

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 18, 1969

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to take a moment to introduce our guests. We have with us today Miss Barbara Ann Balmer, of the Town of Churchill. Miss Balmer has been crowned the Carnival Queen and is visiting the City of Winnipeg sponsored by the Lions Club of Churchill. Accompanying Miss Balmer is Mr. Ritchie the Local Government District Administrator. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today and wish you all success in the future.

We also have with us today 35 students of Grade 11 standing of the Grant Park School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Sigurdson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On behalf of all the Honourable Members I also welcome you here today.

MATTERS OF URGENCE AND GRIEVANCE

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise a matter under a question of personal privilege. This morning when I was not in the House I understand the Honourable Acting Minister for Water Control made a statement to the effect that I had made a charge that was untrue and unfounded, that there was debris lodged in the Assiniboine River and contributed to ice jamming last week. I'd like to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I have reliable witnesses who will back up what I have said. I understand the Honourable Member for Lakeside ...

MR. SPEAKER: It seemed we had somewhat of a problem this morning. The Minister spoke on this subject at that time and the honourable gentleman wasn't present. Now the honourable gentleman is wishing to reply and the Minister isn't here. I wonder if he would care to choose another occasion?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a charge was made about a statement I made in this House and I do not wish to allow this to stand on the record unchallenged. I utterly reject the charge. I think it's passing strange that when I made the statement on Tuesday that the Minister would wait till Friday, until after the jam is over, to make his allegation and I utterly reject his statement.

ORDERS FOR RETURN - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the Order for Return I moved dealing with the matter of employment of students by the Manitoba Government.

Now the reason why I wish to speak to this Order, Mr. Speaker, is to point out the importance and the significance of the role that the provincial government ought to play in the matter of providing employment for high school and university students. The provincial government is by far the largest single employer in the Province of Manitoba. Now, I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that a government ought to create jobs just for the sake of creating jobs - which a government could very well do - but what I am suggesting - a government could do this, yes, by initiating various projects and activities which are not of any great value or consequence to the community - but I am suggesting that the government could plan its operations in such a manner as to make more effective use and give more job opportunities to high school and university students. It could time certain projects, certain activities in such a manner as to make employment in those fields available to students. And if, as I said, I'm not suggesting creating jobs for the sake of creating jobs, but certainly there are and may well be many projects that the government could undertake which would in turn enhance the economy of the province and also provide employment for students. And I'm also suggesting, and I'm hoping that the government would conduct a more active and vigorous recruitment campaign in our universities and in the high schools. After all there are many high school students seeking employment particularly from senior high school grades, who are old enough to be employed and who are anxious and desirous to obtain a job - and who in fact need the job for financial assistance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this group of our population is one that will eventually make a

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) . . . . substantial contribution to our over-all economy by reason of the fact that their education will certainly increase their earning potential and in turn increase the income tax that they will pay, various other taxes that they will pay through an increase in their purchasing power and so forth. Also it will introduce them to the future potential of our province and to the future potential for themselves, that they could play in the development of our province, be it an introduction to permanent job opportunities with the government or be it an introduction to what job opportunities there might be available to them in private industry.

So there exists a real need for a very vigorous campaign in this area. And this too, I may add, is very much in line with the Honourable Minister's philosophy, the philosophy of the Honourable Minister of Education, who not too long ago stated that it's healthy and good for a student to work and work as hard as he could for his education and he stressed the type of work that a student must do during the summer months. He attached very great importance to that type of employment. And if that is so, that I do feel that he ought to take it upon himself to see to it that the government not only sets the example through its own action to provide this type of opportunity for students, -- not that I'm endorsing the Honourable Minister's philosophy but the facts being what they are today, there is need for it -- and therefore I do feel that the government ought to do everything within its powers to make this possible for students. And particularly in view of the increase in university fees which have been announced, the need for the coming year will be even greater than it had been in the past.

So, I'm submitting this Order for Return, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that the public is entitled to know what role the government is playing in this field and I do hope that the Return to this Order will issue shortly to inform the public of the number of students hired by the Manitoba Government and to enable the public to assess this role and determine whether the government ought to be playing a greater role, and if it can or should, in what particular specific areas.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it's not possible to provide the information called for in this Order and I'm afraid we cannot agree with it.

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

MR. GREEN: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Bjornson, Carroll, Claydon, Cowan, Crak, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Evans, Graham, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Johnson, Johnston, Jorgenson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 10; Nays 37.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. LYON: If we've completed voting on the impossible I would suggest that, could we turn now - I believe there is agreement to turn to the Bills on Page 18 and to deal with them.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second readings of Bill No. 31. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: (French here).

Mr. Speaker, on second reading - I'm closing the debate as you will notice, Mr. Speaker - and it was the acting Leader of the New Democratic Party brought in a - talked about the word "treaty". He wasn't opposing it but it did, to him anyway, probably bring back maybe visions of this group signing treaties with maybe DeGaulle or anything like that, and I can reassure him this is not the intention at all. I spoke to the lawyer that prepared this. He feels that treaties, I guess could be the same as the following word, the word "contract", it's agreements between maybe other organizations in different provinces. I can say to the members of this House that the organization would not object at all if this word was taken out, if the members in their wisdom feel it is better to remove this word they would not object at all. It would not change anything in the powers that they are asking for. It is only a group

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . who want to do a little more than, say in the field of education, promote a little more for the French Manitoban and want to help them take a very active part in the affairs of the province. I'm sure that, as I said, if the members of this House, if anybody wants to make an amendment - I won't, because I'm sure there's nothing wrong with this word, but it was brought up - if it is felt that it would make it easier to pass, I'm sure that I would certainly not object to the removal of that word, anyway.

I think this is the only thing that was mentioned. I understand that my colleague the Member for La Verendrye gave a very good explanation and I think this is all that is requested on this Bill. Of course I imagine that it will receive the support of the members and will go to Committee and if there is any other questions I'm sure that there will be somebody there to answer them.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 38, An Act to incorporate the Talmud Torah Foundation for second reading.

MR. CHERNIACK: I note, Mr. Speaker, this is directed to Private Bills Committee.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, from the preamble in the Bill it should be clear this is a Bill for the creation of a charitable foundation whose purpose is to promote and ensure the continuity of education in the tenets and practices of traditional Judaism and to use as its vehicle the Winnipeg Hebrew Free School which is known as the Talmud Torah, for its perpetual existence and maintenance. The purpose of the foundation is to create an instrument whereby donations and gifts will be received so that the income therefrom would be available for the purposes of the Winnipeg Hebrew School. I reviewed the bill myself, Mr. Speaker. There was some features to some of the details here that I had some doubts about. If there are any questions I'll try to answer them, but probably I will not succeed; but I can certainly make certain that someone will be present at committee to clarify any questions that may arise in the minds of any of the members in order to make absolutely sure that this is satisfactory to all. My request therefore is to send this on to committee for consideration in detail.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 9. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, this Act was proposed by a number of students from the Brandon University to attempt to establish themselves as the Brandon University Students' Union to run their own affairs. I think this might be an appropriate time to discuss the role the students play in the university and I would propose to make a few remarks on that topic. In particular, the question of student unrest and what is bothering the students at our universities, not only in this province but across the nation, and also of course the reaction of the public to some of that unrest.

I might in fact point out that although our television screens are flooded with instances of student demonstrations through the world, and particularly in the United States, and some of the more unfortunate incidents in Canada - the most regrettable being that at Montreal, that we have had our share of unhappiness in Manitoba. And I might remind you, Mr. Speaker, that even in what might be regarded as the quiet City of Brandon that only a few months ago in September, there were some demonstrations there and as a result there was some action taken by the Board of Governors which may have temporarily quelled the situation but which some people thought was unfortunate. Because in Brandon, just to mention that specifically, as a result of some demonstrations and picketing students at the university who are foreign students were - their whole education was placed in jeopardy by their scholarship aid being cut off. Four students who were involved in picketing the university lost thousand dollar a year scholarships; and the people in Brandon had, I suppose took this action because they found that money that was being contributed to a general fund for student aid was falling off rather seriously and as a result the aid to foreign students in Brandon was curbed. So that we certainly are faced with this situation even in our own province. When we look at our own province we can see that the students are unhappy about a large number of things and we can see that on the other hand that there's really little danger in terms of any violent demonstrations as had taken place in other parts of North America.

I think what the students want and what the students are disturbed about is that too often their opinions are being ignored by the adult community. One only has to deal with students,

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . or speak to them, or listen to their briefs, or read their briefs, to find out that the student leadership and the average young person of today at university is well educated, intelligent and articulate, and given what I have just said, many of them are adults legally, and many of them are of above average intelligence and above average education and they feel that they have a right to participate on the major decisions that affect university and affect the university community. It's not good enough to say to them that they must listen to their elders or simply take advice; they are confident of their own abilities and they should be given a voice.

One area, for example, where they have sometimes taken action and are traditionally ignored is the question of rating their own instructors. This involves a rather tricky area perhaps of merit rating but whether it's done in fact or not, the students have in some universities taken it upon themselves to give their opinions, collect their opinions and distribute them - sometimes for sale - on the value of their instructors. They want to rate the courses. They want to have a say in the curriculum. They want to have a say in the value of their own instructors and quite often young people feel - correctly so - that the curriculum is not relevant to their own values or that the curriculum is geared to a society which they cannot buy. Quite frequently it's a materialistic society, so that some people are rather alarmed when they see that in the City of Winnipeg a stone's throw from the Legislature there are groups of young people who are hippies, who are not buying the system. And if you travel in the United States you see the same thing in the larger university towns and the larger cities where large numbers of people are opting out of our society because they don't buy the materialistic values and they don't buy some of the 9 to 5 routines.

I think that in Manitoba the least that can be done, or the first step that should be taken, is to listen to the complaints of a student. I think it's wrong to condemn young people, to say that they are simply shiftless or they're not productive - I'm talking mainly now about hippies and university students who often dress differently and often think differently - to think that they are failures and that they are unusual people. I think that they're a reflection of the failure of our society. I don't think that they're a reflection of their own failures, I think it's the other way around. That they are symbols to us that we have failed in some way and that we have failed to perhaps live properly, or perhaps to concentrate on the right values, that maybe some of our values and some of our icons and so on are really not worthy of respect.

Also, it's been true since the dawn of history that there is always a new generation and I think that one of the things we have to face in this day and age is that the generation gap in terms of succeeding generations is narrower and shorter than it was in the past. If it was true that a generation was 20 years in the past, I think the modern generation, in quotes "May occur every 10 or every 5 years." Things are moving faster. Events are moving faster. Technology is faster and I think that the thinking of people these days is changing much more rapidly than the past. -- (Interjection) -- Me or you? -- (Interjection) -- That's right. Every few years - even I who am the youngest member in this Legislature am striving to keep up. I warrant that if the Honourable Minister of Health can stay with it, in terms of keeping up to the ideas of his children then I would be surprised. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. But it's quite a strain don't you admit?

