because one of the few privileges the opposition has had all the years that I've been here, Mr. Speaker, they have the purse and the power; we, at least, had the rule book and you, Mr. Speaker, to give us a chance to be heard.

That is going to be lost from this Parliament as of today, because this Government House Leader has rose in his place and used the big hand of government and power and said, no, you members in the opposition will not be allowed to speak because we are not going to give you leave to speak. That's what happened today, Mr. Speaker. They would not give us leave so that I could address this House tomorrow on this very important subject matter.

So now we are getting to the root of this problem of rules. These people across the way, this government, Mr. Speaker, they don't want to listen to us; they don't want a consensus; they just want to use their power and their big heavy hand to run this province and forget about the oppositin, forget about the people out there. We know better, and I know what the socialist mind generally channels itself in, Mr. Speaker. It gets so that we know better than the little people of this province. We are going to tell you when to get up in the morning; we are going to tell you what kind of clothes to wear; we are going to tell you when to go to bed at night; and we are going to tell you how to repeat your socialist prayers before you crawl into your bed. That's the typical socialist philosophy. They know better than the people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I see now why this bell-ringing incident has become such an issue, and here we are worrying about bells. Bells was never a problem in this Legislature all the years I've been here, and the members opposite know it was never a problem when they sat in the opposition benches, Mr. Speaker.

The problem with the bell-ringing incident is the fact that for the first time in the history of this province we are amending the Constitution; the first time a constitutional amendment has ever come before this Legislature, and we have a government, Mr. Speaker, who didn't have a mandate from the people, who went against the wishes of over 80 percent of the people and told them we don't want this kind of legislation, we don't want this kind of policies and deals which you are making with the Franco-Manitoban Society. We don't want any part of it.

So what opportunity did we have, Mr. Speaker? What other vehicle did we have to use to halt this bad bad government in their desire to further this arrangement that they had made with the Franco-Manitoban Society when 80 percent of the people said they didn't want any part or parcel of it? Mr. Speaker, we used what vehicles were left to us in opposition, and there are not very many. We used the bells.

Is there anything wrong with using the bells when you have an arrogant government such as this? We see another example of it today when they wouldn't give me leave, Mr. Speaker, to adjourn this debate until tomorrow so that I could properly prepare myself and review the speech that was made in this House yesterday by the Honourable Member for Inkster.

We may as well have just thrown the rule book away, because once this precedent is set in this Legislature, regardless of what the opposition has to say, or regardless of what the opposition will offer to the rules of this House, this government is not going to listen to them. They are not. They don't want a consensus, Mr. Speaker; they've proved it again today.

They just want power. They are power hungry to take over the complete ruling of this House and rule you, Mr. Speaker, in a way, I dare say, that no Speaker in

this House will likely have ever been ruled before, because if they are going to go that far - not grant me leave and not accept the consensus from members of the House and the rules - can you imagine what kind of a Parliament that will be? I think it will be a dark day for Manitoba. I think it's an extremely regressive thing to happen in this House today.

When it came to the matter of changing our rules, and we are trying to find if we can't get a consensus with this government, this House Leader and this government says, you, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, will not have leave to speak tomorrow. You will not have leave. Now, what are they going to do if we ring the bells today on this issue? Are they going to say we're arrogant? Are they going to say you're a bad opposition? That we are not representing the wishes of the people; that we are not listening to the people; that I don't have people in Roblin constituency concerned about this rule? Well, Mr. Speaker, they don't care. Because of their tactics today, their big heavy-handed tactics, they don't care.

They are going to ram these changes in the rules through whether we like it or not, and the attitude of this Government House Leader today proved it to me, Mr. Speaker, and I regret it. I regret it very much. I think it's one of the most backward steps that this province has seen in many many years when elected members of this Legislature, which has historically gone on since Day One, sit down around the table and set their own rules. When they walk out of that rules meeting, Mr. Speaker, they have some kind of an agreement that they've lived by, and it's worked well.

Sure there's problems. There always will be problems. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter what type of a rule or a law that you draft or write, somebody, some genius will find a way or a methodology to get around that rule, or to abuse it.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely annoyed today. I am extremely unhappy because of what's going on in this room today by the tactics of this House Leader, by the arrogance of this government who, as I said earlier, are the worst government this province has ever seen. Mr. Speaker, they come on a simple little matter of changing our rules, and they will not allow a consensus from all members of the House. They say no; no, we are going to change that. The rules of this House from now on, Mr. Speaker, will be set by the Government of the Day.

Is that Parliament? No way, no way. That is not the way the British parliamentary system operates, Mr. Speaker. It never was, and I dare say it wouldn't work under this system because any government - what will happen if this House Leader brings in another resolution two weeks from now when we are bringing the labour legislation in, if he wants to change the rules again? We can't stop him; we have set the precedent by this resolution that's on the Order Paper today.

They now can change the rules by breaking this longstanding tradition of this province. They now can break the rules because they can go back in the Cabinet room and bring in a resolution and amend it to satisfy themselves and pass it. We can't stop them.

Is that democracy? Is that the kind of parliamentary system that we are going to practice in this province from now and henceforth after this resolution is debated further or after today because I guess, as I hear, there's no more leave.

The other thing that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, we haven't got one piece of legislation on the Order Paper. What is the big hurry about this rule change?

A MEMBER: Closure.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, sure, it's closure he's imposing today because he said he's not going to give anymore . . . What is the big hurry? We don't have any bills before us, not a one, not one piece of legislation. Why would it be? What have they cooked up in the back room there? Are they going to use that kind of muscle when they bring this in? Is it going to be bad legislation? Is it going to be legislation such as we had in their deal with the Franco-Manitoban Society, whereby 80 percent of the people in this province were opposed to it? Is that the kind of legislation that they are going to bring in?

Well, there must be something because never in this province before, Mr. Speaker, have we had a deal such as this where the Government of the Day sets the rules of the House. Never! It has always been established by a consensus amongst the members of the House.

Why would these wild-eyed socialists want that power, Mr. Speaker? Just let us think why. Give me one or two reasons. I think they need this power because they are scared about the legislation that they are going to bring if they ever bring it. I suspect that's one of the reasons that they want to change the rules, because they don't want to get into a debate again in this House like they did under the resolution dealing with language services in this province.

There has to be another reason. It's power! Power! They are hungry for power.

The third reason, Mr. Speaker, they are scared of the opposition. They are scared to stand up and debate in this House. We saw that all through the debates on the language issue, Mr. Speaker, where they put up one speaker and then we'd go for 20 speakers in a row. They either don't have the ability to debate or they're scared of the debate, Mr. Speaker, because it might expose some of their character — (Interjection) — well, it could be both. They could be classed as people who are not prepared to stand up and debate for what they think about.

So they are, Mr. Speaker, by this method, they are going to pass the rules by government power, great big heavy hand of government. 1984 - the first times the rules in this province will ever be set by government, 1984.

All the history of this province, it was always set by consensus, and we used to have four political parties here at one time. We had the Social Credit, we had the Liberals, we had the Tories and we had the NDP. Now you would think that would have been difficult to come up with a set of rules for this House. It was not difficult, Mr. Speaker, and we've had good rules. We've had good rules in this House, longstanding rules that everybody has respected and just because this government got themselves caught in a trap. Trudeau trapped them into this language issue. They got caught in the trap and now they're blaming everybody in the province and across Canada for the fiasco that they created in this province. So they say, we're going to blame the rules now, so we'll change the rules. Those

Tories over there that stood toe to toe on them in that debate and made them sit down and take notice because 80 percent of the people were against them, 80 percent of the people told them they don't have a mandate to bring those kind of changes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, once this rule change is over, they can bring anything in here and pass it. We can't stop them. We can't stop them. They can go against the wishes of the people again by this rule change. That is not Parliament, Mr. Speaker. That's muzzling the opposition. They have taken some of the rights away from the official opposition in this Legislature, which has never happened all the years that we've been in this Parliament.

Since Day One in this province, the opposition has never been muzzled like they're being muzzled under this resolution by this Government House Leader, who I don't think knows very much about Parliament. He came here from some place a few years ago and now he is the House Leader. He used to sit at the desk here.

I'll tell you, Manitoba may be better off if he would have stayed away from this province if he continues to make these kind of changes to our rules. This is not good for Parliament, it's not good for Manitoba and I think it's a very very regressive day and a dark day for our province.

Mr. Speaker, there no way in the world I can support this resolution.

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, and seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that debate be adjourned. Is that agreed?

Those in favour of the motion, please say aye. Those opposed to the motion, please say nay.

In my opinion, the ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

MR. H. ENNS: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Thanks a lot, Harry.

MR. H. ENNS: Oh, pardon me.

A MEMBER: Who won the vote?

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is shall the debate on the referral resolution be adjourned. Those in favour of the motion, please rise.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Blake, Brown, Doern, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats,

Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Ransom, Steen.

