



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 25B - 8:00 p.m., MONDAY, 14 MARCH, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, 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, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNESSE, 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, 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, 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

Monday, 14 March, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

ADJOURNED DEBATE - CROW RATE

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Member for Virden. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I briefly want to put several things on the record and make several observations with regard to the debate we've been having in the last, I guess, six months in this particular Legislature with regard to the Crow rate.

One of the interesting features when one is discussing the Crow is the peculiar situation in which Manitoba finds itself. I happen to represent a riding in Manitoba, which is east of the Red River, and for the members of the Legislature who don't realize what is happening east of the Red River, we are net importers of grains in that particular area. In other words, we have to import grains into our area; we do not grow enough to sustain the livestock, poultry, hog and dairy operations which we have there. So in that particular instance, in our area, we are unique in the Province of Manitoba because we would basically benefit if there were no eastern subsidies paid to eastern farmers or even if there wasn't any statutory rate.

The reason I mention that, Mr. Speaker, is that members opposite would have one believe that this particular issue is black or white, and it isn't. There are a lot of people that are involved in this particular discussion who want to ensure that the western farmer does not get the short end of the stick, when one is dealing with the so-called Pepin plan.

There are many farmers in my area who realize that by adopting the position as enunciated here today by the government, as well as by the amendments put forward by this particular party on this side, is that too many of the livestock people in my area would be adversely affected by that type of a resolution. But one has to realize that the farming population generally is supporting the wheat producers in this country and Western Canada and therefore would go along with the amended resolution the way it sits right now.

I raise this point, Mr. Speaker, again to reiterate that this issue is not totally black and white. There are some grey areas which the honourable members opposite for some reason don't want to admit. We people, we're are creatures of habit and all too often, Mr. Speaker, we do not want change. Now, I'm not a person who is advocating change for change sake, but there are times when old traditions, old established practices have to be questioned, and people have to look to see what is going to happen in the future and what will best benefit them in the years to come.

It reminds me somewhat of a story that someone told me not too long ago about how we very often put

blinkers on and we're totally against change and suddenly realize when we're confronted with something that the way we've done a certain thing is not necessarily always the best and has only evolved because of tradition.

I'm reminded of the story about the young married bride who was preparing a ham. She had bought a lovely big ham and was getting it ready to put it into the roaster. Her husband was watching her preparing it. She cuts one end of the ham off, then the other end and puts the two ends on top of the ham. Well, Mr. Speaker, her husband asked her why she does it that way, and she says, well, you know, my mother always did it that way and her hams just came out beautifully; when she did a roast ham it was just lovely, and that's the way I've always done it. The next time her young husband is over at his mother-in-law's place he asks his mother-in-law, why, when you prepare a ham, do you cut the one side off, then the other side and put the two ends on top of the ham? She says, you know, I really don't know, but my mother always did it that way and her hams came out just beautifully tender; they were always really good hams. So this young newlywed, he decides he is going to pursue the matter even further and he then asks the grandmother. Grandmother, your granddaughter, and your daughter both prepare their hams this way, why did you do it this way? Oh, she says, it was easy, I never had a roaster big enough to accommodate a whole ham.

This is the problem that many of us face when we're approaching different things and it's not necessarily applicable to this particular thing only. We do things because of habit and we are scared of change; and what this party has said all the way along, and we've been forthright in saying that, is that we are not adverse to listening to different proposals and then evaluating.

What we have said in the amendments to this resolution that we do not agree with the present Pepin plan and do not intend to support it. We are, however, concerned about a couple of other things that are involved in the grain handling industry, which we want included in this resolution. So, when members opposite the other day, when the Minister of Transportation introduced this resolution, Mr. Speaker, he called on all the Legislature to join hands and support this resolution which was passed unanimously in Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, I submit to you, that this party, with the exception of the few small amendments that have been put into this bill or into this resolution, really are doing precisely that, and if the government of the day intends, because of one clause being added to it; namely, the one really operative clause which really will give the Federal Government and give this committee that was going out the right to hear the farmers' concerns with regard to work stoppages at major ports which has been a serious cause of aggravation to the farming industry, to the grain industry, and the movement of grain in this country for many years; that is really the only operative clause

in this particular resolution that we have added. That's all.

We have said to the Government of the Day with this resolution, yes, we will go along with that resolution, we will give in to a certain amount of things that we're not quite happy with, with the resolution; but instead of destroying the resolution, we have added one little clause on there, which every member opposite who represents a rural constituency knows and has received phone calls that it is a major irritant to the farming population in the Province of Manitoba and across Western Canada.

I want to say to the members opposite that we believe on this side, we have gone the mile. We have gone ahead and presented a — (Interjection) — well, the member can laugh, but we have presented an amendment to this resolution which is identical to yours with the exception of the adding of one or two clauses, Mr. Speaker. We have not changed the whereases, and all I'm saying to the members opposite, they can't have it both ways; they can't bring in one resolution and not expect a little give and take on both sides.

So, if they feel, Mr. Speaker, if they want to get up and vote against our amendment, that's fine; but let the people of Manitoba know that the Progressive Conservative caucus was ready to go along with a resolution that was exactly the same as Saskatchewan with one major or minor difference, and that is to add on the . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: Which is it, major or minor?

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a sneaking suspicion that it is of a major difference to the members opposite and maybe minor over here, because you go out to your riding, Member for Springfield, and you say you're not for doing something about the problems of the work stoppages at the ports and you know that is a major issue out there. The Member for Springfield says he hasn't said that. That is why we have put this in the resolution, because it is part and parcel of the movement of grain in this province and it is part and parcel of the movement of grain in Western Canada and has been a source of irritation to every grain farmer in Western Canada for many years.

So all I'm saying to the members opposite . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to say clearly that I am ready to support the amended resolution as put forward. It is exactly the government's resolution with the exception of dealing with the problems of grain handling and the work stoppages of grain handling at the ports and that's all it's all about. The members opposite, if they're talking about dealing with this issue, let's deal with it. Let's vote on the resolution because the resolution, the way it is right now, every farmer in Western Canada, I'm sure, would buy the resolution the way it is right now.

I say to members opposite, if you're really looking for some nonpartisan resolution in this whole thing, here is one we can all support. If you want to say, no, it's our resolution, no changes to it and the opposition of the day doesn't support it, fine, so be it. But I want

to tell the members opposite that this particular resolution that's put before you is one that the farming community in Manitoba can live with and will accept — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, I say to members opposite that I think this is a resolution that after talking to my people in my constituency, dealing with people in our caucus who represent a major portion of the agricultural community, the grain community in this particular province, one has to realize that it is not now a resolution that cannot be supported by the farming population. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, if this Legislature doesn't accept the resolution in the present form and accept the amendment as put forward by the Member for Virden, that I feel, rather than a spirit of unanimity with regard to tackling this question, I seriously doubt whether the members opposite aren't really, in a blatant way, trying to make this a political issue, rather than trying to go ahead and develop a proper resolution for everybody. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, they say they introduced a Tory resolution from Saskatchewan. We have beefed that Tory resolution up a little bit and I want say to the Member for Thompson that if you sit down and talk to the farmers in Southern Manitoba, and I challenge him to do that, because those are my constituents, and, Mr. Speaker, I just spent the weekend talking to them.

And I say, in closing, this is a resolution amended by the Member for Virden, that I hope this House can adopt and it is a clear indication of the willingness of this side of the House to co-operate and send an unanimous resolution to Ottawa - to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker - dealing with the problems of the Crow, as well as other problems related to the movement of grain in this particular country.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to speak on the Crow Resolution.

It seems that we're going around in circles here. Certainly one year ago we were talking on the Crow Resolution and we had an opposition at that time, who was not prepared to take a position. It seems they haven't come very far since then, Mr. Speaker, as they are still giving about four or five different positions. When each one stands up they are all speaking differently.

We certainly had the Member for Arthur saying one thing, we had another one - the Member for Pembina and the Member for Morris - giving other positions and they were arguing with each other and not sure exactly what stand they should take. I think that they should have a caucus on that immediately, and maybe over the next year they can get a position.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear, good idea.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The Crow debate is — (Interjection) — this may be our last kick at the cat, you know, this year. The thoughts that we had last year here seem to have come to fruition. We predicted last year when we dealt with the Tyrchniewicz Study that the Crow was going to be a major problem, that the

increases could be three and four times by this year, and certainly, now when Pepin comes forward, we are in that situation.

We still have opposition waffling, as I said. They're still talking, saying the Crow may have to go, it maybe should go, in order to get an efficient transportation system, it has to go. But we on the government side, Mr. Speaker, are further ahead than we were last year because our resolve has deepened on this question. We are more certain of the problems now because we are faced with facts, not with speculation as we were last year. We are faced with the fact that Pepin has come up recommending as a result of the Gilson hearings, he's gone forward with those and he's even exaggerated those into a situation that is going to be even more difficult for the farmers of this province. So, we know what we're fighting this year, but the opposition I say, Mr. Speaker, is not in that position.

They can no longer say, wait for Gilson, wait for Pepin. What they have seen is that Gilson and Pepin look a lot like Tyrchniewicz said they would last year at this time. It was with that kind of urgency in mind, we knew that it was a very severe problem, with that kind of urgency in mind we introduced the resolution that we did introduce here a couple of weeks ago.

We introduced a resolution that transcends political posturing and political gain. We introduced a resolution that we felt could be supported by all sides of this House in the interests of the farmers of this province. We knew — (Interjection) — Oh, I'm not going to apologize to the honourable members, I think that resolution would deliver a strong message to Pepin that we are against those increases and we are against the Pepin plan and that is what we wanted to do at this point in time.

We wanted Saskatchewan and Manitoba to present a united front, an opposition to the Pepin plan, against the common enemy, and we were expecting, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition would throw aside their political ambitions and would instead move forward with us for the benefit of the farmers of this province. And we're seeing a little bit of difficulty on their part with that.