Mr. Speaker, I think that what we have to do in view of the general unrest among younger people in our universities and in our high schools is to give them a voice, to give them an opportunity to participate, to first of all hear them out, which we frequently do not. And secondly, to actively participate in some of the decision making - and I would even include the baby of the Liberal Party, the Honourable the Member of Hamiota. He might have something to contribute.

The government has taken some steps in this direction and I commend them for it. I hope it's not window dressing. For example, the Minister of Education announced that he was putting a couple of high school students on to the provincial education advisory board - I think that's a step in the right direction. And after a considerable battle the UMSU and the University of Manitoba have ironed out some of their problems in regard to the Senate.

So I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we're fortunate at this point in our history that we do not appear to have any real potential violence in this province in regard to university students, but you only have to go out there and to be in touch with young people to realize that they are unhappy about many things and they are disturbed about many things. I think that it's their right and it's our obligation to listen to them and to give them the responsibilities that

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . they can handle.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in supporting this bill, although I don't quite agree with everything that has been said here this afternoon. It's fine to talk about the rights of the students and the obligations of the public, or the older generation, but you cannot talk about rights without including responsibilities and obligations also. It is true that we've been fortunate here in Manitoba with our students, and I hope that we keep it this way, but we must impress on the people, on the students, and we must be ready to back our educators. They must be competent or I don't think that we would have chosen them at these universities and to keep these posts.

Now one of the best education that we can give this young generation is respect of other peoples' property and respect the freedom of everybody else. Not only their own - I don't think that they should ever be in a position where they can dictate to the rest of the people, and I don't agree with the honourable member to say that you can blame - when you see these shifty characters and so on, you can always blame society - yes you can blame society, but they play their part of society also. This is the easy way out to say well all right blame the family, blame this. Everybody has to take a certain responsibility and I think that that includes the politicians also. It is a lot easier to let them run wild because they are the people that are, maybe more exciting, that they maybe put us in the news, with them. And this is a danger, a danger that we should be very careful, very careful of, because as I say, I feel that we should give the youth of today a voice in the political affairs - in other words, in their own affairs, because it is their own affairs. But we should never divorce the question of responsibility with privileges. And this is the point that I want to make today. I would be ready to go to any length to let these people speak and have a voice, but I also think that they should be held responsible for their actions. I will not buy, say well give them this, but if they're wrong, blame somebody else - that I will not buy. I will not buy that at all.

We, the members of this party, and the members of all of the House, have often said how much it cost to educate people. Not long ago we were told that doctors were educated at public expense, and I guess we could look at all university students, and that's right. But society that pays the bill certainly has something to say. Last year, if you remember right, Mr. Speaker, I did not agree with some of the members on this, the party who felt that the important thing was the freedom of the individual. Freedom to do what - where does that freedom stop? It is no longer freedom if you're walking all over the freedom of somebody else. -- (Interjection) -- Where does it start? It starts by accepting and behaving, accepting your responsibility. If you cannot accept responsibility you don't deserve to be free. And you said yourself, you're only a bachelor; but once you're married and you have children you'll see that if they cannot accept their responsibility they won't be free. You won't give them a rock and say: "Throw it in granny's window because you're free to do it." -- (Interjection) -- You're referring to me? Well I commend you for that because they'll have a good education. -- (Interjection) --

I'm not disagreeing with this bill at all, but I say we must be responsible and the politicians must stand up, we must resist the temptation of maybe looking at all the votes we can get and so on, and it is time -- if you raise horses for instance, you will not always put the spotlight on the weak one, you're not talking about the runt all the time, you're talking about the people that are doing right -- and it's time that - unfortunately this doesn't sell as many newspapers and it doesn't make such a good picture, an ordinary fellow going with his books to school and behaving and so on. You can't sell that on TV and there's not much of a story. I think that the press also should realize, and probably the television and the radio, should realize the important duty that they have. Let's concentrate, let's put the spotlight on the thoroughbred. This is what we're trying to do, let's put the spotlight on the thoroughbred. My friend shakes his head. -- (Interjection) -- You wouldn't be doing that? I think you should. I don't think there's any point putting the spotlight on two or three agitators that maybe come from another country, and that we say all right they're free and blame society if they're not right. I say put the spotlight on the 95 or 98 percent of the people that are doing right and they'll want their freedom. And I'm just as interested in protecting their freedom, more so, than the freedom of this two or three percent that are agitators, trouble -- you ask them what are you against? "I don't know but I'm against it." And there are some people like that.

Now as I say this is - I'm not trying to pick a fight with my honourable friend, I just want

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . to agitate him a bit because he will get married and have children one of these days. I will certainly support this bill but I think that we should pause when we run into a bill like this and give a little backing to our educators, to our people who have a tough job and show these people that we'll bend over backwards to give them a voice but we will be firm if the need be.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 39. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: It's an interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, that since I was out of the House and the honourable member adjourned debate knowing that I wished to make a few comments on the Bill, that there was an indication of impatience for the delay involved in my wanting to comment on this. Since this happened only a few days prior to this in connection with another bill, I'd like to indicate that there should be no hesitation on any member's part to review bills and study them, because we are not so expert any of us, that we can make snap decisions on those matters with which we are entrusted. I have had occasion in the past, I think about four years or so ago, when I commented that I doubted whether bills of this nature should be dealt with by the Legislature and there were certain changes made in the Companies Act which did take away from the Legislature the responsibility of dealing with these private bills involving fiscal companies and giving powers which should not have to be debated in the Legislature. Nevertheless, apparently we are still stuck with a certain type of this kind of bill and since they are presented to us, obviously we have to review them, consider them, and then give them our best judgment in dealing with them. I must indicate, Mr. Speaker, a resentment of pressures which are - and I'm not speaking about this bill particularly - but pressures that are put on members of the legislature to put things through quickly, speedily, for the convenience of this or the other individual. I'm just using this occasion to mention it, but I'm not using this company as an example, alone, because it often happens in these private bills.

I was interested when I saw this bill come before us, Mr. Speaker, because I remember that two years ago we debated a bill, an amending bill for the same company, and I was even more intrigued when I read the bill and I saw that there was a change in share structure. You wouldn't really know it by reading the bill, Mr. Speaker, because what the bill does do is repeal a section and replace the section. The replacement indicates what the capital stock shall be, which doesn't seem really to be of any great consequence unless one remembers that two years ago we did in fact deal with this very section wherein we dealt with a change in capital structure. So I looked back on the debate of two years ago and I found that the bill then was introduced - it was Bill 108 introduced by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews on April 21st - possibly we should have held this another few days and then it would have been an anniversary - April 21, 1967, wherein the member indicated the need for a proposed change and the desire for a proposed change and indicated that the share structure had been 100,000 common shares of \$10.00 par value in Class A, and splitting those into one million shares of a par value of \$1.00 each. So there is really no change in total par value; the only change was that where you had one share for \$10.00 you were splitting that share into 10 shares of \$1.00. But, there was something unusual taking place at the same time, and that is that the voting power of the shares remained as it had been; where formerly an owner of a \$10.00 share had a vote, now becoming owner of ten \$1.00 par value shares he still had one vote. The ownership of one \$1.00 share was only worth one-tenth of a vote. So there is really no change in voting power, but there was a change in the par value of each share and it was indicated that this was desirable for the company, and obviously it was or they wouldn't have done it. So one wonders just why come back now and say that what we did two years ago was not satisfactory and we want to do something else, and what they're doing, is not going back to where they were, but they're making another change and now what they are doing in effect is cancelling the differential between Class A and Class B and they're saying "all shares shall be \$1.00 each; all shares shall have one vote each." Well that, as a matter of fact, makes more sense than the provision that they brought in two years ago. I must say that I didn't quarrel with it two years ago but I said that I felt that the Legislature being charged with the responsibility of dealing with this type of bill should also be granted the opportunity of a full explanation of same.

The company involved has apparently applied to the Securities Commission for approval

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . of its offering and it is now indicating that it is looking for subscriptions at \$1.00 per share. I've been favoured with a copy of the letter addressed to shareholders, and I see that the offering that was made in the letter expired on April 10th, and that a commitment had been received by the majority shareholders of the Class B, which is the stronger shares in terms of voting, that they would make a commitment which would have to be completed by April 11th, all of which I believe is conditional on this bill being passed. Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I'm not objecting to the bill going ahead; I would like to indicate the thoughts that run through my mind, which I think should be answered. And I might say that I am not a member of the committee on private bills and although I might try to make an effort to be at the meeting, I'm not sure that I'll be able to. So to the extent that it might be of value to anybody who is on that committee, I intend to voice the type of questions that occurred to me, in the hope that at least the answers will be available in the event that someone else is interested the way I am.

Well firstly, it occurs to me that, what we are doing now is converting a \$1.00 share with a one-tenth of a vote attached to it into a \$1.00 share with one vote attached to it. Which is good, isn't it? That's giving a man 10 times the value of a vote that he had before. By doing this, of course, we are taking away from the Class B shareholders an advantage which they had of ten times the value of Class A shareholders in votes. In other words, we are really lowering the value of a Class B share as it relates or compares with a Class A share. Where formerly a man had, let's say a person had one class A share, one class B share, the class B shareholder had ten times as many votes as the class A. Now he suddenly finds that with the same investment, and with no action on his part, he still owns that one share, he has now lost nine-tenth value, or some such fraction, of the value of his vote as it was before; so, we ought to, I think, make sure that we are protecting those shareholders who appear to us to have been at a disadvantage. Now it may be that all those shareholders are quite happy about it. Maybe a vote is unimportant to them as long as they get the dividends, but since a vote can be important in control, I think that before we grant this, we have to have some kind of assurance, not just a statement "I assure you that they're happy" but rather a clear cut assurance that they have all been notified and that there is no objection, that they know what they are doing, because if one person objects then that person may become adversely affected by the actions of this Legislature, and I think we are entitled to know the position. It may be that there is unanimous support by the owners of Class B shares, but if one person owns one share and finds that his vote is detracted from to a very large extent, and objects to it, then we have to know it, Mr. Speaker, before we let it through. I, for example, would be very interested in knowing what is the market value of a Class A share and a Class B share. For all we know, the market value is exactly the same, which may then mean that nobody cares. And if that's the case, that's fine then we know it, because certainly the owner of a Class B share who feels that he is hard done by, can then go in and trade one for another and find out that it makes no difference. We should be informed, Mr. Chairman, what is the reason for this?

