

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 26, 1967

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

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 119, The Statute Law Amendment of The Statute Law Revision Act, 1967.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like at this time to introduce our visitors in the gallery. We have 75 Grade 4 standing students from the John M. King School. These students are under the direction of Miss McLean, Miss Bain, Miss Lush and Miss Owens. We also have with us today 26 students of Grade 11 Canadian History Class of the Steinbach Bible Institute. These students are under the direction of Mr. Neil Friesen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Carillon. I believe I overlooked the naming of the school; the school for the John M. King group is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might address a question to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. Could the honourable gentleman inform the House as to what progress is being made, or has any progress been made, in respect of negotiations between the civil service and the Government of Manitoba?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the matters are under negotiation and I can report progress.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, if I may answer a question directed yesterday by the Honourable the Member for Burrows and originally the question was accepted by the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I answer this in my capacity as Minister of Public Utilities, with respect to the ambulance facilities at Kettle Rapids project. I wish to inform the members that Manitoba Hydro presently maintains an ambulance at Hydro's First Aid station at the construction site of the Kettle Rapids project and that is staffed by a full-time first aid man. I have visited the station myself and know the excellent work that they are able to carry out. A trailer hospital consisting of six beds has been ordered and will be delivered about mid June. Further expanded medical services, including a permanent hospital and a resident doctor at Gillam, are being arranged for as the work force expands, and the matter of the hospital is very much under way. There's presently a daily scheduled air service to Gillam and emergency air service is available, and of course there is also rail service to and from Gillam which is right at the construction site.

And again, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, if I may table a Return to an Order of the House No. 14 on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition; a Return to an Order of the House No. 58 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone-Neepawa made the 16th of March, 1967; a Return to an Order of the House No. 64 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie made March 22, 1967; a Return to an Order of the House No. 66 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Burrows made the 27th of March, 1967; a Return to an Order of the House No. 75 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Birtle-Russell made the 17th day of April, 1967.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a further question respecting negotiations with our civil service, of my honourable friend, as an interruption in between times of some other business. Can my honourable friend indicate that -- he states that progress is being made; can my honourable friend give any indication as to when negotiations will have arrived at a state of agreement and the termination of the bargaining period?

MR. McLEAN: I would think, Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, that it would be quite soon and I would anticipate - now one can never tell about these things - but that an announcement would be made within a relatively short period of time.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the alarm and concern

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)... shown by many people in the vegetable-growing industry over the recent announcement by the Honourable Minister, will the Minister accede to the request of the VGAM and hold a referendum and at the same time continue the operation of the Marketing Commission until that time?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it's a matter of acceding to any particular group's request in tying this to the possibility of a referendum. That question is quite clear as a result of my statement the other day in the House. If the growers, all vegetable growers of Manitoba, indicate to my office or to this government that they so wish or desire a referendum to be held, this will be done in accordance to my statement.

MR. JOHNSTON: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand the Minister to say that he would wait until all growers have made the request?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker, obviously I didn't mean all. I meant simply that a request from the growers had to be forthcoming.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a similar question to the Minister. The fact of the matter is that we did have a request this morning and I think this is the question which was posed by the Honourable Member from Portage. Is the Minister going to give consideration to the requests put forward to the government this morning - or this afternoon, I should say?

MR. ENNS: I think, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will recognize that I've just gotten into the House myself and haven't had time to read the document that was thrust into my hands on the steps of the building here earlier this morning. However, consideration will be given to any action they take.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture; I think the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell gave notice of this to him yesterday. There apparently all of a sudden has developed a product Avadex BW wild oats spray used on wheat has disappeared off the market. It is not available; it can't be purchased. Could the Minister give any explanation of this?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is correct in stating that there seems to be quite a shortage of that product. I am told by my Department that this is primarily due to a very very high demand in Western Canada as well as in Europe. Our chief wheat specialist, Mr. Forbes, will be speaking to the representatives of the Monsanto Company in the coming week and we will be making every effort to inquire of the company as to what can be done about bringing in some fresh supplies to this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Is he aware that an emergency exists whereby since termination of the federal-provincial agreement on technical-vocational aid, apprentices since the first of April are not -- some of them are not eligible for assistance because of the new agreement that has been put in, that they have to have three years in the labour force; also that some people that have definitely made up their minds to leave school and go into technical-vocational schooling are also being eliminated from the school on this account. And what is the government doing in this respect?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): This I believe, Mr. Speaker, was stated earlier during my estimates in the course of our discussions. I brought this to the attention of the House; the agreement terminated the first of April. We are phasing all those on course at the time. We managed to place monies in our estimates to phase out this program.

This is a matter of concern to all Ministers in all provinces in Canada. Representations were repeatedly made to the federal authorities re the three year rule. As yet we've had nothing further at the official level. Following our meetings last fall, we had hoped to have further meetings after our technical people had got together to discuss it further but we have been informed that no such meeting would be held. The Ministers of Education are trying to generate a meeting for June to re-open the matter. As yet we have no assurance that same will be done.

MR. FOX: Could the Minister inform us what is going to be done with the apprentices that have to drop out now and the people that are taking technical-vocational training, what is going to happen to them? Do they have to drop out until the agreement is made?

MR. JOHNSON: All people - all training is being carried out by the Department. After they are registered by the new Federal Manpower Division who do all the registering, determine who will qualify and who will not for allowances, and they will be making all payments direct through Federal Manpower to those who are accepted. With respect to those on course at the moment, they are being phased out or carried on until they are through their program, but we are now in the midst of negotiating further of these details with Manpower, reluctantly accepting this new ruling, but these are the facts of the matter. There are certain people who are under the three year rule who were not registered by April 1st, who are not eligible for allowances.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on the same question. Do I understand the Minister to say that anybody who went into the program - that is, who was not out of school for three years and who has been part of the program - will not now find that he has been diverted possibly out of school into the program and won't be able to continue, that the Provincial Government has something in their estimates to carry these people, that it's just new people who won't be taken on.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. As of April 1st all those applying for courses now - as of April 1st - or who were not on course at April 1st, are now completely the responsibility of Federal Manpower for registration for the payment of allowances. They're doing all the registering and all the paying directly. They arrange with us for the training.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities with regard to the development of the Kettle Rapids Power complex. Is it correct that the power that will be generated at Kettle Rapids will not be usable by the industrial sites in the north such as Lynn Lake, Flin Flon and the other industrial sites, but that it will be usable only for export or for other parts of the province?

MR. McLEAN: I would think that that would be a correct situation but I would have to say that I have nothing to add to what has already been said in Committee and elsewhere by the Manitoba Hydro on that question.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. I'm not too sure if it's his department or the Department of Labour who is responsible for this, but is his Department responsible for proper construction detour signs and to see that sufficient flagmen are on the job on road construction, and I'm now referring to the overpass in Assiniboia on the Perimeter west. I'm informed that there isn't sufficient flagmen and there isn't proper detour signs and there has been some traffic jams, and some close to serious accidents. I wonder if the Minister -- has this been brought to his attention and is he aware of this?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways)(Minnedosa): Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is the first I've heard of it. I'll check into the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, it would now be our proposal to call government business in this order: to call the second readings of bills which appear on Page 3 of the Order Paper, and depending on the progress that we make with those items, then to move into third readings, or into Committee of the Whole House third readings, and I should mention for the benefit of the House that we would want to give priority first of all to Bills Nos. 59, 87, 89, and 96, the four education bills - 59, 87, 89 and 96, four education bills.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Leader would consider a request that under the adjourned debates on second readings that we proceed with Bill 117 which was dealt with last night and which was considered to be an urgent matter, and which I think still is.

MR. LYON: Yes, we would have no objection to calling Bill No. 117 first. I should also mention, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Rhineland spoke to me about his enforced absence for part of the afternoon and we would ask you not to call Bill 93 until later. I would imagine somewhere around 4:00 o'clock he expected to be back and I think we can try to accommodate him that way. So, Sir, if you would call the second readings of bills and you can begin with No. 117.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading. Bill 117. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I didn't know whether this was the right procedure. There was a great deal of urgency in the matter yesterday and there still is. However, I thought that perhaps this wouldn't come up as early as it did and I was in fact hoping that it may not, in the sense that I knew of many people wanting to appear in the gallery during the debate so that they may hear what is being discussed, but nevertheless we have to continue with the progress of the House and seemingly there won't be time to inform people that are interested that this matter is under discussion.

The other day, the Minister of Agriculture announced the government intention of amending The Natural Products Marketing Act and he also tabled the report of the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Inquiry Commission, and I thought at that particular time that this was all he was going to do. However, for some reason that I know not of, the Minister also made a statement of policy insofar as what the government's decision is on the whole matter of marketing of vegetables in Manitoba, and I took the position then, and I have not changed my mind since then, that this is a very irresponsible approach on the part of government in tabling the report of the Inquiry Commission and at the same time giving us a statement of government policy without giving the House an opportunity to study the report so that we would have in fact a more intelligent debate in the House on the whole question of marketing boards. Surely this should have been a consideration of government. This province isn't, I hope, run by half the members of the Legislature. Surely the government should have allowed the members on this side of the House at least a couple of days to study this report before announcing its policy. This is a criticism that I'm going to stick to because I think it's worthy, the opinions of the Opposition are worthy of consideration in many instances. In fact, we have demonstrated in this House during this session that the Opposition does have constructive ideas and that the government has accepted constructive ideas from the Opposition members, and certainly on this particular issue they may also have accepted constructive propositions from this side of the House.

The position that government took was dictatorial, it was unwarranted, premature and totally irresponsible. The government should have given us at least two or three days to consider the report; they should have consulted the various segments of the industry; they should not have unilaterally made a decision. I think today the Minister realizes the errors of their ways of yesterday. Unfortunately, it may be too late. I hope it's not. I hope we can convince the Minister that we might do some backtracking because I think it's important.

If we had the opportunity to study this report we could have presented a very comprehensive discussion to this Chamber. We could have heard all sides of the question. We could have determined whether or not the report in itself should be implemented in its entirety, parts of it, or otherwise. It appears that the government has decided to implement only a small part of that report without explaining why it is not interested in the whole report, and this I think is unfair to the Members on this side of the House.

Government promised the vegetable industry that they are going to give them an opportunity to decide the matter for themselves. They did this six or seven months ago. They said that after the Inquiry reports are tabled, that the growers themselves will have an opportunity to decide whether or not they want to continue the system of marketing they have, or whether or not they will want to establish marketing boards, or whether they want to have any marketing system at all. And surely this was a sound and reasonable approach. I can't understand why the government has turned the tables on the industry.

MR. ENNS: We're doing the same thing now.

MR. USKIW: I'm sorry, Mr. Minister. You're not doing the same thing, because what you have done is you've thrown the system out and said that "if you want it, you petition us to bring it back in." You've done the reverse of what you promised to do six months ago, and that was that "after the report we will have a referendum - some time after." You in fact said it may take a year or two or maybe three, but nevertheless, be it a year, be it six months, be it three years, you stated that "after the report is tabled that the growers will have an opportunity to decide whether they want to continue with it by means of a referendum." You did not state then that you are going to throw it out and then tell the growers if they want it back that they petition the government or the marketing board to bring it back in. This is going donkey-backwards, if you might use that expression. --(Interjection)--Something like that; that's right.

The Vegetable Growers Association throughout their history have tried to tackle the problems of marketing, standard grading, vegetable standard packaging, and so forth. They have tried to create a sound vegetable industry in Manitoba, and I for one was a part of that industry and I still am, and for this reason I am taking such a strong position, that I do have a

(MR. USKIW cont'd)...vested interest in the industry. I'm not one of those that is involved in the growing of the small root vegetables although I do grow a considerable number of acres of potatoes, and for me this is a crucial decision; it's a crucial area of consideration; and I don't think that government should have used high-handed tactics in dealing with this and I don't think they should have turned the tables on the Vegetable Growers Association and the farm organizations which have made presentations to government and to the Inquiry Commission. I don't think they should have reversed their position.

