

237 Leg Bldg

ATTN: HANSARD

Key No 119 F)

ISSN 0542-5492



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

STANDING COMMITTEE

on

AGRICULTURE

31-32 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mr. A. Anstett
Constituency of Springfield



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 1 - 4:30 p.m., THURSDAY, 24 MARCH, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Thursday, 24 March, 1983

TIME - 4:30 p.m.

LOCATION - Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRMAN - Mr. Andy Anstett (Springfield)

ATTENDANCE:

Members of the Committee present:

Honourable Messrs. Adam, Bucklaschuk, Plohman, Uruski and Uskiw.

Messrs. Anstett, Downey, Gourlay, Manness and Orchard.

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Government Resolution passed on March 15, 1983, authorizing the Standing Committee on Agriculture to inquire into matters relating to the Western Transportation Initiative proposed by the Government of Canada.

* * * *

CLERK OF COMMITTEES, C. DePape: I call the Committee to order. The first order of business of the Committee is to elect a first Chairman. Are there any nominations?

MR. D. ORCHARD: I think you're doing an admirable job.

MS. CLERK: Thank you very much.

HON. S. USKIW: I move that Andruw Anstett act as Chairperson.

MS. CLERK: Are there any further nominations? Mr. Anstett, will you please take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Andruw Anstett: The Committee is meeting under the authority of a Resolution agreed to on March 15, 1983.

The resolved portion of the Resolution provides that the committee is to inquire into matters relating to Western Transportation Initiative proposed by the Government of Canada, to hold such public meetings as the Committee may deem advisable and to report at this Session of the Legislature.

How do you wish to proceed, gentlemen?
Mr. Minister.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would first of all, move that we agree on a set of dates and places and have some discussion on that. We are not entirely fixed on dates, but I have a proposal to make if that's in order, and perhaps we can amend those if they're not satisfactory to everyone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: The Minister indicates a proposal that he has in writing that he could present to us now, or is he going to present it just at the committee and is flexible on his proposal, is that basically what he's saying?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a suggested list of places and dates which I would read to you verbally.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Okay.

HON. S. USKIW: The first one being
Thursday, April 7, 1983, 1:00 p.m., Morris, Manitoba;
Friday, April 8th, 10:00 a.m., Winnipeg;
Thursday, April 14th, 1:00 p.m., Swan River;
Friday, April 15th, 10:00 a.m., Dauphin;
Wednesday, April 20th, 8:00 p.m., Beausejour;
Thursday, April 21st, 1:00 p.m. Brandon;
Friday, April 22nd, 10:00 a.m., Arborg.
Seven different dates.
I move that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw, do you wish to move this as a motion, or are you just putting it on the floor at this time for discussion? Otherwise we need formal amendment to make any changes to that.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, all right, if it's more logical to put it forward as a suggested list of dates, then we can do it that way and we wouldn't have to go through formality. Perhaps that is the way to proceed. Let's have a response to those dates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that just making it as a suggestion would be a little easier, otherwise any agreement to change it would then require an amendment to a motion.
Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: As I understand it, there's been an informal proposal by the Minister to discuss . . .

HON. S. USKIW: Informal - it's not a motion. Suggested dates.

MR. J. DOWNEY: My first comment, Mr. Chairman, or first question would be, does the government expect us, as members of the Legislature, to travel throughout the province when the House is sitting at the same time that the Legislative Assembly is going on?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, that is obviously the case, given the dates that we have provided for your consideration. I don't know whether we can do justice to the hearings on the assumption that we can only have hearings in

non-House days. Conflicts with weekends and the expectancy of attendance from the public is something that arises. If you were thinking in terms of Saturday or Sunday, certainly isn't a good day. Wednesday night - we have one Wednesday in this schedule, but Wednesday is a difficult time because of other things that are going on that MLAs and Ministers are often invited to. At least within our group we found that it was not a good night either, although we have one Wednesday on this schedule.

During the sitting of the House, it's obviously awkward, but I don't think we really have much of a choice.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a question as to why the Minister feels the urgency of the thing, as has been explained during the House, or he tried to explain it. But I'm now wondering what the House sitting and the Business of the House that we are all pretty much interested in as well, particularly with the economic conditions of the province being in very difficult straits, and I'm sure each one of us want to be here to add to the debate on the different bills and issues that are going to be dealt with, does he feel it essential to have so many meetings? Why does he come up with that number of meetings and the particular locations? I ask him directly if it couldn't be accommodated with less meetings.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, given the geography of Manitoba and recognizing that we do want to appear in every corner of the province to the extent possible, seven meetings are really not a great number. One could have had twice that many. I don't think we would want to argue that any of these places should not be considered as a place for a hearing.

I tried to wrestle with that question myself and tried to shrink the number of days as much as possible but I just couldn't see us doing justice to the issue and to the people of Manitoba, if we didn't have a presence in every part of the province.

MR. J. DOWNEY: It would appear that we're expecting the whole of southwest and Western Manitoba to be picked up, I would think, at the Brandon meeting, which would seem not unusual because of the hearing systems that sometimes go through the province and I don't think it's an inconvenience; but I would think in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, that you are certainly saturating the hearing process with having one at Arborg, Beausejour, and Winnipeg.

I'm not saying that they all should come to Winnipeg by any means, but it could appear awfully heavy in that direct Winnipeg area with Morris, Beausejour, and Arborg, and I again would wonder if that couldn't be cut down to some extent. I would like the comments from the other members who may have a feeling towards this, but it would appear to be a little bit saturated right in that particular area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gourlay.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering, we appear to be at Beausejour, suggest to be at Beausejour on the 20th, then the following day go to

Brandon, and then the third day back to Arborg, or in that area. I was just wondering whether we couldn't pick up that same area at the same time or the same day, perhaps.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you suggesting Beausejour, then Arborg, then Brandon, Mr. Gourlay? I'm not sure on what you're suggesting.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, first of all, I'm not sure that we need the two. Maybe one meeting could be held in that general area, or if there is to be two, why can't they be held simultaneously rather than backtracking?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't mean simultaneously, do you?

MR. D. GOURLAY: If the two meetings are to be held, why would we not have them one following the other?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uruski.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, you have basically three regions of the province in and around the City of Winnipeg; whereby you have communities that are like Arborg, which is roughly 70 miles north of Winnipeg; you have Beausejour in the neighbourhood of what, 50, 45; and Morris in the same proximity of the city; both regions separate and identical. If we're going to have a presence in each region, you then have a bit of a problem in terms of if you're not going to have a presence in those regions of holding public meetings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hyde.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm wondering if the Minister had considered Portage la Prairie, because that being an area they have to service to the south central area of our province, and I suggest to the Minister an important area of the province. I'm wondering if he could not consider moving a meeting to our area to serve that south central sector of our productive centre of our province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when we've got seven meetings scheduled; Arborg is one, Beausejour is another, and Morris is another, all within 70 miles or less from the City of Winnipeg; then we only have one meeting at Brandon which is to, I assume, take in Melita which is 80 miles out; I assume, take in Virden which is 75 miles out; I assume is to take in Russell and Roblin which are at least 100 miles out. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we could expedite the meeting process by scheduling two days, if need, in Winnipeg which would take in the Morris meeting, the Beausejour and the Arborg meeting; schedule a meeting in Carman to cover Portage, south central Manitoba, Morris, Emerson, Altona, Pilot Mound, Beausejour, Boissevain; and schedule the Dauphin meeting to come into Brandon.

You've got no more distance than you are expecting the people in the southwest of Manitoba or the western part of Manitoba to travel into Brandon in any one of

those and you can cover it off with three meetings, well advertised and, if necessary, held for two days; that being Winnipeg, and I make the suggestion of Carman as a south central region, Brandon and then of course the Swan River is a unique and separate place. You could cut it down to four meetings and have no one expected to travel further than you're expecting the people in southwest and western Manitoba to travel to Brandon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Really, I have no particular preoccupation with the number of meetings that we want, other than to try and cover the province. It may be advisable to go along with the Carman meeting in place of Morris. Carman could then facilitate Mr. Hyde's concern quite readily. I think you have to have a meeting in Dauphin. I don't think you can expect Dauphin to go to Brandon; likewise with Swan River. Geographic considerations are such there, I think, and I think Dauphin has to be - it's a major centre, the same as Brandon is or Portage is and so on. So I wouldn't want us — (Interjection) — pardon me?