Now I read what the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre had to say in introducing this bill and frankly, I did not read any reason into what he is saying except the desire to do it and make the shares more easily dealt with, I think - I haven't got Hansard before me but I must say that I was not impressed with the cogency of his argument because frankly I don't think he really gave a reason, a real understandable reason for this change in type of ownership that is being proposed. I would suggest that clarification would be of some value.

I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, what would happen if this proposed amendment came into the office of the Registrar of Companies? What questions would he ask? Because surely he's a much more highly trained and skilled person in this field and we should have the full benefit of knowing the questions he would have asked and the answers he would have expected. I certainly feel that we ought to be aware of that, and therefore I move next to the position of the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who unfortunately isn't in the House at the moment, to say that I expect, I really expect that he would get up in this House and say I have reviewed this bill, I am in support of it, in the position which I hold with the responsibilities assigned to me, because I think that it's his job to satisfy himself that what is being done is in the best interests of everyone involved and that he approves of it. He is now walking in but I won't repeat what I said, because I am sure that, at least I hope that he will take the opportunity to enquire or to check in Hansard on the comments I have just finished making. But I do think that before this Bill passes final reading, that it would be helpful to us that the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . Honourable Minister will get up and say "I give it my blessing, I approve of it." And I'm sure that he will now that he has come in and he's nodding his head. But I didn't even need his promise; I knew he would do it.

I am aware that the Legislative Counsel on new private bills does give a report indicating objections that he may have but I think that his objections or his jurisdiction is more limited in scope than that of members of the Legislature and therefore I'm looking forward to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs becoming involved with it. Other than that, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill going forward. Indeed it's not just no objection, I'm quite prepared that it should go forward, that I would vote for it if it were necessary to record a vote, because I have no question about the integrity of the company involved, nor of the member's good faith in presenting it. I think only that if we're charged with the responsibility we should be given sufficient facts to exercise our decision judiciously.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say that our Department have had a look at this bill and are quite satisfied to see it go forward. There is nothing in the bill that we could raise any objection to. In fact, we think it's a good principle involved and would recommend it to the House.

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

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, several years ago when I first came into this House I had the honour of proposing a similar bill for the same company. I also proposed a couple of other private members' bills and each time that I introduced the bills on second reading I was met with questions from members of the opposition all highlighting one particular aspect - is anybody hurt by what we would do if we passed this bill, and could anybody be hurt, could any particular individual be penalized by the advantages that we are giving another class of individuals by this bill. That has been the governing precept that I have been going by ever since and I think that the Honourable Member for St. John's has hit it again, and an excellent point, that the members of this company should appear before the private bills committee and convince beyond any doubt whatsoever the members of that committee that nobody is being penalized by the passage of a bill like this, because we as members of the Legislature are not in a position to really know. There is not enough publicity given to the contents of bills of this nature that can smoke out from the public the information that we would require to actually find out whether anybody could be hurt and we would be in the position that long after a bill was passed that we would find out that somebody suffered detrimentally from our actions which we carried on in innocence. But I think it is the duty upon people like Fidelity Trust Company who are seeking private legislation through the Legislature to appear before the private bills committee, and this is why I urge the House to give second reading to this particular bill, to give this company this opportunity, but convince the members of that committee beyond any doubt whatsoever that no one is put at any disadvantage by the provisions of legislation like this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Churchill had a couple of questions, one was about where this company invests its money. It has invested all its money in Manitoba. And secondly, who were the shareholders? Over 97 percent of the shares are owned by residents of Canada.

The Honourable Member for St. John's perhaps indicated that I was impatient, or perhaps members of the company were impatient. I'm sorry if I gave him that impression, but I spoke to him, wanting to know if there were some questions that I might get answers for for him, so that he would be satisfied that this was something that could be properly passed by the Legislature. I'm sorry if he thought I was impatient because I wasn't. He says that you wouldn't know by reading the Bill that there was a change in share structure. I think I pointed out clearly in my remarks that the effect of the bill was to make all the A class shares and B class shares common shares, I think that was made quite clear, that there wasn't going to be a change in the structure and that was the change, and that they were all going to be made common shares and have the same number of votes and be the same in every way.

He wants to know if as a result of this, the value of the Class B shares has been lowered? Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that there were very very few Class A shares issued. As of December 31, 1968, the number of "B" shares outstanding was 675,775, and the number of "A" shares outstanding was 35,690 shares - about five percent of the number of "B" shares, so that the people that had the "A" shares and who will now have one full vote for

(MR. COWAN cont'd.) . . . . each share are not very many people. When the meeting was called in January all the shareholders were notified and at that meeting a resolution was passed unanimously approving of this proposed change whereby all the shares would be made into ordinary common shares and have equal value and have equal voting power. At that meeting about three-quarters of the "B" shares were represented and a little bit less than half the "A" shares were represented. As for the market value of the shares, they are not listed on any market and on any exchange, but the market value of both shares was about the same. I don't know if there's really been a separate market established for the "A" shares because not very many of them have been issued. There was no apprehension on the part of the "B" shareholders that the value of their stock would go down because of the fact that the "A" shares would have greater voting power.

The reasons I gave when the Bill was introduced as to why this Bill is being brought forth are two: that firstly, as I mentioned the company no longer has any apprehension as to the fact that eastern interests might take control of the company. They feel that the shares are so broadly held now that the ownership of the shares will likely remain largely in Manitoba and that one of the purposes of the company, to invest the money in Manitoba, will be continued; and secondly, they hope that the shares will gain wider public acceptance because the shares will all have equal voting value. They hope to sell more of the shares and they think if they all have equal voting value, that that will be the case.

Now if there are any further questions there will be representatives of the company at the Private Bills Committee meeting and those questions can be answered at that time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 45. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I adjourned this motion for the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, we don't wish to hold up this Bill and we're quite agreeable that it go on to committee. The only comment I want to make is that we really approve of the steps being taken by the association of the Municipal Secretary-Treasurers to improve their position insofar as their organization is concerned. They want to, according to the items mentioned in the Bill itself, to upgrade the profession as such, or the organization; they want to establish some sort of criteria for their own members to shoot for and to live by - and I don't think anyone can fault them on that. I think we should encourage it because politicians come and go but fortunately the secretary-treasurers stay on, and because of their staying on continuous functions are possible within the communities in which they serve and irrespective of what the elected people sometimes do, the secretary-treasurers can act as a very good brake and a very cautioning influence on a council. I venture to say that many a council has been saved from making some very serious blunders because of the correct attitude or the knowledge of their Secretary-Treasurer in dealing with these matters.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it's proper that this matter should be passed through this House; that the secretary-treasurers are trying as I say to upgrade their own group, and I'm very pleased to note that even though they want certain powers they are granting the right of any individual to practise as a secretary-treasurer irrespective of whether he's a member of the organization or not. In other words, they're not trying to use this association as the base for a power structure to be, but rather simply using it as a device whereby their own members and their own people can enhance their own knowledge and develop within their own profession to the extent that they will be able to draw up courses at the universities, make arrangements at the universities for lectures and things of this nature. I think generally it is a step in the right direction and I'm certainly glad it's come before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to mention that I certainly will not oppose the Bill before us. In fact, I think this is replacing a former bill as the Bill mentions and that the association will be able to continue. I also note that membership will be open to employees of municipalities other than just the manager or the treasurer, so that employees can join.

Then, too, under membership by-laws we note that they will be allowed to establish certain classes within their membership. I would like to know from the member sponsoring this what would be the purpose in setting up different classes within the membership of the association?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): I have only a few comments to make, but

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) . . . . having been associated with quite a few of the secretary-treasurers in the past and still am to some extent, I think I'd like to just make a few comments.

I notice also as already was mentioned, that the membership is open to anyone and will remain open. I think and hope that they will be reasonable and they usually have been, and surely this will be open to anybody qualified to belong to an organization like this.

On the matter of the members entering contracts with private, public or corporation municipal corporations, I believe this will partly increase their bargaining power, especially the items that they've set out under their contract, but I believe in this case this is quite in order. I hope that those that do not belong to this association - I don't think there are too many secretary-treasurers of any municipalities - I think it would be wise for them to make sure they are a member of this organization.

I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, what councils, especially reeves and mayors would do without the help of some of the Secretary-Treasurers that serve us. I think I'm one of those who can say to this House that very often, or possibly most of the time, that our secretary-treasurers have more clear feelings and knowledge concerning the wishes of the people than very often councils have, or as I said before, mayors or reeves. So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to join with the others to pay gratitude. I know that the Honourable Member for Morris mentioned and went into detail as to what some of the other things that they expect to do with the Bill since I believe it's mentioned in the Bill that the Bill of 1955 will be repealed and this of course will give them a complete new bill to operate. And after all, 15 years today, a lot of things can happen and I think they spell out the reasons.

I think also it would be quite in order for me to say that I do not wish to put all the praise of Council work on secretary-treasurers but I think we're all aware many times of the suggestions that they give as far as passing legislation or the assistance they give in creating, for example, the university course - I think one of the members mentioned this - or helped in assisting in setting them up, and I think we had a good example in our committee meeting the other morning when the secretary-treasurers were represented by I believe the Secretary-Treasurer of Portage la Prairie, helping to - their ideas may not all be what everyone wishes they ought to be but I think they certainly help in getting some of the points established better.

So, in my opinion these fellows are really trying to operate, possibly even on a more efficient basis and I certainly wish to add and join in helping pass this Bill.

MR. WARNER JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, just one brief comment. I want to thank the members who have spoken in approval of the Bill before you at the present time and their comments with regards to the work that is being carried on by the municipal secretary-treasurers.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland was the only one that asked any questions and his questions dealt with a clause in the Bill dealing with the setting up of classes. I don't want to go into detail but I don't think there's anything unusual in that. Most organizations that I know appoint honorary members, associate members and the like and the purpose of this particular clause is to authorize them to do that as well under by-laws.

However, I might say that during the course of the study of this Bill in committee, members of the Secretary-Treasurers' Association will be happy to appear before the committee and answer any questions in detail that you may have.

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: We turn back to Page 5 of the Order Paper. Adjourned debates. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Labour in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden in amendment thereto and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Springfield in further amendment thereto. Standing in my name.

