

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 8, 1969.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the petition of The Manitoba Municipal Secretary-Treasurers' Association.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to take a moment and introduce our young guests. We have some that have come many hundreds of miles to be with us today. We have 25 students of Grades 3 to 8 standing of the South Indian Lake School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Hiebert, Mr. Slezak, Mrs. Hiebert and Miss Fulbrook. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

We also have with us today 23 students of Grade 8 standing, from the Edmund Partridge School. These students are under the direction of Miss Murray. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

Also in the Gallery today are 10 4H students from various points throughout Manitoba. These students are attending a Leadership Conference in Winnipeg, and they are under the direction of Mr. Clark.

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

STATEMENTS

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and with leave of the House, I would like to call the House's attention to the achievement of a group of young Winnipeg hockey players, and I refer to the Mustang Pee Wee Hockey Club of Winnipeg, which recently won the 20th All Canada Pee Wee Hockey Championship at Goderich, Ontario. Now these young boys are not only a credit to their parents but they are a credit to this city, they are a credit to this province, and I think it is only right and fitting, Mr. Speaker, that this House, representing the province of Manitoba should send to Joe La Marsh, their coach and trainer, a man who has devoted his whole life to the development of hockey among the youth of our city — he is an employee of the C. N. R. shops at Transcona and I would like to show you the Goderich paper which displayed all the hockey teams that took part in that contest, and I'd also like to read the editorial which appeared in the Goderich Signal Star, March 27, 1969. The heading is "A nice bunch of boys". I will not read from the beginning but about the middle it says, "But while praise is certainly due to all the players and coaches of the teams, and to the officials of the Sponsoring Goderich Lions Club, a special word must be said about the boys of the Winnipeg Mustangs, the only team from the west and truly ambassadors of good will. These boys were outstanding in everything they did during the days they were here. The brand of hockey was NHL par excellence. Their manners off and on the ice were something to talk about. They were superb. Their appearance was as neat as a new pin even after their tougher games, and one was led to recall hockey players' certain hair cream advertisements. Their conduct around town was something parents dream about for their children and very seldom realize. The boys of the Mustang team from Winnipeg were a credit to their team, they were a credit to their parents and to their team officials and, above all, a credit to Western Canada. The folks from out west have a wonderful reputation for hospitality and friendship but rarely does the eastern side of the country witness such a show as these 18 young players put on last week. They won every game in their series and two exhibition games as well. That's an accomplishment that will be talked about for some time to come, but the behaviour of the boys will go down in history of Young Canada Week as something special. But the beauty of the whole thing is this: these boys were not aware that they were anything special, and as far as we are concerned that makes the score just that much better. They are a great bunch of hockey players, they are a real team, and above all, they are just a darned nice bunch of kids."

I think, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the people of Goderich, Ontario, recognize the quality of some of the kids we have in Western Canada, that the least we can do, as representing the people of Manitoba, is to direct the Speaker to send a letter of congratulation to their

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) . . . coach and to the Winnipeg Mustangs.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Member for Selkirk for bringing word of this outstanding event to the House, and I can associate the members on this side of the House with the wonderful achievement of the Winnipeg Mustang's club. I think it's a particular tribute to the coach, as well as to the boys, that they have won this wonderful reputation for sportsmanship and I think it's an example that should be emulated by many other clubs around our province because I think too many are witness to the spectacles that we see on television and unfortunately many of them get carried away and they don't display this sportsmanship that has been reported from Goderich, Ontario, and I want to thank very much the Member for Selkirk and the people of Ontario for their wonderful reception of our boys down there, and would echo in his sentiment that the House send a letter of congratulations to the boys and to their coach and others who sponsored this trip.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Might I just add that on our side we are, of course, very happy to know that the hard work of the boys has been recognized in this way and we certainly agree with the proposal that it be recognized publicly in the way proposed.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall be only too pleased to attend to the wishes of the House in this direction.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources could inform the House when the Mining Inspector is going to take up permanent residence in Thompson.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of government policy that will be announced in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation for the year ending March 31st 1968.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources for the materials in the assessment regarding the South Indian Lake hearings. Some of the material was clearly identified as the transcripts, but there was one document which bears no date and no author. It's entitled "Natural Resources and People of the Churchill River Diversion Area," and I wonder if the Minister could identify what that document is so that we would know what it refers to.

MR. ENNS: Yes Mr. Speaker, that document was prepared by my Deputy Minister, based on preliminary resource studies taken in the area.

MR. MOLGAT: Could the minister identify when this report was made?

MR. ENNS: This was released -- the particular document that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition refers to was prepared and first released in the latter part or the middle of January, just prior to the hearings that were held here in Winnipeg. The information from which it is gleaned was undertaken during a study of the preceding summer, during the summer and fall months of '68.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Is this, then, the Minister's or his department's assessment of the so-called Task Force Report? Is that what it is? Well, is it not correct that it appeared from the newspaper reports that there was considerable difference between the statements in this statement and what was said in the Task Force? I remember one newspaper showed statements in one and statements in the other and they did not correlate. Would it not be better, then, to submit the Task Force report itself?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to comment on newspaper reports.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the attempt by the Member for Gladstone to call a meeting of the Automobile Insurance Committee has been abortive, I wonder whether the person responsible for the calling of such a meeting, the House Leader, could advise the House as to when such a meeting will be held.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I expect the committee will be called, in the famous phrase, "soon".

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked a question of the Minister of Education about these fast reading courses that have been advertising in the newspapers. One is the Evelyn Wood School, the other one is the Angus School of Commerce. I made the enquiry about whether he knew how effective these courses were, and if they were effective would they be introduced into the public schools for the benefit of the students there who may be slow readers. I provided the Honourable the Minister with a copy of an ad that appeared in yesterday's paper.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education)(St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member was good enough to provide me with the advertisement he referred to yesterday and indicated the questions he wished to direct. I have asked the officials of the department to examine the request and see if they could provide me with further information to hand on to the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is it correct that some of the initial writings of the reports in the TED report were prepared prior to the volunteers meeting?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to answer that question.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will the Minister undertake to get the information for us?

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker. The manner in which the TED report was written was a matter that was handled by the Commission; the manner in which the consultants and the advisory committee worked were entirely in the hands and discretion of the Commission and the chairman.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders are called, I would like to direct a question to either the Minister of Education or the First Minister and/or the Honourable Minister who is in charge of the Public Utilities.

I note with interest in the seven years that I have been here that school children come from quite a distance, and I was prompted to ask this question today when I note that for the first time a group of children are here from Southern Indian Lake. I would like to ask the government if there was any government assistance supplied to help these children get here this year?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, not that I am aware of; no government assistance that I am aware of. The students were here and I think it is interesting to note that it's the first time many of those youngsters have been out of the community of South Indian Lake. They are not just here for the day, I was informed this morning, because I had the privilege of meeting them at their request earlier today in my office, and they are here not just for today but they are here for a whole week, and I think that it is a wonderful education for those young people to be here in the capital city of Winnipeg touring these buildings, witnessing the opening of the session this afternoon, and as far as I know there is no government assistance involved.

MR. JOHNSTON: I thank the Honourable the First Minister for his statement and I can say that I concur, but I did gather that he said that they are here not with government assistance. Is that correct?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, not as far as I know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I directed a question to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Transport, and the First Minister replied he did not have the answer. The question was regarding the Motor Carrier Board's decision on the trucking rates that was to be made by March 31st. Can the Minister inform the House when a decision would be made and why a decision has not been forthcoming in view of the fact that it was promised by the 31st of March?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, some time ago I noted a report in the press which carried the suggestion that the report would be available by March 31st. I immediately telephoned the chairman of the Highway Traffic and Motor Transport Board to see if I was reading correctly. He informed me that he had not made that statement and, as far as I am aware, the report of the Highway Traffic and Motor Transport Board, their consideration of the matter has not been concluded and there is no report available

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) at the present time.

MR. DAWSON: A supplementary question. Can the Minister inform us when the report will be made?

MR. McLEAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, some time last week I brought to the attention of this House a kind of lawless situation that developed in Thicket Portage as a result of the opening of a government liquor store at the first of the year. I was home in Thompson for the Easter weekend and I spoke to a couple of people from the area, and they gave me some firsthand information of what's going on as a result of this liquor store. One of their complaints was that there was a petition taken by the people and 90 percent of the people signed the petition against the liquor store, and I am just wondering if the Attorney-General would look into the situation and see what he can do about removing this problem.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the Liquor Control Commission have received this matter, the petition or the letter, and are currently looking into the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the House Leader. Yesterday I asked about whether any contracts had been let on a cost-plus basis in connection with projects on the Nelson River and he said he would enquire about it. Has he any information today?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am not the House Leader but I undertook to enquire and when I have any information I will let my honourable friend know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to answer a question taken as notice yesterday from the Honourable Member for Gladstone, and to inform him and the House that it is the intention of the government to supply the report on Targets for Economic Development to all the mayors and secretaries as well as to the ag reps in the province.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my honourable friend for having made that statement. Is it the intention of the government to see that the reports go forward pronto?

MR. SPIVAK: As always, Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the threat of flood is of considerable concern to those people who may be affected by it, would the Honourable Minister consider devising a system with our news media for the regular publication of flood reports? These publications I would suggest at regular intervals notifying the people of any change or even reminding them of the fact that the forecast and prediction is remaining unchanged.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question under advisement. I think it's probably a reasonable suggestion to make.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. I believe I should remind the honourable members that the Honourable Member for Burrows moved the Return as indicated on the Order Paper yesterday, and in accordance with the contents of our Rule 100 and the fact that he indicated he wished to speak on the matter, he now has the floor.

MR. HANSUCHAK: Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of the Order for Return which I moved yesterday is very closely related to one contained in a previous Order except for this difference, the sum total of the information may be similar but it calls for, it's broken down into various categories as the Order indicates. Now the Minister's reply yesterday, and I'm reading from Hansard, was that "the information requested under paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Order have already been supplied to the Honourable Member from Burrows," and this is correct. This Order was tabled yesterday, Order No. 27. "The remaining information is either of a privileged or confidential nature," and then there was an interjection from Mr. Speaker and the Honourable Minister continued: "or requesting such information as we do not possess, and I refuse the Order."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that if he reads this Order

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) carefully, if he read it and in the light of Section 8 subsection (1) of The Mining Tax Act, he will find that I'm not asking for anything which the Minister may not have; in fact I'm asking for information which under law the Minister does have. The only information that he may not have in the form requested is that asking for the sum total of the various phases of the mining operation, which somebody within his department would have to total up. But insofar as the information on each mining operation is concerned, that is within the Minister's possession and therefore I beg to differ with the Honourable Minister when he suggests that there may be information requested which he does not possess. I do believe that everything requested for is within his possession.

