



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour)(The Pas) introduced Bill No. 121, An Act to amend The Building Trades Protection Act; and Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Operating Engineers and Firemen Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture & Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by The Honourable Minister of Welfare that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved into a Committee of the Whole House with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: RESOLVED that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting ground water and the drilling of wells for ground water and to provide, among other things, for the making of surveys of ground water resources and a study of the conservation, development and utilization of ground water, for undertaking programs of ground water conservation, and for taking certain measures to control the flow and output from certain wells, the cost of all or some of which will be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

Resolution be adopted?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm very happy to explain this resolution because I consider it to be of major importance to the province, and I consider it to be a major step forward in conserving a very important part of our water resources in the province. We are all conscious of the need to conserve our surface water in Manitoba in strategic locations for the benefit of our citizens. Nature has given us however, water storage in the form of aquifer throughout this province, and it behooves us to look after them and to develop them in a way parallel to our conservation of surface water resources.

There has been on the Statutes of the Province of Manitoba for many, many years a Well Drillers Act but it has not been administered insofar as the drilling of water wells is concerned. It is a great pity because had it been administered and a program which is provided for carried out, we would now have a great wealth of information which would be of real economic value to our water users throughout the province. We have a dearth of information at the present time with regard to our ground water supplies. This Act enables the Water Control and Conservation Branch to license the well drillers in the province and to require a permit for the drilling of wells, and it provides that the well driller shall provide to the Water Control and Conservation Branch a log of the well that he has completed, with geological information as to the type of soil he's drilling through, the depth at which water is found, the flows of water that are available in a given area. With this information plotted and made a part of a general log of the water resource in the province, we feel that we can give immeasurable assistance in the orderly and productive development of the ground water supplies in the Province of Manitoba. This is the most important aspect of the program.

The only alternative to acquiring this information that is available, and can be made available so easily, would be for the province to carry out its own survey; and this would mean a vast duplication of work that is being done each year by the commercial well drillers in the Province of Manitoba.

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)

But there are other aspects to this Act too. It will give authority to the government to carry out ground water surveys where the surveys coming out of commercial work are not adequate, or we feel that they should be supplemented, or where hitherto the commercial efforts have been unproductive.

Another important aspect of the bill is that it empowers the Minister to move in and stop the waste of water that can occur from one of these ground water supplies where you have a flowing well that is running wild. I have seen some of these wells. They can affect the water supply of other people who are upstream and at times it is in the interests of the community that the government should be able to step in and bring these wells under control. So this resolution and this measure under consideration will give the department the power to do this. It is going to require the expenditure of some funds. These are provided for in the estimates and I can bring them to your attention at the time that they are under consideration of the Committee.

I think that I have covered the major points that this resolution provides for. I think it is extremely important and an integral part of any general approach, comprehensive approach, to develop and conserve our water resources in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): May I ask the Honourable Minister a question? How will it affect the general projects that we are planning for the flood districts, and whether there isn't a duplication? In other words, the money that we're going to spend now, can it be covered by the general flat budget? --(Interjection)-- I just want to know if he got my question?

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister referred to the old scheme whereby the Province of Manitoba provided some assistance to farmers in the digging of wells for getting the ground water. I might inform the House that the well that there is now on the farm that I sold to my son was dug by a government-owned machine in 1923. At that time the machines were getting old -- they had been purchased originally in 1912 to '16, I believe, and they were getting old and there was the thought that these machines would be sold or just abandoned. There was one some 40 miles from my place, the intended place where I was to put up my farm buildings. I got permission to go and get it. I rigged up three sleighs with three teams of horses, there was no roads, and we picked up that old machine and brought it home. The government had an employee to operate these machines. The owner had to pay for the employee and could dig a well. And I understand that there were records kept by this government employee, this well trained person. The Minister says that there was no record. As far as I can remember he was filling up records nearly every night. But at any rate this plan has been abandoned. And I was wondering whether when I read this motion that the government was thinking of coming back to some kind of assistance to farmers in order to dig these artesian wells. Apparently that's not the case. The Minister says he would like to have records from the commercial well drillers. That might be a good point. I would ask the Minister not to insist on too many details. These men, I know some of them, are not well educated men and it would be difficult possibly to fill out the forms if they are too complicated. The general idea might be acceptable but there should be some reservations.

Now with respect to the government digging some of these wells now for survey purposes, I wonder if the government will buy a machine or will use a commercial driller in order to drill those wells?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, some time ago I mentioned the fact that presently the PFRA made contributions to dugouts on farms and I understand that that has been extended to include certain community wells. I don't know whether that's the right term to use or not, but I understand it was for the purpose of a well that was to be used by a group of farmers. Now does the act or the proposed resolution intend to make available any assistance to individual farmers for deep well digging, that would be my first question, Mr. Chairman. And my second one might be, will the farmer have to obtain a permit before he digs a well? Now that is if he hires the work done or if he does the work himself, will it be necessary for him to have a permit to do it?

Last summer a very prominent farmer and a very good farmer in the Neepawa area, who has experienced considerable difficulty in the past in obtaining water, after many, many years, last year obtained the services of a local fellow with one of these back hole diggers. I think

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . the honourable the minister will be familiar with what they are. But they went out to the farm and used this back hole digger and dug down in several places, probably a dozen or 15 different places and eventually ran onto a stream of water and now he has an ample supply of water, at a depth of about 15 or 20 feet. Would this particular man with a back hole digger be required to have a permit? His principal business is that of putting in sewers and septic tanks and so on. He isn't a well digger by any means, but they did engage him in this particular instance.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): I merely want to ask the Minister whether he wouldn't agree that it would be a good idea that once this resolution or legislation is put into force, that priority be given to the study of what effect, as to what effect the proposed floodway will have on ground water supplies in the area that will be affected? The Minister will recall that in the past 12-month period I have been in touch with his department and with himself as to what possible effect there may be on ground water supplies resulting from the floodway, and the Minister will have to agree that up to now this question or problem is pretty well held up in the air because of lack of information, lack of study of the matter. I know that the express intent of this resolution, this legislation, is not to deal with the problem -- this kind of problem -- but nevertheless in at least one aspect what we have before us here could be used to make the necessary study so that people out there will eventually get the information, before too long I hope.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Just for clarification, Mr. Chairman, I heard the Minister say if there is such an overflowing well the government can step in and stop the overflowing. That doesn't mean that the farmer will have to go and dig another well, that he'll have no water at all. And as far as digging the wells. I don't see -- possibly the Minister is going to come up with another bill -- but in my own area the farmers already have to dig wells to the amount of \$1,000, \$700 and \$800, and so on, and the assistance for dugouts has been given three way I understand, federal, provincial and the farmer, and I don't see no reason why it wouldn't be assisted for digging these wells, because in my own opinion the well is used all year around and the dugout only yields water during the summer and the dugout in my own tabulation did not cost an individual farmer as high as a \$1,000 which wells did cost. Furthermore I would like the Minister to say if there is such assistance for the wells, what these people should do. Now since they have to go and borrow money, some of them, and how do they go and get the reimbursement from the province or whoever the authority may be?

MR. R. PAULLEY: (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I was quite interested to hear the Minister say that among other purposes of this, was the purpose of having the well drillers list the information that they have to the advantage of the department and the people as a whole in the Province of Manitoba. I think that this is a good step. But I'm wondering how much the department itself is going to do in respect of this. How many surveys are they going to take out before they proceed with public work? If I recall correctly here about a year or a year and a half ago -- could possibly be two years -- when they were making provisions for the supports to the perimeter bridge just to the southern part of my constituency, that holes were drilled for the supports to the bridge. The net result was that practically all of the wells in the southern part of my constituency of Radisson went dry, or were being drained out as a result of an upset in the table of water in that general area. Now I don't know -- I'm no engineer -- I don't know whether or not it would be possible to assess the degree of damage that might be caused by excavations of that nature, to the watershed within the general area before proceeding with these works, and I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that that is the point which has been raised by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

Now it's my understanding, reading just newspaper reports, that with the test hole that was made last summer in connection with the Red River Floodway, that when the depth of the trial excavation was reached water was encountered, and it's conceivable that this would affect the water table in the general area surrounding the proposed Red River Floodway. Now I think this is of vital concern to the people in the southern part of my constituency through which part of the Red River Floodway is to go, and also that into Brokenhead, and indeed even into the area of the Honourable Member for Springfield. Now I would like to hear from the Minister -- he does mention that this information is going to be obtained from well diggers generally -- I would like to hear in this connection and I think it's very vital and of supreme importance to the

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) . . . people in the general area. How much surveys have the department itself made in respects of the net effect on the water table in the area of the Red River Floodway? Is the same result going to prevail as prevailed in the southern part of my constituency in respect of the drilling for the piers and supports of the perimeter bridge? I don't know if the Minister is aware of the situation that was caused at that time. It was necessary for the municipality of St. Vital to get water tanks and supply the people in a goodly portion of the area by truck, due to the disturbance of the water table at that particular time.

Now as I said at the offset, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much that possibly this information should have been compiled over the years, but notwithstanding whether it should or whether it should not have been done or the fact is that it wasn't done, but I ask the Minister what the department is doing in respect of this to prevent such situations that I draw to his attention now, in the future, with the contemplated works in the general area in my own constituency, that of the Honourable Members for Springfield and also for Brokenhead?

MR. HUTTON: Well, I'll answer the question of the Honourable Leader of the NDP. I'm happy to tell him that we have teams in the area affected by the floodway, visiting every single home, every single well in that area, and the survey has -- although I don't think it's quite complete -- it's well along the way. It's so far along the way that the information that has been gathered has been scrutinized by geologists and it appears that there is going to be little effect upon the water supplies east of the floodway due to the excavation. I think that the water that was encountered in the excavation last summer, if I recall correctly, was as the result of rain, not too much as a result of any seepage due to the depth of the excavation. It was one of the most encouraging aspects of the experimental work we carried out to discover that we weren't going to run in at that location at least, into problems of ground water. This survey carried on by the floodway division into the effects of the excavation upon water supply, as I said, has been underway for some time. It is an exhaustive survey; every known water supply -- ground water supply -- is being investigated and the effects of the excavation that had taken place last summer are related to it. The depth of the water supply and so on are being logged in order that they can calculate the effects of the future excavation on these aquifers. And as I say the information that we have garnered so far has been very encouraging to us.

