

| ELECTORAL DIVISION | NAME                              | ADDRESS                                   |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| ARTHUR             | J. D. Watt                        | Reston, Manitoba                          |
| ASSINIBOIA         | Steve Patrick                     | 189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12             |
| BIRTLE-RUSSELL     | Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.     | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| BRANDON            | R. O. Lissaman                    | 832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.           |
| BROKENHEAD         | E. R. Schreyer                    | 2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16      |
| BURROWS            | Mark G. Smerchanski               | 102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29           |
| CARILLON           | Leonard A. Barkman                | Steinbach, Man.                           |
| CHURCHILL          | Gordon W. Beard                   | Thompson, Man.                            |
| CYPRESS            | Hon. Thelma Forbes                | Rathwell, Man.                            |
| DAUPHIN            | Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.     | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| DUFFERIN           | William Homer Hamilton            | Sperling, Man.                            |
| ELMWOOD            | S. Peters                         | 225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15             |
| EMERSON            | John P. Tanchak                   | Ridgeville, Man.                          |
| ETHELBERT-PLAINS   | M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.           | Ethelbert, Man.                           |
| FISHER             | Emil Moeller                      | Teulon, Man.                              |
| FLIN FLON          | Hon. Charles H. Witney            | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| FORT GARRY         | Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.      | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| FORT ROUGE         | Hon. Gurney Evans                 | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| GIMLI              | Hon. George Johnson               | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| GLADSTONE          | Nelson Shoemaker                  | Neepawa, Man.                             |
| HAMIOTA            | B. P. Strickland                  | Hamiota, Man.                             |
| INKSTER            | Morris A. Gray                    | 406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2        |
| KILDONAN           | James T. Mills                    | 142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15       |
| LAC DU BONNET      | Oscar F. Bjornson                 | Lac du Bonnet, Man.                       |
| LAKESIDE           | D. L. Campbell                    | 326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29             |
| LA VERENDRYE       | Albert Vielfaure                  | La Broquerie, Man.                        |
| LOGAN              | Lemuel Harris                     | 1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3           |
| MINNEDOSA          | Hon. Walter Weir                  | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| MORRIS             | Harry P. Shewman                  | Morris, Man.                              |
| OSBORNE            | Hon. Obie Baizley                 | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| PEMBINA            | Mrs. Carolyne Morrison            | Manitou, Man.                             |
| PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE | Gordon E. Johnston                | 7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie        |
| RADISSON           | Russell Paulley                   | 435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.      |
| RHINELAND          | J. M. Froese                      | Winkler, Man.                             |
| RIVER HEIGHTS      | Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C. | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| ROBLIN             | Keith Alexander                   | Roblin, Man.                              |
| ROCK LAKE          | Hon. Abram W. Harrison            | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE | Hon. George Hutton                | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| RUPERTSLAND        | J. E. Jeannotte                   | Meadow Portage, Man.                      |
| ST. BONIFACE       | Laurent Desjardins                | 138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.   |
| ST. GEORGE         | Elman Guttormson                  | Lundar, Man.                              |
| ST. JAMES          | D. M. Stanes                      | 381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12 |
| ST. JOHN'S         | Saul Cherniack, Q. C.             | 333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4           |
| ST. MATTHEWS       | W. G. Martin                      | 924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10          |
| ST. VITAL          | Fred Groves                       | 3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8     |
| STE. ROSE          | Gildas Molgat                     | Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1   |
| SELKIRK            | T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.            | Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.        |
| SEVEN OAKS         | Arthur E. Wright                  | 168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17              |
| SOURIS-LANSDOWNE   | M. E. McKellar                    | Nesbitt, Man.                             |
| SPRINGFIELD        | Fred T. Klym                      | Beausejour, Man.                          |
| SWAN RIVER         | James H. Bilton                   | Swan River, Man.                          |
| THE PAS            | Hon. J. B. Carroll                | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |
| TURTLE MOUNTAIN    | P. J. McDonald                    | Killarney, Man.                           |
| VIRDEN             | Donald Morris McGregor            | Kenton, Man.                              |
| WELLINGTON         | Richard Seaborn                   | 594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10            |
| WINNIPEG CENTRE    | James Cowan, Q. C.                | 412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2               |
| WOLSELEY           | Hon. Duff Roblin                  | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1             |



