

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 2nd, 1963.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called perhaps it would be in order for me to make the suggestion that the House should not meet on Monday, April 8th. A good many of the members will wish to be in their places of residence to vote and others of us might have other duties to consider on that day as well; so in the light of all the circumstances, I would propose to the House that we should not meet on Monday the 8th but we should meet at our usual time on Tuesday.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. In view of the request made by the Saskatoon School for the Deaf that the handicapped children of Greater Winnipeg be withdrawn because of overcrowding in the school there; and in view of the Department of Education report, this event proposed problems of providing facilities, what plans of action does the government have with regard to providing adequate facilities for the education of the deaf here in Manitoba?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, since I'm sure the honourable member wishes a specific answer I would take this now as notice and bring in the answer as early as I can.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table a return to an address voted by the House on March 15th, 1963, on a motion by the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): Before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to inform the House, as a follow-up to the question of yesterday from the Honourable Member from St. George concerning a reported diphtheria outbreak in Fairford. The story is that since March 25th there have been eleven patients with positive throat swabs admitted to the King George Hospital from this area. A throat swab is when on swabbing of the throat diphtheria germs are cultured and these people are considered carriers and because of the difficulty in controlling the situation these people have been admitted to hospital for treatment. After three throat swabs in a row are negative these people are considered non-carriers and allowed to go home. The three carriers remaining in the community have been -- their homes placarded and the RCMP have been called in to maintain the quarantine. The public health nurse and the director of preventive health services have paid several visits to the area and hundreds, up to over thousands of throat swabs have been taken; the most recent visit being on Sunday when 180 contacts of one of the positive carriers were examined and swabbed and well over a thousand immunizations have been carried out most recently. The department and the public health officer in charge continue to be on top of the situation and I thought I should make this more complete report at this time.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): I would like to thank the Minister for his statement regarding this situation. It is my information that one of the diphtheria cases he speaks of is a resident of the Fairford Reserve. Have the schools, or is there any decision to close the three schools on the Fairford Reserve as a result of this outbreak?

MR. JOHNSON: No, the Indian Health Services have carried out extensive immunization all this spring in that reserve area, and the only contacts we have as carriers are the ones that we are quarantining at this time, and it was felt that the quarantine could be held there was no need to close the schools on the Reserve.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to make a correction in Hansard. On Friday last when I was speaking on the matter of biculturalism and bilingualism, one statement in Hansard here reads: "In my opinion up to

(Mr. Schreyer cont'd) now the governments have really made an effort to do something about this situation. " It should read: "In my opinion up to now governments have not really made an effort to do something about this situation. " And similarly in the French version of it, it should be in the negative. I hope that this will appear in Hansard just for the record.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would like the indulgence of the House to withdraw this Order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member permission of the House to withdraw? Agreed.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Pembina in amendment thereto; and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Burrows in amendment thereto.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): now realize that my amendment is out of order and I wish to withdraw it. I shall introduce this amendment at a later date.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable the member permission to withdraw? Agreed.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I really don't know myself at this moment that I rose to speak whether I should go over the whole thing again, but something tells me, my prophetic heritage tells me that it'll be "a voice in the wilderness," so I think perhaps with one or two remarks, I would let it go to the conscience of the members of the Legislature.

The amendment moved by the charming lady is definitely not an amendment, although under the rules it is. It is definitely no -- (interjection) -- no, no. Are you on the Old Age Pension? Oh, I humbly apologize, I wasted a good speech. --(Interjection) --

I'm sorry I thought How do the others stand Madam? Well, on, -- I don't think I'll look at the notes at all. The amendment to the request for the school of the deaf is the same amendment which the same learned gentleman has been making since I remember him in this House. It is not

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I never moved that amendment at any time before.

MR. GRAY: No, no, no, pardon me. I'm referring to the --- I'm sorry, I'm referring to the amendment of the Honourable Member from St. Matthews to my original motion --(interjection) -- I'm twice wrong. I still have one more strike.

I think that I have proven that my motion -- original motion, of having a school for the deaf, of bringing them from Saskatoon has been proven. Since then -- we had a week or two -- I have read at least about twenty periodicals where I could have taken the time and read it of men who have made a study for years on this subject, on the subject of the deaf and the blind; on the subject of the underprivileged children; on the subject of the benefits which the child would get by having the parents love and affection close to them.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): I wonder if my honourable friend would forgive me if I try to straighten out what seems to me at least to be a confusion about our business at the moment. I wonder, Madam Speaker if you would indicate the motion that is now being debated. My understanding is that it's the motion that stands on the Order Paper in the name of my honourable friend who is now speaking. An amendment was proposed; the amendment has been acknowledged to be out of order, has been withdrawn, and we are now debating -- (interjection) -- we are now debating the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, "this House requests etcetera," as amended by the Member from Pembina.

MADAM SPEAKER: No. We are debating the second adjourned debate here. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk in amendment thereto.

MR. EVANS: I take it then, Madam Speaker, that the first item on the Order Paper now stands does it? May I ask -- I'm really lost on this at the moment, but I do think it's important to find out what happened to the first adjourned debate after the proposed amendment was withdrawn.

MADAM SPEAKER: The first adjourned debate today is open. The Member for Burrows withdrew his amendment, his proposed amendment, so the debate is still open, and I moved on to the next order of business on the Order Paper.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, as I understood it correctly, may I suggest, nobody spoke after the Honourable Member for Burrows informed the House of his withdrawal, and I suggest Madam Speaker, you were perfectly correct in stating that the first resolution is open. Nobody rose to take part in the debate and I think you went then on to the second resolution. So I'd suggest that this is the manner in which we leave the matter, that we are dealing now with the second resolution -- my honourable colleague from Inkster speaking in respect of the Deaf and the Blind, and that we allow the first item on the Order Paper to remain open until we reach it the next time.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): if I may, Madam Speaker, I think that we have the amendment to the first resolution to consider before we go on to the second one.

MADAM SPEAKER: We will return then to the first adjourned debate which is still open. If any member wishes to speak on this debate he may proceed.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, now where am I?

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the honourable member please take his seat. Would the honourable member please take his seat. We are on the first adjournment. If no one wishes to speak on the first adjournment -- not your motion.

MR. GRAY: We're speaking on the Old Age Pension now.

MADAM SPEAKER: No.

MR. GRAY: On the School for the Deaf. On the amendment of the Honourable Member from Selkirk?

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the honourable member please take his seat. We are on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member from Inkster, the first one on the Order Paper, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina in amendment thereto.

MR. GRAY: I hope the press will not charge me with three times being wrong. It's not my fault.

MR. PAULLEY: Now you can speak on the Old Age Pensions -- go on with the Old Age Pensions.

MR. GRAY: All right, I'm coming back to the Old Age Pension. I could as I said before speak for a long time again and add many arguments in addition to those I've advanced at the time that I have introduced this resolution. In the last probably 18 or 17 years when I had the pleasure on behalf of my group to introduce similar resolutions, it was always -- I wouldn't say "whitewashed" as this may not be parliamentary language-- but amended in order not to place the members -- those who are opposed to it they're entitled to do it -- as voting or opposing directly the increase of the Old Age Pension. If the honourable members would take the trouble to peruse all the journals they will see that every time since the pension was only \$20.00 a month, every occasion it was defeated by an amendment which did not mean anything, but the idea was defeated and they could not be blamed for saying "no" -- but indirectly it was no. The argument for the amendment was very little except mentioning the all-cure medicine, The Social Service Bill. It's just like an aspirin, it relieves the headache for a minute, for an hour, but the disease is not cured.

Now in 1963 we have submitted the very same resolution and again the amendment is to get that all-cure medicine up to seventy-five; not for the Old Age Pension; not for a general increase by the Federal Government, no expense to the province, and if any of the leaders running in this Federal election will be elected they will, they'll have to introduce it, and the province will be in the very very same position but instead -- they are forgiven -- all the leaders in the Federal election may all promise, they have promised, and the candidates have promised \$75.00, and we have promised in the last election, and now when it's submitted "that we request the Federal Government" -- only request -- to give consideration -- not even favourable consideration -- but consideration, only consideration of increasing from \$65.00 to \$75.00 a month, giving a flat increase to all, preventing them of going through the inquisition of means test. And this is being rejected by a simple amendment that the word "seventy-five" be

(Mr. Gray cont'd) eliminated.

Well I'm not going to quarrel with anyone. Each and every one has a perfect right to amend and a perfect right to oppose. The records are here and if the coming generation will want to judge our action towards the old and the aged and suffering people -- and let me tell you again that they suffer now; ten or fifteen years from now you will not have it -- this situation of people in need. --(Interjection) -- Yes, everything, but not as much because the population of the old age pensioners now are those who came in here 50, 60 years ago and they worked for .15¢ or .17¢ or .20¢ an hour and did not have a chance to save up anything. And we did not have the all-cure legislation; and we did not have all the hospitalization and everything else. We have it now. And those people who are deserving -- I'm not speaking of what's going to happen ten or fifteen years ago -- the late Mr. Gray won't be here at that time -- but actually I couldn't understand why people should oppose it; why the members should oppose it. And some of the government will say how do you know we'll oppose it. I've been in here long enough to know that if there's an amendment coming from the administration end of the House, whether it was ten years ago, 20 years ago or now, that means no; but no they haven't got the nerve perhaps to say no; which perhaps would be a better thing to identify yourself and say we are opposed to it.