I'd like to say a word about the PFRA and the question of whether they should undertake to assist the farmers to develop deep wells. I made such a proposal to the federal government, to the Minister of Agriculture of Canada last summer when the shortage of water developed and lent my support to requests from various municipal people who asked for this kind of a program, that assistance be given to the drilling of deep wells. However, there is some very real problems in respect to administrating a program of this kind, and I think we should recognize them. Who pays for a dry well? You see we always come back to this problem that we haven't got the information that we could have had and should have had when a year like 1961 hit us. We come back to the problem that the Honourable Leader of the NDP has posed when he said: "why didn't somebody know when you punched a hole in there that you were going to get into an aquifer -- and affect other peoples' wells?" Well if there had been a survey over the past 20 years maybe we would have known that, but there isn't this information. And information on the water resource that we have is even more important and just as helpful financially to the farmer or other person who wants to get a water supply because there's nothing costlier than a dry hole. If we are able to compile a great wealth of information on our water resource, we'll be in a position to help well drillers, to help farmers, to help anybody who is looking for water, because we will in the future be able to give advice upon what kind of conditions they can expect; whether the experience in the past in that area has been that there's salt at a certain depth or that it is useless to try and find ground water supplies there because all the experience in the past points to the fact that there isn't any available supply to be developed. And certainly although I think it would be most acceptable to have a program of financial assistance to farmers who are faced with the necessity of developing a deep well I think that this program even takes precedence over that.

I would like to say a word about the community wells that were undertaken on an emergency basis. In areas where there were no surface water supplies and no ground water supplies and the cost of undertaking the development of a deep well was so large as to put it beyond the reach of the individual, we agreed, the provincial government and the federal government, to

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) share 75% of the cost with the municipality in the development of a deep well and this 70% of the cost applied not only to the drilling of the well, but it applied to investigation and it applied to the pumps and equipment required and even in cases to a storage reservoir and a building to house the pumping equipment. I believe that there are some 10 or 11 wells that have been developed in the province or under development in the province under this program and its been extremely useful. This isn't a program however, that could apply to the development of wells on private property. However, that does not say that there isn't room for such a program and if I can recollect correctly, it seems that I recall that the assistant to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Jorgenson, when speaking in Saskatchewan, indicated that this proposal was receiving some consideration. But this is another matter. The thing that we are after at the present time is to make use of information that would otherwise be lost to us and that is of extreme value to us today and will be of even more value in the future.

I think the question was raised as to who would be considered a commercial driller; would the farmer who used his own equipment? Now we're getting into details of the Bill. But he would be excluded from the provisions. The man who either does with his pick and shovel, or who used the hand auger, or who dug out a shallow trench to get water, we are not interested in getting information from commercial well drillers and we feel that it can be of tremendous value to us.

Now another point was raised in that of closing wells. I think it was the Honourable Member for Fisher asked "what are we going to do about drilling him a new one?" Well, we're not going to do anything about drilling him a new one, but the cost of closing some of these wells when they run wild is extremely high, much higher than drilling a new well. If you've ever seen one that has gone wild you will recognize that it's in many cases beyond the resources of the individual to cope with it; it isn't beyond his resources to redevelop a water supply where he knows that water resource has been. I think that covers most of the questions raised.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the minister says that insofar as the ground water supplies of the people in proximity to the floodway are concerned, it is not likely that the supplies will be affected. He may very well be right; he may very well be accurate in saying that as far as it is possible to be accurate in forecasting. But I would like to ask him, whether the government has a policy to, in the event that people do suffer, do have their ground water supplies affected adversely by the floodway, then the government must have a policy as to whether they will compensate them for this, for the extra cost of finding a new water supply or drilling deeper or something to that effect? Either they have a policy or they don't and I would like to know if they have? So just what is the nature of that policy?

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I thought perhaps the Honourable Minister was waiting until he got two or three questions to answer. I noticed that he said that they didn't have the records of former well drilling. I presume that means that the records haven't been kept or have been lost that were taken back in the early days, because what the Honourable Member for Carillon mentions is true that there was a time when the Province of Manitoba directly operated, oh, 20 or more well drilling machines and certainly records were kept in those days because it was a pretty big part of the operator's work to see that the records were accurately kept. Now is it the fact that they were -- even though the records were kept by the operator -- that they just disappeared through the course of time? Or is it a fact that in recent years that only the really deeper wells were the ones that they were concerned with?

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister stated that if there is such a wild well, the government will stop from flowing, well then the farmer can go and dig another well and another well will become wild, so how is the farmer going to get his water supply -- and I don't need to go too far -- just go into Sky Lake area and Silver area and there you have these artesian wells flowing all the time even now. These people need water and no matter when they hit the lower level of the well there she comes. Well then you're going to plug all the wells in the area and there wouldn't be no water. However, I would like to turn back the Minister to these drilling of wells and assistance. He mentioned that Walter Jorgenson was speaking in Saskatchewan, that he feels there is a need of assistance in these deep well drillings. Can the Minister tell me how fast the federal government is thinking the need is; or

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) . . . whether the federal government is contemplating to assist these farmers that dug these wells on their own in '61; or whether it can be taken that after the federal election consideration may be taken?

MR. HUTTON: I can't speak for the federal government. I have told you what I know. I have applied to the federal department. I've requested a program of this nature. I have forwarded the requests of municipal people in this regard. The assistant to the Minister of Agriculture has made a statement that indicates that some consideration is being given to this matter. I can't give you any further information.

In respect to the matter raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I would suggest that he should know better than I, why this program was discontinued, because it was implemented, I think about 20 years ago -- the Well Drillers Act. It was never administered. I expect it required money then as it does now to administer a program of this kind, to make sure that all this information is logged properly, and I would suggest that both he and the Member for Carillon knows what happened to it. But it's been resurrected by this present government because we think that it's important and that it should be carried on. Now what happened in the past, I don't know. I expect that the records that were kept under the program which the province at one time had of assisting farmers in drilling wells, I expect those records are still available; but I would expect that they represent a very small percentage of the water wells that are drilled and have been drilled in the past in Manitoba and that insofar as giving us adequate information is concerned by which we can plot our water resources in the province they would be completely inadequate and would have to be filled in with the information that could and will come from the commercial well drillers in the province.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister not going to make reference to the very valid point I think that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead raised? Insofar as the effects or possible effects of the building of the Red River Floodway on the water table in the general area. Now I'm concerned with this because of the fact that it goes through my own constituency. I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Springfield should be if he's not, as to the effects of the possible change in the water level. Now we're dealing here before us this afternoon with a resolution which is broad in its outlook of measures dealing with the question of ground water and its levels. Now my honourable friend the member for Brokenhead asked in connection with this as to whether or not the government has a policy, that if in the event due to the building of the Red River Floodway the farmers and people along the floodway are deprived of water, is there any compensation for them? Now the Minister can simply answer there is, or there is not any policy, and that's all that we're asking. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that for the Minister to ignore the question is to ignore the responsibility that he as Minister of Agriculture in charge of this responsibility and the government in this instance, because I'm sure this is of major concern to the people whose properties are along that of the Red River Floodway. And I don't think that he should ignore at least some answer to this question.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, there is a long disregard for procedure in this House. We're talking about one matter and someone raises a question about something that has no relation whatsoever to the matter at hand, and we're going to start a debate on the floodway. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I have outlined what the government department is doing in this respect; that we are exercising the greatest of care; that we are taking every precaution; that a team is out and visiting every water supply that can possibly affect it; that the information is going to the geologists. What answers the engineers will come up with, I don't know. But the indications are now with the information that they have at the present time, and they have substantial information, indicates that there is going to be relatively little effect upon the water supplies to the people living adjacent to the Red River diversion. And this is all the information I can give them and it isn't a question of being indifferent or callous about this matter. Every step is being taken to -- every precaution being taken that can be taken at this stage.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order before us but you will note that the Minister did answer forthwith my question as to whether there had been any studies made; whether any studies were being undertaken as to the effect on ground water supply. He didn't hold back on that; he answered it. And so I therefore thought it was perfectly in order

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . for me to ask him as to the policy with regard to compensation. It we're going to talk about study of the supply of ground water, then why can't we talk about compensation? It's the same point involved.

MR. PAULLEY: I'd like to hear from the Minister as to whether or not the government has or has not a policy in respect of ground level water in respect of construction where it is possible that through government enterprises the water table is disturbed. That's all that I'm asking him and if he would only stand up and say that we have a policy, or we haven't a policy, it would be quite satisfactory. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that the terminology of the resolution is permissive for me and my colleague from Brokenhead to ask this question. Because, Mr. Chairman, the resolution deals with the whole question of ground water level, among other things, and also a study of the conservation development and utilization of ground water, and for taking certain measures to control the flow. It's all embracive. All I want from the Minister is a simple answer. Has the government a policy in respect of where the water level is disturbed as a result of an enterprise, or whether it has not? It's just as simple as that.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, unlike the New Democratic Party the Roblin Government of Manitoba established its policy on the basis of fact and we are now in the process of accumulating the facts regarding ground water as it relates to the Red River diversion at the present time.

MR. PAULLEY: May I say then their policy is not on the basis of fact -- it's catch as catch can. If the situation arises which we have drawn to the attention of this Committee, of a likelihood of a thing happening, then at that time the government might, or it might not evolve a policy. And I don't think that that is the way the Government of Manitoba or any other jurisdiction should operate. I think the government should have a policy in respect of eventuality, in respect of such a huge excavation as is being contemplated to the east of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I cannot accept the statement of the Leader of the New Democratic Party that we should follow his lead and establish a policy when we don't know what we're doing.

MR. PAULLEY: That's for sure, you don't.