The association which I belong to and have belonged to for a number of years, in every convention, or in most conventions, has passed resolutions asking the association to ask government for some form of orderly marketing in vegetables. This has been a problem with us for many years, and I have been the mover of many of these resolutions, incidentally, and I've been in the forefront of trying to bring in orderly marketing into Manitoba for a good number of years.

We have had a number of plebiscites in the past, and we all know the results of those plebiscites. We were defeated in both of them. But let's examine just what really took place. We made plans for a marketing board in the late fifties; in 1962 we had another plebiscite and we were defeated on both counts. But why were we defeated? Again, because the government of the day did not take a positive approach to the encouragement of marketing boards in Manitoba. Registration procedures - or I should say that there were improper registration procedures. There were unfair voting procedures. There was no real scrutiny on the question of who is eligible to vote and who isn't.

I recall that after a vote was taken in 1962, that the Vegetable Growers Association, having had the names of those people that registered as eligible voters, had subsequently sent them material - which the Vegetable Growers Association often does; material related to production and so forth of vegetables - and we received piles of mail back in our offices stating no such address, no such person, and this type of thing. Yet these people were registered as eligible voters. This is the type of haphazard approach that has been taken by government in the promotion, or lack of promotion probably, or marketing in Manitoba. They have taken a back seat to the whole question. They have not taken a lead. They've always said: "Let the growers do all the work. If they want it, fine, but we're not going to push it. We've not going to give them leadership." And it's leadership that is required, because marketing is a very complex business and I'm sure that you can appreciate that growers themselves don't know all the answers insofar as marketing procedure is concerned.

How many of the members of the Legislature would be elected to this House if we used similar voting procedures as was used during the plebiscites on marketing boards? Where a person that didn't bother to go and vote -- he registered perhaps, but he didn't bother to vote. He stayed at home because it wasn't in his interest; he wasn't involved in it that much. He was a disinterested bystander. But he stayed at home. But nevertheless, under the procedures then, his vote was a vote against the board. This, in my opinion, was unfair. If a grower wants to exercise his responsibility and he's interested in the industry, then he ought to make his position known, and if he doesn't make it known then he should not be considered. This is my position. So there are a lot of areas in which government could have intervened to improve the climate for the marketing of vegetables in Manitoba, but they haven't bothered.

In my opinion, this government was not truly interested in marketing. In my opinion, they are going at it reluctantly. Such as was mentioned here the other day that the Minister of Health is going into a shotgun approach into the medicare program, I would likely suggest that a similar approach was being taken towards the question of marketing. If proper registration procedures were carried out years ago, I am confident that we would have had marketing boards, and many of them, in Manitoba. We ought to take a good look at our regulations insofar as marketing board votes are considered. Growers of many products in Manitoba would have probably had marketing boards today had we been more constructive in our approach as legislators in the Province of Manitoba.

One of the areas where government has failed over the years has been in the area of education, and informally I mentioned this to the Honourable Minister a few weeks ago, that if I was in his position what I would have undertaken to do - and I do appreciate that he's a new Minister and I'm not going to blame him for it. But in the past what government Ministers should have done - and this is an attack on the government - was that they should have undertaken an educational program to inform the industry, to inform growers, what is really at stake in the question of marketing, in the question of the whole industry its future and so forth.

(MR. USKIWI cont'd).... We should have had rural seminars dealing with the question of marketing. Surely we can't carry on with 18th century procedures in marketing in this day and age, and this is an area where government has fallen down sadly, and I think it's not too late. I think it's time this government got off its laurels - you might put it that way - and took the bull by the horns and started promoting some educational programs in the field of marketing.

I don't appreciate half-hearted approaches. You're either for it, or you're against it. There's no in-between. The fact that we are in the dilemma in which we are today represents the fact that the government has been "in-between" the situation all along; it has neither been for it nor against it.

There's no point in belabouring past performance. I think I've made my point. I think I have to make that point because the government has to be chastised for its inability to cope with marketing problems in Manitoba. But let's just examine recent posture of this spineless group which is sitting to my left. Let's examine their posture on the question of marketing. Following the defeat of the last plebiscite on vegetable marketing in 1962, potato growers, after an extensive survey, requested that a vote be held on a single commodity, namely potatoes. I was the chairman of the group that conducted an inquiry; not an inquiry -- well, you may call it that. I organized a group of growers to carry a petition throughout the province to find out how many growers, potato growers would be interested in the idea of a producer-controlled marketing board. We came back with something like 82 percent of the potato growers wanting us to take some action in that direction.

We approached the then Minister of Agriculture, Mr. George Hutton, and it was at that time that I was rather amused by the performance of government, because although we produced evidence that we had 80 percent of our potato growers favouring a plebiscite on a potato board, the government, in view of this, said, "No, I think we've got better ideas for you." We were convinced that we would win support of the growers at that time through a democratic procedure. We didn't have to take dictatorial action as the government did. We told them we were convinced that the potato growers would support such a program. But no. The Minister said to us, "I have better ideas. We're going to amend the Natural Products Marketing Act and we're going to put in a system without a vote." This is what he told us; and he said, "I want you to consider this proposition. Take it back to your growers and then come back and tell me whether or not you go along with the idea."

Well, in fact, the Minister did proceed to amend the Natural Products Marketing Act and introduced the idea of commission marketing, took some of the teeth out of the Act which should not have been taken out - in effect, the policing powers of marketing boards, something that we have to have if we're going to be successful - and proceeded to, after the growers said, "All right, we'll go along with the compromise," - proceeded to impose this system onto the people of Manitoba. And I was in agreement at that time, that if we can't have a marketing board, I was one of those that said, "This isn't what I want; it's second best; but if that's all we can have I'm going to take it because I can't afford not to do something. We have gone on to the brink of bankruptcy too many times in the industry to say that we don't move in any direction, to say that we can't accept a compromise," and I was one of those that led many people to support the idea of commission marketing in view of the fact that we have no chance of getting a vote on the question of a producer controlled marketing board. So I don't hesitate to say that I took some responsibility personally in supporting the Honourable Minister's position at that time, but with those qualifications.

It wasn't the Vegetable Growers Association that used dictatorial procedure; it was the Government of Manitoba. The VGAM went to the growers with the proposed ideas of the Minister. We had a meeting whereby only one grower out of something like 135 or 140 said, "No, we won't accept the proposition." I took the position of addressing that meeting and urging the growers to accept the proposition of the Minister because this was the best we can get at the present time. So the fact is, the growers did buy the proposition and we got into the question of marketing commissions. We got into the position of setting up a Potato Marketing Commission.

Shortly thereafter the government went a step further and included other vegetables, and of course there are arguments pro and con whether they should have or they shouldn't - certainly I'm not going to dwell on that point. But nevertheless, I'm just outlining the steps that were taken and trying to arrive at where we are today. Government put in the commission but kept enforcement powers out of the hands of the Commission. This is the crucial area. There were instances of contravention of the regulations which the commission referred to the

(MR. USKIW cont'd). . . . authorities and which the authorities refused to act upon. Surely if there was any backbone in the government, that they had proposed or introduced a new concept of marketing, surely they should have been prepared to back it up with the necessary powers; otherwise they should not have introduced it in the first place.

Where was the backbone in government in Manitoba at that time? To this very day, and each year, the black marketing picture was increasing all the time. More growers were side-stepping the controls of the Commission and we couldn't get anywhere with the government insofar as enforcements were concerned. Surely this is a direct example of the inability of government to govern, and I certainly have no confidence in a government that sets up laws that it is not willing to back up. It was certainly an insult to the growers, to the association that proposed this system to the members, to find out that they were not on solid footing, that government was not behind it, even though in fact government introduced the idea. So I say that the action with regard to marketing in this province in the last few years was quite a joke. The system broke down. Lack of government fortitude became quite evident. Regardless of all dire consequences, what did this really do to the growers?

Many of us farmers, myself included, invested huge sums of money, confident that the system of marketing that was proposed was going to last for awhile. I myself undertook to borrow huge sums of money to expand my operations. So did many other people. People that have had traditional contacts, growers that had traditional contacts in business prior to this concept, had to drop these contacts. The whole system was disturbed to the point that there was no going back, at least not without notice.

But what really is the situation today? The situation today is that we have invested in confidence that the government has a backbone to keep this in operation until we the growers make a decision ourselves. We have had this confidence broken down this week. This is the sad part of it. There are many hundreds of thousands of dollars involved here. Many growers accepted the proposition that the government "will" study the problem, "will" give us a referendum at some future date, but would not unilaterally make a decision such as they did the other day. The Inquiry Commission recommended in its report that we must move into a producer-controlled marketing board. It admits that the system that the government imposed in Manitoba was the wrong idea and it suggests that we must move one step further and give the whole thing over into the hands of the producers themselves. And this is, of course, in line with New Democratic Party policy; it always has been. The concept of marketing boards has been the cornerstone of our party philosophy as far back as I can remember, and certainly I'm not going to disagree with it because this is something that I was looking forward in the report. So although the Commission recommends that we go into a producer-controlled marketing board, it does not recommend that we do so at the present time; because of the heat of the issues that we must allow some time for a transition period; we must allow some time for tempers to cool, you might say, and subsequently give the people a vote so that they have an opportunity to reason, an opportunity to communicate with one another, and an opportunity to decide their own thinking insofar as this question is concerned.

So I say again, the Minister promised this to us several months ago. He has not carried out his commitment. He has capitulated. He has capitulated to the groups which he thinks are large in number because possibly he thinks that it's politically expedient to do so. Well, I want to remind the Minister and the government that if they thought it was politically expedient to change their opinion on this question they've got another thought coming, because they're going to wake up tomorrow or the day after and find out how wrong they were. They're going to find out that those that have moved into organizing protest are not going to hold together as an organization. They may find this out this afternoon. They're going to find out that they don't truly represent the production of vegetables in Manitoba and that in fact the government has sold the industry down the river. This is a fact. They have not given it the proper consideration. They have not recognized that we have an opportunity in Manitoba to develop further the vegetable industry. They have only recognized about 10 percent of the production of Manitoba, or people that represent about 10 percent of the production in Manitoba don't like the idea, so the government is going to listen to the people that produce 10 percent of our total production. They're not concerned about the people that are the main industry, the ones that want to move ahead and expand further and generate more millions of dollars into the economy of Manitoba. This they've turned their back to and this is disappointing.

We have been undermined. I believe seriously that the Minister - and I give -- with all due respects he's a new Minister and I feel rather sorry for him - I believe that he has been

(MR. USKIW cont'd)....undermined by his own Cabinet Ministers. I believe he has. I don't know how any farm organization in Manitoba and any farmer is going to have confidence in anything the Minister of Agriculture says in this province after what has taken place in the last six months or eight months. How can I believe what the Minister of Agriculture says to me when he talks to us at the Vegetable Growers convention next January? I don't know whether I could believe what he's saying, because he changes his mind, because he's forced to change his mind. I believe that he believes the same as I do but I don't think he has the freedom to express it, and I feel sorry for him. I think that the Cabinet has imposed their will on a reluctant Minister and I think we can appreciate the gravity of the situation.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): He's in a bad crowd.

MR. USKIW: I'll say he's in a bad crowd, and I think that it's time that the Cabinet, especially the Cabinet, realize that they ought to know more about the vegetable industry than they know, not to make a decision on a question of principle, whether it's freedom or not freedom or otherwise; the question is what they're doing to the industry itself. This is what's at stake in Manitoba. There's not a question of principle involved here at all. And I think this is going to haunt the Ministers of the front bench from here on in. No cabinet shuffle next year or the year after or prior to the next election is going to pull them out of this one as far as I am concerned, because every farm organization in Manitoba, every farm organization has supported the concept of producer-control boards. Every farm organization. And they have let every farm organization in Manitoba down. This is the injustice of government in Manitoba today.