NAYS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak, Hemphill, Kostyra, Malinowski, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK, W. Romaine: Yeas, 19; Nays, 24.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly lost.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye on a point of order.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Premier. Had I voted, I would have voted for the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We've now seen Example No. 2 of complete confusion by this government regarding this particular new rule that this government wants to bring in.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier today that I would have been ready to speak today. I stood up to speak, Sir, on the basis that my colleague, the Member for Roblin, had said that he'd wanted the debate to stand; and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, the precedent in this House has usually been when a member says, stand, and I have no objection to anybody else speaking that it is usually allowed by consensus in this House that the debate would stand in the member's name and allow somebody else to speak. I indicated very quickly to you, Sir, that I wanted to speak, but the House Leader and his group over there, who have no regard for the parliamentary rules of this House, said no.

Mr. Speaker, I have never heard of that in the 16 years that I have been in the House — (Interjection) — Well, if it's 15, Mr. Speaker, I stand corrected. I do know that I came in with the Member for St. Johns and I would have expected after his years in this House that he wouldn't have tolerated what he saw today. He obviously has forgotten some of the principles he came in with.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I can say is that I wanted to wait to speak because after what happened today I wanted to do a little bit more research as to the reason why this government wouldn't allow a debate to stand in somebody else's name and let somebody speak; why we have a House Leader that has no regard for that type of attitude in the House of co-operation; but I don't have the chance to research it, so I can only say that the Government House Leader at the present time cannot operate a House unless he has the advantage of closure, unless he has the advantage of people behind him not giving leave, unless he has that type of advantage on his side. Mr. Speaker, that is not the sign of a Government House Leader, that's the sign of a little man. A little man, Mr. Speaker, not in size or stature, but just a little man. Mr. Speaker, that's very simply what it's all about.

He wouldn't even chose as we found out, Mr. Speaker, to try to operate this Legislature, when he became House Leader, in such a way that there might have been better harmony within this House, Sir, during January and February. He obviously was put in the position to do a job and he obviously, in my humble opinion, Sir, said that I can't do the job, Mr. Premier, unless I have closure, unless I have the right to rule, unless I have the right to control, unless I have the right to forget everything that he says he believes in.

Mr. Speaker, that's the way that this House Leader has operated this House. Mr. Speaker, the comments of the Member for Inkster yesterday - I just got the Hansard today myself - and I didn't have to read them because I was here for the first couple of minutes of his speech.

A MEMBER: You almost left.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I did start to leave and I listened to a couple of minutes and I've been sorry every since really. But, Mr. Speaker, I did hear him say one thing - he said, that his parents had taken him to the House of Commons in Ottawa. He said he was brought up to believe in the freedom of the parliamentary system. He said, Sir, that he had sat in Youth Parliaments and had every regard for the system, but he, like the present Government House Leader, has forgotten what he was taught. He has forgotten, Sir, that what he believed in was freedom, I guess, if that's what he was taught at the House of Commons and when he sat in Youth Parliaments.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Inkster when he was sitting in those parliaments, had had a House Leader that muzzled him, what would he have done. What would he have done if he'd had a House Leader operating within the parliamentary system that decided that the members of the opposition would have to be muzzled in order to get legislation through?

Mr. Speaker, we saw that kind of muzzling going on. The bell ringing that went on in this House at the beginning of this year was not because of the parliamentary system as we know it. It was because of a parliamentary system that the Government House Leader and this government chose to use by using closure.

Mr. Speaker, the whole rundown, a daily rundown of what happened in this House back in January and February, is all for the record. Mr. Speaker, I remember when we indicated to the House Leader that our Leader would speak on Friday. That was a Tuesday, I believe - maybe my own House Leader can correct me. On Tuesday or Wednesday, we indicated that our Leader would speak on Friday on Bill 115. We still had the resolution before us in the House. Members on the other side hadn't spoken. Members on this side hadn't spoken, because we wanted our Leader to speak and we indicated when he was speaking and this House Leader called closure. It was a Wednesday - thank you, my colleague informs me that it was a Wednesday. The colleague that informs me was the one that stood it. It wasn't allowed to be stood.

Again, we weren't allowed to stand something even when we indicated when our Leader would be speaking. The House Leader and this government calls closure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, is that really having a Government House Leader that compares with some of the Government House Leaders we've had in this House in my time? He can't even carry their shoes. In fact, he has no right to carry their shoes. Mr. Speaker, I assure you, this Government House Leader, who was supposed to know the rules - the Clerk in sheep's clothing, who was supposed to know all of the rules, steps in and says, I can run this House, but only by closure. The fact that he says, I can run this House - he doesn't say, I can come in and see that this House runs smoothly with co-operation, etc. No, he says, I can run this House with closure, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, putting a Speaker in the worst possible position that he could be in and the worst position I have ever seen a Speaker put in by a government or the House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, then our Leader spoke and he amended the bill. He said it should be read six months hence. We had some speakers on this side of the House - none of the members on the other side of the House wanted to speak. There were still speakers on this side. Members who are elected to this House to be heard, their constituents expected them to be heard, expected them to give their reasons why it should be read six months hence, because the bill obviously would have to be changed possibly because of the resolution. That was not accepted and the House Leader, again he decides to call closure, which he did, Sir. He called closure and that the bill would have to be voted on at 2 p.m. in the morning. Mr. Speaker, that's the type of House Leader and government that we have?

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have another situation where it has been explained we had closure on top of closure. There was a little gamesmanship played by the government and House Leader where he did all the research. Twice he put before you situations that were such that was just using his little rule book on the basis because it was a rule and not using and any common sense and you, Sir, made your decision which we respect in this House. Then the Minister of Resources moves that the question be put. That's closure on top of closure.

Mr. Speaker, these honourable gentlemen opposite keep talking about the fact that the government is there to govern and that they should be allowed to do so, and they really don't think there should be any obstruction whatsoever. Now they may say that's wrong. They may say that there is obstruction. They may say there's debate, but to put closure on a House and believe that it is the right thing to do is saying that they want to be able to govern this Legislature without having any input from the opposition whatsoever, or really does it matter if the opposition does have any input, because in the final analysis if they don't like what is going on, if they don't happen to like what the debate is, the same as the House Leader didn't like what debate was even after all members hadn't had the opportunity to speak, they just say, well, that's fine, we'll have closure.

You know, should a government be able to rule that way and I use the word "rule," because that's what this government is, they're rulers. They don't believe in governing, they believe in ruling. Mr. Speaker, that is very obvious. They, in many cases, tried to rule the House. On occasion - Mr. Speaker, I correct that, they did not try to rule the House when the NDP was in

government before, they had a House Leader that didn't believe in that. They did try to rule with their legislation and rule the people, but Mr. Green when he was the House Leader on the government side, during the NDP years in the Schreyer Government, never once would walk in and have discussion with Mr. Jorgensen, with our House Leader, and say that I'm going to close off debate. I'm going to close off debate, Mr. Speaker. Never once did he say that somebody couldn't speak.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: He stopped the bells once.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface says he closed off the bells. He closed them off after a vote was called and all members in the House who wanted to speak could speak. He just said the vote would be taken at such-and-such a time; he didn't stop anybody from speaking. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface, who's been here longer than most of us, ought to be downright ashamed of the fact that he agrees with the Government House Leader at the present time. As far as I'm concerned, he has lost his principles also.

Mr. Speaker, anybody that could agree with somebody who thought that he'd learned freedom in his parliamentary system when he was sitting in Boys' Parliaments, as he said he was, has certainly forgotten what he learned in those Boys' Parliaments, because he would have been the first one to shout his head off if he had ever been muzzled the way this side of the House has been muzzled by this present House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the House Leader to read Hansard. He didn't have the fortitude to stay and listen, so let him read Hansard. If he wants to read Hansard, he can also read the record from the day the debate started, right through as to when he called closure, when there were people in this House who hadn't spoken and he called closure. On two occasions they hadn't spoken when he called closure.

Mr. Speaker, I've said it before, that proves that this House Leader cannot operate without closure. Mr. Speaker, I heard him say every one of them spoke three times - he's going back to July. Are you telling me every one of them spoke three times after my leader put through the amendment for the six-month hoist? No, we didn't speak three times on that amendment, and I'll repeat it, now that he's here. We told him, on Wednesday that our leader would speak on Friday and we could have spoken on the resolution.

There were members on their side that hadn't spoken, and he pulled closure. He pulled closure on those days. It's very simple, Mr. Speaker, the record is very clear. All you have to do is research it and, as I say, this leader, this House Leader, cannot operate unless he has closure.

Mr. Speaker, the 15-minute bell-ringing rule that's coming in, I can just see it happening. The bells will start to ring and the Speaker will have probably five minutes to make a decision because this government will be wondering where their members are. It will take them 10 minutes to find out where everybody is and the Speaker is then going to have to decide in five or 10 minutes whether the bells should ring longer. That decision has to be made in 15 minutes. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not right. It's not only not right, it's stupid, it's just plain stupid.

The Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is going to have to have in his hands a list of those members or Ministers that are away and the reasons why. When the Minister leaves, he'll have to report to the Speaker and say I have left for this reason and I'm in such and such, Ottawa for this reason, and if the bells ring that's where I am.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if he doesn't have that sort of a record, can this genius, this Little Boy Blue faunterly over here, explain to the Speaker in 15 minutes all of these reasons? Can he walk up and say that the Premier's in Germany and he's in Germany for such and such a reason on government business? Can he say the Minister of Finance is away and in Germany for such and such on business? Can he add the members that are with them and can he say automatically that those are the reasons why these bells have to ring longer?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have read the rule and technically the Speaker will have to make the decision and he will have to make that decision in 15 minutes, in consultation with the Whips. Can the Whips explain it in 15 minutes and make the Speaker make a decision within one minute? Now that's the kind of silly stupidity we get from this House Leader.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said, it's not only right, it's stupid, it's just stupid. I can tell you that the House Leader obviously doesn't want to bring in legislation until he gets this through. That's maybe why he wouldn't stand it today. Could that be the reason? Could that be the reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this House Leader is afraid to bring legislation in this House until he has the 15-minute rule in place?

I assure you that I wouldn't doubt it, because that's his track record. The House Leader - and I am bad, Sir, at making comments across the House - but the House Leader is the worst chatterer across the House in the House.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Except for you.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No, I admit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he's saying except for me, I probably can be accused of offending the rules probably as much or more than anybody else, but he is the worst and he is the House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Only with you, Frank.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: And he says only with me. Let me tell you if he says only with me, Sir, I'm not proud of that, because I don't really know why I waste my time on him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just wanted to emphasize he's the worst offender in the House and he's the House Leader, and that's why the rest of them are so bad. That's why we have this patting of desks, like Thumper the rabbit. Every time somebody gets up to say something, that's why we have this clapping of hands and the cheering. You can just see the situation in caucus, during discussion of question period, now at a certain time, when I raise my hand, everybody claps or everybody thumps. Today we've got to do this or that. It's almost like a trained bunch of seals cheering section, no question about it. The Member for St.

Boniface knows that's the way it operates because he's been around a long time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the rules that have been brought before us for bell ringing are such that we should consider very carefully because they don't have consensus from the Rules Committee; and I've been here 16 years, as I was told, or 15 years as I was told, and I don't recall any rules being changed without a consensus. Let's just think about that being changed without consensus when we think about the House Leaders that we had before. I recall Mr. Green, Mr. Jorgenson, Mr. Mercier, Mr. Ransom, the Attorney-General. — (Interjection) — The Member for St. Boniface is adding some; I wasn't here at that time. I'm going over the ones that were here when I was here and the House Leader, I believe, Mr. Patrick, handled it for the Liberal Party at one time. Mr. Johnston from Portage la Prairie, at that time, was the House Leader or leader — (Interjection) — it's leader, thank you, I've been corrected, he was the leader. All of these gentlemen from different persuasion that I know that had different opinions on rules from time to time were able to sit down and come to a consensus. In fact, I don't believe there's been any Government House Leader in my time that has forced a rule change on this House. This House Leader, as I said, couldn't carry their shoes, nor does he deserve to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the attitude of no consensus is just another indication and it's just like typing it up in big, red neon lights that this Government House Leader cannot operate unless he has closure, or unless he has rules, or unless he has a majority that he forces upon people to put things through this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, that's disappointing, because he must have sat there when he was Deputy Clerk saying, if I ever had that job, boy would I hammer those guys.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: And does he ever.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: And the Member for St. Boniface says, "And does he ever." Let's have that on the record. The Member for St. Boniface once said before that he was - well we could look up in Hansard what he said about him before.

And the House Leader laughs about it. That's his attitude. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, if somebody stumbled down the main stairs of this building, the House Leader would laugh about it.

HON. A. ANSTETT: No, Frank.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No, Mr. Speaker, I assure you that my observation of him in this House, I know he does most of the chattering, my observation of him also is that he laughs at just about anything. So that really comes back to the point that he shouldn't be the House Leader in this House in a democratic system. He should still basically be in kindergarten and that's really where he should be with the other thumpers that we have over there on the other side.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have said we have no consensus in this House on this. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I heard the Member for Inkster say, is this relevant? Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking about the 15-minute time limit. — (Interjection) — Yes, I have, Mr. Speaker.

I heard the Member for Inkster say, I have, and I have. Mr. Speaker, I have no problems about talking about the Member for Inkster, because it's just rather disappointing that we have to have that kind of, as the previous Leader of the NDP Party, Mr. Paulley, would have said, that type of rabble around.

Mr. Speaker, the closure motions that we have before us - maybe I'd better correct that, the new bell-ringing motion or amendment on time limit on bells really makes us wonder why it's necessary at all. I don't personally have any hang-up about the fact that there could be a time limit on bells.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we put a time limit of three hours on the bells or two hours, possibly, I think we could have held probably about 99 percent of the votes that were held in this House in that time, in the two-hour time. I would say, Mr. Speaker, the odd occasion there might have been something longer and there should be if there's a caucus that wants to sit down and caucus and discuss something. But you see the House Leader doesn't believe that a caucus, when the bells ring, could go out and have any discussion. He doesn't believe in that. Now, I'm fully aware of what he thinks about last fall. Of course, he's the one we were voting against closure. But I would say that two hours in the 15 years I've been here, we would have had 99 percent of the votes and we would have been sitting in our caucus room having discussion as to what we may do or what we may not do, but he believes in muzzling the opposition. They shouldn't have the right, they wouldn't have the right to sit around and have discussion on what the vote is about. Mr. Speaker, I said two hours, three hours, half a day, and I don't think that it would have mattered all that much, Mr. Speaker.

So, you know, really what is being brought in is something that is completely unnecessary, absolutely unnecessary, because this House Leader and this government can't operate without some sort of closure and 15 minutes on the bells is closure. You may as well call it that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the opposition caucus hasn't got time to sit down and have any discussion when the bells ring, the Whips will have to explain to the Speaker within 15 minutes why they should ring longer, the Speaker has to make that decision, probably after the explanation is done, make the decision in five minutes, and then the Speaker makes the decision and he says that isn't close to being a form of closure. Every time he calls a vote, he calls closure or the government says, we won't let the matter stand. We're going to muzzle these gentlemen on the other side as happened today, as happened back in January when they wouldn't let the matter stand after our House Leader told them when our Leader was going to speak, wouldn't let it stand. He calls closure. So, Mr. Speaker, what is he presenting to us?

Mr. Speaker, then we have the situation, if there's a time limiting on the bells that can possibly be agreed to, and I don't know, I don't know whether it can or can't, because we've got a dictator on the other side or what I believe to be a dictator. I don't know whether

it can or it can't, but the fact of the matter is that he wants 15 minutes and it can be said used his majority in a committee to do it and now using his majority in the House and he wants it because he hasn't got the ability to operate a House any other way.

Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, I think we could get by with whatever time we decide on bell ringing, because I don't think it matters. It's never mattered for the 15 years I've been here. It doesn't matter now whether we have it or we don't have it. But I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, on constitutional issues, there should be no limit on bell ringing in this House. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I hear from the Minister of Agriculture, him saying how phoney it is. Get him to tell his constituents why he wants it. Is he going to bring in another constitutional change? Does he tell his constituents why he wants it? I will go up and ask his constituents why he wants it.

Mr. Speaker, I have watched the Minister of Agriculture, who came into this Legislature 15 years ago, the same time as the Member for St. Johns did, I've watched him ruin a political career that I thought was pretty good. He just wrecked himself in his own constituency with that kind of a statement. You see, he's not prepared to tell his constituents why he doesn't want to have a time limit on constitutional changes that cannot be changed by another Legislature, that cannot be changed only unless we go to the Federal Government, that cannot be changed unless we change it through the Canadian Charter. He wants to tell his constituents, Sir, — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, maybe my procedure is not completely right, but I can tell you that making constitutional changes is not done by the government, it has to go to Ottawa, so we can't change it in this Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want the Minister of Agriculture to tell his constituents why he doesn't want to have any bell ringing or why he doesn't want to have a time limit. I want the House Leader, with all his excuses that he has given on the television and everything, to tell us why he doesn't want to have a time limit on constitutional changes or a two-thirds majority or something. Mr. Speaker, I've heard him answer it, but I'll tell you why, because he knows that if he ever has another constitutional change, and I don't trust this government, they probably have another constitutional change - that he can't do it unless he has the 15-minute bell ringing.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Nonsense.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the House Leader says "nonsense." If that's nonsense, Mr. Speaker, if they don't want to put through another constitutional change, if it's nonsense, why? Why do they want it on constitutional changes? It's very simple. If it's not important, nonsense, doesn't matter, they say, why do they have it?

HON. B. URUSKI: It's responsibility.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has said something again; he said, "responsibility."

The responsibility of this Legislature, Sir, is to pass legislation designed in this House, passed in this House

and could be changed in this House, but when you pass legislation which is a change in the Constitution, which cannot be changed very easily or practically impossible by the elected members of this House, that's when the people of this province should be able to decide whether they want it or not.