This is a major issue; it is not a joke. It is not something that the Member for La Verendrye - I'd like to point out that he is making a joke about something in comparison. It is not a joke; it is a very serious matter that could affect the future.

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

MR. R. BANMAN: Never did I make a joke of the particular situation. The member is putting words and attributing words to me which are - I used an analogy, Mr. Speaker, and that's exactly what I did.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, it sounded like a joke to me. We are accused of trying to embarrass the opposition. The Honourable Member for Arthur said the other day when he first stood up that really what we are trying to do with this resolution is we're trying

to embarrass them. I can't see how we could have been trying to embarrass them with it when it was a resolution that was introduced in the Tory Legislature in Saskatchewan.

They say, too, that it is not a made-in-Manitoba resolution. We don't give a made-in-Manitoba position and that, too, has shown to be a hollow criticism because when they introduced an amendment in this House, it did have no resemblance to a Manitoba position. They didn't make reference to the specialty crops or to the Churchill line. They made reference to something else that was designed not to get support in this House, but simply to try to embarrass.

We tried to stay away from that. We didn't mention some of our philosophical goals that we have, certainly, Mr. Speaker, that we have always maintained that the CPR - certainly if we're going to put money into it, we should get an equity position in it. We have said that, but we didn't put that in here to make it difficult for the opposition to support.

A MEMBER: Why didn't you?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Because we wanted a resolution that would be supported by all sides of this House, that's why we didn't.

MR. J. DOWNEY: You're an opportunist. You're an opportunist.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, we wanted to send a strong message to the Government of Canada that we were against Pepin's plan and that is what we have done.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. I was having some difficulty in hearing the Honourable Minister, perhaps members would like also to listen or perhaps continue their debate outside the House.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your ruling in that regard and I would like to see a House that is willing to obey the Rules of the House and certainly I have been having difficulty speaking. Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

What they have done, Mr. Speaker, is introduced a resolution in this House, an amendment to the resolution, that is designed to be unpalatable for us. They hope that they can try to make some political gain and try to embarrass us by coming forward with an amendment that is going to throw a can of worms into the process. I want them to know that we are prepared to deal with that issue. We realize that the labour-management differences that exist in the ports certainly are a problem for grain transportation in this country and we are prepared to deal with that, but that is not the question we're dealing with here. We're dealing with the Crow resolution and this is a Crow debate.

So we are not going to let, at this time, an amendment, a red herring, a blue herring amendment

to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, get in the way to muddy the waters as has been stated here. We are going to deal with the issues and present a united front to Pepin, to Trudeau and to the Federal Government. That's what we intend to do. Even though this amendment at this time, this resolution, does not present all of our goals either, we are willing to make that sacrifice to have a united front in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Then the Legislative Committee can be struck. It can go out and listen to the views of the farmers of this province; it can go out and hear the views of the farmers in Morris, in the Pembina constituency and the La Verendrye constituency. We can find out what they think and we can find out whether they agree with the kinds of statements that are made here by their members, Mr. Speaker. We are going to come up with a position that is going to be representative, a Manitoba position, "Made in Manitoba" position, a legislative position. It will be established by the Legislative Committee, and that's what we intend to do. But we have to move fast; we can't wait with this.

We can't wait because things are moving. The wheels are grinding in Ottawa and we don't have a great deal of time. We realize that the farmers of this province already sense a sense of urgency with regard to this resolution and with this issue. They know what's going to happen now. The writing is on the wall, and we want to go out, talk to them and get back a position where we can say to Pepin, this is where we want you to go. We have a position, a united front here in Manitoba.

So when the Member for Arthur asks our real position, again he is trying to create red herrings in this particular situation, Mr. Speaker. It is something that is not the point; what is the point now is that strong message to Ottawa. The Pepin plan has to be overturned; it has to be stopped. We can only do that if we are working together and that's what I am asking the members to do.

Let's just look back shortly, and I am not going to speak a great length of time here, Mr. Speaker. I would like to see a vote on this resolution, but I would like to just briefly look at the historic agreement which was the Crow rate. It was enshrined in legislation as a contract to provide for the efficient movement of grain in this country and at the same time to provide a reasonable rate of transportation for the grain producers of this province and in Western Canada. It has resulted in huge benefits to the CPR and CP Limited over the years, billions of dollars in concessions, direct subsidies in money, subsidies in land, subsidies in mineral rights, hopper cars, branch line rehabilitation and tax concessions. The subsidies have helped turn CP Limited into one of the giant conglomerates, multinational conglomerates in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

Where is their sense of priorities and sense of responsibility when we come into a situation now where the farmers are faced with a difficult time, where the rail lines need rebuilding, where are their priorities now? Now they are forsaking the farmers, forsaking that agreement and asking to have it renegotiated unilaterally on their side. They want more from the grain producers and grain accounts only for 13 percent, less than 20 percent certainly of the volume on the rail lines, and they want the grain producers of this province and the taxpayers to pay for those rehabilitation of those lines.

The railways, the grain producers, the grain companies, the federal Liberals and the federal Conservatives are all in there together, Mr. Speaker. They are involved in one of the most devious tricks ever to be perpetrated. It looks to be one of the most devious tricks that has ever been perpetrated on western farmers and maybe on any group in Canada, a planned devious trick and the media has fallen head over heels in line with this, Mr. Speaker. That is the difficult thing.

They have fallen head over heels and they have bought, hook, line and sinker, Pepin's arguments and his selected information that he gives to the people of this country. He presents only one side of the story. They have created an atmosphere where it is macho to stand up and say, the Crow must go. That's easy to say now, isn't it? You want change. The Member for La Verendrye talked about change, that we are against change. It's macho to say that the Crow has to go. It is not in style; it's not fashionable to say the Crow is in style any more. It's not fashionable any more. That is the toughest thing.

We are prepared to stand up and say the Crow must stay. It is fashionable; it is needed and we don't intend to see it go. We are not prepared at this time to write it off the way that the opposition members have written it off. The Member for Morris stated that he sees it's dying fast, as he says today. Well, he's written it off already and I am sure the people of his constituency know that as well.

The atmosphere has not been right to question the Federal Government's position, to question Snaveley's figures about constant costs that he attributes to the railways without being able to isolate those and identify those costs. No one is questioning those things because it is not the in-thing to do. You can't move grain with 1898 rates; that's a good enough argument. That is all they say, Mr. Speaker, 1898 freight rates cannot rebuild the railways. It seems to make sense on the surface; it seems to make sense until you look underneath at the facts.

The facts are that the railways need to be upgraded for much more than for the grain transportation in this country. Of course, we have to remember that 95 percent of Manitoba's grain is shipped through Thunder Bay and they want to upgrade the railways to the west coast, Mr. Speaker, and that's certainly not going to be a benefit. We're going to be paying for that upgrading for the coal, for sulfur, and for potash that has to go through the west coast. That's why it has to be upgraded; that's why it can't take the volume of traffic and it is not because of grain transportation.

You know, the real problem with this whole thing is you can't believe what the Federal Government is saying, and what Pepin is saying, because they have told different stories to different people, to different groups, different times, in different parts of this country.

They said they'll give us a billion dollars more in beef production in the west. We're going to get a billion dollars more in beef production. Then they go to the Quebec agricultural organizations, Mr. Speaker, and they tell them, even if western livestock production did increase as a result of the government's policy and this increase remains difficult to determine with accuracy, there is very little cause to fear that this western production would make significant inroads into markets

established by Quebec producers, and he says especially because of high west-east transportation costs. Rubbing the salt into the wound a little further, something that has been a sore point for westerners for many years - the high west-east transportation costs and he's going to say that. That's one of the reasons why the western farmers cannot compete with the eastern section and take away some of those eastern markets. — (Interjection) — Well, certainly we can't with those high transportation costs to the west.

He emphasizes the fact that he is willing to offer \$93 million extra to the agriculture sector in Quebec to offset any possible negative impact of changes to the Crow, changes that they might have to the eastern agriculture sector, and that he's going to monitor this situation closely and take immediate steps to correct it if western producers begin picking up any advantage in eastern markets. A billion dollars, that's the ultimate in trickery and hypocrisy, Mr Speaker.

We can look at the — (Interjection) — well, it seems like it's hypocritical to me, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the member used an unparliamentary word. I would wonder if he'd be prepared to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The expressions that the Honourable Minister used are in the allowed list of unparliamentary words and in the permitted list of parliamentary words. It would then seem difficult for the Chair to rule them unparliamentary. They are probably discourteous and the Honourable Minister might wish to reconsider them under that light.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, certainly, Mr. Speaker. It would seem that in describing it that I felt that they were hypocritical in nature, but certainly the term I used was one that has been identified and I appreciate your bringing it my attention and I'll withdraw the word "hypocrisy."

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I could just go on for — (Interjection) — The great pretenders, Mr. Speaker, yes.

What I would say is there is support for the position against the Pepin plan from all sides. We can look at the Pools' concerns and they've been raised many times in here. I think what worries me the most and one of the points that they have raised that I'm very pleased to see, and one of the things that worries me the most, about the Pepin proposal is the concept of variable rates and what it will do to branch line abandonments and so on.

I've had the experience of seeing the hearing and participating in a hearing for one of the branch lines up in the Parkland area, a Winnipegosis subdivision, in the past year, since the last debate on the Crow last year. I can tell you that because of the excellent organization put on by the people in that area, working

together with the member of Parliament in that area, myself as the MLA, and a number of other groups, we have put on a demonstration to the commissioners to let them know in no uncertain terms that we would not tolerate the abandonment of that line, Mr. Speaker.