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
9:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 14th, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees  
Notices of Motion  
Introduction of Bills  
Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to draw the attention of members to the proposed resolution that is now on everybody's desk about making provision for the Standing Committee on Regulations and Orders to meet after the prorogation of the House and to deal with certain bills. I'm going to ask leave to remove this resolution this afternoon and I'd like members to have notice of the fact.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, we are once again in the Sabin Polio Vaccine Campaign, and again I would like to request the co-operation of the honourable members of this House in launching this program for the Province of Manitoba. The members will be able to receive their dose of polio in Room 208 which is on the west side of the building just west of the Premier's office. Perhaps I should qualify the statement that I made and say that they are going to . . . . . this year and take the vaccine on a lump of sugar. Last year they took it in a small cup in liquid form -- or the last time it was distributed. This year it will be on a lump of sugar. It will be very fast, and after having sat till 1:15 last night and seeing so many members here at 9:30 this morning, I respectfully suggest that a lump of sugar might help. So if the honourable members would like to slip down there it would be appreciated. It will be there until just after 10:30. Thank you.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): . . . . the Minister of Health whether the lump of sugar is to sweeten us up or to give us more energy in order to carry on our work.

MR. WITNEY: . . . . basically, though, to sweeten you up.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I wonder if the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce could give me a reply to the question I put to him three or four days ago, relative to the proposed pipeline from Edmonton to Churchill?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I hope to provide the information before we rise. I've asked the department to provide me with the information and I haven't received it yet.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, whether the recent snow storm has endangered at all the water outlet on our rivers to avoid possible flood?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture & Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I don't have an up-to-date report but I'll endeavour to get one and report to the House some time today.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I'd like to express my thanks and appreciation to the Honourable Minister of Utilities for his promptness and courtesy in saving each member of the House a consolidated copy of The Highway Traffic Act. Incidentally, it saved me a dollar.

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, the motion has been moved, so is that the way the matter stands? And the honourable member isn't in his seat but he and I have had discussions and he has agreed that the date concerned shall be the correspondence from January 1st, 1962, to date. There was a further discussion on this point as to what was meant by "and/or agent" in each case, and his request is now in this form that we provide the correspondence between the government and the companies named, and that can be done. So far we are able to trace it, we will also provide correspondence that may have been between, shall we say, a solicitor and the government on behalf of the company. It may not be possible to trace all of this in the filing

(Mr. Evans cont'd) . . . . system but an endeavour will be made, and so far as we know we will be providing all of the correspondence between the companies and on behalf of the companies and the government.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 118. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I haven't had the time to peruse the bill as I would have liked to, and I didn't have a copy of The Highway Traffic Act with me last night, but I notice in the bill that trucks are not allowed to go over the speed of 50 miles an hour, and I was wondering whether this applied to delivery or light, perhaps or trucks of that nature, because it seems to me that it is very severe in that respect. I would have liked to comment on other questions but I'm not fully versed enough to be able to do so at this time.