So I cannot see for the life of me why with the almost approval of any party that will be elected next Monday -- they have given their approval, with our own promise -- Why should we use the all-cure legislation all the time, I cannot understand. So I feel if I have to lose we lose. I have lost before. But I want to place each and every one on record and I say that voting for the amendment means definitely no. That's my interpretation and no one can change my mind. It means definitely you're against an increase of \$10.00. And then I cannot understand for the life of me is, here is a chance for the government or for the expense that is being spent now for the cure all medicine, is a chance for them now to save money because the other \$10.00 will be paid nationally, not directly by the province where this is paid by the province. And here is a challenge to the First Minister. I am prepared right now, speaking for myself, to withdraw this resolution if the First Minister gets up now and says he will give it consideration, I'll let them have the credit. I don't care for the credit; I want a little bit more cash for the old age.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: The ayes and nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment of the Honourable Member of Pembina to the main motion of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after the numeral "65" and adding thereto the following words "On the basis of need to \$75.00 per month or higher."

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 32; Nays 20.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of LaVerendrye, permission be given to let the debate on the proposed resolution stand -- adjourn rather -- I'm sorry.

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend need only adjourn it. --(Interjection) -- Yes, he wants

MADAM SPEAKER: Your seconder was the member for LaVerendrye.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Yes.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable

(Madam Speaker cont'd) Member for Inkster, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the Honourable Minister of Education is not ready to reply to my question asked before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Stand? Has the honourable member permission to have the Order stand? Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. However, if anyone wishes to speak on it we have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, with your permission and leave of the House, I would like to have this stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Minister permission to have it stand? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Dufferin, in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Member for Roblin.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): In the absence of the Honourable Member for Roblin, could we have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Rupertsland in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): I would beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George, The Honourable the Member for Lac du Bonnet,

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Madam Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand also.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I wouldn't like to break up this batting average this afternoon, so with your permission and leave of the House, I'd ask that this matter be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Wellington, The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I find myself in a somewhat unusual position to debate on this motion, because anyone taking an active part in this debate would have to pledge himself to stop smoking, and I could not make this pledge because I don't smoke. Now, the Honourable Member for Wellington certainly must have done a lot of research on this problem, because he stated many statistics, and I was somewhat alarmed when I noticed the statistics, alarmed at the number of our young students, boys and girls, smoking, and at the age that they start to smoke. The reason why I say this it's not so long ago that I was in high school, and in our class there was approximately about 40 to 50 students, and no one in our class smoked. That's why I'm just pointing this out.

I would also like to thank him for the praise that he gave to some of the boys in the Winnipeg Blue Bomber Football Club. I agree with him that many of them are called to attend many functions and to talk to Community Club organizations, to certain school functions -- except that they make their reference a little bit different. I don't think they bring out the connection of lung cancer and cigarette smoking. I think they stress the point that they would not be able to participate to the fullest extent and to the best of their ability if they smoke -- I mean, participate to the best of their ability in athletic functions, if they smoke.

Now, the Honourable Member for Inkster has mentioned that the reason that people smoke is because of hardship, tragedies, nervousness and sickness. Well, I hope it's not the case

(Mr. Patrick cont'd) here in this House, because I'm sure if it is I know that many members smoke here, and they would have to perform their functions under these conditions. I know that increase in young people's smoking is a problem that faces not only our city, our province; I think it's a problem to many countries. But I'm not quite sure that the general public fully realizes that the danger of smoking -- or evidence in smoking of lung cancer. If there is a definite relation between cigarette smoking and lung cancer, then we should get this knowledge across to homes, churches, schools and recreational groups. The parents should be responsible to discipline their children not to smoke, and I believe the children must be made to respect this authority. This respect starts in the home; the parents certainly are the first teacher, and the home is the first classroom. Teachers can exert a great influence on our youngsters on the effects of smoking. I know many men and women that have left school and years later they look back and recall certain influences that the teachers have made on them, and which they appreciate even in later years.

I think all of us should display a greater appreciation of our responsibilities and this would be our challenge. We should have a project of universal appeal through agencies such as health organizations, pamphlets from family physicians, school libraries, discussion on this topic at Home and School Association meetings, teachers' annual conventions and community clubs. I think this topic should be brought to the attention of these agencies with messages from Canadian Medical Association -- the facts of positive relationship between cancer and cigarette smoking. If my information is correct, I think the Medical Association in Great Britain has made this fact known, that there is definitely connection between smoking and lung cancer. I think the government should advertise through all media the harmful effects of smoking and make available more literature on this subject. This statement sounds like "fighting fire with fire", but I feel that something has to be done in this matter. The coaches, the school principals, the teachers, should be more responsible in enforcing "no smoking" rules in all school activities. I also believe that schools sponsoring sport activities should publicize that no athlete be allowed to smoke, and also that student participants, or I should say the students that are spectators at the games, should also not smoke. This might be somewhat hard to enforce.

I'm also wondering if it would be the right thing for the Manitoba Secondary School Athletic Association to be empowered to suspend any student from taking active part in any sports activities if he smokes or doesn't listen to the coaches. Information I have it seems there's one person in every 25 minutes dies of lung cancer in Great Britain, and the Royal College of Physicians showed a definite connection between cigarette smoking and lung cancer. All studies show that the death rate from all cancer was greater in smokers than non-smokers, and the death rate among heavy smokers is 40 percent greater than the ones in non-smokers; so I can't see what other proof we need to substantiate our argument.

The reason given by many school boys and girls for the first smoke is that they want to satisfy their curiosity, they want to feel grown-up, and reach a certain social status. Well, I think a sure defense against the hazards of smoking is not to smoke, and as we all know, it's pretty difficult to stop smoking once you have started. I feel the emphasis should be more in our schools so that our children and our students don't start smoking. If the general public could be brought to face facts as doctors have, they might act with good sense and caution to stop smoking. It is my understanding that one-third of the medical profession smokes. I wonder if Dr. Johnson would agree with that. I don't know, but this is my information while the general public is way -- over 50 percent -- and it's on the increase, while the medical profession, they're on the decrease, which is certainly a good indication. So it seems to me that they must have realized by examining their patients that there is a definite connection between cancer and cigarette smoking.

It is also my understanding that a few countries have prohibited certain advertising in connection to smoking. I don't know if this would be any easy thing to do. I don't mean complete stoppage of advertising, but they have stopped for instance having a young girl of age 15 or a young girl with a cigarette -- this they have been able to prohibit. I think advertising could be used in a campaign against smoking, especially if as many well-known people, particularly people who are admired by boys and girls were associated with it. It is not always easy for young people to see justification for their own self-denial not to smoke, if their parents and for instance, their teachers are probably at times blowing smoke in their faces.

(Mr. Patrick cont'd)

We should use space and money to advertise the dangers of smoking, just as the tobacco advertisers have used teen-age idols and have romanticized the cigarette. I think society will need the help of the well known non-smokers -- and I do not mean this in direct advertising, I mean association of young people not smoking advertising on magazines and on television.

I do not believe it is impossible to unhook the cigarette from the students face. I think it could be done, but we have to get the message and the importance why they should not smoke. I would like to see frequent and regular announcements that cigarette smoking can bring cancer connections so that the danger is kept in the public eye more often.

Cigarette advertising agencies should be required to observe a more honest standard. In the long run I believe the most effective method of reducing smoking would be to create it as a luxury rather than a necessity. The difficulty of stopping the habit of smoking, once it is acquired, emphasizes the extreme importance of preventing young people from starting and laws I think should be instituted and observed concerning the sale of tobacco to juveniles.

Madam Speaker, I would like to move an amendment. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that the resolution be amended as follows: The fourth paragraph be deleted and the following instituted: "Therefor be it further resolved that this House to request the Minister of Education to instruct all school principals, teachers and athletic coaches to stress to the Manitoba school children and college students the harmful effects of smoking, and that health and physical education programs should include definite reference to the harmful effects of smoking.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): I wonder, Madam Speaker, if I might be granted the indulgence of the House and have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Second reading of Bill No. 52. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) presented Bill No. 52, an Act for the relief of Mytro Mandybura, for second reading.

MR. McKELLAR: Madam Speaker, Mr. Mandybura of Dauphin suffered severe and permanent injury and disability as a result of medical treatment administered to him at the Dauphin General Hospital on or about the 24th day of August, 1960. The injury was of such a nature that the said Mytro Mandybura was unaware of its full effect and the permanent disability arising therefrom until after the expiration of one year from the day the injury was occasioned. In my opinion, Mr. Mandybura should be given an opportunity to commence an action for damages and I suggest to the members they give this Bill their kindest consideration, pass it on second reading as I understand representatives of both sides are going to state their cases before the committee.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Bill No. 27. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) presented Bill No. 27, an Act for the relief of Clifford Junghans, Henry Junghans, Albert Chezick and Harvey Chezick, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, a highway accident took place in the fall of 1960 in which the injuries were quite severe. When the injuries were ascertained, the legal representative of both parties began negotiations, and were at the point where they had almost settled when it was discovered that the time of one year had expired. At that point negotiations broke down. I feel that this matter should be allowed to be heard before the courts in all fairness to the parties concerned.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Madam Speaker, may I address a question to the honourable member on this? The last honourable member dealing with the last bill indicated that both sides will be represented before the committee. Is there any indication whether both

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) sides will be represented at the committee hearing?

MR. STANES: I understand they will, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 62. The Honourable the Member for La-Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye) presented Bill No. 62, an Act respecting the Rural Municipality of Ste. Anne, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, the explanation of this motion lies in the fact that in 1961, the rural municipality of Ste. Anne started a very extensive drainage program and they found it hard to levy the money on a mill rate basis; also they thought that it would be fairer to everybody if it was levied on an acreage basis; therefore, they decided in 1962 to levy ten cents an acre and they proposed to do the same this year. This was unanimously approved by the local council and also involves only the Municipality of Ste. Anne.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a committee, with the Honourable Member from St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1. Administration, passed. Item 3, passed.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I thought there were some questions that needed answering but evidently the Minister either hasn't the answers or prefers not to give them.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I don't think we should let this Item 1 go before we've had a chance to discuss it a little further. It appears, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is quite rational when he's talking about matters pertaining to his department, but once he gets into politics, his rationalism seems to leave him and he goes into sort of a haze and gets a fixation, and he's lost. I'm tempted somewhat to follow him into that haze and see what happens, but I think I'll restrain from doing so.