What about the people that are involved on King Edward Street, 60 or 70 employees in the facilities that the Commission now owns? Simply what did the Minister do to their position? He's given them a two-months' notice that they don't have a job. What about the question of the building itself? Who's going to own that? He didn't elaborate on this aspect of it. There are many things to be considered. What about the growers that gave up that building in the interest of the industry without making any money on it in the process, and the commitment that the Commission made to those growers that they will be allowed to use those facilities to sell their summer vegetables? What about that commitment? Where does that go? Surely these things should have been considered. Growers can't afford not to have facilities. I can remind the Honourable Minister and the members on the other side that in 1959 we had a very bad season, a very wet season, whereby all our vegetables and potatoes and so forth were harvested in a very dirty condition, that they had to be washed, and that if we didn't have these facilities the wholesale trade of Winnipeg was prepared to import clean potatoes from the United States because they didn't have the facilities or didn't want to be bothered with washing the entire crop of Manitoba. Surely the growers have a right to have a facility of their own so that if they have this type of conditions they can accommodate the situation. This the Minister hasn't given consideration to. And surely the Minister must recognize that in giving a concession - he may call this a concession - he's saying the potato growers will have a chance to vote but he's not saying anything about the other vegetables. Why should there be discrimination between potatoes and onions? If the onion growers don't want it they'll exercise their right in a vote, but at least give them the vote. He's saying the potato growers first and "maybe later on we might talk about vegetables, carrots and onions and cabbage and so forth." There is nothing wrong with a vote providing all vegetable growers have an opportunity, and if the Minister takes the position that he is the judiciary in this whole matter, that he knows what's good for the potato growers and he knows what's good for the carrot growers and he knows what's good for the cabbage growers, well then I'm going to inform him he doesn't know. He's got a lot to learn.

So I suggest to the Minister, roll the clock back and give all growers an opportunity, all growers an opportunity to make their own decision for their own industry and provide the necessary machinery by which means they can intelligently do so. We have chaos today as a result of government, or lack of government intestinal fortitude. This is what we have - chaos in the industry.

This demonstration that we had in here is a good example of the feeling of the industry itself. This demonstration represented the bulk of the vegetable industry in Manitoba. This demonstration is not consistent with the approach which the Vegetable Growers Association has taken with respect to their viewpoint in the past. This is a departure from their approach. They never liked to exercise strong-arm tactics in trying to pressure government. We were

(MR. USKIW cont'd)...always diplomatic with government. We always wanted to talk to government over a coffee table or at a banquet or reception or a special dinner arranged for the Minister so that we can have some relaxation and friendly chat. We've never wanted to resort to the type of tactics that we had here this afternoon, but the Minister has put us in no other position. If the Minister is prepared and if the government is prepared to accept this type of garbage from some people that don't like it - and they made their point by this type of garbage and this is what strong-arm tactics are, truly - then we have to try to get through to the Minister's mind or the government's mind in the same fashion, because this is their level of understanding and it's a disappointment to me that they don't have intelligence beyond that point, that they can't rationalize.

The Inquiry Report should have been a basis for reorganization, a basis for improvement in marketing, not a basis for abandonment. Surely we didn't go to all that trouble to find out what's wrong with the vegetable industry to destroy anything that was already there, or any benefits that were already accrued from it. Surely we could have taken a positive step and said, "Where do we go from here? What improvements have to be made?" And that we need some backbone and we need it on that side of the House. We haven't got it.

So I say to the Minister, don't throw in the towel because we in the Vegetable Growers Association aren't throwing in the towel, and if you think you had a can of worms yesterday you're going to have two cans tomorrow. This issue isn't settled and it isn't going to be settled...

MR. ENNS: That's my problem; I've got two cans.

MR. USKIW: You sure have. You sure have, as a direct result of government inadequacy in Manitoba. Government has not taken a positive approach insofar as the development ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'd like to remind the honourable gentleman that he has five minutes.

MR. USKIW: Thank you. The government has not taken a positive approach in the development of the industry in Manitoba. The government extension service has taken a very good approach to establishing liaison between the growers and the government administrative offices, but the government itself somehow seems to be far removed from the reality, and I appeal not only to the Cabinet Ministers here, I appeal to the backbenchers too. Become aware of the things that you are making decisions on. Don't follow anyone that tells you that this is what we ought to do. Become informed as to what is at stake in Manitoba. You're throwing an industry down the drain, this is what you're doing; and if we don't have an orderly system of marketing of vegetables in Manitoba you're going to find out that you're going to go down in production of those commodities in the years ahead, because I know for a fact that prior to the establishment of our marketing system that there were two years out of five in which I lost huge sums of money simply because of lack of order in the marketplace, and in those years we also imported potatoes into Manitoba because we were short at the end of the year. We didn't have a surplus but we didn't make any money either. We lost our shirts. It took me the other three years to catch up with the two years that we lost out on.

This isn't progress. This isn't looking forward. And surely the government, in setting up, lending machinery for the farmers of Manitoba, surely that they ought to back it up and say, "We must guarantee that these farmers are in a position to pay back these loans." They have made a loan to me, the Government of Manitoba has, through the Agricultural Credit Corporation - to expand my facilities. But now they're throwing a monkey wrench into the picture and telling me that "I don't know how you're going to pay it back but here, sink or swim." This is what they're telling me to do, and this is irresponsible. You don't want to lend money to farmers to expand their business unless there's some guarantees in the marketplace that they'll have the wherewithal to be able to pay this money back. This is the only sound approach.

So I say to the Minister, don't throw the towel in; there is much to be done, and let's get to work and do it; and I suggest to the Minister, go back from what he said yesterday and allow the Commission to continue for at least another year while we sort out our differences, while we negotiate with the government and the various groups in the industry, to come up with a reasonable solution and then let's have a vote, by all means. But don't make the decision for the growers. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the last speaker on his approach in depth to this problem, and I join with him in saying that I believe the government have let an industry down. It's a well-known fact that there are two factions involved and that they are taking diametrically opposed views and I believe this is the problem that the Minister has become so frightened of that he's panicked and just thrown it all overboard, and he hasn't considered the impact on a growing industry in the province.

I have here a submission from the Farm Bureau. It was made on January 5th, 1967, to the Minister and his colleagues in the Cabinet, and on Page 8 they devote a paragraph to agricultural marketing and they say, and I quote: "Agricultural producers are steadily becoming aware of the needs for improving the organization of marketing for farm products."

Now this is an organization that represents twelve branches in agriculture in Manitoba. They are acknowledged as one of the more sensible and responsible voices for the farmer in the province, and whatever they say they back it up with research and with considerable thought and that's what they have to say as one of their number one problems.

This same group, the Manitoba Farm Bureau, made a presentation to the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Inquiry Commission, Mr. Baron, and on Page 5 they say this in their presentation: "For some commodities, such as vegetables, it would appear that an effective marketing system is essential or there will be a less significant vegetable industry in Manitoba," and it goes on to develop that argument.

Now what has the government done? A few years ago, another Minister of Agriculture listened to a group of growers and exercised his judgment and decided to back them up; and with active support the Marketing Commission was formed. Now we all know that there was some controversy about the way in which a vote was held at that time, and members on this side, I believe their only criticism was that there should be a proper vote taken and in the opinion of some at that time a proper vote was not taken. But however, the government went ahead and actively backed the formation of a marketing commission for potatoes, and then later on went into other root crops.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government today I feel have a moral responsibility to the people who started along that track some years ago. What about the grower who has spent years developing and building up markets independently, and he is approached to come in and actively does go in and work with the Commission and gives them the responsibility of marketing his products? Now what problems do these growers face right this minute? They've seen their own contacts disappear; they've willingly co-operated with the Marketing Commission; and where do they stand now? Where is their investment in land and in buildings and in machinery? What are they to do now? They can't go out and over night recall or find the previous markets that they had for their product. What are they to do? Does not the government have a responsibility here to try and solve this problem? I don't say that they can solve it because it's a pretty knotty problem, but from the evidence that I have seen and the people that I have talked to, there has been no apparent try by the Minister to call in these groups and say, "Look; we've got problems. There are some people who do not like this aspect of compulsion. Can we not sit down and talk this over?" Has this been done? Has an honest attempt been made to call in the two factions and sit down around a table and decide on whether or not to hold a referendum, to decide what the question should be in the referendum? Has an attempt been made by the Minister? I don't think so. I don't think so.

Some people said that in the vegetable marketing, in potato marketing in particular, some years ago it was a dog-eat-dog life, fighting for markets, fighting for prices. Now, by the government's act, or by the Minister's announcement the other day, the chaos that has now taken over is far worse than it was then because at that time those people who had fought their way up in the industry at least knew where they stood and by their own efforts they arrived at the position they had before the creation of the Marketing Commission, but now, by dropping everything in this manner, they're in far worse condition than they ever were before the institution of a Marketing Commission. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister has got to go back into his Cabinet and sell the ones that are playing the political expedient game here. He's got to go back there and lay down the law to them and say, "Look. We've got an industry here. There's hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in it, and we can't turn our backs and walk away from them now. We've got to make an attempt to get the warring factions to sit down around the table and hammer out a policy to go on, and to decide whether a referendum should be held," and I understand that this is what everybody seems to want. Even the ones who are for complete freedom to do as they wish are not opposed to a referendum.

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)...So I think the Minister has got to, in the defence of this industry that is struggling along, has got to sit down with the warring factions and hammer out the question of a referendum, the timing of the referendum, the decision of whether or not to keep the marketing commission going until that time, and all the related questions that should go on the referendum; and I think that if he doesn't do this, he is not acting as a responsible Minister of Agriculture in the field of vegetable marketing and vegetable growing.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): I wish to congratulate the Honourable Member from Brokenhead for the very comprehensive and masterly approach that he made to this very thorny subject.

Once before in this House, in another debate, I mentioned the fact that I had very little use for a parent that abandoned his own child. Now that's exactly what is happening here. This commission was set up by this government when the Honourable George Hutton was Minister of Agriculture. There was considerable debate in this House as to the methods used by Mr. Hutton in setting up that commission. There was no opposition to the commission itself; the only opposition was to the method. And from what I can gather from the growers in my own constituency - and I have a large number of potato and vegetable growers in my constituency - this commission has been working reasonably well and I do not believe that there's one of these growers in my constituency, or in the constituency of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, who if allowed tomorrow to express a free choice, would express a choice otherwise than to retain this commission.

I wonder if the Minister has ever thought for a moment what would have happened to the economy of Canada if the Government of Canada had repealed the Canadian Wheat Board Act without any notice to the farmers. Have you any idea of the chaos that that would create? Well, that is exactly what you are creating in Manitoba in a smaller scale, and I know that these men who are outside of this building today, these men are honest, dedicated and sincere individuals who have given their best to place Manitoba in the forefront of Canadian provinces in production of vegetables. Among that group out there today was one individual that I know of, who has occupied the position of the Potato King of Manitoba and also the Potato King of Canada. You had in that group outside of this House today some of the best vegetable growers in this province, and to me, as a layman, not a farmer, it would appear to me that these individuals must believe in that marketing commission; otherwise they would not be members of it.

Now I think the government has made a mistake, and I think in this mistake that they have placed the members of this vegetable commission in a position of weakness when it comes to bargaining, and I think in order to straighten out this matter, that what the government should do is rescind its present Order-in-Council - if an Order-in-Council was passed - but it can anyway rescind its present decision to do away with this vegetable commission on June 30th, reinstate matters in the status quo as they existed before this Baron Report was received, and in the meantime allow this commission to carry on as it has carried on, and try and get the individuals together and work out some kind of a solution to this problem.