I suppose one could consider Winnipeg as a second day instead of having meetings out in the rural areas, although I don't know how well that would go down with the countryfolk. I think people in the Interlake would want to have one meeting in the Interlake; I'm certain of that. EastMan at least has to have one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would ask, first of all, if the Minister could tell me how many meetings that he called for last year. He doesn't have to give that to me right now. I think there were five, I believe, and maybe the rationale that he used in selecting those particular locations.

More specifically, though, to the point brought up by Mr. Orchard, that being a point more central than what is offered here as between the cities and towns of Brandon and Morris, because really that's what you would be spending under this list of places here. Consequently, I think, I certainly don't need to see it in Morris. I think Carman would be much more central

HON. B. URUSKI: Or further west, southwest.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, if we could find its facility. And I would make the same argument that Don did regarding, again, Beausejour and Arborg. I question whether we really need go to two places. I can see one of those. Therefore, I think we can consolidate this list somewhat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion? Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, yes, if you look at the southern part of the province, I think if one wants to move away from Morris, probably one should move into Morden. Carman is only 50 miles away from Winnipeg. You know I think that makes more sense if you're moving out of Morris and I have no problem with that. I don't know

how we can escape having one meeting in a region. You know we'd be accused of bypassing a whole region, so if Steinbach can be drawn across to Morden, in an east-west situation, and some of those this side of Morris could come to Winnipeg and the area along No. 12 Highway, Ste. Anne and along 59 there, St. Pierre and so on.

It seems to me there has to be at least one meeting in Eastern Manitoba, so we could either have it at Beausejour - I don't know if there's a hall in Dugald, it's a bit too close to Winnipeg though. But Steinbach is already in that far southern part of the province which could go across to Morden. They'd come to Winnipeg, I suppose. Steinbach would be about the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we're going to get hung up on who travels where and who does what, but if your interest is in having a meeting on the Crow Rate, and I would assume that you want to talk to grain producers, if you're talking the EastMan region, I would venture to say in my limited knowledge of east of the Red River, that if you had a meeting in Steinbach, you would be central to a greater number of grain producers than you would be at Beausejour. If you're talking of making the Winnipeg meeting suitable, Steinbach is further out than is Beausejour. I have no objection to Morden being a central meeting for south-central Manitoba, but farmers in the Steinbach area will not go to Morden, they will probably come to Winnipeg because it's too far away. But if we're talking about meeting with farmers in the farm community, with all due respect to the Minister's farmers in his own area, I think there's a great many more farmers southeast and in the environs of Steinbach than there are, for instance, in the Beausejour and immediate area.

The Swan River definitely has to have a meeting by itself because that is a community unto itself, a farm community unto itself, so there's no question there. It's the proposition of how we can arrange meetings to best service the rest of the province and bear in mind that, as well as this responsibility, we likewise have a responsibility of no doubt, Estimate Debate, etc., that many of us are very very interested in, in a number of departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Minister of Highways. Last year he had a series of meetings in Manitoba. What were those locations? Could he give us those?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, we were into Winkler, Portage, Arborg, Brandon, Swan River, Dauphin, Beausejour. There may have been one or two others, and Winnipeg. I wonder if I might just respond, Mr. Chairman, to the last suggestion. I think the reasonable compromise would be Anola. The grain that is produced in and around Steinbach is consumed in that same area. In fact, I believe they're net importers of grain. They don't really export their grain, so the Crow issue is not an issue in that sense to them, as it is in the grain belt.

The grain belt essentially is to the north of Steinbach. Steinbach has special crops, it's poultry, livestock, dairy, and if you get in towards Emerson, it's basically livestock. So actually the heart of the grain belt east of the Red River would be at Dugald, Oakbank, Anola and Beausejour.

So I think Anola would be a good compromise and that would be midway between Steinbach and Beausejour, so that either side would have the same distance and there's a good hall in Anola as well.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, do I take that as the Minister's recommendation that we increase that by one more?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, we strike out Beausejour, we strike out Morris and we replace those with Morden for Morris, and Anola for Beausejour. We haven't changed the number of dates.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, that was the point I've been trying to make. Mr. Chairman, if we could have consolidated some of them I think and again go back in the reasoning, because the House is going to be sitting and I think - I know as a member for the area I represent, I would like to be here. I don't think there's a lot of debate on that. I think it would be accommodating to the committee to try and cut it to as - well, I guess it's been basically agreed that Swan River is in, Brandon is definitely in, those two sites are in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Winnipeg.

HON. S. USKIW: Winnipeg's got to be in.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Winnipeg is in and the other ones are . . .

HON. S. USKIW: See, three out of the seven are definite, any way of looking at it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: What were - and I don't want to deflect from the positioning of this - what were the other - you're not flexible on the dates. You've got the dates picked but it's — (Interjection) — oh, I see.

HON. S. USKIW: It's hard and fast, John.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I see. Well, I think what we're going to have to do, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to our committee, is take a bit of time as a caucus and discuss this because we're getting times, conflicting dates of what we're doing, and you've laid out what your proposal is. We'll have to take a little bit of time to discuss it, I think, would only be fair to our committee, because it is difficult to come up with all the options and reasons why they should go to different places.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Plozman.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, just on that. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is the real question here, rather than the number of meetings. We may be able to cut one out into six, but it doesn't look like any less than that,

and so really it's the time that we're talking about. All of us want to be in the House and if it's a conflict with the House that we're concerned about, then we should be looking at holding these in hours that it's not going to conflict as much with the House. I think we're prepared to look at that wherever possible, as well, if it means Friday afternoons, if it means even some Saturdays, that's a possibility, and Wednesday evening is a possibility in certain cases.

I think that we should be looking at the times more than the locations. I think that it was agreed that Swan River, Brandon, Winnipeg, I think that you cannot, for any other reason than geography. Look at Dauphin, because of Roblin, Gilbert Plains, Grandview, all the way to Ste. Rose, across there, up to Ethelbert and down to McCreary - that whole area in there is a long distance from Brandon and you can't expect them to go there, so I think that is a central location. It would seem to me that those four are central and then we're looking at the Interlake and Anola and I think there was one other suggestion. I don't think we can cut it down in numbers much. I think it's the time that we have to look at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, I was going to say the same thing. I really think the that seven days are minimum. The locations that we have here have to be minimum. Winnipeg, as a place for hearings - it is in my mind at least that it would be essentially for the farm organizations more than the general public; the farmers would be attending most of the other meetings although they wouldn't be barred from the Winnipeg meeting. Essentially, I thought of the Pools and the Bureau and whoever in the farm organizations wants to present briefs in Winnipeg and it would be handy for us as well, being in the building anyway.

We have one Wednesday on this list here. There are problems in Wednesday night because all of us and, I'm sure, many of you are precommitted to events. It is the only night that one can commit — (Interjection) — no, but some of us are already committed into the next couple of months on Wednesday nights. I just don't think that's a practical alternative. Weekends, I wanted to get into weekends. I'm not at all enamoured with the idea that Saturday is a good day for this kind of thing because it's the day where rural folk like to go shopping and things of that nature. They take their children along and they go uptown for the day. It's really not a good day for them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hyde.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Chairman, when I raised my hand, I didn't have the hours of the meetings in front of me and I see by Mr. Gourlay's list there that you do only have one or no, there are two afternoon meetings. I suggest that if the Minister can, he should have the morning meetings wherever possible.

HON. S. USKIW: All right, can I make a point of that, Mr. Chairman? If you look at Brandon as an afternoon meeting, the reason for that was that we knew we'd be late the night before because that's an evening

meeting. Therefore, we have to fly people out to Brandon from Winnipeg or drive, one or the other. There's no sense in trying to pretend we can do that and be there for a 10 o'clock meeting. I think that's a bit onerous.

So we thought that if we have a night meeting, the next day should not be a morning meeting, it should be an afternoon and that's the reason for these times.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I can, Mr. Uskiw and members of the committee, perhaps I can be of some assistance here. The suggestion was made by one of the members earlier that, if we do go to Arborg and Beausejour or Arborg and Anola, as has been suggested, that those might be back-to-back rather than having Brandon in between, which is a long trip in the middle.

HON. S. USKIW: That doesn't help. It is the same trip, only it's by car the other way. We were thinking in terms of flying our people out to Brandon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other problem I have and the reason I raise this, Mr. Uskiw, is that if we are going to advertise these meetings in sufficient time for adequate notice, we're going to have to make our decision either today or tomorrow. We are under the gun. The Clerk pointed out to me near the beginning of the meeting that there are going to be some advertising problems as of now, so I think it's imperative that we make some decisions as quickly as possible.