MR. HUTTON: . . . at the present time we wouldn't know what we were doing.

MR. PAULLEY: I agree most heartily.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, how can you without knowing what the facts are, without first determining what the effect will be, what would be required to obviate any adverse affects on water supply? How could you possibly establish a policy? Only the New Democratic Party could ever do that.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest this, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest this, Mr. Chairman, in answer to my honourable friend the Minister. That if we were in power and if we were expropriating property to the degree that my honourable friend is along this area and taking parts of the property; if we were making a floodway to this degree, certainly we would make provision that where the comforts and the facilities that the people have in the general area were going to be disturbed as the result of our decision that we would have a policy of compensation far and above what that is of the government at the present time. --(Interjection) -- Never mind the votes that I'm trying to get. You look after yours.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, that was the essence of my question. It is not inconceivable that the ground water supply might be affected by the diversion. My question was simply, does the government as yet have a policy as to compensation? It's not good enough to leave it off until the excavation has taken place and then fight it out to see if there is any compensation. I'm trying to establish now whether there is a policy or not, in the eventuality that the ground water supply is disturbed. If they don't have a policy yet the Minister should say so and then when we get to his estimates we will attempt to find out when they think they will begin to establish and formulate a policy. I don't think the Minister has any right to be so snide and secretive.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . I had arisen, I was going to suggest I would attempt to pour some water on the troubled oil here, but since water is what we're discussing, I couldn't help but take some issue with what the Honourable the Minister said with regard to the Act that is presently on the Statute books. He said that it was put on something in the neighbourhood of

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) 20 years ago. That isn't the Act that the Honourable Member for Carillon and I were speaking of because that policy went out of effect much more than 20 years ago and the well drilling operation was completely disbanded. That may or may not have been a good thing; it may or may not have been a bad thing. The point I'm making is that certainly the records were taken. Now probably the same thing has happened that does in other places -- they may not have been kept. They were made at the time. Maybe they haven't been kept; maybe they're lost. But I think the later Act that my honourable friend is speaking of is one that deals with wells that were primarily deep wells, and just a quick glance at the Act it seems to me that it deals with wells only of 500 feet in depth or more. Well that would apply to, I would think, less than one-tenth of one percent of the ones that we're talking about today dealing with ground water, would it not?

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify, and it's a very easy question. The Minister stated that he requested the federal government for assistance on deep wells. Now I understand in my own knowledge that he was turned down. Now I want to ask the Minister, whether or not ---

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I never said I was turned down.

MR. WAGNER: Well it's not in progress as yet. There's no assistance -- let me put it this way -- there is no assistance for deep well drilling from the federal government, that's under the PFRA. Now I understand a dugout was dug 35-35-30, something like that anyhow. Now my question is: would the provincial government give its share to the individual farmer of the 35%, say the federal government hasn't got a policy, they would not assist? Well then would Manitoba government give their portion to the individual farmer that drills such a deep well?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Minister has answered the questions I've asked him. Possibly he forgot the questions before the time came to answer mine, because I was the first one to ask a question. But it seems to me that the whole success of the plan depends on the co-operation that the Minister will get from the commercial well drillers, or maybe the greater part of the success will depend on that co-operation. Now I wonder whether the Minister has contacted these well drillers; whether he will force them to fill those forms and give the information; whether he is ready to compensate them for the labour involved in filling in those forms. And again I will ask him what will be his program to supplement the work done by the commercial well drillers, because I believe he told us that he would supplement that with work of his own?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, just to answer that question because I think it should be answered. We consider that far from being an imposition on the well drillers, that this program, which is going to cost some money on the part of the provincial government, will become more and more beneficial to them because it will make available to them as they move about the province and do their work, information that would otherwise not be at their disposal. In fact the Act provides for the licensing of these people, but we feel, and I might say that I've had indications from the well drillers themselves, that they would welcome some supervision and regulation, because they are interested in their business and they want to do a better job and they think with some centralizing of the information and correlation of the information, that this can be of great assistance. They're not interested in drilling dry holes either, and certainly the property owner, whether it be farmer or otherwise, isn't interested in drilling a dry hole. It's far cheaper for him that he pay a small amount and get the advantage that can be had from such a program as this, rather than to invest hundreds of dollars in a futile attempt to find water in an area where there isn't any. I'm quite aware that the program that you were referring to, the Honourable Member for Carillon, in the first instance is not related to the Well Drilling Act.

I wonder how many members in this House realize that there is more water coming out of the ground under Greater Winnipeg than is coming through the aqueduct? Fifty million gallons a day, in excess of 50 million gallons a day, and it's about time that somebody found out where it's coming from and how much is down there, because we are told that the population of Metro Winnipeg, for instance, is going to reach 800,000 within the next 20 years, and with the demand on ground water increasing, with increased useage of ground water supplies for industrial purposes, it can very well be -- we don't know -- but it could well be that there is a

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . limit to this resource that we're drawing and I think it's about time that we found out something about this resource that we're using in this manner.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, it appears as though the Minister is not going to give a definite statement today in respect of the question that has been asked by my colleague the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and myself. I would appreciate it very, very much -- he may not be in a position to have thought -- or he may not have thought that this particular question has been raised by us -- it might be Mr. Chairman, between the time that this committee ceases and the time that we have under consideration his estimates that he may reflect on the questions and problems raised by ourselves and we will be asking him when we deal with his estimates, questions similar to what we did today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted?

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister didn't answer my question when I asked whether or not the province would give its share to assist the farmer in deep well drilling?

MR. HUTTON: No, we wouldn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Call in the Speaker. Committee rise and report. Mr. Speaker the Committee of the Whole House has adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. HUTTON introduced Bill No. 124, An Act respecting ground water and the drilling of wells for ground water.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I call the Orders of the Day we have with us this afternoon, Augustana Choir from South Dakota comprised of 65 members. I believe some of the members have already left the gallery but some are still with us. I am very happy that they have chosen to come to Manitoba and visit with us and view the great City of Winnipeg and the Legislative Buildings of Manitoba. We hope that their stay with us will be a happy one and that sometime in the future they will come back again.

Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of ---

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker. As is our custom I must report to the members of the House the death of a former long time member of the Legislature of Manitoba. And I refer to the late Mr. William Blaine Findlater, who was a member of the Legislative Assembly for the Gilbert Plains area many years ago. Mr. Findlater had a very long and interesting life. I think he was over 90 years of age when he died. He came to the Province of Manitoba from Ontario as a young man of 21 and pioneered in various sections of the province, finally settling in the district of Gilbert Plains where he made a mark for himself. He was active in all the activities of that community in those days, as a farmer, as a merchant and particularly as a livestock man. He was a member of the first council of the Town of Gilbert Plains in 1906; and for 20 years he was the president of the Agricultural Society in that neighbourhood. So it speaks something of his interest and the part that he played in the development of that community. He was a member of this House, Mr. Speaker, from 1915 to 1922, which is a period that extends beyond the experience, I think, of any of us here, and it may be that few will have known Mr. Findlater personally, although perhaps the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains might be an exception and the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

However, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have permission to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains that this House convey to the family of the late William Blaine Findlater, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I am indeed thankful for the privilege of paying tribute to one of our very prominent citizens of the Province of Manitoba. I knew Mr. Findlater personally, have known him for many years, but prior to my acquaintance with him he was a very close political colleague of my fathers. They came into

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . . the Gilbert Plains area at about the same time -- I think that Mr. Findlater came in a few years earlier -- and for more than a half century they were very close personal friends and had the same outlook on politics and the political life of the province.

Mr. Findlater in stature was really a big man and he carried himself erect and he did so until the very last days of his life; and within this fine physical frame he carried a very keen mind and a very warm heart. I don't know in my long experience and association with people in the province and elsewhere of another man that was so highly admired and respected by everyone that knew him. It didn't make any difference as to what their political views may have been or how they differed from him in his opinions, they still respected him very, very highly. As was pointed out by the First Minister, he took an exceptionally active part in all community affairs; anything that was worthwhile you would always find Mr. Findlater right in the midst of it and giving it every support. He was a very firm believer in democracy and our way of life and he really felt that it was the one and only way of life. His contributions were varied, but the outstanding thing about him, was that he not only firmly believed in certain principles, but he practiced them very religiously and I am quite sure that as far as the community is concerned, that they will feel that loss because he is one of the few individuals in Manitoba that are going to be very hard to replace. You would think that he would be sort of a stern character when you have that sort of outline about him, but he wasn't. He was a very kindly man and he had a very fine sense of humor. In fact it was only a short while ago that he was taking one of his medical check-ups and when he was asked by a friend as to how things turned out and what were the results, he says, "well I can't tell you yet, all the polls haven't been heard from." So I say again that we have lost an excellent citizen and as far as the community of Gilbert Plains are concerned, they have lost a man that was helpful, not only in the community effort, but to anyone he met and anyone that needed assistance and I certainly join in expressing our deep felt condolences to the family.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should say something on behalf of the New Democratic Party in respect of the loss of a former member of this Legislature. Neither I or any of the other members of my present group had the honour and privilege of knowing Mr. Findlater, but when the Honourable the First Minister mentioned the period during which he was a member of this Legislature, I thought that he must have been a progressive person, at least he belonged to a very progressive legislature, because Mr. Speaker, as we all well know, it was during the years from '15 to '22 that some of the most progressive pieces of legislation that the province has today, was first enacted on the statutes of the Province of Manitoba. It was during this period of time that we first of all had our Mothers' Allowances legislation. It was during this period of time that women in Manitoba were first granted the privileges of voting. So when I have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of paying a tribute to any member of the Legislature who was representing the Province of Manitoba during that period, I feel a kinship to them and recognize the contribution that they have made to the Province of Manitoba. So, Mr. Speaker, our party joins in the message of condolences and sympathy to the family of this great Manitoban.