It's rather strange to me, Mr. Speaker, that on receipt of this Baron Commission Report, that the government took no action to get the various parties together, to discuss the recommendations of the Commission with them, and to see, in the light of what their respective views were, what could be done to bring about a lessening of the areas of conflict between these two parties, and I think the government acted very unwisely in taking the course that it did because it has dealt a serious blow to something which is a substantial part of Manitoba's economy, and I think that the government should recognize its error and mistake, and reverse its field and retain that commission as it was before it took the present decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Minister closes the debate, I am not going to cover the whole ground again; I just want to speak very briefly. Some of my colleagues have spoken already.

I just want to re-emphasize, Mr. Speaker, the importance of this industry to the Province of Manitoba, and the statements that were made to us by the Minister of Agriculture originally, not the present Minister but the past Minister, when the government moved into this field. Now at that time the position that I took was that there should have been a proper vote, and I really think, Mr. Speaker, that a good deal of the trouble that has arisen has been as the result of the fact that a good number of the growers felt that they had not been consulted, this was simply being shoved down their throat; and there is a natural resentment on the part of people when that happens. And the Minister now finds himself the recipient of past problems which he did not

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)...create, I recognize. But I'm disappointed in the fact that the Minister has not now seen fit to attempt to get the two sides on this matter together.

I think that his decision to appoint the Inquiry Commission was a welcome decision by both groups. Regardless of their points of view they agreed that there was a problem in the industry, that they wanted to see the problem resolved and that the solution was to have an inquiry into this matter. And both groups recognized how vital the industry is to the Province of Manitoba, as I'm sure the Minister does himself. Because of our geography and our climate this is an area where we can hope for expansion in the future. I think we can look forward to an ever-expanding vegetable production in this province, servicing, obviously, not just the Province of Manitoba but a much wider area, and we have to be looking at export markets at all times. We are obviously in competition with many other regions but we have certain natural assets, and I think we have, by and large, good growers. So we have to be very careful, Mr. Speaker, in all of this not to endanger or damage the industry.

Frankly, I would have liked to have seen the Minister, on receipt of this Inquiry Commission, get the two groups together. Now I know that it's not going to be easy to do but, Mr. Speaker, we have to face the facts that they are there; that there is a conflict between the two, and that unless this conflict is in the best way possible settled, the industry will remain in turmoil and the growth of the industry will be jeopardized for the future. And I would have preferred, Mr. Speaker, to see the Minister, having received this report - and I readily confess that I have not been able to read all of the report and I don't claim to know its recommendations in detail - but I would think that the proper course would have been to get the two groups together and say to them: "Look, we've had an inquiry; here is the recommendation. We can act and accept completely what is being proposed here; here are the things that we see it might do; what can we now do to resolve the conflict and do the best for the industry here in the Province of Manitoba?" And I think that with that sort of an approach, with the Inquiry Commission behind the Minister and his obvious concern about the problem, that there was hope that we could arrive at some degree of understanding, and while I have been critical on past occasions of the government not taking action on reports, on this one I'm afraid I find myself in the position that I think that the Minister has acted hastily because of this conflict in the industry, and I fear that the decision that he has taken may in fact end up by being very difficult for the industry and that more could have been achieved by some consultation.

It was my understanding that the Minister had agreed to have such consultation with the two groups concerned; my understanding that he has assured them that there would be no action without consultation with them. Well I don't know at what stage the matter is at now, Mr. Speaker, but I would hope the Minister will take the position here -- and if there is a conflict with his Cabinet colleagues, as I understand from the TV last night, that he is on one side but cannot get support from his colleagues, then I would hope that he would put pressure on his colleagues to have them understand the problem that exists and how serious this can be for one of the major agricultural industries in the province, and that no steps be taken now that are going to end up as permanent damage to this industry, and I would strongly recommend that he sit down with both groups before he gets himself into any further difficulties on this, see what can be achieved and what can be resolved in the light of the Inquiry Commission.

I've always been of the view, Mr. Speaker, and I still hold the same view, that marketing boards should not be put into effect without a proper vote. A marketing board is, once into effect, a very powerful agency; it is one that affects directly the livelihood of many people. The compulsory aspects of it, the dictatorial aspect if you like, are not aspects that I like and I don't think that they should be invoked without having a complete consultation with those involved. Had this been done at the outset I don't think that we would be in the difficulty that we are now. It was not done then. I think that in the present circumstances it might be difficult to do at once, but I think that before any final step is taken that we should have recourse to the people who are involved and let them have their say.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Member for Rhineland was attending a funeral this afternoon and - is he here now? - and was anxious to speak on the debate before it was closed, and I agreed to bring this matter to the attention of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm afraid we have no other alternative but to continue, or does someone wish to adjourn the debate?

MR. LYON: I don't -- speaking on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rhineland did speak to me about a number of bills and I believe he did mention the Natural Products Marketing Act as being one that he would wish to participate on. I wonder if it would meet the convenience of the House if, by unanimous consent, we just agreed to go to another bill and then when he appeared we could come back to this, have his speech and then permit the Minister to wind up the debate.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I understand he's here now and will be in momentarily.

MR. LYON: Well, perhaps...

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to ask the Minister on this bill before anybody proceeds - would he tell us, when he closes the debate, when the bill will be referred to Law Amendments Committee so that the growers will have an opportunity to make presentations to the Committee?

MR. LYON: I think I can answer that question on a point of order. The bill, if it receives second reading today, would be in Law Amendments Committee, tomorrow morning. The Committee would then have to determine the question as to who would be heard on the bill, because of course the terms of the bill relate to certain constitutional amendments that have been made, but that would be in the hands of the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Did I understand the Leader of the House to suggest that we proceed to another bill and come back when the Honourable Member for Rhineland returns?

MR. LYON: If that would be agreeable. If that would be agreeable to accommodate the honourable member, I think we would like to do that. Perhaps we could call Bill 115, although I see the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain is not in his seat. Perhaps if we worked in reverse order down the sheet, the next one would be 112. I see the Leader of the Opposition has the adjournment on that. He could oblige us maybe. But I understand the member from Turtle Mountain is coming in. Our problem may now be resolved, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: For the information of the Honourable Member for Rhineland we are dealing with Bill 117, the Act to amend The Natural Products Act; several have spoken and the Minister is ready to speak and the House has delayed until your arrival. We hope you're prepared to carry on.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House would allow me to adjourn it until tonight.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are attempting, if the number of speakers have been exhausted on all sides of the House we are attempting to get all of these bills moving into Law Amendments Committee tomorrow morning, and while I'm sure we would all like to accommodate my honourable friend, I would ask him if it would not be possible for him to proceed now because the matter has been before the House for a few days.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got my notes before me yet, and if ...

MR. LYON: Perhaps this suggestion would be helpful to my honourable friend, if we could do as we intended to do earlier, just let the matter stand for approximately an hour and my honourable friend might then be able to organize his notes, and in the meantime we could proceed with other bills; leave this matter standing open.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 112. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I had not expected this bill would come on the scene right at this moment. However, I am prepared to speak on it at this time.

On listening to the Minister introducing this bill the other day, Mr. Speaker, I was immediately struck with the question: Well, what does this now do to the Council of Higher Learning? I have no objections basically to the establishment of the Grants Commission, but I wonder what is going to be the structure insofar as the development of higher learning in the Province of Manitoba in the future, because it seems to me that under this bill we are giving this commission some, if not all, of the responsibilities that were originally intended to be in the Council of Higher Learning, and I find myself, Mr. Speaker, in the position that I am really speaking virtually on three matters at the one time, because failing any action on the part of the government on the Council of Higher Learning, one of my colleagues introduced an amendment to a resolution on community colleges which is before us, where we are asking - and he was speaking on behalf of the Party in that matter - where the Liberal Party was asking for an extension of the responsibilities basically of the Council of Higher Learning, and with a further proviso of a responsibility of that Council to the House so that the House would be familiar with their recommendations. Then I introduced on my own a resolution asking that United College be made into a university, and this I did, Mr. Speaker, after a series of questions to the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)...Minister of Education during his estimates regarding the possibility of United College being made into a university and replies from him at that time indicating that this was not anything that appeared to be in the immediate future, and now I find the Minister introducing a bill covering part of the things that I have asked for, and introducing some new concepts, so I suppose it's not in order for me, Mr. Speaker, but if I could know from you whether I will be allowed to speak on my resolution regarding United College, for example, or whether in the light of the Minister's statement it would be ruled out of order, I could determine whether I can limit my comments at this point or whether I have to cover all matters. Is it in order, Mr. Speaker, for me to find out from you what is likely to happen to that resolution when it comes up for discussion? You will find it on Page 15 of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: At this juncture I would suggest that it probably remain in its proper place and be dealt with at the proper time.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, if the statement of the Minister the other day won't preclude me from speaking on it, that suits me fine. I would rather speak on that resolution. Then I can in that case devote my comments, Mr. Speaker, to the direct bill before us, although I repeat the Minister brought in these other matters.

Well, insofar as this bill, Mr. Speaker, I think it brings in a sound concept, and that is that there be a commission to study the whole of the demands of university financing across the Province of Manitoba, and as we are entering into an ever-expanding secondary education and post secondary and university, I think that this is a proper course of action. I presume from the way the bill is worded, giving this commission the responsibilities listed on Page 5 of the bill, which are that the commission shall study the requirements of the province for post secondary education at the universities and colleges in terms of the kind, quality and quantity of such post secondary education required, the capacity of the universities and colleges to provide the post secondary education required, and such other matters related to it, and that it's to give advice and assistance to the universities and colleges in the preparation and implementation of plans and so on, that in fact the Minister intends to do away with the Council of Higher Learning.

Well, I don't know whether that is wise or not, depending on exactly how much the Council of Higher Learning has done, and this I'm in no position of judging, Mr. Speaker, because the Council of Higher Learning doesn't report to the House. We've had so far only some documents tabled by the Minister, but it would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would be desirable to keep both groups and that rather than expand the Grants Commission into the field of a Council of Higher Learning we would be better to leave the Grants Commission as a pure financial operation, and that they have the responsibility of allocating the grants that are going to be coming to them from the Federal Government on the one side, the province on the other, and that they do the allocation of these monies, and that we retain in the Council of Higher Learning the responsibilities for the future planning of our university development in Manitoba. And I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that it's essential that we have that future planning.

We are a province of less than a million people at this time. We have tremendous needs in higher education. We have many interested groups in this area but we lack the financial ability to do everything that we want in this particular field, and while we would like to have all the types of courses possible, if we are going to have a university at Fort Garry and one at Brandon and one at United College and each is to go on its own, developing courses on its own without relationship to the others, then we could end up by having a great deal of duplication, failure to use our money to the best advantage.

So I think that we have to have, on the one side, the body that is doing the planning. Obviously they must have a close relationship with the one that is granting the money, but I think that there are here essentially two different functions. It may be that the Minister would want to reconstitute the membership of some of the boards or of the council, although it would appear to be that the council has in fact proceeded with its work. It certainly has made a recommendation insofar as Brandon College, which has been accepted. They now, the Minister tells us, have made a recommendation on United, and presumably it will be accepted. They are studying the other affiliated colleges. But when that is finished surely the work is not completed, because then we end up with the question of the courses, the various departments to be established.

Earlier this week we were talking on the resolution on transportation, for example, and the possibility there of establishing a department of transportation. Well, where is it going to be established? I presume at the moment it will be at the University of Manitoba because the

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) negotiations have been going on for some time. So there is more and more planning to be done, and this, I think, should be left in the hands of the Council of Higher Learning, and the Grants Commission be devoted to the question of the grants, and the capital end, and the financial aspects only.