Since Anola is in my constituency, I'm not at all adverse to the suggestion the Minister makes with regard to Anola but I have to point out that Anola is less than 20 miles from Transcona. Although it would be an attraction for rural people from the Steinbach-Beausejour area, we're back into the same problem.

In terms of organizing committee meetings, I think there are two things we have to consider. When we had the Municipal Affairs Committee traveling around the province, one of the advantages we had with that committee was that we traveled as a group and we made travel arrangements so that we had the whole committee together, the sound equipment, and everybody arrived on time. That was important in terms of facilitating the committee. As well, the suggestion of the Morden meeting in terms of past committees that the Legislature has held, we've often held meetings in Morden because that serves a very distinct area in that part of the province.

I think we've made some progress, but I think it is imperative that, if we can't decide it today, we meet again tomorrow.

Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the government, of course, is to fly the members of the committee and the people to the different locations. As the time schedule would indicate, that's going to be a necessity. I think it's going to be, with the House sitting and the time schedule of everyone, that this is being crammed in more or less - to use the proper term - but that's the only that way we could accommodate the movement of staff and members of the committee.

It would appear, as has been indicated - and I'll leave this with some reservations - that possibly seven

locations might be all right. I would like to have seen us to try and roll them into one less if possible. If not, fine. But I would agree to meet then tomorrow at - well, I can't be here tomorrow. I'll leave it up to the rest of the committee members. So I would say, I'll leave it with my committee colleagues to finalize it. It will be decided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Maybe we can compromise on that. Why don't we agree to meet this evening for a short time? You will have had an opportunity, in the meantime, to further discuss it amongst your colleagues.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's good. We can discuss it over dinner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a difficulty with meeting this evening. A committee meeting can only be scheduled for a time when the House is sitting with the leave of the House. This committee cannot agree to meet this evening unless it meets prior to the House resuming Committee of Supply at 8 o'clock. If that's agreeable, that would require meeting at 7:30, but we would have to rise at 8 o'clock.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I think if we could take a 15-minute recess, we could probably resolve it then.

HON. S. USKIW: Maybe that makes sense too. I don't think we're far apart really.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: I agree to that suggestion. But before we go away, I would like to know whether the Minister or the government has decided on the format of these meetings. What are we calling for?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would be one of the next items on our agenda including advertising, travel and meeting format, yes.

Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I have a question. Yesterday, when I posed the question to you, Sam, you mentioned that you would undertake an information and whatnot to interested groups, etc. Has your department sent out information on the Crow Rate?

HON. S. USKIW: I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, just where the information has gone out, if it has, to date. The instructions have been out for some time to get it out.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then I assume that members of the Agricultural Committee will be receiving copies of that material that you're sending out.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, there's no problem with that. Essentially, I believe, what we're sending out is the resolution that was passed by the Legislature as

information. That's essentially what we are doing at this point in time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So then I take it, Mr. Chairman, any information that goes out from your office to interested groups, organizations, etc., regarding this issue and the agricultural meetings, we will receive similar information.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, anything that we put out as an information piece, in my opinion, should be part of our information as a committee, so I concur with that. It's logical and I think it should be done. You already have that particular piece because it was debated in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, in view of the several topics we have to discuss, would it be amenable to members of the committee to take a 10 minute recess now, come back, then if necessary recess again over supper and meet again at 7:30? Or would you like to adjourn now and meet again at 7:30? What is your will and pleasure?

Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: What other items on the agenda do you have to deal with?

HON. S. USKIW: You should dispense with those.

MR. J. DOWNEY: We could dispense with the other ones.

HON. S. USKIW: We could deal with them rather and then just leave the one outstanding issue.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the first item is Advertising.

Mr. Manness has suggested that we go forward with the usual advertising campaign. Can we model that on the advertising that was used for the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs Hearings on Municipal Assessment? That amounted to a total cost of \$6,000 twice in the Free Press and in the Winnipeg Sun, and once in all weeklies. That's what was done for Municipal Assessment.

MR. J. DOWNEY: You missed The Manitoba Co-operator, I think would be pretty important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Once in all weeklies, that includes the specialized weeklies like La Liberte and the Co-operator and others.

Mr. Plohman.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, on that I think that it should receive the widest possible attention in terms of the media and certainly not just the newspapers. Are you saying that there was no advertisement then on radio and television whatsoever?

The second point, I feel that the weeklies wherever possible there should be two ads, two weeklies wherever possible. Some of these it may not be possible for the early meetings but after that I think we should have

two weeklies as opposed to giving it all a play, if we want to keep the budget down for that, as opposed to putting it into the Free Press and the dailies in Winnipeg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Plohman, I have to point out that the timetable may make it impossible to do two insertions in the weeklies at this point.

In answer to your question, there was no television or radio advertising of Municipal Assessment. Television and radio advertising of committee meetings has been done only in very exceptional cases and usually when timing prevented print media advertising, primarily because of the cost.

Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're still on?

Mr. Plohman

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes. In terms of - it just takes some organization - many local radio stations and television stations have coming events that they'll do gratis if they have to make an effort in that regard and I wonder what mechanism we have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We automatically do that, Mr. Plohman, with all committee hearings. Information Services does a news release and there is a circular that goes out to all broadcast media as well as print media as a news release advising. It is done and used as a community service announcement or picked up as a news story by those media. That will be done automatically as part of the advertising package. I should have clarified that.

Mr. Plohman.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: A last point. It is my suggestion then that wherever possible that the weeklies have two consecutive ads where possible and that's what I suggested. In terms of the timing if we're going till the 23rd of April I think in some of the locations that some of the meetings could be advertised twice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I would support the basic advertising program that was put on for the Municipal Affairs as suggested in the guidelines, and not two additions in the weeklies, just the one shot I think as was in the Municipal Affairs hearings and no paid television or radio, I don't think it's necessary. It wasn't done for the Municipal Affairs hearings. There was good turnouts at those, I understand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

In view of the fact that this has more of a rural focus, do you want to buy ads twice in the Free Press and the Sun? The Clerk has whispered in my ear that we might wish to consider only one insertion in the Free Press and the Sun.

Mr. Downey?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Was the Brandon Sun covered as well?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, the Brandon Sun was not done. Sorry, yes, the Free Press, the Winnipeg Sun and the Brandon Sun, sorry, it was both Suns. Not that I would want to mention them in the same breath.

So, one insertion in the Free Press, the Winnipeg Sun and the Brandon Sun is what I am suggesting, and one insertion in all weeklies including the special focus weeklies like the Co-operator and La Liberte.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's satisfactory with me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that suggestion agreed to? (Agreed).

Mr. Plohman.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, I made my point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion on advertising. I take it that's agreed to. Agreed and so ordered.

Travel. Seeing as how we have the Minister of Transportation, who is also responsible for the air division on the committee, perhaps we could impose on him or his department with the Clerk, to make the necessary arrangements for the long distance travel to be by air. That would include the meeting that we have agreed to at Swan River and should we be going to Dauphin when we sort this through, that could also be tied into that.

The Brandon meeting, if it is scheduled the way it's presently scheduled with an 8 p.m. Beausejour meeting, will allow return by all members to Winnipeg that night and since it only starts at 1 p.m. on the Thursday, that could probably be done by motor vehicle, unless members wish to fly.

Morden is within easy driving distance as is Arborg, Anola, Morris, Steinbach, the other options. I don't know if you want to then fly to Brandon or limit the flying to Swan River and Dauphin.

The time pressures for travel may be dictated by the meetings scheduled. Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I would hate to appear to be an elitist, but if the staff certainly has more time to get out to those places than what MLAs do, especially when the House is sitting, and I would make the suggestion that every effort be made to get us to and from meetings by aircraft simply so that we can carry on both functions of representing our constituencies in the House, at committee meetings in this Chamber because a Session is sitting as well as at the Agriculture hearings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you make a valid point, Mr. Orchard, and the reference to the staff is also an important one because of the time that is required to set up sound equipment, etc. They have to be there generally ahead of the time that the committee members would have to be there.

Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm hoping that we are not suggesting that we need air travel to communities other than Swan River, Dauphin and Brandon. That's agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will fly Don only to Morden.