I think what's being overlooked here, is the fact that the attitude of the Minister is not the kind of an attitude you'd expect of someone who is deeply concerned with the situation in Agriculture. From what he says he leaves the impression that everything is rosy with the farmers, and I think that is wrong. There are too many people today who feel that the farmer is having it very easy, that he's a pampered child of the governments and they're looking after him in every way, and that he's really the one in the community that is receiving all the attentions of all the governments in the country. Well that just isn't correct; and I suggest to the Honourable Minister, that he should try to avoid leaving that impression, or corroborating it. After all is said and done, what he has to say is taken as gospel, and the people who are not acquainted with agriculture are led to believe that what is being said about the farmers going south for the winter and so forth is true right across the board, which isn't a fact. Now as to his statement yesterday that 1962 was one of the best years the farmers ever had, I don't agree with him, and I think the very figures he gave us show that that isn't true.

Now if we take his own figures, he said in 1948, the average income was \$3,800 per farm. He says that was the second best year the farmers ever had, 1962 being the best. Although he mentioned the fact that there are fewer farms -- and he bases all his arguments on the per unit basis -- but if he would go ahead and explain to the people of Manitoba that if you multiply the number of farm units in 1948 by the income per unit the gross net income throughout the land was considerably higher in 1948 than what it is in 1962. Or even taking it from the acreage point of view -- if you take it from the acreage point of view the returns in 1948 were .12¢ per acre and they were only .10¢ per acre in 1962. Now I'm going by the over-all income and taking into account that there were 435 acres per farm in '62 and only 306 back in 1948.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to correct him right off the bat. He's working on the assumption that the average income per farm was \$3,800 in 1948. The figure is \$3,299 so he'd better work his statistics again.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well I think even if you take that figure my argument is still sound

(Mr. Hryhorczuk cont'd) and I think that if you take that argument and take the per unit as a basis it isn't a logical argument and it just won't hold water. But that isn't the point. I don't think that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is trying to tell this House that the farmer is well off as compared with other sections of the community. I don't think he's trying to tell us that; at least I hope he's not because it isn't correct; and if that is what he's trying to tell us then let him in answering make it quite clear that he's trying to tell us that. I suggest to him that he should give a clear and concise and accurate picture of the situation in our agricultural community; that our farmers are not as well off as almost all the other sections of the community, and make that in no uncertain language. Otherwise he's going to leave the impression, as he has, that the farmers are well off, they don't need any further assistance, they don't have to be looked after, all they have to do is meet the challenge. Well I've said in this House before, Mr. Chairman, that if all other things were equal I'd agree with him entirely, but unfortunately they're not equal. Other segments of our community, of our society, have certain protections and that's the only reason that the farmers must have them also. The price-cost squeeze is evidence of that and it's irrefutable evidence, so why on the one hand mention the fact that we have a cost-price squeeze and on the other hand say that everything is rosy with our farmers. The only reason I got up, Mr. Chairman, is I'd like to clarify that point. I know the farmers would like to see the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture make this point quite clear.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I just have one point I would like to bring up at this time and it has to deal with the matter of hog production. I mentioned this last year and the Minister, when I told him that we were importing all this pork from the United States, told me be careful, free trade -- didn't I believe in free trade. Well the situation has got much worse since the time I mentioned it last year. Our hog production has gone down and it's gone down quite a bit. It's quite some time since I've been at the plant where I work but I know that they were importing into the one plant alone, in a two-week period, a quarter of a million pounds of pork and that doesn't take into consideration the other two big plants, and I understand that they are importing more and more. I suppose maybe I'm bringing this up from a selfish point of view because on account of less hog production we have less people working. Talk about this Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future. We aren't even holding the jobs that we have today, and something very drastic is going to have to be done very shortly because it's getting worse every year. We started out with just a carload or two once in a while and now it's getting that it's carloads and trailer loads coming in every week. I don't think this is good; the income of the farmer is not as good as it should be and I believe that if they went into hog production, as my colleague the Honourable Member from Brokenhead mentioned the other day, that it has to be on a planned basis, that there isn't a glut at one time. And I believe that's why the production has gone down, that the farmer has got caught so many times in this squeeze where they raise hogs and then the price goes down, that they've decided just to quit raising hogs and I think it's a very bad situation.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to answer a couple of these matters that have been raised. I'll go back to last night to the questions that were raised by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I might say that it's the best speech I've ever heard him make on agriculture and even though I didn't maybe agree on some of the points he raised I thought he made a lot of sense. Not just because he happened to get up and substantiate some of my arguments but I think that kind of contribution that he made last night helps to throw a little light on the real problems in agriculture and helps in finding some solutions to them.

The first thing I want to do is answer his question about potato production in Manitoba. The reason that it appears from the statistics that potato production is not increasing is that in the past, in formulating the statistics, there was no difference made in the acreage of potatoes grown for domestic consumption and that grown for commercial consumption; they were all lumped together. Actually there has been an increase in the commercial acreage potatoes of about 2,000 acres per year. If we go back to 1960 it was 16,000 acres and in the year 1962 it was in excess of 20,000 acres. There has been a very marked increase in the acreage of potatoes grown for processing, and of course one of the reasons for this is the arrival in Manitoba of the Simplot Corporation. However, there may be a little levelling off of potato production. You have to have a little adjustment from time to time and I think we're better off to have

(Mr. Hutton cont'd) an orderly increase of the nature that we've had rather than to get too large a production without having time to establish markets for this production. In the past year the Simplot Corporation and the Carnation people have been successful in marketing our processed potatoes as far away as Great Britain and it bodes well for that particular product that we are able to find our way into such distant markets. I think that we can take some satisfaction and encouragement from the increase that we have shown in the past few years. I think we can look for further increases but we want to make sure that we have a market for these increases as they occur.

This question of guaranteed prices, I'm just going to say a word about that because I think it's pretty fundamental in this business of farming. I think if we talk about floor prices, which are designed to shield the farmer from violent fluctuations in price which can break him overnight this is one thing, but when we suggest that we should adopt a policy of guaranteeing prices which will return to the farmer his costs of production plus, I think we cannot do this unless we subscribe to the principle that we are willing to control our production. The present government at Ottawa increased the floor price on hogs back about 1957 and they got such a tremendous production of pork that -- and this was an increase if I recall of about two or three cents a pound -- they got such over production of pork that they didn't know what to do with it. The reason for this is very simple, that to the farmer who has the financial resources, if you guarantee him a profit on the production of any particular product it is a very simple matter for him to make certain that he has a substantial income. All he has to do is market enough units of production, even at a marginal profit, and the very volume of its production will give him a good return on his investment. As a matter of fact, the smaller producer is the loser whenever you try to guarantee profits to farmers. It has the effect that, instead of acting as a floor and only coming into effect periodically to save the farmer from undue losses, it acts as a ceiling on the price. If you put say -- guarantee to the farmer in Manitoba a return of twenty-two fifty or twenty-three cents on hogs, some of the producers will make certain that they have enough production -- are given an incentive to increase their production to the point where the price will never go above that, and to the smaller producer twenty-two fifty or twenty-three cents return on his hogs isn't enough. During the past year the price has been almost up to .30¢ -- it's sliding now, but it's sliding because there is some increase in pork production taking place in Canada. I think that if you want to subscribe to guaranteed prices which will guarantee not only the cost of production but a reasonable return to the farmer for his labour and his investment, then you have to subscribe to controlled production.

I'm not going to say that this is absolutely unacceptable. Maybe this is the answer, but I don't think the farmers of western Canada are prepared to accept this condition of guaranteed prices. It's going to mean controls. It means controlled production. It means that the government is going to tell them how much we are going to be able to produce. I think that when you consider the prairie region -- consider Manitoba, that we would lose a great deal by going into such a controlled production. It would tend to inhibit our growth and I think the growth of this prairie region depends, economically depends on our freedom to develop our resources and to get the most out of it.

Now, I just point this out. I think it's a set of circumstances devoutly to be wished for that we could produce our products with guaranteed prices -- but believe me, I'm afraid. Look what happened in butter -- we have quite a problem there. We had it with hogs when the Federal Government raised the support price and put no limit on production. Now that support price is only extended to the first hundred units of production. If you produce more than 100 hogs, sell more than 100 hogs, you take your chances on the balance of your production. They did the same thing with eggs because there you see, again, the large producer can produce in volume a price that your smaller farmer cannot match, and it is a puzzling problem. We should learn something from our sister nation to the south where they have endeavoured to support prices and they have got themselves in a great deal of difficulty down there. About the only things they are not in trouble with are those products which they have not supported pricewise, and I think it would be a little foolhardy for us to rush in. I will not argue against the contention that we can have guaranteed prices if we control outlets. That we can have, but I do suggest to you that western farmers are not prepared to accept those controls.

And I might relate to you, my experience last winter when I went down to take part in the

(Mr. Hutton cont'd) Fargo Farm Forum. This is a Farm Forum along the lines that our own Chambers of Commerce here sponsor each year and which has just completed its '63 conference. There were hundreds of farmers in there at this centre in Fargo, and they questioned me for an hour and a half because they were intrigued by the amount of freedom that our Canadian farmers have in choosing their production pattern on their own farms. So I think that even grant you some of the merits of such an approach, it is a grave decision that the farmers have to make, and I just suggest to you that they are not prepared to do so at the present time.