He also stated, Mr. Speaker, that the information requested is either of a privileged or confidential nature. The Honourable Minister gave this House a similar reply to the previous Order that I referred to, and in support of that reason he quoted Section 11 of The Mining Tax Act, Section 11 subsection (2), which reads as follows: "A mine assessor shall not communicate or disclose to any person any information of a private or confidential nature acquired by him under this Section except insofar as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act." In other words, Mr. Speaker, there was an exception, but what is more important is that this privilege of retaining information, not disclosing information as being of a private or confidential nature, is limited only to information acquired by — and this is important — by the individual known as the mine assessor, and secondly, to information obtained under this Section. And I would wish to draw the Honourable Minister's attention to Section 11 and what Section 11 says. And Section 11, Mr. Speaker, subsection (1) to which this makes reference, states that "a mine assessor may enter upon any mine for the purpose of making inquiries, obtaining information and otherwise performing his duties under this Act, and for those purposes he may (a) descend all pits and shafts and use all tackle machinery. . . ." I needn't bother reading the rest, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker. "(b) Enter, search and examine all buildings, erections and vessels used in connection with the mine. (c) Take from the mine such samples or specimens as he may desire for the purposes of determining the value of the minerals or mineral products being taken therefrom, and he shall have full and complete access to all books, letters, papers and documents kept or used for or in connection with the work and business of the mine, and may examine them and take copies thereof or extract therefrom."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not the information sought in this Order. This is not the information sought, and if it were, then I would agree with the Honourable Minister that under the provisions of this Act this is privileged information and ought not be released in reply to the Order placed before this House. But, Mr. Speaker the information sought herein is under Section 8 — under Section 8 of The Mining Tax Act; and Section 8 subsection (1) states: "The operator of each mine in the province, without any notice or demand to that effect and in addition to any other statement that may be required from him, shall, on or before the 25th day of March in each year, deliver to the director a detailed statement in which he shall set forth. . ." and then it lists all the matters that shall be set forth in this statement and those matters are those which I have included in my Order for Return, other than those making reference to the sum total of the various operations.

Now there's a distinction here, Mr. Speaker. The section cited by the Honourable Minister as his authority for refusing the Order refers to the mine assessor. This information is that which was filed with the mine director, and if I'm reading the Act correctly, Mr. Speaker, those are two separate offices, two separate individuals; the Mining Tax Act in Section 2 provides a separate definition for each. It defines a mine assessor and there is a separate definition for the office of director. Now on that basis I cannot understand the Honourable Minister's reasons for denying this Order. Secondly, it also puzzles me on what basis the Minister could say that the entire contents, even if the section that the Minister cites is applicable which notion I reject — I can't accept that because according to my interpretation of the Act it isn't applicable — but even if it were, Mr. Speaker, much of the information requested, I am sure is public knowledge. Bits and pieces of it here and there are likely contained in various reports tabled in this House. Where they are obtained I'm sure one would have to search through many reports, but I am sure that much of this information is available in some form or another. Now that being the case, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister and his government would reconsider the position stated by the Honourable Minister yesterday.

Now in checking the rules governing parliamentary procedure and reading Beauchesne, there is a section, Section 213 in the Fourth Edition of Beauchesne, which states that a motion

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) for a Return may be opposed on the ground of public policy, such as that the disclosure of the information sought is not for the public interest or that its supply would involve unreasonable labour or expenses. Then the explanatory notes dealing with this section go on to explain what "public policy" means, and I could not find any reference to documents filed with a government department of this type. There is reference to matters at that time in the courts; there is reference to an Order for Return which at one time was put in, I believe, in the House of Commons calling for information, dealing with information contained in tenders, tenders of a project which wasn't yet finalized, and matters of that type. But here, Mr. Speaker, these are reports on something gone by, on a year's activity of a mining operation, filed with the Minister's department, filed with his Director of Mines, and I certainly could not find this type of information falling within the category of being privileged or confidential.

Now have we the right to ask for information of that type? Beauchesne, in a previous section, states that "papers are laid before the House in pursuance of" and lists the five ways in which papers may be laid before the House, and one of them is on an Order of the House. And subsection (2) of the same section states: "Papers may be directly ordered where they relate to" and then it lists all the various examples - and this, of course, is with reference to the House of Commons, I appreciate that; canals, railways, post offices among others, and mining - and it concludes with this statement: "and other matters under the immediate control and direction of the different departments of the Dominion." And I would assume, Mr. Speaker, that this could be read as it applies to the Province of Manitoba by substituting the word "province" for "Dominion". In other words: "and other matters under the immediate control and direction of the different departments of the province." And this matter is under the control and direction of a department of this province. So on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I urge the government again to reconsider the position stated yesterday and accept the Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I was expecting that the Minister would deal with the request of the mover of the motion to either agree to giving the information or to justify the refusal, and I rise more in surprise than in any other motivation, to note that had I not risen the question would have been put and the Minister is sitting there and nodding his head as if to say that he has no responsibility to deal with the . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Perhaps my honourable friend is not aware of the fact that the Minister already spoke in this debate yesterday and thereby cannot speak again even if he wished to, even if he thought it were worthwhile.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, now we're talking about the rules of the House about which the House Leader is supposed to be expert, and certainly I don't question the fact that he has knowledge of the rules but my understanding of the rules is that when an Order for Return is presented, the mover may indicate that he wishes to speak, in which case it's stood over for Private Members' Day, or it may be indicated to him by the government that the Order will be rejected in which case it's stood over to Tuesday. And that's exactly what the Minister said, and if my honourable friend the House Leader would look at the rules - and I haven't looked at them lately - I'm pretty sure he's going to find that the statement, the mere statement by a Minister that a motion in order will not be accepted shall not be considered a speech, and therefore for a Minister or for the House Leader to hide behind a supposed speech that was made yesterday is - is it hypocritical? I'm wondering. It's probably . . .

MR. ENNS: small point of privilege. I suppose . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think the honourable gentleman used a word there a moment ago that he would wish to - if he wished to express his opinion, he'd use some other word.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh I do want to withdraw that word. Even when I said it, I was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest to him that the word he did use was unparliamentary.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well that's why I said I do want to withdraw that word.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I see.

MR. CHERNIACK: I want to hear what the Minister interrupted me for.

MR. ENNS: Merely, Mr. Speaker, to indicate my definition of what constitutes a speech. It's not necessarily the length of words. I thought I indicated to the Honourable Member from Burrows that I had supplied certain of the information requested, that I rejected other information for what I thought fairly clear and concise reasons for my rejection, and I saw no need to

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) repeat them this afternoon.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has now indicated that what he said yesterday satisfies him as the speech that he would make on this matter. Even after having the benefit of listening — and I imagine he did — to what was said by the Honourable Member for Burrows, all he can contribute to this debate is a repetition of what? Of the statement that he made that the information requested is either of a confidential, privileged nature or information that "we do not have". This, then, means, Mr. Speaker, as was already pointed out by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that the law was not complied with because the Act quoted by the Member for Burrows says that the information shall be filed by March 25th of every year without notice or demand being made, and therefore, if the law was not complied with, the information was not sent in, that must be the interpretation that we give to it because the Minister says either we don't have it or something else. So it must be that he has it or else the law has been broken. If the law has been broken I think we ought to know that and know there are stiff penalties imposed. I think it's a fine for every day in arrears, and of course March 25th isn't that long ago but March 25, 1964 — March 25, 1965, would be a great deal of days that would amount to a very substantial fine if indeed it were true that the government does not have the information requested. Because the law says it shall receive that information, and the law says if it doesn't, there shall be a fine calculatable by the day — I think it's a \$20.00 a day, but whatever it is it's a fine per day of default, and we have here 15, 16, 18 hundred days. It's still quite a bit of money for the government and will certainly help substantially in providing funds for the government's operations to collect these fines.

Now I think we're entitled to know, Mr. Speaker, and since the Honourable Minister has given up the opportunity which he has to deal with the questions posed by the Honourable Member for Burrows, I think we're entitled to know from one of the other 20-odd members on that side of the House: Was the information filed that was required to be filed under the Act? And if not, have the fines been collected for the information that wasn't filed? I think that's important. We should know. There's a very important principle involved in that the Act requires that it shall have been filed and the question refers to 1964 and subsequent years, so let's find out. Has there been default under the Act? Is the information missing because there was default under the Act, and if there was default was there prosecution, or is the government negligent? Is the government embarrassed by the fact that it doesn't have the information and has not done anything about it, and has neglected to collect all these fines? Or possibly the government has the information and maybe the information has been filed, in which case how could the Minister possibly say that it's information we do not have? Maybe there's some portion of this long list of information requested which they don't have.

Then, doesn't the Minister owe it to the House to indicate which part of the information is missing? Or possibly there is no information missing; maybe the government has it all; therefore, according to him, it is all confidential or privileged. Well now, if that's the case, how confidential? To whom confidential? From whom confidential? Or to whom privileged? This is information which has to be filed in order to make certain that taxes, royalties, the people's share in the profits of a mine are to be paid to the government. On what basis is it confidential or privileged? Maybe it is. Maybe it says so in some Act that we're not aware of. Maybe it says so in Beauchiesne that we haven't found. Maybe it says so in some other precedent or principle that we're not aware of on this side. Doesn't the Minister owe it to us to point out on what basis it's confidential or privileged? Maybe it is, but does he have the right to sit there comfortably in his seat, having said that it's confidential or privileged or he doesn't have the information, and then not be accountable to the members of this House for an explanation of the basis on which he makes this statement? It may be that he is justified. How are we to know? And since he can't speak, I would hope that there's some other member of this House who can speak. Possibly a former Minister of Mines can speak, and there are such present in this House. Possibly the Provincial Treasurer, who has some interest, no doubt, in what is paid into government coffers, can speak; possibly the House Leader, who is now consulting with the Honourable the Minister of Mines, will get the information on the basis of which he will speak, because certainly only the Honourable the Minister of Mines is incapable of speaking because he has made himself incapable.

So Mr. Speaker, I would ask of the honourable Ministers — there are five or six of them in the House at the moment, there will be others coming from time to time — that one of them do justify the action of this Minister who has barred himself from speaking, from justifying his

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) statement. I think it's only fair; I think that the House is entitled to the information as are the people of Manitoba: if privileged, how privileged; if confidential, on what basis confidential; if the information not available, then what is not available and what has been done to enforce the law to see to it that it be made available or that the substantial fines provided in the Act have been collected.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to endorse the request made in this Order for Return. I think this is information that members should have and in my opinion are entitled to. Certainly the better informed the members of this House are, the better for the people of Manitoba. At least, that's the stand I take, and when we are asking for information such as is asked for in this Return, I'm sure this would give us much more and better information as to the situation of our mines and minerals, resources and the returns we are getting. So why not give the members of this House what they're asking for? I'm sure that if the Honourable Ministers would want to come across I'm sure they could do a lot towards this.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Borowski, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Doern, Dow, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Claydon, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Graham, Hamilton, Johnson, Jorgenson, Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 25.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a previous occasion I did speak on this resolution. I wasn't able to finish my remarks at that particular time. I would like to add a few remarks and probably bring in another amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers' situation today definitely is not a rosy picture. It is one of hardship and one of frustration, because right now he has to prepare seed to put in another crop and we know the difficulty he is in. Probably many of them didn't even pay last year's account, pay last year's fertilizer, and here he is faced with putting in another crop and getting the necessary requirements such as fertilizer and what not. We heard not too long ago the president of the Manitoba Farmers Union stating that many of the farmers would go broke here in Manitoba, I forget the exact percentage but it was very high in my opinion, if things would not be improving.

Then, also, we know that the farmer today is unable to compete in the labour market for labour with other industries. He hasn't got the wherewithal. The commodities he sees are based on world markets and therefore are much lower; his return is much lower as a result; whereas those, a lot of the industries in eastern Canada are protected and therefore do not face the competition that the farmers face in western Canada today. Then, too, we know that the farmers are not getting their full return of their crops probably for the next year or two. They're not reaping the fruits of their labour at all at the present time. They have to wait, wait and wait.