MR. SPEAKER: Members please rise as a mark of respect to a former member.
Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask permission of the House to do so, I should like to report that for the last two mornings I have been appearing before the Royal Commission on Banking and Finance to present some of the suggestions of the Province of Manitoba in connection with their work and I am asking the officers of the House to place a copy of our submission to this Royal Commission on the desk of the members so that they may have an opportunity to read it. I would however like to offer a cautionary word when this report is read by members of the House, because in a sense it's a little bit unusual. In most cases when we appear before Royal commissions, we have a pretty good idea of the kind of policy that we are advocating at the particular moment for the particular subject and we make recommendations which are relatively speaking considered expressions of policy on the part of the government.

Such is not the case with the recommendation that was made the other day to the Royal Commission, because we are dealing here in a field where we find ourselves greatly handicapped by the lack of firm factual information and basic data on which firm recommendations

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . ought to be based. Consequently what we have given to them is more or less in the line of suggestions respecting fields which they ought to investigate -- fields of study. Some of these suggestions we put forward with a great deal of diffidence because we're not at all certain that they're really lines of policy that they ought to explore. We must leave it to their judgment. Others perhaps we feel a little more enthusiastic about. But I would like to warn members of the House that when reading this statement they should remember that it is in the nature of suggestions for fields of study, rather than firm recommendations of policy in most instances. There may be one or two that are perhaps a little more firm than others but on the whole it's in the nature of a series of suggestions rather than a statement of government policy. So I make that explanation so that members may know something of the background against which this presentation was made.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I be correct in assuming then we will not be anticipating a resolution of endorsement as to the presentation before this Royal Commission?

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend cares to offer one, I might -- (Interjection) --

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is it true that the federal government has made an offer to the Province of Manitoba with regards to the new townsite at Churchill, whereby the federal government would participate to the extent of 66-2/3 percent on the new site?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): The negotiations have not been completed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the same question though. Has this offer been made by the federal government?

MR. EVANS: I have no further statement to make; it's under negotiation.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, is it correct that there are survey crews now operating in the proposed area of the new townsite?

MR. EVANS: I'm not aware of any. There may be.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Health was kind enough to invite the members this morning to visit and inspect the laboratory on the 10th floor of the Norquay Building. To me, Mr. Speaker, it was absolutely an eye opener. I have not been aware that the angels are watching over us when we are asleep. The exhibits there and the explanation was something outside of the world, particularly in connection with the water we consume. I only seen part of it. It is very gratifying that when I get up in the morning and want to make my own cup of coffee that I'm satisfied that the water is pure, it's being filtered, it's being looked after in every respect. I am sorry that not too many members were there, but I would urge everyone to see it and when they do, they'll probably throw snowballs on the Minister of Health and not stones. I congratulate him for this aggregation which I had the privilege to visit today.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Has he or does he intend to investigate the report of this "party" held by some members of the medical profession on last Saturday? According to the report no charge of willful damage will be laid, but Mr. Speaker, at this time with your permission I wish to read just a short paragraph of what was in the Free Press of yesterday. "The police report on the incident was brief. Constables were called to the residence shortly before 12:30 P.M. Saturday, after they received complaints from homes in the area. One police official said that the doctors attending a medical convention here received permission from the City to break windows and wreck the building for old times sake. Although windows and doors were broken down by the celebrating medical authorities, the police official said, no charges of willful damage would be laid since the building was condemned. Mr. Morgan said that when he came on duty the glass lay deep all over the entrance to his parking lot and a short time later a car came and picked up several cases of empty liquor bottles. Two empty cases remained in the building Monday morning."

Now I wonder if the Honourable Minister feels that nothing should be done about this, and does he feel that these people being professional have any privilege -- I wonder if he agrees that these people should have more responsibility, especially in a public place where the people visiting patients might be in a position to see this and lose confidence in these people. I wonder

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . also if he could find out if the Honourable the Minister of Health was there, and if so, maybe the Honourable Minister could give him an eyewitness account of what's supposed to be happening at this wild orgy where Bacchus seemed to be the M.C.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'm in exactly the same position as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface; I don't know any of the facts about the circumstance at all. I'd be pleased if he would send me the clipping; it's the first I've heard of it. If he was at the party I would be quite happy to hear more of the details.
--(Interjection)--

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to take this opportunity to announce a further policy in respect to the movement of seed oats, effective, March 15th, 1962 to May 15th, 1962, covering shipments of carload lots by rail. Freight assistance on the movement of seed oats by rail. Assistance to the amount of three-quarters, 75%, of the freight costs up to a maximum assistance of \$12.00 per ton will be provided on carload lots of seed oats purchased by municipalities or grain companies for distribution to farmers resident in Manitoba and moved from any point in Alberta, Saskatchewan or Manitoba. The municipality or grain company must first move the seed oats, pay freight charges and obtain receipted weigh bills. Assistance will be granted subject to the following conditions: That all seed oats are sold to bona fide farmers resident in Manitoba; that the distributing agency, municipality or grain company will indicate on a form provided by the Department of Agriculture and Conservation, the names of farmers who receive the seed, their address, legal description of their land and the number of bushels each receive; that applications for freight assistance on shipments of seed oats originating at points outside of Manitoba, be accompanied by a control sample certificate as evidence of a minimum commercial No. 2 seed grade on purity basis as defined for seed oats under the Canada Seeds Act. All applications from rural municipalities must be made on the appropriate forms provided by the Department of Agriculture and Conservation. All applications from grain companies must be made on the appropriate forms provided by the Department of Agriculture and Conservation. Forms may be obtained at municipal or local government district offices or from the Soils and Crops Branch, 711 Norquay Building, Winnipeg 1, Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister a question in regard to the statement he just made. I notice that the dates he gave are March 15th. Will that mean that any movement since that time that has gone on they can apply for retroactive payment?

MR. HUTTON: That's right.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Leader of this House. When could I expect an answer to my Order of Return of March 13th, re: Boards, Commissions, the names of people on it and salaries and so on. It's nearly a month now and - -

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to look into that order today, by coincidence I suppose, and I find that it does require a great deal of work according to the staff and they have not yet completed the order. I've asked them to proceed with it as fast as they can.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Before the Orders of the Day, I also have an Order for Return, asking for the cost of the judicial enquiry into the Brandon Packers Strike. When can I expect an answer on that?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I may say to all members who have outstanding orders that I have asked for a list of them to see what progress has been made and we will try to expedite all of them.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Welfare. Has he received word from the federal government as to the amount that they will be contributing this year toward his Fitness and Amateur Sports Bill?

MR. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Minister of Public Welfare)(Portage La Prairie): Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was reported in the press this morning. There is only one thing that I would add to the press report. They stated that the amount received was \$145,856.00. This is made up of a lump sum grant to every province of \$50,000 plus a per capita over and above that which

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.) . . . brings Manitoba's share to that amount. In addition they are providing a one-time grant for the purposes of organization of \$15,000 to each province, plus a per capita above that and Manitoba's share under that proposal will be \$18,531.00. The total proposed to date is \$164,387, and I would point out that these are under Sections (5) and (6) of Bill C-131 The Federal Act, and we fully expect that there will be other proposals coming forward at a later date.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Did I understand the Minister correctly, that he received word of this by reading the newspaper?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: No, I said that in addition to what was reported in the newspapers, I wanted to report that other grant. I had received a letter from the National Minister of Health and Welfare at noon today, outlining the present status of the program.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, that should mean that the federal government has approved the program of this government in this field?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: No, Mr. Speaker, this is the amount that they are prepared to advance to the Province of Manitoba under Sections (5) and (6) of the National Act which sets out that agreements can be made between the federal government and the provincial government for the purposes of Bill C 131. This is the amount that we will be receiving.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it correctly then the news was released to the press before the Minister received it at noon today. Is that correct?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I presume, Mr. Speaker, that the news wires are a little faster than Her Majesty's Mail.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, isn't it a fact that the federal bill states that this money will be granted only for costs of said programs and that the government could not have any insurance that this would be paid unless and until the program has been approved by the federal government?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well that's right. The money will be spent under agreements that will be reached and the authority is in Sections (5) and (6) of the Bill C 131. It's quite right, we don't have any formal agreement with the federal government as yet, but this is the amount of money that we will be able to receive as soon as we take our proposals down to them and reach agreement on those proposals. And I don't anticipate that there'll be the least bit of difficulty in reaching that agreement with them.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, your program has nothing to do with that at all. The government has been promised this amount, regardless of what kind of program it has or even if it hasn't any kind of program at all? This money has been promised without any condition?

. Continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my remarks on this particular amendment will be very, very brief. As a matter of fact, I was somewhat surprised frankly when the amendment was allowed for debate, due to the fact that we had just recently passed the resolution in the House asking for amendments to the BNA Act to make provision for the subject matter of the amendment. Now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment does not fulfill the desirability of the original motion, in that it defers action until after consideration, not only by the Government of Canada but until after a contributory pension scheme is set up which, under our present constitution, will require the unanimous consent of all of the provinces of the Dominion of Canada. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it is not acceptable to us. We had agreed to the changes in the amendments to the British North America Act which would set up a contributory pension scheme, but we feel that there should be an increase now in the old age and blind pensions from \$65.00 to \$75.00 a month.

Also, another objection that we have, Mr. Speaker, to the amendment itself, in all due respect to the honourable member who proposed it, we feel that it was just an attempt to have this House endorse the policy of the Liberal Party of Canada in respect of pensions. Because when one compares the words that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye used in the introduction of his resolution to the reported remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party federally, they're almost word for word. I find that on Page 429 of Hansard, of March 6th, 1962, my honourable friend the Member for La Verendrye says: "I think that there should be an opportunity for all in Canada to contribute to a retirement plan, a plan which will be practical, which will carry itself, which will not be a hand-out, and which will be geared to the economic progress of the country." Then, Mr. Speaker, when I refer to the Winnipeg Free Press of January 10th of 1962, containing the words of the Leader of the Liberal Party at Ottawa after a conference, I find that Mr. Pearson emphasized at the outset that the plan is not a hand-out, and goes on in somewhat the same vocabulary as my honourable friend.