HON. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Minister as well for the copy of The Highway Traffic Act that he handed to us this morning. My colleagues yesterday covered a number of the points in which I was interested but there is one further that I would like to have clarification on. That's one that I think we've discussed here in the House before and I'm referring to the present Section 8 which lists the various speeds at which one can travel in the Province of Manitoba; then the details about the restricted zones, such as, oh, railway crossings, where people are engaged in construction, Institutes for the Blind, school buildings, institutions for the care of children and playgrounds and rinks. Now it seems to me that in too many cases in Manitoba various municipalities, instead of following this provincial Act, have regulations of their own. Now I would like the Minister to correct me if this is not so, but I hear quite frequently of people being arrested in a certain part of Winnipeg, for example, for having gone through a zone at over 15 miles an hour at periods that are not the ones laid down here. The provincial Act in this regard is clear. It states the hours at which a school zone is in effect a school zone from a speed standpoint, but I understand that certain municipalities don't follow that. It's 15 miles an hour all through the day and all through the night. Now I'm not that concerned, Madam Speaker, which one we choose, whether it be the provincial Act or -- but couldn't we get down to the point where there's one standardized rule so that everyone in the province will know exactly where it stands? For example, if -- I notice that the ex-Attorney-General is shaking his head -- the speed zone in Tuxedo on the highway there by the school is strictly enforced; and I note that traffic there slows down very specifically at I think almost any time of day or night, I understand that in certain of the Kildonans that the same thing exists, and I've heard of people who have been fined, it seems to me, in periods outside of this. Now I'm not saying that maybe the rules shouldn't be stricter. Maybe we should have 15 miles an hour all 24 hours a day. But what I am saying is, can't we get down to one standardized rule? Sit down with the municipalities and establish one rule that will be applicable across the province so that motorists will know? I think the danger right now is that motorists may feel very confused about what the law is and simply don't pay as much attention to it as they might. I'm particularly concerned about these school zones and playgrounds because very often you get in the habit of driving past certain areas and you forget that the signs are there, and if we could make sure that they're strictly enforced, it would be better for everyone concerned but we can only do it, I submit, if there is one clear rule for all of the province.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, there are three matters to which I'd like to refer in connection with this bill. In the first place, dealing with the same section with which the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition dealt, that is, the speeding clauses, I would like to suggest to the Honourable Minister that it is time that consideration be given to extending or increasing the maximum speed which shall be permissible on some of the highways for which this government takes credit. I think that it's time to recognize that some of the highways have been improved to the extent that they warrant a higher maximum speed with improvements in the intersections, with the improvements of the curving roads, and therefore I would suggest that real consideration can be given to it. Vehicles have improved in their mechanical conditions, and the condition of the roads I think justifies an increase in the speed limit so as to recognize what is being done by so many of the people who travel these highways, and that is that they are going in excess of 60 miles an hour in the daytime, and doing

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) . . . . so with safety. I think that it can be admitted that many accidents that occur are accidents that do not occur because of speed alone.

The second point I'd like to make is in connection with the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and the attempts of this government to "encourage people to take out public liability insurance." And I'm quoting from what the Honourable the Minister said yesterday. If it is the decision of this government to penalize in some way, or to put a cost on people who do not take out public liability insurance, then I would like clarification on just what the people of the province will receive in return. Therefore I would ask the Minister, either now or in committee level, to have information available on the status, on the financial stability of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. I think it would be of interest at this stage to have information as to the amount in the fund; the amount normally collected in a year; the amount paid out per year in the last several years, to get some idea of the financial fluctuations of the fund and some forecast as to what is likely to happen by this \$25.00 build-up. If, of course, only two percent of the drivers pay in the \$25.00 after a year or so, then it could be calculated as to how much will be in the fund. And I'm wondering whether it isn't time for the government once it decides to embark on this project to make a change in the Act to provide for the recovery of damages to vehicles and to property other than personal loss. The limitation now is to damages suffered from bodily injury, and you could have your car smashed to the extent of \$2,000 by another vehicle and you don't have the right to claim for the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, or a person can be injured and have damages of \$110 and can collect. Therefore it seems to me that if the government is going into a form of compulsory insurance it ought to take in this lapse, or this omission rather, in the Act that is to take care of financial loss caused other than by bodily injury.

HONOURABLE MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (Provincial Secretary & Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, taking some of the points in reverse order, in the matter of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, I think I'll be able to provide most of those figures in committee. Roughly there is now some \$445,000 in the fund plus about \$175,000 that will have been generated this spring and this summer on the new licence plates and the issue of them this year. You will recall that there's a provision in the Act that when the Fund gets to around the \$500,000 it is cut off, and that probably will happen some time this fall when the contribution . . . . for registration will be eliminated for next year. The question of adding damages to property as well as to the bodily injury is quite a complex one and has to do with the whole realm of insurance and I think that we'll have -- this is not either the time or the place to discuss that but it's something that could be brought up I think properly in the Committee. To recall it, you understand that notwithstanding the fact that the fund is there this does not eliminate any personal liability that the driver has. First of all you must exhaust every avenue of recovery from the one that's responsible before the fund comes into play and even then there's a method of recovering from the individual.

