

**THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 25, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

**HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Law Amendments Committee.

**MR. CLERK:** Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg me to present the following as their Second Report:

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 8 - An Act to amend The Jury Act.

No. 13 - An Act to amend The School Attendance Act.

No. 19 - An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments Act.

No. 21 - An Act to amend The Forest Act

No. 24 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act.

No. 25 - An Act to amend The Gas Pipe Lines Act.

No. 26 - An Act to amend The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act.

No. 33 - An Act to amend The Mortgage Act.

No. 34 - An Act to amend An Act respecting Soldiers' Estates.

No. 36 - An Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 7 - The Presumption of Death Act.

No. 11 - An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act.

No. 12 - An Act to amend The Garage Keepers Act.

No. 17 - An Act to amend The Wildlife Act.

No. 20 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

No. 23 - An Act to amend The Provincial Police Act.

No. 35 - An Act to amend The Treasury Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments; all of which is respectfully submitted.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MR. SPEAKER** presented the motion.

**MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's):** Mr. Speaker, it is not my proposal to oppose this motion, and I don't think that the business of the House should be held up by attempting to send this report back, or any part of it, but I feel that I cannot really record my vote in favour of the motion without at the same time indicating a strong objection to a section in each of two Acts, that is, two separate matters that were dealt with by the Committee this morning and which will have to be dealt with in greater detail by the Committee when we come to review it in Committee of the Whole, and I want briefly to refer to these two items so that it is clear, that on these two items we have strong objection to their being enacted.

The first was a matter in the Bill dealing with The Presumption of Death Act, where the Bill itself on second reading received the approval of this group, and of course of the House, but it was in the Committee, Law Amendments Committee itself, that a proposal was made by or on behalf of the Honourable the Attorney-General who is a sponsor of this Bill, bringing in amendments to his own Bill and indicating additions, some of which were in order to ensure that the courts would be bound to make further investigation and give proper notice to people concerned, of the possible actions involved in making an order declaring a person to be dead, and that of course is proper and may well have been the result of certain comments that were made during second reading. However, the other amendment that was introduced was a section which provided that an order made under this Bill No. 7...

**MR. SPEAKER:** As the Honourable Member for St. John has the floor. I wonder if attention may be paid to him.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under Bill No. 7 the order that was made should not apply for the purposes of a policy of insurance, and when this matter was discussed in committee, and after hearing a representative of the Legal Department of a life insurance

April 25, 1968

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)... company, it became apparent - to me anyway - that this Bill was designed to make possible the easier dealing with the estate of a person about whom there was not sufficient proof of death in the form of a death certificate but circumstances such as indicated the probability of his being dead, and it enabled the dealing with his estate. It also would enable his widow to marry again, to obtain a marriage certificate, marry, have a marriage which would not be subject to prosecution as a bigamous act, have children who would be considered legitimate, until this person, who is presumed to be dead and by order was declared to be dead for all purposes, suddenly turns up and says anything to indicate that he's not dead but he's very much alive, in which case this widow could still be free of prosecution under a bigamous act but she would not be validly married to her second husband, nor would her children be legitimate, nor would the estate to which she may have succeeded belong to her because it would have to revert back to the person presumed dead.

Now, we considered this and we accepted the fact that this is a bill which was necessary, because many occasions arose where this type of legislation should be used for the benefit of society, but we could not for the life of us see that the matter of payment of a life insurance policy is of such serious, has such serious consequences that there should be some other act, the Insurance Act, that would have control over the dealing with a life insurance policy, and it seemed to us that life insurance industry was put in a preferential class as compared with a potential widow, as potential children may be involved, or all the other aspects. There, of course, is a contradiction in the Act itself as now proposed by this Committee wherein it says the court may make an order that the person shall be presumed dead for all purposes, and then it goes on to say it shall not apply as an order for the purpose of a policy of insurance. So as I say, there's a contradiction in the Act itself, no doubt brought about by the fact that there was an amendment brought in at Law Amendments.

I therefore indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have opposition to this amendment and I might indicate that it's a matter of some satisfaction to know that some of the members of the Liberal Party voted with us on that, and I noticed also a number of the Conservative Party, so that one can't say that this is a matter on party lines, although I should also indicate that all members of the New Democratic Party present voted in opposition to it.

The other point I'd like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is our strong opposition to a provision in Bill No. 11 which permits a municipality to make a deal with private interest with some industry, some consumer, probably a public utility or water, to give preferential treatment by way of reduced charges to this industry, which can only be assumed to be an inducement to come into the municipality, and the Bill provided that this would have to be approved firstly by the Public Utilities Board and then sent by by-law to resident electors whose approval would have to be given, and when given it would then become a matter where the difference in cost between the reduced rate and the regular rate would be charged to the -- by way of -- well, charged to the general fund of the municipality. It was indicated today in Law Amendments - an amendment was brought to the Law Amendments Committee - that this might not be feasible because indeed there is a limitation of 30 mills that any municipality may charge on this general fund, and apparently the Minister of Municipal Affairs has to approve of any increase beyond that 30 mills, and to obviate that need, apparently the amendment was brought to provide that, instead of being charged to the general fund, there would be a special levy made to provide for this shortage between the special concession, the preferential treatment, and the regular rate.

Well, we opposed that, Mr. Speaker, for several reasons. One reason is - and I don't quote the former Premier verbatim because I don't have before me what he said - but I recall his agreeing to the proposition that deals - preferential deals - are harmful to provinces when provinces compete one with the other in order to induce industry to come to one province rather than the other. And the making of concessions is a dangerous thing because then you start competing on concessions, on give-aways, on buying industry to come in, and that's a never-ending problem that occurs. And I know the former Premier in the past also felt that this was harmful as between municipalities; and yet, although the Municipal Act as it stands today does permit municipalities to make special concessions, that doesn't make it right, and the fact that it's been on the books for 10 years, which is roughly the length of tenure of this government, does not in my mind improve this government's attitude in any way whatsoever and is only to their discredit rather than to justify their continued actions in making it possible for municipalities to compete in a give-away program.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)...

Now the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities, when he introduced this Bill, said that this section was so designed that the persons who are most concerned are given an opportunity to vote on it, and this I think is not correct because I think the people of Manitoba should be most concerned with special deals that are being made, and competing municipalities should be most concerned with special deals that are being made, and these people will not have any opportunity to voice their views or to object or to be protected by the Minister of Municipal Affairs or anyone else, except that the matter has to be dealt with by the Public Utility Board. But the Minister said, in all fairness, that he doesn't control the Utility Board; there are other ministers who have indicated that they do have influence, such as the Minister of Agriculture and the acting Minister of Highways, who unfortunately isn't listening to what I'm saying so he can't reply to what I'm saying, but he indicated that he could possibly have some influence on, I think it was the Milk Control Board. But the Minister of Public Utilities indicated that he has no way of instructing or consulting with the Public Utility Board and can therefore not vouch for the manner in which they would deal with a proposed by-law such as this. Therefore, I don't feel that, unless the Act says something about it, that we can rely on the Utility Board looking at this from the standpoint of the province, or of the welfare of competing municipalities, or other than for the welfare of the municipality itself and its ratepayers, who would possibly benefit from the introduction of new industry into that municipality.

So, for the reasons mentioned, Mr. Speaker, although there are other features in these bills which are important and need to be dealt with, we are opposed to these two particular ones, and since we don't want to hold up the others, I propose that the House should vote in favor of the motion before us but should check its conscience carefully on the two items which I mentioned and then deal with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the Honourable the Attorney-General when he's on his feet. Unfortunately, when he is seated and interjects, the contribution he makes is worth no more than the fact that he is seated and it is not recorded on the Hansard.

MR. LYON: ...order, my honourable friend perhaps is aware that I can't speak on this motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, if the Honourable the Attorney-General can't speak on the motion, then the fact that he tries to do so on a seated basis with interjections does not give him any more right. I'm sure, though, that there must be other colleagues of his who can speak on his behalf and who can explain the indignation which he seems to show at the fact that I am making a point, good or otherwise, but one which seems to arouse his ire in some way. He's still interjecting but I think it would be better for the House if I ignored him, and indeed I intend so to do, and if he would only stop speaking, then I could stop, Mr. Speaker. Might I say, I've heard people say that it's difficult to know how to start to speak. I often find it more difficult to know how to finish, and I would know how to finish if only the Honourable Minister would stop interrupting me.

I used the word "conscience" and I don't know whether it's "conscience" I should have used or "good judgment," but I do feel that the two points that I made are worthy of consideration and are not really in criticism of the government as such, but in criticism of the actual approach to these particular two items, and I don't think that it would be wrong on the part of anyone, or loss of face, if a review were made in the minds of the people promoting it to see whether or not it is really necessary in each of these cases to be as strongly in favor of these amendments as the Committee majority appeared to be this morning. So I hope that when we come to deal with this in Committee that there will be an opportunity to make some changes that would seem to show a proper approach to the problems and a change in thinking in that respect.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of the record I should record, on behalf of my colleague the Attorney-General, who introduced the resolution, and myself, and we are responsible for the two bills referred to, we will indeed be glad to take what has been said under consideration and be prepared to deal with the matter properly when the third reading, the committee stage on third reading, is before the House.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, having been a member of this Committee which dealt with these two bills this morning, and having supported the Honourable Member for St. John's in his motion to have deleted from Bill No. 7 the reference to the Insurance Act, I feel it incumbent upon me to say a few words.

April 25, 1968

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd)...

Bill No. 7, in my opinion, is a general extension of the law. It gives a right which we did not previously have or could not previously exercise, because my understanding of the law before this Bill was passed or introduced in the House, was that there are only two instances where you could apply to the court for a declaration of presumption of death. You could apply under the Marriage Act, and if your application were granted and a marriage licence were issued to you, that marriage licence was endorsed with a stamp to the effect that if a spouse turned up at a later date your marriage was invalid. Then there was the case where you could apply under the Insurance Act for a declaration of Presumption of Death.

Now, as I say, I supported the Honourable Member for St. John's in his motion to have deleted from the amendments proposed by the Honourable Minister of Utilities, the 3 (2) which he excepted from the operation of the Act the provision of The Insurance Act, although quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I was of the opinion, and still am of the opinion, that a general Act does not supersede a special Act, and that it was not necessary to put this amendment into Bill No. 7, because if Bill No. 7 had been enacted in its original form there would have been excepted by the operation of the law and the interpretation of statutes the provision relating to insurance policies, and I think that that would also be true in relation to an application for a Declaration of Presumption of Death under The Marriage Act. So I don't think that we're arguing in respect of a matter that carries great weight, and I felt that I should explain to the House the reason why I do intend to support this bill on third reading.

I think it gives us something which we did not possess before, and I don't think that the addition of that amendment has taken away from it anything at all, because the law itself presumes that this general bill, Act, would not apply to a special law.

Now, as to the other Act, the Utilities Act, I appreciate the fact that perhaps we have been wrong in our history in Manitoba in allowing municipalities to make special deals for utilities to come in, but I think we're a little late now. We're sort of closing the barn door when the horse is gone, and particularly in the Greater Winnipeg area where planning now is under the jurisdiction of Metro. Other municipalities -- certain municipalities in the Greater Winnipeg area would have no right to grant an industry a special privilege by reason of the fact that industries are not allowed there, and, to me, I think that the amendment that is suggested here takes away from this House something that we had to deal with and lays the responsibility at the door of the municipality in question, and I think that's where the responsibility should rest. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I do intend to support both bills on third reading.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support and I did support the comments of the Honourable Member for St. John's in connection with Bill 7, The Presumption of Death Act, in the discussions that we had in Committee and in the amendments proposed; I did support his views and I still do.