HON. S. USKIW: I don't think we have to fly to Arborg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed then, that meetings in Swan River and Dauphin would be travelled to by aircraft, and Brandon would be by aircraft depending on the scheduling of the meeting? Or do we want to agree at this point, that we will definitely . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: We are going to have members who are in here who are going to want to fly in, and out and back again. I think you would want to be set up to fly to Brandon, too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will then finalize the transportation arrangements once the meeting schedule has been agreed to.

The next item is Format. How do we wish to proceed in terms of the conduct of the meetings?

Mr. Uskiw, do you have any suggestions?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a standard procedure that committees of the Legislature have used over the years and I don't believe that we want to detract from that. Whatever those are, written briefs were accepted, verbal briefs were accepted, in person or through the mail. I think the committee should be quite flexible with respect to any kind of submission that is made in any way.

So I would not want to be more restrictive than what we have been, if that gives you the answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that's the answer I am looking for as Chairman in terms of receiving guidance. I would assume that in terms of the advertising that's to be done, the notice that will go out, which I will prepare with the assistance of the Clerk, will include the provision that the meetings will be held, that briefs may be written or verbal, that sufficient quantity of written briefs be provided, and that written briefs may be supplied to the committee up to the end of the hearings. That's fairly standard.

The meeting format at the commencement of the meeting would consist of an introduction of all members of the committee to the public, a reading of the resolution, a reading of the list of persons who have advised the Clerk in advance they wish to make presentations, request for any additional names to add to that list and then commence going through the list. I'm not sure that beyond that there was any specific suggestions as to format. That would be a fairly standard format. Are there any suggestions from members as to anything else that we want to accomplish at the meetings?

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: I would take it then the specific objective of calling this is under the resolved resolution point (a).

I'm wondering if it is the intent of this committee to maintain that specifically to the Pepin proposals. I think that's what it means. Or does it mean more than that? Does it mean in the whole history of the Crow, or does it mean to every matter related to transportation of Western Canadian Grain?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your question, Mr. Manness, because I'm going to have to maintain order in these meetings.

Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the resolution does deal with it in an adequate way. It says to inquire into matters relating to the western transportation initiative proposed by the Government of Canada, so we are dealing with the proposal that we have decided by resolution of the Legislature that we don't like, that's what we're dealing with. Whatever comes out of those hearings, of course, will impact on where we go from here.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, of course, that can lead to a lot of background. I'm trying to, in my own mind, determine specifically how much history will be allowed to come in support of any brief that is given specifically. Are we going to find ourselves again listening to the whole history of the economic and rail development in this country?

And secondly, are we going to find ourselves talking again specifically about any matter related to transportation of Canadian grain? That can take into account world markets. That can take into account — (Interjection) — Yes, I forgot about that, labour and management disputes and any number of items. I think that we, on this side, would like to know specifically how contained the objective is going to be of this particular hearing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, as I recall the set up for the Municipal Affairs Committee, there was a presentation basically on the Weir Report and its conclusions and on the analysis made of four recommendations by the government.

Since this resolution is reported to object to the Pepin proposal, are we going to have the Federal Government explaining their position at the meeting so people know what they're addressing, because we are objecting to the western transportation initiative as proposed by the Federal Government? We are making the assumption that everyone who is going to be there presenting a brief understands all of the facts surrounding the western transportation initiative.

With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the level of confusion out there on what is fact, and what is fiction, what is a real position, what is an imagined position, is indeed high, so that we are going to have people coming there saying they don't want to pay 10 times Crow because that was part of the information you put out last year.

We are going to hear all over the waterfront and, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how you're going to rule indeed what is in order, and what is out of order, because there is a great deal of confusion on what the specifics of the Pepin proposal are.

You know, I can't offer you a suggestion as to how we go about this, but I know there's going to be everything but the kitchen sink thrown in. We're going to hear grievances on when the train sat and left 21 boxcars full of grain and my flax car was in it for 31 days, and they never picked it up, and I never got paid.

You know, basically with the latitude that's allowed in this resolution we passed, I think a Chairman would

have a difficult time ruling those specifics out of the debate and out of the presentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the committee doesn't come to the position that we want to be terribly restrictive, because that in itself sets a tone for those meetings which are, in my opinion, less than productive.

At the same time I think it's fair to say that we ought not to allow people to draw other issues into this question. I guess in my usual candid way I would want to make reference to your efforts in the House in drawing a labour issue into this question, which really has nothing to do with dealing with the freight rate system in Canada and the upgrading of railways in Western Canada. It has a lot to do with movement of grain related to labour disputes as is the case in similar situations with other commodities where there's a labour dispute that interferes with the movement of those goods.

It is not a freight rate issue, it is not a railway upgrading issue; it is a labour management issue and applies broadly across the economy of the country not particularly to this industry.

So, you know, if you're thinking in those terms, are we going to allow that? I would hope that we do not because then we will be all over the waterfront.

We should be dealing with the Pepin proposal. It's impact, and yes, if people want to grieve that they're not satisfied with the present mode of transportation, and they don't like the fact that it takes 21 days to turn grain cars around, they'd like to get them turned around in four or five I think that's legitimate. That's within the ambit of grain transportation issues, but surely we don't want to stretch this to the point where we can bring in everything that one could imagine and throw it into this discussion because we'll be there a long time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may, before I recognize Mr. Orchard again, I have to say I appreciate this discussion but I hope we do come up with some guidelines, because as Mr. Orchard has said, whoever is Chairman at the meetings will be in a very difficult position.

Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, there is concern that labour management disputes get brought up, but I'll assure you that contrary to the obvious belief of the government when they voted down our amendments, practically every discussion you'll get into of paying more for grain comes into two things: performance being one, on the railroads part, and that performance is directly linked to labour management disputes in the eyes of the farmer.

Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, I realize the Minister of Agriculture doesn't agree with me on this, but he certainly has had the position put to them that what's the sense of paying more to move grain if a labour management dispute can stop at no matter what your paying.

You know, the position, the linkage has been made by farm organizations, by the Manitoba Chambers of

Commerce last fall where they telexed the Federal Minister saying, you know, this has got to stop. They did that on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce, of every rural community in Manitoba. That resolution, and I can table it for the use of the committee, specifically said that the issue of labour management dispute has to be taken out of the grain system for three years. That's how serious they were about it in representing every rural community in Manitoba.

So that, you know, you take the issue of labour management dispute is going to be one that's going to come up. Also the Pepin proposal really has nothing to do with the National Farmers Union standard diatribe about the gifts to the railroad and the taxation. Are we going to rule that out of order, Mr. Chairman? Because I'll guarantee you at every meeting, we'll have a formal presentation from the National Farmers Union, plus several presentations as individual members of the National Farmers Union. Each and every one of them will go through the hand wringing about the gifts to the CPR, and are we going to rule that out of order, because, Mr. Chairman, that's a simple repetition of a message that has been given year in and year out for the past 20 years. If we're going to waste committee time hearing that, then I think we're going to waste committee time hearing legitimate concerns of the farmer.

So what's acceptable to you to listen to, may not be acceptable to the majority of the farmers at those hearings to listen to, and if we're going to administer on one hand restrictions on certain topics, but yet have a free-ranging, wide-ranging opportunity for discussion on other hands, I think we're going to restrict some groups of people from having a proper say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was going to speak to Mr. Orchard on the point he's raised, because as your Chairman, I would have no difficulty on briefs or comments which dealt directly with labour management issues, because those issues were addressed by the House. The House spoke on that by turning down the amendment, but there are other issues that may come up, as you point out, on which I would have some difficulty because the House has not spoken and the committee has not - well not so far - given me any guidance on the other issues. But on the strict question of labour management, the House did speak and I would be bound by that. The House specifically said, we don't want that to be part of the committee's mandate. Okay. So on that one, I can you that as Chairman, I have some direction directly from the House to this committee, but on these other issues, I still await some direction from you.

Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it was indicated by the Minister, when he introduced the resolution, that he would like to set aside the rhetorical debate on the history of whole thing, and that's in Hansard recorded in this House, and I would hope that we could somewhat keep away from that and try and deal with what the present Pepin plan is proposing.

Am I understanding the Minister correctly when he made his introductory remarks to this resolution? I go back to that because I think that was part of his reason to get the support he got in the final stages when it

was supported. It was in his introductory comments that he wanted to deal with the specific Pepin plan and allow the latitude, I guess, that would provide for getting information from the farm community to achieve what he wants.