Earlier in the session I brought to the attention of the House the quota system presently in existence in Manitoba which is much much lower than the other two provinces in western Canada. Many of our points are still on the unit basis and on the one bushel quota, whereas you find in the other two provinces they are much higher, so that the farmer here in Manitoba is at another disadvantage in that way, that we are presently experiencing some of the lowest quotas I think in history at this particular time of year. In many other years we've had higher quotas by now, but we're in a spot where farmers are unable to deliver, unable to sell their

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) grains and get the cash to meet the expenses that they have to pay for. In my opinion, this government is far too negative in this situation. We should be far more positive, because we find that the influence of the west, especially of the western farmer, is losing out in Ottawa. Less attention is given to the western farmer. At every revision we are losing members in the federal House and now, with a revision coming up in this House, we will find that the farm population, the farmers in Manitoba are again losing out because we'll have much greater representation from the urban and city area than from the farming communities and therefore our voice in this House will be weaker as a result.

The farmers of this province and of western Canada definitely are not getting the attention they deserve. We've had the western, the prairie provinces, get together on occasion, the premiers of the three prairie provinces; I think what is known as the Prairie Provinces' Council. I just wonder what is being discussed at these meetings, whether this matter of the farmer is really brought to the attention at that meeting and what is being discussed. Where are the reports? We do not hear of these reports, what is being done, what is being contemplated, and where they're going to put the emphasis on. Surely on this point they should be able to agree and go after, if necessary, go after the Canadian Government or the Wheat Board, whichever is the proper one, and bring about changes, and as the resolution points out, we have the motion as proposed originally to have a certain number of bushels sell at a certain price so that the farmer will be able to get a better price for the initial bushels that he'll be delivering. I think this is a very good idea. This brings about the two-price system which we have endorsed on previous occasions and certainly our party endorses, and I am sure the other parties here on the opposition side have all endorsed from time to time, so that certainly there is no difficulty on that point. Then, too, as I already pointed out, the eastern industries are protected and the enormous amounts of money that the federal government collects in tariffs could be used for a purpose of this type to subsidize the western prairie farmer.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the motion and in particular the amendment as it is before us, and I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Carillon, that the amendment be amended by deleting Clause 2 of the amendment and adding the following words after the word "policy" in the last line of the Resolved part: "as well as a system of acreage payments to bona fide farmers."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I imagine that you have already received the same advice that I am going to tender and that is, namely, that with all the respect in the world for my honourable friend's position and with a good bit of sympathy for what he is trying to achieve, I think his amendment is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it deserves my usual attention and I will take it under advisement. The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member . . .

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think too, while you are considering the amendment to the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, you should consider the amendment that has already been made, because in my opinion, the amendment that was made doesn't make sense, and just to point out, the amendment is

MR. SPEAKER: Well of course, the honourable gentleman — is he now making a speech on this matter?

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'm making a speech on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. I would suggest he keeps in mind that my ruling at the moment is with the amendment to the amendment that I have in hand, and I would like to keep the book closed until I have decided what I'm going to do.

MR. HILLHOUSE: If you prefer to deal with the amendment to the amendment, then I'll raise the question of the amendment after you bring in your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: That was my thoughts in the beginning.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

In the absence of the Minister will the matter stand?

MR. EVANS: With the indulgence of the House, Mr. Speaker, could we have this item stand?

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.)

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, this resolution has already received quite an amount of discussion, and I think it should. It affects quite a few people in this province and I think it should be considered seriously. However, Mr. Speaker, in considering this resolution I would like to take some exception to some of the things that were said by the members that were in favour of adopting this resolution, and I would like to quote at this time from page 496 of Hansard, and I'm quoting the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains. "It was interesting to learn during the by-election campaign in the constituency of Birtle-Russell, I learned that the feed mills were buying oats for as low as 25 cents per bushel. Well Mr. Speaker I'm sure all the farmers in this House will readily agree that this is somewhat below the cost of production. It was even more interesting to find out that the places that they were buying these oats from, or the farmers they were buying the oats from, were the farmers who had commitments to make or payments to make to finance companies, and somehow or other, probably by sheer coincidence, wherever there was a farmer who was just on the verge of having to make a payment to a finance company, all of a sudden by sheer accident a buyer from the feed company would appear in his yard and say, "Well, we can probably buy some feed grain from you but at a very low price. So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the farmer is at the disadvantage from both ends. In the first place, I think - but I can't document this evidence- that the finance companies are playing it so that the farmers are forced to sell their grain to the feed mill and the feed companies probably, by some method of collaboration, are making sure that they appear at the right yard at the right time. It would probably follow, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this grain is obtained so cheaply or inexpensively, that the feeds produced by these feed mills would be in turn made available to feed lot operators and farmers at a very moderate price."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason I am quoting this is that although we had a bad year and although we certainly should look at all aspects of farming and see what can be done, I am one who doesn't believe that this situation exists in south eastern Manitoba as painted by the honourable member here. Certainly the feed mills that I know, the farmers that I know in south eastern Manitoba, would not act this way. I can name you right now, Mr. Speaker, nine feed mills within 15 miles from Steinbach, within a radius of 15 miles. Now, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that this is happening is absolutely not true in our area. I can't talk for the farmers from Birtle-Russell or Ethelbert Plains; however, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that feed mill operators would do this kind of finagling, I don't think is proper. We have in my area, Mr. Speaker, feed mills who have been there for as many as two generations, three generations, 15, 20, and 25 years. In my opinion, they have been working with the farmers. These operators are members of our local school boards, hospital boards, councils, farm organizations, and there is a great deal of cooperation between the farmers and the feed mill operators. This is what is going on in that part of the country.

Now to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they would take the advantage of the fact that the farmer has payments to a finance company to come and offer him ridiculously low prices, and first I don't agree with the 25 cent price, Mr. Speaker, but to agree -- (Interjection) -- it certainly is -- to think that these farmers would be in the hands of the finance companies, Mr. Speaker, I don't think this is general and I don't think we can base legislation on that fact. We have in our areas local banks, local credit unions, that do business with most of our farmers, or I should say where most of our farmers do business, and certainly for a farmer to go and borrow money from a finance company it certainly is disastrous, because at this time it's just impossible. There isn't that much money in farming that you can pay the kind of interest rates that one has to pay, and certainly when a farmer goes to a finance company he must have exhausted his means and the credit union or the bank would not give him credit. If he had any grain and if he was soluble, I am sure he would get some assistance from either his credit union or his bank. So Mr. Speaker, I certainly take great exception. As I say, I'm not an expert at what goes on in other areas, but certainly I have been around south eastern Manitoba all my life; I have been dealing with the farmers there for the last 23 years and I know hundreds of them, and this is certainly not what's happening in that area.

Now my honourable friend goes further in his next paragraph and says, "However, as the facts reveal, that it was presented to us by the Manitoba Farmers Union at its annual submission to the Government of Manitoba, and this release took place on February 21st, and I'm referring to you the figures and charts presented on page 3, it is interesting to note that while the price paid to the farmer for his feed grains decreased considerably - take for example, in 1965 the

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.) . . . price paid to the farmer for a bushel of oats was 55 cents, in 1968 the price of oats decreased 20 cents per bushel, the cost per ton of feed increased \$4.00. It sold for \$84.00 per ton in 1966 while in 1968 the retail price per ton of feed was \$88.40, an increase of \$4.40. So, by that token of reasoning, the farmer really gained nothing. He sold his grain at a drastically reduced price and yet had to pay more per ton of feed. So it is obvious who has been making the profit in this particular case."

Mr. Speaker, again I'm not here to defend the feed mills, but I think that farming today is a matter of cooperation between the different people that are involved, and to try and paint this kind of a picture of the feed mills is absolutely not right, Mr. Speaker. I don't know why \$4.00 is taken because actually you could make it \$40.00 or \$50.00 because, Mr. Speaker, we are no more in the time of the feed mill grinding a little bit of chop for the pig or for the horse or, as they used to say to us Frenchmen, to give some horse some hay over the fence. We have passed that day. We are now in the age of balanced rations, of added drugs, of added supplements and so on, so if you take the price of a ton of feed three years ago and if you take strictly a mixture of grain, and you take it today where you have a balanced ration for, let's say, young animals, chick starter or anything of that kind, it will sell for about \$120.00 or \$125.00 a ton, so you could easily point increases of \$40.00 or \$50.00 a ton, but this is not factual. This is not grain; it's the added supplements, the added minerals and so on, in order to have a balanced ration.

Mr. Speaker, I could show you invoices after invoices of the feed mills that I am talking about - people who have been there for 20 and 25 years and will be there many years from now - and I can show you reductions in the same rations for between I'd say \$10.00 and \$15.00 a ton, and that's the people that are paying not 20 cents for oats. I was this morning in Steinbach and I will quote the names, Mr. Speaker. I was in both feed mills there - Steinbach Flour Mills and Steinbach Hatchery, and farmers delivered their oats this morning for 50 and 55 cents a bushel, and I don't hesitate to say that I'm buying feed myself for my own farm and we are paying 50 cents to the farmers on the yard, and you can say -- you have to be realistic and say that when grain is bought like this, this is ungraded and this is for cash; in most cases it's picked up on the farm. Now, for example, the Honourable Member from Brokenhead quoted somewhere - and I could read it - that one farmer was weighing a load of grain and selling it for 20 cents. Well Mr. Speaker, this means that he was actually getting 15 cents for his oats. Well, no farmer in his right mind would sell oats if it's any good, and if it's not good the feeders just won't buy it, Mr. Speaker. So to say that the feed mills are taking this kind of an advantage is certainly not right, Mr. Speaker, and the reason that I'm taking objection to this is that I don't like to see a picture painted that is completely unrealistic.

I realize that it's a tough year for the farming industry certainly. Nobody likes it. We wish it was better, and we want to do as much as we can, but you can't legislate on a year that's completely extraordinary, unusual, for years to come. And again, under the existing conditions, the farmer has all the alternatives not to be, certainly not to be the victim of the feed mills, because actually under the present legislation one farmer can go to another farmer and buy grain, bring it to his own place, mix it himself and make his own chop, his own concentrate. He can buy the grain from another farmer, take it to his feed mill or any local mill, have it mixed on a custom basis, have ingredient supplements added and bring it back on his farm. Or he can -- one farmer who has grain for sale can sell it either to a farmer or sell it to the feed mill, and then the feeder goes to the feed mill and buys it at a price, and I can quote -- as I said awhile ago, there are all kinds of prices from these feed mills that I've quoted, where they are buying grain, for example, at, well 60 cents is what? About \$1.75 a hundred, and you can buy feed mixed with added ingredients, supplements, delivered to your farm for around 3.10 which includes the mixing, the adding of the supplements, the minerals and so on, plus your delivery to your farm. So to suggest that it's just daylight robbery, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely not right, and what I'm trying to point out here is that under this legislation there is a great deal of freedom for farmers, producer farmers and feeder farmers, to deal together.

Now it was suggested, it was even suggested by my honourable friend - and I'm quoting from page 497. The Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains, in answer to a question by the Honourable Member from Morris, says, "I have no objections to the transactions which take place between farmer to farmer if it only pertains to seed. However, I think that the feed proportion should be applicable the same to the farmer as it is to the feed mills."