When you change the Constitution of this province, you change it forever; you change it for us, our parents, our children and our grandchildren, and the Minister of Agriculture should remember that. When he puts that through, he better make darn sure that he has given every single opportunity for the people of this province to be heard; and, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province were heard on the last constitutional recommended change by this government and 78 percent of them said we don't want it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it's not important and nonsense, as they said from the other side of the House, why do they want it? They want to put through a constitutional change against 78 percent of the people of this province. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have heard from the dictating House Leader again that my argument was wrong and I have heard all his reasons, but I say to him the only reason he could possibly want this on constitutional changes is because they probably have one to put through.

They were stopped, not by the opposition side of the House, Sir. You have never seen anybody from this side of the House running around beating their chest saying we won. I'll tell you who won. — (Interjection) — Sir, you might have been listening, but you weren't here earlier when I said he would laugh at anything. But, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba won against a dictatorial House Leader, who couldn't run this House unless he had closure.

The people of Manitoba, if you want to put it in real terms that most people understand, finally beat City Hall. The people of Manitoba registered their complaints, etc., and they won; this government withdrew the legislation and the resolutions and what have you. You know they could have stayed here, the bells could have rung for a few more days, we weren't up to two weeks, which was their agreement, but what did they do? They came in and they withdrew it, because they knew the people of Manitoba would have probably gotten up in arms and thrown them out of the building bodily if they pushed that through the House. They knew it, the Minister of Agriculture knew it, his constituents knew it, and they all knew it, so they withdrew it.

Now what have they done? They've come back and said, now we'll put in a bell-ringing situation, or a time limit on the bells that says the next time we want to push something through over the people of Manitoba, we won't have any trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I know what the Minister of Agriculture believes the issue is. He's talking about Parliament getting their work done and what have you. How much work have we done? How many bills have we had this Session? What about all that falderal about holding up the business of the House in January or February? Where is the business of the House?

Mr. Speaker, that is the two-facedness of the House Leader. He continues to think in his smart aleck way that he is right. Well, let me tell you, the people of this province know this man now, they know his methods,

they know why he wants them, because he likes control and he likes to rule over people who basically have more principle than he has. They know him now and they will get rid of him in the next election, Sir.

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

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to spend a few moments on this issue because hearing what some of the honourable members opposite have said, and particularly the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek and the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell speaking this afternoon, one would have the impression that someone was muzzling the honourable members, especially the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell who has been in this Chamber longer than I have, and since when does one make his speech or be prepared to make his speech on the basis of whether he has received Hansard or not?

Mr. Speaker, this House only in the last - what is it - 30 years, 20 years that we've had Hansard - about 30 years. Prior to that, there was no Hansard, Mr. Speaker. Since when did anyone prevent the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell from making his speech because he didn't have Hansard?

Mr. Speaker, I know the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell only too well, that having a sheet of paper on what someone else has said in debate has never been an impediment for the Member for Roblin-Russell in making a speech. Never in my time. That has never prevented him from making a speech in this Assembly, Sir, and for him to get up and clearly attempt to chastise members opposite that somehow he was being denied an ability to speak, Mr. Speaker, it really doesn't wash. It is very weak and it really doesn't wash.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a continued impression put forward by the members opposite that somehow we would agree to a rule change with the exception of the constitutional amendment, that there should be no rule change if it comes to a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Speaker, what was the ringing of the bells in this Assembly about? It wasn't even on the constitutional amendment. We did not even have the bells ringing in this Chamber all the time. They were not on the constitutional amendment. There was no debate on a constitutional amendment when the bells started ringing. There was debate and that is the impression that is being left. The debate here is whether or not there should have been a limit to the debate. We were not even near the process of ringing the bells or making a decision on a constitutional amendment.

A MEMBER: That's stretching it pretty far, Billie. You're stretching it pretty far.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, what are the facts of the matter?

A MEMBER: Never heard of foresight, Billie?

HON. B. URUSKI: We were . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we rang the bells on whether or not we would even consider making a decision that the ringing of the bells would be limited.

If ever there was a case in parliamentary history in this province of the tail wagging the dog, this has been the case. This has been the case of the tail of the opposition wagging the dog of this Assembly, Sir. That's really where we're at. No Manitoban, no Canadian would want to have a group hijack Parliament, nobody, not even members opposite.

It's interesting, Sir, that you have an opposition now objecting to a rule change, limiting the ringing of the bells, when it was their own House Leader who said it wouldn't make any difference because as a House Leader he wouldn't allow the bells to ring on. Mr. Speaker, what sheer nonsense, what sheer hypocrisy of a group of individuals in this Chamber to now say, in terms of their overall stand, that they now say that there should be a limit on the bell ringing on all matters with the exception of a constitutional amendment. Since when should a Provincial Legislature, in making its recommendations to the Mother Parliament in this country, an opposition in the Provincial Legislature, have the authority to impede the work of this House of all members?

We are here as a collective, Sir. We are here elected by all the people of this province. To say that a group of individuals in this province have more rights than the sum of the total, Mr. Speaker, there is no logic to it. They would not agree to it. If they were in government, they would not agree to it and at least the House Leader of the Opposition Party, during his debate, said that he would not allow this to go on. You wouldn't allow it to go on, but where are they now on this issue? Now all of a sudden they want to be seen kicking and screaming because they have, Sir, created the impression that the work of this Legislature should be impeded by a minority. They want the work of this Legislature to be impeded by a minority, whenever they decide, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, if ever there was an erosion of this Assembly, it has been by the tactics that was employed by members opposite, and now to suggest that Parliament should not do its work and there should be no limiting of the bells. I have been in this House for a number of years, there was only one time I recall, in the mid-'70s, when the former Member for Inkster went to the opposition over the issue of bell ringing. I don't know what discussion was held. I really don't know; I wasn't there, but I tell you that the bell ringing didn't go on for very long. The vote was taken in this House.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's always a matter of all members' responsibility to see that the matters that are being put on the public record are reasonably accurate.

I want to assure the honourable member who has just spoken that the then Government House Leader did not come to the opposition to consult about the

stopping of the bell ringing. The bells were stopped. How they were stopped, Sir, I do not know, the former Speaker is in this Chamber. But I just want to put on the record that there was no consultation and there was no agreement from the Opposition of the Day that the bells should be stopped.

MR. SPEAKER: That was not a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, matters of history and interpretation of history vary as the colour of the suits that we wear in this House. They may change with the stripes that one has, whether it be blue or whether it be grey or whatever the colour of our suits, and history and the interpretation of history may vary just as much, Sir.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: We now have such great indignation from the members opposite about closure in this Assembly. I recall the former Member for Morris. I know the predecessor, Mr. Jorgenson, predecessor to the present Member for Morris, the former Minister of, I believe, either Government Services, I recall in Agriculture Estimates one evening that they had enough. They had enough of the opposition discussing the Estimates of the former Minister of Agriculture dealing with land sales, MACC land sales. What did they do, Sir? Boom, closure; the vote was taken and the job was done.

Now we have such great indignation by the members opposite that there was never closure and all of a sudden this Assembly is going into ruin because — (Interjection) — we want to limit the bells.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Sir, had there been a willingness of honourable members I think to recognize the authority of Parliament, but you see they had a political issue that was far stronger than they believed in the traditions of this House and that's what coloured their vision.

They believed that there was a much stronger political issue that could do them much more good than the belief in the traditions of this Assembly and that's why they went out and they decided after the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain spoke. I would venture to say that the phones must have kept ringing all weekend, that they could not support some of the measures of this government and this Assembly after the hearings in this province. It was politically expedient for honourable members to hijack this Assembly, and now to stand here and say, oh, Sir, somehow this Assembly is going into ruin, what shall we do because this government is ramrodding limits in this Assembly?

Sir, I have been told by many Manitobans, how can you allow a bunch such as that to prevent the workings of this Assembly? I have had many constituents tell me, how can you allow a bunch such as that to stop the workings of this House? There should be a vote, as should be conducted by all elected representatives, in this Chamber.

Even the House Leader of the Opposition agreed with that premise, he even said so. He said I wouldn't allow the bells to ring; I would call the vote. What is he doing with his honourable members now, Sir? Why is he dragging his feet and saying we want to stall, we want to stall this very motion.

Sir, we did not agree with what happened in Saskatchewan with our party colleagues in the Province in Saskatchewan just lately about the bell ringing. We didn't agree with them, but we believe in the right of Parliament and the right of the Legislative Assembly to make a decision.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. B. URUSKI: What are they doing, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we believe, on this side, that normally the rules of this Chamber and the tradition of this House would have been operated by consensus. It was clear from the actions of the honourable members opposite that that no longer works in this Chamber. That no longer works. They were prepared, by the hours and hours and days and days of bell ringing in this Chamber, to say that we don't agree, we no longer believe in the traditions of this Assembly because there was no rule. We're going to keep the bells ringing, because it was politically expedient.

The roof will fall in over their ears, Sir, the roof of this hijacking will slowly come crumbling down around them. They may have, Sir . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the walls will come crumbling down on the honourable members opposite. It is happening here and it won't be very long. The only mistakes that they probably - they rang them too long, Sir. The mistake that they made is they rang the bells too long and the people of Manitoba said enough is enough, that the bells should stop ringing in this Assembly.