I might say a word on marketing boards. Well, we had a vote on marketing boards in Manitoba and less than half the vegetable producers voted in favour of it, and this again seems to indicate the feeling of the farmers in this western region. Marketing boards have gained acceptance in eastern Canada and maybe it's because the economic pressures are greater upon the producers in that area than they are out here. I think few people realize the wealth of the natural resource that the farmers in the west have at their disposal. My former deputy minister often said when we went away to attend a conference and we landed back in Manitoba "Thank God for the prairies." It's a wonderful region, a tremendous farming region and we have this great resource, and maybe the answer to our problem lies in developing that resource rather than relying or leaning upon Legislation to solve our problem, at least at this stage. But I would suggest to you that the Legislation in Manitoba pertaining or authorizing marketing boards was born of desperation; it was born in the 30's; conditions were desperate. I believe that it offends the sensibility of the majority of the people today. I think maybe it should be re-written in the thought, in the environment of 1960 rather than try to gain acceptance of many of the provisions in that Legislation as it now stands. I'm not saying that marketing boards aren't the answer; all I'm saying is that here again producers have to make very grave far-reaching and permanent decisions; and maybe if they're a little slow to arrive at such decisions, maybe if they're a little bit chary about going into these programs, maybe you can understand it because I think there's no turning back from them once you embark. One of the reasons that many of us have farmed was the thrill that we get out of making our own decisions, the satisfaction that you have of being wrong as well as right. A lot of the farmers, a lot of the agriculture producers cherish the right that they have and intend to hang onto it; and maybe if it doesn't make much sense from an economics point of view, it does from a spiritual point of view.

I'd like to answer here your proposal to provide in the Legislation of the Agricultural Credit Act for leniency in payments of loans in times of disaster. I think that you appreciate, and you mentioned that you did, that the Agricultural Credit Corporation does take into account the circumstances over which farmers have no control in times of disaster, in making their demands for repayment. But my experience on the farm was that it's just at that time when you have suffered a disaster that you've got to put forth your greatest effort if you're going to keep your head above water, and I suggest that although it might appear on the surface that this Legislature was helping the farmer to give him that assurance, that he wouldn't be required to make his payments, it might appear on the surface that this was a good gesture on our part, but let me suggest to you that in actual fact it might be the worst thing that we could do, because I don't think that we should go on record as encouraging complacency where the repayment of commitments are concerned. These are business arrangements that we're making with the farmers. They enter them knowing so; their record of payment indicates their good faith and in spite of the fact that we've gone through two very bad years in '59 and '61, their record of payment stand is something that I think few private lending agencies could match in terms of repayment. I would ask your indulgence in this matter, that you do not request such statutory leniency in times of disaster for the simple reason that it would encourage complacency. I think that we don't have to look at the other fellow and to pick him to pieces; I think that we can probably pick the beam out of our own eye in this regard -- that necessity is the mother of invention. I only have to go back to some of my early experiences in farming to remember how tough it was sometimes to find that extra \$50 or \$100 to meet a commitment, but necessity being the mother of invention you found it some way. Now if you remove the necessity by statute to meet these commitments, you're going to put that farmer maybe in the position where he's going to find it more difficult a year or two later to meet a growing obligation. I think that you can trust the administrators of this Fund to mix a little milk of human kindness in the administration and in the collection of monies that are due.

(Mr. Hutton cont'd)

Now to move on to the Member for Ethelbert Plains. He says the attitude of the Minister is wrong; the Minister says that everything is rosy, and he doesn't think I should try to create this impression. I wish that the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains wouldn't try to create this impression about the Minister. He endeavours to do so at every opportunity. Well, of course, I guess that's the prerogative of any politician to cast his opponent in the worst possible light. But I'm not standing in any rosy haze, I know, and I mentioned last night, that although farming is better in many respects than it has ever been, the pressures are much greater, the strains and stresses on the individual are much greater than they have ever been. It's much more difficult to get established in agriculture than it has ever been. The stakes are greater and higher than they have ever been and you can lose a great deal on one turn of pitch and toss in agriculture today, and this is the reason why we have tried to evolve the policies that we as government feel will help the farmer to survive under this modern economic climate. This is the reason that we have striven harder than any province in Canada to make crop insurance work for the farmer, because we know that a farmer today cannot hope to recoup his losses through the provisions that the PFAA makes for instance. That program may be adequate in 1940, but it is totally inadequate today and if I went back and gave you some of the statistics on the investments, although they're in that COMEF report, but the investments that are at stake today -- it seems to me I had them here last night -- were the investment even since 1946..... The capital investment per farm in Manitoba has grown from 9,000 in fifteen years to 25,000. This is what is at stake. His costs of production have gone up that's true and he's using fertilizer, his widespread use of fertilizer, his costs of sowing that crop today are greater, and if he happens to get a hail storm or rust hits him or the grasshoppers get him or for any other reason he loses that crop, he loses far more today than he ever lost before.

We've tried to develop a program of crop insurance which took into account these larger stakes that the farmer has in his business and will help him to protect himself against those risks that he has to take in modern day agriculture. To give you some idea of the difference, in 1961 the largest indemnity paid under crop insurance in Manitoba was over \$5,000, and the largest indemnity paid under PFAA was \$800, so that \$5,000 was almost seven times, going on seven times as effective to help that farmer who'd lost his crop. This past year in 1962 the largest indemnity was over \$9,000, eleven or twelve times more effective than PFAA was. What if that farmer had suffered that loss and all he'd had to fall back on was PFAA and he'd gotten \$800.00. He'd have been out over \$8,000.00. But these are the kind of programs that we are trying to evolve and develop to help the farmer to do a job.

Now we've been arguing about statistics, but let's look at those statistics once more, not to create an argument but just to give you an idea of the effectiveness of the program. Let's go back to 1954 when rust hit us in Manitoba and the total net income for the farm was down to sixty-five million; and 1955; and 1957 wasn't such a good crop; and look what happened to us in 1961 when we dropped from a hundred and fifteen million net income to sixty-four million in one year. And what was the reason for that? The reason for our net income dropping in half, or almost in half, in one year was the fact we didn't get a crop, we got half a crop. We can take these net income figures and we can do something about bolstering them or at least we can offset the deadly impact of such wide fluctuations with a program like crop insurance.

Now I want to go on record again, as I did last night, saying that we have only begun the job. We have only begun the job of trying to improve the farmer's position. Unlike some of my friends across the way -- and they're entitled to their opinion -- I believe that we can help the farmers to strengthen their business, to make it more stable, more by programs which help them to develop their business, which protect them from the vagaries of nature, which enable them to keep pace with producers of agricultural products in other jurisdictions, and if we have at the same time, reasonable protection from fluctuations in the market, and above all, if the policies of the Federal Government will keep those commercial channels open to our markets; because this is the lifeline of western agriculture and if anything happens to our markets we're done out here because we have a tremendous capability in production. It has not as yet been developed, I'd say probably half of our potential has been developed. I would make a plea that we stop talking about the terrible situation that the farmer's in. Let's recognize that he's got problems but let's not go around and talk about the terrible situation that the farmer's

(Mr. Hutton cont'd) in. We want a lot of nice young people, smart young people, clever young people, to stay on the farm, but if the only thing they ever hear is doom and gloom they're not going to stay; they'll leave. If at breakfast time, at lunch time, at supper time, every time they turn the radio on and the television on and every time they read a paper they talk about -- the topic of conversation is the terrible situation in which the farmer finds himself as compared to the rest of the economy, how are you going to encourage young people to take their place on the farm? How are you going to keep them down on the farm after they've seen Paree? And the old song still goes, but for some reason or other -- and unfortunately for the farmer in the rural community -- the politicians have found it to their advantage to continually cry about the terrible situation affecting the farmer. Now I object to that. I object to it for this reason: I chose farming as my vocation, and when you fellows over there are successful in booting me out of here that's where I'm going back. But, I object to people going around and giving the impression that this vocation that I chose to follow in life is a depressed vocation and that there's no future in it. I think it's wrong if we want young people to stay on the farms. I think it's wrong -- if the Member for Elmwood wants to get more hog production in Manitoba he'd better say to the farmers, "there's some future in hog production in Manitoba" and not say to him, "don't go into that because the price is liable to drop out of it." Sure the price may drop; the price has dropped on cattle in the last few months, but this doesn't change the decision, my decision, my determination, nor that of the government, to go ahead with a program to encourage livestock production. You've got to look ahead. We know that the potential is there and we've got to develop it. I think that we can recognize the problems of the farmer without talking about him as if he's some odd sort of person who has got himself into a predicament and all the King's horses and all the King's men aren't going to get him out of it. I think that we can do him a lot more good if we look objectively at it and see the good side, and see the problems that he's got and try to develop programs that will help him. This is what we have tried to do. You can't do it overnight.

I haven't made any exaggerated claims as to the progress we have made. I say we have made some progress. I must believe in it or I might as well put on my hat and coat and go home. I must believe in what we are doing; I must believe that it's going to be effective, that it is helpful, and if we can gradually build, and if we can save the ground that we gain, then I think, looking ahead in the next decade, we can look forward to a sounder, a more stable agricultural industry in Manitoba than we have ever had before; and one that's going to make its contribution, not just to the rural community, but to the whole economic structure of the province.