I've considered the sub-amendment as tabled by the Honourable Member for Springfield.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . The perusal of same indicates in part that it intended to amend the main motion. The sub-amendment should, of course, be intended to amend the amendment. Accordingly, I must rule the sub-amendment out of order in its present form.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been before the House on several occasions and we seem to have had some difficulty in presenting it in a form that is accepted by the Chair. I have undertaken to make one more attempt. Before I go any further I think I should move the amendment so that we have the motion properly in front of us. My intention is to delete only one word in the sub-amendment that was presented to the House by the Honourable Member for Virden and I think with that one deletion and the substitution of another word, I think the motion, the original motion and the amendment will make sense. I have extra copies of the motion that I intend to present, Mr. Speaker, if the page would like to take them around to anybody who may be interested.

I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews that the amendment be amended by deleting the word "whereas" in the first line of the amendment and substituting therefor the word "clause". That would have the effect, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . put the motion if the honourable gentleman wishes to speak to it.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Probably the Honourable Member from Morris would like to give his explanation now.

MR. JORGENSEN: The effect . . .

MR. GREEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My question is that when an honourable member speaks prior to the introduction of an amendment to a resolution that that becomes his speech and then when the resolution is put - when the motion is moved the resolution is then put and he has not got the right to speak on it. Now if I'm correct, I don't wish to stop the honourable member from speaking but would he not require the leave of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster is he of the opinion that the Honourable Member for Morris has spoken on this subject before? -- prior to today?

MR. GREEN: No, just in introducing his resolution. There was no other way in which he could introduce the amendment except by speaking, which he did. He made some comments in introduction, then moved the resolution, and I take it that that's as far as he can go. This is my understanding of the rules, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I appreciate the opinion of the Honourable Member for Inkster. We are deep in the woods you know and all I'm attempting to do is to get the sub-amendment before the House in its proper perspective with the thought that the honourable gentleman wished to speak to the amendment that he's putting forward. I can withdraw having put the question if it is the wish of the House that the honourable member speak to the amendment before you get it.

MR. GREEN: I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, that we'd be prepared to give leave but I don't think that we should change the rules of the House whereby a person introduces a resolution -- my understanding is that he's then exhausted his right to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the House give the honourable member leave to speak? (Agreed)

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the purpose in moving this amendment is to first, as you have indicated, put the motion properly before the House and to create some continuity in the sub-amendment that is now before you. I would hope that the motion, or the amendment that I have moved at the present time is now in order and that the motion is properly before the House.

In talking to the resolution itself, Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks, indeed in the past few years, we have heard a considerable number of suggestions as to the difficulties facing farmers and how the price structure of the products they produce can be improved. I don't intend to go into the subject of whether or not it is necessary. That case has been made over and over again. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead, who introduced this resolution, I think fairly substantially made the case for something to be done, and others who have spoken on the resolution itself have done as well, and I don't think there's any need for me to cover that ground. What I would like to do this afternoon is to deal in some way with the methods that are being suggested, and to offer my views as to the practicability, or otherwise, of the suggestion that is now before us. I don't disagree with anyone who brings before this House a suggestion as to how the situation can be improved. I don't disagree with the arguments that have been presented. I do, however, disagree with the results that they anticipate

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . . from this motion. And unlike the position that I took on the previous motion when the Honourable Member for Inkster took some exceptions to words that I used, I don't think that this is a silly or a stupid suggestion. I think it's an honest attempt, as I indeed - I take nothing away from what I said at that other occasion - I still believe that that was as I'd indicated it. However this one is a little bit different. This is a suggestion that has been kicked around the country for a good many years.

I must say that at the time that I happened to be a member of a government in Ottawa that had something to do with deliberations concerning this particular suggestion, we run across a good many difficulties in its implementation and I would like to apprise the House of some of the problems that we face in making the suggestion. In saying so, I'm aware of the suggestions that the Premier of Saskatchewan made yesterday to the House of Commons Agricultural Committee, and I can't disagree with his position because he's speaking for his province. I daresay that in the Province of Saskatchewan where wheat is so vital to the economy of that province, there's a possibility - I'm not saying by any means that there's a certainty - but there's a possibility that a case can be made. But I find it difficult to accept the philosophy that the case can be made with equal validity in the Province of Manitoba. We in this province, although we do produce a considerable quantity of wheat and it is vital to the economy of this province, I think our opportunities for shifts in production to meet market demands of other products is a great deal more flexible than it is in the Province of Saskatchewan. And to place the wheat economy in a rigid position, an economic strait jacket if you want to call it that, might make it more difficult to encourage the shift of production and thereby create a harmful rather than a beneficial effect on the production of that commodity in this country.

Now what does the resolution suggest? And I note with interest that the mover of this resolution, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, has taken a somewhat unique position, somewhat different than the suggestions that have been made on previous occasions. In all of the suggestions that I have heard on previous occasions, the two-price system would have applied to that quantity of wheat that was consumed in Canada, which approximates around 50 million bushels. Now, if 50 million bushels is the quantity of wheat that is consumed in Canada, then you conclude that that is the quantity which will receive a support price. And, at the level suggested in this resolution, it would amount to approximately \$1.00 a bushel assuming that wheat commands a price of \$2.00 a bushel on the international market, which it doesn't at the present time. But let's assume that it does, and happily this situation will be with us again. That means there's an amount of something like \$50 million to be paid either out of the federal Treasury, as has often been suggested and indeed is suggested in this resolution, or by the consumers of the products of wheat.

The difficulty with that suggestion was that presumably wheat used for human consumption is the best quality wheat, normally the three top grades, and the argument that could be presented is, well what happens to the producers of wheat who are not fortunate enough to produce the three top grades? Suppose that because of climatic or other conditions the quality of the wheat they produced was somewhat less than the top three grades, and unfortunately, low grades are usually associated with poor weather conditions and poor yields, so the people who would need the help most would be unable to receive it under the suggestions that have been made in the past, and I again want to emphasize that I am aware of the fact that this particular suggestion is not the same. And if you then would say, well, we'll include all producers of wheat, it doesn't matter what the grade is, then you place yourself in the position where the producers of oats or barley or coarse grains, they're going to say, "Well, what about us?" It would increase the quantity of wheat because the domestic consumption, the total domestic consumption if you include for feeds, as well as feed, would amount to something like 160 million bushels, and if you do include that group then the producers of oats and barley will quite legitimately, quite legitimately, say, "Well what about us? We are producing a commodity in this country that is in demand, that is being consumed in much the same way that feed wheat is being consumed, so therefore we're entitled to a subsidy as well," and the first thing you know you've placed yourself in the position where you have to subsidize all grains consumed in Canada, and that amounts to a considerable quantity. And then you place yourself in the position that if you subsidize all grains you run the risk of countervailing duties being placed on those grains that are exported, and although the quantities that we export are not that great, it closes off quite effectively any opportunity for

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.) . . . . exporting feed grains out of this country.

But the mover of this resolution has taken a somewhat different angle on it, and I presume that he's considered all of these problems; and his intention here is to create a situation where the government would be responsible for ensuring that on the first 2,000 bushels that is produced in this country by each producer, that farmer will receive \$3.00 per bushel. There are something like 190,000 producers on the prairies at the present time, and if they each were to receive approximately, I say roughly \$1.00 a bushel, which would be the difference between what the market price is and what the subsidy would be, or the level at which the price would be placed by the government, that would mean something in the order of \$384 million. I find it very difficult to believe that the present government at Ottawa is going to entertain that kind of a suggestion.

But whether they entertain that suggestion or not, this is really not the great difficulty that I foresee. My honourable friend from Inkster the other day mentioned that when he was dealing with the payments that were made under the acreage payment system, that he had many farmers coming into his office asking for subdivisions of their land so that they could all, father, son, daughter - that all qualified for \$200.00 under the acreage payment system, and one can readily see what would happen here. You have 190,000 permit holders and if one looks at the record of the Canadian Wheat Board where they list the permit holders on the back page of their annual report, you'll find that during those years that the acreage payments were being paid, there was a fairly substantial increase in the number of permit holders. One can well imagine, if they'll do that for \$200.00, what they're going to do if they have an opportunity of selling 2,000 bushels each at \$3.00 a bushel. It most certainly, it most certainly would put a lot of money in the pockets of the farmers and I have no objections to that, none whatsoever. The Honourable Member for Inkster went on to point out in his comments to the House the other day, when he spoke on this particular measure, that he has no objections to that either. He went on to say that - and I will just paraphrase him because I don't want to take the time to locate this particular part in his speech - but I think he did say words to the effect that city people would not object to that, would not object to the farmers receiving a substantially higher income or a substantially higher price for their product. Now if I'm quoting him incorrectly why I'd be glad if he'd rise and say so.

MR. GREEN: I said that we would be happy to see that they got a minimum standard of price for their product.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes. Yes. That was roughly the position that he took and I don't think anybody in this House is going to disagree with that position, but the other day we had an opportunity to witness the inconsistencies in that easy philosophy that honourable gentlemen opposite hold. There was a report in the papers that the price of milk was going to go up a few cents. And we all know what happened the other day. Now I'm not saying that the Honourable Member for Burrows got up and complained that the farmers were getting too much, but it was an indication of the screaming and hollering that would take place; indeed it took place when the price of milk was going to go up four cents. I wonder just how much screaming and hollering there would be in the length and breadth of this country if the price of wheat were to go up \$1.00 a bushel. You have to be realistic.

I say again, I have no quarrel with the attempts of the honourable gentlemen opposite in putting forth suggestions to this House in an effort to find solutions to an extremely difficult and vexing problem, but the difficulty is here that you just simply can't apply a pat or a standard solution to meet all problems, because they're all different. He compared the farmer, the Honourable Member for Inkster, compared the farmer with the worker, with the doctor, and with the lawyer, the nurse. There is no comparison. There's a big difference, and the big difference is that the doctor, the lawyer and the worker, when he gets his wage, when he gets the salary or whatever it is he's drawing, he's already performed the service. The farmer has yet to sell the grain even if you -- you can say wheat will be \$10.00 a bushel. It's not worth a darn unless it can be sold. And so we depend, we depend on situations that are created internationally and over which we have little or no control. The only control that we have been able to exercise, and it's one of the reasons why Canada has been such a strong supporter of the International Wheat Agreement and at the present time of the International Grains. . . . It's because we see in these commodity agreements some means of establishing some order in the marketing of products, and that applies not only to wheat.

If the terms of such an agreement where a minimum and a maximum price are established

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) . . . . are beneficial to this country, then surely the producers of cane sugar, the producers of other commodities that we import into this country, can argue with equal validity that such agreements should apply to them as well, and Canada has played a leading role in attempting to establish such commodity agreements. We played an important role in the establishment of the coffee agreement, and for some reason or other we've never been able to sign a sugar agreement, but hopefully, hopefully, the "dog eat dog" attitude of international traders that exists today can be replaced by some semblance of order in international markets; that first of all we can determine what the markets will be so you have some idea - and that's not an easy thing to do. When I spoke the other day on a matter similar to this I mentioned the research that is being done, that changes the whole pattern of production, and it changes the whole market situation. It's not an easy situation to overcome, but it's not a reason why we should attempt to place an industry such as the wheat industry in such a strait jacket, that it will not be able to adjust to the conditions that are going to be even more pressing than they are today.