In most provinces, Sir, in this country have had to resort, unfortunately so, but have had to resort - even the Parliament of Canada has had to resort to limits on bell ringing. Because obviously it was by tactics such as we had here, Sir, in this Assembly by members opposite that they had no consideration for tradition for the unwritten rules of this Assembly. They have no - talk about a group of people who talked about tradition on Parliament being eroded - Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a bunch such as the bunch opposite derogating, degradating the tradition of this Assembly. Never in my time in this House, Sir, has there ever been a catastrophe and a real shemuzzle created by the members opposite, Mr. Speaker. Clearly. I am very pleased that we are trying to deal with this question in as commonsense way as possible.

You know, I venture to say that deep down in the heart of the Member for Lakeside, the House Leader,

he is saying, gee, Uruski, get on with the job, we want to pass this thing because we've got to show the public that we are opposed to it. We just have to show them because we couldn't have had the bells ringing for all these weeks and months and now say we agree with the rule because it's coming in. I realize that, that he's saying that, but really in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside should get up and say, look, we know that we really denigrated this Chamber by our actions. It was really a case of the tail wagging the dog and we really shouldn't have gone that far, so we agree with the changes and let's get on with the job.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. If the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable Member for Inkster wish to hold a private debate, would they do so outside this Chamber.

In the meantime, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

A MEMBER: Kick them outside.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I believe that members opposite will want to get on with the job - because I have to say that and I say it again - they may have rang the bells and they did, they rang them just a little bit too long, and the whole scenario and their whole situation will come crumbling down around them. Only time will tell, Sir, how their actions will come to haunt them, because they will come to haunt them. This Chamber will be haunted by the actions of the honourable members opposite because of the way that they have held this Chamber to ransom, Sir, and let's get on with the job and make sure that Parliament in as reasonable a way - because I don't believe that the rules here are so harsh that they are inoperative.

Mr. Speaker, you see, there is a great difficulty for members opposite. They agree with the rule change, but now they're saying, while we agree with that - (Interjection) - No, there has not been one speech that said that they disagree. They disagree if it's for a constitutional amendment. It is for a constitutional amendment, so they say, yes, the rules are good, but and here's a case. Since when - (Interjection) - oh, the worst thing was created by yourself. You have to sleep in the mire that you created. You have to sleep in the mire that you created, Mr. Speaker. It is like the advice that our livestock specialists give to hog producers that if you put too many in a confined environment all the sort of the pecking order and the way the cleanliness of the hog goes all to hell. That's really what's happened. They congregated too much and the whole system got botched up, Sir. That's really how the Tories here in this Chamber, they just went a bit too far.

Well, Sir, we will see how the honourable members opposite will handle this situation. I know that they will want to deal with this question. - (Interjection) - Oh, no, the parliamentary expert, the Member for Charleswood, their former leader, no doubt, that he will have his - yes, he's certainly the greatest defender - he will come here and he will shed some light very soon, Sir, whenever he decides.

But there is, Sir, limits set in the House of Commons - 15 minutes respecting Votes and Supply and Throne Speech and Budget Debates - and they had to adopt a measure in 1982. I wonder why, Sir, that no longer than 15 minutes to summon a quorum.

In Alberta the rules are silent, Sir, an eight-minute limit is set by practice, in effect for a minimum of 10 years; a date of adoption is unknown, so they've had an unwritten limit of eight minutes in the last 10 years. Mr. Speaker, in British Columbia, not less than two minutes and not more than five minutes, adopted yet in 1930. In Manitoba the rules have been silent, Sir. New Brunswick, not more than five minutes, adopted in 1963. In Newfoundland, not more than 10 minutes, adopted in July of '79. The Northwest Territories, 15-minute limit applicable only when bells rung to summon a quorum, adopted in 1983. Nova Scotia, a reasonable length of time and in no event longer than one hour, adopted in 1980. Ontario, not more than five minutes in Private Members', not more than 10 minutes in committee, not more than 20 minutes standing and select committee, not more than 30 minutes for votes prearranged by all-party agreement; all above provisions adopted prior to May of 1980. Prince Edward Island, Mr. Speaker, also adopted the rule this year, not more than five minutes in 1984.

MR. C. MANNES: Adopted unanimously.

HON. B. URUSKI: The Honourable Member for Morris says adopted unanimously. Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information, probably some of my colleagues have. But you see, they have seen the nonsense that has been created in the Legislature and they moved because they saw the anarchy created by members opposite. They really saw what kind of a mishmash and a shemuzzle could be created by a minority in his Assembly. Because, notwithstanding a government, Ministers who are appointed by Executive Council, we are members also. We on this side, everyone of us, whether we are Executive Council or not, we are members of this Assembly. It only happens to be that some of us have had the privilege of serving as Her Majesty's representative and appointed to the Executive Council. But we are foremost, Sir, members of this Assembly and there's no way that a minority of members in this Assembly should rule this Assembly. It is clearly a case of the tail wagging the dog, Sir. Clearly a case of how — (Interjection) — Quebec, Sir, as I was speaking, the Speaker orders bells turned off when he considers they've rung for sufficient time. They've adopted that rule also in 1984.

In Saskatchewan, where we've had an incident just this year, the rules are silent. I venture to say, Sir, that the government there and the Assembly there will be attempting to deal with that question because we do not agree with hijacking Parliament by bell ringing for an indefinite period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the Yukon, not less than two, no more than five minutes. Those are the rules in this country. So we are in Manitoba, Sir, in fact in the minority in terms of what the rules are across this country and clearly the impressions left that we were somehow voting on a constitutional amendment are erroneous, Sir. They are totally erroneous because we weren't even

near that issue. We were voting on whether or not we should limit debate and the honourable members should not - and I will get up as any other member, will say to them, when they get up and say we want a limit on constitutional amendments, our vote in this Assembly was not on the constitutional amendment. It was whether or not we would put a motion to limit the debate. — (Interjection) — Absolutely.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, he doesn't even know what the issue is about, Mr. Speaker. A total distortion. Sir, I welcome the comments of the members opposite and let's get on with the business of this House and pass this rule change very quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: I wonder if the Minister would submit to a question.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether he, as a member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, when faced with an issue in the Legislature which 80 percent of the people in Manitoba were opposed to, whether or not he would employ the bell-ringing tactics to ensure that the people's will was achieved.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, my record in this Assembly is very clear. No, I believe that the right of the majority in this House has the right to rule. There is a time to govern, and there is a time when the people of this province will have their say on what is being debated in this Assembly and will be able to deal with the actions of the government. The people of this province will have an opportunity to deal with the actions of the opposition as well.

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

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to enter debate on the referral motion and, Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize the opportunity to speak on a referral motion would present itself quite as quickly again as it did, as I remember most of my speeches last summer were made on a referral motion.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but listen very carefully to the answer given by the Minister of Agriculture to the question from the Member for La Verendrye. He caught himself halfway through the answer when he said it's the responsibility of elected people in majority to rule, then he changed it to govern. I suppose that's the essence of the disagreement in part that we have facing us. Because, through the issue, when a government ignores 80 percent of the people, really obviously they believe they've got the divine right to rule and they can do what they want, when they want, in the manner they want to do it. That, Sir, is divine right to rule.

Whereas in my view, the right to govern is one that acknowledges what the vast majority of the citizens of the province want done and that's what this government did not do not last year to any degree. — (interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I've managed to speak for one

minute now before the Government House Leader feels compelled to jump in. He says is that the new theory of governing now, the populist theory? Well, Mr. Speaker, there are times, and last year was one of them, when you spring on an unsuspecting public a major item of which the Government of the Day was not mandated, did not come into power, having discussed at all during the election campaign.

Nowhere on their literature, nowhere whatsoever were we given an understanding by this government when they were in opposition that they were planning to expand the rights of a group of our people by way of constitutional change. So, Sir, when the Minister of Agriculture says what's happening now is the tail is wagging the dog, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when you have 80 percent of the people behind you, you are the dog. When the members opposite fail to understand that, then they're believing in the divine right to rule and not to govern. — (Interjection) — That's right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30, when this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have 37 minutes remaining.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RES. NO. 2 - WESTERN CANADIAN GRAIN PRICES

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, the Honourable Member for The Pas has 10 minutes remaining.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to once again have the opportunity to finish my comments on the resolution put forward by the Member for Roblin-Russell. There is no quarrel from this side about the importance of the grain industry, the farming industry, to the economy of Western Canada. Most of our members don't quarrel with it; all the members who understand don't quarrel with it.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that wheat is the single most important contributor to the well-being of the agricultural industry in Western Canada and we also recognize that grain accounts for 60 percent of Manitoba's farm cash receipts. We also recognize, Mr. Speaker, of the competition that western Canadian farmers have, the European countries and the United States of America. In any European countries the subsidies are three times as high as the subsidies that our western Canadian farmers receive. In the United States of America, which is quite often held up as the epitome of the free market system, farmers receive double the subsidies that the Canadian farmers receive.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we were so concerned over the loss of the Crow. It is unfortunate that the opposition did not recognize the long-term consequences of the Crow and didn't whole-heartedly support the resolution that was put forward last year in this House and they had to be really dragged into supporting us. The Member for Morris, who was one of the people on the committee who went around and listened to it, half-heartedly supported the Crow resolution and finally he was dragged into supporting it.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when the Conservatives were in opposition federally, they had

done a long-distance study of the Port of Churchill which is affected to a very great degree in this new rate that is being put forward. The Member for Lisgar put forward a report on Churchill without having gone anywhere near Churchill. The closest he got to it was Dauphin. He made a recommendation that Churchill was a luxury that we could not afford. The Member for Morris, who was a member of the committee studying the Crow, in his comments said we recognized that Churchill would become important 20 years down the line, that Churchill's time has not come yet and 20 years from now maybe Churchill would have a place in the transportation industry.

We recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there is a need to modernize the transportation industry in Western Canada, but I would argue with the notion put forward that the need is there because of our grain industry. I think there is a recognition that the coal, the potash and the sulfur industry will be going when the recession is completely recovered and a modern transportation system will be needed to transport these commodities. It is not because of the increased tonnage in the grain industry.

While I'm speaking on the Crow, I would like to mention briefly some of the gains that have been made in co-operation between the Manitoba Government and the Federal Government in the area of transportation. The recent ERDA Agreement, the signing of the transportation agreement, will put Churchill in a very competitive position, but we have to recognize that it is 1,000 miles closer to most of the European markets than the other ports of the West Coast or the St. Lawrence Seaway; and I believe that Churchill's time is not 20 years down the line, as the Member for Churchill mentioned, but it is now.

Recently there was a meeting of the Hudson Bay Route Association where there was a unanimous resolution passed, encouraging the people from all of Western Canada, including Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba to be using the Port of Churchill to a much greater degree.

I'm glad that the members of the Opposition recognize that the Member for Churchill is usually in the forefront and he's leading people, rather than being led by members of the Opposition.

What we are talking about is a cash shortage for the farmers in Western Canada at this time. We agree with the Member for Roblin-Russell and his resolution put forward that the farmers in Western Canada need more cash in their hands at this time. The Federal Government is not being consistent in their treatment of Western farmers because, on one hand they are saying that there will be \$300 million to \$400 million released from the Grain Stabilization Program, which would amount to about \$40 million for the Manitoba farmers, but at the same time they are reducing the initial payments for the farmers of Western Canada.

I don't think that they are being very consistent and we as a government should be pushing for them to release more of these funds to the farmers. It is there for the farmers funds so they should be releasing them to the farmers at this time.

I also agree with the Member for Roblin-Russell who says that the price for domestic wheat for domestic consumption should be raised. I agree with this because I believe that the farmers, to a degree, are subsidizing

the bread that the members of our society are consuming. Recently there was a reduction in the price of grain, but there was no reduction in the price of bread; so you can see that it affects the price of bread - it doesn't affect it to a very great degree - so I think that we should be raising the price of domestic grain that is consumed by our people and by the people of Canada and it wouldn't have that great an impact on the price of wheat to the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that the Member for Roblin-Russell has a legitimate resolution. We know that there is need for more funds in the farmers' hands at this time, but we do not believe that the Member for Roblin-Russell has gone far enough. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I want to move an amendment.

I move, seconded by the Member for Concordia, that the resolution be amended by adding thereto the following:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Canada be urged to make an initial interim payment from the Western Grain Stabilization Program in view of the financial difficulties being experienced by Western grain producers and the increase in freight rate cost scheduled for August 1st, 1984; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Canadian Wheat Board be commended for its excellent record in increasing the export wheat sales from 8.80 million tonnes in 1974-75 to 18.27 metric tonnes in 1982-83, thereby increasing Canada's share of the world wheat market from 13.7 percent to 17.1 percent and providing much needed cash to Manitoba farmers; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in light of the recent signing of the \$93 million Churchill sub-agreement between Manitoba and Canada, that this Legislature encourage the Canadian Wheat Board to maximize utilization of the Port of Churchill.

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

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if I could speak as to whether this is a valid amendment or not.

Mr. Speaker, reference is made in the amendment to the immediate pay out of the Western Grain Stabilization. To my knowledge, this House has already dealt with that resolution, has passed it unanimously and, as such, I question whether we can deal with it again, under the rules of our House.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the essence of the original resolution as brought forward by the Member for Roblin-Russell dwells very heavily upon specifically the production of wheat, also our position as an exporter into the world wheat market and, as such, I think that some of the further resolutions brought forward by the amendment are totally outside of the main intent of the original proposed resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure you and all members are aware, generally the rules with respect to amendments have been interpreted more broadly in Private Members' Hour than they are with respect

to government resolutions and other matters before the House, but nonetheless - and if the Member for Morris is insisting on a strict interpretation - I would suggest that this amendment certainly falls with the parameters of our rules respecting amendments.

I would point out, Sir, with respect to the question of a matter being raised a second time, the intent clearly, in the first RESOLVED portion of the proposed amendment, is to deal with an immediate pay out, which is a different request than was contained in the original resolution and is in response to a subsequent decision and announcement by the Federal Government.

So there has been a response to that original resolution, which I note was supported by members opposite, and we thank them for that, and this is in response to that and is a more definitive statement; but I grant it, it is on the same subject but I don't think our rules prohibit us addressing that subject on a response basis to the Federal Government.

Certainly, the next two RESOLVED portions deal very specifically with problems associated with the pricing of wheat and the marketing of wheat, which I think is the issue that the Member for Roblin-Russell wanted addressed in the resolution, and members opposite have been the first to say that the Port of Churchill's problems were marketing problems and that grain is not moving through there because sales are not taking place. If those sales aren't taking place, I don't need to debate, Mr. Speaker, the impact of those sales on domestic pricing and on initial prices.

So, Mr. Speaker, clearly, they are not only related but very directly related and, clearly, it is germane to debate the question of grain stabilization in response to the federal response to the resolution unanimously passed by this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: On the same point, Mr. Speaker, the resolution put forward by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, has a very clear and specific request:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Legislature recommend and urge the Government of Canada, the Canadian Wheat Board, to at least maintain existing grain prices and increase the initial domestic price of wheat.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is there to meet a specific need. There is a crisis developing on western grain farmers, particularly, with respect to wheat. Now it has to do with price. The subject of wheat and western agriculture is very broad, I appreciate, but this is the very specific intent of this resolution.

The amendment, in the first instance, deals with something which this House already dealt with with some dispatch. It's not a question of patting the Wheat Board on the back or acknowledging them for the sales or for their past performance; and, Mr. Speaker, it is not a question to deal with whether or not it's to the advantage of the overall transportation system or pat this government or the Federal Government on the back to the improvements that are being noted to or referred to with respect to the Port of Churchill.

There is a crisis of grain, the pricing, in the land; that's what the member's resolution refers to. We are

asking this Legislature to encourage the Federal Government, the Wheat Board, to maintain the existing price structure. For the members opposite, they may not be aware of it, but there was a very substantial decrease in initial payments announced just about a month ago, and that's what this resolution addresses itself to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the advice of honourable members on the point of order, but they should restrict their remarks to the point and not debate the issue.

Does anyone else wish to advise the Chair?

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa to the same point.

MR. D. BLAKE: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there appears to be some controversy over the resolution, if it would be helpful to call it 5:30, you could take it under advisement and bring in a ruling.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I listened very carefully to the advice of honourable members, and reading the proposed resolution and the amendment thereto proposed, it would seem that the resolution very much has to do with the price of grain.

Looking at the proposed resolution, it seems clear that paragraph one has to do with the price of grain, and I would therefore think it in order.

The second paragraph would have also to do with the price of grain and would therefore be in order.

The third paragraph has to do with the utilization of the Port of Churchill and, as such, its connection with the price of grain would be somewhat less firm. However, since it may well be argued that the use of Churchill would have a direct bearing on the price of grain, I would therefore rule the amendment in order.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I would like to have the opportunity of speaking on this resolution and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague, the Member for Roblin-Russell, for bringing in the proposed resolution; and, with respect to the amendments, I have no quarrel with the amendments that have been brought in.

However, after having said that, I believe that my colleague has brought in a specific request, an issue that comes up on an annual basis where the Wheat Board establishes an initial payment of grain to be paid to farmers and this is really the main question that is of concern to farmers today.

With respect to wheat, it's been said by those that have spoken on it before me that wheat is still king in this province, and I represent an area where wheat is still No. 1. We have many other grains that are grown there as well - rapeseed, oats, barley, rye, flax and what have you - but wheat is still No. 1 there.

I have served in the constituency as an agricultural representative for a number of years and I know the

importance of the grain production to farmers not only in my area but to farmers in Manitoba and farmers in Western Canada. Certainly, I don't recall, over the number of years that I have been involved in agriculture, the amount of pessimism that exists in the farm community today. Certainly, prices, input costs that go into agricultural production have been increasing on an annual basis for a number of years whether it be fertilizer, chemicals, farm machinery, labour costs or what have you. Those costs have been continually escalating and, at the same time, the amount of income that farmers are able to get from the sale of their grain has been remaining relatively constant.