But I have another objection to this amendment of my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, in that he does not spell out what he means by the sentence, "the Government of Canada to establish a national pension plan to which the individual contributes." Now we envision that when we do have a national contributory plan it will be one in which everybody makes a contribution. The plan as announced by my honourable friend does not mention the fact as to whether or not this would be a compulsory plan, or whether or not it would be a plan under which everybody would be able to join or not to join, as they felt free to do. The implication is in the amendment that on one hand it seems to be that the individual would be under no compulsion, it would be voluntary, and yet he did not say so in his remarks to this House; and because of the incompleteness of the method by which he suggests this plan and this fund should be established, we cannot accept it. It seems to me that he was following the Liberal pension plan at Ottawa as announced by his federal leader, and I refer again to the press report of January 10th, in which it is said that Mr. Pearson clarified a number of points in the Liberal scheme for national portable old age pensions. The article then goes on to say the plan, which has been a subject of long years studies by a committee of experts and accountants meeting in Toronto, would be compulsory for employees, but voluntary for the self-employed. Now I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that unless we have a plan which was all-embracing, to which everybody made a contribution, then the plan was doomed to failure.

I said at the offset that I would not be long in my remarks in connection with this amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I think that I have said sufficient to suggest that, first of all, the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye does not, in effect, give us any concrete proposal on which to base our judgments; that it does not give what is desired in the original motion; and namely, an immediate increase to our old age pensioners, because of the fact that if we accept his proposal, we would have to wait until we had the unanimous agreement of all of the provinces in the Dominion of Canada before we could establish a contributory pension scheme from coast to coast. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we reject the amendment of my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: Does anybody else wish to speak on the motion?

MR. EVANS: On a point of order -- no, my honourable friend is speaking on the amendment. Yes, I am sorry.

MR. GRAY: Yes, I am speaking on the amendment. The amendment, no matter how it's worded, can be accepted by us as an entirely separate motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Hasn't the honourable member spoken on this amendment before?

MR. SPEAKER: We are checking on that at the present time.

MR. GRAY: No, I didn't. I introduced the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, that's right, and if you will just wait for a minute we'll find out whether

MR. CHRISTIANSON: then I would just like to say a few words on this subject. We've had quite a full and complete discussion on old age pensions at this session, and mixed up in the discussion of the perennial resolution of the honourable member from Inkster has also been some discussion about the resolution presented by myself with regard to the amendment to the constitution to permit contributory old age pensions. Now that resolution has been disposed of and you have permitted this amendment to come forward, and I think that it deserves a few comments. I think I would like to go a little further on it perhaps in my remarks than the Honourable Member from Transcona, the Honourable Member from Transcona, the Honourable Leader of the NDP.

However, before touching on that, I would like to say a few things about some remarks that the Honourable Member from St. John's made back on March 6th when he was speaking on this subject. He quoted at some length from a speech made by the Honourable Member from St. Vital the previous year -- last year when he was speaking on this same resolution -- and the Honourable Member from St. Vital was very ably putting forth the view of the government with regard to this subject, that is that we had accepted the principle that we were going to meet need as it existed in this field and we were not in favour of any blanket pension increase necessarily, because we felt that the resources of the province could be best utilized in meeting the need as it existed in the individual case.

Now the Honourable Member from St. John's, in talking about this, attempted to prove that we had abandoned our principle, that we were no longer holding to this principle of meeting need because we had accepted the proposal of the federal government that some of the pension categories should be increased to the same level as the old age security pension. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that the honourable member doesn't have a better understanding of the principles of these particular pension programs. He doesn't appear to realize that these programs are based on income ceilings which the federal government has set and which are probably a fairly good measure of the fact that these are not blanket pension raises to everyone over a certain age. They are, in fact, pension raises to which people are entitled only on the basis of their income, and this, as he knows, is the age old means test. It's been liberalized to the point now where the ceiling for a single pensioner is \$1140, and we are quite prepared to accept that definition.

The federal government, as you realize of course in setting these policies in this area that can apply all across Canada, it must have regard for the policies of every provincial government; and we have felt, at least at this stage, that it would be advisable to go along with this policy. But this is certainly not an abandonment of our social allowances principle, because this only affects a very small group of pensioners indeed, and I think that the honourable member will agree that those people who have this income limitation are, indeed, in need in today's economy. So I just want to assure him again that we have not abandoned our principle at all. Our principle is still the same and, notwithstanding the increases in the pension categories, we are still prepared to meet the need as we find it, over and above this figure.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): \$5.00 a month?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well the member can say \$5.00 a month as he likes, but he knows full well that there is no limit on the amount of money, within reason, that can be given to people who receive social allowances.

MR. ORLIKOW: \$5.00 a month.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Now I'm a little surprised though, Mr. Speaker at the Liberal Party, like the Honourable Member from Transcona. They are certainly proposing some pretty wild schemes. The recent conversion to this case reminds me of 1958 when the Leader

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.) . . . of the riddled remnants of the Liberal Party, after that election, went up to his own private Mount Sinai in the Laurentians, and he came down with an election platform. He was going to cut taxes by \$400,000 and he was going to increase spending by an equally large sum; and he was going to do it all with a balanced budget; and a host of other wonderful plans and programs that he had learned in the four days that he spent up in the hills.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they're at it again -- they're at it again. Look at the latest program that they have out now -- it's really a dandy. Just let me quote what he says here. He's going to -- he's talking about the new program of the party and what wonderful things they're going to do. They're going to take the old age pensions out of politics and they're going to take politics out of the old age pension, and all that sort of thing. But then they're going to: "and so I suggest that using the base which now exists of \$65.00 per month per person, we should, in addition to that, create a fund, a national contributory pension fund; and from that fund, add a supplementary pension to all those who are receiving \$65.00 of another \$10.00 per month, making it \$75.00 a month. And then as the plan goes into a full-scale retirement pension plan, make provision for a much more generous and dignified means of retirement." Well that's a dandy. That's a real good one.

This plan was introduced in the House of Commons by the Honourable Member for Essex East, who I think was once the National Minister of Health and Welfare. In fact, he's the fellow that back in 1957, when the government had a \$100 million cash surplus, could only find \$6.00 a month on top of the \$40.00 that the old age pensioners were then receiving. That only took, I think, some 60 -- I believe if memory serves me correctly, some \$60 million of the surplus and they wanted the other \$45 million for another purpose. However, be that as it may, this same fellow, this same fellow is now proposing a tremendous plan, and I'd just like to quote from this Mr. Paul Martin as he spoke in the House of Commons on February 6th: "The scheme outlined by the Leader of the Opposition," -- that is Mr. Pearson -- "will make it possible for all Canadians to take part in a contributory pension plan geared to the growth in our economy. It will not require any addition to taxes because the plan calls for payment of benefits out of contributions which will grow during the first ten years, enabling the giving of pensions in larger amounts, proportionate to the earnings of the contributor. Added to the existing federal old age pension, this plan will establish a new national minimum of \$75.00 per month for a retired person at age 70 and \$140 for a married couple." Listen to this now: -- this is good. "The size of pensions will rise year by year as people retire after contributing to the new plan. Full pension rights -- a good proportion of most people's earnings will be reached in ten years. These pensions will be available from age 65." Well there's a remarkable similarity between that and what was said by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye, and I don't suppose that is surprising in view of the circumstances as they are today and in view of the task which lies ahead of him.

Now I just want to have you reflect on those words, and I would like to read to you a few short excerpts from a report by Dr. Robert M. Clark that was prepared for the Government of Canada and tabled in the House of Commons on March 5th, 1959 -- (Interjection) -- Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member from St. John's will wonder why he made that remark when I'm through reading what this report says. I think that they will realize it's all very well to propose these schemes, but they must have some regard for the facts as they exist today. Now this report, as I said, was tabled in 1959 and he's talking about the federal government's old age pension plan, security plan, and the American system of social security, and he's comparing the two. Now on Page 3 of this report: "The taxes under the two programs are as follows: in the US, the 1958 rate of 2-1/4% on employees and employers, and 3-3/8% on the self-employed, will rise to 4-1/2% and 6-3/4% respectively by 1969, with no change in the benefit formula during that interval." Now I think that's pretty important to remember that. The total then is 2-1/4 and 3-3/8 -- or 5-5/8% of the employee's salary is being contributed, or was being contributed in 1958 to the old age security plan in the United States, and this rate was progressively increasing. In Canada, the taxes at this time were 2, 2 and 2 and they were raised in 1959 to 3, 3, and 3 -- three percent on the personal income up to \$3,000 and 3% corporation income and 3% sales tax. The benefits under this program in December 1957, notwithstanding the fact that the American program had been in effect for quite

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.) some time at that point, the benefit for the people in the United States were: for retired male workers, \$70.47; for retired female workers, \$52.23; and for all retired workers, \$64.58. In Canada at that time the pension was \$55.00.

Now I would just like to read some of the conclusions that Mr. Clark draws from this study. "1. There is a strong case both for and against the Canadian contributory program with variable benefits. 2. The issues involved are complex and the sums involved that, in any major changes in legislation, the importance of allowing ample time for preparation and consideration of any new legislation is obvious. Even if the Canadian people were prepared to allocate a substantially higher proportion of their national income, the range of benefits above a flat rate minimum that could be paid in the next decade under a Canadian contributory program would be significantly less than those that would be paid in the US, for these reasons: Benefits under any contributory program, in which benefit levels are even approximately related to contributions, build up rather slowly. The Canadian contributory program would presumably begin above the present \$55.00 per month. After 22 years of operation, the US minimum for retired workers in 1959 was \$33.00 per month. The average Canadian per capital income is about 30% lower than the US. In the event of a contributory program with variable benefits, the prior preparation of detailed estimates of expected benefits and of various means of paying for them is essential. It would be important to consider other possibilities also, because there are a variety of alternatives between the current Canadian and US program. The experience of Great Britain and other countries in this connection may well offer useful ideas."