However, in connection with Bill No. 11, the bill amending The Public Utilities Board Act, I take a different view than what he expressed, and I do support the bill and the amendment that was brought in this morning in Committee of Law Amendments. I felt that what we have been doing in the past where deals were made by certain towns or municipalities with certain industries and so on, and then they came in to have these ratified by the Legislature, I felt this was wrong. I believe that . . . can be made and that they would be made at the local level and that the people concerned would then ratify and act on these. This is what the legislation proposes to do and I am in support of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 72, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I may inform you that His Honour recommends the proposed measure to the House and I have here for you his signed recommendation.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have several schools represented today. We have 46 students of Grade 11 standing, from the Carberry High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Presunka and Mrs. Ansell. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs.

We also have 20 students of Grade 8 standing, of the Aberdeen School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Davids and Mrs. Daly. This school is located in the constituency

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)... of the Honourable Member for Burrows.

We also have with us today 49 students of Grade 11 and 12 standing, of the Gilbert Plains School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Ray Murray. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to put a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Is he now in a position to inform the people of Manitoba with respect to the situation concerning the negotiations of the Manitoba Medical Association and the MMS?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. According to the story in the paper, the negotiations appear to be at a stalemate. One of the parties, and namely, the medical profession, walked out. Could the Honourable Minister inform the House whether negotiations have resumed?

MR. WITNEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member for Burrows a supplementary?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Please, Mr. Speaker, a further question. Could the Honourable Minister give this House any indication as to what the state of affairs is, when will negotiations resume, or if he doesn't know that, when will he be in a position to inform the people of Manitoba as to what the situation will be come July 1st?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Russell.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. I, along with members of this Legislature, today received a letter in the mail from a woman representing a committee, the residents of Headingley, and I noticed in reading it that they pay Metro taxes and they depend on receiving police and fire department and hospitals and school representation from the Metro area - and I am taking for granted, I presume that Headingley is in the Municipality of Assiniboia - when Assiniboia and St. James become one, this union takes place, can you visualize that they would no longer have to pay long distance telephone calls? It seems rather unfortunate.

MR. MCLEAN: Mr. Speaker, this matter was discussed at some length in the Committee on Utilities and Natural Resources and I would have nothing to add to the information that was given there by the Chairman and General Manager of the Manitoba Telephone System.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Commissioner of Northern Affairs. What is the target date for licensed television coverage for the northern communities?

MR. LYON: That question, Mr. Speaker. I think could more properly be answered by my colleague, the Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. MCLEAN: May, 1969.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to advise the members of the House that the Principal of the R. B. Russell School has made arrangements to conduct a tour for the members of the House through that facility on Tuesday next. I believe the Whips have been together and suggested a date, a firm date be given. It is thought it would take about two hours to go through the school in groups, followed by a light lunch at the school, and have you back here as soon as possible in the early afternoon before the House. If the Whips of the different parties would just give their list of those interested in coming to the Whip of this Party, it would be most helpful to know the approximate numbers of people who would like to make that tour. I think you would enjoy it and it might be helpful to honourable members in looking at a junior vocational type of operation.

While I'm on my feet, I also wish to advise the House that there is open house at the Manitoba Institute of Technology for students around the province on Thursday and Friday of this week. In connection with both the Manitoba Institute of Technology, the School for the Deaf or any other educational facilities, I'd be happy to have anyone, through their Whip, signify to our Whip, and if there are groups or individuals in the House who might like to pay a visit to any of these facilities, I could try and arrange small groups during the Session. I'm just at your disposal, or at the disposal of the House, Mr. Speaker.

April 25, 1968

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)

Thirdly and lastly, this afternoon I will be distributing vocational kits to the honourable members, which is the kind of brochures that are available outlining the kinds of courses available at our three vocational and technical centers in the province, and I pass this out as, I think, useful information for the benefit of the honourable members and I'll follow this up with further material at a later date.

MR. CHERNIACK: Might I ask the Honourable Minister of Education to repeat the date and time when the invitation is being extended to members of this Assembly to visit the R. B. Russell School in my constituency, and I would like to endorse the invitation that he has made.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, it is my error. I had planned to ask the Member from St. John's to second the motion. Tuesday at 10:00 o'clock next. This coming next Tuesday at 10:00, and if we get enough people willing to come, we can have lunch there and be back here in plenty of time.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary question to the Minister of Public Utilities. In his reply to the Member for Birtle-Russell with regards to telephone service for Headingley, he stated that the Chairman of the Commission had made a statement in committee, but not all the members of the House are members of the committee and obviously there is also no record there. Could the Minister make a statement to the House, if not today on some other occasion, outlining exactly what the situation is, and in specific reply, if the amalgamation does go through between St. James and Assiniboia, whether under those circumstances service would be extended?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I would want to take this matter under consideration. I am inclined to think that this would be more properly the subject matter of an Order for Return or some such appropriate measure, because I do not, as Minister of Public Utilities, undertake to answer for the Manitoba Telephone System. They are a Crown Corporation and in matters of administration I think it is best that they should make their own statements with regard to the service to their customers. I just indicate that I'll be glad to consider what he has asked me. I'm not able to give any undertaking at this moment until I've had an opportunity of considering the position.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the Minister says that they are a Crown Corporation. That's correct, but surely questions asked in this House of the Minister are properly answered in this House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think on a point of order that the whole question is really a doubtful one for Orders of the Day in any case.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, further to a question of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface the other day with respect to the Health Resources Fund. We have received a letter from the Minister of National Health and Welfare advising that there might be a limit put on the amount of money available from the Health Resources Fund for this year, and indicating that each one of the submissions by the provinces will have to be approved by him. There has been no indication as to what that limit will be and, pending further clarification, no change is being made in our present plans.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, is the total amount being reduced - 500 million - is that going to be reduced?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, not according to the information in the letter, although it is not stated yea or nay.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Yesterday, Mr. Minister, you indicated that a bill dealing with The Electoral Divisions Act was on its way from the printers and would be here soon. I wonder if the Minister could indicate how soon and what sort of a journey the documents may be taking that they have not arrived as yet.

MR. LYON: It will be distributed very shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I may direct a question, please, to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources whose picture appears on a recent issue of "The Fisherman", I think it is, which was received yesterday. There is a statement there which reads: "Fishermen will be glad to know the Revenue Tax Act, often called the Sales Tax, has been changed. You can now buy fishing gear or repairs at any time of the year." Could the Minister indicate to this House when and how the Revenue Act was changed to make this provision -- this possible.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, that question should be directed to me. I'll take notice of the question.

MR. CHERNIACK: The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer suggests the question be directed to him. I thought that the responsibility of this publication is that of the Minister of Mines and Resources, but if the Provincial Treasurer would rather answer the question I certainly have no hesitation in ...

MR. EVANS: I think it's my subject. I'll take notice.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

(a) the date; (b) the number; (c) the nature and purpose;  
of all Orders-in-Council passed in the years 1966, 1967 and 1968 up to and including March 31st, 1968.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Rhineland ...

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to suggest to you, Sir, that the question should not be put on this Order for Return because it is out of order with respect to -- and I would refer you to Citation 171 of Beauchesne Fourth Edition Page 147 Paragraph (ff): "A question, oral or written, must not seek information set forth in documents equally accessible to the questioner as statutes, published reports, etc."

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, what I'm asking for here is more or less a catalogue of the Orders-in-Council passed. Sure, this is information available, but how are we to know the numbers and the nature of the Orders-in-Council? How are we to find out which Orders-in-Council to ask for? We have no way of knowing, and this is my purpose in having them listed in this way so that we are able to get the proper information the way we want it. In other years we have had Orders-in-Council passed and affecting certain legislation -- I can mention the Development Fund, the Development Authority Act, and we as members had no way of knowing that certain changes were made. Not all of these Orders-in-Council are gazetted and therefore we, as members, have no way of knowing. The same applies to letting of contracts and so on. These are also let and we have no way of finding out or knowing in what way to ask for the ones that we do want to know about. This information is simple in nature, and certainly we could then know the various Orders-in-Council concerning the different departments, the numbers and the dates thereof, and the nature and purpose, so that we had a way of finding out and getting the information that we need. So Mr. Speaker, I deplore the Honourable Minister's comments here that it should not be put to a vote because this is information that should properly be made available to members in the proper way.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for their comments and I appreciate the feeling of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I intend to take this matter under advisement and give it the consideration it deserves.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would be good enough, Sir, to call the second reading of Bill No. - I'm looking to the Honourable Member for Selkirk for some -- Bill No. 51. That's on Page 2.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon, Bill No. 51. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate to have a look at the Bill and I see no objection to it; therefore I'm not going to take up any more time on it.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'd like to speak on it, Mr. Speaker, if I may. I had several comments to make respecting this Bill, but at the outset I wish to make it doubly sure that I have no objection to the City of Brandon acquiring as many parkades and community clubs and as many of such facilities as possible. My objection to the Bill is based on the method by which they intend to raise the necessary funds for those purposes.

In the first place, dealing with the parkades, it is the intention of the city to obtain statutory authority from this Legislature to create a Local Improvement District and to charge that District with the cost of a public parkade. Now I have always felt that the basic concept of our local improvement legislation in The Municipal Act was that the area to benefit from the local improvement should be charged, but if you created a Local Improvement District it

April 25, 1968

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd)...was presumed from that that the whole district would benefit and consequently the whole district would be charged, but here we have a case where the city is seeking statutory authority to create a Local Improvement District for the purpose of raising funds to build or establish or open a public parkade.

Now I cannot see by what stretch of the imagination that anyone could set aside a certain area and designate that as an area which was going to benefit from a public parkade. I ask you to visualize the Park -away at the Hudson's Bay Company here. Supposing now that were a public park-away and it had been built by the City of Winnipeg, and supposing the City of Winnipeg had asked this Legislature for legislation permitting it to draw a line around that area, say of two or three blocks or more, and say that this is the area which is going to benefit from that public parkade. Now to me it doesn't make sense. A public parkade is for the benefit of every citizen in that area; not only that, it's for the benefit of every tourist and every person who comes to that area and who would use it.

Now another thought that has occurred to me is this. It is being created for a public purpose. The money is going to be raised by a local improvement levy. Now once we in this Legislature say that this is the area which is to be charged with this local improvement levy, we are denying those people a right which they possess under the ordinary Municipal Act of appealing to the Council against a levy or assessment on the grounds that they do not benefit. Now it's fundamental in The Municipal Act that if you are going to charge property other than property fronting and abutting on a certain local improvement, you must give the people whom you are charging the right to appear before you and object to that assessment. Now if we in this Legislature say that you have the right to measure off a certain area and say that is the area that's going to be charged, you're going to deny those people a right of appeal against that assessment. And I think the principle is wrong.

Another thing that I'd like to call to the attention of the House and that is this: this is a public parkade which is being built by moneys financed from local improvement levies. Now, assuming that in due course the cost of building this parkade will be paid off and that parkade is starting to show a profit, where's that profit going to go? Is it going to go to the City of Brandon as a whole or is it going to be held by the City of Brandon in trust for the Local Improvement District upon which the money was raised to build it. Now I think you're digging yourself into a hole here and I think you'd better take a very close look at it before you go ahead and shut the door completely.

Now another objection I have is this: that is, to building community centres by a Local Improvement levy. I think that principle is wrong for this very reason, that you may decide that this particular area is going to have a community centre; you're going to make a levy; you're going to create this a district for the purpose of that levy. Now that may be a rich area but you have other areas in the city that are not as rich; they haven't got the assessment. So what you are in effect saying is that if you have the money to raise the assessment in this particular area, you're going to get a community club, whereas I maintain that a community club should be for the benefit of the whole community, and by this method of setting aside a certain area and saying that "we're going to make a levy here for the purpose of raising the capital funds for a community club," it's basically wrong, because if an area is rich and can support that levy, you're automatically or indirectly depriving a poorer area of the benefit of a larger assessment base to cover the cost of a community club in their area. And I think we should take a pretty close look at this because I think it's the wrong principle. I think community clubs are for the benefit of the whole community, and if a city or a town or a village intends to establish one, the necessary capital costs should be raised from the whole district so that there's going to be no discrimination against a rich area and a poor area.