The matter of higher speeds is something that is under consideration and has not been touched upon in this Act. Mention was made of the automobile, condition of roads, improvement of these. We also have the matter of trucks going at 50 miles an hour, which in my opinion are a distinct hazard on the road when cars are permitted to go 60 miles an hour, and this business of a car trying to pass a truck has caused any number of bad accidents. It is our intention to bring up a complete revision of The Highway Traffic Act at the first opportunity, and these amendments are just some that had to be, or should be put through at this session.

The matter that was brought up by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition about uniform speed regulations is also something that I agree with completely and we are trying very hard to accomplish. The matter now is in the hands of the Highway Traffic and Co-ordination Board and I understand it's been a game of economics almost, for years in some municipalities, certainly in years gone by, of setting odd speed limits so that if you knew the rate was 20 miles an hour they'd set it at 18 so it would help the local treasury a bit by catching the odd fellow who goes through at 19 or 20 or 21 miles an hour. We have in many municipalities now -- I haven't mentioned any names -- tried to raise the minimum speed limit to 30 miles an hour and I may say that there is some objection, quite a lot of serious objections, because most of them feel this is a matter for their own business and that the government has really no right telling them how fast vehicles can go through their town. The same applies to the matter of going by schools and other zones. Every effort will be made when we set up the new Highway Traffic

(Mr. Steinkopf cont'd)..... and Co-ordination Board to give them the kind of authority that will give us uniform speed limits all over the province. I don't think it's going to be an easy thing to put into effect, but every effort will be made to do it.

There was some mention made last night about the charge of driving carelessly as against the new one of exceeding the speed limit. Subsection (2) of 73 provides that "no person shall drive carelessly." We've left that in the Act the way it is. This means, I guess, weaving down the street. It hasn't really to do with the speed limit but has to do with just being foolish in the course of handling a car on the speed limit, and where one is driving properly and the only crime is going over the speed limit, then in future that's all he would be charged with -- exceeding the speed limit. If he goes 61 miles an hour in a 60-mile zone he gets charged for exceeding the speed limit and not for driving carelessly. Many people have objected in the past to the charge of driving carelessly when they say that they have in effect taken more care and more caution in exceeding the speed limit than if they were going underneath it and therefore they did not like to plead guilty to driving carelessly, but they were free to admit that they did exceed the speed limit and would plead guilty to that charge, and it was for that reason that we thought it wise to break up the charge and if it is -- you could be charged with both, careless driving and exceeding the speed limit, but not automatically having a "careless" driving charge thrown at you if you simply exceeded the speed limit.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, ..... a question. Is it legal then for a municipality at this time to make restriction of speed other than the ones listed here, and if a motorist is in contravention of such a municipal by-law is he responsible even though he is following what's laid down in this Act?

MR. STEINKOPF: It is legal for a municipality to set the speed limit but it is also legal for the Highway Traffic and Co-ordination Board to tell that municipality what the speed limit should be. In many cases the Highway Traffic and Co-ordination Board has not done that so that there's a conflict of interest at the moment between the speed limits that have been set by the municipalities and those that the Highway Traffic and Co-ordination Board would like to see set. They are getting around to setting it.....

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if I could break in -- in other words a motorist cannot depend upon this Act. He may be following this Act but be guilty of an offence on the municipal basis.