I think, Mr. Speaker, when you read that and are able to accept the conclusions that Dr. Clark has reached, that you will realize that the program suggested by the federal government, who are going into this with the provinces, with the concurrence of the provinces at least, is a pretty valid approach to the problem at hand. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we shouldn't be misled by the window dressing that is being brought forward by aspiring candidates to Ottawa. And so, Mr. Speaker, I find that we must reject this amendment in its entirety.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ORLIKOW: ask a question. What is this program of the federal government which we're going ahead with? When will it begin and how much will it give the people of Canada?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the details are in the Hansard of the federal House of Monday, February 5th, if the member cares to read them. I'm sure that I explained them fairly fully when I introduced the resolution with regard to the constitutional amendment. The federal government is proceeding with the plan and I'm sure that all the amounts -- as this excerpt from this report indicates very clearly, nobody can draw a figure out of the air and say this is what we're going to pay at this date. It just can't be done, Mr. Speaker. Economic facts militate against it. I suggest that the actions of the federal government, in raising the pension levels to the levels that they have today, are accepting the fact that it will take considerable time to effect a really good contributory pension plan and a system of survivor's insurance and disability benefits on top of its present flat pension grants.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeas and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye to the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Inkster. The amendment reads as follows: That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "petition" in the first line thereof and of substituting the following: "The Government of Canada to establish a National Pension Plan to which the individual contributes, and from that fund pay to all old age and blind pensioners in the province a further \$10.00 per month in addition to the \$65.00 which they presently receive; and to those who will retire after having contributed to the fund, additional monthly payment based on their contribution to the fund."

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roberts, Shoemaker and Tanchak.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Roblin, Scarth, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; Nays, 43.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The question before the House is the proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Inkster. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member is closing the debate.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, unless somebody else wishes to speak, I'll close the debate.

There is one good thing that the Conservatives, since they have occupied the front benches have done; is reminding the Liberals of the old -- I'd like to say "tricks" but tricks is not a parliamentary word and I haven't got one other -- Can anyone help me out? -- to white-wash everything that comes from our corner. For 18 years, if you want to take the trouble of reading the journals, you will find they have never opposed old age pension, even when it was \$20.00 a month, but they wrote in a resolution whitewashing the original motion and refused to be on record opposing an increase of \$20.00 or \$25 and \$30 and \$35 and so on. They have never yet said yes or no, they believe in it or not. They refuse to support it by reasons of their own, and I'm not going to question their reasons; at the same time, they never voted "yea", except once in 1958.

This amendment, which I'm not supposed to speak about it now, and I want to thank the honourable members in the House by reminding me and watching me that I have already spoken -- it would have done a lot of harm to them if they would have kept quiet and I would have said a few words, even if I'm not entitled to them. The question before the House is only one. Take away all the theories; take away all the histories; take away all the Hansards; take away the Clerk; take everyone away -- it's only one. Shall we provide to the old age pensioners another meal, another pound of potatoes, another onion, another loaf of bread? Nothing else matters. Anything that will come later could be changed according to the proposals of any government that will come in the future. But this is not dealing with planting a tree, which is important, this is not in connection with the way something is planned for the future. The man is hungry today -- period. A mother cannot comfort a child with singing for her or telling her a bedtime story when a child is hungry, when there's no milk in the house. That's all that matters. It's very simple as could be.

I am very much surprised of the Minister of Welfare who has made almost the first speech on welfare matters to me, finding 120 reasons, reading from everything that he could lay his hands on, "why not"; and not a single word "why yes" -- not a single word. That amendment which the Liberals have submitted is the same kind of amendment that they have submitted for 18 or 20 years since I'm in the House. Unfortunately, the Conservative benches have agreed to it, the Minister has agreed to it, so now the public will try to find out who is right and who is wrong; who is a Liberal and who is a Conservative? You might as well get together and let us, the slow group, fight both of you, because as far as principle is concerned, you are all in the same boat. It's true -- analyze it and it's true -- see the amendment. What right had the Liberal Party to submit an amendment as such. If they want something to do for the old age pensioners, do it; and if they don't want to do anything, sit down and keep quiet. Why be afraid to be on record? You are a record anyway; and if you are not a record, it plays to your record that you are opposed to the old age pension -- period. There is nothing else in existence. You might as well speak plain and tell the truth.

I made a bunch of notes here but I'm not going to say it. I don't think it's any use; it's a voice in the wilderness. Nobody listens, but the public -- remember the public -- the higher jury, and this is the electors, will not remember the speech that has been made by the mover of the amendment of the Liberal Party and will not remember the speech which has been made by the Minister of Welfare. Not one will remember it, but we'll tell the public, and this is the truth, we wanted \$10.00 a month today -- tomorrow. Whenever you come with any other proposition or any other scheme or so on, we'll support it. I would have supported the amendment if it were to come under a separate motion, but the amendment was definitely -- and that's my opinion and I have a right to speak my opinion -- was definitely submitted to kill the

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . original motion. These boys on my right have done it for 18 years or done it for 16 years. They're not going to change their minds, it's a habit with them. If something comes from here, it's got to be defeated. I pray to be on record.

We're not claiming that we are the only ones that have the needy and the suffering in mind -- no we are not, we are not, I don't claim it -- but on the other hand, you fellows have not shown a single thing that I know of that you are in favour of it, particularly on the question of the old age pensions. I know what the result is going to be, but I'm glad of one thing, that once the amendment is out of the way you'll have to vote for or against; and this will follow you for years and years in every election, irrespective of who runs.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The question before the House is the proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Inkster, which reads as follows: That this House request the government to petition the federal government for an increase for all old age and blind pensioners in the Province of Manitoba from \$65.00 to \$75.00 per month.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner and Wright.

NAYS: Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 33.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The question before the House is the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fisher and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly to this resolution. The resolution introduced by the Honourable Member for Fisher appears to be relatively sound and it deserves considerable consideration. It allows support to agricultural produce, price supports, either as floor prices or under the deficiency payment plan. Unfortunately, it appears to refer to The Stabilization Act as a cure-all, indicating that it is the honourable members' impression that if the prices were high enough, that this would solve all of the problems in agriculture. The Stabilization Act, a floor price program in itself, is not a cure-all. I would agree with him that it is an extremely important part of our agricultural program, but there is much, much more to an agricultural program than a floor price support at a high level. There is much, much more than price supports as a government measure, for the basic agricultural problem is still the cost-price squeeze, so that costs enter into it too as well as the price received for a product, and there are many other fringe complications as well.

The amendment proposed, however, by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, is to be entirely unacceptable. In the first place, the first "whereas" which he introduces makes what I term a shocking statement -- "and whereas total payments to Agriculture have been \$706.8 million in the 1957-61 period as compared to \$363 millions from 1953-57." Mr. Speaker, what a shame to suggest that the federal government, that the taxpayer of Canada is contributing all of this money to the farmers of Canada. I think this is really one of the biggest problems the farmer has to face, and that is, supposedly well-meaning farmers like the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne; supposedly well-meaning Legislators; supposedly well-meaning spokesmen, anywhere in the country, making ridiculous statements about how much money is being paid out by the taxpayers to the farmers of Canada. The taxpayers are paying some support to the farmers, but they're not paying a portion of the amount he says they're paying here. They're not paying a portion of the amount the average Manitoba citizen, urban dweller particularly, thinks they're paying to the average Manitoba farmer.

It's like saying, for instance, that the Government of Canada in the last five years has contributed a billion dollars to the unemployed in Canada. Because there was a billion dollars

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . in the Unemployment Insurance Fund before and there's nothing in it now, therefore the Government of Canada contributed a billion dollars to the unemployed persons in Canada. Was that the government's money? Was it the taxpayers' money? But it was money paid out by the Government of Canada and lost through some bad investments in peculiar type bonds, but it was still not the government's money and it was not taxpayers' money. It was the employees' own money; it was their insurance fund. Because it has been paid to the farmers, then it's announced in all the papers, and the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne who himself is a farmer and wishes to support the farmers, contributes to it by making a statement saying that in the last four years \$706.8 million have been paid out to farmers. What a lot of rubbish. Over two-thirds of that is their own money and the rest of it is just contributed in order to assist the economy.

Just because the Minister of Agriculture, every time that there's a payment being made on wheat, makes the announcement that there's a ten cent a bushel payment on wheat, is this the government's money? Is this the taxpayers' money? Of course not. This is the farmers' own money, being repaid to him. If there's a couple of hundred thousand dollars paid out in crop insurance, is this the government's money? Is this the taxpayers' money? No, it's the farmers' own money. But who announces it? A politician every time, and you are contributing to it; you are destroying the case that the farmer is trying to make for himself by picturing this situation, helping to paint this distorted picture that the farmers of Canada are receiving huge amounts of subsidies from the governments at the present time, and the taxpayers. I hope that the members will attempt to establish an honest amount which has been put into support payment because it's only a portion, a small portion of this amount and it's only a portion of what the average citizen thinks it is, because these amounts are being blown up, blown up and blown up every time a payment is made, pretending that it's government money; pretending it's taxpayer money; when it's really the farmers' own money which has been pooled for them.

The Honourable Member for Springfield contributed to it as well. He referred to the price of grain, saying that the government had nothing to do with the price of grain, and then he goes on to say that the Wheat Board was to take charge of the marketing of grain. Then he goes on to say that since this new Government of Canada has come in, why wheat has gone up ten cents a bushel and wheat is going up another 12-1/2 cents, and all sorts of things. When it's convenient, the government did it; when it isn't, the government had nothing to do with it, it was the Wheat Boards. And pretending it was a hand-out again; pretending it was a government support program; whereas it's just the government's own money being pooled for them -- the farmers' own money.

The egg prices. The member for Springfield referred to the egg prices. I think he said that the support program was 83% deficiency payment program on eggs -- 83% where? In Manitoba? No, 83% on the weighted national average for Canada, which is not Manitoba. We're in a low region here. We're receiving far less than 83% on a deficiency payment under The Stabilization Act, yet he had nothing to say about this part of it and yet large numbers of his constituents are egg producers. Did he call for a regional basis for this egg production -- egg deficiency payment plan? No. He said we probably shouldn't be producing eggs in Manitoba. He bragged about the empty bins and the empty elevators and the wide-open quotas, as though this drought was a wonderful thing that had just happened to help this government out. -- (interjection) -- Well had you some other reason for saying that this was such a good thing that the bins were all empty and the elevators were empty?

FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): On a point of order, Sir. I think what I meant -- or what I said at least was that the grain was being sold by a good salesman, that is why the bins are empty.

MR. ROBERTS: A good salesman had quite a time getting rid of any more of it than had been sold in other years. In fact, he hasn't got rid of any more of it. A good salesman ended up by selling a lot of it on a pretty shaky basis to a pretty shaky country under pretty shaky circumstances, and aided by a drought, there is an open quota.

The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne made great issue about the law of supply and demand, this is what establishes farm prices. I wonder how long he's had his head in the sand, because the law of supply and demand has nothing to do with farm prices world-wide any longer. We're the only country that even comes close to throwing our farm products out to

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . meet the law of supply and demand as he refers to it. Every other nation that we know of, nations close to us, nations in Europe, common market nations, Britain, nations of the former outer seven -- I guess it still exists, nation of Japan, nations that we're all close to, do any of them have their farm products price based on the law of supply and demand? To some extent probably Canada's products are based on that law, but that doesn't establish the world price of these products. It has nothing to do with the world price of these products. The law of supply and demand doesn't even play a role in the price of Canadian products in the world market.

So in the amendment the member for Souris-Lansdowne called for the Government of Canada to continue its efforts to provide parity for agriculture by pursuing a farm policy that will: No. 1. Stabilize prices of farm products at the highest levels possible consistent with the demand outlook for specific products but at all time providing reasonable protection for the producer by means of a floor price. That's a mugwump statement if there ever was one. How can you be on all sides of this thing at once. But I guess you are. You are in favour of more for the farmer; you are in favour of what the government is doing; you are in favour of increasing floor prices as long as it doesn't affect the market, then you're not in favour of increasing floor prices. I think that this deserves no more comment than that, for it really doesn't say anything except that we don't really know what we want in floor prices or stabilization prices.

If I was the government or represented the Government of Canada as the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa and this resolution came to me, I'd say, well Manitoba's sure satisfied with our program because it says: "continue its efforts to provide parity for agriculture by pursuing a farm policy that will"--and this is exactly what they're doing, virtually nothing -- "Expand markets to enable farmer's to utilize volume production to spread rising costs." Expand markets where? Is this House going on record as approving the trade policy of the Government of Canada? Surely not. Surely the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, an agricultural man with his feet firmly planted in Manitoba soil, will not approve of the trade policies of the Government of Canada. Oh he doesn't mean it -- he couldn't mean it. It's impossible to believe that the trade policies that Canada has been carrying on with Britain, refusing to go into a free trade area with them; the trade policies that we've been carrying on with Japan, imposing quotas; the trade policies -- well what kind of trade policies have we got with the Common Market? We don't even talk to them. We just snipe at them from the back. Is this Canadian trade policy? Well, we'll do a little business with Cuba just so long as it continues to antagonize our next door neighbours -- our biggest market. Yes there's no end to the number of tariffs this government has put on since 1957. Surely the Member for Souris-Lansdowne is not pleased with them.

Mr. Speaker, we are not pleased with the agricultural policies of the Government of Canada. It is not true that Manitobans are satisfied with the present Government of Canada's agricultural policy. Handouts are not policies, and that's the kind we're getting now -- purely charity-type handouts. We don't like having the taxpayer provide support to us. There are times when the farmers of Canada require assistance. It's unfortunate because most of the farmers of Canada, particularly western Canada, love to be free; love to be free of government control; love to make their own decisions; love to operate their own business without government assistance or control. Unfortunately, the facts of life are at the present time that we cannot do it that way, because every other industry in Canada is being protected by tariffs; because every other country in the world has subsidy programs for their agricultural products; and because we have a whole new situation now with the United States on the one side and the European Common Market on the other side; and we have to fit in between them. It's impossible that the agricultural program of Manitoba, of Canada, be free of government assistance, but while the government is assisting agriculture, let's do it on a policy basis. What can acreage payments be called other than a handout -- charity -- surely they cannot be called a policy.

The Canadian Government role is to give farmers in Canada an opportunity, an opportunity to meet the market; an opportunity to fight their own battle; an opportunity to compete on an equal footing; and a federal government which will lead the way will start first of all by opening the door between Canada and other nations and providing freer trade, so that we can market our products in the manner in which they should be marketed and so that other countries

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . will have the dollars with which to buy our products. A government which will lead the way in providing a good agricultural policy for Canada will have a sound financial and fiscal policy and will not have an \$800 billion dollar deficit. A government of Canada which will assist the agricultural program in Canada will lead the way towards establishing a world food bank. -- (Interjection) -- It's coming up -- just wait about two months. A government of Canada -- (Interjection) -- it might be two and a half months -- it won't be any more than that. A government of Canada which will lead the way in agricultural program, Mr. Speaker, will look at the marketing of agricultural products; will provide assistance to the farmers all the way along the line; will provide assistance in forming co-operatives; will provide assistance in forecasting markets; and will provide assistance wherever the farmers want it in orderly marketing. A government of Canada which is helping the farmers of Canada will provide sound floor prices or sound deficiency payments -- and/or sound deficiency payments. Not the kind that we have presently on pork and on eggs which are weighted to help the people of the eastern provinces, not Manitoba; and not the kind that are so low that by the time the price has dropped to the deficiency payment level that already a great loss has been incurred by the farmer. A government of Canada which will assist agricultural programs in Canada will have a permanent Agricultural Research Council which will give full study, continuing study to marketing, to processing and to production. A government of Canada which will provide a good farm program will provide federal assistance and federal underwriting of a crop insurance program. Not the kind of half-hearted effort that we have at the present time, the kind of half-hearted, half-baked effort which is typical of the kind of assistance that the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne was saying the government is now giving us, the kind that actually saves the government money; because they contributed quite heavily to the former plan but they don't contribute to the crop insurance plan nearly so heavily, and they refuse to underwrite it when it gets into trouble. A government of Canada which is helping the farmer will provide unemployment insurance for farm help, and will provide other forms of help, Mr. Speaker. It will provide tax help with a greater depreciation on buildings and provide a setup whereby a municipal loan fund will help municipalities and schools, and, by the same token, help the farmers who live in these areas to live in a manner in which they can be as comfortable and have all the advantages of those who live in urban centres, because a farm is not only a business, it is also a home. A government of Canada which will provide help to farmers of Canada will provide an equal opportunity for higher education to every child whether he's born in rural parts or in the urban parts. These are the things that we should be pressing for.

We shouldn't be patting the Government of Canada at this time on the back; we shouldn't be patting ourselves on the back; we should be asking for these assistances, because they are the kind of assistances which give the opportunity to the farmer to make something out of himself, to pull up his bootstraps to make a good living without handouts, without charity, and with a sound solid program and policy based on sound economics.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, this is just an impromptu speech. I have no notes and very little material. The only material that I have, Mr. Speaker, is that supplied by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and also the National Liberal Party.

"A square deal for the farmers," they say -- and it wasn't enough that I read it, but I was treated to a version by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

A MEMBER: Read it all.

MR. HUTTON: Oh, I don't need to read it all, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye read it all. That was enough. Once is enough -- Once is enough. Once bitten, twice shy, too, Mr. Speaker. The wounds don't heal easily. We're still feeling the results of them. The pain of experience -- the pain of experience that lasted for 20 years isn't forgotten in five. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm interested in the new party. I'm not interested in what went on prior to 1957 -- that's history. But I'm interested in this new Liberal look, the new look of the Liberal Party. I'm enthralled by their agricultural program. You know they have been just tremendous in the way that osmosis has affected the Liberal Party in respect to agricultural policy. They have -- (Interjection) -- yes, that's right, it's a good word in any field and so applicable to the Liberals.

You know there were some ideas that were current about 1957 and they weren't very popular then, but everybody has taken them up, and especially at this time when everyone is

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) expecting a federal election. A lot of these ideas have become tremendously popular. You know I was just amazed and most interested to hear the Honourable Member for La Verendrye take exception to a method of supporting prices that was set out in the amendment by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, because you know it isn't very much different from the one that we have in this brochure about the square deal for the farmers. This Liberal brochure -- (Interjection) -- yes. Here it talks about flexible price support. Now what I would like to know, how flexible are they. How flexible are they? It doesn't even say anything here about a floor price. It just talks about flexible price supports, with the government providing adequate deficiency payments.

Now I wonder what the Liberal conception is of adequate deficiency payments. I guess we'd have to trust them on that. Well of course if you're going to trust them on it, the only way you can have any idea of what they might do is to look back to see what they did when they had a chance. Of course they didn't do very well -- they were kicked out. There are none left in western Canada, not one -- no, not one -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, oh yes, by late conversion -- definite conversion. You know he found things a little bit hot where he was so he thought that he would help himself, and he jumped from the frying pan into the fire, but he'll shortly have time to cool off -- lot's of them. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it says here, flexible price supports, with the government providing adequate deficiency payments where appropriate. Well, we aren't even sure by this that they're going to apply to all the products. I forgot how many it is that are now under The Agricultural Stabilization Act. I haven't that material at hand, but there are quite a number that are designated and then there are others -- I think it's something over 20. Well I wonder if there would be as many supported under a Liberal administration as are presently supported.

It says here, "At the present time the alarming decline in butter consumption must be arrested. A new Liberal Government will see that butter is placed on the market at a price that will move the surplus." Too bad, but the Conservatives have already looked after that little problem so they'll have to remove that plank from their program.