Now I'm prepared to let this Bill go to second reading because I'd like to hear what the city fathers of Brandon have to say in justification of their thinking, but quite frankly I am opposed to this principle of using local improvement levies for those specific purposes. I think those local improvement levies should be over the city as a whole and should not be on a designated Local Improvement District.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member for Inkster has leave of the House to allow this matter to stand?

MR. LYON: He said he did not wish to speak, Mr. Speaker. He said he had taken the adjournment, looked at the Bill, but did not wish to speak.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would you now call the Committee of Supply.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. 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.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Arthur in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Agriculture. Resolution 7. (a) -- passed?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should take this time to reply to a number of the questions that were asked by the members yesterday.

The Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains made a particular point about the defect that's in our crop insurance, and before I get on a band wagon and blow their trumpet, let me admit that any program that we have to offer has to evolve and continue to improve, but there are some particular things that he stated that just don't stand the light of day. The program has evolved and is providing a very real and meaningful service to the farmers. He made mention of the fact, or he challenged me with the suggestion that most or a good number of the farmers in Manitoba were purchasing it solely to get out from under the PFA levy. I should like to inform the honourable member that this numbers less than 2,000 or 2,500 and we expect this to go down. Now you might ask me how do I know that, and I say this from the information that we have that particularly in that area, of Hamiota west to Saskatchewan, as high as 75 percent of the farmers are buying the higher coverage of crop insurance that is being offered. Now if the farmers were, in fact, only buying crop insurance to do away or to get out from under the PFA levy, surely it's safe to assume that they would be buying it at the very nominal or the cheapest level that they could buy it at. The fact, however, that they are purchasing it at the higher coverage levels would indicate to me in no uncertain manner that they see the benefits of the program and are in fact buying the program because of its own merits. There have been a very low number of cancellations, numbering less than four percent, among which of course you have to judge that there would be some 2 1/2 percent of these people who are just simply getting out of farming. The response to the program this year is very encouraging. We anticipate a considerable rise, over some between 500 and 700 new applications made within this particular area that I'm talking about alone in this coming year.

The honourable member took some time to read about the need for subsidies in agriculture in terms of complementing the farmers' income, and I'm not prepared to say that there is not a rationale for the judicious use of these. I think we all agree that we have a national cheap food policy prevalent in the country, and I have to also agree with him that it is not fair to expect the farmer to be the sole carrier of this burden. But isn't that precisely our problem; in trying to find the right kind of mechanisms, in trying to find the right vehicles through which this will be done? Is it through the vehicles of marketing boards and the increased bargaining strength that farmers hope to achieve through there? Is it through broad national support prices, recognizing at all times that there is of course only one taxpayer in this country and we of course are part of that taxpayer too and we have to support these programs?

I'm suggesting to the honourable member that these are the current questions that are being exhaustively examined by both federal and provincial experts, and certainly our influence--that is, the provincial department's influence - is making itself felt wherever and whenever conferences of this nature and get-togethers of this nature are being called.

He made a comment that I couldn't quite follow with respect to land grants. I see nothing particularly wrong. If you're concerned about a man's income, if you're concerned about a man's income, and his income can be improved in fact through renting out his land, this is a matter of personal choice. In today's agriculture this is sometimes the case, where he may not be on that kind of a unit which makes common sense for him to get himself involved with the expense of machinery and what have you, to operate a small acreage or something like that he may do just as well by renting out, if that's his choice. I don't advocate it. This is a matter of personal choice on the farmer.

He went on to list of course the declining number of farmers; and yes, that concerns us. It concerns us to this degree only, though, that we are concerned about what we can do about

April 25, 1968

(MR. ENNS cont'd)...the viability of those who choose to remain in agriculture and keep agriculture the important industry that it is for us. You know, there are all kinds of locations that are disappearing to some extent. I suppose I could list a long list of, you know, blacksmiths or candlelight-makers or others who have disappeared from our scene. Now I'm not suggesting that our farmers are ever going to disappear from our scene or that agriculture will ever cease to become the important industry that it is, but it stands to reason that with the changes that we see, that with the opportunities available in other areas some shift will continue to occur. I have no guarantee that my two sons particularly wish to farm. I hope that one of them will, but if they seize some of the educational opportunities that my colleague the Minister of Education puts before them, they may well choose another vocation. Of course this is one of the freedoms that we enjoy in this country.

The Honourable Member from Lakeside took particular pains to remind me of my predecessor's old statements with respect to what we would do in terms of the cost-price squeeze. At the outset I would have to agree with him that the cost-price squeeze is not eliminated. It's possibly been better identified in the last eight or nine years but certainly it is not eliminated. However, I take issue with him on this particular score. I take issue to this extent, that we have done as much as we can do and, well, I shouldn't say as much as we can do - that always denotes a self-satisfied position and certainly I don't hold that position - we have done a great deal towards doing what we can in terms of alleviating the cost-price squeeze in those areas that we are empowered to act in. And again, I wouldn't insult his intelligence by referring to the kind of programs that I have referred to several times in the past.

Now it's also very difficult, because I'm well aware that the advances so often gained by introducing new technology into agriculture are but a short-term gain for the farmer. The innovator often does very well in this particular field - that is, the man that leads the pack, if you want to put it that way. But generally speaking, when that general productivity increase is general throughout the farming practice, it seems somehow that the consumer ends up being the prime beneficiary of the gain in productivity and that the farmer once again is faced with the question of another step in increase in productivity to keep abreast with the rising costs. I suggest these are the areas, the main areas of conflict within this squeeze situation. Ours - and I don't wish to appear to simply be passing the buck - lie in the area of our failure to come to grips with sound national agricultural policies. Just what is the total Canadian response towards the kind of national agricultural policies that we wish to adopt in this country? I'm not prepared to dogmatically state that I have the answers.

I would like to think that it has to begin by a series of things. I think we have to decide that it is to the Canadian national interests that a level or degree of agricultural activity is desirable through the country. And I would have to agree with him that perhaps the experts, the people that look into the future, have over-sold the concept that it's fallen on our particular lot to feed the hungry millions of the world, and I must say to him that in this particular area it's been a very frustrating one for any government or political person to be in, because the very same experts in some instances - and I don't challenge their expert knowledge - who but 18 months ago or two years ago predicted this kind of a situation, are now in many instances doing a considerable about-face on this question, and one can't help but be in a very perplexed position on this. Some suggestions go as far as to indicate, for instance, that India, a country of traditional famine, will in fact be in a self-sufficient position within five years and indeed, if need be, in a position to export wheat to Canada. Now where does that leave us in terms of our long-term approach to our tremendous capabilities of production - that is, if they continue to be harnessed in the direction of a one-crop economy, primarily wheat? I don't know. All I say, that in defence of this, governments are looked upon, are expected, are asked to lead - and undoubtedly sometimes they lead with the chin. We do this on the best advice possible. I don't think that we would be serving, you know, the farmers' interests if we shied away from making these projections. I'm suggesting and realizing that a lot of people, a lot of government people both federal and provincial, a lot of people in the grain trade, considerably more knowledgeable than I am, are just as perplexed in this particular instance, that is, the change from a very buoyant wheat and general cereal crop outlook of just a few months ago or a year and a half ago, to what we face right now. And I must interject at this moment that it is also completely wrong to allow a, you know a prevailing feeling of gloom to enter into it, because the situation can change just as rapidly, just as rapidly. So I have to leave that particular subject with the traditional farmers' approach. We're all "next year's" men. We take that

(MR. ENNS cont'd)... attitude every time we take our last crop off and look for the coming spring to put our next crop in.

Now the honourable member made a specific point, and I think in answering this particular question I would answer the questions of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead and the Honourable Member from Gladstone, when he drew my attention to the Productivity Council, and I have to admire and appreciate the way and the manner in which this was brought out. I again feel that the honourable member is well aware that nothing has been done in terms of setting up this council. He perhaps is more concerned about what has been done with the money that this Legislature voted for that particular council in the previous session and why it is again appearing in the estimates of this session.

I should have to say this: we are not at all sure just in what direction we want this particular piece of legislation to go at this point of time. I would have to say to the honourable member that I listened, and I think perhaps my First Premier, my First Minister listened, with a great deal of attention when during the last session the Honourable Member from Lakeside took considerable time and effort to berate this government for passing on its powers and authority to the various boards and commissions that we have set up from time to time, took considerable time to point out to us that we have abdicated some of our responsibility, in fact becoming a government of different boards and advisory boards and commissions.

Now perhaps it was this particular advice that the Honourable Member from Lakeside gave this government at that particular time that sunk in, if I might use the expression, that has led us to re-assess our position in some of these areas. As the First Minister has indicated, the whole area of government activity, including the boards and the commissions that operate under government activity, are being re-examined and it was felt that during the course of this examination we did not want to add into or establish a new council or a new board during this interval. I would like to indicate to the honourable members that the \$55,000 which was budgeted for the Agricultural Productivity Council was not spent or transferred last year, and in fact that appropriation, Appropriation 36A, in General Research, there was some \$67,000 under which this Productivity Council money was not spent at all last year. The same amount is included in this year's estimates under the heading of General Research. We have provided it there because in the area of general research we are never quite sure precisely what we will be called upon to spend. Different producers' groups, as I mentioned earlier, will put special requests in for either ourselves or the Faculty of Agriculture to respond to special research studies; we like to be in a position to respond to them.

Secondly, I should also say that I hope that perhaps with some further plans that I wish to announce to the House at a later date, that there may well be an opportunity and reason for me to consider my present thinking on this and indeed go forward and establish the Agricultural Productivity Council. So this basically, Mr. Chairman, is the situation with regards to the Agricultural Productivity Council.

And just in passing, I should just let the honourable members know that I have no lack of boards, I'm not wanting in boards to advise the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I'm just listing a few of them that I'm involved with such as the Milk Control Board, the Manitoba Marketing Board, Artificial Insemination Advisory Board, the Horned Cattle Advisory Board, Agricultural Society's Advisory Board, the Women's Institute Advisory Board, the Board of Wheat Commissioners, Horticultural Society's Advisory Board, Veterinaries' Service Commission. In other words, your Minister is being advised from all different directions and all different points of view, and I shake my head a little bit about just whether I need another board to advise me at this particular juncture at this particular time. It may well be.

On the question that the Honourable Member from Emerson raises, I would have to -- he's concerned again, similar to the ones that his colleague the Member from La Verendrye, with respect to the drainage, lack of drainage within his area. I know that he is aware that I have met with municipal officials from his area, from his constituency. I can't, off the top of my head, recite to him just precisely the work that is being contemplated within his constituency. I look forward to dealing with those matters in the estimates of the Department of Highways under which water control is situated.

There seems to be a suggestion that when we're dealing with the area of the marginal farmer or person under these circumstances, that there is a specific plan or specific, you know program on the part of the government, to relocate for relocation's sake. I know that that may well be some of the kind of suggestions that economic studies or surveys indicate.

April 25, 1968

(MR. ENNS cont'd)...

Our program, of course, is very simple; that we feel that we have the same obligations to bring to all residents of Manitoba the kind of educational facilities, the kind of recreational facilities, or what have you, in the best way we know how. Now, very often in so doing this, of course, brings about a shifting of population, a shifting of population from some of these areas into urban areas or into growth centres within the region, the purpose being, of course, simply to try to improve their opportunities through the services that the government has to offer.