And this question that the member for Elmwood raised about hog production. He's put his finger on a very important matter. It is true that our hog production had dwindled here in Manitoba in the last year or two. I'll just take a moment or two to give you my ideas of why this happened. Manitoba has been in the past, traditionally, a grain growing province, a mixed farming province. We never had the economic pressures on us here that they had in Alberta for instance. Out in Alberta they get a great deal of grain production there that is subject to unfavorable harvesting conditions. Each year, unless it's an outstanding year, they harvest large amounts of out-of-condition grain. During the war years when grain was backed up on the farms, they had to find a way to get rid of it. During the war years and in the post-war period Manitoba was in a more favourable position to get rid of her grain because the bulk of the shipments were going through the Lakehead.

Since that time this situation has changed, and a great deal of our grain production is finding its way into the commercial markets through the west coast ports. But because they had all this grain, out-of-condition grain and other grain, they had to find a way of changing them into dollars. They developed quite a livestock industry in Alberta. They produced -- I think, if I'm not mistaken, they're the second largest hog-producing area in Canada, second only to Ontario -- maybe they're first now. But they developed, because they had wonderful range land and so forth, they developed a livestock industry. They developed a feeding industry that we haven't got here, a livestock feeding industry, because they had this out-of-condition grain; they had all the livestock there; they were a long way from markets and they had to do something; so they put the two together and they got a livestock feeding program. There was something else, though. Back about 1936 out there, the government passed legislation which guaranteed loans which were made to livestock feeders, and so they have had the advantage for some 27 years of a line of

(Mr. Hutton cont'd) credit, which encouraged this sort of an operation. We haven't had that.

I shouldn't say this probably, because it'll only lead to more debates and heat and arguments, but I think that this province suffered for many years because there was a tendency to "Let George do it" or let somebody else do it. There was an attitude in this province that matters of agriculture were the business of the Federal Government. One of the reasons why I contend that the programs that we are promoting here provincially are beneficial and they're helping to do the job, I insist on this, because I think there's a great danger in letting somebody else do it, I think that we should do as much as we possibly can ourselves, and I believe that if we follow that kind of philosophy, that probably what the other fellow does or doesn't do won't affect us nearly as much as it has in the past. The fact is, that in 1954 -- I know this is going to bother the member, the former Minister of Agriculture from Lakeside -- in 1954 when our commercial channels for grain dried up to about two-thirds of what they had been, the sales dropped from 385, as he pointed out, to 265 in one year. You don't need a Wheat Board report to know what happened, I know what happened, I got into the hog business to find a market for the grain. We were relying here in Manitoba to even a greater extent on our field crops production than any of our other provinces -- maybe Saskatchewan, I don't know. We had nothing to turn to cushion that change. "She was a pretty rough go," as the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has pointed out. We needed credit to make the adjustment that we needed to make, but there was no easy credit around. It was very difficult to get it. With the prices going down and our markets curtailed, we had to make adjustments. We found ourselves in the position where the larger farmer had an advantage. He could sell more bushels because of the quota system, and he could get by not badly. But the little farmer who had relied upon his excellence of management, this fellow who had grown 40 bushels to the acre instead of 30 or 25 and had been getting along, he found himself in the place where it didn't matter if he did grow 40 or 50, he couldn't sell it. And if he didn't have livestock, he had no way to convert it into dollars.

This is the reason why I believe that if we carry out these programs, extension-like programs, education, credit, crop insurance and so forth, that we can build an economy that is going to be less vulnerable to changing economic conditions. I agree with the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that we are vulnerable to these outside conditions and I think we should do everything we possibly can to reduce the impact of these changes over which we have no control. This is why I welcome the opportunity to build up the livestock industry in this province. Why? Because here is an area where we are looking to the demand on the North American continent, an area where we are less vulnerable than we are when we rely on areas beyond the seas. If we can develop this livestock economy and shift more of our emphasis on to it, we're going to stabilize this income and I think our farmers will be in a stronger position.

..... continued on next page.

MR. GRAY: First of all, I would like to ask you, Sir, whether we have a quorum here. I realized when I rose to speak, some honourable members, not all, felt what have I to contribute to agricultural discussion, and why should I interfere with the opinions of such a great man in the agricultural field like the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, and the Honourable Member from Lakeside. I think their speeches introducing the estimates were a real university lecture, not only for those who claim to know everything about agriculture, but for those who did not know, and have an idea right now. My agricultural experience was harvesting -- No. 1; and secondly, in my own business, I work with the Conservation Department as manager of a steamship line, in bringing here hundreds, if not thousands, of settlers who have settled, some in Manitoba, mostly in Alberta; had something to do with their settlements, with their welfare, and so on. So I take the liberty of getting up to take a few minutes to express my views. And finally, I did not want to have my grandchildren read the Hansard and not find that their grandfather had taken part in a discussion for which they may claim that I don't know anything about it, and which I admit. Now years ago, at a banquet given in my honour, I made this statement, that the rest of my days I will serve two ideals. One is try to repay Canada in allowing me here to become a citizen of Canada -- I have not yet paid my debt. I hope to pay it before I get my heavenly summons. Secondly, my contribution to, call it socialism, call it social democratic, call it justice, call it anything you like -- to try and make my little bit to create a better and freer and more peaceful world. And the third one which is my own idea, has nothing to do with this Legislature -- is to see that my own people who have gone through such a persecution and prosecution and Hitlerism and Fascism and everything else, if I could make my small contribution there.

I'm a member of Manitoba. I've lived in Manitoba all my life, and I've tried my best, outside the House and inside the House, whether it was listened to or paid attention to, to add my little bit of improving, in my opinion, the welfare of the province. I've always realized, long before I came to Canada, reading the Canadian literature of the Colonization Department, reading the posters distributed all over Europe about the glorious and fine country of Canada, and particularly the bread-basket of the world, like Manitoba and Saskatchewan, who are able and willing to feed the hungry people of Europe, at that time, half a century ago, and it still stands good today. While there are millions of people going to bed hungry, not having a piece of bread, we have plenty in Canada. So I looked on Canada all the time as an agricultural province creating food, not only for themselves, but for the rest of the world. That's why I'm interested, not in a scientific discussion between the Minister and the Honourable Member from Lakeside, or anyone else. I'm interested only in one thing, how much more can we produce of food. And it doesn't have to go to waste; it doesn't have to be burnt. If they cannot sell it, give it to the hungry world. If we can't consume it ourselves, help others. That was my ambition, my little contribution to the Province of Manitoba and to Canada, which is my ideal and idea and hope and aspirations, to pay my debt to Canada for allowing me to come here. I cannot understand -- you will always have to forgive me -- the discussion about a million bushels of grain or five million bushels of grain. This is a private economic struggle.

I am anxious to know one thing. How many farmers in the province are making a living through their sweat, through their labor? I'm not considering a farmer, whether he has 500 acres or 8,000 acres, who lives on Wellington Crescent or in Tuxedo or anywhere else, and sends out men down there to cultivate the land and raise so many million bushels of wheat or other grain. That doesn't interest me at all for the moment. That, I call it a manufacturer of farming, a manufacturer of grain, but not one that raises, not one that sweats, not one that plows the fields, not one that harvests under different circumstances and this is his livelihood. I want him to get the most revenue possible, but at least this is his livelihood; he's there for the purpose of creating provisions for himself, for the province, for Canada and for the rest of the world. My interest is how many young men, natural young men, children who were born on the farm, are remaining down there. If not, why? This we've got to look for the remedy. Why? Why are they leaving?

Years ago they left the farm because they had not the human conveniences. They left the farm because they did not have the conveniences of the city people. Now they have electrification and let me tell you something. Whoever is responsible for electrification -- I'm not going to take credit for any party, or anyone; I'm speaking objectively -- whoever has introduced

(Mr. Gray, cont'd) electrification on the farm, their name, their effort, their government, will remain as a wonderful example in the history of Manitoba, because if not for that one thing and others they would abandon most of the farms. I remember that during the relief years that people came into Winnipeg, stayed here for a year, starved, lived in single rooms, lived in fire hazard places, didn't know what to do, in order to stay here a year and get their right to apply for relief because the government at that time -- and I'm not speaking about any party at all -- did not allow them to get relief unless they're a year there, and what could it have done? Even the relief was worse in the country than it was in Winnipeg. Well, finally the powers--that--be have remedied it to a certain extent by the wonderful idea of electrification, so that they could have the same conveniences as the city; they could have television, they could have radio, they could have toilet facilities, if this is parliamentary language to mention here, because they didn't have it.

Now what are we doing today? To my understanding, you're encouraging big farms. Fine. You're encouraging people to make a business of their farms. This I cannot accept. I think we should do everything possible, either by credits or loans or hail insurance and fire insurance and every other medium that you can think of. Do one thing and one thing only. Manitoba is not yet an industrial province. We are doing the best we can to have industry here. Fine. That's good. But actually -- actually, it's a farm province and I haven't heard a thing through all the discussions here, an actual remedy to see that the farmer stays on the farm and their children follow them. You are encouraging urban development. It may be a good thing, providing you're not hurting the actual producer of nature. There's no responsibility yet expressed for our interest, for our concern of the millions of people who are creating trouble in the world today, not because they believe in Communism, not because they believe in something else. It's because there is nothing to eat over there. They are creating trouble there because they couldn't all come to Manitoba; they couldn't all come here.