Now insofar as this commission itself, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister intends that this be a high quality commission. I see that he intends to have five members nominated by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I would repeat my suggestion to him that I've made on other boards, that these not be members of the Legislature, not because I do not consider those to be high level members but I think that if a proper job is to be done it must, in a sense, be at arm's length from us but reported to us, and I would hope - and I see that it is in this bill - that the report will be directly to this House, and this I understand to be the understanding of the Minister as well, that he will receive the report but then be tabling it in this House, which is an improvement in my opinion over what is the present situation of the Council of Higher Learning.

So, Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the bill, but I would hope that the Minister would consider this question of the Council of Higher Learning on one hand, and the Grants Commission. If he proceeds with the bill as it reads now, I think he is killing the Council of Higher Learning. I think that the moment it concludes its study on the affiliated colleges, then presumably they will have no further work to do and will be disbanded and taken over by this commission. I doubt that that is the best course. I think he should look at keeping both bodies going, obviously related, because they cannot operate in a vacuum any more than they can operate separately, obviously, from the government, from whom part of the funds will come, but I think that a better job can be done if the straight financial aspects are separated from those of the long-term planning, repeating again that there will have to be a close relationship between the two.

I would hope too, Mr. Speaker, that before too long the Minister could tell us exactly what the financial contributions are going to be from Ottawa on the one side, and from the province on the other, and that the total amounts of these would be turned over to this commission, that there would be no possibility of any of the funds simply coming into Consolidated Revenue and not being turned over holus-bolus for the purpose for which they were intended in the first place, of higher education.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, this bill, Bill 112, to establish a Universities Grants Commission, is certainly going to set up one of the most powerful groups in the history of our province in regard to education, and I think it's essential that the people who are going to sit on this board, or commission will be people who have not only a knowledge of fiscal matters but also some knowledge of education, because they're going to not only rule on budgets and matters concerning money, but they're also going to in effect control, and I suppose plan, education in the future of Manitoba at the post secondary level, because I see that not only do they have the power, of course, to approve under Section 15, subsection (2), that they may grant approval for certain courses and certain patterns for a limited period, but they may also order a college or a university to stop any program that they may be offering, and of course this gives them powers of censoring as well as the powers of encouraging. They of course are going to have control over the budget and will of course need the kind of technical and educational expert assistance to arrive at certain decisions. It will be interesting to see - and I don't recall what the Minister said on this - whether or not they are going to include such matters as community colleges in the sense that this bill seems to deal with post secondary education and seems to, in particular, single out the universities and colleges but does not seem to limit the scope to that, so that I would expect that the matter of community colleges would be a possibility in terms of coming under this reference. I know the Minister, I believe, asked the Council of Higher Learning to look into the matter of community colleges and I hoped that he would also ask or instruct this Commission to do the same.

The Minister announced -- well just a few other points. There's probably a need for some kind of a buffer between government and the universities or colleges, to allow that political pressure or political considerations will not creep into these decisions, and I suppose this is part of the reason for the establishment of this Committee.

Now the Minister has announced a partial acceptance, or acceptance subject to further approval, the fact that United College will be recognized or has been approved in general to be recognized as a university, and I think that when you get into the question of the recognition of colleges in Manitoba as universities, one must step rather cautiously because there are a great number of colleges and there's some historical patterns which have developed and that we have

(MR. DOERN, cont'd) developed from a system of colleges which historically created the University of Manitoba, to a situation where the University of Manitoba has grown as sort of one big university, and now we are in a sense going in an opposite direction, so that one must carefully consider movements to, in effect, decentralize and there are of course reasons for this in the sense that some institutions have shown themselves by virtue of their record and other considerations, to be able to stand alone. There's a continuing problem, I think, in any university. It's a question of at what point does size become a detriment, and there have been attempts on the part of the University of Manitoba I think to get around this problem by setting up such sort of colleges within the university, like University College, to allow students to feel some closer identification with a particular segment.

We look at the case of United College. It is, of course, a fact that like Brandon College they have a different geographic location, and somewhat analogous to George William's in Montreal and, not surprisingly, the recent Metro report for their development plan in 1966 recommended the establishment of an urban university, and in fact I think mentioned that United might be a possibility here. When we also get into this area of setting up a number of universities, there is of course the question that there is a need for co-operation and co-ordination, because sheer competition and sheer duplication may be very harmful and may also deplete the limited resources of our province.

United, of course, has had a very fine academic record. For example, this year when they are apparently going to be recognized, they seem to have almost hit their peak stride and have come through with all sorts of scholarships. For example, they were third in the entire country when it came to Woodrow Wilsons, which are among the highest academic recognition. They picked up four, and were awarded honourable mentions in two. One of the people in fact who was given an honourable mention later picked up a scholarship from Princeton which was even worth a greater value, perhaps, than a Woodrow Wilson. They also in addition had several Commonwealth scholarships, Queen Elizabeth scholarships and so on.

It was really only in 1950 that United College got any tax monies other than the amounts of money they raised on their own, so that in a sense they present the province with a plant with a considerable amount of money, and would only require assistance in particular at the present time with operating grants. Their present plant is probably worth \$4 to \$5 million, and it was only in the 1950's, in the early 1950's, they got money from the Federal Government and Canada Council grants which of course have now been taken over by the provincial governments since the Federal Government is pulling out of this program. And of course they have a very large student body which is probably a factor to be considered in the establishment of any new universities in our province. They have some 1,700 Arts and Science students, 350 in the Collegiate division, 20 in Theology, 800 in the Evening Schools and some 2,000 in the summer school. So that I think when the Council of Higher Learning is examining the question of colleges and their relation to the University and also as to whether or not any college is worthy of being considered as a university, I think that if we look at the record of United College as having a fine academic record and having several faculties rather than one - they have of course Theology in addition to Arts and Sciences and so on - they appear to meet the requirements for separate status.

But the Grants Commission I think is going to have to come up with what was called for by my colleague the Member for St. John's, and that is a general criteria to determine any further steps in this area, and this is going to be of great importance in the future when there may be an increasing demand, or even a need for more institutions. They'll have to establish criteria for the colleges. Perhaps this would include such things as two or more faculties. It will undoubtedly include such factors as their record of academic achievement. I think they would have to have a certain minimum size. And there would also have to be some concentration or specialization in certain areas rather than just a proliferation into any area, and I think the present bill appears to take that into account by the approval of certain measures or having the powers of being able to turn down others.

So, in general, this is going to be a very powerful Commission. It's going to determine the future of education in Manitoba and we will certainly watch its development very carefully.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, if nobody else wants to talk on this I'd like to close the debate on second reading. I want to thank all those who have spoken. I think, as the last speaker has indicated, this is a very timely measure; I think that we're taking in Manitoba at this time in the evolution of our secondary system and generally speaking the various points, for example raised by the last speaker are included in my statement on second reading, namely the emphasis which the Council of Higher Learning in its recommendations has given to the need to avoid unnecessary duplication in a province of less than a million people. I know that this has been difficult for some members of the House to follow as this has evolved, but I will try and picture it as we see it.

With more than one university I think we all agree there has to be a central financial clearing house and the criteria which they set down I'm sure will be along the lines as is occurring in other jurisdictions some of which sound most interesting. One of their very real functions will be to prevent duplication. Instead of having three students in elementary Greek at two colleges, you have one in one of the three and this sort of thing. I think it's very necessary and for that reason they have to have certain powers.

Now with respect to the Board of course we do hope to have the same calibre of people as we have traditionally had on our Boards of Governors of universities, people of ability to operate and to act as the Grants Commission. With respect to the Council of Higher Learning, as I have said many times before, this Council was set up and charged with responsibility of higher education and its composition is well known to the members and in its discussion it really reflects the opinions of both the academic and interested lay members who are on that Board, amongst them the most qualified people in the province. These recommendations are the results of two years of their deliberations and largely, I would inform the House, revolve around the rationalization of the administration of the one university as we have it. They went through many painful hours of -- typical hours of rationalizing how they were going to work this out. Brandon seemed a natural as the Member from St. John's said, being geographically located and so on. The problem of United and the constituent colleges absorbed many many hours and I'm delighted at the tremendous feeling of good spirit and co-operation with which both academic and lay people examined these problems. Their main factor was to work out schemes of administration, sort of internal semi -- and largely academic problems came to the fore and these minutes reflect this barter back and forth. They have come down on the side of recommending United College become a university and as soon as this recommendation is circulated as it's worded to all the constituent colleges, I believe I might have them all in now or one more to come, I believe I have one from the Senate to come of the university, once that's in then I could table that as I've tabled other correspondence which gives the recommendation. But largely this Council as constituted, its function was to rationalize the problem of the colleges concerned and most of their deliberations were internal at the academic and administrative level. They have felt in the public interest this is the best course to follow and it certainly commends itself I'm sure to both the government and all the honourable members.

Now the Council of Higher Learning still, as I indicated on second reading, has to examine, complete its work with respect to the constituent colleges on campus, which it hopes to do soon, and as a matter of fact has recommended a certain framework as to how they see the colleges will operate on campus and this in turn must be circulated to all the constituent members. It looks excellent. Secondly, they must look at St. Boniface College and they must, as I reported, they were to report on junior and community colleges as they saw it. One may well argue, well, there aren't all the disciplines on the Council that is presently constituted; it's made up of academic and lay representatives of the post secondary university level, where their interests are mostly focussed and so on. It might well be that we could take the nucleus of our present Council of Higher Learning, graft on these other disciplines and have it continue to examine the post secondary area which isn't particularly the concern in total of the University Grants Commission, who surely, if they're going to prevent duplication and what have you, must continue their research and become knowledgeable, and it might well be, and I do want to discuss this further with the present Chairman of the Council of Higher Learning before I make any formal statement, but it may well be that a common secretariat of sorts might serve both such bodies. However, this is flexible at the moment because until I hear the final report of the Council of Higher Learning on community colleges, junior colleges, what they think as a result of their deliberations, what they think of this whole matter; and of course, as community colleges, as they are defined, do include some subjects at the university level they must be involved in any community college examination that may take place.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.)

The courses and so on. These are the very things as we mentioned that are going to have to be worked out between the universities, colleges and the University Grants Commission, keeping in mind the need for no duplication, etc.

With respect to the financing of course, as I indicated earlier, now that the Federal Government has changed its policy, quite honestly at this very moment I am not certain of the exact amounts despite the figures that appeared in the Federal Hansard, I have had no official communication as to just what is involved, as I said earlier, it may well be that there was a total of six million more this year for universities and colleges under the new formula which our people are still working out technical details with the Ottawa folk. Our budget this year for universities and colleges in my estimates was up \$12-1/2 million as you know, of which about five million was money which was funnelled through our estimates this year rather than given directly to the university, so there's an appreciable increase, and certainly the intention is to meet the needs as we best can to our universities. I would point out as I did earlier, that nine million that we know of now of the estimates we passed this year under university items, is non-shareable with Ottawa at the present time, so it's a rather complicated matter that we hope to get ironed out, but we are transferring in short, all the moneys they formerly received direct, plus increased sums this year, well over and above last year, to the sums as I indicated.

I believe that's all I have to say at this time and I would hope to answer any specific questions at the time of Law Amendments or third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: . . . ask a question for clarification of the Minister? Did I understand him correctly to say that he thinks that there might be \$6 million additional for university coming from Ottawa this year?

MR. JOHNSON: As I said at the time of my estimates, the situation hasn't changed. I pointed out at that time that in the field of post secondary education at the university level I thought it might be six million minimum; it may be more, as I said. I'm not certain at the moment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Are we prepared to move back to Bill No. 117? The Honourable Member for Rhineland. Bill 117.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also wish to thank the other members of the House to give me a little time and gather my thoughts.