I'm concerned that if it does continue, if variable rates are implemented, that we certainly will have a much weaker case to retain those branch lines. We feel that we may have retained the branch line in the Winnipegosis subdivision, but there's been no ruling on that one yet. I'm very concerned that we'll be faced with much more difficult situations in the near future with regard to that. Certainly variable or incentive rates would raise a great deal of difficulty for us. I'm very surprised to see the Member for Pembina actually in favour of incentive rates because he doesn't really realize what it's going to do to the branch lines and the small communities in this province. It's going to be devastating and certainly I, given the benefit of the doubt that it may have been a slip of the tongue when he wasn't in one of this thinking moods — (Interjection) — oh, well, maybe in that case he meant it, Mr. Speaker. He's going to have to clarify it and we hope that he will be able to clarify it. It's a difficult one to get out of after putting it on the record that way, and I hope that he's able to.

I think the other concern that I have, and it's raised by the Pool as well, is the fact that the limit, the 31.1 million tonnes, Mr. Speaker, that will really have an impact of compounding the increases that could be felt by the farmers in regard to their transportation costs. I think that the example that they use in their pamphlet is that a 10 percent increase in volume would lead to a 51 percent increase in the costs borne by the individual producers on average. So that is the difficult one that we have to highlight here and certainly one of the reasons why we cannot support anything close to what Pepin has put into his proposal.

I would think that the opposition would be very eager to support the matter of equal rates for equal distance. In the watered-down version that they give us about distance related in their amendment certainly is not what the urban municipalities, for example, have called on.

Last November, they passed a resolution at the urban municipalities, RESOLVED that the urban Manitoba municipalities support the present Crow rate with its guarantee of equal rate for equal distance and its fixed rate for the farmer. I wonder where they are now when it comes to working with the municipalities. They refer to that group quite frequently as a group that we should be listening to and we should be heeding their advice. I wonder if they're heeding the advice that was put specifically in that resolution last November - equal rates for equal distance, which is not the real substance of their particular amendment that we got this afternoon when they talk about distance related. It's a little bit of a watered-down version of it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You don't know what you're talking about.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Now, I will say too that the only group in this country, Mr. Speaker, that has had the courage to stand up to Pepin, to see through what he

is planning, is the National Farmers Union and Roy Atkinson who have been willing to stand up in a difficult time to stand alone and say, we know what you are trying to do to the western farmers and we are not going to have a part of it. The Pool tried to work with them, Mr. Speaker, tried to work with Pepin. They went out and thought that they could have a part, a say in what was happening; they found out that they had been led down the garden path now and they realize that Pepin was taking them for a ride in the smooth way that he's able to do, but the NFU did not. The National Farmers Union was prepared to stand up and to stay away from the plans that were put forward by Pepin and not to get involved in that pork-barrelling.

I want to quote from an individual, Mr. Speaker, just briefly to show the support, an individual, John Potoski who was the Reeve of the R.M. of Dauphin, for many years and he wrote a letter just the other day and he said, "Please take notice that I am strongly opposed to the changes on the Crow as proposed by the Honourable Jean-Luc Pepin. There is too much said on the Crow rate on moving grain but very little or nothing is being mentioned about the benefits derived by the railways on the concessions given to the railways by the government in lieu of the Crow. There's a great deal of merit on the proposal put forth by the NDP Federal-Provincial parties on the Crow question. Wishing you every success on save the Crow. Sincerely John Potoski." I read that into the record, Mr. Speaker.

I want to applaud him, because he has been a long-time hard worker for this country and for our communities in the parkland region and he has the background and the experience to know what the history is with regard to that, Mr. Speaker. Now he is able to put forward a position that we can put on the record in here and I'm pleased to see that. — (Interjection) — Mr. Potoski is not a political hack at all; he is not known as a New Democratic supporter, Mr. Speaker.

I want to just mention something else that concerns me very greatly and that is the fact that the contributions of public money that would be made through the Pepin plan are being portrayed as generous subsidies to prairie farmers and I'm concerned that this portrayal, Mr. Speaker, may cause resentment among Canadian taxpayers. Certainly it will towards prairie farmers, a resentment which is undeserved and ought to be directed more directly to the real source of the problem, that is the CPR and the Federal Government. I'm concerned that will result in resentment towards the prairie farmers which is something that they don't need and it certainly is not deserved at this particular time. That is one of the major concerns that I have with regard to the subsidies in the Pepin proposal as well.

So, I want to just briefly conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the Crow is not gone yet. It is not gone. It is not in a situation that the Member for Morris says, that we intend on this side to establish a new in thing on this side, Mr. Speaker. It is in to say, the Crow must stay. It may not sound as good as, the Crow must go, but it certainly is what has to be the case and we are going to continue to work towards that goal. We intend to make it relevant and fashionable again, Mr. Speaker. And remember, that if the Crow is dead, remember dead is forever. Just remember that and the decisions that are made now are going to cost the farmers and

the prairie producers a great deal over the next number of years and we have to be aware of that.

So, I would say, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be prepared to support the amendments that have been put forward because they are not in keeping with the spirit of this resolution that was introduced in this House and that was to get complete united opposition to Pepin. We are not going to put up with red herrings that are going to take away from the real meaning of opposing that plan by Pepin. So, I can say to you, we are not going to fall with that. We'll deal with that issue at another time. We're prepared to deal with it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on an important issue the second time in less than a week. — (Interjection) — I, Mr. Speaker, believe the issue as I said earlier, I think is of utmost importance to the agricultural community. However, we are through this process delaying getting into the specific Estimates of the Department of Agriculture in the Committee of Supply which I think are as well a pretty major priority, particularly in light of the fact that we are facing one of the toughest economic times for Manitoba farmers.

We are debating in an arena in which we have very little, if any jurisdiction or influence, other than the fact that we are going to be sending out a message from this particular arena and I really have to question the effectiveness of what the present government are proposing in their exercise, particularly, Mr. Speaker, when precisely one year ago, we debated a resolution in this arena where in fact the Government of the Province of Manitoba, the New Democratic Party said, we do not want to entertain any change, we want to maintain the status quo, we want to maintain the farmers union position, but we will go and have hearings throughout the province with the Department of Highways and Transportation, we'll spend taxpayers' money to listen to the farm community in a way in which was orchestrated - and remember this, Mr. Speaker, a year ago, they forgot about the opposition. It was totally in isolation. They forgot about the opposition.

They said, we will go as the NDP Government and party to the people of Manitoba and we don't care about the opposition. Now, they come cap in hand, Mr. Speaker, to the opposition saying, oh, won't you go hand-in-hand with us to stop Jean-Luc Pepin. They're saying to us, we want your support on a resolution that not we could develop, we can't develop a resolution that the people of Manitoba want, the people of Saskatchewan, the Government of Saskatchewan prepared it and now we'll present it to these people in Manitoba and that, Mr. Speaker, is what we're being asked to support today.

There isn't one original idea coming from the NDP Party of the Province of Manitoba. It's a bunch of political posturing, Mr. Speaker, and don't let them try and tell the farm community, the urban community or anybody else in the Province of Manitoba that it's anything but a bunch of political posturing and I am so fed up with it that tonight I will let them know precisely where they will end up because of their political

maneuvering and the lack of leadership that they are showing to the Province of Manitoba. — (Interjection)

Mr. Speaker, what could be called the Member for St. James or the Minister of the Resources Branch talks about, it might work at an auction sale. Let me tell you how the farm community in Manitoba works, Mr. Speaker, just so he's aware of it and it is pretty much to do with auctioneering and it is pretty much to do with basic trust and I can tell you right now, the farm community don't trust the Government of Manitoba and they don't trust the government in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, because they have very little reason to, because the NDP sitting in Manitoba, the NDP sitting in Ottawa gave us Pierre Elliot Trudeau through a non-confidence motion in the Budget presented by Joe Clark. That's why they don't trust the people in opposition.

But let us deal with where I come from, Mr. Speaker, in the profession — (Interjection) — I'm a farmer, but as well, I'm an auctioneer. Farmers work all their life, Mr. Speaker, to save the wealth that they have in their farm assets. Mr. Speaker, how do they dispose of those assets? They say to an individual that they trust, Mr. Speaker, an auctioneer, that we want you in one day to take our assets and offer them to the public; trusting me, the auctioneer, to negotiate those goods to all that community for the best dollar and look after their interests. Mr. Speaker, that's why there are so many of us sitting on this side of the House representing the rural community, rural Manitoba, because they trust us with their policy decision-making process and they believe in us. That's why we're here, and that's why we will continue to represent the farm community, and that's why we will be in the government after the next election, is because this government are bringing non-issues to this political arena, which is not even . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . which is not even — (Interjection) — That's right, Mr. Speaker. What have they saved? It's a non-issue, Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable members must be enjoying the honourable member's remarks and I'm having some difficulty in hearing over the noise.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I said it was a non-issue because a year ago they should have proven to themselves in the process that they set in place to go out and talk to Manitoba farmers wasn't even paid attention to by the farm communities. How many people went to their hearings, Mr. Speaker? How many people went to put their opposition forward at that time, Mr. Speaker? They can't even tell us because they're ashamed of it. Now, what are they saying to us, Mr. Speaker? Let's go through the process of hearings throughout Manitoba. Let's now ask the opposition because they represent the farm community, and because the opposition are going to be at those

hearings, there may be a few farmers show up, Mr. Speaker, to talk to those members of the Conservative Party who know what's going on. That's why they're going to go, Mr. Speaker; not because the NDP are doing some posturing to stop the Government at Ottawa.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, why is it a non-issue, particularly as it relates to this resolution? You know why it's a non-issue? Because the goldan government, Mr. Speaker, have said - two weeks ago at their convention, "We don't care what the farmers of Western Canada think. We as a New Democratic Party nationally, provincially - we believe that we should take that money that we're going to get and nationalize the CPR. We don't give a darn what the farmers think at that convention. We're going to take our position when Ed Broadbent's in town, when Allan Blakeney's in town, when the Barretts of B.C. are in town, and the Howard Pawley's are all standing there." That great socialist group of people are standing there saying, "We're going to posture to the people of Western Canada. We're going to take a position on the Crow rate. We're going to nationalize the CPR." Where are they at, Mr. Speaker, and have the audacity to come into this Legislature and ask us, as an opposition, to go to the farm community and ask them what they think, so they can develop a policy? Get out, Mr. Speaker, they aren't worthy of the positions that they hold. Mr. Speaker, they aren't worthy of the positions that they hold.