Well, Mr. Speaker, even if we wanted to, even if we wanted to I don't think we could,

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.) and do we really want to put the farmer in the position where he has to have an Act, he has to have a permit, he has to have a policeman watching him whether he's selling to his farmer friend? Are we really that far gone as far as legislating for the farmers? Certainly not, Mr. Speaker. These people are people like everybody else. They enjoy freedom and they certainly do not want to be put in that bracket. Now I know the argument is that the feed that doesn't go through the Wheat Pool is reducing the quota of the producers, but Mr. Speaker, I was just checking the Wheat Board statistics yesterday, and from what I can find on pages 6, 7 and 8, tables 7, 8 and 9, there were what is termed in the report, domestic disappearances of western feed grain to the amount of 642,348,000 bushels. Now my honourable friends claim that about 35 or 37 million bushels are being sold outside the feed mills. Now I realize that in these figures, this is the domestic consumption where there is a producer who is feeding his own grain, but Mr. Speaker, if we have to legislate, if we have to legislate that closely for all the farmers to tie them down that closely, because 37 bushels out of 642 million bushels is being sold, I don't think that there is any merit to this. I certainly don't.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point that I would like to make here which I think was exaggerated and my figures are worth no more and no less than my honourable friend from Brokenhead, when he says on page 721: "Mr. Speaker, many fertilizer dealers today in my own area have outstanding accounts over 100,000 from last year's operations." And then he continues. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought this was very high and I phoned one of my friends who is in the credit department of one of the major fertilizer distributors and he gave me these figures out of 52 agents, Mr. Speaker - out of 52 agents - and here are the four top big amounts: 58,000, 54,000, 38,000, 34,000, and all others were under \$11,000. Now I'm not saying that this is the picture for all Manitoba but this is the report from 52 agents. Now again, as I say I realize that this is a bad year and all that, but let's not exaggerate it, Mr. Speaker.

So in concluding, Mr. Speaker, I think that we do not - as I said before - we do not want to pass legislation on the basis of an extraordinary year, we want to do what's good for the farming industry. However, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this resolution would be much more punitive than beneficial to the good farmers of this province, because let's face it, every task force, every work that is being done, experimenting on sales prescribes that we should do all we can to try and consume locally as much of our grain as we can. And I'm convinced that with this permissive legislation - and let's remember, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation as it is now does not prevent anybody from selling through the Wheat Board, just nobody, it just says that you can sell outside. But it doesn't prevent -- nobody has to sell to any feed mill, to any other farmer or anything. The legislation is there that one can sell through the Wheat Board, so actually what we're saying to these people is that we have to make the decision for them. And so, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the arguments that have been brought about by the supporters of this resolution and on the basis of my experience with the farmers of this province, I intend to vote against this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I was tempted, Mr. Speaker, to add a few words in support of my colleague the Member for La Verendrye, and I would also like to say that we at the present time, the farmers at the present time have the freedom of selling their grain wherever they wish. If they wish to sell it naturally under quota to the Wheat Board, they do; if they wish to sell it to a feed mill there is no compulsion, nobody can compel them to do that, they could do so if they wish; if they wish to sell to another farmer they may do so just as well.

I would like to say that I have no shares in any feed mill and I do not operate a feed mill, although I buy quite a lot of grain during the year on the operation of my own farm, probably as much as a small elevator will buy, and in no time in my experience so far have I paid less than 60 cents a bushel for oats. I'm not trying to take advantage and I'm not accusing any of the former members of accusing another farmer of taking advantage of this legislation, but I would like to point this out, that there is no compulsion whatsoever and I don't like this inference probably that some of the members who have spoken in favour of this resolution infer that most of our free enterprise is very unjust and probably trying to gouge the public. I would like to believe that over 99 percent of the free enterprise are just and honest and they're trying not only to look after their own affairs but at the same time trying to look after the economy of the province as a whole or the industry in which they are engaged. Of what use would an industry,

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) or how could an industry flourish, an industry like the feed mills, if they kill the incentive to produce, or kill the incentive of the farmer to produce if they gouge them or they charge excessive prices for their feeds. These people will go out of production and therefore there will be no necessity to have these feed mills in that area. I do not think that attacks that have been so far made on some of our free enterprise have been justified, unless it is just to prove that free enterprise is outdated, and I completely disagree with that.

Now the farmers, probably through their organizations and there are different organizations - the Farm Bureau, the Farm Union - they could make some kind of an agreement with some of those feed mills. They could meet them, or these farm organizations can instruct the farmers not to sell at a price which would be at a disadvantage to them. We have these organizations. So I think that the farmers have the organizations to turn to, but in a year like this when there is an over-abundance of grain, and especially some of the poor grain, I don't think that we should have the restrictions or ask the provincial government to request Ottawa to make further restrictions. Why? Because if they were compelled, if our feed mills were compelled to buy all their grain, feed grain or the grain that they use, the cereal grains that they use in the manufacture of feed, in many instances it may be too high, the price may be too high and they may be compelled, as has happened in the past, to buy grains produced in other countries, as has recently happened with corn out east. It also happened here in Manitoba not so many years ago when we were short of feed grains. Due to the fact that it was a dry year, there was an awful lot of corn that came in to the Province of Manitoba, and I do not think that it is fair for any member in this House to paint pictures like have been painted by some of the members.

I took the trouble of enquiring through several feed companies, and then I went further than that, I went to the Chairman of the Feed Grain Committee - Manitoba Feed Manufacturers Association, and I have a few facts here that he had given me. Comparison of prices that the feed mills are charging, not on all the products because they've got many products, but I've picked out a few and I'll give you a few here. In 1967 - it's March, in both instances it was March - in 1967 we had the laying feed at that time was priced at \$76.00 a ton; in 1969 - that's this last March - the same feed was \$69.00 a ton; that's a reduction of \$7.00 per ton. That's the complete feed. Hog finisher - probably the member who has just spoken from LaVerendrye is more acquainted with that - but in 1967 the hog finisher was \$66.00 a ton, presently it is \$56.00 a ton - same day in March - that's a reduction of \$10.00 a ton. Turkey finisher was \$75.00 a ton in 1967; in 1969 it's \$67.00; a reduction of \$8.00 a ton. So there is a reduction.

Now to be fair, there is a comparison of what the feed mills were paying and presently are paying for wheat. In 1967 they were paying \$1.50 per bushel for wheat - that is on the farm - or \$50.00 a ton. In 1969, a poorer grade of wheat, they're paying \$1.14 - not all of them but this is on an average - \$1.14. I agree that some do pay less but for a poorer quality of grain. In fact I was offered wheat at 60 cents a bushel out in the field which I refused to take. I knew it wouldn't keep; it was wet and damp and dirty, so it's not even worth that. But \$1.14 - that's \$38.00 a ton - that means \$12.00 a ton cheaper between 1966-67 and 69. So the percentage of grain that is used in most of the feeds is from 40 to 80 percent grain and the rest is not grain, as the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye tried to point out, there are other ingredients that affect the price in that. So it isn't quite right to say that the feed manufacturers are taking undue advantage of the fact that they can buy - probably there might be the odd one who would do it, but I suggest that this odd one is not going to stay in business very long if he resorts to practices such as these - but most reputable companies will not resort to practice like that, they'll try to go along with the trade.

I have another comparison here and this goes all the way back to 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969. I'll just take one and this one would be the dairy ration. In 1965 it was \$53.00 per ton; in 1966 it went up to \$55.00 per ton; in 1967 it was up to \$59.00 a ton; 1968 - \$56.00; and 1969, down to \$48.00 a ton. So that's quite a reduction. Now most of these rations contain a high proportion of grain and it is apparent that the prices of feed do reflect the changes in prices of grain, but as I said before, not all of it is grain in the feed.

So before we vote on a resolution like this just because someone may try to stampede, I would think that we should think twice before we support it. And another was I think in my opinion we've got too many resolutions which say that we should urge this government to urge some other government to do it. I would say that we've got representatives from Ottawa here

April 8, 1969

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) who are representing the prairie provinces in Saskatchewan, in Alberta and in Manitoba, so why not write to these members, the MP's who represent the farmers and ask them to pass a resolution in Ottawa if in their opinion they deem it as necessary. They should be close enough to the people, to the producers, to the farmers in western Canada, and not only one political party, there is the Liberal MP's, the Conservative and the New Democratic, they're all there. So if they think that the farmer is suffering so badly on account of this privilege that the feed mills have to buy, why don't these MP's do something about it. They're the ones who represent the farmers; let them do it. Why should we go ahead and try to persuade - or this government persuade the federal government. The MP's are there; that's their job; they're representing. If they do it then we can go ahead and help. So I would suggest that before we vote on this we seriously think about what has been so far said regarding this resolution.

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite surprised to hear so many members discuss this resolution on the basis that it is in some respects a blow against the profit system, the free enterprise system, because as I read the resolution, Mr. Speaker, it's nothing more than a resolution which attempts to make sure that the free enterprise system results in a profit being made to the producer of the product, which is not unusual, and I don't think that anything that the Member for Ethelbert said is unusual to the system which the Member for LaVerendrye and the Member for Emerson are seeking to uphold. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, and I stand to be corrected if I'm wrong, one of the first rules of the economic philosophy of free enterprise is buy cheap and sell dear, and all that the Member for Ethelbert has said is that if a feed mill is permitted to buy cheap it will behave as a proper entrepreneur within the profit system would behave. It will buy cheap, and if an opportunity is afforded to the feed mill to obtain feed or to obtain grain at cheaper rates than could otherwise be obtained, that that opportunity will be taken. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't look upon that as an evil step of a feed mill. If the Member for LaVerendrye or the Member for Emerson sees some . . .

MR. VIELFAURE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I didn't quarrel with the philosophy of buying cheap, I just said that the figures were not realistic. That's what I said.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I distinctly thought that I heard the Member for LaVerendrye say that no feed mill would take advantage of a very low price, and all I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that if I were a feed mill - and here I will make a confession, and if the Member for Emerson wishes to criticize me for doing so, let him do so - if I were a feed mill and if I was offered grain by one farmer at 30 cents a bushel and by another farmer at 25 cents a bushel, and given it was the same grain, I believe that I would behave in the true tradition of the free enterprise system by buying the 25 cent grain and I don't think that I should be strongly criticized for so doing. I would be behaving in the best tradition of everything that the members, or many members in this House consider to be the highest principle of free enterprise, and I don't think that we could criticize nor do I think that the Member for Ethelbert criticized the feed mills for so behaving. All he indicated is that this is what was happening, and Mr. Speaker, if it weren't happening, why would anybody wish for the elimination of the regulation which prevented them from doing that. In - 1961 is it? - in 1960 when the Member for Morris told us that the regulation was done away with, it was done away with in order to enable feed mills to buy grain at a cheaper rate - and I want to be careful about this because the rate that they permitted to buy was not in itself regulated, merely the quota was regulated - but nevertheless, the regulation of the quota itself in the long run affects the price and this enabled them to obtain a cheaper rate by opening the quota system which otherwise would have, artificially if you like, kept the rate higher. And therefore they asked for the . . .

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question at this point.

MR. GREEN: Certainly.

MR. JORGENSON: He raised the question of prices. Would he not agree that if a farmer has an opportunity for example to sell to the Canadian Wheat Board and get the maximum price that's available to him under the Board alternately to sell to the feed mill, would you not agree that he had a choice and that he was not compelled to take a lower price. It would only be a matter of judgment on his part that because of the necessity of building additional storage or something like that he would sell it at a lower price, not because he was compelled to.