MR. STEINKOPF: ..... fines are up in the municipality.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, would you be good enough to call the resolution on the Shewman Report, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Morris, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, the debate on this resolution is taking almost as long as it took to analyze the problem and to draft the report in the first place. As members well know, the personnel who served on this committee changed two or three times. I was privileged to serve on the committee in its latter stages and while I missed out on many of the nicer aspects of serving on a commission, namely some of the trips out of the province and so on, on the other hand I feel that I did serve at a time which was most crucial, namely the sifting of the evidence and the drawing up of the report itself. And I consider it to have been a privilege again to have served with the other four gentlemen who were on the committee, namely the chairman, the Member from Arthur, the Members from Fisher and from Gladstone.

What surprised me, Madam Speaker, was that I found myself in agreement with them most of the time. I thought that our political views would make this very difficult, would make this very difficult for us to see things in much the same light, and yet we did. I should say that I found myself quite in sympathy with the idea of a voluntary Hog Marketing Commission or Agency, and I was one who voted for this particular recommendation. But I should point out, Madam Speaker, that at that particular time there did not seem to be any organized group or any organized demand asking for a plebiscite on a producer hog-marketing board, and

(Mr. Schreyer cont'd) . . . . therefore to recommend a voluntary commission or agency such as the Shewman Commission does was understandable.

But about two weeks before the Shewman Commission completed its report, there came to public attention the fact that some producers in the province, some organizations in the province, certainly one of the larger ones, were in an organized way asking for a vote on a producer hog-marketing board, and at that point Madam Speaker, I suggested that we should make it clear in the report that if a vote is asked for that it be granted, in our opinion, in the committee's opinion. This was not acceded to by the committee as a whole and my worst fears have taken place, Madam Speaker, and that is that in the face of a legitimate request for a vote on a producer hog-marketing board, in the face of it, this government, the Minister is going to use one of the recommendations of the Shewman Report to block if you like, to foil this legitimate request for a vote, and I don't believe that this was in our minds at all last fall when we were finishing drafting of the report. In fact, Madam Speaker, I agree with the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. In fact, in the four paragraphs which that honourable member proposed by way of amendments, each point seems to me to stand on its own, to stand by itself, because each one is so true. There has been a good deal of public discussion of the merits of producer boards for hog marketing. There has been an attempt made now in the three prairie provinces to work toward a producer marketing board in locked step action -- the member for LaVerendrye points that out -- and in addition there is a formal request for a vote; a formal request has been made by some producers, and so therefore there is no, in my opinion, no good argument for, no good reason why this government should be so bent on implementing one of the recommendations of the Shewman report and using that as an excuse, which is what it is, for refusing to grant a plebiscite or a vote to hog producers of this province, and this is the pity of it, because whereas up until now I have felt that the work that came out of the Shewman Report was of decided benefit, I am disappointed and sad to see the report being used to thwart hog producers in their attempt to get a formal vote.

So sure was I that this might happen that I tried to prevail on the chairman at the time, last fall, late last fall or perhaps I should say last winter, to do his utmost to see that this report would not be used as an excuse for not granting a vote should one be asked by hog producers, and I feel that perhaps I'm in the grey zone here as to what is in good taste or what is in order for a committee member to reveal, but I have here three pages of typed transcription of hearing that took place at the last committee meeting of the Shewman Commission, and the three pages are in effect a running argument or discussion between myself and the chairman as to the possibility of this report being used by the government, by the Minister, as an excuse for not granting a vote to hog producers should they ask for such a plebiscite, and that is exactly what has happened, Madam Speaker, and because of that I feel that I have been used, as I didn't dream that should we recommend the voluntary agency that this government was going to seize on it and use it as an excuse for refusing a vote, which happened.

All I can say is, if the government insists on doing it this way, there isn't much that can be done about it, I suppose, in the meantime, but I do believe that a voluntary hog marketing commission, I believe it is better than nothing. I believe it is better than what we have now, which is in effect no orderly hog marketing, but I do not believe that it is quite as good as a producer board.