As well, Mr. Speaker, let's deal with another particular issue on this subject. I question, Mr. Speaker, and there are many here who will also ask the question. Can we, as a Legislative Assembly, allow the Agriculture Committee to leave this hall, to leave this arena, go to the farm community, and find out what they think of the Crow rate, when such subjects are going to be debated as The Farmlands Ownership Act, as all the issues they want to bring before this Legislature, do we have the legal authority to leave this Assembly?

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to leave this Assembly and leave this bunch of government people to put through legislation that's taking away the rights of Canadians to own Manitoba farmland. Is that the game we're up to, Mr. Speaker? Do they have the authority? Do they have the authority to take many effective members away from this Legislative Assembly to go to talk to the farm community on the Crow rate issue, which is totally out of our area of responsibility, totally out of our jurisdiction and go out, or is it window dressing? Are they just going to have the Agriculture Committee walk into the next room and say to the farmers, once again, come to Winnipeg and tell us why we should oppose what is happening in Ottawa."

Certainly, we oppose what is happening in Ottawa. All my colleagues said, we oppose the present, and that's the amendment, Mr. Speaker, the present proposed Pepin plan, because we don't like it. But I'll tell you this, Mr. Speaker, there's one addition that the farmers of this province and this country want us to add and we've added it. The Member for Dauphin said they wouldn't support it. They are not going to support, Mr. Speaker, that after we get a mechanism in place that's going to move the grains that are produced, they say it's a non-issue, that it isn't part of the debate. Well, we're now, Mr. Speaker, going to say if the labour can tie all that up, we can have the best mechanism in the world - we can tie all that up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Government Services on a point of order.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I did not say that it was a non-issue. I said that it was an important issue, that we would deal with in a different form. It was not related to this. I did not say that it was a non-issue.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister for that explanation. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I, as well, thank the member for his explanation, Mr. Speaker. The position I still take that they're in is that they're not going to support an amendment to this resolution that says to the farm community that they, as a government, don't believe they should correct the labour problems in the grain handling industry.

A MEMBER: No, he didn't say that.

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, he didn't say it, but he implied it, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: He doesn't want to talk to the farmers about it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: He implied that we can deal with this whole Crow debate, we can get the best transportation system available to the farm community, and if a few people want to strike at Thunder Bay, or at Vancouver, then in fact, we are held as a farm community in jeopardy, or in a position of unable to deliver our commodities because of that group, and they said, "We will deal with it at another time."

When, Mr. Speaker, are they going to introduce a resolution that deals with it then? When are they going to have the hearings in the farm community so that we, as legislators, can carry out our responsibility in this Chamber, go out, and as the resolution says, meet with the farm community, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you this. If they go out to the farm community and don't deal with the labour issue and the grain handling transportation system, then they might as well stay right where they're at, because they aren't going to deal with the real issues that are facing them today.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. James indicates that I would rather protect the CPR. Well, I'll tell him that is totally false. That is totally false, Mr. Speaker, because I don't believe that any group in society should get different treatment than anyone else. Do the members opposite agree with that? The man with all the mouth over there, the Minister of Natural Resources, does he agree with that, that everybody in society should be treated equally? You know, if he subscribes to that — (Interjection) — he says including the CPR.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that government's responsibility is to treat people equally in society. Give them equal ground rules and opportunity, but don't try and legislate them back to that equal ground rule, Mr. Speaker. You know, I believe - and I'll stand here in

front of all my colleagues and in front of this group of so-called government people - and I believe that the farm community, first of all, should be given a fairer return on their investment for the efforts that they put into the production of grain, livestock and their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support that and I think that should be our No. 1 priority. That, Mr. Speaker, is why I think we should be debating that and staying here and dealing with the Department of Agriculture Estimates, not dealing with an issue that we haven't got any direct control over. We should be dealing with the direct income of the farm community today.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, there were 30 farmers in to see the Minister of Agriculture. Why were they in to see the Minister of Agriculture? It wasn't dealing with the Crow rate, Mr. Speaker. It's because they are under severe economic strain from the banking community, because the initial grain prices and the money they're getting for their commodities are too low, because of the gas tax, Mr. Speaker, which has been imposed by the Federal and Provincial Governments over the last few years and the inflationary costs and the interest costs have put them into a bankruptcy situation, Mr. Speaker, and that's what we should be debating, Mr. Speaker, not the Crow rate.

We should be dealing with the Department of Agriculture Estimates, not this phoney-baloney of politically posturing to the rest of Canada, saying, we want to preserve something that has already flown the coop, Mr. Speaker. Don't let them give me that political garbage that they've been handing out in the last few days because that's all it is, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Dauphin makes me disgusted because he is such an impossible representative of a farm community, Mr. Speaker. You know, he sits here and he says, why delay the debate?

You know, it's interesting, we introduced an amendment and I challenge the Minister of Labour to stand up and say why she cannot support our legislation or our proposed amendment to this resolution. I made a slip of the tongue, but I'll correct it, can she stand up and oppose directly, as the Minister of Labour, or does she support it? She's been very silent. You know, any Minister of Labour in the Province of Manitoba who has the number of people working in the grain industry in this province or related railroad industry should stand up and say, the Tories are wrong, we're right. Why doesn't she do it? I haven't heard her say a word in the Crow rate debate, Mr. Speaker, and I can't understand why. Well, I would hope she does stand up and make her thoughts known.

You know, the Treasury Bench have been very silent on this whole issue. On a matter of extreme importance I haven't heard from the front bench people. We've heard from the Minister of Housing, or the Minister of Government Services, all those heavy portfolios. We haven't heard from — (Interjection) — very few of the individuals who . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: We heard from a few erstwhile leaders, but not your leader. Where was he?

MR. D. ORCHARD: You kicked him out for four days.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the individual who suggested that he'd be better off climbing trees in North

Dakota than representing the people of St. James I think should pay attention to what is happening.

The priority item I have dealt with, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think this is a priority item, I don't think it's a priority item in the minds of farmers who are on the verge of losing their farms. What is a priority item is the low income they're getting and the high expenses of their farm operation. You know, what does it matter what the freight rates are, Mr. Speaker, if the farmers aren't there to produce the grain. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I'm concerned about and that's what we should be dealing with. We shouldn't be worrying about the issues that this government brings forward, because they've been so far out on their priority items that again it makes me somewhat upset.

Mr. Speaker, again the Member for Dauphin says, you know the only reason that we want to upgrade the railroads is because we want to export the potash from Saskatchewan and the coal from Western Canada. This is really an interesting situation and it really brought to mind, again, another failure of this government. Because if it hadn't have been for the New Democratic Party in the Province of Manitoba today, we'd have been able to export Manitoba potash, Mr. Speaker. We'd have been able to export Manitoba potash, Mr. Speaker, but because of their failure and their economic policies, their economic policies have forced out the development of our natural resources, our resources in this province and we, too, could have participated in the movement of potash out of Western Canada.

But it's that kind of narrow vision, that kind of inability to really have any imagination to develop this province to make it extend to its fullest potential so that some of the weight, the taxes of this province are taken off the backs of the farmers and are carried by the potash industry, the hydro-electric generating system or whatever other natural resources or mineral resources we have, Mr. Speaker. But you see, they become so narrow-minded to say that we have to develop a rail system for the other provinces of Canada so their potash can move.

Mr. Speaker, we would move potash as well, but we have got a bunch of incompetent people who haven't got any vision over there other than to further tax those few people that are left in this province to the depths of where they'll hardly see the light of day after they are thrown out of the office that they now hold.

The Member for Dauphin again referred to the National Farmers Union as having the end-all and the best policy and at one point the Manitoba Pool supported them. Mr. Speaker, I have a hard time recalling at any point Manitoba Pool Elevators of which my colleague from Morris stood up and made reference to today, I have a hard time ever remembering in my mind or in this history of this province where the National Farmers Union were supported by Manitoba Pool Elevators in the Province of Manitoba on any policy, Mr. Speaker, let alone the one on the Crow rate or the changing of any transportation costs.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was the past President of Manitoba Pool Elevators, Jim Dennison, and I don't mind using his name because I consider him as a good friend - Jim Dennison was the individual who took the lead as President of Manitoba Pool and said, we have to get on with some work on the transportation industry and if it's looking at the Crow and negotiating a change,

then it has to be done, Mr. Speaker. That came from the President of Manitoba Pool Elevators. That didn't come from the farmers union or any association with the Manitoba Pool and the farmers union, that came from the President of Manitoba Pool Elevators, Mr. Speaker. So, don't let us sit here and have the Member for Dauphin say, that the National Farmers Union and the Manitoba Pool Elevators are part and parcel of the same thing and believe in the same policies. You know, that, Mr. Speaker, is totally an irresponsible statement.

A MEMBER: They're onside now.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, they're onside now.

Do the honourable members know that today just recently - there is a press report in today's paper - that Manitoba Pool, Alberta Wheat Pool and Saskatchewan Pool were a part of the preliminary drafting team on proposed changes to the Crow rate changes in Ottawa? No, Mr. Speaker, let's get down to true facts and times. They're using Manitoba Pool, they are using all the grain co-ops as basis for their support for the position they're taking. These co-operative farmer elevator organizations are down negotiating preliminary legislative changes. Where in the dickens are we, Mr. Speaker, in our history in this province?

I, somewhat, get overexercised when I am dealing with — (Interjection) — Pardon me, Landslide, I didn't quite hear you.