Here this year, in 1984, we see a substantial reduction in the initial price of grains being paid to those people that are struggling to stay in business. We have seen a record number of bankruptcies in recent years, and that trend is still continuing. As a matter of fact, I would say in my own constituency it has never been more prominent than it is today, the number of farmers that are in very serious difficulty.

Although not many of them are declaring personal bankruptcy, they are in very serious financial troubles and they are trying to work out their problems with the financial institutions. Some are able to do that and able to keep on farming. Many are not able to come up with the necessary kind of funding to be able to keep on their farming operations.

So, Mr. Speaker, this resolution specifically requests that the Wheat Board at least maintain the initial price that has been in effect for some time. The farmers cannot continue to produce food for the nation at a reduced income, especially when they can't meet their obligations in their farming operation. So I know that many farmers in the Swan River area are under serious problems.

It's also been brought to our attention the problem of the farmers in the Riverton area. They have received some publicity where they require extra funding in order to get their crops in. I believe they had made a request to the Minister of Agriculture earlier this year and he wasn't able to see fit to provide them with the kind of assistance that they wanted, but I understand that the Mennonite Central Committee has offered to provide some limited assistance to the people of Riverton.

Those are only two examples that I've given you. I'm sure that there are many problems throughout Manitoba. We've heard of - as I indicated earlier - the number of bankruptcies that have gained national prominence or provincial prominence, at least, that the farm survival groups blockading roadways and what not to prevent bailiffs from removing farm machinery or assets from a number of farmers that have seen their lifetime savings or workings just dissipate overnight.

So this is a very major or basic kind of request that has been requested of the Wheat Board to maintain prices and we all know - this has been mentioned too, I believe - that farmers when they have the money, they certainly put it into circulation. When farmers are able to produce their crops and earn some profit, they are not long in spending it whether it be on machinery, consumer goods of one kind or another, but basically improving their farming operations generally. So, in recent years, the farmers have not been able to do this. They need this kind of extra effort to have the kind of money that will keep them in business.

it was interesting - I believe it was the Member for Roblin-Russell that indicated some statistics that had been provided by the Department of Agriculture - I think it was built around a 600-acre farm, where you need 37.6 bushels per acre to break even. Now, 37.6 acres is not a bad crop. As a matter of fact in the Swan Valley area, I believe it's fair to say that we have the highest average yields in the Province of Manitoba taking the rest of the province as an average, the yields in the Swan River area are about five bushels an acre of wheat higher than they are in the rest of the province.

I don't have those figures at my fingertips, but I believe that the long-term average of wheat production in the Swan Valley area is nearing the 37.6 bushels per acre. It may be slightly under that, but certainly in order to break even today, a farmer has to have almost a bumper crop. I know that last year's production in the Swan Valley area was a very disappointing one. Unlike other parts of the province, we did have good moisture conditions, but with the hot weather in August, excessive rainfall in other parts of the valley that is not well-drained; there was absolutely very disappointing crop production in 1983.

So we are entering this year, after having come through a very disappointing crop year last year, and this is a major responsibility for the lack of enthusiasm in the farming community and the fact that many farmers are suffering from lack of ready cash this year and having much difficulty in negotiating the kind of operating finances that they require from the various financial institutions that are available to them.

Of course, many of the financial institutions have been very cautious because of the number of bankruptcies that have been evident in recent years and this compounds the problem for farmers, to say the least.

Unfortunately, our farmers do have to compete against unfair competition and again this is not new information. I believe the Member for The Pas had indicated and members on this side have indicated the kinds of subsidies that are in place throughout agricultural countries of the world. Certainly, the kind of subsidies that are available to Manitoba farmers are nowhere near the kinds of subsidies that are evident in other countries, particularly to our neighbour immediately south where the kinds of subsidies available to farmers in the USA is considerable and so we are at a very serious disadvantage in competing in world markets.

The price of grain is below the cost of production to our farmers and so it's a very serious problem that we are faced with. Absolutely we need the kind of initial payment to be maintained that we've had, and even that is not asking for very much. I believe the initial price established for 1984 is somewhere in the neighbourhood - I think it was \$10 a ton below that of last year. Now this may not seem like a lot of money, but anything less than what we have been receiving in the past is an added burden to the farmers of this province. Certainly, I believe that anything that can be done by this Legislature to urge upon the Canadian Wheat Board to recognize the kind of serious problem that does exist in this country today, certainly I believe that you're not asking for a great deal.

I'd like to give credit, too, to my colleague, the agricultural critic, the Member for Arthur, who had

initiated a meeting of MLA's in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta to discuss the important issues facing farmers today. This is an area that was touched on and certainly it was an area where they came out, pressing for the Federal Government to release funding that is available through the Agricultural Stabilization Fund, almost a billion dollars, 900-and-some-odd million dollars that is available in that fund. I believe, although I haven't got a copy of the amendment to this resolution proposed by the Member for The Pas, I believe that that is part of it.

Now just to review what the amended resolution is now, the Member for Roblin-Russell basically says we need to maintain a higher initial price of wheat. Now it's being further resolved that the Wheat Board be commended for its excellent record of increasing export wheat sales - well, I think it's not getting to the crunch of the problem. Sure I don't mind giving credit to the Wheat Board, but the immediate problem right now is that farmers need more money in their pockets, and also the fact that it be further resolved that the night of the recent signing of the \$93 million Churchill sub-agreement between Manitoba and Canada that this Legislature encourage the Wheat board to maximize utilization of the Port of Churchill. Well, that's fine and dandy. That's an issue that is down the road a little ways and certainly I could support that kind of resolution and I'd like to see it as a separate resolution, but to cloud the kind of issue that is before us, it's a neat little package that was brought in here by my colleague from Roblin-Russell to request the Wheat Board to get the price, the initial price of grains, to a level where it would be more acceptable.

So, I find it difficult to support the amended resolution in the form that it is brought in, because it does muddy the waters somewhat and I would be reluctant to condemn the requests that are being made, but I feel that it would have served a better purpose to be brought in as a separate resolution where we could have dealt with that in a specific way.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to make these few remarks on this resolution. I believe that the resolution is timely.

I would urge again that the problem is a serious one. Farmers are in a difficult situation at this point in time and we are in the process of seeding the 1984 crop. The price has been reduced some \$10 on the tonne, on the initial price.

As I indicated, there are a record number of bankruptcies that we've come through the past few years. There are further bankruptcies that are pending. There are many farmers who are in very serious difficulty today and they're not sure that they can complete their operations for the current year, so, at this point, I cannot support the amended form of the resolution because I think it takes away from the intent of what my colleague wanted to achieve.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is introduced by the Member for Roblin and addressed by other members, who spoke subsequent to the introduction of the resolution, is one that I suppose

could be classified as a bit of a motherhood resolution because everyone wants to sympathize with the plight of people who are in trouble at any given moment, whether it would be in trouble because of a natural occurrence, such as a flood or perhaps an example would be the most recent storm that went through part of the province, things of that nature. So there is always a tendency to want to sympathize, for the moment, in order to appear to be addressing a problem, and often to be expedient, for reasons of a political nature, as opposed to trying to come to grips with a long-standing problem that is always there and that we must work on to bring about the necessary adjustments that have a long-term benefit. This is something that agriculture has been wrestling for for many many decades, I guess since this country was first developed, Mr. Speaker, and it's nothing new. We have been through these discussions many many times over the years of our history, so it's not difficult for me to, in principle, support was is being asked for in this resolve.

But I think I want to take some moments to dwell on some of the reasoning behind the result, because I think there isn't ample discussion on the reasoning for the resolve, and maybe we should direct some attention to removing some of those reasons as apart from just crying about the price of grain itself, which is important, but we must understand why the price of grain is not sufficient to cover the costs and to retire mortgage payments, if you like, and to generate a standard of living for people who are involved in the industry.

The member refers to the effects of high inflation and of course that is indeed a very important contributing factor to the price squeeze that is so apparent in agriculture today, but it's nothing new. We've had cost price squeeze debates since ever I recall having anything to do with agriculture. It comes and goes. It's a bit of a wave and it subsides and then it comes again like a tidal wave now and then, Mr. Speaker. So that too is not new, and we must address it because it has to do with a much larger policy area, because what we're implying when we refer to that is the need for some degree of stability in the economy. We don't want those high crests and then those big deep bottoms.

What we're talking about is some stability and to the extent that government policy can bring it about, it must be pursued. That's really what we should be addressing. So, let's talk about inflation as a contributing factor.

Inflation is a matter that has to be settled by way of national policy, by and large, and certainly provincial policy. It touches on price mechanisms in the marketplace and when they are excessive, they create inflation. It touches on monetary policy that will create inflation, isn't working in a certain fashion. Interest rates create inflation. High interest rates, if they're passed through the system as they are in many sectors, create the inflation that contributes to this problem and contributes to this problem because there is the inability to pass through the cost in this sector of the economy, and that's essentially the nub of the problem in agriculture, is that agriculture is subjected to world price fluctuations. We don't have pricing agreements that are tailor-made to follow the economic pushes and pulls, if you like, the demands of higher costs.

We are not able to transfer those onto the consuming public wherever that consuming public is in the world,

and especially when you're producing an export commodity, by and large, you indeed are at the mercy of the ability of the rest of the world to pay a certain value, and to the extent that you over-inflate that value at this end, you lose the ability to market the product.