That is one point, and the second Madam Speaker is this: Hog marketing seems to me, if orderly hog marketing can be organized on a regional basis, the three provinces moving at the same time, this is fine. It is perhaps the start of a national hog marketing board, but it seems to me that here in Manitoba this government is -- well it's certainly going to make it virtually impossible to achieve any sort of prairie province uniformity of action in this regard. In Saskatchewan and Alberta they are now hard at work with a view to holding a vote on a producer hog marketing board. Here in Manitoba we are pulling in a different direction now, and I wouldn't want to be this Minister and this government four or five years from now, and to have it said to me, with justification, that "it was you who scuttled integrated inter-provincial marketing board legislation in this country," and therefore I oppose the amendment and I would support the amendment as proposed by the Member for LaVerendrye.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I suppose that as a member of the Shewman Committee that I would be expected to say something on the resolution that is before us. I would like to say at the beginning that I too, found it a privilege to serve on this committee. I found all members of the committee --- and incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I only served for exactly the same length of time as the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, namely one year; we were both appointed I believe a year ago at the session -- and I found all members of that committee most pleasant to get along with and was surprised, as my honourable friend has said, on our unanimous agreement on most matters. Now it is true, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead did not go on our most recent pilgrimage to Saskatchewan and Alberta where we drove over 2,000 miles and visited many producers and agencies in Saskatchewan and in particular in Alberta. I think perhaps that if he had that he might have changed his mind slightly in his decisions. He may not, but Madam Speaker, I come from a hog-raising family myself. I continue to be a hog raiser myself. My dad, 45 years ago I believe, was considered to be one of the best swine producers in the Province of Manitoba. I'm revealing -- at the risk of revealing my age I give you this information.

Now in Alberta, to point up that we are pretty small hog producers in Manitoba and probably pretty small potatoes so to speak, in Alberta -- and I'm quoting now from the statement here -- "for a number of years Alberta has been the second largest hog-producing province in Canada. One quarter of Canada's plant-inspected hogs were produced in Alberta in 1962. In 1962 Alberta produced 1,674,672 hogs. This was 490,336 more hogs than the combined total from six other provinces, namely British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island; so they grow a lot of hogs in Alberta, and it was with the producers in Alberta that we spent considerable time.

One thing, Madam Speaker, that I cannot fathom yet, and I suppose that I could be classed as stupid by a lot of people, and that is in this regard, that just every hog producer of any size and any consequence was opposed to a compulsory hog-marketing board. It is true that the little fellow, the fellow with a couple of sows, seemed to favor it, but just every producer of any size was opposed to it, and this applied in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta on the trip that we were on. Now it is true, as my honourable friend has said, from Brokenhead, that in the last four or five months in particular there has been this movement on foot for a plebiscite. I agree 100 percent with what my honourable friend has said, from Brokenhead, in regard to his attitude towards the plebiscite. I have exactly the four or five pages that he referred to before me, and time and time again he said in that discussion as regards to the plebiscite -- and I think it is only fair that I should read it as it points up what my honourable friend said -- he says, "The point is that I wouldn't want the cabinet to interpret our silence on this as opposition to it." That is the only point I think. . . . . What he is saying is that he thinks that if the committee remains silent on this matter of a plebiscite, that it's an indication we are opposed to giving the farmers the opportunity of having a vote, and certainly that was not the intention of any member of the committee, to refuse them the plebiscite. What my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture is saying in the amendment that is before us, as I take it is, well, let's get the Shewman Commission's recommendation with regard to the teletype system of marketing. Let's give it a fair trial, and then if it won't work give the farmers the opportunity of throwing it out.

Now I must say that I think that this is a fairly good idea, to try something out, if it won't work then throw it out, and this was something I am certain that the Farmers Union was afraid of. That is, they were afraid that if certain recommendations of the Shewman Report were implemented, and in particular the one as regards the setting up of a commission, then you would be stuck with it. I'm sure there's lots of them who still think that, or certainly did think that, until the Minister of Agriculture introduced his amendment. I know this to be a fact from two meetings that I attended, one in Neepawa and one at Plumas, that was attended by the Vice-President of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, Mr. Young.