MR. S. ASHTON: Hyperventilated.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Is that French or English? Oh, yeah, I think so, I think you're overventilated all right.

Mr. Speaker, what we are proposing as a Progressive Conservative opposition, I think, are meaningful amendments. We are dealing with the labour issue. Remember this, the members of the government are going to have to vote down this distance related part of the amendment. Now they vote against something that I think they believe very strongly in. Mr. Speaker, they're voting against the same thing that they are really saying they want to do and that is oppose the present Pepin legislation because that's what we are saying we want to do. We want to vote against the present Pepin legislation; that's our proposal. We think, as my colleagues and as I stated the last chance I had to speak, that there are certain things we don't agree with, but at least we're man enough and woman enough to stand up in this Legislature and debate and put on the record what we think.

It's been pretty unified, not like the members of the New Democratic Party who went to their convention two weeks ago and say they want to nationalize the CPR, and then come to this House with a resolution saying we support the Saskatchewan Conservatives, but we want to add committee hearings that go to the farmers and tell us what position they want us to take.

Mr. Speaker, the smell of it from that opposition just bothers me to no end and I think they will pay the price. They will pay the price this year with their resolution. They will pay the price. They paid the price last year; they'll pay it this year and, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be afraid to bet any member opposite, if they

went into any public meeting with our resolution as we've presented an amendment to the resolution that they introduced, that we will win. We will win in rural Manitoba. If they had the legal power and the legislative ability to now take us, and they are going to take me and they're going to take my colleague, the Member for Pembina, and anybody who's interested in rural Manitoba on agricultural hearings, into the province at the same time the Legislative Assembly is sitting.

It really bothers me that we're going to have to leave this Assembly when the other important pieces of legislation, the Estimates of Agriculture and all the other Estimates of the province, Mr. Speaker, have to be brought before a committee of this House and all members. It really bothers me, Mr. Speaker, but you know I guess it shouldn't bother me because that has been their track record in everything they have done . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: When are you going to talk about the Crow, Jim?

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . They have done everything so inconsistently, Mr. Speaker, that nothing should surprise us. I would therefore say in concluding my remarks that the resolution as presented by the government as taken from the Saskatchewan Government, which is a Progressive Conservative Government - because they didn't have any ideas of their own, they adopted them - Mr. Speaker, to this Legislature as prepared by the Saskatchewan Government and as amended by the Progressive Conservative caucus, who truly I think have a feeling for the needs and the desires of rural Manitoba should be supported by the New Democratic Party of the province.

However, the Member for Dauphin said, they couldn't support the amendment. They can't support the amendment; he didn't give us any reasons why, Mr. Speaker. He said - Mr. Speaker, and I'll quote roughly what he said - we will deal with the one specific issue, that's the labour-related issue, we're assured as a farm community that the grain is going to be handled and that the system is in place; we'll deal with that in another issue. He didn't say anything about opposing the present Pepin plan which each and every one of my colleagues who spoke on addressed it specifically, addressed the fact that they did not want to cap on the 31 million tonnes of grain — (Interjection) — Well, if he said it, Mr. Speaker, then I will withdraw the statement I made. But I won't make it on the labour; I won't withdraw it on that. He didn't say anything about, Mr. Speaker, the inflationary costs which I addressed in my comments the other night, which each and every one of us addressed. They didn't address the Churchill issue, Mr. Speaker. Oh, the Member for Thompson's going to say, well, I did. I got a resolution, Mr. Speaker.

So they really haven't dealt with it in a specific way in which we have. I will go back again, Mr. Speaker, and say that we as a Progressive Conservative Party have no problem and have had no problem with keeping the No. 1 objective in mind and that's to improve all of Canada through the production and the movement of our agriculture commodity through a transportation system that works and works very effectively. — (Interjection) — Okay, we're pretty much on common

ground on that. We don't mind talking about or discussing, or changes to the Crow rate as long as the benefits are retained for the western Canadian farmers and as long as those benefits are put in the statutes of the House of Commons in Canada. We have no problems with that, Mr. Speaker.

You know what the Federal Government are going to do - I'm sure the Minister of Transport will pick up the Hansards from this Legislative Assembly and he will say, I'm sorry. The New Democratic Party are playing a big political game. The Conservative Party have in good faith, as well as the political parties in Saskatchewan and Alberta, put the interests of the farmer before the political interests of their party. This Government of Manitoba have demonstrated through their actions at their National Convention; they've demonstrated through the introduction of a Saskatchewan Government resolution in this House; they've demonstrated through the inability to support a labour related amendment to this resolution; and they've demonstrated not to support opposition to the present Pepin plan, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, their credibility not only is going to be challenged by the Federal Government, but more importantly is further going to be challenged by the constituents in rural Manitoba, by the constituents in urban Manitoba and the working relationship that I think is desirable to make the Manitoba economy healthy and grow, unlike what they believe should happen because their policies are doing the very reverse. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our proposals, particularly those in the speeches that have been presented, will in fact make this province better for the farm community, better for the urban community, and better for all of Canada, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I was quite prepared to sit and allow the Conservative Party to vote on this resolution. I got the distinct impression that was what the Member for Arthur wanted, and I was quite surprised after his speech, that isn't what the Conservative caucus wanted. Apparently they can't get their act together at all.

I was concerned, during the course of his speech, in that I felt we were hearing a lot of sound and fury signifying nothing, Mr. Speaker, and that was so true, because the Member for Arthur spent most of his time saying that the changes to the Crow rate are unimportant, that they aren't an important and legitimate issue for this Legislature to be discussing. He said that is entirely a non-issue.

We have the farm community of Western Canada realizing that it is the most critical issue facing the future of the farm community in Western Canada; and we have the former Minister of Agriculture in the Conservative Government of Manitoba saying that it is a non-issue, that we shouldn't be paying any attention to this at all when, in fact, we're finding that the Federal Government is quite prepared to bring in the legislated changes by June 30th. They are doing everything they can to speed up a process, whereby a draft bill will be reviewed, because it can't be formally introduced until

they bring in a new Throne Speech, but that draft bill will be reviewed as quickly as possible, so that they can speed up the process and bring about the changes to the Crow rate. Mr. Speaker, when you have the attitude of the Member for Arthur where he says, this isn't important, we shouldn't deal with it, he is acting in concert with the Federal Liberal Government to bring about these changes.

Then they have the audacity to talk about the NDP possibly doing things in concert with the Federal Liberals when, in fact, the actions speak louder than words, and 75 votes have been made with the Conservatives joining hands with the Federal Liberals and the Member for Arthur is acting in total concert with Pepin's plans. If you notice, he brought in every possible issue to divert attention away from this resolution. He didn't talk about what was in the resolution because he doesn't want to. He can't get off the fence on this issue because there are differences in that caucus - major, profound differences.

The people from the Swan River area and the Roblin area, they don't want the Crow rate changed. They don't want those changes. There are certain people in the southern parts of Manitoba who are quite prepared to sacrifice their fellow farmers in the northern part of Manitoba, quite prepared for their own particular interests, without getting any type of satisfactory arrangements in place; and I'm glad that my colleague, the Member for Dauphin, is prepared to stand up for the farmers of the Parklands area.

The farmers of that area will recognize who is defending their interests. They'll recognize that when he says this is a critical issue, they will listen. When the Member for Arthur says this is not an important issue, we shouldn't waste our time debating this, they will see the fallacy of that type of argument. He said, and he had an interesting type of argument, he said that the real problems facing farmers - and I agree with him in part with this - are high interest rates and monetarism. We have been saying that for about three years. It was his leader who went to Ronald Reagan's Convention and worshipped at the shrine of monetarism, and when . . .

A MEMBER: You fellows who gave the Marxists the money for their convention.

HON. W. PARASIUK: It's interesting, Mr. Speaker. Marxism has not brought about the problem that the North American economy faces right now, it's the monetarism of Ronald Reagan. It's the high interest rates. Go talk to the farmers and ask them if Marxist philosophy has brought about a situation where they can't meet their payments. Is that what's brought about the profit levels for the banks?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Does the Member for Arthur have a point of order?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, could the member tell me what he is debating in this particular speech that he's giving?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd be quite delighted to, in that the Member for Arthur ranted and raved

and then walked out of the House, having raised the whole matter that the Crow rate was not important. I'm trying to point out to the Member for Arthur that it is important, even though he thinks that it isn't important.

I'm also pointing out to the Member for Arthur that when he says high interest rates are a problem for farmers, he's correct. They're a long-term problem brought about by monetarism, which he has supported consistently, Mr. Speaker. He has supported the high interest rates; he has supported monetarism. He said that inflation is the biggest problem, and I'm responding in the course of debate to the matters that he put forward himself in the course of debate, which is again a parliamentary tradition, Mr. Speaker. He doesn't recognize the urgency of this situation that, by June 30th, the Federal Government wants to bring about these changes and get them passed and bully them through, Mr. Speaker, and he's prepared to accept that; he's prepared to go along with it.

You know, his speech today was a direct slap in the face to the Government of Premier Devine of Saskatchewan. It was the Saskatchewan Government that sat on the fence, by the way, for some time on the whole Crow rate issue, who finally called an emergency debate of the Legislature, brought the Legislature in, brought an emergency resolution in, and the two parties of that Legislature were quite prepared to act expeditiously and bring in that resolution.

A MEMBER: How long did it take them to pass?

HON. W. PARASIUK: It took them two days, two days. We were quite prepared to do that. — (Interjection) — No, I was quite prepared and he again left before I could make my comments clear to him and I think he might have some trouble hearing, or possibly tonight, understanding. But I pointed out that I was quite prepared . . .

A MEMBER: That's the problem he usually has.