On the matter of what is a friendly family farm - or I guess we know what the Friendly Family Farm is, but what is the family farm? He asks specifically for a definition of — or I believe the Member from Gladstone raised that particular point. I would have to say to him that there is no set definition of a friendly family farm and that we are in error if we attempt to do so. That definitive line of what constitutes a family farm will always be a fluid one. For example, for instance even in the very highly mechanized situation in the United States where there are at the moment, where the rationalization has far exceeded our own situation and where you have some presently, some population of six or seven million actively engaged in agriculture out of your 200 million, it's still considered that the bulk of the food produced in the United States will be maintained in the hands of independent family farms but that these independent family farms could number as little or as low as 750,000 to a million. That is in the United States. So obviously there, when they're talking about independent family farms, they're talking about very large independent family farms, and I'm suggesting to you that what we could consider ten years ago, even, to be an independent family farm unit need not be the same today, in fact will not be the same tomorrow. I think it's more important that we make it possible for the independence of these farm structures to continue, and certainly it's my intention to see that that comes about.

The Member from Rhineland spoke at some length with respect to the projected developments of the Pembilier. Again, perhaps, this particular subject would have been more appropriate if this had come during my estimates on the Department or the Branch, the Water Control Branch. I think the honourable member knows the position basically that I have taken on this. I could report to him now that initial meetings have taken place between departmental officials. I had hoped myself to be meeting with the federal Minister; however, pressures of the House prevented me from going in the final instance. My Deputy Minister represented me with Minister Pepin of the Federal Government. I would have to indicate to him that when he attempts to put specific deadlines to what should and shouldn't happen in the near immediate future that we are of course getting ourselves involved with a very large project, one that will require a great deal of negotiation with the Federal Government. We have asked the Federal Government to approach, through its External Affairs Department, the American Government to see what action they are prepared to take in this regard and I look forward to, perhaps later on in May when the Federal Minister will be travelling through this way, to have a further report from him. -- (Interjection) -- Well, he may be a part-time Minister too, but at any rate I'll take what I can get in this particular area.

More and more important during those discussions - and I don't want to digress from my agricultural discussions - was our concern with the situation with PFRA, and because of some uncertainty existing in PFRA we have what is growing to be an intolerable situation with respect to the southwest region of our province where some projects of some eight, nine years of standing, and certainly that would have to be considered on top of our priority list, have been stalled, and we hope, through means of direct confrontation with the senior PFRA officials both in Regina and the federal people in Ottawa, to see what can be done to get these moving.

He made some reference to or remarks particularly to the FRED program, and critical to this extent, that he thought that some of the programs that were carried out in the FRED program were not in effect necessarily specifically designed for agriculture. I believe those were some of the concerns that he has. Well I would, of course, have to point out to him the difference between FRED and ARDA. FRED, if you take the full term, Funds for Rural Economic Development, is not at all solely directed at agriculture. Under FRED we are improving the recreational facilities at Lake Winnipeg Beach; I'm buying wetlands for wildlife; we'll support the efforts of my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce in helping to establish Industrial Park in Selkirk; we'll develop lands for agriculture; we'll hold short courses in classes for agriculture as well as other courses. The greater amount of this is perhaps — or

(MR. ENNS cont'd)... a great portion of it is geared fundamentally towards education particularly as it relates to adult education and manpower facilities, roads - a good portion of it is involving roads which are not necessarily tied directly to agriculture. It is in fact embracing the total development of the area - Funds for Rural Economic Development. A good road, a good drainage system, or improved number of acres within a given municipality, certainly all adds to the economic well-being of that particular municipality of in that particular area. And I have no difficulty in speaking about FRED in this regard in that if we're doing something with FRED money other than agriculture. There should be no mistake about it; a good portion of it is directed towards agriculture.

As Minister of Agriculture, I am of course specifically concerned about improving the agricultural opportunities within that particular region. We now number some 1,200 - 1,300 commercial farmers in that area; we know from our technical knowledge of the area that that area could support numbers of successful farmers numbering in the 3,000 - 3,500 area, and that's my particular goal in that particular region, to increase the number of successful viable farm units. But at the same time it's also quite in keeping with the principles of the program to improve recreational facilities at Winnipeg Lake, to improve wildlife facilities in the northern portions of the district, to improve roads or to improve industrial opportunities within the region. The ARDA program as it is applicable to the province as such, again very wide in its frame of reference if you take it in the federal context, it's of course the priority that we place on the ARDA funds available to us that determines the nature of the program and how in effect it will be carried out in Manitoba. We relate more definitively towards agricultural projects. And here again it's spelled out for us in specific terms: 50 percent of the funds available can be used, or not more than 50 percent can be used for water conservation projects, so much for other projects, and so on down the line, but these are, in the ARDA program as it relates to this province, are tied more specifically to what you would call, I suppose, the development or the improvement of agricultural opportunities in the province.

Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps -- well now, I should deal with the Honourable Member from St. George who brought up the matter of a particular specific problem of spraying that he had. I have some personal knowledge about this particular situation and I did earlier on, some time ago, take the trouble to ask my Director of Soils and Crops Division specifically about the incident referred to, and to the best of my knowledge, not having the specific information at hand at this moment, I am told that while it is quite true that the Department of Agriculture recommended this particular spray, or this particular chemical, to I believe it was Mr. McPhedran, the operator, at the same time this was being done we had indicated to him that we had some question as to whether or not he had the right equipment to apply it, and also we indicated to him under the conditions under which it had to be applied. Now I could be getting a little off base here, but I think I'm referring to such things as pressure, spray pressure and such things as the volume of water to be used; you know, the actual mixing of it. Now, I'd be pleased to take this up more specifically with him, but it was our feeling that the department was -- we recommend the spray and the spray is being used, if the operator is properly equipped to use it. I'm not prepared to accept the operator's throwing the responsibility back on the department simply by saying that we recommended it, because to the best of my knowledge he received information from us, or we were knowledgeable -- I should say, at least, we had some knowledge that we had some doubt as to whether he was in a position to use this spray properly.

Now I'd be pleased to take this subject up further with the member if he so chooses. In any event it's a matter, of course, for a civil suit as far as the party who feel that they have not received, you know, the services for which they contracted for. I don't think the department can in any way be held responsible for it. We give general recommendations in many areas. We're called upon every day to give general recommendations in many areas, and certainly if we have somebody here in the city phoning up, "What's the best fertilizer for my apple tree?" and if we then recommend the particular fertilizer for apple tree and the little apple tree goes dead or only grows sour apples, certainly the department can't be held responsible for it. But I know that, and I'm going from memory, that in this particular case there was some -- the department did caution the operator, or question the operator about his ability to use the spray that was being recommended, that we are recommending to be used in these areas, having something to do with the equipment that he had.

Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should sit down and let the members carry on. Well I should -- I wasn't quite aware of what the Member from Burrows was going after in terms of

April 25, 1968

(MR. ENNS cont'd.). . . . the numbers of people involved in our Extension Service contracts. I just made this one particular note, that I was of course referring to only one center - that was the Brandon center - and giving some figures to indicate activity that was taking place in Brandon. This was in no way total figures for the contracts, the number of courses, the number of people reached through our Extension Service. I seem to gather from the statistics that he was reading that he was relating those 9,000 or 8,000 figures that I was reading to what was going on in other provinces. This wasn't the case. I was giving no total figures. I was zeroing in on one particular course or sphere of activity in the Brandon Extension Service Center, and the figures, of course, for the province as a whole would be a great deal larger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . please. I'd like to draw your attention that it has come to my attention that the group of boys and girls that are up in the gallery to my right here are 12 high school students from the High School of Ashern. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Nowasad. They are from the constituency I believe of the Honourable Member for St. George. On behalf of Mr. Speaker, boys and girls, and all members of the Legislature, I welcome you here this afternoon.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, there is a quotation in that Great Book that I sometimes refer to in this House. I refer to it, for one reason, because I am sure that the younger generation has not had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with it the way some of we older citizens had to do in our youth; and it runs something like this: that the sins of the father shall be visited upon the children even to the third and fourth or maybe it was even the seventh generation. Well, I'm not so sure of that and I don't consider it the best philosophy in the world, but it's certainly true in this House that the sins of the former Ministers are visited upon present Ministers. And one of the reasons that we talk about this Productivity Council now - and I must say to my honourable friend I did not know that it had not been set up; I did not. I am not tremendously surprised to hear that it wasn't but I didn't know it. But one of the reasons is that the Minister of that day, which is only two years ago, was so optimistic as to what it was going to achieve, and he was so disdainful of the suggestions that came from this side of the House that maybe he was being too optimistic, that I simply must visit a few of his sins upon my honourable friend the present Minister, and say to him that those boards and commissions and advisors that he mentioned, I think all of those - if not all of them, the vast majority - were already in existence when my honourable friend his predecessor introduced this bill that was to do so much for agriculture. And as far as any remarks that I made last year having to do with a decision that his present First Minister or he in his position now if I ever had so much impact upon that side of the House I must confess that it doesn't often exhibit itself so that it can be noticed. I thought I was rather singularly unsuccessful in getting any amendments that I moved or suggestions that I made adopted.

But even if those remarks of mine about boards and commissions had had something to do with the thinking of the present First Minister and my honourable friend, yet a year and a half had elapsed before the present First Minister came into his present position. There'd been a whole year and a half in between the time that this Productivity Council was to have been set up. And I want to read to my honourable friend just a small portion of what the former Minister said about what this Council would be expected to do.

Now, I think that my honourable friend the present Minister made a good reply to the ones of us who had asked him questions about the Productivity Council. I think his reply was excellent, because for a few moments I almost thought that the former Minister was back here in the House because he talked around the subject so well that even I pretty nearly got thrown off the trail. But what he really said, when that pleasant and logical speech was finished, what he really said was: in spite of all the great predictions that we made for it, it was never set up. That's the real story, isn't it? Well, as one who didn't expect very much of it, I certainly couldn't criticize that and I shall not attempt to read at any great length from my honourable friend who used to occupy that position, for he had the same reputation that I have in the House of being just a wee bit on the verbose side and some of his quotations are pretty long. But I just want to read a concluding paragraph. This is found on Page 2033 of April 19, 1966, so that it's just a trifle over two years ago.

Now I am quoting: "I look to this board as being a catalytic agent which can weld the very considerable ability, the very considerable resources of the total agricultural industry in the province into a unit that will help the industry achieve its potential. In the Third Annual

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)..... Report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board they called for such a body to be responsible for a continuing assessment of Manitoba's agricultural performance. I look for something more than just a continuing assessment of criticism. I am looking to this board to do more than analyze; I am looking to the Board, as I said before in the committee stage, to determine the goals, the legitimate goals, and to contribute to a ground swell of attitude and action which will help us to achieve these goals. Again I say that it isn't just the establishment of the board, it is my hope that the very many distinguished, able people who have been serving industry, the agricultural industry in Manitoba to this date, will be able to make an even greater contribution through the medium of the Agricultural Productivity Council."

Well, Mr. Chairman, after all of this, the story is - I'm not too critical of this - that it was never set up. I must confess that I had looked forward, even having some doubts about just what it would accomplish, I had looked forward to another report of just what such a body would contribute to the discussion and dialogue that simply had to continue as to where we go from here under the situation that we face. I certainly don't object to the statement that my honourable friend has made this afternoon of the fact that, in spite of the difficulties that beset us and the prospects that at the moment don't look to be very bright in the marketing field, that we have to carry on with our production job to the best of our ability. I don't want to be too critical of the present Minister. I was really just attempting to visit upon him the sins of his predecessor. Maybe that's a bit unfair, but it's a thing we have to keep reminding ourselves of once in a while here, and while I am probably one of the least of the members of the House to make suggestions of political motives here - maybe one of the reasons that I'm a little careful about making those suggestions is because I've been here a long time and it can be a double-edged sword, I know, and not many politicians or even groups that I have been acquainted with have been entirely free of it, in my opinion - but maybe I wouldn't be too far out if I suggested that two years ago when this most optimistic discussion took place about what the Agricultural Productivity Council was going to do for agriculture, we were facing an election at that time and the election was held, while it didn't turn out perhaps quite as well as expected at least the government was back in office, whatever the reasons, it never was established so we can't have the report and we'll just have to go along with what we've got.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ... subject of the herbicide which the Minister replied to a few moments ago. In the contract that was signed by these farmers for this spraying, there is one paragraph which reads that there is no guarantee for the application of the chemical that was used. Now what's disturbing the farmers who are involved in this situation is that the government recommended through their representative and pamphlets that they use the 240-amine instead of the 240-ester.