Bill 117, An Act to amend the Natural Products Marketing Act is one where we're trying to correct an error or to make the former bill good again. I will not oppose the bill since it is there to correct a situation and validating the legislation; but on the other hand, I do not necessarily subscribe to the principle as laid out into the original Natural Products Marketing Act Bill of legislation. At that time I opposed the legislation and I gave my grounds for it. I do not believe in compulsory marketing boards. I feel that this is against our rights as individuals and I certainly do not subscribe to that.

On the other hand I think there is merit in discussing commission versus marketing boards. I feel that there is a difference, in my opinion, between the commission type of handling and having marketing boards. In my opinion, the commission type, we are holding the government responsible for its operations, actions and policies as they are considered Crown agencies and in this case I do not object so much if these are voluntary entities. I only need refer to the Hog Commission which allows a certain amount of freedom to the individual. He may market his hogs to the Commission and at the same time he can deliver them to the company of his choice. He has to pay a small allowance per hog for this to help defray the costs of the Commission but at the same time he's still allowed a certain amount of latitude in doing as he pleases.

On the other hand when we consider marketing boards are generally held more responsible on their own, especially if they are producer controlled boards, and in my opinion they should not have any compulsory powers. We, as a Legislature and as far as Parliament is concerned, should be very careful in delegating powers of this type to any board whatever. I feel that we're not careful enough in this matter and that we're not protecting minority rights as we should. Then too the regulations under the board, even if the vegetables are dropped, are not altered. We have had no remarks or no statement to the effect that they won't be altered either. I feel that this is where a lot of injustice is being done, that these boards or commissions are abusing, in my opinion, the powers and exceeding them in many cases, when they draw up and make their

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) regulations because under the present commission we find that they're allowed to regulate and control production through the allocations of quotas that are being set and this should never happen. This is making it a closed shop affair. I've said this on previous occasions in this House and I still maintain this is what it is and I do not support this in any way.

There is also another reason why I objected to Bill 57 when it was brought in two years ago, establishing the Natural Products Marketing Act and these were more or less the grounds I based my objection on. Once again I repeat, we are here to protect minority rights under such cases and in my opinion this isn't being done and that we're allowing actions to take place that should not have happened. I think this is also the reason why we find that producers have turned away from this board and not producing or maintaining production in Manitoba.

Production if you take a look at the acreage last year of vegetables in this province is down - all I think except for cabbage - and the growers have been telling us that there will be further reductions this year if they're to be kept under this board. I feel this is not a good thing and we should allow these people more freedom. In my opinion the government is doing the right thing when they are dropping vegetables other than potatoes from this Board.

Producers are telling me they were making more money before, prior to the legislation coming into effect, there was less loss in handling. Apparently tremendous dockage is taking place in the handling of certain vegetables by the central agency. And there is the matter of direct retailing. The middle man under the board apparently takes a large swath and this means that there is either less coming to the producer or the cost is being increased to the consumer. It is either one. If the middle man takes a large swath it can only be in either direction. And then also in the matter of direct retailing the middle man under the board apparently takes a large swath and then the consumer pays more for the same product now because of this. I think these are matters that should be weighed very carefully if it should be reinstated.

I don't know whether it's the government's intention to change its mind. If I understand correctly from what the First Minister said last night, this was not the case. However, they're more or less acceptable to having potatoes continue if the growers request a vote and if the vote is favourable.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion these crops are a purely provincial crop and under the bill before us it will make it apply to the province only. Up until now it wasn't defined as a purely provincial matter but now it is definitely a provincial matter and I feel that we could do a greater service to the industry if we would institute floor prices on a provincial basis and let the law of supply and demand be allowed to operate and function. I think in this way we can preserve the producer so that he will not go broke and at the same time we will be giving the consumer a product at a very reasonable price and at a price that the board can afford.

I therefore would say that I believe the government is following the right course in dropping vegetables other than potatoes from the board and rather than reinvoke compulsion, we should consider floor prices. I don't think this would amount to so much in Manitoba to have floor prices for vegetables. I think this could be handled quite easily and certainly if the growers today, especially of potatoes, who have large stocks on hand, and if the board is not able to sell them, this means that they will be taking a large loss and a big blow. And if we had even a floor price, it needn't be high, but at least so the producer knew that he wouldn't go broke and that he wouldn't be, in a year when we had an excessively large production, that he would still be able to dispose of his product in some way and receive a fair remuneration for it, I'm sure that they'd be quite happy. In this way they could then operate on a voluntary basis and in my opinion, the consumer would reap the benefits as well.

These are my views on the matter for what they're worth. I'm sorry that I wasn't here earlier this afternoon; I couldn't be here; had to be at another function and I didn't hear the contributions that were made by other members who spoke on this bill earlier. I'm certainly going to read up in Hansard as to what they've said but I feel this is what should take place and this is what we should do here in Manitoba.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the honourable member?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member willing to answer questions?

MR. PETURSSON: You just happened to say that the potato grower might be left with great quantities of potatoes that the board could probably not sell. Could the individuals, operating as individuals, sell them any better than the board could?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I think quite an amount could be sold locally and disposed of

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) in that way and this is not open to them now.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I understand if the Minister speaks now he'll be closing debate so I would like to have a word before he does, if I'm correct?

Mr. Speaker, I returned to the city yesterday and the first thing I saw when I got home was the headlines with respect to the discontinuance of the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission and this was somewhat of a disappointment to myself because I've always been a believer in the fact that if people don't get together for the orderly marketing either of their product or their services that they will be subject to exploitation by those who do get together, and of course those who do get together are continually advising the people who are not organized that they should be and remain martyrs to the free enterprise system. The Canadian Manufacturers Association that likes to tell people not to get together, they have for years been getting together to keep the tariff walls high enough so they will be protected from competition from outside sources. The Manitoba Bar Association which likes to speak of no compulsion and freedom for the marketing of services, it has indeed a very strong trade union which has very high dues and which has resulted by the way in very good fees for the services performed by these people. But it's always the people who are very organized, highly organized and who have a very strong bargaining position who like to tell the disorganized that they are in fact the true reflection of our way of life and that they should continue to be such and nowhere has this attitude been more persuaded upon people than against farmers. The agricultural people are continually told that they mustn't get together, they must be the martyrs to the free enterprise system.

I expected, Mr. Speaker, that the report that was prepared by the commission that was studying this question had probably been placed on the Minister's table and that that report had given him, so to speak, an "out" to dissolve the present Marketing Board. Now I notice that we have a very small portion of the report but in reading it, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how - just the synopsis, that is - in reading the synopsis, I wonder how the Minister came to the conclusion that the marketing of products as established by this commission should be completely done away with and that a so-called free vote on the question be issued. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that most of the people who oppose marketing boards say that the consumer is the one who is going to be hurt and I note on Page 2, "the commission has won support from most major farm organizations in Manitoba, from the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Association of Consumers, from wholesalers and from many growers." So that in this case, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this particular board in any event, the consumer says that this was a good thing and a healthy thing. And what I found most surprising from this synopsis, Mr. Speaker, is that the recommendation that comes from the Inquiry Board, confirms an opinion which I've held since this commission was established and that is that this should have been a producers' board, and the first recommendation on Page 3 says: "The Marketing Commission should be converted into a Producers' Marketing Board because it is necessary that those who are living with any regulations that are essential, should understand them, accept them and before long, sanction. Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree. I think that it's anomalous that the growers have to be in a situation where the wholesaler is telling them what they must sell their product for other than the wholesaler taking the position that he won't buy unless the price is right. So I have always felt that the commission form of marketing was not as equitable nor as effective for protecting the interests of the producer than would be the producers' form of marketing board. And I concur that this should be and should have been a producers' board. But, Mr. Speaker, the Inquiry Commission doesn't say that this board should be done away with and that there be a vote taken. What the commission says is that a vote would be meaningless at the present time, that everybody, the growers, the wholesalers, the consumers and substantially even the people who disagreed with some of the regulations, that the most violent protests as indicated by the synopsis, and I admit that it's not a complete document, was against regulations, that they sought improvement.

Now that being the case and this board having won unanimous approval from all sections of the community, why is it that the Minister now says that he's going to - as I take it, and he can correct me if I'm wrong - stop the board, have a vote and if that vote produces an affirmative result, to reinstitute the board for potatoes only. And I recognize that the Inquiry says that vegetables should be dropped and in this respect just as the Minister chooses to ignore some of the recommendations of the board, I say that in this respect the board is wrong because nowhere throughout the synopsis in any event, does the Inquiry Board say that vegetables are different than the other products which are marketed; and to go back, the Commission itself,

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) which includes vegetables, has won the support from most major farm organizations in Manitoba, from the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Consumers Association, from wholesalers and from many growers. What large element of the community is the Minister then looking to or what large segment of the community is he responding to when he dissolves or takes the action which he is taking with regard to this board? Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is somebody who he's responding to because there has been in our community since the setting up of this board, two people - and I use the word "people" collectively, in its collective sense - have consistently said that this is wrong. One is the Winnipeg Free Press and one is the Winnipeg Tribune. Those newspapers from the beginning and continuously have been asking for the type of action that this Minister is now taking and I suggest to you that the Minister has chosen to respond to the agitation of these two newspapers not supported by any significant or representative segment of our community, rather than to follow the principles as enunciated by his own Board.

Now I guess, Mr. Speaker, that both those papers have their own reason for having made the statement that they made with regard to the marketing board and now are jubilant in the fact that the Minister has followed them rather than have followed what all of the people interested say should be done. It rather reminds me -- and I think possibly that the Minister set up the Inquiry Commission or his actions in any event reflect the fact that the Marketing Commission was going to be set up, that the report would be received and that the Commission would be dissolved. Which reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of something that happened when I was in university in about 1949 but it was such a good little piece of nonsense that I can't forget it. There was an article published in "The Manitoban" and at that time the Greater Winnipeg - not the Greater Winnipeg Transit Company, but the Winnipeg Electric Company was running the transit system and had been particularly abhorred by the students because they couldn't get a special students' rate, which I guess is why everybody abhors something, they can't get a special rate, and the students being no different than others attacked the Winnipeg Electric Company because they couldn't get a student rate and they printed a little message in - they printed a facsimile of the "Take One" - the Winnipeg Electric "Take One" in the Manitoban, with various little articles, and one of the little articles was headed: "Vandals Rip Bus Seats" and it said "The seat in the Cathedral Bus" (which is in the north end) "was wantonly torn by vandals and because some university students sometimes go on the Cathedral Avenue bus, it is expected that this was done by university students. However, before anything is done, an inquiry will be held. The inquiry will be distributed amongst university students to see whether or not the seats will be removed from the University buses." It then went on to say and closed with the paragraph: "The Inquiry will be held; the results will be tabulated and the seats will be removed." Well, Mr. Speaker, in this case the Minister has acted in such a fashion as to show that the Inquiry will be held; the results will be tabulated and the Commission will be dissolved.

Now the Winnipeg Free Press and the Winnipeg Tribune, who I say Mr. Speaker, are the significant voices - and I have to regard them as significant much as I disagree with them - the significant voices which have carried the government benches to take the action that they have taken, should have been satisfied in June of 1966, because both papers, Mr. Speaker, if I can recall correctly, both papers said that the vote in Brokenhead -- and they picked that constituency -- the vote in Brokenhead would be a referendum on the Marketing Commission. I have in my hand the pre-analysis of the election in the Winnipeg Tribune written by Peter Liba dated June 18th, 1966: "Referendum in Brokenhead, that's the question mark." And the Free Press did exactly the same thing if I can recall correctly, Mr. Speaker, and I don't have the article in front of me. They said -- they said that people in Brokenhead should go to the polls that the issue in that constituency is clear-cut. We have on the one hand the New Democratic Party candidate who has expressed his unequivocal stand with regard to marketing boards. We have on the other hand -- and I think it was the candidate for the Liberal Party -- who has expressed his unequivocal stand against marketing boards and this will be the signal to the government as to how they should feel about marketing boards. So, Mr. Speaker, they've had their vote. They identified that election as a referendum. That was the significant vote. That's the vote that tells the government what to do; the vote that people cast when they are casting it in favour of candidates who take positions with regard to an election. Mr. Speaker, I'm not alone in feeling this. The Commission has said, the Minister's Inquiry Commission, has said a vote would be useless, and I, Mr. Speaker, am not here to criticize the right of people to vote or not. I am following what the Inquiry Commission said, that a vote under these circumstances would be useless. All segments of the community have indicated their preference for this type of Board,

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) the inquirer indicates that that has been the case and the referendum identified by the Winnipeg Free Press and the Winnipeg Tribune was held on June 23rd, 1966.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I don't really see any particular point in closing this debate with any lengthy discussion. We've had this belted around in many directions. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that in the last few days that greatly controversial Vegetable Marketing Commission has taken on such a rosy hue and chime that it's hardly recognizable.