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . to not stand and debate this issue, and let the vote be taken, and I am quite prepared to sit down if he will give me the guarantee right now that his caucus will allow us to vote on this issue - right now. Will he do that? I have asked him. I am quite prepared in the spirit of co-operation to do that. Is he prepared to let us have the vote right now?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Member for Roblin-Russell on a point of order.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the honourable member a question? Is the Honourable Minister denying me a right to speak on this resolution?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. W. PARASIUK: I don't want to deny you the right. I want you to tell me whether in fact you support what the Member for Pembina says, because if you support what the Member for Pembina says, you'll be cutting the throats of the farmers in your area, and I want to give you the opportunity to say that, if you want to say

that. But your colleague, the Member for Arthur, said that this was an unimportant issue.

A MEMBER: That's right.

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . that we shouldn't be wasting our time debating it and I said that if that was his position, I felt that other people felt otherwise; that I was quite prepared to sit down and let the former Minister of Agriculture for the Conservative caucus give me the assurance for the Conservative caucus that they were prepared to let this matter come to a vote, and that we could move on and vote on the general resolution. But that's not the case, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, there is dissension within that caucus; obviously, there is a tremendous difference of opinion; and, obviously, they don't know what to do so the way in which they thought that they might deal with the substantive aspects of this resolution is to divert attention away from it, not to deal with the question of whether, in fact, we would have a situation where we'd have a continuation of a statutory rate for grain. They brought in a fuzzy amendment, a fuzzy amendment that says - it doesn't express comprehensively the principle that grain freight rates shall continue to be distance-related. That to me is quite an open invitation, on their part, for a variable freight rate and we are totally opposed to that.

I'd like the Member for Roblin-Russell, if he's going to follow me, to get up and say that the Conservative caucus as a whole is completely and totally opposed to that.

We believe in equal rates for equal distance and the reason why we believe in that is that we want to make sure that the small rural communities of Manitoba and Western Canada have a chance to survive. We are doing that because we value the rural fabric and we are quite prepared to take that value, our definition of that value, into rural Manitoba and point out the impact of variable freight rate on their grain elevators, and on their grain handling system, and on their railway lines.

If they are going to then get up and defend the variable freight rate system which could bring about elevator closure, railway line closure, the destruction and disappearance of small towns, the tremendous onus put on the Provincial Treasury, these people who are concerned about the deficit, shifting the onus from the railways onto the provincial transportation system, and onto the backs of the farmers who'll be caught between a rock and a hard place then. We'll go out to the general public and debate those differences because this amendment that they put forward doesn't cover that issue clearly at all and our position is very clear on that, Mr. Speaker, and we haven't heard a clear articulation from that side at all.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Are the hearings to be debates?

HON. W. PARASIUK: So that's why that amendment isn't a worthwhile amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Are the hearings to be debates? Did I hear you say the hearings would be debates?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Now the interesting thing is that - and I hear the Member for Sturgeon Creek asking

me if the hearings are to be debates. No, we're quite prepared to go into the rural community on our own, we have many opportunities, and point out the differences between the position of the Member for Roblin-Russell, and that of the Member for Pembina if there are those differences.

We have never heard that clearly articulated by people on the other side. We've seen a lot of squirming, we've seen a lot of wiggling on their side, and we've seen a lot of posturing. That's why this first amendment that they make which has some relationship to the resolution as a whole isn't accepted by us. It muddies the water with respect to variable freight rates, we're against it. We believe, as I said before, in equal rates for equal distance. That's not what that amendment says. — (Interjection)—

Secondly, and this was the thing that is rather cute on the part of the Conservative caucus who doesn't want to deal with the Crow rate issue at all, they bring in the issue of labour management relations and labour management disputes.

I don't know if we have any contracts being negotiated right now. I don't know if we've got the threat of strike. I don't think that's going to happen at all.

What we do have is, possibly it's a sincere attempt on the part of the opposition, but an attempt to shift the whole debate away from the Crow rate issue which they say is "not important", onto another issue which we say - yes, that's an area of concern. We're quite prepared to debate it, we're quite prepared to discuss it. I can say that we as a caucus would be quite prepared to discuss a separate resolution on that. We're not saying that we want to avoid that issue. We're not saying that issue isn't important, we're not adopting the same debating style and tactics of the opposition. We say - yes, that's an important issue that does not relate to this resolution and it'll muddy the water with respect to the message that we are trying to take to Pepin.

Pepin has consistently said that he can divide and conquer, that there are so many different opinions out in Western Canada that it'll require Pepin's opinion to bring that all together, and to bring about some change, and we say that isn't so. We say that there is a new consensus developing in Western Canada as farmers get a better idea of the facts, Mr. Speaker.

It's just not farmers, it's people who live in the city like myself who grew up on a farm, whose father was a grain buyer for the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, who lived in a number of those small communities which face the threat of disappearance because of changes in the Crow rate, who are as interested as farmers are in this particular issue.

This is not an issue that is just the domain of rural Manitoba. It's an issue that is the domain of Western Canada, and it's an issue that is the domain of Manitoba.

And why would anyone want to somehow give some further fuel to Pepin's tactics of trying to divide and conquer by bringing in a rider to this resolution to fudge the water and to give him some ammunition as to - well they don't really know what their priorities are, you know, and it's interesting on this that the Member for Arthur - I mean if we took the Hansard and sent it to Pepin, and I hope no one does, and I certainly hope that none of the Conservatives do, if they took the Member for Arthur's speech and sent it to Pepin

he'd go into his caucus and say we can ram this through tomorrow because the Tories don't care.

Well, we care. And I'm surprised. I'm willing to sit down soon because I won't talk for the 40 minutes. I'm willing to sit down and see whether the Member for Roblin-Russell will get up and say that he thinks the Crow is important; that he thinks the Member for Arthur was completely off base when he said that we shouldn't waste our time in this Legislature dealing with that issue. I'm waiting for him to say that, if he in fact cares about rural Manitoba as much as the rest of us do.

As I said we are quite prepared to discuss the other matter. We don't want to muddy the water. We want a very simple, clear, precise statement going to Ottawa. And that is the statement and we are quite prepared to compromise ourselves, and come up with a statement that was brought in and passed in the Saskatchewan Legislature, and then we can come forward as another province, the Province of Manitoba and say that we take that position as well. And then instead of Pepin saying, well the provinces of Western Canada are split on this issue, we can point out that the two major provinces in Western Canada, who care about agricultural production as their primary industry, are united in this matter, and are opposed to what Pepin is trying to do because I believe that Alberta has some other interests.

They have their coal interests, they have their petroleum interests, and they're weighing those off against each other. But in Manitoba and Saskatchewan we say that agriculture comes first. That's why we want a united position. It's such a simple thing to bring about. Not with these other amendments which you in all good conscience would have to say - do not relate to the intent of the resolution that was brought forward by the government which was copied from the Saskatchewan Legislature. If you can somehow get up and say that in all the work that's been done on the Crow, the Hall Commission Report and other commission reports, that somehow the industrial disputes have somehow superseded all those other discussions, then I'd be prepared to listen to your arguments, but I know that in good conscience the Conservatives wouldn't be able to do that.

So I say, let's have the Conservatives and New Democrats in Manitoba joining hands on this issue, linking up with the New Democrats and Conservatives in Saskatchewan, and going out against, with the Pools as well, and with a whole set of other agricultural and rural organizations . . .

A MEMBER: We've done that.

HON. W. PARASIUK: No, you're not. Don't muddy the waters; let's come up with a simple, clear, precise statement. If you believe in it, you'll allow a vote to come about by 10 o'clock. If you want to continue to muddy the waters, then you won't. So the challenge is yours.

The Member for Roblin certainly has sufficient time to present his position. We, as a House, will have sufficient time by 10 o'clock to take the vote on this issue; I sincerely hope we do it. I hope that there's sincerity on the part of the Conservative Party as well.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, since this government took office we saw a classic example of how mixed up they are and don't know where they're going - that government can't lead. Mr. Speaker, not five minutes ago this member that just spoke, said let's vote tonight. Let's vote tonight; let not McKenzie have a chance to speak on this resolution. Let's vote tonight and deny democracy to run in this House. — (Interjection) — That's what he said. That's what he said, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have just been accused by the Member for Roblin of saying that I didn't want him to speak tonight. I distinctly remember saying, about one minute ago, I invited him to speak; I said he has enough time to speak tonight on this issue. So I think it's rather out of order for him to get up one minute later and accuse me of denying him his right to vote when I sat down before my 40 minutes were up precisely to give him the opportunity to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister for that explanation. I'm sure the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell will bear it in mind.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: That was a pretty weak explanation, Mr. Speaker. Let Hansard spell out what he said.

Mr. Speaker, I've been looking forward for a long time to discuss this matter. I know they have a problem over there because they don't have many farmers over there, people that are closely tied to the farm community.

Mr. Speaker, let the record show, without any previous meetings with our caucus, no meetings, no discussions of any way, shape, or form, all of a sudden on Tuesday, March 8th, the Honourable Minister of Transportation stood in his place in this House and said, "Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to members opposite that it is not our intention to get into the arguments about the way in which the Crow was established, the pros and cons of the Crow and all the old rhetoric, so to speak, on either side at this point in time."

He went on to say, the Honourable Minister - and by the way, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the few Ministers that I trust in that government - the Minister of Transportation who has been in this House a long time, a man that I have the greatest respect for and I abide by his judgment and statements that he makes - I adhere to it.

Mr. Speaker, he goes on and says, "I believe there will be other opportunities for that to take place, but at this time what we are attempting to do is arrive at a consensus in Western Canada on an issue that is just about to be introduced into the House of Commons by way of legislation." The Minister rose in his place and said that.

Mr. Speaker, he went on, "So I want to appeal," he said, "with members opposite with, in fact, a direct request that we co-operate." That we co-operate. Up to that time, who had co-operated? Nobody. There was no co-operation. Until the Minister rose in his place, there was no co-operation from any member over there with our caucus. Absolutely nobody over there can communicate with us. Let's further it. He speaks on and he says, "So that, indeed, the committee might be able to get its work done in time for presentation to the Commons Committee that will be dealing with the legislation that is to be introduced shortly."