They don't like these haphazard acreage payments. No, there's no policy -- there's no policy there. Well you know it's amusing to me that they don't like acreage payments. Now I'll tell you what the acreage payment does, Mr. Speaker. In a period of great difficulty for the small farmer, the acreage payment is one means of giving help to the small farmer that he wouldn't otherwise be able to get if you had one of these orderly policies that are based on Liberal persons. Now he wouldn't get any help. He doesn't grow any wheat or very little, he couldn't get in on a system where you have a deficiency payment, one of these orderly well-defined programs that the Liberals would have. No, he'd just have to do without, Mr. Speaker.

You know the small farmer is really having a tough time today, but these Liberals, I think that they believe in real efficiency, I don't think that they believe in any of these stopgap measures to try and help the little farmer. They say so. I don't know what the Honourable Member for La Verendrye is going to do because he's running in a federal constituency where, to the best of my knowledge, there are quite a few small farmers -- quite a few small farmers -- who wouldn't benefit very much from a deficiency payment program with respect to cereal grains. They get a lot more out of an acreage payment, but they'd have to forego that to have the pleasure of being represented by the present Honourable Member for La Verendrye. I don't know if he's worth that much. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether the farmers are willing to pay that price or not. I doubt it very much. Even though he's a fine fellow, I doubt if they're willing to pay the price. -- (Interjection) -- Well on one other occasion I pleaded with him to stay with us but he seems determined to leave, where for I don't know -- or where to, no one can be sure.

Well he wants marketing. He says that we've got to do a better job in marketing Canada's agricultural produce. Well let's look at the record. The last former Minister of Trade when he said that he was going to try and sell -- he set 300 million bushels as the goal, the former Liberals -- and unfortunately the personnel haven't changed too much, the people who laughed at him are still running things in the Liberal Party -- and they said it couldn't be done; and lo and behold the present government in Ottawa did better than they said they would try to do. They outstripped their goal, and now the "laughing boys" are going to come back and do even better than this government. I don't know whether I'd put too much stock in that or not. If

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) they couldn't sell more than 270 million bushels five years ago, I don't think they could sell more than 270 million bushels a year now, and I wouldn't count on it. We've had a sample of their performance and the one that we've had in the last five years is a great deal better. I think that we ought to just -- when you've got a winner, keep betting on it -- when you've got a winner, keep betting on it.

Now the Honourable Member for La Verendrye made some pretty wild statements and took great strong steps into the fact that some place in this resolution it said that the total payments to agriculture have been \$706.8 million in the '57-61 period as compared to \$363 million from 1953-57, and he seemed to think that some of this money belonged to the farmers. Well I agree it belonged to the farmers, but all that resolution states is that agriculture got this much money from the federal treasury. It wasn't money that was being held in trust for the farmer, not the \$706.8 million. It's got nothing to do with what he was trying to tell us that it had to do with. It wasn't the matter of monies being held in trust by the Canadian Wheat Board payments. It was monies that included expenditures under The Agricultural Stabilization Act; it was monies that reflected in expenditures for storage; it was monies reflected in expenditures for PFA. -- (Interjection) -- Out of the federal treasury -- nothing to do with the farmers. The important thing here -- the important thing here, Mr. Speaker, is the comparison that was drawn. From '57-61 these monies were \$706.8 million; from '53-57, these expenditures were \$363 million -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, they needed PFA. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Honourable Member for La Verendrye isn't going to start telling fairy tales about the Liberals being responsible for good weather.

The fact is that in this resolution it says that, in spite of payments that are almost double what they were in the previous period, agriculture is still in trouble. It doesn't say anything here about the government not being interested in the plight of the farmer; it doesn't say anything here about the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne being against the government putting out this kind of money; all it says is that in spite of these expenditures we are still in some trouble, and our trouble at the present time is due primarily to the loss to the western farmers because of the drought that we have experienced -- and we haven't only had a drought. In 1959, we had substantial losses incurred by farmers because of that snowstorm. They were hurt badly, and many of them were hurt again in this past year because of the drought, and so they've had two hard knocks in two or three years. In spite of the prices, in spite of the fact that grain prices are up; in spite of the fact that the prices for beef and pork have been pretty satisfactory; in spite of these matters, the farmer is still in trouble because he lost a large part of his production. Pretty simple kind of a statement I think.

But these other matters, the things the Liberals are going to do. Well they're going to do away with acreage payments. They're going to have a sound financial and fiscal policy. Well I wonder if theirs will add eight cents to the price of wheat as one aspect of the financial and fiscal policy as the present government did. I wonder if theirs can increase the sales of our western grains the way the policies of the present government did. I'm not going to argue about all the techniques, the proof of the pudding is in the eating -- and I'm eating better and so are all the other farmers eating better today because of the present government. We've got a lot better taste in our mouths than we had five years ago. We were pretty sour --

MR. SCHREYER: You know the farm income is down four years in a row.

MR. HUTTON: -- Five years ago. We've got a lot better taste in our mouths as a result of the present administration at Ottawa. Well if we're going to have deficiency payments, we're not going to know what they'll be or to what they'll apply. He wants research into the problems of marketing and so on. Well now we had an historic conference in this province about a year ago -- (Interjection) -- Oh no, it wasn't -- oh no, it wasn't.

MR. DESJARDINS:..... never heard much from him since.

MR. HUTTON: No, but you are going to. My estimates haven't come up. You're going to hear a lot more. This province took the lead in calling a conference. We've got the support of the federal government in this matter; we've got the support of other provinces in this matter; we've got the support of the general farm community behind this matter; and we're going to have just what this honourable member says we will get if we vote for the Liberal Party. You don't have to pay that price in order to get an Agricultural Economic Research Council. You can have it without it -- a better bargain by far.

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)

Oh yes, and here's a real dandy, Mr. Speaker, this one. They're going to do something about crop insurance. Well now, they had all the chance in the world to do something about crop insurance in the past. I'll admit, and I'm the first one to admit that I'm not satisfied with the present arrangement of financing. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, we've been saying so for a long time. It is Manitoba that developed the proposal for re-insurance. It's Manitoba that's been out in the lead on this matter, and now Saskatchewan is following in behind us on this matter, but it's Manitoba that took the first steps in this matter. Yes, we have -- yes, for re-insurance -- and we have put the matter before the federal government.

I have a sneaking suspicion that like many other platforms or planks that they have borrowed from the Conservatives, either at Ottawa or in Manitoba or some other province that's fortunate enough to have a Conservative administration, that they're going to find that you can't build a solid house with too many borrowed planks, because the owners are likely to come back and want some of their materials to do a little building in their own house. I think that just about the time that this thing might be -- this question of improved federal financing of crop insurance -- I have kind of a sneaking suspicion that the federal government is going to need this plank and they're going to look around for it and it's going to leave a great big gaping hole in the Liberal House of cards. -- (Interjection) -- Oh well, these things take time, and it happens that once in a while some things have to be done just about election time. -- (Interjection) -- That's true, but it happens with everybody and not just with the Conservative Party. It's a failing, if you want to put it that way, that is common to all of us. But nevertheless, and unfortunately for the others, the Conservatives have an opportunity to implement it and they have it. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, they pioneered in this thing along with Manitoba. We've been working out a program and I don't think that we're ready to let anybody else capitalize on our groundwork in this respect.

Well I think I've just about run over the program that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye outlined. I just wanted to point out that most of his ideas are borrowed and that some of the points that he tried to make were off the mark; that what his party has to offer today must, of necessity, be looked at in relation to what they have been able to produce in the past, and it's a pretty hazy thing. It reads well, but when you try to pin it down, I think it leaves something to be desired. I think the way things are going now, with expanding markets and opportunities to produce and a measure of price support that the farmers never had before in this country and an understanding of the problems which they never had before; and an effort to move on these problems, on all fronts; an effort to industrialize the rural communities; an effort to build up the rural communities in every way possible, with both short-term programs and long-term programs; and I think when you consider that these things are under way now; they have been implemented by these people; we know that the federal government at Ottawa is sincere in their attempts. We have nothing to go on, nothing whatsoever to go on in respect of the Liberal Party except their word, and their word in the past didn't mean an awful lot. In respect to some programs, you had to wait 40 years to get them implemented and I don't think there are going to be too many of the farmers around to take advantage of any of their fine agricultural programs 40 years from now, not at least the ones who are going to be voting whenever the federal election comes along.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Logan, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear your seconder.

MR. SCHREYER: Logan -- Logan.

MR. SPEAKER: Logan?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The next motion on the Order Paper is held in my name and I propose to hold it for another day. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I beg the indulgence of this House that this matter be allowed to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution, proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I would be heartily in favour of the resolution. No one can argue or dispute physical fitness and the organization of leisure time and our youth. Everybody knows in this House that while I personally did not have the opportunity of participating in sports except running around barefooted in the fields, I am wholeheartedly in favour, but I do not believe that it is necessary to have a special department for this purpose. The program that the Department of Education and the Department of Health -- and probably the programs that they have now for the very same thing are being conducted and carried out. I admit not enough, so all we can do is tell them that they've got to have a more and more and more effective program for the same purpose. But we have enough departments now, and it sometimes needs one that refers their problems to the other. The only thing that I'm opposed to it is the consideration, the advisability of establishing a Department of Youth and Recreation. This, in my humble opinion, and I think the opinion of some of my colleagues, are not necessary. So while I'm supporting wholeheartedly the intent of the resolution, I'll have to vote against it because of the opening of a new department. If the last sentence could be eliminated and if it is eliminated -- I don't know how the original resolution will read -- but if this could be eliminated, I'll be very happy to support it.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The question before the House is the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. Whereas the youth of our province is our greatest asset; and whereas more leadership and co-ordination is required in the field of recreation, physical fitness, and in the organization of the leisure time of our youth, our adults, as well as our older citizens; and whereas, in addition to education, there are many other important factors required to further develop our youth; therefore be it resolved that this government give consideration to the advisability of establishing a Department of Youth and Recreation.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roberts, Shoemaker and Tanchak.

NAYS: Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hutton, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Orlikow, Pauley, Peters, Reid, Roblin, Scarth, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Watt, Weir Witney, Wright and Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; Nays, 44.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. I call it 5:30 and return to the chair at 8:00 o'clock this evening.