Now, according to the former president of this company, they've had bad luck using the amine regardless where they use it, if they use it in the Holland area, and yet wherever they use the 240-ester they have good results. Now, from what I gather from these farmers involved the 240 - amine was used because of the government pamphlets or pressure or suggestion - whatever word you want to use - and they switched from the 240 - ester. Now the brush has not died as a result of the spraying; the farmers have lost all their money; and they feel that they should be compensated somewhere for the loss.

The Minister suggests that they can proceed by civil action. The contract precludes this. There is no guarantee. But the government urged the contractor to use this particular chemical, which didn't work. Now this is the problem, Mr. Chairman: had the government not urged this company, the Aerial Spray and Charter Limited of Neepawa, they would have proceeded with the 240 - ester, and judging from previous experience they would have had a good kill and they would have had no problem. So it looks now that the government has made a recommendation which wasn't satisfactory and the farmers are the ones that are suffering as a result of it.

As I told you, I can read a sentence out of this letter from the company. It's out of context. "Please note that the recommendation for the use of amine did not come from us. At this point we have no experience to agree or disagree with this government recommendation." And it says, "However, as soon as we returned to Holland we encountered the same disappointment you experienced and were convinced that 240 - amine was unacceptable. After careful consideration we adopted the stand we would only apply 240 - ester." Now, this is the experience of the company. I don't know what experience the government found with other people

April 25, 1968

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.).... in this business but it's most unsatisfactory to the people that I'm speaking on behalf of, and they feel quite upset that they're going to lose their money as a result of this recommendation.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just a further word on that. You know, the government or any agency is under constant pressure from a wide variety of groups of people and persons who are concerned with the indiscriminate use of sprays, particularly when it comes to spraying by airplane. We heard yesterday afternoon, the Honourable Member from Selkirk express his concern about some experience that he is knowledgeable about in his area; the Member from Wellington expressed further concern about what the government is doing in terms of assuring that all due caution is used in the matter of spraying. I would suggest the airplane spraying is perhaps the most critical one, particularly as it relates to any built-up areas.

Now again, Mr. Chairman, I'm speaking more from memory than from certain knowledge, but we are constantly looking for sprays that take these additional safety precautions into consideration. To the best of my knowledge the spray that we recommend from time to time - amine - is a safer spray to use if properly used and for this reason of course we feel confident, that we recommend this to those who use these sprays. I would have to inform the Honourable Member for St. George that this spray has been used very successfully in many different parts, particularly in the PFRA programs and what have you, in the eradication of brush in this manner. It would again suggest to me though that particularly in view of the fact that this operator has had little or no success with the use of this spray, that it's a matter pertaining to his method of application or his equipment that he has to apply it with. Again something that I drew his attention to.

I certainly have compassion for the operators or the farmers, group of ranchers, who paid good money to have this job done but I think the Honourable Member from St. George pretty well read it to the Committee when there was that clause in the contract stating that the operator could in no way guarantee a satisfactory brush kill, that at what point does the individual's responsibility enter into it to accepting that kind of contract. Certainly I don't think the area of responsibility can be shifted to any government in this regard. I think the honourable member would have to make himself more knowledgeable about the successful use of this spray in other areas and for this reason our recommendation for it. Those are the only other comments I can add to that particular subject, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, the Minister was questioned yesterday I believe on a couple of instances in regards to policy in regard to his department. I was reading the Hog Marketing Commission's Report and on the latter stages of the report there was the proposed sketch of the proposed facilities that were proposed, and one of the paragraphs in regard to the report was that, not wishing to put it all on record, Mr. Chairman, was the fact that it looks like the Commission are suggesting that new facilities be set up for the marketing of hogs, in St. Boniface. I have no quarrel with this, Mr. Chairman, but I can recall some few years ago that certain discussions took place that the marketing facilities in Manitoba were not keeping apace with the rest of North America in regards to receiving facilities and sales and at that time it was suggested that possibilities of setting up a private enterprise company as a modern receiving yard for cattle and hogs; and I'm wondering if the Minister has any long-range policy in regards to this because I would not like to see our marketing of livestock set-up on a bits and pieces sort of a building, that the Hog Marketing Commission would have a new set-up, cattle and other livestock would be using the more antiquated type of equipment. We don't have too far to go to find that in the areas of United States and other areas where they're using the receiving of livestock that they do have a much improved area or improved buildings and facilities to handle livestock, so I was somewhat concerned that I would like the Minister if he could, to set us straight on the policy he may have in regards to the total overall improvements of livestock facilities, particularly of receiving and sales in the Province of Manitoba. I wouldn't - as I say I don't want to go too far in regards to the fact that we shouldn't do this for the Hog Marketing - I don't want to say that, but I would like to have some policy whereby the complex of the whole marketing system, that this is one stage that we are going into a modern receiving and sales agent for all type of livestock and this is going to be part of it. I wouldn't want just to see this and the rest forgotten.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, yesterday when I spoke I mentioned the matter of storage facilities for wheat and other grains and whether consideration has been given to providing terminal space or storage space here in Manitoba so that farmers could deliver their grain to

(MR. FROESE cont'd.).... an elevator or to a point where they could sell it. Mr. Chairman, I think this is very important and the Minister has not commented on it. I feel that if we only had sufficient storage space where our farmers could sell their grain then at least one difficulty would be removed and that the farmer would have more of his income at the time that he wanted it and not have to wait two or three years before he can make delivery of his product. We find for instance under the European Common Market, the countries in Europe, the farmers there if they're required to store their grain they get paid for it but not so here in Canada or in Manitoba. We get the same price regardless whether we deliver it in August of the crop year when it's being produced or two or three years hence, the price is the same. We don't get anything for storing the grain and certainly this in itself is also something that we should be taking into consideration.

I'm very much concerned that we as a government here in Manitoba should take a good look at this and if necessary provide storage facilities so that the farmer can deliver his grain. Right now if he cannot deliver, he cannot sell, because the Wheat Board, the advances that they make on home-stored grain is very little, in my opinion. It only applies to a certain number of bushels and then the amount that is being advanced is only a small part, too, of the total value of the grain. I feel that here is an area that we could certainly do something for the farmers of Manitoba and I think this could be restricted to the farmers of Manitoba as far as making deliveries to this terminal or to this storage point.

This is something that we have experienced now for a number of years, that there is a chronic shortage of storage space where we can deliver and at the same time sell. I would hope that the government give some consideration to this very matter. We find that the elevator associations have enlarged their storage space somewhat at the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur. However, I feel this is still very inadequate in years where we have large crops and where the grain is moving very slowly. And here - either we construct or build storage facilities here in Manitoba or at the Lakehead. Personally, I would feel that it should be right here in Manitoba because I think we could start shipping more of our grain through the western ports and not be so dependent on the eastern ports, because here again I feel that we're being taken for a ride too much and that the east controls the situation far too much, in my opinion. I would like to hear some comments from the Minister on this very part.

The other point I would like to know from the Minister, does he want to discuss this FRED Agreement under the estimates now or would he prefer to have this done under the Highways Department?

MR. ENNS: I think on the matter of the FRED agreement Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to have it done on the specific FRED vote later on in the estimates.

MR. FROESE: Since I've already mentioned some points yesterday in discussing this item, I find that this is a very large project that they're contemplating, and not only contemplating, starting work on, in the Interlake area; we find for instance they intend to develop some 50,000 acres a year for the next 10 years. This is roughly 15 townships, if I figure correctly, and I don't find a map actually where this development is to take place. Could he inform us as to just where these 15 townships lie and when they are being developed will they be for grain, or is it just for pasture, or what will the purpose be of clearing this large acreage.

Then, too, I find here that certain funds are supposed to be earmarked from the Agricultural Credit Corporation for providing the necessary funds for the farmers in this area. Does this mean that a certain amount is being set aside for this purpose?

Then, too, in connection with the Credit Corporation I read an article in the - I think it was the Tribune - the other day where they mentioned that certain changes are to be brought about, not only in the administration, I think in the purpose as well of this Credit Corporation. I find from the report that there is mention made that a good many farmers feel that the 30,000 limit per farm is too low and that therefore a good number of them are going to the Federal Farm Loan Board or Federal Farm Corporation for their money requirements. Is it the intention of the government to increase this minimum or what changes are they contemplating in connection with this Credit Corporation. I would certainly be interested to hear.

Also in connection with the development in the Interlake area, where they do clear land do they allow for shelter belts when they clear away the trees? I was up in northern Alberta where they are doing a lot of clearing as well and there the people are required to retain shelter belts where tree growth is present and unless they do that they will not get title to their land. I think this is something worthy of keeping in mind because where you have the lighter

April 25, 1968

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... soils, drifting is definitely a possibility once you clear large tracts. This is something that should be kept in mind, in my opinion.

I commented on the Pembina Development matter yesterday and I'm glad to hear that at least some development or some progress is being made. However, when I read about the development in the Interlake and the amount of money that is being spent there, I feel that our project in the south is warranted just as much and probably more so because the amount that is involved is not as large and I do hope the Minister will give just as much support to that development in the south than what he'd give to the Interlake area.

Mr. Chairman, I do have further comments but I would like to hear from the Minister first on these two points that I have raised.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that The Seed Cleaning Plant Act that was legislated in 1958 is in dire need of revision. When one looks over the situation and sees that it takes 300 charter members to form a group to institute a seed plant, you can see that the figure is too high because of the fact that we have our farms becoming increasingly larger and we have fewer farmers in the area, makes it very difficult to obtain the 300 necessary names. Then people of course with a half section feel that \$100 membership fee is too high for them. Although I have not heard very many complaints about it, they have voiced the opinion that it is rather high. One of the thoughts I had was that maybe this could be worked on an acreage say with 800 acres maximum. But since the Act's inception in April of 1958 there's only been one plant built under this Act and that's the one that was built in my constituency at Rivers. When you review other provinces you can see that there is 61 plants that are strategically located throughout the Province of Alberta and they're all doing over 300 bushels a year, yet we have only one in Manitoba in the 10 years.

And then it struck me as rather odd, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. L. Martin, the cereal crop specialist is continually telling our farmers to sow good clean seed and all the agricultural meetings that are sponsored by the Provincial Government say the same thing: "Sow good clean seed." The literature produced by the Minister's department says the same thing: "Sow good clean seed." The Minister has stated this week that he's to bring in a new bill on noxious weeds and this has certainly caused an awful lot of expense to municipalities and towns and farmers. I believe that we waste hundreds of thousands of dollars because the farmers are not able to sow good clean seed and the Act needs revision immediately.

I would like to point out and read into the record something that was printed in the Gladstone, or the Neepawa Press - but I want to point out that the information is correct. It has to do with the seed grain survey that was made in 1965 and it was the first survey taken of this kind since 1954-55, and I'll read it: "Grain samples were taken directly from seed drills while farmers were engaged in seeding. A total of 856 samples of wheat, oats, barley, flax and mixed grain were collected and sent directly to the Seed Analysis Laboratory, Plant Products Division, Canada Department of Agriculture, Winnipeg. Each sample was graded on the basis of the inspection report obtained on the sample after analysis. The seed was examined for the following points: the presence of other kinds of grain, the presence of weed seeds, germination, the presence of disease such as ergot, quality factors - those were the five things. At the time these samples were collected, the collector was required to obtain the following information in addition to the name and address of the farmer: the variety name, source of seed, class of seed being planted, seed cleaned, and if so, the method used; seed treated, and if so the type of chemical used. Of the 856 samples taken, 430 were rejected for one reason or another, and under the heading "Reasons for Rejections" 242 of the 430 samples were rejected for weed seeds, that is 56.3 percent of the rejected seed was rejected because it was not properly cleaned. The summary shows that 845 of the 856 samples were cleaned but certainly an unsatisfactory cleaning job was evident. Under the heading "Cleaning Method" we find that 298 farmers had their seed cleaned at the country elevator; 309 cleaned their own grain on their own farms; 209 at stationery plants and 30 elsewhere; and 10 samples did not indicate the cleaning method."