Mr. Speaker, I am a supporter of orderly marketing. I am also a supporter of having different commodity groups, primary producers or others, to have by and large their say in setting up these programs. I won't attempt to answer all the different questions that have been raised. I will try to deal with some of them. The First Minister I felt in his usual precise manner pretty well stated the government's position last night before leaving. However, I would like to make a remark in answer to the Honourable Member from Lakeside and I would like to thank him for being about the only member that did give me the consideration or the reasonable assumption that some thought had been given into the action taken by this government in the last few days, and I would have to say this to all vegetable growers in Manitoba: that from the very outset of my term of office I have devoted a tremendous amount of time to the vegetable industry. Indeed if a casual observer were to look at my appointment book he would have to be reminded that there are wheat farmers in this province, cattle growers in this province, hog producers in this province and a few other primary producers in this province. I say this in no derogatory manner; I'm merely trying to bring things into perspective. I have the responsibility of looking or answering to a \$500 or \$600 million industry, primary industry, of which the vegetable industry is \$4 million. To say that I have not been involved with the vegetable groups simply isn't true. I know that the vegetable growers from both sides are aware of this. I have made it a point to visit them on their farms, both pro or anti commission supporters. I have on enumerable occasions held discussions with the Marketing Commission members, all of whom I hold in very high regard as being individually outstanding men in their field. I have had a very open door policy towards the Commission and Commission members. They came to my office at will and indeed have had full formal meetings with them as late as last week and so that while I accept the criticism of the manner and the way or if you want to call it the haste that you attach to the judgment that was exercised in this respect, I do not accept the criticism that I acted in a manner that failed to take in the full considerations of the problems that we were heading into.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead took me to task with respect to the report not being available to the honourable members here in this House for full discussion so that I would have the wisdom of their debates and while I would be the first to acknowledge and welcome the wisdom of all honourable members opposite, I would ask him what would his attitude have been if that report came down two weeks after this House prorogued. Was I to sit on it then for five or six months until the next Session and then begin action on it? In this instance the responsibility clearly lies within the government who initiated the report, the Minister who initiated the report, the Minister to whom that report was delivered and while I certainly do not reject the idea of a debate on these matters, I have to accept the responsibility as a Minister of the Crown to make my judgments on these matters. -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. USKIW: . . . differentiate between the fact that it isn't if or if we are not sitting; the fact is we are here, the report was tabled and surely there were two or three days left by which means we could have studied that report.

MR. ENNS: That's a matter of judgment. I also have to comment on the fact that the Member from Brokenhead made considerable to do about how well supported the Commission in reality was and I would hope it is true. This is precisely the situation that exists. I'm beginning to believe after today that this probably is true. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, if I acted as a catalyst in this matter then perhaps, quite contrary to what the honourable gentlemen opposite are saying, then I have performed a service to the vegetable industry, because believe me, Mr. Speaker, I take no pride and certainly it takes no talent to bring something down. I would much sooner be associated with having created something that is viable and something that is worthwhile and something that will be in operation long after this humble Minister of Agriculture has left the scene. So that I want to make that point very clear. And while I must indicate my own personal feelings in this regard, and which to a large extent was borne out by the Baron Commission through the actual report that he wrote and through the private conversations that I've

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) had with him, was that while the manner and way in which the Commission type of marketing was introduced - and I should take a moment off here and talk about the two different concepts of marketing that have been talked about here. It is my judgment that the Commission Marketing Board is the right type of marketing board, and not without its difficulties. However, I am prepared and certainly indicated my willingness and this government's willingness that in all likelihood, and this is what the Commissioner saw, that the producer type board is more acceptable to the producers that are going to be governed by this board. But I must warn the members, I must warn the members of the vegetable industry, of all farm boards that seek protection or seek organization in producer boards like this, they are not without their pitfalls. They have a tendency to become solely producer orientated, to become a very inward looking group, to close their eyes to passing technology, not to take into account the expansion that could be generated but rather evolve into a very cosy home grown type of a production unit which is not the kind of basic agricultural production that we in the western world are going to have to have if we want to produce the food that the world is crying for.

I say that there is room for a producer board if it is aware of these inherent difficulties that we sometimes have in producer boards, if there are sufficient gateways left open to accommodate new blood into them, a certain percentage of new growers that can enter into the field as the expansion permits, that it doesn't lock out different types of approaches to the industry. The whole area of marketing or commission, producer board or marketing boards or indeed vertically integrated farms all centres around the problem, the ever growing problem that's facing agriculture which is marketing. The large vertically integrated farm unit is in that setup primarily because of the marketing advantage that it gains from that setup, not necessarily because they can produce the primary product cheaper or better than the individual family farmer beside him. But in my humble opinion his biggest gain is in the marketing advantage that the organization has. Likewise the same thing can be held true for a producer board of some kind, the bringing together of the total production of a commodity, the better bargaining position that it puts the primary producer in, again it hinges on the marketing aspect whether or not it is successful.

When the Vegetable Commission was set up I think my predecessor rightfully foresaw some of these difficulties and we have attempted to meld together the better parts of two worlds in this Vegetable Marketing Commission, that is the knowledge of the trade tie in with the retail outlets and your primary producer. And the very same people, whether or not they will admit it at this time, are most -- most of the people that I know of will admit that it is highly unlikely to ever introduce such a plan voluntarily by a voluntary vote. It very often needs the imposition as it were that my predecessor gave to establishing this plan. In fact it has been the contention all along that if we -- or the idea has been and this is the one perhaps that I've been most severely criticized for is that we need time. We have established this Commission, we need three or four years time, five years time to allow the benefits of the orderly marketing process to accrue to the producers and then they will support it. Well gentlemen, my whole position in this matter can be summed up in one very short sentence and that is simply this, that instead of that gap of producers' support narrowing it's my judgment that it was widening and I think that's a fair observation from the sources of information that are available to all of us, keep our eyes and ears open. So I have no assurance that six months from now, 12 months from now or 18 months from now the situation with respect to the difficulties, the controversies surrounding the operation would have been improved. Indeed I submit that we would have probably had, as they refer to the south on another matter, "another hot summer."

The suggestion is certainly valid that we could have played around with it, we could have changed some of the regulations, taken some of the abrasive corners off it, relaxed some of the regulations that have proved so irksome to some growers. I find myself again coming up with the idea that when you have something not working quite properly or not being accepted, you can change its different parts, you can call it another name, you can paint it a different colour, you're very often further ahead if you attempt to take a rather more drastic approach to it in the way that I've suggested.

Now, almost singularly the members who spoke have decried the total abandonment of the present marketing system. This is not the case at all and members present or most of you who were must realize from my statement the other day the commission as such is carrying on and it will carry on and I'm perfectly prepared to accept recommendations from the Member from Lakeside that we don't necessarily put in any arbitrary date to the time that it should indeed

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) fold up if no support is forthcoming. I've indicated only the date June 30th as a date by which some time I want to get or this government should get some firm recommendations as to what the producers desire is in this matter.

MR. USKIW: On a commodity basis, yes.

MR. ENNS: Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- This is fine. I don't wish to enter into this kind of a debate on this thing. I would challenge the people that are seriously interested in orderly marketing whether or not they're prepared to rest the whole case of ordering marketing and throw it on all seven vegetables.

MR. USKIW: On a commodity basis, yes. You sure are.

MR. ENNS: Well, we'll think about that one. I think there are lots of things you want to think about before you accept that line of reasoning. I simply say this, we have no intention to allow the facility that we have there to be abandoned and to drop it. We have every reason to believe that this facility is going to continue to be of very necessary service to the vegetable industry in Manitoba and it's not our intention that it should be lost to the vegetable industry of Manitoba. The actual mechanisms of how this service will be carried on, members must appreciate are questionable at this time because we do not know what's going to occur in the next six months; whether or not the commission will continue to operate as it's operating now if such is the favourable response from our friend; whether or not we have a Producers' Board as recommended by the commissioner or whether or not we have to find some other means of keeping that facility operating to provide the very necessary service that the vegetable producers in this province have a reason to expect and a reason to hope to continue.

The question resolves itself then and I've indicated this to the gathering that greeted me this afternoon. The ball is in their court. We ask only that we want a firm reply from the producers who are going to be governed by this plan to indicate this to us.

I find it, although I take it with a certain amount of salt I suppose, but the Honourable Member from Inkster, the self-appointed apostle of human liberty and freedom that we have in this House, I wonder whether he would be prepared to take the regulations and the rules and the compulsory nature that is necessary in performing orderly marketing of this kind; and I have to take issue with my honourable friend from Lakeside there, the idea of operating it on a voluntary scheme is just not feasible as much as it appeals to me. It may well have to be feasible if we want to tide ourselves over a period of time. I understand that there have been a fair amount of vegetables being delivered to that facility throughout these years on a voluntary nature, vegetables that were not controlled that did not have to be delivered to the facility, but growers took advantage of the fact that the facilities were there and took advantage of the marketing facilities of the Vegetable Marketing Board and brought these vegetables there on a voluntary basis. But I think any of us who have come to realize the nature of what orderly marketing entails, and it does entail quotas, it entails production, delivery quotas and this calls for pretty severe restrictive regulations to live under. It has become very patently obvious to all of us that while it may chaff some who have to live under, who have maybe lost in a minority vote, but will live under those conditions because a vote was held; to expect somebody to live under those conditions indefinitely without having the benefit of a vote is asking the impossible.

And so with these few remarks I want to remind members that the commission as such is not out of operation; it will continue to operate until we have further views from the growers on this subject. I myself personally am very hopeful that we will have a successful vote on the potato question this summer or later on whatever such time is deemed appropriate and that in resolving this whole question and in retrospect we will not look upon this as a regressive step in the progress towards bringing some form of order into the selling and the production of our primary products here in Manitoba. Thank you.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister submit to two questions?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman asked permission to ask the Minister a question a few moments ago and it was rather than a question but a statement, I trust . . .

MR. USKIW: Just two questions, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister not realize that he is denying a vote to people that have a right to have a vote under the Natural Products Marketing Act? Does he not realize that he's only giving it to one group, one commodity group, and he's denying the rights to the others?

MR. ENNS: I'm prepared to consider that. I'm not prepared that you're prepared . . .
-- (Interjection) --

MR. USKIW: Yes, and does the Minister truly expect that the facilities in King Edward can be run on the basis of one commodity?

MR. ENNS: I indicated to him, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have to take a very hard look at how we will keep that facility running. My interest is to see that that facility is available to the vegetable industry in Manitoba.

MR. GREEN: ... to ask the Minister whether he doesn't consider that there are other members in the House who speak for liberty and freedom?

MR. CHERNIACK: ... be permitted a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The last statement was hardly a question.

MR. PAULLEY: We just want to ask a question - the Member for St. John's has a question.

MR. ENNS: Do you want an answer to that question ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Would the Minister accept a question from the Honourable Member for St. John's?