And one more point and I am through, as an inexperienced agriculturist, and this is, there was a time when the position, or the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture was called also Immigration. Immigration is not dead. We need immigrants. We still have land here, quite a bit of land for the immigrants. We don't give a hang whether they come or don't come. As a matter of fact, the way I feel is, that we are opposed to immigration. If anyone from the hungry world wants to come here and he has so much land, instead of having one farmer having a thousand acres of land, let him have his 160 or 320 or even 600 acres of land, but don't leave a single farm a single acre of land uncultivated. Immigrants are here; they produce. If you take the history of the immigrants in the last 50 or 60 years you'll find out that 90 percent were immigrants who have cultivated our province and helped our province to progress. So the comment I want to make is this, instead of fighting over how a word should be spelled, whether with a "th" or whether with a "d", which is being done during the discussion the last couple of days, think how can you settle another farmer, how you can get the acre being cultivated. We have Crown lands. I asked the question the other day, what is the extent of the Crown lands available for settlers who want to come here and even sacrifice, and even work hard on a small acreage on a mixed farm, and so on. The question was not even answered because it didn't come in from an intellectual. The question was not even answered. So all I wanted to say is this to the Honourable Minister, who has done a good job -- I congratulate him; I think he knows his job; I think he knows the work; he is familiar with it academically and otherwise. Carry on with the raising of more grain, raising of more products, and don't worry about where or who will consume it. We'll find a place -- we'll find a place to do it. If butter is not economically produced by the farmers we have a government to subsidize it, as long as somebody eats the butter, and the butter and the fish and the meat and everything else you have is stored and preserved for our future generations in this province and also the rest of the world.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, since the matter of the Portage diversion was touched on by the Minister of Agriculture, I'd like to say a few words about this at this time. When I was elected to come and speak for the constituency of Portage and because I'd taken a strong stand against this proposed diversion, I was told by the grapevine that I was going to be in for a rough ride. I was going to have things made uncomfortable for me and I expected this, and I might say I wasn't disappointed, and I'm referring to some pages in Hansard, from 140 to 144, March 11th, when I listened to the Minister of

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd) Agriculture as he expounded on the sins of omissions of the Liberal Government in Ottawa in the '50s. He had quite a few things to say about the people on this side of the House and this Party. As a matter of fact -- I'm fairly broadminded -- I thought some of them were insults. There was innuendo and name-calling and, to put it quite mildly, I was shaken. When my honourable friend from Lakeside took it upon himself to set the Minister of Agriculture right in some of his misinformation -- and I think this House will agree that there was some misinformation that was corrected quite politely but firmly -- now I'm not suggesting that the Minister is spouting misinformation on the question of the diversion but I am suggesting that the rigid dogmatic approach which seems to be his approach -- well, I don't think it is right. Perhaps it is, but I'm just not buying it, lock, stock and barrel. In this case we are dealing with people. We are dealing with a small growing city. We're dealing with rich agricultural land; and because of things like this, because there are those of us who feel that there is an alternate solution, I don't think that because we have objected and we have what we think is an alternate solution, we have to be subjected to abuse and insults such as I'm going to record here and ask questions about. I don't think that the climate of brooking no discussion, or brooking no opposition, or tolerating no difference of opinion, is something that I, for one, feel like knuckling under to. I think of the last war in Europe, 1939 to 45, when many members in this room here were involved one way or another, and I think part of the reason for that fracas was because one person decided to enforce his single decision on others. Speaking for myself, I'm quite proud to be a Liberal and I'm quite proud to associate with the men on this side of the House, and when I hear names and allusions and inferences to the words like "puppy dog" and the "kiss of Judas", "misrepresentation", and "chameleon character" that have been thrown at us by this Minister, then I think perhaps we're on the right track in opposing him.

While we're talking about this type of debate I'm going to say it right here and now that I've had enough. I'm not going to take any more brow-beatings or insults. As I said before I consider it an honour to sit with the people I'm sitting with here, and if I have a difference of opinion to make with someone on the other side, I will direct it to the person. I won't direct it to the decent people who form that party or this party or the single person who represents the Social Credit. I've had about enough of this, and I would like to turn to one section in Hansard on page 141, and I'm going to ask the Minister, after I read this, if he's alluding to me. "One of the members put the question in the House the other day that he didn't understand why the people in his constituency didn't agree with part of the Water Control and Conservation program for Manitoba. Well, I don't think I need to tell him why they don't understand. There was a deliberate attempt, a concerted and a prolonged campaign waged in that constituency to draw the people astray and put the wrong -- to distort the facts -- and to create this opposition for political purposes." Were you referring to me?

MR. HUTTON: I think your guilty conscience probably prompts you to ask that question because I wasn't referring to you.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, if you were referring to me, I was going to call it a lie. -- (Interjection) -- Is it order when we have to take the names such as I have enumerated and then we question something that is said?

MR. EVANS: My honourable friend, it is not proper to call someone a liar or to refer to any statement as a lie.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member did not do that. He said he would if what he stated was true.

MR. EVANS: He'd better not.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: from the objection which we've just heard.

MR. JOHNSON: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture was, I think, proven wrong in some of his estimation of the cause of the wheat sale situations in the 1950s. To say that his figures used on that occasion were proven quite wrong, I think is a reasonable assumption; and coming back to this diversion, those of us who oppose this method of flood control and water conservation are by that same token not willing to accept wholeheartedly his assessment of this situation either.

There have been other methods of flood control and water conservation mentioned in connection with this area. For instance, the Holland Dam, the diking, items of that nature; and to

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd) suggest that there is less than complete agreement within his own Party seems to -- or with us rather -- seems to raise the Minister's blood pressure, and while he speaks of this agreement on this subject in our Party, I would suggest that there's also less than complete agreement or accord on this subject within his own group. I refer to the senior body in Ottawa where the former Conservative member for Portage-Neepawa, Dr. Fairfield, made no bones about making a statement that had a lot of publicity, and he believed firmly in, and he said that this new river, or canal, or diversion or whatever it is, would divide Canada in half and it would be a monumental blunder to the Conservative Party.

A prominent ex-MLA, Mr. J. McDowell, who has a farm on the Assiniboine River and has had some experience with floods and hardship from floods, and who understands some of the conditions, felt so strongly about it that he felt compelled to write a minority report which I would like to take a few items out to show that there isn't quite -- all the right isn't necessarily one way. "The Royal Commission of Flood Cost Benefit for 1958." Mr. McDowell has this to say in part; "As a member of the Commission I have given careful consideration and study to all matters pertaining thereto including submissions tendered and opinions expressed by experts and others. One of the basic and possibly main considerations in connection with the problems herein and their possible solution is one of economics, not only for the present generation, but for those of the future generations."

Further on, in giving some of his recommendations, he recommends that there's an extensive removal of silt and other objects deposited in river beds, that by undertaken to be dredging and straightening would be of help. He recommends part, I think, of what the thinking is of other members of the Commission when he says that a dam be erected on the Assiniboine River at Russell, and he likes the idea of a dam to be erected on the Assiniboine River at Holland. However, he has some things to say about that particular dam and I would like to quote: "This dam should, if adequate footings can be established, be of such a magnitude as to utilize the river channel which runs through the adjacent hilly country and builds up an impoundment of water to the extent of 4 million acre feet. Further, if this impoundment could be built up to a high enough head, it would permit of the diverting of water to southeastern Manitoba through the Morris River basin." Next he says that - "if adequate footings cannot be established at Holland to build up a head water as aforesaid, then a series of dams should be directed between Holland and Brandon, that consideration be given to a larger basin being provided in the Assiniboine River at Portage la Prairie so as not only to maintain that city's present water supply, but to assure of an adequate supply for future needs. Further, in my opinion, what is referred to as the High Bluff diversion into Lake Manitoba should only be resorted to after it has been definitely established that all other means of control are exhausted." And he mentions the cost of this item which I think is known.

"Further" he says, "the silt and other obstructions such as islands, may be removed from the Assiniboine River through its course from Portage to Headingley." And he goes on. Coming near the conclusion he says, "I am unable to approve or join in my fellow Commissioners' recommendation for the construction of a floodway." Now at this stage he's speaking about the big one around Winnipeg, and he says here, "It is estimated roughly that the cost of construction of this floodway would be \$64 million plus an annual maintenance cost of \$225,000.00. If, as proposed, these costs were amortized over a period of 50 years at five percent it would entail an annual payment of \$3,760,000, or a grand total of \$188 million."

Coming near the conclusion of this report he says, "If we clean out the Red River and the Assiniboine River by dredging and removal of obstacles therein, as well as remove the lister rapids and raise our permanent dikes, we could take care of a flood as high or higher than the one which occurred in 1950. Finally I must stress the importance of reasonable financing costs to carry this out."

Now, when I read from a minority report I'm not reading to prove a point for myself. I'm bringing this forward to say that there is differences and serious differences. Another person quite far removed from the scene, who is not closely or, shall we say, emotionally connected with this particular item, has something to say along this line and I would like to read it. "The Honourable Mr. George Hutton made a statement at the Winnipeg Junior Chamber of Commerce meeting recently, that Manitoba will be safe even from major floods by 1967. This exuberant message carries with it the spirit of Mr. Hutton's political statement that now

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd) the Roblin government has done its best in the interests of Manitoba's future. I make this statement as a challenge to those that are for the floodway and the diversion canal at Portage la Prairie. I say the intended creation of the floodway around Winnipeg and the diversion channel at Portage la Prairie into Lake Manitoba, are the two greatest mistakes ever to be undertaken by any government in Canada up to the present time. The diversion of Manitoba water from central Manitoba around Holland and the Souris basin to Lake Manitoba is a disaster of the first magnitude. These waters should be kept up on the plateau. From there they should be let down by gravity to be used when required. There the water can be used for for the benefit of the whole province. Diverting these valuable waters into Lake Manitoba makes the water useless. It must be remembered that Lake Manitoba is from 25 to 50 feet lower than the Holland area and 100 to 200 feet lower than most parts of Manitoba where this water could be used. Once in Lake Manitoba the water is lost to 90 per cent of agricultural Manitoba. The only use for this water will then be to divert it into Winnipeg to clean up excess sewage rubbish. The loss of this water which has great potential use west of Portage, will in time be a serious matter for Winnipeg. This great city cannot live by and to itself, but only if water can be built up above the first level." He goes on to state that we are living in a 10-inch annual rainfall country but the government is taking steps in terms of a 50-inch annual rainfall country. Now again, I don't say everything this gentleman has to say is true, but it sounds quite sensible, quite reasonable.