MR. GREEN: I quite agree with the Member for Morris that the farmer who would take a lower price as against a higher price would do so because he saw an advantage at that point of taking the lower price, and I also agree with what the Member for Ethelbert Plains said, that a farmer who is desperate will see an advantage in taking the lower price, and every single economic grouping operates the same way. There are all these trade unionists who say that we should not work unless we receive a higher price, and there are a few people who are desperate who say that we should now take a lower price. There are always other groups in society who feel that they can only stay in business on a certain day if they run a sale which in the long run is going to break them, and we have seen discount houses go broke on the basis that they had to sell at the moment for a lower price. So when you talk about compulsion, I would say that the elements of compulsion are much more subtle than the mere compulsion of a regulation. The onus of compulsion can be economic, and what the Member for Ethelbert has said and what I have seen in other areas than in agriculture, is that many people will desperately

(MR. GREEN cont'd) sell something at a price which they shouldn't if they had any other choice, but will sell it because they stand in desperate circumstances. We've seen auction sales of very expensive merchandise being sold in order to satisfy judgment.

MR. JORGENSEN: Another question. A point was raised by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that out of the total of 37 million bushels that were processed through the feed mills - I think that was the figure that was quoted, there were 37 million bushels that were being sold through the feed mill compared to a total of some 600 million bushels that are sold on a farmer to farmer basis - what impact would that 37 million bushels have in the light of the total volume of grain that is moving between farmer and farmer?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, every single person who is going to cheat a little on price says that my little bit of cheating is not going to affect the total results. I remember we had a case with the International Nickel Company of Canada where the workers, certain workers had agreed that instead of taking their vacation they would work their vacation --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I realize that. Order please. I have given the honourable gentleman ample opportunity. Only moments ago he was talking about trade unionism which is privileged, but he is leaving the debate that's under review. I hesitate to interrupt him, but I have waited and waited, and now he's taking us into the mining field.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I assure you I am sticking to. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Inkster has the floor.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I will stay with the question of price, and the reason that I am using the price of another commodity is that somehow some people can only understand the question of price when we are dealing with it in matters of every day terms to themselves. So some members in the House, including, Mr. Speaker, myself, are not fully cognizant with the price of wheat, oats and barley, but I know that the price of labour is maintained in the same way and I wanted to indicate to the Honourable Member for Morris who said that this little bit of cheating is not going to affect the overall price, a similar situation.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member is putting words into my mouth that I never uttered. I did not say that's because of that little bit of cheating. I did not even imply that and I want the honourable member to withdraw that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member -- it is correct, I withdraw, as a reference that he says that it was made for him. In my view this is the type of thinking that induces a man to reduce his price on the basis that it's not going to affect the over-all, and I was trying to indicate an example of a group of workers in Thompson who decided that instead of taking their vacation wages they would work for those two weeks and take the wages in addition. In other words, they would work the full 52 weeks and get 54 weeks' pay. They would work 52 weeks, they would work throughout their vacation and they would take two weeks' vacation pay in addition, and they would work therefore - if we calculate that - that's 54 weeks' pay for 52 weeks of work instead of 50 weeks of work for 52 weeks' pay, and they said we're making the same wages. But, Mr. Speaker, they're not making the same wages, and by offering that kind of competition, they are very infinitesimally but nevertheless profoundly, affecting the wage rates of every other employee in the plant. And the same thing is true of the people who say that by selling 35 million bushels of grain to the feed mills we're not affecting the over-all situation. Someone describes it in a brief that I read, I believe it's the Minister's own words or perhaps -- not the Minister's, the member for Morris, maybe he will be a Minister soon -- but nevertheless, this is like putting a tiny hole at the bottom of a bucket; it's a tiny little hole, but, Mr. Speaker, it affects the entire orderly process of marketing and this is what the Member for Ethelbert Plains and the Member for Brokenhead were trying to say.

But, Mr. Speaker, that's not the real reason that I got up to speak on the subject. I was somewhat detracted by the remarks that somehow the resolution was a blow against the free enterprise system. I don't agree, I think that it really represents the need to provide for orderly marketing in order to make this system work properly, and I have no criticism whatsoever - and I want to make it clear to both members who preceded me - I have no criticism whatsoever against a feed mill that will buy at the cheapest rate available. I criticize only those farmers who don't see it in their interest to protect the price so that the feed mill will not get the cheapest rate, that they will have to pay a fair rate, and that the only way we can assure that there will be a fair rate is to gather the entire commodity on the basis of quotas, on the basis of quotas of producers, and then sell it for the price that is obtainable by reason of orderly

(MR. GREEN cont'd) marketing. That's all the two members suggested; they didn't criticize the feed mills.

The reason that I got up to speak is that the Member for Morris spoke the other day, and I must say that in this area I certainly have to admit that I don't know the subject matter as well as I would like to and the Member for Morris certainly does know the subject matter, but he raised certain questions and spoke in certain terms which, Mr. Speaker, caused me frankly to want to examine what was being said by the Member for Ethelbert and the Member for Brokenhead, because he referred, Mr. Speaker, to the fact of this being a silly resolution. He said that it was a silly resolution, and I know the Member for Ethelbert Plains generally. . . .

MR. JORGENSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not say it was a silly resolution, I said it was a stupid resolution.

MR. GREEN: All right. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend wishes to challenge what I am saying, I would suggest that he go back and read his speech and not verify and then properly correct the House, that he used the words "silly resolution" - yes, he used the words "silly resolution". He now adds the words "stupid resolution". That's fine, that gives me another reason for speaking, Mr. Speaker. I know that the Member for Ethelbert may have different ideas than the Member for Morris, but I know that he doesn't have silly or stupid ideas. I know that the Member for Brokenhead may have different ideas than the Member for Morris, and I wouldn't refer to the Member for Morris' ideas as being silly or stupid. They are different, I disagree with them, but they are not silly or stupid, and I want to examine whether members on our side said anything that can be properly classified as silly or stupid.

He also said, Mr. Speaker, that to pass this resolution would be the height of folly, and certainly the members on our side have never trapped our group into falling into or leaping at the height of folly before, and therefore it was necessary to examine his remarks to make sure that indeed we were not embarking on something which is the height of folly. And then certainly and possibly, Mr. Speaker, most important from many points of view, the Member for Morris said that the farmers don't want this resolution, and this would indeed be a problem if the Member for Ethelbert and the Member for Brokenhead were to be urging something on behalf of their constituents which their constituents themselves don't want. And it's on that basis, Mr. Speaker, that I decided to examine what my honourable friend said and to attempt to deal with it, with what I admit is my limited knowledge of the subject itself, but nevertheless to deal with whether he had presented an argument which could convince somebody that something was silly, stupid, the height of folly and not wanted by the constituents of the two members who advanced it.

Well, why is it silly, Mr. Speaker? What does the Member for Morris say? He said it was silly because you don't need legislation at all, that this is a regulation that can be passed, can be amended, can be enacted, can be repealed, can be changed by the Canadian Wheat Board itself, and although he didn't say it, Mr. Speaker, he would have the House adopt the notion that it was the Wheat Board and no policy of the government which was involved in the change of this resolution. It's true the House of Commons had a committee, it's true the Member for Morris agreed with what they were doing and he was in a position of some authority, and I think that it's naive for anybody in this House to believe that the Wheat Board would do either of two things: one, that they would change the regulation, if the Treasury Bench of the then administration did not want them to do it that they would change it - this is what my honourable friend is leading us to believe; or secondly, that they wouldn't change it if the administration wanted them to change it. So it was on this basis that he said it was a silly resolution, that it doesn't require legislation.

But, Mr. Speaker, because it doesn't require legislation, does he then mean to say that legislation would not do the job? Didn't we have, Mr. Speaker, exactly that type of argument in this House with regard to the right of assignment? Didn't all members, and I don't suppose the Member for Morris would call the Member for Lakeside silly or the Member for Rhineland silly, or any members on our side of the House. He didn't use that phrase when we suggested that the prohibition of assignments should be right in the legislation. It's not silly, it merely means that the Member for Ethelbert wants to have this as a matter of government policy enacted and confirmed by the Legislature and not subject to the vagaries of Orders-in-Council. And that's not silly Mr. Speaker. So let's abandon the word silly. And does the word stupid apply for the same reason? Because if the word stupid applies for the same reason, then let's

(MR. GREEN cont'd) wipe out the word stupid. I'm satisfied that on that basis, which was the argument for the Honourable Member for Morris, that the resolution is neither silly nor stupid.

The next thing he said was that this was the height of folly, and Mr. Speaker, as near as I can analyze his remarks, the reason that it's the height of folly is that it's impossible to enforce, that there is permitted traffic in grain as between farmers, and although the Member for Ethelbert says that that might be something that he would like to correct, that's not in this resolution. This resolution deals merely with the supply of grain to the feed mills, but he says that it's impossible to enforce this type of legislation. Well, Mr. Speaker, in all economic questions, the people who reject the order that is attempted to be instituted say that it's impossible to enforce. But, Mr. Speaker, will the government want to enforce an economic regulation of this kind. That argument doesn't mean a thing and has never prevented the institution of regulation which would in fact result in at least a measure of enforcement and to some extent a large measure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, suppose that someone was to say that we were going to put a line across the 50th parallel of Canada, across the 50th parallel, and that over that line we were going to restrict the sale of commodities from people who live below the line to people who live north of the line and from people who live north of the line to people who live south of the line, we were going to prevent 3,000 miles of trade as between individuals. The Member for Morris would say that it would be impossible to enforce that type of regulation, but isn't that what the government of Canada has done? But instead of doing it on the 50th parallel, they've done it on the 49th parallel, and Mr. Speaker, would anybody believe that it would not be the height of folly to suggest that you were going to have locations 20 miles apart or 30 miles apart, stretching from the east coast to the west coast, to prevent somebody from selling a package of cigarettes over the 49th parallel. It would be the height of folly, wouldn't it, applying the Member for Morris' definition? Would it not be the height of folly, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that someone could pass a law which could prevent the manufacture of spirits containing one and a half percent proof or more of alcohol and to prevent those spirits from being sold between individuals from one to the other? I mean, it would be ridiculous. Who could enforce such a regulation? Do you mean to say that you're going to have people all over Manitoba looking in people's cellars to see whether they are distilling potatoes and apples and all other kinds of commodities and making alcohol out of them? It would be the height of folly to suggest that such a regulation can be enforced, but Mr. Speaker, when you want to do it and when you say that this is necessary for one reason or another, you do it and you dismiss the folly.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the honourable member a question. My honourable friend's a lawyer, and I wonder if he would answer this question for me. How could the federal government do it when the authority for imposing legislation on farmer to farmer basis rests in the provincial authority rather than the federal. In other words, what you're asking is that the federal government do something that it has no authority to do.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, the same thing applies to every federal law. The administration of those laws are left to my friend the Attorney-General. Some of them they administer themselves, they administer the Food and Drug Act themselves, they administer the Excise Act themselves, but if they wanted to, Mr. Speaker, if they wanted to, they would go into the field and they would require whatever they required before 1960, and what we do know is that up until 1960 only five million bushels --(Interjection)-- five to ten million bushels were sold in the manner now advocated by my honourable friend, whereas in the intervening years when the regulation was lifted - and I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the lifting of the regulations must have had some effect because it was wanted - the lifting of the regulations caused 35 million bushels to be sold in this way as late as 1968.