A further disturbing comment was made under the heading "Class of Seed". 69.3 percent of the samples collected were classified as ungraded indicating the seed had no pedigree and the generation was not known. One of the recommendations which involved so many of our Manitoba farmers is seed grain should not be cleaned in country elevators. The 1965 survey indicated that 35.2 percent of grain cleaned by this method and that 73.5 of this seed grain rejected. Country elevators are not equipped to clean seed and there is no added danger of

(MR. DAWSON cont'd.)... introducing weeds -- and there is the added danger, pardon me -- of introducing weed seeds not previously found on the farm." This is one of these surveys as I pointed out that was made by the government.

Now I said that the Act should be revised immediately and I would like to point out the main reason for this, it should be done immediately. The people and farmers of Shoal Lake area were given a personal commitment by the Minister that legislation was to be brought in at this session. He held a meeting with five directors from the proposed seed cleaning plant at Shoal Lake in December, I believe, and they were told and given the guarantee of the Minister that something would be done for them. They have since gone out and enrolled 180 farmers at \$100 apiece which has given them their \$18,000.00. They cannot come up with the 300 figure, they realize this, but they are sure they can come up with 200; and they feel that they cannot proceed under the present Act; and they also feel that the Minister must keep the personal promise that he made to them. These people have spent many dollars, as volunteers, out of their own pockets. They've held numerous meetings. The people that have been appointed as directors have been spending days and dollars and mileage in their cars to obtain the necessary enrollment of members for their seed plant. They've attended two delegations in the city here and they've visited the Rivers Seed Cleaning Plant and this is the third attempt that they have made to try and get a seed cleaning plant in the area, and they have been doing this in co-operation with the people at Rivers.

Now when we come to the Rivers Seed Plant there is a debt there that hasn't been reduced too drastically in the last ten years, but I personally sat in at a meeting with the Rivers' directors where the Minister promised them, about a year ago now, that the Act would be revised at this session. And the reason why I am sure that the Act will not be revised this session and the Minister is not going to keep his promise is the fact that the Deputy Minister phoned the Chairman of the Board of the proposed Shoal Lake Seed Plant and told him that we're sorry you will have to proceed on your own there will not be any changes in the Act this year. This has caused a great deal of alarm to these people in Shoal Lake. They thought that they would be able to proceed with their Seed Cleaning Plant this year and are very disappointed in the phone call that they received. It's very obvious that something must be done if we're to get seed cleaning plants in the Province of Manitoba. The Act as it's presently constituted is not suitable. The loan is a good idea but there must be cash grants made as well, because as I pointed out the farms are much larger than what they were before and it's almost impossible to get 200 farmers in the necessary radius to support and use the seed cleaning plant.

I hope that the Minister in view of the few remarks I've made will reply to me and one of the nicest things he could say would be that the Act will be changed this year and I can assure the people of the area of Shoal Lake and the people in Rivers who were made the same promise that there would be a method for the Rivers' people of maybe easing the debt on their loan and seeing as how we only have one seed cleaning plant in Manitoba and a proposed second one is on the books under this Act, that whatever legislation is introduced will be made retroactive to include the plant at Rivers.

... continued next page.

April 25, 1968

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, if I can answer a few of the questions briefly that were raised. The Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain spoke with respect to the Hog Marketing facilities or potential hog marketing facilities and marketing facilities in general that are available in the province.

I would have to agree with him in the first instance that we are concerned, have been concerned for some time, that is the department, about the facilities that we have available to us. I think they in the initial instance served the province well -- I'm speaking primarily about the Union Stock Yards. However, the fact that they have become somewhat antiquated is common knowledge to all of us who have had occasion to be there and certainly the stock-growers of the province who do their business there. However, I'm encouraged by some of the activity that is taking place there; they are embarked on a program to revamp and revitalize those facilities. We hope that this will continue and eventually improve the situation.

I have some nervousness about allowing the Hog Marketing Commission to proceed with its proposed facilities separate from any, you know, major complex. I agree with the member that it would serve the best purpose for the producers as a whole to be able to continue to centralize his marketing wherever possible. The grouping of packing plants and other facilities are in that general area and I have asked and expect to hold a meeting in my office within the next week or two to bring together the Hog Marketing Commission members and representatives of the Union Stock Yards to see whether or not we can't arrive at a satisfactory adjustment in the plans that are presently being contemplated. If necessary, build the necessary improvements within this stockyard complex that the hog people feel are necessary for their facilities. These are some of the avenues that I would like to investigate at any rate prior to allowing the Hog Marketing Commission to proceed with their plans. I voice the same opinion that he does that I'm not opposed to the plans as such. I see some difficulty and some of the hog producers have mentioned them to me and I'm cognizant of them.

There is one further difficulty that I have with the Hog Marketing Commission as such. The members of the House will probably be aware that I have a resolution still pending, or before me, that this House passed at the time of the Hog Marketing Commission was set-up, that is respecting a vote that was supposed to be held within 24 to 36 months or 30 months after it starts and while I am not entirely sure just what I want to do at this point I feel that that particular matter has to be resolved in order that we are on firm ground as to the exact future and whatever the future holds for the Hog Marketing Commission. I have some nervousness about being strapped into a position where you proceed with a relatively expensive building and facilities and then possibly face you know a vote that could appreciably alter the nature of the Hog Marketing Commission. I don't envisage this; I've received no pressure from the groups involved, but I do draw to the attention of the members of the House that this resolution is standing. It may well be that I'd have to ask the House to rescind this resolution and I will be considering bringing in that kind of a resolution for their consideration.

The Honourable Member from Rhineland, and I inadvertently forgot to mention when I was up on my feet last, in his call for terminal elevators or that the government should get into the business of grain storage, there was the one particular point that I wanted to mention. He in his speech the other day seemed to suggest that if we got into it that there could be considerable savings to the producer, the farmer, in the nature of storage costs as well as of course I think what was his main concern was facilitating the shipment of the grain. Surely he doesn't suggest that the government could store this grain much more economically than it is stored now. There would be basically the same storage costs, the same handling charges would have to be inflicted and I would question him on that particular score. I don't think that we would want to have the government move into this area. Again I would have to compliment the grain trade as a whole along with their railways who in times of stress and in times of need performed admirably in the movement of very large quantities of grain. I think we come back to the more central issue is if we got a place to move the grain, we'll move it and we'll store it, but we have the more difficult problems at the moment actually, we just aren't quite that sure and we don't have the immediate ready source of sales.

I think if he goes back in his memory and recalls the tremendous amount of grain that was moved during the peak years of our grain trade in these bigger contracts to either Russia or China, one can't really fault the present grain handling facilities, nor the railways, for the tremendous effort they've put into seeing that this was indeed moved to points of sale. And just on that subject, the question of terminal development is one that is being given a lot of

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) ..... thought to in many circles. I think that the idea of inland terminals is probably a very real one. This will come about I think perhaps quite naturally in the development of our road system and possible further phasing out -- this is being spurred on to some extent in some areas with the management policies of the railways in some areas. The idea of having large inland terminals situated on the prairies, further developments in rail transportation of grain, that is I'm referring to perhaps the large super tanker type grain carriers of the future that could well be changing appreciably the present storage pattern in the grain handling patterns that we have come to know as traditional.

On the matter of FRED again he wanted to know specifically about where we find these acres to develop. I can only suggest to the Honourable Member for Rhineland that I'd be only too happy to host him in my part of the constituency, him and his large family to enjoy a weekend or a Sunday with me in the Interlake. This is a fairly large region, the acres are there I can assure him and the progress in this program is most encouraging. I understand since our individual program came into effect some 30-32, 000 acres have been developed in this manner.

Now a good number of these acres are being developed for either straight pasture improvement for either further cultivation into improved forage stands and of course a fair amount of actual cropping is taking place on some of these acres. The increase in cattle in that particular area of the province has been remarkable, some 146 percent in the past five years, and the direction that we hope to see it take is primarily to support this increased cattle activity in that part of the country. So I'm very optimistic about that particular part of the program.

He raised a further question with respect to farm credit. I would again have to ask him to consider my answer to this particular question that I gave to the Honourable Member for Brokenhead in this particular instance. It's anticipating legislation. I expect to have more to say on it as the session wears on.

On the matter of seed cleaning plants, grants that the Honourable Member from Hamiota raised, I would now have to inform the honourable member that it is not our intention to change the Act this session. I am well aware as members of this caucus are aware that this is part of the election platform that this government was voted in on June 23rd or thereabouts of '66 and it certainly remains part of our election platform. However, in the priorities of programs and the priorities of demands for money we have not been able to bring this particular piece of legislation forward.

Insofar as the personal commitment that he's referred to several times that I have apparently made to the directors of the association that is formed there -- and I'm well aware of the very good organization that he has in that part of the country. I've met with four or five different groups that have expressed an interest in this matter -- the commitment was always subject to the fact that this legislation was accepted, that we are talking about proposed legislation. In other words the commitment was given on the basis that I personally was in favor of seeing this legislation come forward and would do whatever I could to see that it would happen in the near future. I have every confidence that we will proceed with this legislation at a later point.

In the meantime, I would have to suggest to him or to any organizations that are planning this very worthwhile development that the present Seed Cleaning Loan Act piece of legislation is there available to them and in real sense is of very little difference to them in the intervening years between when I hopefully bring in the changes as to its present application; that is, the changes that we were speaking about involve perhaps a forgiveness clause of the \$30, 000 grant that is presently given in the Seed Cleaning Act if certain conditions can't be met. The amounts of money immediately forthcoming to any such group would be the same under this Act or under the revisions of any Act, that is the loan would be made available to them, so in a real sense I can't detect any appreciable difference to them. It is still the intent of the government to bring in these necessary changes. We have some concern about the possible disruption that it may have to private seed cleaning plants and while he suggests and made particular reference to the fact that we only have the one seed cleaning plant here, this of course isn't quite true in the sense that there are numerous private seed cleaning plants in the province. There is of course a precaution here that we in government would have to be very cognizant of, and that is that we do not disturb the business that any private individual or private group of individuals have set up in the seed cleaning business. This calls for a fair definition of areas where such plants can in fact viably operate. We wouldn't want to see, you know, government supported

April 25, 1968

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) ..... plants intervening with the satisfactory operations of a privately operated plant.

So I have to indicate to the honourable member that I don't really see that the doors are closed to the members in his group from carrying on with their project. I would also indicate to him that while the present legislation has some particular clause in it as it relates to numbers of farmers having to be involved, that I think the department is prepared to be reasonably flexible in this particular situation. We're talking more about a desirable amount of bushels going through a plant that can or cannot make it economical and while the regulations presently call for a specific number of farmers, I think that if the department can be satisfied that a sufficient number of acres are involved, a sufficient number of bushels are involved and other conditions are met, there is room to accomodate these kinds of requests. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FROESE: I would like to make some further comments in connection with this matter of grain storage. Several years ago I was at Wichita, Kansas, and I noticed there they had open storage and large piles of grain right on the ground. Naturally you have a concrete slab floor but otherwise it was in the open and certainly storage of this type is as cheap as you can get it. And even if you had a roof over it it still would be very economical and it would cost much less than what we are paying today to the grain companies to store it at the Lakehead in their terminals. I for one am all for having inland terminals -- why not store the grain right here and be in control of it. This would enable farmers to sell their grain and this is exactly what we need. We need - that the farmers can dispose of their grain and get their necessary income when they want it.