Now, Madam Speaker, when we were in Alberta, the four of us, I was particularly interested in what the Alberta Livestock Producers were doing for the hog industry up there. We spent considerable time with the manager of the Alberta Livestock Co-operative in Calgary, a Mr. Winkelaar and his brother who holds the same position in Edmonton, and it seemed to me that they were really trying to do something there for the farmers. However, I must admit

(Mr. Shoemaker cont'd) . . . . . that the farmers didn't seem to appreciate what the organization was trying to do for them. That is, they were getting about 25 percent of the hogs there, and I maintain that as a result of their operations that 100 percent of the hog producers in Alberta were benefitting from it. I will go as far as to say that I believe that perhaps that by reason of the hog marketing board in Ontario the hog producers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba receive some benefit. I mean who's to say that they don't? It's a pretty hard thing to prove. But once again, Madam Speaker, I will say this, that the farmers that we talked to in Saskatchewan and Alberta and the farmers, the big producers that I continue to talk to in Manitoba, they want to remain individualists; they want to remain free; they want to remain free to sell their hogs where they like and whenever they like, and I think that I am quite prepared to go along with the recommendations of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, because what we are saying here is: "Let's give it a trial. If it won't work well then let's throw it out."

MR. PAULLEY: I'd like to make one comment in connection with the amendment to the amendment that is before us at this time. My colleague from Brokenhead has pointed out quite clearly and concisely the position of this group in respect to the amendment to the amendment. However, I suggest that all of the members of the House should read very closely and carefully the amendment to the amendment as proposed by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, and read it in connection with Bill No. 76, because here in Bill 76 the regulations are set up by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council who has the control over setting up of these regulations. Now then, Madam Speaker, the amendment to the amendment that we have before us says that "not earlier than twenty-four months nor later than thirty-six months following the coming into force of a regulation under the Natural Markets Products Marketing Act establishing a voluntary central agency for hogs." In other words, Madam Speaker, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council has the sole right to bring in regulations and now in addition to that they're saying that not sooner than two years after they bring in the regulation or more than three years after the regulation is put into effect, then changes can be made. But what is omitted and very obviously omitted from the regulations, or from the amendment to the amendment as proposed by the Minister of Agriculture, is the timing of the regulation itself, because the regulation does not have to be set up by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for years hence. There's no directive insofar as the setting up of the regulation, so in effect I suggest, Madam Speaker, that the reference to the 24 months and the 36 months in the amendment to the amendment really doesn't mean too much. The Honourable Member for Gladstone who has just spoken indicated he's prepared to go along with it on the basis of "Let's give it a try" and I draw to the attention of the members of the House, Madam Speaker, that there's no indication as to when the trial period should start or if indeed even it will start, because in accordance with the amendment to the amendment we have to await regulations from my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I too wish to make some very brief comments on the resolution that we are dealing with, and I have come to the conclusion that I will endorse the committee's report and recommendations and also the government's amendment that is being proposed. I feel that under the proposal producers will be free to sell and be free and be able to take advantage of what the government is proposing in setting up this type of marketing.

Now in this province we have the farm organizations which are crying out with a loud voice, but I'm sure we have as many or probably more people that are giving tacit approval to what is being proposed, who have no organization, no mouthpiece to speak through, so that I am in agreement and I will endorse the resolution that we have before us.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. D. WATT (Arthur): Madam Speaker, I had thought probably that I would adjourn the debate this morning but I think I'll make a few comments at this time. First, I would like to say that I certainly have enjoyed the work in the 2 1/2 years that I have been on this committee, and I must say to the Honourable Members from Brokenhead and from Gladstone that I have very much enjoyed the work of both these gentlemen along with the chairman and the Member from Fisher Branch, and I may say that we did enjoy co-operation from members of that side of the House who were on the committee prior to the time that these two gentlemen were appointed.