I would like now to refer to a flood control meeting at Portage la Prairie last April when there were about 400 people in the hall, and there was much discussion taking place with the Minister of Agriculture on the platform along with some of his advisors from his department, and there was a question and answer period, and at that time I was trying to form an opinion as to whether this thing was of some harm to the City of Portage or not and I asked a question, I believe it was Mr. Griffith I directed the question to, and I asked him -- while in my view I'd stated before that this thing was too close to the city; it was cutting off the westward growth in a year or two or a few years when we reached that stage, and I asked, could not this structure be moved further west, and I think I used the actual guess by mileage of five miles -- four or five miles -- and I was rather surprised to get the answer back that he didn't know. Now perhaps more studies have been made on this, and perhaps this department does know now. If so, I'd be interested to hear.

Also at that time, I had heard, more by hearsay I think, and I think I saw it in print once or twice, of the proposed canal that was in the wind, or talked about, that may be constructed from Lake Manitoba back to the Assiniboine River east of Portage. So I directed this question to the Minister of Agriculture, if this was so, was his government considering the building of this type of a canal, and his reply was "No, we have no intentions." So I took that as an answer. Later on I started to wonder, but at the time I took it as an answer.

During the recent election campaign, when the Minister of Agriculture came out to Portage to take it upon himself to explain a few things, when it was suggested -- and I believe myself was one of the people who concluded that this diversion route was laid out where it was staked out, which was about 300 yards from the built-up area on Portage limits -- if I can recall correctly, the Minister said that this route wasn't necessarily the route; that there were two other routes in that area under consideration, and he said that one of them was as was being staked at that time. The next route that was possible was just to the west of the cemetery which would take it not much over a mile, and I would say under the mile -- it's just an estimate on my part. And the third possible route was further west. I would like to know, for the people affected in this area, if you can give the correct route of this to allay their fears, that instead of having probably 20 or 30 or 40 families and house-owners worried, you now have around 150 of them quite upset. And for the relief of their feelings, I would think that at the earliest possible moment you could tell us just where the proposed route is.

When we come along later to this particular item in the estimates, with my limited knowledge that I do have, I have a few questions that I would like to ask, and I will take it up at that time, but I think one of the primary things that we in this area are concerned with, aside from the taking of much rich agricultural land and stunting the city's growth to the west, is the separating of our water plant from the city, if this one particular route is used, which incidentally our Water Superintendent, Plant Superintendent, tells us that he cannot guarantee our

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd) water supply during the period of time there is water in that particular ditch in that location.

We come to the question of the priority on the water once it gets into Lake Manitoba, and I refer now to the year 1961, when there was very small run-off, very little rainfall, and now -- I can be corrected on this -- but I have read, I believe, in some of these reports, that the desirable level of this lake is from 811 to 813 feet above sea level. I have information that, and I can't prove it out, but it is semi-factual, I'm going to try and prove it out, that the evaporation rate in that particular area is always a foot -- a foot per season that is -- and has gone as high as two feet in evaporation. Now as I say, I may be a little extreme on that two feet, but I can -- I'm sure I can get the information to substantiate the fact that there is a foot or more evaporation in that part of the country in the summer season.

Now, in this priority and water use, we have people who have built up their lives and their homes and their livelihoods in that area, and where would they come in the question of the priority, because there's a canal back to the river east of Portage la Prairie? Does this mean that the most people who happen to be in Winnipeg have the priority, and they take this water? I am inclined to believe so, if the means is there to take it and their need is as it was in 1960 or 1961. The protection of the farm people, the fishermen, the resorts -- cottage areas in that area, the trappers and the wild life people, I believe, are prime consideration because they were there first. As far as downstream people and the flooding problems that they have, it has been said -- of myself I believe; I've had it quoted to me often enough -- that "you people up there in Portage don't give a darn for us and our problems downstream." Well, this has been said to them -- I don't know who said it; possibly it's like any other election, the rumours fly -- but nothing could be further from the truth. We are concerned about them downstream, as much as we are concerned about ourself. We are concerned about Winnipeg's problem with their cleaning of their rivers. We had the same problem ourselves a few years ago in Portage la Prairie, and through the enactment of a law we had to correct this situation, and this correcting the situation has placed a heavy burden on the taxpayers of Portage la Prairie; yet we don't see the same solution being used in Winnipeg, or the fact that they should also take steps to clean up the pollution that is of their own making.

Once again, I would like to say that for those people downstream that need help and relief, we are certainly for it, and we believe that this other means that has been suggested, although it is more costly -- I'm first to admit that -- but when you come to put money and people together, I don't think it's a very fair choice to ask people in this area of the Portage Plains and Portage City to step aside in favour of money. If it can be proved that this is the only method of flood control and water conservation, I firmly believe that these people would go along with it and make that sacrifice. But we are not convinced of that.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, speaking to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, I listened with great interest to the Minister the other night when he gave his introductory report, and claim that they're in a much better position -- personally, I feel that we are all happy that we had a better year in '62 than in '61, because as already said by previous speakers, and also as the report of the Farmers Union bring out, that the total net income for '61 was down to 61 million, so that -- and the '62 is much higher. Therefore I think it is reasonable for all of us to be happy about the situation, that we have had a better year.

Mr. Chairman, I think farming must be profitable in order to make it attractive and also in order to keep the farmers on the farm. Too many of them already have left the farm, and too many are leaving the farms in pursuit of other jobs, other better-paying positions than farming is able to provide for them. I am not going to discuss the cost-price squeeze because I think that has already been dealt with quite ably by both the Minister and the Member for Lakeside, so that I will more or less just deal with matters that are of interest to me and where I feel improvements can be made.

In looking at the COMEF Report, which is protecting farming also for the next 10, 15 years, I read with interest the comments made regarding special crops, because that is very close to home. Southern Manitoba is the one area that I feel vegetable growing can be done in larger amounts than it is presently done, and can be done with success. Therefore, I think we should put more energy and more research into this field in order to provide us with the

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) necessary costs to be able to grow them successfully. I notice it mentions such special crops as sunflowers, the canning crops such as sweet corn and peas and beans, but I think there are other special smaller crops that could also be produced and canned or frozen in large quantities and be put on the market. We have two canneries in the southern area located at Winkler and Morden, and I'm sure that the farmers in those areas would only be too happy to increase their acreage in producing these crops. Presently, they are limited to a large degree by the volume the plants can handle, and therefore I feel that more interest should be taken in trying to develop the present industries there so that they could handle larger volumes; and at the same time, I think freezing should also be considered at this time.

However, I also feel that in respect to cereal crops, that this is an area where we could afford improvement. Not knowing that I would speak at this time, I left some of my statistics at the hotel, but I know some of them from memory. I noticed from the Cereal Reports that they put out weekly, that barley production in Canada is way down. I think it's about a hundred million more than it was some ten years ago. And Manitoba's production is lower than the average for Canada. So that here is an area that I feel research is needed and new varieties should be brought about so that we can grow that crop once more successfully. Too often the crops are hit by smut, mildew, or root rot -- I think these are some of the most common diseases, and some of these are not being resisted by the present varieties that we have, and surely this is a commodity that we can export, that we can sell, that we've had markets developed for in the past, and I think we should do everything possible in not letting these markets go; to increase the production and, in order that farmers can grow the crops and sell the products, because many farmers in the past enjoyed selling a carload of barley every fall even when the quotas were in effect. So that this was one way of getting some more cash into their hands in the early fall.

Another item I feel should be stressed and more concentration should be given to, is the matter of soil erosion. We have quite a few smaller streams in the area and these overflow in spring and we have erosion, soil erosion by water. This is a very sad state because once the land is eroded you have no way of restoring it, because once the top soil is gone, your land is almost worthless, and we have a good many quarters in the southern part of the province where we have almost annual flooding and you see deep gullies in, about three, four feet and even deeper, and thereby causing so much damage to the property which presently has a very high value, so that I think this is an area where we should have more development and more way of assistance in fighting. I think the work on the Hespeler floodway, if you can call it that, should be increased so that it would be ready in a short time. The way it's going now it'll be years before it's completed, and by that time too much damage will have been done.

While I'm in full support of both the Manitoba Credit Corporation set up to assist young farmers, and also the Manitoba Development Fund which assists smaller businesses, I feel that we should also petition the Federal Government to increase the maximum that they presently have under the Farm Improvement Loans Act whereby farmers can borrow to develop their homes and their farms. I think a number of farmers would avail themselves of this because it would not entail mortgages and long-term dealings with the two said organizations that I already mentioned, or with the Federal Farm Loans Association. Surely enough, this could be done quite readily and I feel that this government should make representation to the Federal Government to have higher maximums placed on these loans. Presently, to construct the farm dwelling costs about the same as a city dwelling except that you don't have to pay for the lot and some cost regarding sidewalks and so on, but surely the cost of the dwellings are much higher than they used to be and that these maximums should be increased, so that farmers could make more use of the Farm Improvement Loans Act. This is also low-cost credit, and therefore I feel I can recommend this very strongly.