..... continued on next page

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

So I find it difficult to satisfy myself, even though I agree with the intention of the honourable members, but something must be done. I find it difficult that the placing of the wheat economy in an economic straightjacket is going to help them get out of their difficulties. One of the peculiar things about agriculture is that the more governments try to help them, the worse their difficulties are. For the last twenty years we have been trying to find a way out of the dairy problem. Something like a half a billion dollars has been poured into that industry in the last twenty years and they are in worse shape than they were when they started. This has been the experience not only of Canada, it's been the experience of all the countries throughout the world. I read from an article the other day, which indicated the difficulties that the European Common Market countries were facing in attempting to find solutions to the problem that they are faced with there.

I have mentioned some of the difficulties that we are going to face but there is one that keeps nagging in the back of my mind all the time, and that is, if you are successful in finding a means whereby some stability in wheat prices can be achieved, what good is it unless you can find some way of finding stability in the prices of the things that the farmer has to buy. If the price of wheat was to be raised \$3.00 today, tomorrow somebody will have figured out a way to get that extra dollar out of the farmer's pocket and you are even worse off than when you began, because then you are placing yourself in a more difficult position in regard to international trading, and we depend so much on selling our wheat in international markets that it would be foolhardy on our part to try and price ourselves out of this market.

In addition to that, during the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations, there was an agreement that was arrived at by the negotiating countries and later ratified by the House of Commons - I think it was on the 18th of December of last year - the anti-dumping duties, which brings a new perspective into international trading that it might be well to mention at this time. I got in touch with the officials at Ottawa to attempt to determine how they would interpret the particular resolution that is before us today and here is what I find. If the government, as is suggested in this resolution, were to pick up the tab, the \$384 million that I mentioned earlier, there is a possibility that it could not be construed as dumping, and dumping is defined in the legislation as when a commodity which is sold at - and this is the term they use - which is sold at arm's length in the country of origin, is sold for a lower price in the country of export. If the consumer were to pick up the tab, the \$3.00 a bushel, then there's no question in their mind, it would be out and out dumping, because you have created a price in Canada which is in excess of what you could get on the international markets. There is no question in their mind that that would be construed as dumping and we would be charged as such. And that seems to rule out that possibility. It's almost as difficult, Mr. Speaker, as the possibility of ever getting the government at Ottawa at the present time dishing out \$384 million, so you are caught both ways.

I must say again that I am most concerned with what is going to happen if tomorrow the price of wheat should go up to \$3.00 a bushel. Every machine company, every fertilizer company, every farm supplier would be huddled the next day finding a way to extract any excessive money that may be around in the farmer's pockets. They have a habit of doing that. They think it's their God-given right to extract every nickel out of their pockets, . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: What about your government?

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . every nickel that they possibly can, and until and unless -- and we had a recent example of this, and now my honourable friends across the way are smiling happily. They believe, I suppose, that I have finally come around to agreeing with their way of thinking, but I assure them such is not the case. I find that, Mr. Speaker, it's a good thing for young people to be Socialists, and it's better if the younger they are the better it is because they have a chance to grow out of it. But I must say that a recent occurrence in Toronto struck my attention when a young man went over to England and purchased a tractor and brought it back here for \$3,000 less than what that tractor was selling for in Canada. That doesn't surprise me, because we have had farm machinery enquiries before and I sat on one of those enquiries on the House of Commons committee, and they quite openly admitted their philosophy is to charge what the market will bear, and that's a philosophy that even my honourable friend from Inkster agreed with the other day.

MR. GREEN: That's right.

MR. JORGENSEN: So the countervailing balance must now come from the agricultural industry itself.

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

The strange thing about this whole thing is that the people who were most embarrassed was a cooperative farm implement industry in Canada, right here in Manitoba - CCIL. One would have thought: why weren't they doing this? Why aren't they now bringing tractors over for \$3,000 less? Surely they must be in a position to be able to do that and supply those tractors to the farmers. I always presumed that that was one of the reasons why these organizations were set up - to give the farmer something to judge the price of a commodity by. Is it that they have failed in that responsibility? Is it that they have failed to recognize the need for change within their own industry, and to bring about those changes that will make them effective in dealing with the situation as it exists today?

I was rather interested in the report, the interim report that was handed down by the Barber Commission. After a lot of fanfare, task forces and all, the Barber Commission triumphantly submitted an interim report. And what was that report? Their whole purpose of the investigation was to examine the price of farm machinery; why it was so high. Their interim report contained this statement: too many farm accidents and the company should put roll bars on those tractors. Hardly the sort of thing that they were set up to do in the first place. But I am convinced, and if I have transgressed somewhat, Mr. Speaker, I think I have strayed somewhat from the motion, but I think I had to do that in order to bring in all of the ramifications of this particular suggestion, and I'm convinced that unless some way can be found -- and I would much prefer that the farmers do that themselves because I believe what the Honourable Member for Churchill said the other day: "Government makes a mistake, everybody will suffer; but if a farmer makes a mistake on his own, he's the only one that's going to suffer for it." This is good philosophy and I think that the honourable member should preach that philosophy to his colleagues. But if the farmers can get together, I know that they can resolve this difficulty and I'd much prefer to see them do it themselves.

So accordingly, I cannot go along with the particular suggestion that was made in the original resolution, but in order to give assistance to an industry that is in difficulty, the method proposed by my colleague from Virden is in my view, although it may not involve as much financially, it is perhaps something that is within the realm of expectation, and it is a suggestion that is far more equitable in its application than the suggestion made by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. And so, Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I hope that honourable members of this House will support the amendment to the amendment and perhaps it may not be too late when we get out of here to go over to the House of Commons Agricultural Committee Meeting, which is meeting right at the moment in the Monarch Life Building, and listen in to what some of the experts have to say on this particular situation. I'd be interested in knowing just what their suggestions are. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words in defence of the farmer, the much maligned farmer. You may not believe it but I was born and raised on a farm, and I'm sure what the member said there a minute ago, I don't think he meant that because I believe he's a farmer himself. I've worked with many people in camps, logging camps, construction camps, bush camps, and I think the most honest people in the world are farmers. Now he made a suggestion there that if they brought in this resolution there would be 190,000 farmers who would take advantage of this. Surely you're not suggesting that the farmers would cheat and take advantage of legislation that would make them \$2,000 richer. Surely they're not...

MR. JORGENSEN: They're good businessmen too.

MR. BOROWSKI: I hope you didn't mean that, and if you didn't, perhaps you could apologize to the farmers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris again draws me to my feet because every time, it seems, that he participates in the debates of various resolutions that are proposed, that he always has a very negative approach. His last statement, Mr. Speaker, was that he thinks that the farm problems can best be solved by farmers themselves, and I'm surprised that my honourable friend, with the amount of background experience that he has, that is, in the House of Commons and in public affairs generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, that he would say something of that nature because he knows fully that the business of farming is one that has many hazards, be it the market place, lack of market organization, or lack of weather co-operation, the hazards of nature, Mr. Speaker, and for him to suggest that the

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . farmers themselves should be put in a position of solving their own income problems is just a little too much to expect, in that we recognize that all the developed countries of the world do participate to a great extent in the development of the agricultural industry and indeed in the well-being of the agricultural industry. Every government is heavily committed in the support of that industry, with the exception of this country, of course. My honourable friend knows that Canada is one of those countries that participates very little in a direct way in ensuring that the agricultural community would be healthy, viable and progressive.

So I take my honourable friend to task, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's a lot of bull, I think it's a lot of bull that is coming from that side, and I'm not prepared for one moment to accept the kind of guff that he is dishing out this afternoon. My honourable friend was in a position for many years, a position of government, whereby he could have participated in genuine policy development for agriculture, but as he stated this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, he believed that these matters can be left to the farmers themselves, and although there may be problems, they are best equipped to solve those problems and we don't need the intrusions of government. This is his position and it's not surprising, Mr. Speaker. It's consistent with the philosophy of the Conservative Party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the proposition of my honourable friend is that there are so many handicaps, so many reasons why we shouldn't adopt a resolution such as proposed by myself, that he is proposing an alternative that will indeed hopefully do the same job, and that is to help our farmers get over the critical period which they find themselves in today. Now if you recall, Mr. Speaker, the history of that kind of idea, and we have some history because the Conservative Party was the Government of Canada a few years ago and did have a policy of acreage payments as their answer to dealing with the farm income problem. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I don't have to remind my honourable friends that that was not a program at all; that it was an election bribe; it did not solve any income problems as far as the farmers were concerned. If my honourable friend can prove to me that \$200.00 of assistance to any farmer solved his income problems that day, that year and for ever, ever and after, then, Mr. Chairman, I would be prepared to consider such a recommendation. But we know that we had the program and his government abandoned it, Mr. Speaker. He was then in the House of Commons and his government was then in power, and they abandoned that kind of a program, and maybe for reasons that were suggested by my honourable friend the Member for Inkster, that too many people were trying to get into the act to get the \$200.00 and they were parcelling off their land, and something of that nature, and it wasn't really doing the job. Why did they abandon that program, Mr. Speaker? I ask my honourable friends on that side. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, please.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, it's very simple. Because the price of wheat went up to over \$2.00 a bushel and when you can sell all your wheat at \$2.00 a bushel what is the point of subsidizing it at a level that doesn't bring you as great a return as all the wheat being sold at \$2.00 a bushel?

MR. USKIW: My honourable friend should be reminded that there was a bit of inconsistency in the payments of the \$200.00, even in the years in which it was paid, in that it wasn't paid every year and the price of wheat did not fluctuate at that time year about, Mr. Speaker. It was consistent for two or three years. -- (Interjection) -- That's the point, Mr. Speaker, and I've made this point before, that those payments were coincidental with the political dilemma of the Conservative Party at the time, and that was the only reason that there was any consideration given to the plight of the farmers of this country, and none other, Mr. Speaker. It was purely a political bribe.

MR. DESJARDINS: It was just a coincidence.

MR. USKIW: Just a coincidence, my honourable friend from St. Boniface says. Well, Mr. Speaker, I for one moment, in introducing this kind of a resolution and other resolutions that I have introduced in this House attempting to deal with farm income problems, I for one moment, Mr. Speaker, have never suggested that this was the answer. I think I have to remind my honourable friends that the Member for Lakeside made a very good presentation in the House a week ago on this particular subject, where he said that he recognizes also that this isn't the answer, the permanent answer, but it is something that we might tide the farmers over in the meantime until we devise an agricultural policy that we can pin ourselves down to, that will bring about the kind of agricultural progress that we want in this country.