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: I assumed he wasn't replying to the other. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the Minister what his definition of a majority is when he speaks of the vote.

MR. ENNS: I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have to be very sure of what the present legislation calls for with respect to the votes held in this area. I am not fully aware of them. I would have to indicate my own concern in view of the past experience and in view of the type of restrictive regulations that we are prepared to, that we know now from experience that go along with these plans that it would have to be a sizeable majority. I think the Act calls for a two-thirds or sixty-six percent majority, in other words somewhat better than 51 percent.

MR. CHERNIACK: A supplementary question. Would the Minister be ready to give that information when we go into committee so that that could be dealt with with his recommendation and also whether it's 65 percent or whatever the proportion is of eligible voters or of those voting?

MR. ENNS: I'll give that.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would you now call Bill No. 93.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland does not appear to be in the House.

MR. LYON: I wonder if we can just hold that then, Mr. Speaker. There is some urgency in connection with Bill No. 93. If we can retrieve the Honourable Member from Rhineland again, or perhaps get him back in. Bill No. 78.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 78. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I'll try to limit myself to the principles in this bill. It's a very large and extensive bill. I wouldn't want to go through it section by section. It is a new bill for Manitoba in an area that certainly needs a new look and a new approach, because Bill 78 is a new Housing and Renewal Act and of course it is long overdue and I'm not being too critical of the government in this matter. I recognize that there are many problems in the whole matter of public housing and of urban renewal that the government cannot be held solely responsible for. Unfortunately this is one area where public opinion is not too favourable towards action although the need as we all know and those who are at all interested in the field, those that are working in the municipal field are quite aware of the fact that something has to be done because the problem is a very real one, and yet it's a problem that apparently people tend to want to either ignore or sweep under the carpet. I suppose the feeling is that since I'm living in an adequate house I'm not too concerned about it so let someone who isn't living in adequate housing worry about it, but I think we've come to the point where we cannot overlook it any longer.

I believe that the Minister in her remarks to a recent housing conference, one I regret I missed, mentioned that there was something like 40 percent of the population in Metropolitan Winnipeg or perhaps Manitoba that was in need and could benefit from proper housing, that a great percentage of people - this 40 percent - their incomes were too low and therefore they could not take advantage of the fact that new housing might be available, because the problem we're facing is that the cost of housing has gone up so astronomically in the last few years that the average person with the average income just finds that he cannot hope to either buy or rent at today's prices. I realize that some of these problems are perhaps problems which arise because of the cost of servicing the land, the municipal services that have to be put into the land itself in order to make them available for housing or for development adds considerably to the cost of the land and consequently when the builders start building on them, the cost of

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) the house goes beyond what the average person can hope to pay and which the average person should pay for adequate housing.

The other problem, the other side of the coin of course is because we are perhaps a young community, young in years, compared to Europe for example, I don't think Manitoba ever thought in terms of having to worry about areas of blight developing. We could always somehow turn our backs to a blighted area or a slum area and strike out in a new direction, in a new suburb, and we'd leave the problem behind us. Well, I don't think we can afford that luxury any more because I think it is a luxury to think that we can somehow turn our backs on it. We have areas in Greater Winnipeg for example, and I'm sure this happens in the rural areas too, perhaps not as severely, but in Metropolitan Winnipeg certainly, we have areas that have been permitted to go to rack and ruin simply because of the short-sightedness of our municipal people, of our provincial people, but more important of the public at large. I think they are the ones who didn't see what was happening, couldn't evaluate what was occurring and therefore we are now faced with the problem and what do we do about it? This bill, as I see it, is an honest and sincere attempt to come face to face with the problem and for that I want to commend the Minister for bringing it in. It's a bill, that if it works, can go a long way to help to erase this problem that we have been living with for the last few years.

Now we know this that a private sector of the economy cannot resolve this problem, and there too, I'm not being critical of any businessman who doesn't want to put his money into a poor investment. I can well understand why builders or developers are not content to invest their money at a very low rate of return. At the same time if they're going to get the rate of return that they feel they're entitled to, the cost of the housing is such that, as I said, about 40 percent of the population can't hope to pay these prices. And so we do recognize, and I think everybody today recognizes that governments must step into the picture, that only through government intervention will this problem be licked, if we're ever going to lick it.

Now I know there are still some people in a community, and I'm talking about the public at large now, who somehow feel that public housing has a stigma attached to it and it's an argument that I think has been kicked around in a lot of levels of government. Many municipalities resent and will oppose public housing within their borders. There's two facets of this: on the one hand they don't like the idea of having people, supposedly welfare people coming into their area; on the other hand it's a very selfish and financial reason on their part, because their problem is that the housing of this type usually has a lower assessed value and since the services which they have to render particularly in the field of education are such that a house with lower than let's say \$16,000 assessment, they discourage, they don't welcome and so we've been faced with this problem of recognizing there's a need but asking somebody else to do something about it and unfortunately no one has been willing to do anything about it. About the only area I think where Manitoba has come out looking good is in the field of limited dividend housing for senior citizens and there, thanks to the service organizations, there has been a fair amount built in Manitoba and although the need is not entirely filled, at least it's kept pace with the problem. But that's the only area. In any other area we haven't even scratched the surface.

I'm concerned that if we're going to really tackle this problem, we have to overcome this reluctance and this natural reluctance on the part of the municipalities. And one of the matters in this bill which I'd like clarification on, the way I read it: The municipalities will still have to enter into an agreement in regard to urban renewal certainly and public housing as well. Now if the Minister is going to wait until the municipalities come forward and ask for an agreement I'm very doubtful whether there's going to be too many municipalities interested because as I say they have other reasons to fear or to look upon public housing and urban renewal with any great interest. It's a financial one. So that if they are going to have to wait until the municipalities ask for it, I'm not sure it'll ever come about and I'm wondering why the Province of Manitoba in this bill couldn't adopt some of the powers that the Ontario Housing Act permits, where I believe - and I stand to be corrected - but I believe that in Ontario, the Government in Ontario does not set in advance as the bill does here, the percentage of municipal budgets . . . The way I read the bill the municipality must pick up or must share with the province 50 percent of the portion which CMHC and National Housing Act won't cover. In the Province of Ontario, from what I understand, in some cases the municipality just picks up five percent; in other cases even less than that. So that there is some inducement to the municipalities to come into it, because the problem facing the municipality is one as I said, of finances. I know the Minister has remarked on occasion, and the First Minister certainly, that Manitoba

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) couldn't take advantage of the federal moneys available simply because Manitoba hasn't got the finances. In this case she was referring to the provincial finances. I suggest to her if the province hasn't got the finances, certainly the municipalities don't and so if the municipalities are going to have to contribute 50 percent of the share unpaid by CMHC, they're not going to welcome this. They're going to drag their feet and try to perhaps avoid something that they should go into and I think in principle would like to go into but simply cannot afford.

Now I know the Act here has provision for loans to be made but a loan still has to be repaid and I'm not sure that that is the answer so I'm wondering whether our bill here couldn't be made more flexible to allow municipalities to enter into an agreement without having to pay this 50 percent cost. In addition to this 50 percent cost, as I read it, the municipalities also have to pick up the full cost of any expenditures which are not covered by NHA or by the scheme itself. In other words other costs which may be incurred in the process of land assembly and the process of studying this matter.

One of the drawbacks in the past in dealing with this matter of urban renewal I think has been that any government renewal schemes that were started had to be in the form of housing. In other words you could tear down an area but it had to be rebuilt for homes only and I'm wondering if this makes any sense at all, whether we can't perhaps adopt a more realistic attitude towards these things. There are some areas which are dilapidated and which certainly should be levelled but it makes no sense in some cases to replace these areas or rebuild in these areas residential communities. These are perhaps surrounded by other industrial commercial areas. Couldn't we in Manitoba simply create an urban renewal area but rebuild it for industrial and commercial development? The province, the federal government moneys could be used to assemble this land, to level it if necessary and then to either lease it back or sell it for industrial and commercial development. I think we could make better use of some of the land and also the costs then wouldn't be quite that high because one of the problems in the Lord Selkirk development is that the unit cost by the time they're through building is going to be fairly expensive and the cost of the public housing therefore will be quite high. Perhaps we could go into the idea of a land bank, the province stepping in now into areas around Greater Winnipeg where there are no homes, there are no dilapidated commercial or run down industrial areas, but land banks could be set aside for future construction of public housing, for future construction of even limited dividend housing; the land could be assembled now, could be kept in a land bank and be used as the need developed. I think it would be less costly and I think it would be a way that we could be assured that as the demand built up and as the need for housing increased that the site would be there for future use.

A criticism I've had of the previous attempts, attempts up to now on urban renewal and public housing has been the fact that in my opinion it has been compartmentalized; in other words you've had different groups of people working on a problem and I've felt all along that there hasn't been enough of an integrated or unified approach to this very question. I think an example is Lord Selkirk Park again where just recently the school board requested or announced that there wasn't enough land set aside for the school and play areas and that they felt there should be more land. But of course by the time they got into the picture it was too late, the plan had already been accepted by CMHC, it had been pretty well frozen and to do anything about it now was too late. But this simply shows that we're not approaching this as an over-all problem. We're dealing with land only apparently. It seems to me that we're not just renewing land, we're renewing people and when you're thinking in terms of building homes you've got to think also of the services that go to make the amenities for these homes. You have to have play areas; you've got to have schools; you need some commercial areas and particularly with some of the areas that are going to be built, that I hope will be built, you need the services of the various departments which will be working with these people if we're really going to help them. It isn't just a matter of giving them a house; it's a matter of giving them perhaps home-maker services, day centre services, as I said playgrounds, guidance. These people too, need the facilities right in the area. They've got to be available to the residents of the area so they can consult them, so they can be an on-going liaison, and perhaps that way we could really come up with a housing development which is positive and which can then achieve what I think we are hoping to achieve. We're trying to take people out of slum conditions, out of areas where children are born and raised which are self-defeating and which I feel inhibit the child from almost the beginning, from ever making a go of it. The children from these areas, as I say, living in areas where congestion is the order of the day, where you have six and seven

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) families living in homes that were originally designed for single families; children in areas such as that are handicapped. If we're going to bring them out of that slum area and slum thinking that that type of living creates then we have to certainly not just give them adequate housing but we have to then work with them through our various social agencies to break that pattern and that mentality that too often grows up and becomes part of slum thinking.

So, I say we're talking, certainly not only in land renewal but in people renewal and this I think is the goal that we should all strive for. I don't think anyone here is in disagreement with this and I certainly hope that this is something that this Act will help to achieve. One of the features about the Act that I certainly was pleased to see was the fact that the housing authority here can step into a single unit and buy up a unit and simply make it available for public housing. This will go a long way to perhaps preventing some of the blight that develops, that occurs. Some of the problems have been that as the families of older couples move on. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. It is now 5:30. I expect the honourable gentleman wants to complete his address.

MR. MILLER: I'll carry on after, at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. LYON: Might I suggest that we agree to call it 5:30 and carry on with the same Order Paper this evening; there have been no adjournments. Is that agreeable?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Mr. Speaker, if I may to my honourable friend. There may be some members of the Assembly that would like to take the advantage -- I'm not suggesting that I would -- but there may be, because of each sitting being a separate sitting to have the Orders of the Day read in order to pose questions to members opposite which we would be prevented from doing. I must apologize to my honourable friend. I did not think of this or mention it to him when he was over here. This is the only objection that I would have.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think it would facilitate matters if we could agree that it be a continuous sitting. However, if there is not unanimity on the point we're not pressing the matter at all. It is much more convenient I think for the staff and we'd lose nothing in time. We'll have . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I've just had a caucus meeting, Mr. Speaker, as far as we're concerned . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and return to the Chair at 8:00 this evening.