So, Mr. Speaker, the argument about the height of folly just leaves me cold. What I find from the member's argument is that he disagrees with the member for Ethelbert Plains. He doesn't want a system of marketing which would prevent this sale and the Member for Ethelbert Plains wants it, but neither is silly, neither is stupid and neither is embarking on the height of folly.

Mr. Speaker, he said, as well, that another reason it's the height of folly is that the farmers don't need this protection. He indicated would any farmer sell grain for less than the price of production. Well, Mr. Speaker, I beg to say with deep regret that many farmers apparently have been put into this situation where they have been required to find an outlet for

(MR. GREEN cont'd) their grain, where they have been driven by desperation to undercut all their other farmers, and I can't be critical of the individual farmer who does it, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that marketing legislation always has this characteristic. It's usually opposed by two groups of people: firstly, the very big, and they oppose it because they can control the market by themselves and they don't need the joint control of all the farmers; or it's opposed by the very small people who either have units which are not enabling them to make a proper living through the sale of grain or people who are not farmers at all and sell this as a surplusage, as a moonlighting activity. Now I don't know whether that's true in the grain field but it certainly was true in the vegetable marketing field, but those are the people who oppose orderly marketing of grain; or else, Mr. Speaker, people who deem it in their interests - and I hope that this is a minority - to have an edge on the other farmer, be able to undercut their fellow producers. These are the people who oppose marketing boards and these are the people who will always oppose marketing boards, and there is nothing particular about this particular type of grain sale which is different than any other argument that the honourable member could use against opening a chink in the orderly system of marketing these products.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the last point that the honourable member made was that the farmers don't want it, and that would be indeed a grievous problem, and I would say that my honourable colleagues were embarking on some sort of folly if they actually wanted to impose a scheme that was not wanted by the farmers. But, Mr. Speaker, I have a brief here from the National Farmers Union. . It must be an organization of some repute, the Honourable Member for Morris was a provincial director of that organization for four or five years. I don't think that he would say that --(Interjection)-- he was the vice president. So he thought it was --(Interjection)-- he wasn't the vice president. Well at least, Mr. Speaker, he thought it was a sufficiently eminent organization so that he would lend his name, his good name, to the Board of Directors of that organization. And this is not an old submission, this is National Farmers Union, Memorandum to the Canadian Wheat Board on the subject of feed grain sales to feed mills, dated Oct. 17, 1968. I assume these are farmers; I assume that they speak for some farmers; I assume, Mr. Speaker, that if the Member for Morris was distinguished enough to serve on its Board of Directors, that it would speak for many farmers.

And what do they want, Mr. Speaker? They want the resolution that has been moved by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert which the Honourable Member for Morris says is stupid, silly, embarking on the height of folly and the farmers don't want it. And what do they say about it? They say, Mr. Speaker - and I want to quote from this brief on Page 6 - "It is clear that the exemption of feed mills has lost to the Board's market approximately 150 bushels of wheat, oats and barley over the past eight years. To the extent that this grain has entered the market at less than true value, grain producers, many of whom have sold to mills because of pressing financial need, will have lost several million dollars in revenue. To the extent that this grain has entered a market without regard to the quota system to assure equality of opportunity for delivery, thousands of producers have grain on their farms today that might have been marketed had orderly marketing existed for feed mill sales. This, in turn, has meant loss of income opportunity. To the extent that grain sold to feed mills is purchased at less than proportionate prices asked by your Board in other domestic or world markets, the bargaining power and authority of the Board is undermined." Those are the words that are used in the resolution. "To the extent that a cheap food policy militates against competitive position on the livestock market of grain producers who also grow livestock, the effect of continuing the present feed mill policy contributes to a growing corporate control in the production and marketing of livestock. To the extent that the present feed mill policy is a violation of the principles of orderly marketing, further violations to the orderly marketing system are a natural result. We therefore once again request your Board to rescind instructions to the trade nos. 41 and 43 of 1960-61 and resume full responsibility in the marketing of western wheat, oats and barley without further delay." Now is my honourable friend the Member for Morris saying that the National Farmers Union is stupid, silly, embarking on the height of folly and doesn't speak for the farmers of the Province of Manitoba, because this is what he says about the speech made by the Member for Ethelbert Plains.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was impressed by the position that was put by the Honourable Member for Morris. To me, it represented a clear articulate argument against orderly marketing of grain, and I think that there are substantial arguments to be formulated against the resolution that was put, but they really represent a difference of opinion. They

April 8, 1969

(MR. GREEN cont'd) are not in any way -- I wouldn't refer to the member's arguments as stupid; I wouldn't refer to the member's arguments as silly; I wouldn't even have said in 1960, if I had known about the problems, that the Wheat Board was embarking on a program which was the height of folly. I would say which was the truth, that the present administration had less belief in the orderly marketing of the products as they affect the feed mills than had the previous administration. It's a question of your opinion, and I submit that that's all it is.

So, Mr. Speaker, I speak today merely to renew my expressions of confidence in the two members who have pursued this resolution to date. I don't say that they are more wise or more all-knowing than the Member for Morris. All I indicate is that their opinion as to how a price for a product should be insured to the producer of that product is more consistent with mine than is the reasonable and articulate opinion which was expressed by the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker will the Member for Inkster answer a question? I would like to know -- he stated the National Farmers Union requested this. I would like to know if he knew what the Canadian Federation of Agriculture requested in this matter?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, knowing something about the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and not knowing their specific requests, but knowing something of the organization, I would presume that they didn't request this. They believe less in orderly marketing than does the National Farmers Union, but I wouldn't call the Canadian Federation of Agriculture stupid and I wouldn't call them silly, I'd just say they represent one body of opinion which I happen to disagree with.

MR. GRAHAM: I would also like to ask a supplementary question of the Member for Inkster, and I would ask him which of these two bodies represents the larger numbers of the farmers of Canada.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture is so structured corporately that it can claim to represent all of the farmers. It claims, Mr. Speaker, that it represents everybody who belongs to the co-operatives, everybody who belongs to an Agricultural Society, but when they were challenged, Mr. Speaker, to go out and get an individual membership, then the Member for Birtle-Russell well knows that they would not pick up that challenge because they knew that they would not get the farmers to support that organization.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at length on the resolution before us. However, I would like to state my views on the matter in order, when I vote on the motion later on, so that members will know where I stand.

The way I read the resolution, it has two main points and these are brought out in the "Whereas" part. One is the undermining of the Wheat Board quota system and the other has to do with the price of grain. I have always taken the stand and view that organizations such as the Wheat Board, and probably other co-operatives, can be used to advantage by the farmer. I don't subscribe to a loyalty to these organizations. I would like to differentiate here because I see these organizations as a tool that the farmer can use to advantage, and if he can gain by it, let him use it; if not, leave it. I think it's no other than any other asset that the farmer might own. Certainly he'll have equipment that he can use. He will have a cultivator, he'll have a discer, and if the discer suits the purpose better he'll use that equipment. If he finds the other implements will do a better job he'll use that piece of equipment. This is the way I consider these organizations, these set-ups. If you can use them to advantage, use them, but I don't subscribe to the idea that these institutions should be set up to dictate to the people of this province and to the people in Canada as such.

After all, the farmer is paying the total shot of the operations of the Wheat Board, therefore let him use it to advantage. We know that away back in 1936-37, I think it was, this was a few years after the Canadian Wheat Board was set up, that the farmer was given a choice at that time whether he wanted to use the services of that Board or not. And what happened? He did exactly that, when he was better off by using it he would use it, and if it was the other way around he would not, and I feel this was the way it should be. The Wheat Board should not be a master which would be dictating, because if it does, this means restrictions and controls imposed by this super body, and this is what we find today, that the farmers are restricted in

(MR. FROESE cont'd) delivering their grain. They are restricted in the amount of grain they can sell as a result of the quota system, and as I pointed out earlier, these are one of the lowest on record this year. This is why farmers are in the squeeze and this is why the farmers resort to this practice of selling outside the Canadian Wheat Board even if they have to accept the lower price. The important thing is that we keep the grain moving, that farmers will be able to sell. We know of certain firms here in the city that are purchasing a lot of feed grain at the present time, and while some might not agree with it, others certainly do and they do sell and ship to these people.

The other item is prices, and here again if you can hold out for a better price this might be well and good, but I take the stand that the farmers today cannot hold out much longer for better prices, that we will have to accept what is offered in order to be able to get rid of some of the surplus. And when you take into consideration the amounts that the farmer pays on freight charges and on overhead of the Wheat Board, these prices might not be so unrealistic at all, as was pointed out by the Member for La Verendrye, that they are not so much out of line if you take these things into consideration.

The Member for Inkster quoted from a report which gave the line of a true value - less than a true value. Is this really less than the true value if you deduct the freight charges, if you deduct the overhead of the Wheat Board, take into consideration probably high moisture content and that you would have to dry this grain and cause a lot of expenses that way. I don't think some of these prices are so unrealistic at that time and that they could mean the real true value.

So that, Mr. Speaker, I more or less take it that the resolution that is before us represents the philosophy of the New Democratic Party rather than what the farmers in this province would like to accept. We know their philosophy is one of controller production and that this be centralized, and this is exactly what this resolution would do. It would centralize the control of marketing and this is what the Wheat Board has done for these many years when they were given exclusive powers. I personally do not subscribe to that philosophy nor do I agree with the resolution.

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member permit a question? Is he proposing that the Wheat Board be eliminated as well?

MR. FROESE: I don't think that's what the resolution proposes. Let him put forward a motion like that and I'll give him my views.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I have the feeling that with the excellent treatment that resolution has already received that there isn't very much that I can add to it. I would think the points of view from the proposing side have been quite well stated. I have the feeling that we would have been deprived of the excellent speech of the Honourable Member for Inkster, who is rapidly developing into an outstanding authority on matters agricultural, if it had not been for the Honourable Member for Morris using a particular word to which my honourable friend objects. He seemed to find very very little to argue with in the content of my honourable friend from Morris' speech, but because my honourable friend from Morris was so ill-advised as to use a word that is not really a very strong one as we sometimes use words in this Chamber, he developed a very telling argument of his own and apparently convinced himself that the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains and the Honourable Member for Brokenhead did in fact represent the farmers of their constituencies.

I am inclined to doubt this. I shall avoid referring to my honourable friend's argument as either stupid or silly so as to try to not incur his wrath in that regard, but I think he overlooked some of the factors in the present situation that are rather important. They have been so well stated by the Honourable Member for Morris and the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, who I thought gave a most practical and logical speech on this matter, that I am not going to take much time to develop the argument. Maybe you would allow me, Mr. Speaker, maybe you would indulge me to the extent that I could review a little bit of the history of this rather contentious question.