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . And I'm not suggesting that this is something that should be of a permanent nature. I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there is a problem today. The farmers are in dire straits economically, and this is one way in which we can do something about it, and I'm not suggesting that this should be perpetuated for ever and ever. I think that until we devise agricultural policies that are meaningful -- and with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, we have not had agricultural policies in this country to date. There has never been a formula, a program to which our agricultural producers can gear themselves and be confident that they are going to get a decent return for their labour and their investment. We have never had such a policy and, Mr. Speaker, for the Honourable Member for Morris to suggest that we adopt something that indeed did not work, I think it's a lot of window dressing. I think it's a lot of window dressing and it doesn't mean a thing.

The Honourable Member for Morris mentioned the fact that we cannot solve the problem entirely in the sense that what are we going to do with the producers that don't have a milling quality of wheat, and that are they not entitled to the same kind of support. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that my honourable friend didn't follow my remarks, and, if he did, he would have known that I suggested that even grains that were sold to the feeders would be so subsidized in the sense that I wanted the establishment -- or not the establishment, I wanted to perpetuate a cheap food policy in this country. And I didn't want the feeders to pay a high price for their feed grains which, if they did, would put them in a tough competitive position with other countries or other areas, but that I wanted the feeders to be in a position of competition and also to maintain a cheap meat policy so that our consumers in this country would not have to pay a higher price for the basic necessities of life in the food area, and that the best way to approach this was through the Federal Treasury through some program. Indeed Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest we have had a policy of cheap food for Canada but that that policy did not come from the government at Ottawa; it was in fact effected by the fact that the producers of those commodities did not get a fair return for their labour and their investment, and that is how we have to date maintained such a cheap food policy.

My honourable friend went on to say that we have to be very careful that if we provide some form of assistance to producers in this country that we may face some retaliatory measures on the part of other countries that are in the exporting business of wheat and other grains. Mr. Speaker, surely we recognize that all our exporting countries in competition with us to some degree, and some countries to a very substantial degree, have and do and intend to continue to heavily subsidize agricultural production. In the Country of France, as my honourable friend the Member for Morris pointed out, is subsidizing a bushel of barley to the extent of \$1.23 per bushel. I want to know the kind of retaliation we're going to take against that country, Mr. Speaker. How does my honourable friend expect the farmers of this country to compete with the treasuries of other countries, Mr. Speaker? They can't. They have to have the involvement and participation of government. It is too big a problem for them to handle themselves, and I think it's a lot of poppycock and nonsense that is coming from my honourable friend the Member for Morris in the absence of a policy of their own, Mr. Speaker; in the absence of a policy of their own.

I have been attempting throughout the entire session to get some indication as to what kind of an agricultural plan that my honourable friends have in mind, because although they have been overly critical of all the suggestions that have come from this side of the House, they have yet not presented this House with one iota of a solution to the problems in agriculture. All we've had from them is criticism of our position; that our position is not workable, it creates too many problems; but not once have they proposed -- show me on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, where they have some proposal which would bring to the agricultural community some form of assistance or alleviation of their present income situation. Show me. What is your program, Mr. Speaker? My honourable friend hasn't mentioned one item which he would propose that would deal with the current farm income crisis. Not one item.

They have done a lot of other things that have increased the crisis or have amplified the crisis, and that is that they have proceeded with policies of increasing the interest rate; they have abandoned the credit field and said to the farmers of Manitoba that you can go to the private lenders, pay your 8 or 10 or 12 percent; we're no longer interested in supporting a program of low interest rates. They threw the farmers to the sharks, Mr. Speaker, and they are going to suggest to me here and now that they are at all concerned with the problems of agriculture. Mr. Speaker, they're not going to convince me, and indeed I don't propose that

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . they're going to convince anyone, that they are truly concerned with the plight of agriculture in Manitoba and indeed in Canada. And when we talked about what happens when we give the primary producer an induction of money, whether it be through a subsidy or otherwise, the fact that there are people ready and waiting to take this money away from the farmers, that we have people that are experts, that they will go out and they will rob the farmer -- this is what he really suggested, Mr. Speaker -- that our businessmen of Canada are ready to pounce on these farmers and rob them of any wealth that they may accumulate from any measures that government may take to assist them in their income problems.

Now maybe he's right, Mr. Chairman, I don't know. But he said it. He said it. And I want to remind my honourable friend that he should have enough experience -he's been in the House of Commons for a good number of years; I'm sure he's heard many debates on this point - but I want to remind my honourable friend that in the United States, when President Kennedy was then in office, how many times did he intervene in the private sector and say to them, "Don't you dare increase the price of your commodity." He has -in the price of steel, Mr. Speaker. The price of steel determines the price of a combine, determines the price of a tractor. It determines the price of almost everything the farmer must buy in order that he will provide himself with the necessary machinery and equipment to his operations. That government was not afraid, Mr. Speaker, to intervene. My honourable friend will say, what will we do if the machine company decides to take that extra dollar a bushel away from the farmer? I'm telling him what he could do and he's in a position of government and that's the policy he should be following. We ought to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that we don't allow the sharks of this country to exploit people. And my honourable friend is in a position to do something about it but he refuses; he refuses. Mr. Speaker, I don't buy the kind of proposal, the kind of argument that the Honourable Member for Morris is giving to this House this afternoon.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I find in this resolution that the preamble is in many ways acceptable and repeats the position that I have taken in the House on a number of occasions, both on the Throne Speech and the Budget Debate. I find that the first operative section covers in fact what I think is the right principle in which we should be heading. But I find unfortunately that the second operative section -- well, to be fair to the member, I don't think he has thought out the implications really of the particular wording that he has used. I won't go as far as to say it's irresponsible. I'll give him credit of not having worded it adequately, because it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is far too broad in its application. It does not refer, for example, to owner-occupied dwellings. In fact it doesn't refer to dwellings at all. It refers simply to \$2,000 of municipal assessment. This could be on vacant land; it could be on business premises; it could be on anything. It doesn't take into consideration in any way the ability-to-pay principle, which my honourable friend says that he supports. It's simply an across-the-board exemption.

It seems to me that this is not the right approach in this area, Mr. Speaker. I would prefer at this stage to recommend to the honourable member who is proposing this resolution, the consideration of Resolution 44 on Page 17 of today's Order Paper, introduced by my colleague the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia, where he is asking for a \$2,000 exemption but with some specific area in mind, the residence of an owner who is receiving Old Age Security Pension and Old Age Supplement.

Now when considering this resolution on the whole, I think that one of the aspects we have to look at is what is involved in dollars and cents. On the very broad basis presented here, it's difficult to make an assessment. I have, however, been able to make a partial assessment, at least, of the cost if you accept certain basic guide lines. In accepting the guideline of owner-occupied dwellings, I find, for example, that in the Greater Winnipeg area there is something in the order of 105,000 residences. It's approximately -- the normal figure is about 90 percent owner-occupied. So taking that figure, we would find that the \$2,000 exemption, for example, would apply to about 94,500 dwellings in Greater Winnipeg, and based on an average rate of 55 mills the exemption would be in the order of \$110 if

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . . applied to the first \$2,000. So the total cost for the Greater Winnipeg area alone would be 94,500 times 110, or something in excess of \$10 million. It's a little more difficult to get a figure for rural Manitoba because of the mixture of farm and residential property, but considering that half of the population of Manitoba roughly is in Greater Winnipeg, I think it would be reasonable to assume that probably the equivalent amount would apply to rural Manitoba so it would be another 10 million. And so, if we limited the resolution at this stage strictly to owner-occupied dwellings, which is not what the honourable member is doing, then we are talking something in terms of \$20 million.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm all in favour of tax reform and I've said so, but I think that when we're talking in these sort of figures that what we ought to do is proceed to another resolution on the Order Paper as well, and a full-fledged provincial-municipal conference, because I don't think that it is realistic in one year to ask for a shift of \$20 million when at the same time we are asking in the field of Medicare that a shift be made there, and in other areas that additional amounts be given. And so, I find that I cannot support the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and that while the principle of shifting the load from property to other taxes insofar as education, health and welfare is one that I endorse, that really I think that the proposition as presented to us now is not feasible of implementation at this stage. And so I regret that I will be unable to give the honourable member support on this one. I commend to him, rather, the proposal that we should have a full-fledged provincial-municipal conference on taxation, and for the time being that we should move along in the area of greatest need as proposed by my colleague, the Member for Assiniboia, and help out people on low and fixed incomes and the old age pensioners.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that debate be adjourned. I'll be closing the debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the member for Souris-Lansdowne, I move that this be let stand, and seconded by the member for Springfield.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Agreed? Agreed to allow it to stand?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, according to the rules the member now, because this matter has been stood once, the member loses his right to speak. However, with unanimous consent I suppose it could stay on the Order Paper. Is that what is being requested?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member is correct, that there is a penalty. Agreed? (Agreed).

Adjourned debate No. 18 of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this resolution, we in our group certainly would not vote against it; we intend to support it; but frankly, I'm afraid that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, in bringing in such a resolution, isn't going to resolve the problem which he puts forward facing the municipalities and the taxpayers of Manitoba. If anything, I feel he's playing into the hands of the government by giving them an excuse to delay direct and immediate action, because he calls for a provincial-municipal fiscal conference and he bases his argument on the "Whereas the Manitoba Government at federal-provincial conferences has taken the position that the Provincial Government has insufficient taxing powers relative to its responsibilities." He therefore feels that the municipalities, being in the same bind, the Government of Manitoba should meet with them and discuss their mutual problem.

But there's a difference, Mr. Speaker. In regard to federal-provincial jurisdictions, the area responsibilities are set out in the BNA Act. The province is charged with certain responsibilities; the Federal Government has certain responsibilities; each unfortunately jealously guarding their jurisdictions and wishing in many cases to retain the powers within their jurisdiction. But surely the municipalities are not in that position at all. The municipalities really have no established area of responsibility. They are creatures of the provincial government. They've been created by the provincial government. They are instruments of the provincial government. And so any authority they have, they have because they've been vested in them by the provincial government. They are actually administrative units established by the provincial government, and so to suggest that the relationship between federal and

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . provincial governments in any way is similar to the problems facing municipalities, is I'm afraid going to prolong the day that it will take to find an answer.