I listened with great interest to the Minister also some time ago when he brought in a sample of rapeseed, a new plant that had been developed. I'm sure this is welcome to the farmers not only in our area but across the province and also in other provinces, because this is a larger type seed and rape is a crop that can be quite readily produced. As long as you have a good, normal rainfall and moisture you can grow a good crop of grain, and it is easy harvesting so that there should be no obstacle in raising and increasing the production of rapeseed. This would also help our local plant at Altona which is processing all seed crops, and

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) presently we are importing most of the crops, or most of the raw product that is being processed from across the line, and here again I would like to impress on the Minister that we develop varieties that are suitable for production in Manitoba. I brought this to the attention of the government on previous occasions and I still feel that this is an area where improvement can be made, and that we should do all in our power to provide the growers with the new varieties so that they can produce the crops successfully.

I did not hear the Minister mention anything about credit unions. I think he mentioned co-operatives in connection with the Metis, and some projects that they have going or are contemplating, and certainly we can bring this matter up under the proper item. However, I would just like to mention that a credit union movement is growing very fast and that this self-help movement is providing the necessary working capital for many a farmer in rural Manitoba today. If it were not for these organizations, these societies, I'm sure the call on the Agricultural Credit Corporation and other such credit institutions would be called on much more, but through this self-help movement the people provide for themselves a place where they can secure the necessary credit that they need in their operations. I will have something further to say on that when we deal with that particular item.

The matter of marketing boards came up this afternoon. I noticed the Minister mentioned that a vote had been held last fall, I think it was, in September, and here I cannot go along with the government nor with the legislation that is presently on the books. I feel that this legislation is giving too wide powers to boards that should not be given to other bodies and to this Legislature. There was an article in the Winnipeg Tribune on September 8, 1962, dealing with this matter -- I think it was on the editorial page -- and I would just like to read a part of that editorial because I felt it was very timely and it also hit at the very root of it. In part it reads this way: "The orders of such a board would carry authority in a sense the board would be given law-making power, another instance of the Legislature's delegating legislative authority to a private board or commission. The Act contains the provision that any person who fails to comply with an order of the board shall be liable to a fine of not less than \$25.00 and not more than \$500.00 and to imprisonment up to three months."

Then they go on: "If a vegetable marketing board were set up, here are some of the powers it could have," and they list quite a few of them. I'm going to read out the powers that they name out there: "1. To set the time, the place, the buying agencies, the price, the quantity of any regulated vegetables that might be sold. 2. License anyone who desires to grow, pack, store or transport any regulated vegetable. 3. To prohibit anyone who hadn't such a license from marketing, storing, transporting or packing regulated vegetables. 4. To charge license fees. 5. To cancel licenses. 6. To require information from growers or marketers with power to inspect books and premises. 7. To limit the amount of any vegetable that should be sold. 8. To set maximum and minimum prices for regulated vegetables. 9. To seize any vegetables marketed against board orders, to sell them and to retain the money received from the sale. 10. To search trucks and other vehicles transporting regulated vegetables. 11. To license road-side vegetable stands even when the producer was selling his own vegetables."

Then they go on, saying, "Such sweeping powers are sanctioned in the Natural Products Marketing Act. It is difficult to understand how so drastic a piece of legislation has been permitted to remain on the statute books without being challenged by members of the Legislature who have valued individual freedom of choice, and the right of the individual to market the product of his labours." It continued, "There's a great deal to be said for the idea of voluntary co-operation among producer groups in marketing products, and for consumer co-operation as well. The reasons most often advanced for compulsory marketing boards are that such boards ensure stable prices. This stability could be a small return for the loss of freedom and initiative." That is in part the editorial that was in the Winnipeg Tribune on September 8th of 1962.

Mr. Chairman, I agree that under this legislation the powers given are far too wide and that these powers should be changed. I'm all in favour of voluntary boards, I'm in full accord that where people can get together and work together for the common good, I think it's valued and it's done the right way, but when we delegate authority and power as set out in that Natural Products Marketing Act, I think we're stepping beyond our bounds.

(Mr. Froese, cont'd)

In discussing marketing boards, naturally our Canadian Wheat Board is also a marketing board under federal act, and they have sold the products such as wheat, oats, and barley for many years through the facilities of the commission houses and the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, and while I do not say that they haven't done a good job, in my opinion, they have held the line, but certainly the prices we receive today are not what we would like to see. I think the farmers should receive better prices today and that the Board, and also the governments concerned, should see to it that the farmer gets a better price and receives more for his product.

I would also like to mention the farm worker. I notice in the COMEF report, on page 329, that they list personal income per person, per farm person in Manitoba, and they give the figures from 1941 to 61 every five years, and certainly according to those figures farm income for the farm worker is still very low, and one of the paragraphs reads this way: "Decline in farm income has made it impossible for farmers to raise farm wages in comparison with other industry. From 1944 to 1947 farm wages in Manitoba averaged \$4.74 a day for hired labor, while unskilled labor in Winnipeg received \$4.66 a day. By 1960, however, the wages of farm workers had risen to only \$8.00 a day while unskilled labor in Winnipeg was receiving \$12.24 a day. As a result of this low farm income two major changes are under way in agriculture in Manitoba, and many Manitoba farmers, in response to better income opportunities elsewhere, are leaving agriculture."

Then if we take a look at the Canada Year Book, 1962, on page 734, we find the table of the wages paid both daily, monthly -- yes, daily and monthly wages, and they have them there for all the provinces, and if I take a look at the situation in Manitoba the average monthly wages, without board, in 1961 was \$141 for January, and \$165 in May, and \$167 in August. This compares with the -- since 1957 it was \$123 for January, and \$151 in the month of May, and \$146 in August, so that you have a very little increase over the last five years or so that farm labor is receiving. In addition to these monthly wages we must also remember that many farm workers are not employed the year round. They only work some seven months a year and then they have to try and make ends meet and use some of the money that they earn during the summer months to get through the winter, so that I feel that we have to have higher income for the farmer in order to be able to pay more to his farm worker. We know that the farm worker today is not able to receive unemployment insurance. This has been extended to all other workers -- even construction workers today are able to receive unemployment insurance. The fishermen are able to receive it. However, in the fishing industry this is on a voluntary basis and they may contribute to it if they so desire. I think farmers should also be able to contribute to the unemployment insurance fund so that a farm worker would be able to draw in the off season if he is unable to secure employment.

Farm workers today are actually in the low income group as we consider it in Canada. Very often we speak of the Maritimes and some other areas as low income groups, and I am sure that the farm worker in Manitoba belongs to this group of low income, and I think we should do more for them to raise the income of this group. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I'll have to stop.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I rise, not as an agricultural critic but simply to obtain from the Honourable Minister of Agriculture an explanation or clarification respecting a question which I asked him on March 6th last, and the answer which he gave me. In Volume 5 of Hansard, page 42 and page 43 of March 6th, 1963, I directed to the Minister the following question: "Could the Honourable Minister advise me as to whether or not any Order-in-Council was passed under the provisions of Section 21, subsection (3) of The Rivers and Streams Act as amended at the last Session of the Legislature, raising the designated area from 150 to 350 feet -- that is, in horizontal width from the summer water level of the river?" To which question the Honourable Minister replied, "Madam Speaker, this has not been done. The matter is under consideration between the municipalities interested and the Department."

Now I understand, Mr. Chairman, that before anything is passed as a regulation in Manitoba there must be an Order-in-Council, and I find in referring to the Manitoba Gazette, Volume 91, 1962, July to December, on page 210, "Manitoba Regulation 52 of 62 being a regulation under The Rivers and Streams Act designating a district under Part 3 of the Act which was filed on June 29th, 1962." And a reading of that regulation, Mr. Chairman, shows that

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd) the area designated as Area No. 1, which includes the City of Winnipeg, the City of St. Boniface, the City of East Kildonan, the City of West Kildonan, the Rural Municipality of Fort Garry or the City of St. Vital, were included in that designated area, and the area was extended from 150 feet to 350 feet back from the summer water level. Now it may be that there was some misunderstanding on the part of the Minister but I thought my question was quite clear and I thought his answer was quite clear, and there was no equivocation either in my question or in his answer. In the light of this regulation as it appears in this Gazette, I would like to know or have some explanation from the Minister as to why he advised me that no Order-in-Council was passed.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I owe an apology to the honourable member because I should have corrected the understanding, or misunderstanding, that I left with him. The reason that I probably answered that way was that I was aware of the fact that it had not become operative. It can't become operative until it is approved of by a Resolution of each one of the Councils involved. Only three of the municipalities involved approved of it so that the regulation did not become -- or the Order-in-Council did not become operative. It is not yet operative. The 150 feet is the area, the designated area even today, and it won't become operative until all the member municipalities pass a Resolution endorsing the change. I know that the information I gave the honourable member was incorrect. I was aware of what he was talking about, and at the time I knew it hadn't become operative and it was really a slip on my part.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister this question. Isn't it a fact that your Order-in-Council should not have been passed until you received the Resolutions from the six municipalities concerned, and that being so isn't it a fact too that your regulation should never have been passed?

MR. HUTTON: I suppose from a strictly technical view this is true, but you will recall -- I must admit that I'm guilty of giving misinformation to this Legislature over and above what I gave to you, because the last Session of the Legislature I was asked whether the area municipalities had given their approval to this extension of the designated area, and I said yes. The reason I said that was that their representatives on the Rivers and Streams Authority No. 1 had come to me and asked me to have this amendment to the legislation put through, and so when the representatives on the Authority came to me and asked me to amend, or asked the government to amend this legislation, I took for granted, and so did the Department take for granted, that the member municipalities were approving of this, and that is why we put through the Order-in-Council; but then subsequently, just as a matter of form, we asked them for the Resolution and it wasn't forthcoming, but I might add I think we're going to get it now.

MR. HILLHOUSE: the question, Mr. Chairman, what stand is the government going to take in respect of any municipality which has acted on the strength of this regulation and is sued?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.