Now, Mr. Speaker, who are these honourable members over here telling us that we bring a resolution in this afternoon, that we have to vote on it tonight? Are you prepared to put a closure motion on it, my friend? Here you have your — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, on Friday afternoon, March 11th, the First Minister, the Premier of this province, stood in his place and said, "Mr. Speaker, I only need again comment, surprise and disappointment. When we need a united voice out of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, a voice that will not be divided, we find that we don't get that kind of support from our own opposition in this Chamber."

A MEMBER: Right on. That's right, that's the problem. You guys are playing games.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Can you believe that, Mr. Speaker? Can you believe that? Can you honestly believe that? We're co-operating to the "nth" degree. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the members opposite know how long it takes to get a consensus amongst the farmers in my constituency about your resolution, but I certainly got it on the weekend.

Let's go on and see what the First Minister said. "Even when we frame a resolution that was drafted by Conservatives in Saskatchewan, we find that our opposition, they flee to cover." That's not true. We're not fleeing to cover on this issue, Mr. Speaker, in no way, shape or form. The opposite members over there are the ones that are fleeing for cover, some of the backbenchers over there don't know anything about farming or the Crow rate. They're the ones that are fleeing to cover, or the Member for Springfield. I'd like the Member for Springfield to respond to the comments that were made by my colleague from La Verendrye tonight. Where are his comments in this important resolution?

Mr. Speaker, he says, "They duck the basic issues pertaining to the Crow." That's not true. We have an amendment before you - ducking the issues.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, we have this again-planned NDP trap. This is the third one we've had. We had a resolution here earlier, it would be when the Saskatchewan election was on; they pulled it. One Minister spoke. How many members in our House, on our side, stood and asked me to call the resolution? The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources was House Leader or something like that. How many times? He never called it, so he buried it.

They go over to the convention here and they shake hands and they bow with their Federal counterparts

and their friends from British Columbia and they come up with another position. So that's the second position, and now we come into the House here now and they've got the Saskatchewan position.

Well, let the record show, Mr. Speaker, I support every concept in that Saskatchewan resolution, every one, and I'm providing two amendments which the people in Roblin-Russell Constituency asked me to add as provisos to that constituency, and I'm asking you to support it. Mr. Speaker, you're talking about co-operation, we're giving you the co-operation. There's our resolution, there are our amendments.

I wish the Minister of Transport was here. I trust him, and I'm sure if he was here tonight I imagine within an hour, Mr. Speaker, we could come to a consensus on this resolution and pass it through this House real quick, because I have no hang-ups on that.

Sure, I don't agree with all those Saskatchewan points, the same as the members opposite don't agree, and you say we're not co-operating, certainly we're co-operating. Saskatchewan isn't Manitoba, as many members in our caucus have already pointed out - there are many things in that resolution.

I'm going to ask the honourable members and the Minister of Natural Resources, have you been out and met with your counterparts in Alberta? What do they say? You can ask the Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Government Services, have you been out and talked to the boys in Alberta? You're the government; we're the opposition. You're the government, what do they say? Have you been to B.C.? The Minister of Municipal Affairs, I'm sure he's talking to his counterpart in B.C. What are they saying about this resolution? Are they supporting it? — (Interjection) — Well, you haven't done it, have you asked them? No, they haven't. They're only out, Mr. Speaker, trying to get our hide. They don't care about Alberta; they don't care about B.C. They say they don't care about the farmers in this province; all they're trying to cover is their own political hide. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of the people that I represent support this resolution that was amended in this House today, and I defy this committee to come out to the Roblin-Russell constituency. You can have hearings any place you want and you'll find out that the majority of the people support the resolution in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

Talking about haste, we're in haste. Talking about non-political, I've never seen a more political resolution in this House during this Session than the Crow. What did the Minister of Transport say when he rose in his place? - I want to indicate to members that it's not our intention to get into arguments. How many arguments have we had tonight on this matter? Who's causing the arguments? We brought in a couple of simple amendments; two simple amendments. How many positions on that resolution? There's nine points, while we don't agree with them in their entirety, we agree within at least the majority of them in the concept of it. We ask you to accept two small amendments on behalf of our people. You don't represent all the people in the Province of Manitoba; you certainly don't. Therefore you're talking about co-operation, you want co-operation, we'll give you co-operation. Accept our two amendments. There they are, two of them, simple, basic, small, and easy to understand, not hard, not difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to delay. The Minister of Energy wants to have a vote on this issue tonight. It's very simple and it's very quick. I'm going to sit down real quick because I've been through this thing over and over and over again. I'm telling you what the people in my constituency, according to what they want, and let's get on with the job in Manitoba, let's get dealing with the Estimates and get this thing out of the way.

I'm asking members opposite, stand up and give us a chance. You never consulted with us before this resolution was brought in, in any way, shape or form. We offer you two small amendments, accept them and let's move Manitoba on and get on with the business of making this province tick.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? — (Interjection) —

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very distressed, Mr. Speaker, that members of the government had to silence the Member for The Pas and prevent him from speaking on the amendment. It would have been very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to hear the points that the Member for The Pas, representing a reasonably good chunk of farming country in his constituency, might have to contribute.

As to the two points that we've added to the resolution, namely, the distance related rates, and the issue of whether his farmers are at all concerned about the disruption of grain movement by labour management disputes - hopefully, we'll hear from the Member for The Pas before this is over. Maybe he can slip in a speech when some of the heavies in the front bench aren't here and will allow him freedom of speech in the House, instead of silencing him like they did tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the issue was explained I think very nicely by the Minister of Transportation. He says he wants to take a resolution which unites Manitoba and Saskatchewan in opposition to the present Pepin proposal. That's what he wants. You know, Mr. Speaker, we said that there are areas in the resolution that were passed in Saskatchewan that we agree with and we have concerns with. But we also said, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution does not address the real issue that is often voiced by Manitoba farmers. That's why we made those two amendments, Mr. Speaker, because you cannot deal with any grain transportation issue, be it the Crow rate or be it any other logical and productive discussion with the farm community on grain transportation, without asking them their opinions on labour management disputes that stop the flow of grain to the export market. You can't do it.

Any member from the Treasury Bench or any member from the government backbench that stands up and says that they want to listen intently and objectively to the farm community on the issue of grain transportation, and to the proposed change to the Crow that's in the Pepin proposal, and refuse to listen to the farm communities' concerns about the stoppage of grain movement by labour management disputes are simply posturing in this House, Mr. Speaker. They really don't want to talk to the farm community about the issues that are truly bothering them in grain

transportation. That's why, Mr. Speaker, we brought that amendment into this House, because when we take the agricultural community to rural Manitoba and we meet in the constituencies of rural Manitoba, we want to hear from the farm community on what they think about the 31.1 million tonne ceiling on the Crow benefit. We want to hear on whether they believe the branch line abandonment process has gone far enough and a number of the things that are addressed. But we also want to hear from the farm community, and particularly we want this labour-backed and union-funded government to hear the concerns in rural Manitoba about the hardships that are caused to their economic living by labour management disputes. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, these people don't believe when we say that it's a legitimate concern expressed to us by farmers; they think that we're in here union bashing. Well, we're not, Mr. Speaker, we're in here reflecting legitimate concerns expressed to us by the farmers in our communities and our constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, when the last grain shipment, the last labour management dispute caused a shutdown in Thunder Bay - that was in about August of 1981 - within 36 hours there was a meeting organized in Carman, Manitoba, in my constituency. There were over 1,200 farmers there and they drove from as far away as Rosburn and from the west side of the province to come to that meeting to express extreme displeasure that in a time when grain prices were reasonable, the movement was good, we were meeting, we were exceeding export targets, and all of a sudden a small group of people in the grain-handling system, could tie it up completely at the peak shipping time, that being in the fall when grain was coming off the fields and could go to the elevators and get on the boats and be sold and improve Canada's cash flow.

A MEMBER: Okay, let's call the vote.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Twelve hundred farmers on 36 hours notice. And these people in the government don't want to talk to the farm community about that issue? They don't want to talk about that and here, Mr. Speaker, is an ideal opportunity for the government and for members of the opposition, both on the Treasury Bench and in the opposition ranks, to take the transportation issue to the people of Manitoba, to the farmers of Manitoba, and to hear what their concerns are about Pepin's proposals, where they agree, where they disagree; and at the same time that there's going to be transportation legislation drafted in Ottawa, to send Ottawa the message, along with the disagreement with portions of the Pepin proposal. Send them the second message that the farm community cannot economically stand any stoppage of movement of export grain from the farm because of labour management disputes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do you think that's an unrealistic request to make of the government, to listen to the farmers? We heard Cabinet Minister after Cabinet Minister get up on Thursday afternoon and Thursday evening and they said they wanted to get this dealt with, they wanted this done quickly because they wanted to hear from the farmers. They wanted to get out and

hear from the farmers before they got into the fields in the spring for seeding. But they only want to hear one part of the grain transportation issue.

The moment we bring in the total picture, expressing the true concerns of farmers, all of a sudden we have this union-backed government, backing off and saying, hey, we don't want to talk about that. No, we don't want to talk about that and this, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Federal Government is bringing in legislation dealing with grain transportation, would you not think this is the most ideal and opportune time to bring in some method of preventing grain stoppages, so that grain will move continuously and not be tied up at the whim and the will of a small group of people in the system and hold up 30,000 farmers in Manitoba to ransom, and hold up how many farmers in Saskatchewan to ransom, and how many farmers in Alberta to ransom, and in the Peace River of B.C.?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. ORCHARD: You see, these people make light of this. The Member for Dauphin, this Minister, is making light of what I am saying, but he doesn't understand and he doesn't listen to his farmers when they tell him what the total concern in the transportation issues are.