And certainly I don't think it should be just a nebulous conference saying, "Let the municipalities get together with the province," and I think the suggestion was that they be regional meetings held throughout Manitoba and the members of the Legislature be on a committee, to travel throughout the province of Manitoba and meet with members of municipal councils; because in a sense this has already been done. It's been done by the fact that commissions were established over the years, and the municipalities came to these commissions and they made submissions, and the purpose of these submissions was to bring to the Royal Commission the views of the various municipalities, the various areas, the various differences of opinion as between municipalities, bring it to some forum where they could express their views and have somebody evaluate these views, evaluate it in the light of the needs of that community, the impact that it might have on other communities and on the province as a whole. And we've been through all that before. The Fisher Commission did all this. The Michener Royal Commission did all this. And they have set out the guide lines; they have the answers and we know the answers; so that there are known answers to known problems. It isn't as if we're starting somewhere afresh, and I regret really that it was felt necessary by the Leader of the Opposition to bring in this resolution, because I think, as I said earlier, it plays into the hands of the government who now have an excuse to sit back on their haunches and do nothing because they now are going to probably accept the Leader of the Official Opposition's position and they'll say, well, even the Opposition wants us to hold a conference so we're going to call a conference. Of course, conferences take time, and if we're going to set up committees to tour the countryside that's going to take time, and before long we're going to be into 1970 and that not being a good year to hold conferences we'll likely go until 1971; and in '72 we'll still be talking about who will evaluate what the conferences are.

There's no suggestion here that the government make set proposals, come up with specific ideas of what it will discuss with the municipalities. It's just a vague resolution, sort of all in favour of motherhood please stand up, and everyone no doubt will stand up, but I regret to say it hasn't enough meat to it. If this resolution was critical of the government for not coming up with specific proposals, or at least for coming up with proposals which it might perhaps clear through a series of meetings on the province's, there might be some immediate value to it, but failing that, I'm afraid that all we're going to achieve with this type of resolution is an excuse for the government to hide behind this type of resolution, call or convene a series of meetings over the next year or two or three years, and having done so, come back and say, "Well, you know they didn't agree with each other," and of course that's not surprising because, as I mentioned last night during the debate on estimates, the problems of Manitoba vary as between rural and urban, as between the sparsely populated areas and the densely populated areas, and there's no chance that there can be a meeting of minds. Someone has to evaluate it; someone has to come up with proposals; and this was done.

So, Mr. Speaker, we intend to support this resolution but I regret and hope that the government isn't going to take advantage of this type of resolution to sit back in the bushes and do nothing, when it has before it a program set out by the Michener Royal Commission and the Fisher Royal Commission, setting out quite clearly what its responsibilities should be, what the municipal responsibilities should be, how the money should be levied, what financial obligations the municipalities should have and what financial obligations the province should carry. And with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I hope that in closing debate the Leader of the Opposition will make it clear that he certainly did not intend this resolution to be used as an excuse for no action by this government.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, just a few words on this resolution. I'm certainly pleased that the last member that spoke is going to support this resolution, but I cannot for the life of me see his concern that this resolution should be used to delay what we actually want. Now the member stated -- first of all, he made the comparison that it wasn't the same thing between the federal and provincial governments, and the provincial government and the different municipalities. Well I think it is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that these two were used just as a comparison. In other words, all we hear from the province here is that Ottawa will not co-operate and they need more and more money, and now we're saying, well, if this is the case it is doubly so in the case of the municipalities. Now we were told yesterday that the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) ... First Minister, when he received the report of the TED Commission, said, well, he certainly will endorse it and start working on this vigorously, immediately; give real leadership. And then we keep on reading the report, or the press coverage, and what are we told? Well, his vigorous endorsement of the TED report is that he's going to start to write vigorous letters to Ottawa, and apparently this is all that's being done. This is the vigorous action of the government. Everywhere we're told that they're going to go ahead and start asking more money to Ottawa. All right, this is fine, but this is not leadership and this is only half the battle.

Now, somebody that wants to write vigorous letters to Ottawa should at least be reasonable enough and write maybe little tender love notes to the municipalities and say, "Come, we'll speak with you." I think this is fair enough. You don't have to be as vigorous if you don't want, if it's a little more embarrassing, but invite them; invite them to come and discuss this question because it's obvious, it's obvious that the whole tax structure has to be reviewed, and you can't just say, well all right, Santa Claus is for us but the heck with you. As much as the Canadian government has the responsibilities of helping the provinces, surely, surely there's as much responsibility for the provincial government to assist the municipalities. The municipalities are a creation of this government and they certainly must assist.

Now we hear, day after day, ... that Canada, that the federal government should do more. Well, we're right here in Winnipeg. We don't have to -- we can even use the phone if we don't want to write those vigorous letters to the municipalities, but we should invite them to talk with us. And, as I said, I cannot see the concern of the last member that spoke and he wants my Leader, when closing the debate, to assure him that he's not suggesting this resolution to give the government an excuse not to do it. Well, surely he's not serious. He doesn't think we're going to lose our . . . by -- I think that they have enough excuse without giving them any more excuses. -- (Interjection) -- Well, no, we're not giving them more. If you read this correctly you will see. If the government was speaking they'd play with words. When they say "in due course," that could mean in three generations. We know that. But the words used by my Leader here in his resolution were: "Therefore Be It Resolved that the Manitoba Government immediately," - and we mean immediately, and I think that the member, who certainly is very knowledgeable in this field of municipal affairs, he would be - and I think that he contributed quite a bit today in this debate - he would be the type of man that would be invited. This is what we're saying. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if you don't trust them, don't say to us, well don't make any resolution; don't make any resolution. Don't ask for anything because what can we do? We say immediately -- (Interjection) -- Get them to talk. You'll have to run around with a bell and everything else to wake them up to start with. They don't give a darn. They're not interested in talking but at least they'll have to stand up. If we can't make them talk the next thing is they stand up. If they don't want to vote for this, that means that they want to be vigorously interested in the TED Commission, they're going to write these vigorous letters but no love notes to the municipalities.

Now I think this is clear. I think my honourable friend probably wanted to show, I don't know, that he doesn't want to apply this too soon, or maybe he wants to show that it's time for action. We agree with all that, but we use the word "immediately" and we think a good action is to start to discuss with these people, the municipal men and the other people of the provincial government. We heard all about priorities. We heard all about this, and we have all the facilities here, and I can't see, I can't see, Mr. Speaker, how the government, how they could dare vote against this resolution because if they do there's not a darn bit of sincerity in what they've been telling us about their concern of priorities for the people, about doing something to make it easier, possible for the homeowners to pay taxes and so on, it'll be just lip service. And you can't go on forever. The people are getting wise. You can't go on forever.

All right, Premier Weir made his point. He was terrific. He stood his ground and he said, "Ottawa give us more money." But is he ready to speak with the municipalities also? Is he ready to say, "This is a priority list, not only for me, but for the municipalities"? It seems to me that this government is taking this as a joke. It's playing politics. On an important subject like this, what did we hear from the Minister when he started his estimates yesterday? I think he congratulated the former Minister - that was the first thing. This is fine; I don't object to this; and two of his deputies. Not one word about anything else. He says, "Ask questions. I'll try to answer." Well he's supposed to provide leadership. This

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . is a government that's telling us all about those priorities, that you want to do something in this field . . . .

MR. BAIZLEY: . . . away ahead.

MR. DESJARDINS: What?

MR. BAIZLEY: We're away ahead . . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: You're away ahead. Well, let the people of Manitoba know that you're so smart because by looking at you we'd never guess. Never. Never. Stand up and say a few words, then we'll ask questions and everything will be fine. This is all we want to know. If you're ahead we'll try to run behind you and try to catch up with you. This is all we want.

MR. BAIZLEY: That's what you're trying to do now.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I would have caught you and passed you by a long time ago, because I think you were tripped along the way. You're certainly not stopping to answer questions, that's one thing I'll say.

So I think we want to hear about this. I hope that the Minister will tell us about these things, will tell us what he wants to do. We'll share all this, well these good policies. If you're that far ahead don't be ashamed, don't be bashful. This is some thing that you've never been before; you've never been bashful before. Just tell us how wonderful you are, about the great plans you have. Tell us. We'd like to share them because we are concerned also. So all we're saying, I'm sure that the Minister will probably want to say something on this. I hope so anyway, on a resolution that important. I mean if they're going to go all the way to Ottawa and wait till the television cameras are on him to say this is a priority, surely they can say that they're interested in treating the municipalities the same way as they want to be treated. That's fair enough. It's all we want. And I would say to my honourable friend that if, by your speech, you were trying to show that it is urgent, we're with you; we're with you; but we said we've got the words there; my Leader introduced this resolution and he's got the word "immediately" and immediately doesn't mean "in due course" for us. It means right now, and I hope that the Minister will favour us with some of his great ideas. He says he's away ahead of us, so if you don't want to give it to us all at once keep a little bit, but give us a few kind words, please, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have studied this resolution rather carefully and am convinced that, due to the inaccuracies of the resolution, I shall not be able to support it. I don't think there is any doubt, Mr. Speaker, but what this government has always provided a deep commitment to northern development through which the mineral development and the extraction of other renewable resources is quite evident. The matter of transportation that's mentioned in the resolution, I think it's generally understood that a good move from north to south, or south to north, whoever is at the end of the line naturally is going to pay more for the goods than the one that put them on the carrier. And I think in the other part of the resolution, the success of the developments in the north are going to depend a great deal on the northern residents themselves, who are, I say, on the threshold of a great future and a great history of progress, and I think one of the urgencies of the north at this particular time is for permanent residents to fulfill the true role of a northern resident. I don't think also, Mr. Speaker, that there is any argument but what this House supports the continuing programs of the north, and in particular such measures as will ensure equity for the citizens of that community. So therefore I submit, Mr. Speaker, and would suggest to the House that they vote negative for this resolution.

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

MR. PATRICK: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I have decided not to speak and will waive my right. If anyone wishes to speak they may do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I was sincerely hoping to hear some words of wisdom from the Member for Logan and I was hoping to speak on this, on some of the things that he would probably be bringing up, but in the light of the fact that he has waived his right, I would like to move, seconded by the Member from Springfield, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I notice that an opinion is being given but I'm sure the honourable gentleman would realize the situation that the honourable member that did say that word, he intended to move the adjournment but he did say a word or two but I don't think it was his intent to speak.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, my only point would be that if he weren't quite new to this House I would certainly object because I think it is wrong. But certainly, in view of his lack of experience, I would not press the point.

MR. SPEAKER: I couldn't agree with the honourable gentleman more. He will see me act in that direction at the proper time, but under the circumstances I feel ...

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave. Have it your own way. Agreed? (Agreed.)