MR. ENNS: Would the member permit a question?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. ENNS: Is he aware of the tremendous storage cost that the U.S. Government pays out for its various storage programs?

MR. FROESE: I still maintain that this need not be costly storage here in Manitoba. All you need is a slab floor and a roof if necessary and even that wouldn't be necessary and you could store that grain. This has been done across Canada in the prairie provinces for a number of years. Many farmers have done it, stored it openly, but I would think that we should have a roof, but even at that it would be a very minor cost compared to the charges that are presently being levied against stored grain by the companies when you store at the Lakehead terminals. And at the same time as I say the farmers would be enabled to dispose of their grain. Now they're compelled to hold their grain for one, two, three years, and while they're storing this grain and cannot sell it they have to pay interest costs where they are probably indebted and this, as a result, gives them less return for their grain than they should normally have. Therefore I feel that we as the Manitoba Government here can do something about it.

We now have The Canadian Wheat Board, a Federal Crown Agency, looking after the sales and looking after the marketing. But certainly this doesn't mean that we cannot bring about something whereby we can help and assist our farmers here in Manitoba. I am sure once we did this the other provinces would follow suit and would do likewise. Surely we shouldn't sit idly by when we know that the farmers are in dire need of the cash and in this way they could sell. The other alternative is advances, and advances is not the answer at least not according to the legislation that we have on the statutes federally at the present time. I think that is very very inadequate as far as advances are concerned. And here we have a possibility, we can do this at very little cost in my opinion, and certainly this is something that could be looked into and could be checked and reported on and take action. Because then the Wheat Board would be obligated to purchase this grain at the time that delivery is made and the farmers will be able to deliver and not have to wait for years to make their deliveries.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of getting into agriculture really, as most members don't, but -- I am sorry I didn't get the first part of this debate -- but I must come to you and agree in respect to grain storage in the province and in the western provinces, I believe that something should be done about it, and of course you will realize that from there I would extend my thoughts to the grain storage at Churchill and the particular problems that are involved in that area at this time. It is amazing to me that during the agricultural debate, particularly on storage, that no thought is given to what could be done about storage at Churchill. Because the one thing that we do here in respect to deliveries from Churchill is that you do not have storage space available. Secondly, you read each day

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) .... with the thoughts being given to rail abandonment that there will have to be additional storage areas built either in the east or at Port Arthur, and I would suggest that serious consideration be given to additional storage area at Churchill.

All parties are in agreement that it should be doubled from five to ten million bushels. This is being assisted at this time this year by giving additional, I believe it's around \$750,000 investments, at Churchill for seed cleaning. And I think that if we even extended it one stage further and some co-op or some grain company were allowed to buy the storage area at Churchill they would get it probably at a book price that would be less than what the cost is for developing additional storage areas today. As I understand it a capital cost of \$1.00 a bushel would be very reasonable in building grain elevators today -- grain storage elevators. This would be as I understand approximate book value of the five million bushel elevator at Churchill today -- which is not being used, which is not being used for the storage of grain because they say, "We don't know what our customer is going to want." So I think that they would have to extend it one stage further and go to doubling the quantity of storage area in that vicinity and store the different types if this is what is going to be necessary over a period of a year or two years if they haven't got sale for it -- if they've got sale for it then they can deliver out of the Churchill area.

And with these few remarks I would like to close with again advancing the new techniques that have come to view in the last year in respect to both the Alex Bowe and the Gibson ice breaking facilities which will be used this winter in January, of all times, to bring a shipment of commodities into Churchill in January, of all times. This is being underwritten I believe by the Prairie Economic Council and we will have an initial shipment from Montreal to Churchill in January. And if this comes about successfully then we can foresee where the western prairie provinces will have a year-round delivery point at Churchill.

MR. ENNS: ... on this matter of grain storage and I don't want to protract the debate on this but I think it should be clear to us that when we talk about grain storage it's not just a matter of piling up multi-thousands of bushels of grain on a concrete slab somewhere. This is distinctly possible and can be done very cheaply, I agree with the Member from Rhineland. But surely really what we're talking about is having grain in position -- grain in class and type in position at the different ports of call in our country, and as much as I would like to see them be in Churchill, this is not always the situation when we're at the will and fancy of our customers. I suggest we are at this particular time in a buyers' market and not a producers' market and we can have all our particular western grain at Churchill and if the customer demands it in Vancouver that's where it has to be or in the St. Lawrence Ports. And really it's a matter of having the different kinds and classes of grain -- indeed that's I suppose one of the biggest headaches to the Wheat Board sometimes when they have a particular class and type of grain available at one port and then try to negotiate a satisfactory sale with all the freight factors entering into it, the competitive nature of it entering into it, it's a matter of being as fluid as possible in this situation to get the maximum sales, move the maximum bushels and in the final interest this is what we as western farmers have to be interested in. If it was simply a matter of finding a place to store our grain I would suggest it wouldn't have taken this long for the initiative of our own farm groups or individual municipalities to pour a slab of concrete somewhere and put a roof over it and dump our grain into it. That would only be taking it out of our bin and putting it on a slab. You still have to get that grain into position.

MR. FROESE: .... could sell then. That's the main thing.

MR. ENNS: We have to get that grain into position to get it into the cargo ships of the world, and in that particular case should certainly, maybe more so than we like to be - we sometimes like to for national policy reasons divert some of our shipments either to the west coast or to the east coast because it would suit our rail situation better or certainly here in the west and certainly in Manitoba we'd like to ship all our grain requirements through the Port of Churchill if we could do so from our own Manitoba point of view. But this interest as desirable as it is has to be subjugated sometimes in the interests of just getting that sale and if the customer wants it coming out of Montreal or wants it coming out of Vancouver in the final analysis we have to see that it gets there. I suggest to you before I'm prepared to recommend to the government that we take on the whole grain handling system, there are -- we have the good fortune in this country of having perhaps the best grain handling system devised in the world and while it has its share of problems and its inefficiencies like any other business they're doing a pretty fine job.

April 25, 1968

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have to get into the debate again because I still feel that the proposition that I make is a valid one. We need inland storage and we need cheap storage because the storage that we have now at the terminals costs the farmer if he stores his grain a cent I think for 25 days per bushel and this amounts to a lot of money in a year, and I'm sure that we can store it much much cheaper on the proposition that I make. This is what they do in the States in many areas and I'm sure we can do that. It has been practiced by the farmers in western Canada all these years and they just deliver it to the elevator after that. Why not have central points where you make deliveries on this basis and then the farmer can sell it and he doesn't have to wait for years to get his return.

The matter of Churchill was raised here, the Port of Churchill. Sure enough we should do something about it as well as this government. B.C. is developing their waterfronts so that they'll be able to do more shipping and have more modern facilities. They have been waiting for the Federal Government to do things for them and they never were brought about, so they are going ahead on their own. I think we will have to take some initiative, too, in Manitoba if we want to have the Port of Churchill to be put to greater use, that we should proceed on that basis as well. But I still maintain that we can do something for the farmers in Manitoba that they can sell their grain and this is the cheapest way of bringing it about and the matter of having grains at hand so when it's necessary to ship, we already have terminals for the -- they can supply the immediate needs out there so that this would be long term storage and certainly this would fit in very well with the present facilities and with the present program that we have. In this way farmers could sell their grain and this is what the farmers in Manitoba and in western Canada are interested in. They want their returns and not have to wait for years.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'd be the first in this House to recommend that we build all the storage facilities that we can if I thought that would sell one bushel of grain. The Honourable Member for Rhineland is simply confusing the matter of storing grain and selling grain. I'm looking for the customer to whom I want to sell the grain to.

MR. FROESE: It also means selling because whenever we make deliveries we sell and if we had these storage facilities where to deliver we could sell. This would mean that the Wheat Board would have that many more bushels. Why do we compel the farmers to store it and to carry the storage charges for the consumers of western Canada and for the consumers of the world? It's not necessary that the farmers carry this burden all these years. Let other consumers help as well.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Chairman, I'm listening with great interest to the debate that's going on on storage of grain, I think I have the solution to this whole problem. It's going to happen on June 25. It's going to happen on June 25. That very important day. On that day we're going to elect Bob Stanfield and Alvin Hamilton and they're going out and sell the grain. They're going out and sell the grain like they used to before. And only with that interest at heart and drive that Alvin Hamilton made back about 1960-1961 and got out and sold the wheat in the countries of the world. That tempted our granaries and this is the only way that we are going to get back to a normal situation again. If you leave Joe Greene in there long enough, and Mr. Drury, who is now the Minister of Trade and Commerce, by God we'll have wheat sticking out of our ears, because I have every bushel on my farm that I grew in '67. I've already delivered a four bushel quota and I got only one more thousand bushel of wheat that I'm going to sell. I realize the situation, but the Honourable Member for Rhineland, if he'd get out and work for Bob Stanfield on the coming election, he will get what he asked for right today, that of getting rid of our surplus grain and having the economy of western Canada get back to normal again.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, really, really, my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne must be joking. If he'll get up and admit that a sense of humour starts suggesting itself to him at this time in the afternoon and that it was really all a joke then I'll ...

MR. MCKELLAR: I'm serious. He sold the wheat.

MR. CAMPBELL: He can't be, Mr. Chairman, because really this is a subject that I think it would be better if we didn't bring it up in this House because the Minister has been trying to say here we've got a job to do in trying to market the grain, but it's the same story with marketing the grain as it is about industry coming into the province. Industry comes into the province because we've got resources here that they want to get and we can make good deals with them and get them to establish. They don't come because of the government that's

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) ..... here. That isn't why they came in our time; it isn't why they come now it's because of the industry that's here. And similarly, the deals that are made, the ones that were made that my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne talks about, were made because the countries were in a position to buy. They wanted to buy. Nowadays, because of a difference in the supply situation, they aren't as anxious to buy.

But my honourable friend really shouldn't mention Alvin Hamilton, because this thing that Hamilton did of flying over to China or Hong Kong or wherever it was to pretend that he made the deal that the Wheat Board had already signed up several days before, this, whatever Alvin Hamilton had done before or has done since or will be likely to do in the future, this has discredited his position in that matter. Anybody who will take the trouble and go to the expense of taking a few of his advisers along with him and going over on a jaunt of that kind, I can't think of anybody in this House, except the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that would be likely to do that sort of thing, but Hamilton did it, and in my opinion this kind of thing discredits not only the individual who does it but it discredits a lot of politicians in the process. And surely - I've never raised this before in this House or any place else - but surely nobody should get up here and quote Alvin Hamilton to us after what he did in that case. And he wasn't the one who opened up the markets. The markets had been buoyant times before; they've been buoyant since; mainly because of poor crops in other parts of the world where they needed food.

Now, if my honourable friend will get up and say he was only joking, why I still will agree to never mention this again. I don't think it should be mentioned but I see that the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce is smiling about it. I think that he would rather approve of that kind of a deal, but I can assure my honourable friend the most of people don't, the most of people just don't, and that won't help any on June 25th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think before we proceed with this completely out of order discussion any further, that I'd better close it off there. I allowed the Member for Souris-Lansdowne to speak and I'm quite aware now that he was out of order, and also the Member for Lakeside, but I let the Member for Lakeside reply.

Anything further on.....

MR. NELSON SHOE MAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I haven't heard the Minister touch on this particular subject matter yet, and I suppose it could be raised when we got to the particular item under the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, but he has announced, or certainly the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation has announced, that effective immediately, I suppose - or will it be the first of May; it could be retroactive, I suppose - but that interest on loans made to farmers under the Act will be increased to 7 3/4 percent. Now does this apply to all farmers who presently have a loan from the Corporation and they come in to make an application for an increase in the size of their loans? That's the important thing. Supposing I have already borrowed ten or 15 thousand dollars from the Corporation at four or five percent, I now come back and I want to borrow - well, let's say I want to double the size of the loan. I presently have \$15,000; I want to increase it to the maximum of thirty. What will I now pay on the thirty? That's the important thing. Or will I, in effect, have two mortgages, one at four, if I borrowed it in the beginning as a young farmer, and will I have one at 7 3/4 now that I'm over 35? These are the important things, and I certainly would like my honourable friend to comment on that particular subject because this is a real important one, because interest can decide whether or not a farmer does have a net farm income.