It isn't so long ago that there was quite a controversy and people held very very definite views as to whether coarse grains should be marketed through the Wheat Board, and the farm organizations, I think being unanimous on this occasion, took a stand generally in favour of coarse grains being placed under the Wheat Board. Up until that time they had not been so handled, and there was a very interesting correspondence in those days, Mr. Speaker, between

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) the then Minister of Trade and Commerce in the Government at Ottawa, the Right Honourable C. D. Howe, and the then Premier of this province, because Mr. Howe told the Premier of our province, Mr. Garson, that complementary legislation by the province was necessary in order to implement this program that the Federal Government had decided upon. The Federal Government, conferring as it did so with the governments of the three prairie provinces, proceeded to pass the legislation providing for coarse grains to be marketed compulsorily through the Wheat Board if the provinces passed complementary legislation. And Mr. Garson argued strenuously and at length that that complementary legislation was unnecessary. Mr. Howe used to write little letters, about that long, saying that they were needed. Mr. Garson replied in letters, at least that long, and in my opinion Mr. Garson won every argument, bar none. He didn't fail to make his point. In my opinion he was right, but Mr. Howe won the war because he simply said, "The legislation is on the Statute Books of Canada. If Manitoba wants to avail itself of it our legislation requires that complementary legislation shall be passed."

Well, about this time Mr. Garson was translated -- by the way, Mr. Garson used to keep in touch with Mr. Manning and Mr. Douglas and they left it pretty well to him to carry the ball on this correspondence -- but eventually my recollection is, and I'm speaking only from memory, that Saskatchewan passed the Act almost immediately, Alberta a little while after, and about this time Mr. Garson was translated to the Ottawa political field and a fellow who wasn't anything like as competent to argue these questions with the federal people came into office here, and we thought that the best thing to do was try and survey the situation as far as the farmers were concerned, and we got in touch with the various farm organizations. Our judgment was that the vast majority of the farmers who were growing coarse grains, preferred to have those grains handled by the Canadian Wheat Board, and we accordingly passed -- I think it was in the 1949 Session -- the required complementary legislation.

But we did another thing, Mr. Speaker, that I have always thought was rather intelligent -- probably an accident -- but I still think, and anything that twenty years after you can still regard as being pretty intelligent I think is fairly unique in governmental circles -- and here's what we did. We gave the farmers two years, two years, two years of operation under the Canadian Wheat Board, with coarse grains under the Wheat Board, and then we held a referendum -- actually a plebiscite rather than a referendum -- on the question of whether they wished that program continued or not. And do you know what the result was, Mr. Speaker? The result was the biggest vote in favour that there has ever been of anything that's been held in the Province of Manitoba. The vote was simply overwhelmingly in favour. My recollection is that it was something in the neighbourhood of 90 percent of the farmers voting, voted in favour of continuing under the Canadian Wheat Board. So that I thought that the action that had been taken a couple of years earlier was justified.

Well, things went on from there and the Honourable Member for Morris has given you a history of what happened insofar as the Federal Government was concerned later on. And I find myself in considerable agreement with the position that the Honourable Member for Morris has taken. I must say that at that time, bearing in mind the questions that had exercised our minds years ago with regard to the constitutionality of the situation, that I thought that perhaps this was not a very good move. Mr. Speaker, I have in that case, as I have in a few others, changed my mind. I think it was a good move at the time. I think in general that it has found favour with the farmers. I do not think it has done the damage that a lot of my honourable friends think that it has. And particularly I have the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that right now when the marketing situation is so difficult, that it would be the wrong time to urge anyone to close off any avenues of getting their grain on the market.

So I am not in support of this resolution. I recognize the fact that my honourable friend who has introduced it and those who have spoken in favour of it hold their views just as sincerely as the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and the Honourable Member for Morris. Myself and others hold ours. This is a matter on which you can have a very different point of view, and I am . . . to admit, Mr. Speaker, that it's a matter on which I have changed my point of view because it seems to me that in practice it has not had the disadvantages that some of us foresaw at the time that it was introduced. But even admitting that some of the arguments that have been advanced are at least theoretically correct, and I don't think in practice they amount to a great deal, even admitting that, I repeat that the marketing situation being so tight now, I think it would be ill advised for this Chamber to recommend to the Federal

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) Government that they close off, to even any small extent, this market which does exist.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Member for Lakeside permit a question? Where in the resolution does it suggest that any market be closed off? And subsequent: does the honourable member not realize that it's really a situation whereby the market is improved for those that opt out of selling through the Wheat Board in favour, or as opposed to those that are in? It's a transfer of market.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is asking me where I see in the resolution where any market is closed off, then either he or I is not understanding the resolution very well because surely, surely he recognizes that if you force all the coarse grains to go through the Canadian Wheat Board that you are to that extent closing off a market, a direct market or direct access to the market.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Does the honourable member not recognize that the same volume of feed grains are still required and will be purchased from the Wheat Board?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, of course I recognize this, but I also recognize that the administrative and other processes incurred in putting the grain through the Wheat Board is in itself a closing off of the market. It slows up the transaction; it relieves the direct area of dealing between the farmer and the feed mill. Now my honourable friend thinks that some farmers are taken advantage of. Well, in the odd case this may happen. But in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the benefits of the present system outweigh the disadvantages, real or imagined.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be appropriate at this time for me to make a few comments . . . that you heard this afternoon trying to obstruct the passing of this proposed resolution of mine. However, before I go into the context, I would like to assure my honourable friend the Member for Morris that when some ten days ago or whatever it was when he had the privilege of speaking to this resolution, I had to leave a little before he was all finished and he had mentioned in his remarks that I perhaps did it deliberately. I want to have my honourable friend rest assured that that was not the situation as he will probably witness in the future that it is an accepted practice for me on Fridays to depart slightly before the 5:30 hour. However, as a matter of fact, I had prolonged my stay to take in some of the entertainment that was forthcoming from the seat of the Honourable Member for Morris. I'll have more to say on that matter in due course.

However, perhaps I will start with the last speaker first and go in reverse procedure. I would like to make comment on the fact that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has so ably reviewed the happenings or the events that took place in the past that brought about the coarse grains under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, and I was happy that he made reference to the fact that there had been a referendum held. I know I was just a small fellow, maybe seven or eight years old at that time, recalling very vividly that all the farmers from our own particular area made it a point to go out and cast their ballot in this plebiscite, and I also recall it was an overwhelming majority that carried -- or the referendum was carried with an overwhelming majority, and I would just suggest to my honourable friend from Lakeside, would he not think it appropriate now to also vote a referendum to get the feelings of the farmer the same as it was a few years ago when the coarse grains were put under the jurisdiction? The Honourable Member for Rhineland, he had made numerous requests that referendums be held on various other issues, so I'm sure that in this respect too he would also be in favour of having the referendum or plebiscite held to get the true feelings of the farmers or the grain producers of this province, and Western Canada for that matter. I would submit at this time, Mr. Speaker, that if there was a referendum to be held at this time I would suggest that perhaps 70 to 75 percent of the votes cast would be in favour of having the exemption lifted and the coarse grains placed under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board.

I want to make a few comments on the Honourable Member from Emerson. He made it his point to stress the fact that freedom of selling feed grains was something to be enjoyed, and he went on to make a great speech in favour of free enterprise. However, I would just like to pose this question to him, that if I recall correctly a few months ago he was one of the strongest advocates to advocate the institution of a turkey marketing board to provide orderly

April 8, 1969

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd) marketing for turkeys. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this perhaps would be appropriately to have coarse grains also put under an orderly marketing system or back under the Wheat Board jurisdiction. He also said we should not stampede into making a rapid decision on this matter, and he also made reference to the fact that perhaps our federal representatives can look after this matter for us.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House now that it is not only the coarse grain producers of western Canada that are asking for it; it is not only the Manitoba and the National Farmers Union representatives who are asking that the exemption be lifted, but we have some non-Socialists, the people who prepared the report of the Commission on Targets for Economic Development making a similar recommendation, and I would like to read into the record their view on this subject matter, Mr. Speaker. And I quote from page 167. Perhaps I should read an introductory paragraph so I wouldn't take the whole thing out of context. Under the heading of Feed Grain Pricing: "A major issue for the feed industry is the matter of free sales to licensed feed mill operators versus Canadian Wheat Board control of all sales of grain. This issue has taken on strong emotional overtones but it is one which needs rational examination if Manitoba is to develop its feed and livestock industries. Even if all sales of grain were to revert back to controls by the Wheat Board, there is no apparent reason why the Wheat Board is compelled to maintain one price for feed grains across the country. In other words, the price flexibility that is usually associated with free sales could still be maintained if the Wheat Board adopted a policy of selective pricing."

And the second paragraph says: "It is recommended that the Manitoba Government, supported by Manitoba agriculture and business organizations, make representations to the Federal Government on this issue. At the same time, a request should be made for the repeal of the Free Feed Freight Assistance Act which places the Manitoba livestock industry at a competitive disadvantage and militates against its expansion."

Mr. Speaker, it is not only the farmers of this province, it is not only the farmers of western Canada who have been crying for a good number of years to have this exemption lifted and place the coarse grains under the jurisdiction, but now we have an independent commission making a similar recommendation as a result of their findings throughout western Canada. There is also a clipping in the paper the other day, in the Free Press dated April 2, 1969: "The National Farmers Union has invited A. J. Olson, Federal Minister of Agriculture, Otto Lang, Member of Parliament for Saskatoon-Humboldt and Jean Luc Pepin, Minister of Trade and Industry, to a farm rally here April 10th." "Here" refers to Saskatoon. "Doug McFarlane, Saskatchewan Minister of Agriculture, has also been invited. The union will present a brief on sales of feed grain outside Canadian Wheat Board regulations, a news release said. 'We certainly intend to halt this trend to ruining this feed grain marketing,' said the National Farmers Union President, Roy Atchison." So we are exactly embarking upon that suggestion, and it was made by the Member for Emerson, whereby our federal representatives will have an opportunity to study this question more closely when they tour Western Canada this week.

There were a few statements made by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye which I think perhaps need comment on. One of the facts -- I think he did it unintentionally -- was the fact when he mentioned there was some 635,000,000 bushels of feed grain consumed domestically last year. I think the reference was made to the Western Canada area, not Manitoba. The 37 or 36 million bushels makes reference to the Manitoba area alone. So perhaps for the record that should be put straight.

Although he acknowledges the fact that there is not much money in farming he seems to think that everything is fine. He made a great point to impress upon this House that there are no such --(Interjection)-- well, that's not the right term either -- that there are no purchases of feed grains in the southeastern portion of the province to the tune of 25 cents per bushel for oats. Well Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear I never referred to the southeastern portion. I was referring to the west and central area of Manitoba, and on numerous occasions farmers have brought this to my attention that this was the case, and since then, Mr. Speaker, since I introduced this resolution, I had a phone call at home last weekend. A fellow neighbour of mine informed me that last fall he had some excess barley he wanted to get cleaned out of his bins and had informed the feed mills to come and purchase it. In the meantime, before the representative had appeared at the neighbour's yard we had a killing frost in that area, as you are probably well aware, and when the feed mill representative arrived in

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd) the yard he looked at this barley, this barley which was two year old, and says, "You know, Mr. Farmer, it's slightly frozen." Well, needless to say, it wasn't very long before this honourable man was just making tracks off his yard. It's just another example, Mr. Speaker, of how the feed mills will take advantage of a farmer who is in a position where he needs extra space for storage of his future crops, or is in a position whereby the finance company has a payment coming and he is forced to sell his grain at a somewhat low price.

My honourable friend from La Verendrye dwelt on that and I would just like to inform him that in both my constituency as well as the constituency of Roblin, as I am very well aware of, there have been repossessions of farm machinery taking place last fall. In my own particular constituency there was a combine repossessed because the fellow was default in payment. In the Grandview area it was a new tractor that was repossessed by a machine company, and if that isn't a good indication of what is happening, I wonder what else is.

Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps a few remarks would be in order with respect to the presentation made by my honourable friend for Morris. I can vividly recall, Mr. Speaker, that back in 1956 or '57 my honourable friend appeared at the Elk's Hall in Dauphin and at that time the egg industry in Manitoba was in a great dilemma. They were shipping eggs from the Winnipeg area into Saskatchewan and from Saskatchewan back into Manitoba. And my friend on the platform that day put on a terrific show before the farmers of that area. He said if there was anything needed in Manitoba at that time it was an orderly marketing system, a national marketing board, and my friend, if you will recall, got elected on that left wing platform a year later, and this government got elected into office on the coattails of John Diefenbaker; and what happened when he gets into power? Instead of instituting these long-advocated national marketing boards, he goes into the office with the greatest majority that's ever been enjoyed by any government in this country, 208. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I respectfully suggest to the honourable gentleman to contain himself if he will and . . .

MR. KAWCHUK: I will try my utmost.

MR. JORGENSON: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I wonder if your limited knowledge of the subject of agriculture has prevented you from following the refinements of this argument.

MR. KAWCHUK: Would the honourable member repeat the remark. I didn't get the last part.

MR. CHERNIACK: He says the Speaker doesn't know what you're talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I want to assure the Honourable Member for St. John's that I am paying particular attention. The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . that was said over there.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, well I didn't hear it or he'd have got the same answer.

MR. KAWCHUK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think my remarks have complete relevance to what I was going to say in the future because of the fact that my honourable friend, he was all for the orderly marketing of farm produce and especially the establishment of national marketing boards, and I think that that is directly parallel to the marketing board grains under the orderly system, namely the Canadian Wheat Board.

However, I will make some remarks on his comments here as they appear on page 644 of Hansard dated March 21st, and in the first place he goes on, or he starts off by saying: "In listening to the member for Ethelbert Plains last week when he introduced this resolution I was hoping that he would produce some evidence that the regulation of the board which was passed in 1960 has proved to be detrimental to the producers and consumers of feed grain alike."

Well Mr. Speaker, I endeavored to do the utmost to indicate to my honourable friend how detrimental it was to the producers, grain producers of this province, and western Canada for that matter. However, he didn't seem to get the message. He goes further to say: "However, during the course of his remarks, I could not help but come to the conclusion that he could produce no such evidence to substantiate the purpose of his resolution, nor did he get many of the facts that he said he was going to put on the record straight." Well Mr. Speaker, after reading his remarks which consisted of some two and a half pages I fail to see where he put up such an effective argument for having the feed mills exempted. However, he did walk into a few traps and that's what I would like to dwell on at this time.

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd)

He goes on further to say: "And it was the Canadian Wheat Board itself that changed the regulations following a very thorough examination of the entire problem by a committee of the House of Commons; and during the course of the committee hearings, organizations from across Canada interested in the grain trade submitted evidence and answered questions on this very important subject matter." And Mr. Speaker, he very deliberately had left out the representation made by the grain growers themselves or the grain producers of western Canada, and I would just like to ask him: what was the reaction of the grain producers of western Canada? I had made the remark that the announcement was made in the Marlborough Hotel and he quickly came to the rescue, and said, "Oh no, it wasn't made in the Marlborough Hotel. I made it in the House of Commons." And as a result of that announcement, Mr. Speaker, there was a mass protest meeting called in the Marlborough Hotel protesting this exemption or proposed exemption at that time, and that was the time when I said that the farmers of western Canada were promised that this would be a temporary exemption and that the exemption would be lifted in due course.

That reminds me of a little incident that took place in the by-election campaign. With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, we're just about ending the day here anyway so a little humour wouldn't hurt. As I was campaigning in Churchill, having a cup of coffee at the Plaza, a gentleman came up to another party candidate across the aisle. They were enjoying a few remarks, and this candidate asked the constituent, - he says, "Have you committed yourself for the 20th by-election?" And this fellow says, "Yes, I have." And he says, "Was it for me?" And he says, "Well, I'm afraid not." Well the candidate kind of scratched his head and he says, "Well, you know, it is customary for us to promise our support to one candidate and vote for another." The constituent kind of scratched his head and laughed, and he says, "Under those terms of reference you have my promise." And that was exactly precisely what happened at the mass meeting at the Marlborough Hotel in 1960. There was a promise made that was never fulfilled.

He goes on to suggest: "Now surely he doesn't mean to suggest that the farmers are so incompetent and so hopelessly inept in the management of their affairs that they don't know what it is costing them to feed their livestock or what they are selling their product for. I am sure that any farmer who was to take into consideration the costs that are involved in preparing feed would soon stop buying grain or soon stop buying his feed from a feed mill if he thought he was being bilked." Well, Mr. Speaker, I never made reference of that nature whatsoever. And then he goes on in his remarks to indicate to this House that there was no problem as far as cash was concerned. As a matter of fact he tried to infer that the farmer, all he had to do was go to the bank and would be advanced all the cash he probably wanted, until it was brought to his attention that there was an interest rate charged by the bank, and being an assistant to the former Minister of Agriculture I believe that was a statement that left a lot to be desired of my honourable friend the Honourable Member for Morris. And as was said this afternoon by my honourable colleague from Inkster, that he'll probably become the Minister. Well, heaven help this province if he should.

And then he goes on: "Well I might point out to him that in the election of 1962 we won every rural seat in Manitoba, all but one in Saskatchewan and all but two in Alberta, and if that's what he calls losing heavily at the polls, we are happy to lose like that." Mr. Speaker, I never indicated that the Conservatives lost in western Canada, they lost seats in Ontario, and the reason for that is because of the fact that when the exemption took place in western Canada it had . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I haven't extended sufficient privileges to the gentleman thus far without getting into an election campaign at this particular time. Could we not deal with this? I realize the heat under which the honourable gentleman is now bending, but I would ask for his co-operation if he wouldn't mind.

MR. KAWCHUK: I am most willing to co-operate, Mr. Speaker, but in view of the fact that my honourable friend for Morris had this privilege I thought it was only appropriate I should have the chance to

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I feel I have treated the honourable gentleman equally with the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. KAWCHUK: That's the trouble, but he reminded me -- I will go on to the next one then. "Well maybe I should point out to him that there never were, and the Wheat Board has no authority to apply restrictions on farmer to farmer sales, and they never have. The Wheat

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd) Board is authorized to act as an agent on behalf of the farmer in interprovincial and export movement of grain. Farmer to farmer sales within the province has never come under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. So his suggestion that the regulations be applied to prevent farmer to farmer sales is one that simply cannot be done by the Canadian Wheat Board because they have no jurisdiction to do so."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that, however when he asked me the questions earlier I told him that I was in favour of even having farmer to farmer sales put under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board. It's no different than a teacher who wants to teach has to have a licence and apply to the Department of Education. By the same token of reasoning of my honourable friend, who is a lawyer, in order to practice law he has to subscribe to the rules and regulations set out by the Law Society, then I suggest to my honourable friend that by the same token of reasoning if a farmer wants to produce grain that he should have rules and regulations to abide to. It's no different from anybody else in our society.

"They were subject only to the quota regulations of the Board, and you had a rather ridiculous situation where, because of the lack of storage in most of those small rural feed mills, they were prevented from purchasing sufficient quantities of feed by virtue of the quota restriction, to enable them to supply their customers." Well, Mr. Speaker I fail to see how that hampers the feed mills from appropriately operating because of the fact that there is always ample supplies of feed grain in other areas. As is happening presently, the feed mills from the Winnipeg area are going out as far as Birtle-Russell area, they come down as far as Gilbert Plains and buy feed grains and truck them all the way into Winnipeg, so I fail to see how that would affect the situation.

Then he goes on to say, "How do they justify."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the honourable gentleman would quote the number of the page that he's quoting from.

MR. KAWCHUK: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, Page 646. Of course all these comments are attributed to the Honourable Member for Morris. It's 646. -- (Interjection)-- I'm just giving you the highlights. "How do they justify the application of a regulation that does not have the public support of the people who are intended to use it." Well, Mr. Speaker, how does my honourable friend take the position that maybe we will not have the support when he really never had asked for support for this implementation of the coarse grains under the Canadian Wheat Board. I suggest to my honourable friend the way to do it was the way it was done, as has been outlined by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, hold a plebiscite, then you will get the true feeling of the people of this province, of the grain producers of this province, and then you will be in a far better position to suggest whether or not you have the support of the grain producers of this area in western Canada.

Perhaps I could go on and on but I fail to see any further reason to go through his comments other than the fact, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to the TED recommendations there has also been a similar proposal made by Dr. A. W. Wood, Professor and Associate Head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Manitoba, and in his paper presented to the Agricultural Economics Conference at the University of Manitoba, February 28, 1969, he had the following comments to make on it: "In fact one of the most serious criticisms that have been raised is that the Board has priced western feed grains out of Ontario markets by failing to ensure that oats and barley from western Canada are competitively priced with respect to U. S. corn in that area. And third, perhaps the most serious current controversy relates to the pricing and sale of feed grains in western Canada." And he goes on to outline the arguments for the listing of the exemptions that had been instituted in 1960. He goes on here to indicate: "It is reported that current offering prices for direct sales are as low as 40 cents per bushel for barley and 80 cents per bushel for wheat." My honourable friend the Member for La Verendrye of course had quoted higher prices than this which prevailed in his particular area. However, this had been a study made by the university throughout the whole province and these are the average prices that prevailed insofar as the feed mills buying coarse grain or feed grain from farmers directly.

"The most effective Board operation would require that the Board be able to control all feed grains, feed grain use, and the prices paid by all users." And this of course appeared in the Manitoba Co-operator, March 13, 1969. For those who haven't read it I commend it most highly, as I do this resolution of mine, Mr. Speaker. I think if we are sincere when we talk about the low income of farmers in this province, this is one way we can show our

(MR. KAWCHUK Cont'd.) . . . desire to help alleviate this low income position and make it possible for the grain producers of this province as well as western Canada to receive a reasonable price for their coarse grains which would be commensurable with the cost of production.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, would the member permit a question?

MR. KAWCHUK: Certainly, I'll try to answer it.

MR. TANCHAK: It will be very simple.

MR. SPEAKER: I trust it won't develop into a debate.

MR. TANCHAK: No, it is just a question. I wonder if the honourable member is aware of the fact -- he mentioned me as Chairman of the Turkey Marketing Board. I wonder if he is aware of the fact that the turkey producers have certain privileges whereby they can sell directly to consumers. That's one. Also, that they make contracts with further processors themselves outside the board providing these further processors can prove that they have a market.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, if that is the desire of the turkey producers of this province I wholeheartedly support it, but by the same token of reasoning when I submit that a referendum be held to get the wishes of the grain producers known, and if the grain producers of this western Canada indicate by a plebiscite that he does not desire to have the exemption lifted, I am perfectly willing to abide by it, but I would submit to my honourable friend that, contrary to what he has said, with all these recommendations put forth by the various bodies throughout western Canada, I fail to see why a plebiscite wouldn't carry.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Borowski, Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Miller, Petursson and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Claydon, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Graham, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Johnson, Johnston, Jorgenson, Klym, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 11; Nays, 39.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think it might meet the wishes of the House if you were to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. I am leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 this evening.