So there is an element of being counterproductive in that sense, if you push your luck too high on the price side and force people to look for alternatives in terms of food supply, as opposed to what we are able to produce here on the prairies.

Interest rates are an international problem. Canada, as long as it's maintaining an open border, is logically tied to what happens in the United States if it wants to maintain a certain relationship with respect to the value of its currency. That has been a preoccupation of the Bank of Canada and the Government of Canada under any regime that has had the authority and power at Ottawa. Whether it be Tory or Liberal, it has made no difference with respect to the monetary policy in that respect, and I don't know whether we have exhausted all of the avenues and levers of control there that would bring some reduction of penalty on the people of Canada and in particular on the people of the prairies, who are engaged in agricultural production. Perhaps maybe we have not been vigilant enough with respect to what we may have done or what we might be able to yet do in order to control that cost input in a way that would not rise further even bringing a reduction because, as it is now, it is too high.

No one can convince me that one can pay 12 or 13 or 14 percent in interest rates in an economy that has an inflation factor of 5 or 6 percent. I just don't believe in that relationship and I believe something has to be done about that and maybe it will require world leaders to come to grips with that. Perhaps that's the vehicle that will bring a change in that policy.

Now what is the Member for Roblin-Russell suggesting when he suggests that the Government of Canada and the Canadian Wheat Board should maintain the existing grain price and increase the initial domestic price? What are they really asking for? They're not quite clear, because the resolution is talking about maintaining a price structure for producers without recommending on how to bring that about, and you have a whole host of areas there that you can consider as a means of bringing that resolve about.

We have recently dealt with one of the means and that is the Western Canada Grain Stabilization Program. That is a vehicle that could bring this resolution into play if we want to use that vehicle. But the Member for Roblin, or others who have spoken, did not reveal to us what they have in mind when they say that the producer should have a higher or maintain the initial price for their wheat delivered to the country elevator.

Now we all agree with that and that's what I said was motherhood. Now how do we do it? Let's now find out how we should do it. Well, is the Member for Lakeside, or the Member for Swan River, or the Member for Morris, or the Member for Roblin introduced this motion recommending that there be an effort made to convince the National Treasury that they should inject X hundreds of millions of dollars into the Wheat Board pot in order that the Canadian Wheat Board could increase the initial payment, is that what they're saying? Because if that's what they're saying, what they are asking for is a direct subsidy from the Government of

Canada to the Canadian Wheat Board so that it may be passed on to the Canadian western grain producers by way of increased initial payments on delivery. That's really what that suggests.

I recall many arguments, especially Tories and Liberals, over many many years and especially at the federal level, that said you mustn't do that because that introduces inefficiencies into agriculture and people learn to depend on subsidies rather than sharpening their pencils, rather than sharpening up their management abilities. Those arguments, the Journals are full of those debates.

MR. H. ENNS: Those were good arguments, but these are difficult times.

HON. S. USKIW: The Member for Lakeside now says that those old arguments are no longer all that relevant, and I presume that's because of a sense of desperation as to where we are in this current depression economy, and that's really what it's all about.

Mr. Speaker, while supporting the resolution in principle, I want to take a few moments to talk about mechanisms because I alluded some weeks ago, in response to a question put from the other side to mechanisms, and that has to do with some old mechanisms that have been in place in this country for many many years. I refer to The Agricultural Stabilization Act.

I want to indicate to members opposite that Western Canada may have had a bit of a trick played on it by the powers that be in Eastern Canada with respect to the changes that were made, because I go back to the days when we were discussing pay outs from the Stabilization Fund when John Diefenbaker was Prime Minister, when Alvin Hamilton was Minister of Agriculture and in charge of the Wheat Board. I recall those discussions when we said let's have a pay out, out of the Stabilization Fund, and the Government of Canada, whether it be Conservative or Liberal, always said no, even though the fund provided a lot of discretionary power to the Minister to declare a pay out at any level, even beyond 100 percent of price that was in the marketplace over their five-year average period or whatever. That was a discretionary area for the Minister to undertake to deal with from time to time as the need arose. Every time that they made a pay out, it was always at a very low percentage of a given average period, never at a high percentage; but members will now want to be acquainted with what changed.

We have the Liberal Government introduce The Western Canada Grain Stabilization Act, which took Western Canada out of The Agricultural Products Stabilization Act, set Western Canada aside. They would now have their own formula. What did that formula require? It required that the producers of Western Canada would have to make a large contribution to the fund. — (Interjection) — And they did, that is correct, and they participated in a very large way, although it was voluntary initially. I think it still is, if I'm not mistaken. They participated in good measure. But we find now that we have Western Canada partially financing its own Stabilization Program, that the discretionary power the Government of Canada has

with respect to the rest of Canada, still under the old Agricultural Products Stabilization Act, is used in a much more generous fashion than it ever was before, where producers don't make one penny of contribution toward that fund or toward that program. Not one penny of contribution comes from eastern Canadian producers under the old Agricultural Products Stabilization Act. They are treated now much more generously, percentage wise, over the average price period that they utilize in making out their payments than the Canadian producers as a whole were treated when all of Canada came under that act. So what does that say, Mr. Speaker? It suggests that there is a little more political clout in Quebec and Ontario and a lot less in Western Canada. So we can convince the western Canadians to help finance their own insurance program and the Government of Canada will continue to pay the full shot for the same kind of insurance program for eastern Canadians. That's really what happened.

Now, that's what we must address and we must address it, Mr. Speaker, as a mechanism in dealing with the way in which producers get more money through the Canadian Wheat Board or through another form of sales mechanism we have in the prairie area. That's the mechanism that must be addressed. That is not something that should be addressed in a partisan way. I don't think that's a partisan issue. I think that Conservatives feel strongly about the way in which there's a double standard in Canada over many areas and this is one of them. The New Democrats feel strongly about that. I think Liberals in Western Canada feel strongly about that.

A MEMBER: All two of them.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, all two of them my colleague suggests, so that there is room for a consensus of western Canadians on that issue. Mr. Speaker, that is the way and in the spirit through which I wish to support this motion. We've put the principle of need for cash on the table and you must be prepared to bring about some means of understanding on how to do it financially. That's really what we're coming down to.

I want to take a few moments to talk about the amendment, Mr. Speaker, because the members opposite are somewhat nervous - for whatever reason I'm not yet aware - over the three paragraphs that are attached to their motion. Let's bear in mind the context in which I am introducing my contribution to this debate, that is, that there is no room for partisanship on these issues in Western Canada. That's why I think it's healthy for us to tie together a resolve. We tied together a resolve and I want to correct the Member for The Pas to some degree. A year ago when we arrived at a consensus on the Crow issue, that was indeed almost a benchmark on that issue. It was a benchmark on that issue in this province because we've had many divisions of opinion on that issue for many many years. But somehow last year, because there was a willingness on both sides that we must put a unified front together vis-a-vis the Government of Canada, we agreed on a common position on a wording that was acceptable to all of us.

So I think that was a most positive way of handling this kind of an issue. I suggest that there's nothing

wrong with attaching to your resolution, which is indeed a good resolution in principle, the amendment that was introduced by the Member for The Pas and hopefully have a unanimous position.

With respect to the freight costs that were mentioned in paragraph one of the amendment, I think we should remind ourselves that we gave up one hell of a lot a year ago when we gave up on the Crow. That was one of the major price stabilizing mechanisms in the grains industry of this country. That was a major concession given to prairie producers many years ago which we always wanted to protect because we always argue that the east had the protection of tariffs against imports from other countries. We had a quid pro quo and that was the Crow rate on freight. That was the sort of saw-off and there were many other components to that. — (Interjection) — Yes, my colleague says quid pro Crow, that's all right. So let's not forget that we gave up a major piece there, and because we did I believe that we should collectively try to at least extract from the Government of Canada as much financial support towards the stability of the Canadian agricultural industry as they are prepared to put forward toward the rest of Canadian agriculture. We should be vigilant on what those numbers are all the time, so that we can at least have some sense of equality of treatment between Eastern Canada and Western Canada. That's the direction we should do some research and some refinement in and propose very meaningful resolutions on.

With respect to the Wheat Board, yes, I think they've done a fairly good job, but not beyond criticism; and

I think it's nice to be able to say once in a while to one of our Crown agencies that they are indeed an important component of our system. I think they like to hear that once in a while, because they certainly hear the criticisms when something doesn't go right. So I think that's the right kind of window dressing to be built into this kind of a resolve.

With respect to the last point, the question of shipments to Churchill - I don't know whether it's true today, but I believe it is - but historically a bushel of grain shipped through Churchill yielded more money for the farmers of the prairies than a bushel of grain shipped through Vancouver or Thunder Bay. So what's wrong with maximizing the shipments through the Port of Churchill as part of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is up. I want to ask the members opposite to keep within the spirit of last year's resolve and let's put this thing together, both sides.

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

MR. H. ENNS: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that debate on this matter be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There can be no adjournment of a private member's resolution. Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed)

The time being 5:30, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).