I think to stay out of the historical thing - it isn't going to be totally possible - but I think it would be helpful if the Chairman of this committee hearing could, because to you go to all these meetings and listen to brief after brief that give us the history of what has happened, then we aren't going to be able to get these meetings accomplished and the majority of people listen to them do have, in fact, imput on the present Pepin plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that to recap where we come from, the government has already taken a position on this issue, which is not the old Crow issue, or the old Crow argument, because we did already indicate to the public that we recognize a need for increasing revenues to the railway system and a method by which we would prefer that be done. So that, as far as the government is concerned, is a different ball game than the old arguments about where we were and why we are changing the system.

I wouldn't want to preclude a person presenting a brief though, from making the argument that what we had was sacred, and we should hang on to it. I think that's legitimate. I don't know how much latitude we should give anyone in presenting such a brief. Perhaps a time limitation is maybe the way to control that and I appreciate the point that is being made. We don't want to get to the point where we waste an awful lot of time on a lot of history, which we've all recognized isn't altogether relevant today. But we shouldn't preclude anyone from wanting to make those points in the time that's allotted to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said something that causes me a little bit of concern. Are we going to be expected to entertain presentations on the proposal that came from the New Democratic Party meeting, as he suggests they do have a solution to how the funds can be given to the railroad? I would hope not, Mr. Chairman. Maybe he could clarify that.

HON. S. USKIW: No I was responding, Mr. Chairman, to the member's point, of my asking for unanimity, based on the fact that we want to be objective about this exercise, and that he quoted me as having said that we're not interested in going back to the old debates. I say that still stands, because we have already taken a position that is somewhat different, as a government, from where we were some years ago. So it's not in our interest to try to turn that clock back either, but at the same time, I don't think we ought to prevent anyone that wants to make reference to historical fact, or even to suggest that we ought not to make any change from making their case. I don't know how we could do that legitimately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Plohan.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, it seems what we are doing, Mr. Chairman, is the government is saying we reject the Pepin plan, and this is the reasons why, and we have to have a presentation, yes, and there are some of the reasons right there. It's a provincial committee, therefore the Department of Transportation has to put together a presentation at the beginning, something similar to what happened at the Weir Commission and an initial presentation, it seems to me, is an explanation of what the Pepin plan is, because I admit and I agree with some of the honourable members that have said, that there's going to be a lot of confusion about what it is, so certainly they have to know what is being proposed.

So it seems to me that if part of the format should involve a short presentation on that and I think it would be helpful. From that then, I think what we're going to see is what the people of Manitoba, the farmers and so on, that are presenting, what they are suggesting as alternatives, what alternatives they want, what is an alternative position to the Pepin plan and that's what we're attempting to arrive at a consensus at and that's what we want to hear.

It will range all the way from keeping the Crow as it is - that's one alternative - to accepting Pepin's plan as being okay, and it'll range from anywhere in-between there, all kinds of suggestions as to what kind of a position we should take. I think that anything that is relevant to making the argument that people make, as to alternatives, whether it be to retain the Crow, which they'll do on the basis of history probably, to a position that is somewhat close to Pepin's position, is relevant as long as they are making their argument as to the alternative that they're suggesting.

So it does allow for a large range of it, but we attempt to steer them back to the Pepin proposals and alternatives that they're giving. So, therefore a brief coming in on labour management disputes, that being main theme of it, would not be in order. But some reference to that by someone discussing the issue of performance guarantees, obviously is going to happen and I don't think we can stop it. — (Interjection) — No, and we don't want to stop it, we want to hear what their views are. But, it shouldn't be the centerpiece of that presentation, they should be focusing on the issue and they will all obviously get into some of these other issues that the Honourable Member for Arthur says he doesn't feel they're relevant, just like some of us might think to the issues that they have raised aren't relevant, it's just a matter of perspective. I don't think we can rule them out of order at this particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Plohman has indicated that there should be a presentation made up by the Department of Transportation to, I assume, recap - I don't which, whether the resolution or whether it's going to recap the Pepin proposal.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Here it is and that's why we objected.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The question I would ask of the Minister is in developing a presentation on the Pepin

proposal for use at these seven hearings, would the Minister be able to assure Manitobans that the Federal Government agreed that was a fair presentation of the position. Because I believe there are times when you are going to say a clause means this, and the Federal Government is going to say a clause means entirely the opposite. If we have the Provincial Government developing their position, and the Federal Government, on the other hand, saying well, they could conceivably be there and present a brief saying, the presentation is wrong here, here and here, to further add to the confusion.

If we're going to start out with a presentation, I would hope that the presentation is drawn up, so that the committee can see it well in advance of going out there, because there may well be certain colourations; certain methods of presentation that might be not in accordance with the intent of the Pepin proposal. Because as I say - I'm not making accusations or anything like that - but, there are interpretations by all groups who look at it; who say this will do that, and another thing will do another thing. That is where we can get into a very interesting position. If we go out there with a piece of information that is developed, and which the Federal Government may perchance say is not factual, then we would be really defeating the purpose of going there and trying to listen to the farmers as to their legitimate concerns.

Once again, I go back to the stated position I had earlier. There is so much confusion out there as to what is really going to happen, and I believe, not in a detriment to any of the farm communities that are trying to fathom through the reams of information that come out, I don't think they've had an adequate explanation of what really is going to take place by anybody. Maybe they can't get it. I would want to assure that any introduction to this committee process would be a very objective one that would, as clearly as possible represent the position. That might have to be co-operative position developed by the province and the Federal Government to present the Pepin proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize anyone else, Mr. Manness, was on my list next. If I may, I'll strike him off, but speak briefly in his place as your Chairman.

We're onto a slightly different topic now in terms of the presentation angle. What we were really talking about was how are we going to limit the range of material to be covered in the presentations? Both are part of the format question, but perhaps if we can deal with the first one.

I got the impression from Mr. Uskiw and from Mr. Downey, and I think they appeared to be agreeing, that what you want from your Chairman is a primary focus of briefs and presentations on the Pepin plan, and on the resolution that was passed and that any lengthy - that might allow a lot of wandering into the nine Saskatchewan points. I think the primary focus is on (a) in the Resolved, and that any wandering into the nine points, any briefs which focused primarily on the nine points, you would expect your Chairman to call to order any briefs which focused primarily on the history of the Crow, and didn't deal with the Pepin proposal, would be called order; any briefs which dealt with labour/management relations would be called to order.

Am I reading the sense of the committee? With a certain amount of leeway, as the Chair always has to hear what people have to say before he knows they're really wandering off the topic. Is that the sense of what you want on that item, and then we can deal with the presentation questions?

Mr. Adam.

HON. A. ADAM: There will be people in my opinion who will make briefs on different assumptions and for different reasons. There will be people opposing the Pepin proposal for different reasons. For instance, the National Farmers Union which was raised by the Member for Pembina, the National Farmers Union look at this in two separate issues. They see one as non-negotiable, as far as the costs of transportation and that, that is something apart. It should be dealt with separately to the issue of the statutory Crow Rate.

There will be others there who will say, we reject the Pepin proposal, but if we can be guaranteed that we'll only have to pay a 6 percent increase in grain freight rates, we'll accept it.

There'll be others will say 7 percent and there'll be a whole host of reasons why they'll be opposing the Pepin proposal, but for different reasons. I can't see how you could start restricting people thinking the way they do.

I want to say, in what Mr. Orchard raised in asking the Minister of Transportation by saying well, how are you going to present this, you know the Federal Government may disagree with your interpretation.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman - I don't want to get into a debate on this thing - but the fact is that the Pepin proposal disagrees with itself. Mr. Pepin disagreed with himself. He says one thing in western Canada, and he goes down in eastern Canada and says just the opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

The purpose of this discussion was to provide guidance to the committee and to the Chairman on what format we would follow in terms of briefs which are going to be considered to be generally in order when they're presented in committee. We're now getting into a debate. That's not helpful.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order. I'm referring to the discussion that took place with the Member for Pembina and the Minister, of how that presentation would be made. That is what I'm referring to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you address your remarks more specifically to the problem the Chair and the committee are going to have when we hold our hearings?

Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I did not suggest that the Minister develop the proposal to start off the meeting. That was a suggestion made by your colleague sitting next to you. If the Minister is going to develop such a thing and the committee hasn't decided whether he should or not, I pointed out some of the problems you're going to get into. I'm not sure you should even do that; start

out with a presentation, because you can get embroiled in an argument right away, just as we have done here now.