Another thing that does affect the cost-price squeeze and determine to a large degree whether or not a farmer will in fact have a net income at all or not, is what he has to pay in this day and age for farm land, and since my honourable friend is in the money-loaning business to the extent that the Corporation will supply the money to acquire new land and, Mr. Chairman, I believe that 90 percent of the loans are made for this purpose, to acquire land rather than to build buildings; about 90 percent of it is loaned for the express purpose of increasing the size of the units or purchasing land in any case; but where do we draw the line on the price of land? How much can a farmer afford to pay for land and still have an economic unit? What can he afford to pay? I would like to know whether the appraisers or inspectors or advisors that my honourable friend has engaged under the Manitoba Farm Credit Corporation, are they in a position to advise the farmer and say to him, "We believe the asking price of the land you intend to purchase is too high; it will never pay for itself"? Who takes it upon themselves to advise the farmer in this respect?

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) .....

Now Mr. Hutton, at one time - and not too long ago - he said that he thought that the Farm Credit Corporation and/or the Federal Government should get out of the farm loan field, supply the provinces with the money, and he would administer all of the funds. That is, he had the time if somebody else had the money. This is what he said. My honourable friend kind of looked surprised upon hearing that statement but he certainly said it and it's reported in the Tribune of two or three years ago. And I'm reading now; he's speaking after he returned from Ottawa at a federal-provincial conference of some kind or another, and Mr. Hutton said the meeting had also expressed "growing concern about the intrusion of federal employees in the field of credit supervision into the work of the provincial Extension Departments." Growing concern over their intrusion and interference in his plans. "The Federal Farm Credit Association, now lending more than a million a year..." - well, it's a great deal more than that - "was supervising farmers regarding management and accounting, the fields where Extension Departments are putting their emphasis. Sometimes the farmers get conflicting advice, Mr. Hutton said." Well, they sure do. But what Hutton was saying here was that if he could handle all of the credit loaned to farmers in the province, then this would end the confusion, that he would have complete control of all credit facilities to the farmers of the province and thereby end this confusion, and that he would be in a position to give them the kind of advice that would warrant an economic program and an economic guarantee, a fair share, I suppose, of the national income to the farmers of this province.

Now to point up that there is in fact conflicting advice - and I'll agree with Mr. Hutton on this one - there often is conflicting advice, and I want to read you a little hand-written letter from a farmer, a retired farmer now, who was most successful and had a great number of economic farm units; at last report I think he had 41 farms in 11 different municipalities and about a half a million dollars to prove that he didn't make too many errors in his day - financial ones - and here's a little hand-written note from him and it's just "N. Shoemaker" at the top.

He said: "I write this only because it's interesting and there's a lesson to learn here from somebody that hasn't gone astray. In 1963," he said "you sent a man up to see me to borrow \$2,000.00" And admitted, I do this quite frequently because he's got the money and he'll often loan it when the governments won't. "He farms three quarters of sub-marginal land and he only grows oats or flax and hay, and sometimes it floods and he has no crop. I loaned him a thousand dollars to buy six brood sows and the balance to get a few heifer calves and seed grain. He contacted the Wheat Pool officials in Neepawa and ended up buying (against my advice) 20 Hereford heifer calves at \$90.00 each. They are still one year from income-producing, and the debit, \$2,000.00 plus, is due in April. He proved an honest risk and has paid most of the loan back. I asked him why he had bought 20 calves instead of 10 productive animals. Well, the government said get into the beef cattle, and I did so. That was what my farm is best fitted for, they said."

"Yesterday he came to ask the Farm Credit Corporation to ask for a loan to pay off the \$2,000.00 to keep his foundation herd, and further, to buy a half section adjoining him for pasture and hay at a figure of \$6,000.00. His age - 53. He owes the bank \$1,500.00 and he owes \$2,000.00 on the cattle that he purchased as a loan from the Pool. They turned down the loan." They wouldn't give him the \$6,000.00. Now he wanted the \$6,000.00 to acquire an economic unit but they turned him down. "He left," he said, "he left his place completely puzzled because he got so much conflicting advice from the farm loan people and from the government that had urged him to get into cattle and so on." And he said he was simply -- He said, "I think that the Farm Credit Corporation appraiser gave him every consideration. He was just carried by government and Wheat Pool optimism to buy too many wrong aged cattle to face a slump in price." Now this points up that just about everybody that is loaning money wants to pass on what they think is sound advice to the farmer, and often it's conflicting, very conflicting.

MR. ENNS: ..... government loaning agency and it wasn't the government that in this particular suggestion advised him to buy these 20 heifers, was it?

MR. SHOEMAKER: In this particular case it was the Manitoba Pool that had loaned him the \$2,000.00, but it was that that got him into the trouble that made it necessary to borrow more money. He said the government advised him to produce more cattle, so then he went and got the cattle and then the trouble started.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, does my honourable friend concur in what Hutton said? Does he think that the farmers are getting conflicting advice from the provincial and the federal levels? Does he think the time will come when somebody will have to say: "The price of land has got so high we won't loan you any money because you simply can't pay it all back."

Now I have a little interesting story to tell in respect to farm lands but I'm going to reserve that for the resolution that is on the Order Paper now that relates the value of land to productivity, and I won't burden the House with it at this particular time, but I would like to hear from my honourable friend, in particular in respect to the interest rate on loans generally. What's going to happen if I have one loan now at four percent and I come back and I want to double the size of the loan; then what do I pay?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we dispose of the matter we were discussing before completely, I want to make one or two comments. I do not accept the Minister's statement that he made before, that just because nothing has been done heretofore in this respect that we should not tackle it. I disagree completely, because what are the restricting factors that the farmers cannot deliver more grain and sell more grain? It's mainly two factors. One is the sale of wheat by the Canadian Wheat Board as to the amounts that they sell; secondly the storage facilities. These are the two restricting factors, and the one, the sale of wheat, this is a matter for the Federal Government and the Canadian Wheat Board and that we can do very little about here in Manitoba, but I maintain that on the second count we can do something about, and we can bring about more storage facilities where farmers can deliver and sell their grain.

Any other people get paid for their work immediately, or almost immediately, after they've completed their work. Not so with the farmer. He has to wait not one year, but two years and three years and sometimes more than that, in order to sell his crop and get paid, and I feel that this is very unfair and that this need not be the circumstance at all. We have to a large extent given away our rights under the legislation when the Canadian Wheat Board was set up, and they have certain controls that they can exercise, but as far as the storage of grain, and this would enable the farmer not to sell one bushel, two or even five or six bushels a year, but he could deliver all his grain. There's no reason why we cannot set up sufficient storage facilities inland so that the farmer can sell all his grain in a given year. There's nothing to prevent us from doing this, and at least this would also give the government some power and a greater say in the economy of the province. This would give the farmers of Manitoba ready cash and they could go ahead and do what they like, but here we are prevented from developing because we haven't got the cash that would readily be ours if we could dispose of our grain. Mr. Chairman, if our government doesn't realize this then I think we are in a sorry state of affairs here in Manitoba. We are being restricted in too many occasions already by other bodies, other federal bodies in our economy here in this province and this is one that we can correct in this way and I request and urge that the Provincial Government give consideration to this very matter.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it just dawned on me what the Honourable Member from Rhineland was driving at and I admit that at this hour of the afternoon my thinking apparatus is somewhat slow. It's rather inconceivable to me though, because I do identify the Honourable Member from Rhineland, of his particular political persuasion as being one somewhat to the right of centre. I was having difficulty in finding out just how you create a sale by storage. I now gather that he is suggesting that the government buys all the grain and then in hopes that we have some sales in the future, because I would still have to - and I want to exhaust the question, Mr. Chairman, I don't think we can repeat it any further - there is only one factor that influences the amount of grain leaving this country, a successful sale; and putting it into storage certainly doesn't generate a sale. But if the honourable member is suggesting that the government purchase the grain, that's another matter, but I find it somewhat difficult to believe, in view of his general attitude that the private enterprise system of our government's one that I know that his party by and large support.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, who buys our wheat presently? Who buys the wheat off the farmer? It's the Canadian Wheat Board. All that we would be doing by this is increasing the inventory that the Canadian Wheat Board would have. That is all. There would be no change whatever and certainly we would be helping the farmers in this way. So I am at a loss to understand the reasoning of our Minister in this connection.

April 25, 1968

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I'll make it before 5:30, yes. I just wanted to make a few comments on the Hog Marketing Board. Last year during the estimates I suggested that the matter of the payment getting back to the farmer after the delivery should be checked into because there were some complaints that some of the smaller buyers were taking more time in paying back. I must say that I have checked it very closely during the year and there has been a real improvement. I checked my own area only and I would say that in 95 percent of the cases or more the payments have been mailed back the next day.

Now I have heard some rumours that the Marketing Board were considering the idea of taking the hog receipt and then paying the individual as such. Now I would advise some caution in that respect that this would mean a fairly expensive office equipment and staff and I wonder if this is one of the matters that is pressing at this moment. I think the people are fairly satisfied with the Hog Marketing Commission and certainly there are many other fields where we could improve rather than this particular item of the Commission taking over the payments themselves, that is receiving the payments from the buyers and then passing it on to the producers. So I would just make this comment at this time that I would advise a lot of caution before we do go, I don't think it is really needed at this time. Also, as a suggestion and while I'm on my feet, I think that some rotation of the board members would probably be advisable. Not that I have any criticism against any board members or so but I think there are five members and some rotation I think would probably bring new ideas and new representation from different districts and so on. I'm just making this comment at this time. I think there would be some advantages to doing just that.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW(Brokenhead): The Honourable Minister has on a number of occasions taken the privilege to answer some of the questions posed to us and it seemingly appears that either he is absent-minded or he simply wishes to ignore some of the questions which were put to him. He has not made mention in the area of marketing boards and how the Turkey Board is going to be set up or the problems of the broiler industry and whether or not he is going to provide the industry with the type of marketing board structure that we are used to, that is traditional, or whether he is going to ask that specific exemptions be given to certain groups or corporations. And I can't imagine that during the estimates of the Department of Agriculture that we are unable to get a statement of definite policy from the Minister.

I am not satisfied Mr. Chairman, that we ought to wait till next year's estimates are before us to get the answer that we're seeking today. Surely he must have a position on the whole question. And if he hasn't it's time that he has, Mr. Chairman. The broiler people wanted a marketing board 3 1/2 years ago and they are asking us why they haven't had an answer on the whole question. So, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I can't accept the fact that the Minister wants to slough this one off and hope that he gets by this Session because I'm not intending to let him get by on it. I want an answer and it's time the farm community had an answer.

I'm sure that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is probably breathing down the back of the Minister of Agriculture's neck, hoping that he convinces the Minister of Agriculture that he ought to provide some exception to certain people; but Mr. Chairman, I think the House should get a statement of policy from the Honourable Minister of Agriculture in this connection. I notice the Minister is nodding; I wonder if he wants to answer because I have more to say.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know it's just about 5:30 but within 30 seconds let me announce just briefly that No. 1, as the Members knows, the situation with the Turkey Board is moving forward. An inaugural meeting will be held this Friday. I yesterday instructed the Manitoba Marketing Board to proceed forthwith the vote on the adoption of our Broiler Board. I can further add to him that I have made, my department, the government has made no exemptions or particular accommodations to anybody at this particular time. It's my hope and my judgment that the growers themselves will in their good judgment make the necessary accommodations that I think have to be made, but this will be a matter for them to decide.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 5:30. I leave the Chair till 8:00 o'clock.