I would like to say, Madam Speaker, at this time, that three years have been spent in

(Mr. Watt cont'd) . . . . . compiling this report; three years I think, Madam Speaker, of active and intensive work by all members of the committee and by counsel and assistants that we brought into our committee, but I would say more so by people whom we have met throughout the Province of Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and different states in the United States, particularly Iowa, in the heart of the hog-producing area. I think, as the member from Gladstone has pointed out, that the one thing that seemed to stand out wherever we went, was that there were ills in the marketing of hogs in particular, but wherever we went, Madam Speaker, wherever we went, we found that no one was laying the blame at the door of any particular phase of the production and the marketing of hogs, but simply the general picture that there were certain ills along the line that could possibly and should be corrected. And what I suggest to you now is that the general feeling that the committee had when they returned from these trips was that surely someone would find some answer to correct our hog marketing systems not only in Manitoba but across the prairie provinces and in the United States without going to compulsion. And to this end we have worked, and as the Honourable Member from Brokenhead said a few moments ago, up until a short time before the report was finally completed he agreed that we should go along with the proposed plan of the Shewman Livestock Marketing Report, until suddenly the Manitoba Farm Union came into the picture and suggested that we should have a vote on compulsory marketing.

Now, Madam Speaker, as I have said, we have been working on this report, I as a member of the committee in the original committee, for three years. When did the Manitoba Farmers Union come into the picture? The Honourable Member for Lakeside said it yesterday, or recently, that there has been a movement afoot for years to establish a plebiscite on a compulsory marketing basis. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead said this morning that it just came up last fall when we were finally completing our report. Somebody must be right -- it may not be either of the honourable gentlemen. As far as I'm concerned I never heard of a move in southwest Manitoba to establish a compulsory marketing board until a meeting at Melita was held last fall, where they imported this speaker from Saskatchewan, and I may say at that meeting that 40 members turned out of 200 where they were receiving their badge for the 200 Club. No vote was taken that night on whether they should vote for a compulsory marketing board for hogs. No vote was taken, Madam Speaker. I have been told by the Manitoba Farm Union that votes were taken all over the province and that they were predominantly in favour of a vote for compulsion. I attended the one meeting of my constituents, the one meeting was held -- and there was no vote and 40 members of 200 turned out at that meeting.

Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member from Brokenhead is perfectly right when he says that we had a very agreeable association during our meetings and our association as members of the committee, and that only at one point were we at variance to any extent, and this is where he suggests that we should have made it clear in this report that we would not obstruct a vote on compulsory marketing; and I well remember the discussion and I well remember opposing, Madam Speaker, inserting anything into this document which would say that we as a committee after working for three years to try and come up with a marketing system that might be acceptable to the majority of the farmers, should suddenly say at the last day of the completion of the document, "Put this on the shelf for awhile; put a paragraph at the back end of this book that says that the farmers better go and vote on compulsion before they look at this." Madam Speaker, if this House decides today that we should shelve this report and go out and say to the Manitoba Farm Union, "You boys go ahead. Your study has been longer and greater than ours. You know what the people of Manitoba want, the hog producers," then I say we have spent three years that we might as well have been home on our farms and in our schools and in our jobs and forgot about the marketing of hogs.

I suggest to the House that we have here in this report a workable plan. I don't think my honourable friend from Lakeside agrees with me. He says the farmers cannot get together and do anything to their own advantage unless they are compelled to. Probably I took him up wrong on this suggestion, but I rather think that is what he meant, that before the farmers of Manitoba are any good to themselves somebody must tell them what to do. I suggest this is wrong. I think, Madam Speaker, that the organizations representing farm people over the past years have been following the work of Shewman, or I should say, the Livestock Marketing Committee. I believe they will support the recommendation as laid out in this document for a voluntary central

(Mr. Watt cont'd) . . . . . marketing agency. I recommend this to the House. I hope it goes through. Thank you.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if we may have a recorded vote on this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House is the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation.

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannottee, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Vielfaure and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 35; Nays 17.

MADAM SPEAKER: Carried. The proposed amendment as amended by the Honourable the Member for LaVerendrye.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Morris as amended.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I suggest that the House would now be willing to rise and go to Law Amendments Committee to complete the business that we have there. I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn until 2:30 this afternoon.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.