I'm saying that if that suggestion is followed through by the government, proceed with caution because it could get you into a lot of trouble.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your contribution, Mr. Orchard.

Is there any further discussion on the specific question of the parameters that we will allow on briefs, and if not, we'll go to the question of a presentation at the beginning.

Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak specifically and directly to it. If we don't stick to the resolution, as we've been directed by the House, then we are going to be fully wasting our time in the farm community. I think that is something that I don't want to do, and any member of the government who is receiving public funds should be doing.

Therefore, I would suggest that the THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED in

- (a) To inquire into matters relating to the Western Transportation Initiative proposed by the Government of Canada;

That says to me it is the proposed Pepin Plan and that is to inquire into matters relating to that. Now there is a broad range, but I think you could in fact keep it pretty restricted to that in your chairing of the thing. In fairness, I think you can, but I think we have to, as directed by the Assembly, do that. What we are doing here is wheel-spinning and I would like to move on to the next subject, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there agreement that the focus of all briefs and submissions to the committee will be restricted to the (a) portion of the Resolved portion of the resolution? Is there agreement on that or is there further discussion?

Mr. Plohman.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Can I interpret that to mean that it also means that when the discussion on that issue - and people will say why they are not, for whatever reasons, in favour of it or they are, that they volunteer alternatives to it, that's obviously in order? Is that correct or not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a personal opinion, but I'm subject to the will of the committee. I can't answer your question. I have to have the committee's direction on that.

Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think we are attempting to be too strait-jacketed with this whole business. I don't think we are going to control what the public is going to do ultimately anyway, even if we wanted to. There is going to be some latitude that we're going to have to allow. People are not accustomed, by and large, to the strict rules of procedure anyway and it's going to be difficult to say that, yes, you can talk about that but you can't talk

about that. They will come there with prepared text and to get them to delete references and things of that nature is not going to work. It has never worked in my experience over the years, and all you will do is waste a lot of time on procedural things we will even get at each other's throats over, if you like, and waste an awful lot of time which will not be productive at all.

It's probably easier to hear them out even if they are somewhat irrelevant to the subject than to try to . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Even if they talk about labour-management.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, you know, the Member for Pembina raises a good point. If they are clearly out in left field on the issue, then that's quite another matter . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or right field.

HON. S. USKIW: . . . whatever. But, in any event, we are going to be advertising that this committee is going to be considering this resolution. That's what is going to be in the ad, is it not? Therefore, whether we like it or not - and we don't like all of the nine points, by the way, but they're there. Whether we like it or not, if someone wants to take issue with one of those nine points, there is no way in which we can say, no, because this is what's going to be in the ad. So I don't know how we can say, but ignore those nine points. Just talk about (a).

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have suggested that the whole resolution would appear in the ad?

HON. S. USKIW: I'm asking the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we would triple our advertising costs if we printed all of the text of the resolution. It would have been my anticipation that we would - the introduction would advise that committee hearings were to be held and that the committee had been directed "to inquire into matters relating to the Western Transportation Initiative proposed by the Government of Canada." That hearings will be held as follows.

If you wish, and I can make this suggestion, that I could have the Clerk place in the ad that individuals making briefs and presentations are asked to direct their comments, specifically and directly, to the matter before the committee.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on that same point of order . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you want the whole ad, that's the committee's will and pleasure.

HON. S. USKIW: I am not proposing that. I thought that was a given and, since it is not, then I have no problem with the advertisement. But I do have a

problem with the opening remarks of the Chairman then. If the Chairperson is going to read the Resolve of the Assembly and all those nine points - (Interjection) - that's right. Well, the preamble to the Resolve - if we are going to read this whole thing into the record, then it's difficult for us to raise points of order on any representations having to do with any of those nine points. If we are only going to read (a), then we have no difficulty and perhaps we can make that decision here right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: The Legislature, through this resolution - the Standing Committee were authorized to do (a), (b) and (c). We aren't told to deal with the issues above that. We are told to deal with this. I think that's what we should stick to because, in fact, if we don't, - (Interjection) - no, it doesn't.

HON. S. USKIW: It will be all over the waterfront, I know.

MR. J. DOWNEY: It's all over the waterfront if you include all this; it's all over the waterfront if you don't. But I think we could keep it more contained, if you were to stick to what we were directed by the Legislative Assembly, what we're authorized to do. We aren't authorized to and I think if we . . .

HON. S. USKIW: Can we agree then - oh, I'm sorry, I thought you were finished.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I am finished and I think that, if we stick to the BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, to that portion of it as the introductory part of it, I don't think the committee has any other authority to prepare, other than through agreement, a committee document, that introduction. We don't need it. That does it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would want to concur with that. I think there would be nothing productive about reading into the proceedings at those hearings those nine points of reference under the WHEREAS. We simply should deal with the RESOLVED portion and, that way, we could have better control from the perspective of the Chair. I concur completely with Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, just further to that, for example, with part of the Pepin Proposal, let's go to 7. Prescribe an unacceptable limit of 31.1 million tonnes for subsidized shipments. That will be part of the debate because that's part of the Pepin Plan.

HON. S. USKIW: But they will raise it under (a).

So can we agree then, Mr. Chairman, that the Chairperson will read into the record the RESOLVED portion on which then we will be prepared to receive briefs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I may not be following the logic of you two fellows, but we brought in the - (Interjection)

— particularly when you're agreeing, that's what's troubling me. But look, seriously, the matter that we discussed when we debated it in the House and we presented our case and our concern, we addressed a nine point resolution from Saskatchewan. That's what the hell we passed to send down to Ottawa. That is the resolution you sent down to Ottawa, is it not? You didn't send down, THEREFORE we're going to inquire into western grain transportaton. You sent down the nine points that come from Saskatchewan. That is what you sent to Ottawa.

Now you're saying, you don't want the Chairman, when he introduces the meeting, inviting discussion on what you sent to Ottawa; that you are not going to tell the farmers what you sent to Ottawa. I think if that's what we are going to do, cancel every hearing because we are not going to address what we sent to Ottawa.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, I think all of those points are going to be covered in some way under (a) anyway. It's just, if you are going to open your meeting with a listing of items, you are going to lead people into a direction that will unnecessarily prolong the hearing and the discussion. (a) is ample to deal with the issues. The Whereas merely give us the justification for the hearing.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I go back to what I think is a relatively simple point. We debated a resolution in the House and we sent a message to Ottawa. The message contained nine points. Any meeting inviting discussion by the farm community is totally incomplete unless they know what the nine-point message we sent to Ottawa was. We sent that message to Ottawa as a unanimous House representing every single farmer in Manitoba. I believe that it would be an incredible situation to go out in a hearing and not tell them what message we sent to Ottawa when we open the hearing. That means starting out with the first WHEREAS and going right through, and saying that those are the nine points that we sent in a message of objection to Ottawa on the Western grain transportation, and we want you as the farm community to tell us what the Western Transportation Initiative means to you and where you object and where you agree.

We cannot go out there and not read those nine points. That was the whole centre of the debate. That was the whole reason why you introduced a Resolution, was to have the same nine points from Saskatchewan going from Manitoba. You can't avoid it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Am I reading the will of the committee that the Resolution should then be read, but that discussions should be restricted as closely as possible to (a) of the resolved portion?

HON. S. USKIW: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Assuming that I will be your Chairman at that point, I would expect the support from all members of the committee in trying to restrict it that way, I think members who attended the Municipal Affairs

Committee meetings, know that we did that on those hearings and we did it very successfully without getting into procedural wrangles about it. We did have a few odd moments with the Member for Pembina at the Souris meeting. — (Interjection) — Well, my concern is that if the committee agrees today that I will, as your Chairman, receive support from both sides in doing what you've asked me to do, then I feel I have sufficient direction. But if we don't have that agreement, then I'm in a spot.

Mr. Adam.

HON. A. ADAM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It was indicated that these have already been mailed out or are being mailed out to some groups out there, this paper?

HON. S. USKIW: Not yet.

HON. A. ADAM: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: No, the instructions have been given that we communicate with the Government of Canada, with the political parties in Ottawa, that is, the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party and others that are interested in receiving that information.