Now the one thing that I'd like that Minister for Dauphin to do is simply ask his farmers - he claims he knows what they think and he talks to them and he listens to them - simply ask them if they, when they make presentation to the Agricultural Committee on the Crow rate, if they'd like to voice their opinion on policy development that will prevent the stoppage, the shipment stoppage of grain, because of labour management dispute. And you know what will happen, Mr. Speaker, 99 percent of his farmers will say, yes, we want to talk about that at the same time because we believe the issues are inter-tied and inter-related and we believe that if there's legislation coming up to resolve the Crow rate, and structure a new Crow rate system, that we also have to talk about labour management disruptions in the system.

That's what they'll tell him if he dares to ask them. But what I suspect, Mr. Speaker, is what the government is going to do. They probably had a quick phone call down to Dick Martin at the Manitoba Federation of Labour and Dick Martin has told the "puppet" Premier we've got in this province, we don't want you talking about that out in the farm community. Because we know what the farm community really thinks about labour management disputes and we don't want that talked about. So you strike that out of the resolution. That's what Dick Martin will have told the Premier in the Treasury Bench of this government. More policy from union hall, Mr. Speaker, that's what we're going to see when we vote on this amendment to the resolution.

But, Mr. Speaker, don't let our honourable friends in the government think for one minute that the issue is dead. Even if they vote it out, do not let them think for one minute that we're going to have this committee go out, without the ability to address the true issue, as they see it, Mr. Speaker.

They're going to talk about the Crow rate and the Pepin plan for change, but they're also going to want to talk about labour management disputes and how

to resolve them in an equitable fashion, so that you don't cripple the farm economy in Western Canada and we'll discuss that when we get our hearings on the road, despite the fact that these people do not have the constitutional fortitude to leave that amendment in place and give farmers an opportunity to talk about it. It'll be there and it'll be talked about, Mr. Speaker, I'll guarantee them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are our honourable friends over here — (Interjection) — well, isn't it interesting that now the Member for The Pas, who stood up and wanted to speak on this and was silenced by his front bench, is now saying, let's vote on it. Are we not going to hear from the Member for The Pas in this issue now? Is that what we assume? He's been silenced, Mr. Speaker, he's been silenced.

It'll be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to have a little talk with the farm organization in The Pas and just see how well they appreciate their member being silenced on an issue of grain transportation and labour union managements. — (Interjection) — Interesting.

Mr. Speaker, this government is caught in a bit of a dilemma, a wee bit of a dilemma. Mr. Speaker, last year the Minister of Transportation brought in a resolution for which he attached a great deal of urgency and the Premier . . .

A MEMBER: Big, big deal . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . was forcing a debate in the House, Mr. Speaker, because he was terribly upset about the headline he got when he explained his waffled position on the Crow rate. He was terribly excited about that, Mr. Speaker, because that headline came out on a Friday morning and it just so happened that on the next Monday, the Monday following, Saskatchewan voters were going to the polls and the Premier of this province didn't want to have anything on the issue of the Crow rate that might be detrimental to Mr. Blakeney in Saskatchewan.

Now the moment, Mr. Speaker, that his friend in Saskatchewan, Mr. Blakeney, got defeated wholesomely, all of a sudden the Crow issue was not even debated or called in this House. And now, Mr. Speaker, we have again this year, this government, lacking the ability to draft a resolution on their own, simply mouthing a resolution that came from Saskatchewan that in many ways is not acceptable in Manitoba - read the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture when he spoke, he said, there are parts of this that he can't agree with, but in the interests of getting the job done and sending a message to Ottawa, here's what we should do and he's prepared to vote for this Saskatchewan resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to vote for it too. But we believe to properly reflect the concerns in Manitoba, that we need two more issues put into that resolution, two more messages sent to Ottawa, and we hope that members over there would agree with them. It's not a major request we're saying. You know, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a little while ago that this group over here, that is now the government, are caught in a little bit of a dilemma.

A MEMBER: Yeah, but where did their job priorities go?

MR. D. ORCHARD: We've definitely got a credibility gap, call it, between the citizens of Canada and their present Federal Government. The Federal Government, I think it's fair to say, is not trusted by too many Manitobans, probably west of London, Ontario now, because the line keeps moving further east all the time. The greatest concern that I have expressed to me, when I discuss the Pepin proposal and the Crow rate, is that the farm community does not trust the Federal Government to make a decision that is good for them in changing the Crow rate. You know, Mr. Speaker, many farmers will recognize that the Crow issue has to be resolved in an equitable fashion, and the majority of farmers supported the Gilson exercise of determining what that equitable resolution of the Crow was, but they have a deep and lingering doubt and suspicion about the credibility of the Federal Government, and rightfully so, Mr. Speaker.

Let's take just one small piece of history in the last Federal Government's cap of achievements. They said that an 18 cent a gallon increase was just preposterous, it was incredibly large, it just couldn't be borne by Canadians, and basically they won an election telling Canadians they would not raise their price of gasoline by that 18 cents. And, Mr. Speaker, I think most candid observers of what has happened, since the Liberals got re-elected in Ottawa, is that they were very untruthful with the electorate, hence the credibility gap. I just want to point out to my honourable friends over here that they likewise suffer from a similar credibility gap when it comes to a discussion of the Crow rate because, if you think that farmers out there did not recognize the posturing urgency last year of the Minister of Transport and the Premier and the Attorney-General, who last year had this resolution that had to be passed so urgently, and the urgency disappeared, Mr. Speaker, when the Saskatchewan election was lost.

Do you think the farm community out there did not recognize clearly and totally that this government, this NDP Government, were totally out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Housing on a point of order.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Pembina, on at least one occasion during his comments, has indicated that the government did not call the Crow Resolution after the Saskatchewan election, and I would just like to point out to him, for the record, and perhaps he will like to clarify his remarks, that on April 27th, on April 28th, on April 29th the government did, in fact, call the Crow Resolution and there was no response from members opposite.

A MEMBER: After the election.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Flin Flon has indicated that the Crow Resolution was called; indeed it was, but it wasn't called for at least a month after the Saskatchewan election. The urgency . . .

A MEMBER: The Saskatchewan election was on the 26th.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . the 26th? The urgency of the Crow debate, Mr. Speaker, disappeared with the election in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, these people decided that they had an issue in which they were going to help Allan Blakeney in Saskatchewan win an election. It was clear to anybody who was looking in at the process that they didn't have one nit of concern for the rural community on the issue of the Crow. The only concern they had, Mr. Speaker, was for playing politics to help their socialist bed partner in Saskatchewan, and once that was impossible to do, the Crow was no longer an issue; and I will point out for the Member for The Pas, who just rose on a point of order, that his Minister withdrew the resolution. That's how important the Crow Resolution became after Blakeney lost the election. No more important than that, Mr. Speaker.

That is where this government established the first and major gap in its credibility with rural Manitoba. When they would simply posture on an issue of the Crow rate for political purposes to help Allan Blakeney in Saskatchewan, the farm community said, we're not really interested. And what happened, Mr. Speaker? What happened when they took their travelling committee to talk to the farm community? I think they had as few as five farmers at some of those meetings. Those hearing were a disaster. And why were they a disaster, Mr. Speaker? Because once again the Minister of Transportation used very original research material; he used this as part of his material at the meetings and it was "Save the Crow, the Saskatchewan Solution." There wasn't original Manitoba thought went into this. Some of the indications in here were - and there's no pages in this but it's Table I - Table I here — (Interjection) — my colleague, the MLA for Minnedosa, said that Bill Janssen wrote it. I believe, probably he had a hand in it, because he was in Saskatchewan before this government saw fit to import him into the province on a contractual basis to help the Minister of Transportation; he may well be right. Mr. Speaker, part of the information that was given as theoretically factual information to the farm community on the Pepin proposal was that by 1990-91 we would be paying 9.7 times the Crow rate. Well, farmers knew, anyone who had read anything on the issue, knew that that wasn't true, yet here was a government in Manitoba mouthing these things, not backing them up with any definitive research of their own - their own research showed something like 5.6 times Crow - but here they were throwing this fear campaign on the farm community imported from Saskatchewan.

Well, that is where this government has a credibility gap. It doesn't want to talk real issues with the farm community; it doesn't want to talk the amendment that we've put to this resolution, they don't want to hear those opinions from the farm community, no. They simply want to posture on this issue and hope that they can make some kind of electoral gains out of it. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the farm community is infinitely more intelligent than to fall for the fact that this N.D. Party, the one that gave us the Land-Lease Program that removed long-term loans, are going to be the friend of the farmer. They just won't buy that, Mr. Speaker, and they won't buy it on this issue of this resolution and the proposal to have Legislative Agriculture Committee hearings go through the province.

But, Mr. Speaker, what will add credibility to those Agricultural Committee hearings that will listen to farmers is our two amendments because they truly reflect the concerns that have been expressed to many of us on this side of the House about what the real issues are in the transportation and the Resolution of the Crow, the Transportation of Grain System and the Resolution of the Crow.

They want to talk about it, Mr. Speaker, and tomorrow I will conclude my remarks because we are getting very close to 10:00 o'clock, but I hope that the members in the government overnight reconsider the phone call they obviously got from Dick Martin saying not to go for that amendment, and they really start to seriously give consideration to listening to the farm community and listening intently to their concerns about grain transportation. And, if they give that kind of serious consideration overnight, then tomorrow we should be able to see a rather speedy passage of this amended

resolution so that we can get on with the hearings in the farm community and listen to their concerns about the Crow rate, the Pepin proposal and labour-management disputes which have cut their income off from time to time without any course of action for resolution by the farm community. That's what they want to talk about, Mr. Speaker, and if this government has any gumption and has any integrity and has any feel for the farm community they will allow the farm community to have that voice when we call the committee hearings with an amended resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time of adjournment having arrived, when this amendment is next before the House the honourable member will have 18 minutes remaining.

The House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow. (Tuesday)