HON. A. ADAM: Well, to respond to Mr. Orchard's concern, what is wrong with having these at the meetings and distributing them out to everybody, and they can read what we dealt with. They're there — (Interjection) — We just hand them out so that they can have them and read what we did. You hear it on the microphone. — (Interjection) — That's a part of the information package.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Adam's suggestion agreed to? (Agreed).

Copies of the Resolution, Mr. Adam, will be available for the public at the meetings.

Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, what is your next item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item is the question of Presentation, and then after that another item was raised, it was the question of a time limit.

Members will recall, if I may, that there was a presentation at the commencement of the Municipal Affairs meetings on Municipal Assessment. In fact, there were two presentations, and a question and answer period.

We did, prior to the commencement of those hearings, hold a private meeting of members of the committee, so that we could ensure that the presentations which we made to the public would be as - I guess I can use the word - politically neutral as possible, and be a straight statement of facts.

I think there was general agreement on both sides that at that meeting that the statement was, and certain modifications were suggested and were made in terms of the presentation that was made by staff, to accommodate that.

Now, that's what happened at that committee. I don't know how you wish to proceed here because we're not

going to be dealing with a report that was prepared by our government, or by the Province of Manitoba. So it is a different situation.

Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it's very plain what must be done. What we must have is the verbatim Pepin proposal, and then this Resolution of the Assembly, as two pieces of information for the public.

We can't get into the idea of interpreting our position into what the Pepin proposal is, or the position of the Conservative Opposition, or whatever. We are simply going to lay on the table the information as we have received it verbatim from the Government of Canada. We're going to put this there as our concerns, relative to that document.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Besides that, you should be able to get the Federal Government to pay the printing costs on the Pepin proposal, and save us some money, Sam.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Am I to understand then, Mr. Uskiw, that you are proposing only that a copy of the Pepin proposal be available at the meetings, but that no presentation of it be made?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have no reason to not want to do a presentation on it, if it's the committee's wish that we do a short presentation but, in fact, have a staff person along to do that. It might be helpful for the discussions that take place.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think to have the Pepin plan so the people know what they're talking about, a little more knowledge of it would be helpful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're suggesting a presentation as well as having it distributed and available to the public?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Plohman.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, that's exactly what I suggested. What I would like to suggest is that we can highlight some of the points. It might be some of these nine in here from the Pepin plan. We might be able to agree. If we can't agree on that, then we have to just go with a straight presentation of the proposal itself.

But if we can agree on a few points, that we can all agree with the major concerns that we have with it, that's fact, I don't think there's a problem with putting that forward; a slight elaboration of the Pepin plan as it is written. There are some points that we could agree with and I don't see why we couldn't sit down before and agree with a few major concerns that we as a province, see in the Pepin plan. We've voiced some of them right here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Plohman, I'm not clear on what you're saying. I think Mr. Uskiw and Mr. Downey were agreeing that it could be possible to do a straight,

factual presentation by staff. Are you suggesting that in addition to a straight factual presentation, those items on which both parties in our Legislature agree, are in some way not the greatest for Manitoba, would also be addressed?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, there would be a statement to Mr. Chairman, a fact as well. I'm not suggesting anything should not be factual. You're talking about a straight factual presentation — (Interjection) — I think what you're saying is reading the Pepin proposal to the people there.

I would say slightly more than that would also be desirable for certain elements of it. I think we could agree on what some of those elements are and those we can't agree on, we stay away from.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Adam was next.

HON. A. ADAM: Yes. I have one concern in that you present to the hearing the Pepin proposal as it is written verbatim. Then you expect people to respond to that at that meeting. I just flag that because when we had our Municipal hearings, we made sure that we sent out the analysis of the report and explanation of the analysis. So if you're going to expect to get some response to a document that's been prepared by the Federal Government, you'd better get it out to those groups, so that they can study it, otherwise they won't be able to respond to it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, let the Minister respond to that last comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He was next. Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, that thing has been studied to death. We've been around the country once a year ago with an interpretation of impact. The department has done a very thorough analysis. That information was mailed out to thousands of people. I think every Wheat Board permit holder has one. So they are equipped, if they want to go back and do some research on that information they've received, to present their opinions or make their submissions.

Now, I don't believe for one moment that our presentation at any of these meetings is going to change the briefs that are already prepared and are going to be presented there. So it may affect some discussion, that's right, but people will be there with prepared opinions, to try to interface, or try to present to them an interpretation of ours, prior to them presenting their brief to us, will get us into an awful lot of difficulty, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Pardon me. It isn't our objective to start with. We're inquiring into what they think of the proposal that is there - not what we think to tell them what they're thinking . . .

HON. S. USKIW: They have all the information anyway. It's been out there a long time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, what is your will and pleasure? Could I ask you to bring this matter to a

head to make a decision, as to whether we want (1) no presentation; (2) a shortened version that is purely descriptive of the Pepin plan; or (3) that description plus some analysis. I think those are the options that have been tossed on the table. Can we address those three choices and make a decision, please?

Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Can I make the suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister have his staff take the Pepin proposal as printed, summarize it into something that would take no longer than seven minutes - say, as a target - in point form, verbatim, pick out the major thrusts in the Pepin proposal, attach this Resolution, have no longer than a 15-minute presentation to start each committee hearing and then throw it wide open for briefs. No analysis on it. Wimpily a summation of the Pepin proposal by Mr. Uskiw's staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Without any detailed analysis or comment?

HON. S. USKIW: None, right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was the second suggestion I made of the three options. Is there further discussion? Mr. Gourlay.

MR. D. GOURLAY: On a point of clarification. At the earlier part of this meeting, I believe the Minister of Transportation indicated that a package of material was in the process of being readied to be sent out. Was that not right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I dealt only with the question of the Resolution that was passed in the Legislature, as an information piece that is being mailed out to the Government of Canada, the opposition parties and if others want it, they're available, sort of thing. But it's not what we're talking about.

MR. D. GOURLAY: That would be the same material that would be sent to members of the committee?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes. Well, you've got it. That's what it is - it's this.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I gathered there was some other kind of information that the department had prepared and you weren't sure that it was ready or not.

HON. S. USKIW: No. Mr. Chairman, the member is confused with the other point that I made, is that a year ago the department did the analysis and had mailed out, I believe, to every permit book holder, the department analysis of the Pepin proposal. So I merely made the point that the information has been out there a long time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Plohman.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, I agree with the matter of summation. I wonder if the opposition members would

agree that without having seen the summation, because it involves some degree of discretion, there's certain facts that they can mention about the Pepin proposal, such as 31.5 tons limit for example, that I think we can all agree with. If those were going to be mentioned though, Mr. Chairman, if certain points are going to be mentioned, does the opposition want to see that statement before it goes out? Or are we just agreeing that it's so factual - and it's not that clear cut - if we're going to agree that the staff is going to make up a synopsis of the major points of the Pepin proposal and send it out, are we agreeing here that is okay, or does that have to come back to this committee first to authorize it to go?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, my suggestion to the Minister was that he instruct his staff to make a summary of the Pepin proposal that would last seven minutes - that's relative to what time - and have that summation come back for approval by the committee and use by the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I detect agreement on the second option, which Mr. Orchard has described. That is, that staff prepare a short - in the range of seven minutes, in terms of verbal presentation - summary of the Pepin proposal, without commentary, without analysis that describes only the salient points.

That the staff summary be discussed at a subsequent meeting of this committee, prior to the hearings; that any changes, in terms of the description will be made at that point; then that document will be distributed to all interested groups, if possible, before the hearings start, and will also be available at the hearings. Is that a correct summary of what we have now agreed to? And the Resolution, of course, will also be distributed with the summary document we've described. Is that agreed? (Agreed). Agreed and so ordered.

It was also suggested by, I believe, Mr. Uskiw that we may wish to consider time limits on briefs. This has always been a difficult question for committees. What is your will and pleasure?

Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: If we were to put a time limit, and that always gets very touchy, but would 20 minutes not allow an adequate presentation time? That's what we use in Private Members' Hour in the House, when we're debating in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you also place a limit on the question and answer period then, following the presentation?

MR. D. ORCHARD: I withdraw any suggestion of time limits, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I see it pretty much impossible to put a time limit on the presentations and briefs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm willing to hear your suggestion that we have a brief limit, a limit for brief presentation,

with unlimited question and answer, but beyond that the committee may have some difficulty, in my opinion.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I think the Chair could instruct the presenters of the briefs to make sure that they respected all those people that were trying to get their information across to the committee and to in fact do that, keep their presentation as brief as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suggest they begin to wind up after the first hour and fifteen minutes?

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, there won't be. To give them a reasonable warning that we do have limited time because of our other responsibilities, we want to make sure everybody is heard and that's as gentlemanly as you can be about it. You can't cut someone off after 10 minutes, if they've got three minutes left, and the committee who sets those rules run into those difficulties.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gourlay.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Assess each location as to the number of briefs that will be indicated they're going to be there to present briefs, and try and get some clarification from the people at each location as to whether a time limit is necessary. Obviously if we have a big run at some locations and we only have so much time, we're either going to have to just hear part of the group and come back, or limit the presentations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think what we should do and I've barely touched on it, and that is, assess the crowd that is at any given meeting. Assess the number of briefs that we have been given notice of, that will be presented, and on the basis of that, determine how long each brief should take and make that point at the beginning. If we have 25 people here, if we spend 20 minutes per person, this is how long we're going to be here and sort of ask them to cooperate to expedite the hearing.

There's one reservation I have on limitation. I would not want any limitation as to time on major farm organizations. If Manitoba Pool wants to take two hours to explain their case to us, I think we should hear them out, because I think they are an important part of the industry and certainly have to be looked upon as a major spokesperson, or agency, representing a lot of producers in Manitoba.

Likewise with people like the Bureau, or UGG, I think have to allow them as much time as would be deemed reasonable to hear them out and to have a proper cross-examination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I take it, it's the will of the committee then to allow the Chair to use some discretion in working with the number of delegations and the timeframe that we have to encourage shorter or make no statement with regard to time, depending on the number of people we have.

Mr. Plohman.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I don't think we should put a time limit, even if there are a lot of things. I think Mr. Downey's

suggestion was the best. Appeal to the people that are there and we will regulate that by questions. You would be surprised how effective that can be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed there be no time limits then, subject to the discretion of the Chair and the committee if there are problems? (Agreed)

Further discussion then, that's the end of my list. Are there any further items, other than the schedule which we are going to discuss at 7:30 which is fast approaching.

Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I've got a proposal on that so that we could maybe wind it up right now, other than the times. I have no difficulty with the times, but I do have one suggestion. It would be to go with the Morden, Winnipeg, Swan River, Dauphin, Anola, Brandon and, rather than drive to the far end of the Interlake to break, split the difference and go to Teulon, would accommodate both the committee . . .

HON. S. USKIW: Teulon is just a few miles out of Winnipeg.

MR. J. DOWNEY: It's half-way. If you look at the road map, it's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Probably as far as Anola.

HON. S. USKIW: But it's a long way up the Interlake, beyond Teulon.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I have a suggestion. I think if you look at it, it's half-way.

A MEMBER: Teulon's 40 miles.

MR. J. DOWNEY: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, if I still have the floor is Arborg is somewhat about 80 miles out. It would be a 40-mile drive for that Interlake area. Dauphin, on the north end, would pick up the north end of the Interlake across the Narrows. But what I'm saying is that it would accommodate both the south end of the Interlake and the north end. It's a central point.

HON. A. ADAM: It's 80 miles from the Narrows to Ste. Rose.

MR. J. DOWNEY: It's 80 miles from Melita to Brandon, too.

HON. A. ADAM: But not to Dauphin.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, and then you have got to go to Pierson too, which is another 30 miles. So you can keep going to the different points. What I'm saying, it would be more of a central point possibly than going to the north end of it. That's a recommendation that I would have and we could resolve it now and not have to come back at 7:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey, may I have your list again? Morden, Brandon, Winnipeg, Dauphin, Swan River . . .

A MEMBER: The same as presented excepting . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anola and Teulon. So, in effect, what we are doing is removing Beausejour, Morris and Arborg and substituting for those three, Morden, Anola and Teulon. Okay. Further discussion?

Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: One concern that I have, Arborg is a major grain-handling centre. That's why Arborg makes, in my opinion, a lot of sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if we can resolve it, then . . .

HON. S. USKIW: Just let me finish, Mr. Chairman, if I may. If you look at the map, the west side of the Interlake there is, by and large, non-grain producing area. So the grain production area is on the east half of the Interlake region and Arborg, being a key area for grain production and handling. The elevator system is, by and large, located in - I think there are five elevators in that one town and it is recognized as the agricultural hub of the Interlake by everyone in the Interlake, Mr. Chairman, so I think we should stick with Arborg.

MR. J. DOWNEY: In taking this to the backyard of the Minister of Agriculture, I would expect . . .

HON. S. USKIW: We've got to give them something.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . the Minister of Highways would say, we've got to give them some credit. Well, it may be all he is going to get in his four years. We would proceed to agree on those towns and dates, Mr. Chairman, subject to - and I think we are going have to do this, it is a little off the subject. We may have to substitute, through the House, one or two members if we are not able to attend. I think that's the flexibility that we are going to have to maintain.

HON. S. USKIW: One more point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: I have one additional suggestion maybe we can get agreement on very quickly and that is that we ask our staff to write a letter to the major farm organizations announcing the Winnipeg date for them - (Interjection) - well, I'm talking about, like, Manitoba Pool and the UGG, so that they're here anyway. Rather than them trying to determine where they are going to pick us up in the hearings, that we pretty well have set aside Friday, April 8th, in Winnipeg, here in this room for that purpose, for their convenience sort of thing. That doesn't mean they can't go elsewhere. But if they know that this is sort of set aside for them, I think what we will have is all of the large groups come in that one day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One point, Mr. Uskiw, with respect, if these notices are to go out, they probably should go

from the Clerk of the Committee rather than from staff within a department.

HON. S. USKIW: No, no, I'm talking about the Clerk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Orchard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, just one question, do the major organizations involved with the change of freight rates, are they assumed to include CN and CP?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, I would think so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw, will you be prepared to provide a list of those organizations to which you would like notices sent, to the Clerk?

HON. S. USKIW: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Adam.

HON. A. ADAM: That would not preclude any locals to make a presentation anywhere out there.

HON. S. USKIW: No.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Farmers Union will be at every one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, there was some concern expressed about some of the times. I believe it was Mr. Hyde, originally, who expressed concern about some of the times and trying to have as many morning meetings as possible to avoid conflict. We have not commented on the times. If the Clerk is to prepare the advertising, I think we should firm up both the times as well.

HON. S. USKIW: I thought we agreed with my time.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I asked a question. What were the time proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey, the Thursday, April 7th, 1:00 p.m. meeting was to be in Morris. Is that the meeting we are moving to Morden?

HON. S. USKIW: Morden, right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do you still want that meeting in Morden at 1:00 p.m. or do you want to move it to 10:00 a.m.? What is your will and pleasure?

A MEMBER: What day is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: April 7th, Thursday.

HON. S. USKIW: See, that makes it difficult for people that have to travel a long way to Morden if it's 10:00 a.m. They will need more than two hours to get there. That is the reason why it was put in for 1:00 o'clock. For example, if the Minister of Agriculture wants to attend that meeting and he's home on Wednesday night,

then he has to travel from Fisher Branch all the way to Morden for 10:00 o'clock in the morning.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, let's just go through the times again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could fly the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Which times again did you have, Mr. Minister?

HON. S. USKIW: I had 1:00 p.m. in Morden, Thursday, April 7th; Friday, April 8th, 10:00 a.m. here in this room; Thursday, April 14th, 1:00 p.m. in Swan River; Friday, April 15th, 10:00 a.m., Dauphin. Now it means that we would stay over either in Swan River or in Dauphin the one night.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Swan River's a nice friendly town.

HON. S. USKIW: Wednesday, April 20th, 8:00 p.m. at Anola; Thursday, April 21st, 1:00 p.m. at Brandon - and that's again recognizing the fact that we'll be coming in after midnight from Anola the night before - and Friday, April 22nd, 10:00 a.m., Arborg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The two meetings that take place on Fridays, Mr. Uskiw. In view of Mr Hydes' concern - he's not here now - about sittings at the same time the House is sitting, is there any wish to move those to the afternoon of those two dates?

Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: No. I think, Mr. Chairman, those times are as good as we can . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's agreed then by all members that the times just listed will be the times at which the meetings are held.

Is there any further items?

Hearing none, can I have a motion to adjourn then?

MR. D. ORCHARD: I move that we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Orchard.

Thank you very much gentlemen.

The next meeting will be at the call of the Chair depending upon the availability of the staff summary and the other material required.