The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. LYON: Did you put the question on that motion, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, it's been a long day. The question on the adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Minister of Education. He too loses his right.

MR. LYON: . . . the matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. CHERNIACK: If it stands, then why not call the vote? I don't understand how it can stand unless it's stood by the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, this came up earlier. If I may, on the point of order. If I recall the rule, and I haven't read it correctly, if an honourable member adjourns the debate and he's not there the first time, it stands in his name. If he's not there the second time, then it's open and it's no longer in his name. And so we're now at the position that if the honourable member is not there to speak he loses his right, and either someone else must get up and speak, or someone else get up and adjourn, or the vote must come. Is that...

MR. CHERNIACK: Right. Quite right.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I will be brief but I do wish to make a few comments on this resolution. I think it's a good one, and dealing with the Resolved part that the 5 percent sales tax be eliminated on all clothing and footwear for children eligible for federal government family allowance, I would like to at this time state that it has been quite well put to this House in the last few weeks that our wage is probably the lowest of any province in Canada, and I'm sure all the members will agree that our winters are probably the coldest and it certainly costs the families, the parents who clothe the children, more money in this province during the winter than probably any province in the rest of Canada. So I think this is in itself one real good point that we should consider this resolution.

Our educational tax has been continually climbing. Our mill rate and assessment on our

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . property has been continually going up as well, in view of the fact that two years ago we brought in the 5 percent sales tax. When the sales tax was introduced in this House it was at that time brought to this House quite forcibly that this is going to take the tax load off the residential property and the property -- the educational tax on the property, of the residential property owners. Well this has not happened, Mr. Speaker. So I feel that the least we can do is to remove the 5 percent sales tax on children's clothing and footwear. I know in my own situation myself, I have children all under age 11, and the two of them that are 11 years of age I have to pay the sales tax which is because apparently they're just much bigger than -- (Interjection) -- Probably this is the case but really I think this is the case in almost every family.

MR. JOHNSON: Blue Bomber material?

MR. PATRICK: What's that?

MR. JOHNSON: Blue Bomber material?

MR. PATRICK: No, I'm afraid it's the opposite sex.

MR. JOHNSON: Maybe they'd do as well.

A MEMBER: A Cheer Leader.

MR. PATRICK: That's right. Cheer Leaders. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that this resolution has good merit and if you recall, I don't know if you had the opportunity to hear or not, but this week on Bill Trebilcoe's by-line there was a survey made throughout the City of Winnipeg, and I understand over 95 percent of the people that were asked and surveyed at that time, the thing that they requested at that time was that the sales tax be removed on children's clothing, and I think this is the feeling of not only the people here in the City of Winnipeg but I think this is the feeling of all the people in the Province of Manitoba, and I would venture to say that probably up north this situation is probably much more serious than here in Winnipeg. I think that when the government did introduce the 5 percent sales tax, this was to reduce much of the property tax which has not happened. The tax is continually climbing and I would like at this time to support the resolution . . .

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. PATRICK: When I'm finished.

MR. CLAYDON: You stated that on the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. When he's completed his remarks.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'm almost finished. I was just ready to sit down so I'll try and answer the honourable member. But what the government tried or proposed to do with the 5 percent sales tax has not happened, so the least we can do at this time is to remove the sales tax on children's clothing and I would hope that most members would be able to support this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. CLAYDON: Would the honourable member permit a question? You stated that 90 percent of the people surveyed on a by-line voted in favour of this. How many people were surveyed?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many were surveyed on the by-line but I know that there were many calls made that morning, and the ones that were asked the question, over 95 percent requested and suggested that the sales tax should be removed on children's clothing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will be absolutely very brief. I'd just like to present one thought. I have to go along with what my honourable colleague has mentioned. Can you imagine an auctioneer after he is finished selling a pair of boots, maybe a little bit of manure on them even, then the party comes in and you have to charge the 5 percent sales tax on that. Can you imagine how pleasant this is?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, our group is - first of all I'd like to indicate that we are going to support the resolution, but I would like to deal with some of the difficulties that are involved, and in particular to distinguish between the resolution now proposed and the resolution which the House previously rejected - that is, the government members of the House and their supporters rejected - which called for a rebate to the low income groups. Before doing that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to perhaps digress for a moment on the question that the Member

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . for Wolseley raised. He said how many people the Member for Assiniboia said that there were 95 percent or 90 percent were in favour of removing the tax, the 5 percent sales tax, on the basis of the children's receiving the federal government family allowance, and the Member for Wolseley said, "How many were surveyed?" I don't know whether the House all heard the Member for St. John's rejoinder. He said 100 percent were surveyed and 90 percent gave that answer, so I think that the rejoinder is about as meaningful as the survey, Mr. Speaker, and I think that's probably what the Member for St. John's was trying to point out.

I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that if we went to 100 people and asked them whether they would agree that a tax on anything should be removed, 90 percent would say that they would be in favour of it being removed and the other 10 percent would probably not have understood the question, because if they had understood the question they would likely say that it should be removed as well. So the response that we get to a question of whether the public does or does not want a particular tax is not, Mr. Speaker, what I consider to be a very good gauge as to whether that tax should be or should not be imposed, because the public in answering that question - and I'm not saying that the public is ill-informed, but the public in answering that question is merely answering the question that they would not like to pay that tax, and there has to in all of these cases be a corollary question, that when you remove that tax and you therefore remove from the public revenues a certain amount of money and assuming that you are going to have the same expenditures, with what tax would you replace the tax which has been removed? And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the best example that we got of this kind of response was when we were talking about the tax on laundry and dry cleaning, when we were dealing with the sales tax legislation, the main legislation itself, and at that time, Mr. Speaker, each of us received a copious petition, thousands and thousands of names - I don't remember the number -- (Interjection) -- Was it 65 or 70 thousand signatures that were received in favour of not having a sales tax on laundry and dry cleaning bills? And I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the only difference between the tax on laundry and dry cleaning services as against a tax on other services is that the other services didn't have an organization collecting signatures, because anybody who organized a petition of that kind could probably get a great many names in favour. But when we look at the laundry and dry cleaning and I'm going to link that up with the resolution in a moment, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the laundry and dry cleaning tax, if we assumed for the moment that the government receives \$200,000 -- and I'm throwing out a figure which is meaningless to me and I hope that it won't be accepted as in some way suggesting that this is the amount -- if the government, by exempting laundry and dry cleaning from the tax roll, lost \$200,000 in revenue, the question which would still have to be answered is, what would be done to reclaim that \$200,000 in revenues? The expenditures would not go down. Therefore there would have to be, let us say, an additional one percent of sales tax or an additional one percent of income tax or another area, and I, without examining the question deeply, Mr. Speaker, am fairly satisfied that the incidence of taxation could possibly hurt the person who is trying to save it more than the other person -- would hurt the lower income groups rather than the higher income groups especially on laundry and dry cleaning, because I would think that the lower income groups do their own laundry, send very little to the laundry and maybe have one suit or a small amount of material that is sent to the dry cleaners, whereas people in the higher income groups do a greatly disproportionate amount in this area.

. . . . cont'd on next page

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, at that time, and I make no apology for it, at that time the claim was against paying a sales tax, and as against paying a sales tax and anything that could be exempted from the sales tax was something which could be supported at that time. But whether the exemption works equity or inequity is really quite impossible to say, and with the present exemption I think that what the Member for Assiniboia is doing is really trying to rationalize the present exemption because the present exemption is based on sizes, and what the Member for Assiniboia wants to do is make the present exemption based on the age of the children. I know that the Member for Churchill, who is not here now, has three children, all of whom are under 16 but two of whom are over 12 years old and who are probably five foot three inches in height and 125 pounds apiece. They are grown; they are adult physically but they are still children, and because his children happen to have matured quickly his taxes are higher than the children who have not matured as quickly, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, he is paying a disproportionate share of the sales tax as it's presently constituted and the government will say, and we sympathize with them - not with the original imposition of the tax, but given the tax the administration is very difficult, because if you don't exempt on the basis of size rather than age, then children could be buying clothes which would be used by adults, and this is one of the anomalies which we are faced with when we impose a sales tax of this kind and it applies to clothing. But I think that in all fairness, that the only just situation is to say that every citizen in Manitoba is taxed equally and he won't be taxed improperly because his children happen to grow quicker than the children in other families; and that being the case, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that we will support this resolution. We don't think that there should be a problem but we do think that the proper way of making exemptions and the way in which we can assure that exemptions work equitably, is to provide a rebate to those people in the lower income groups. That way the exemption is not so important but you are rebating a tax to people who obviously should have an exemption on the basis of income rather than on the basis of their purchases. So we're going to support the resolution, Mr. Speaker. We recognize the difficulties but this appears to be more just than the present situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member I ask that this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Gladstone introduced a resolution for the consideration of this House, which I think makes a great deal of sense in that we are caught in somewhat of a squeeze, that is the farmers are, as a result of producing an over-abundance of food, No. 1. And No. 2, as a result of the bad weather conditions that we had last year that made it necessary to enlarge storage capacity in order that we may salvage that crop without too much spoilage, and for that particular reason I have to compliment my Honourable Member for Gladstone for recognizing the immediate need and that government policy ought to be directed in that direction in such a way that we would remove some of the costs of providing temporary storages, if you like, or indeed going into the building of facilities that could be subsequently used for other purposes.

I think that we must take recognition of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that it doesn't make good economic sense to put up a building that you feel will be used for a purpose only temporarily, and for that reason alone, Mr. Speaker, the government should not bind the farmers in this position; it should in fact encourage the use of dollars in such a way that will provide benefits, most benefit to the farmer in the type of building that he may decide to construct for this particular purpose. We know that we have fluctuations in the amount of grain sales each year, and we know that for the time being we are in a surplus position, and because we are in a surplus position we find that we have to provide additional storage facilities. But, Mr. Speaker, it just doesn't make any economic sense to build facilities for a short term period or to use in a short term period, but it is advisable to build facilities that we can subsequently use for other

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . .

purposes, and because of this particular critical situation that we have at the moment, I think that the Honourable Member for Gladstone was quite timely in presenting this resolution and I simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do endorse his position; I think it's a very good thing to do; the farmers need some assistance, and if we can remove the sales tax from these building materials at this time, that it would augur well for the whole community.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: I think that there might be agreement that we could call it 5:30. If my honourable friend says no, we're quite happy to proceed.

MR. USKIW: I'm prepared to proceed on the next resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the copy here; I'll just use the Order Paper if you like. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that

WHEREAS two thirds of the world still suffer from hunger; and,

WHEREAS Canada's basic industry is agriculture; and,

WHEREAS export of agricultural products greatly improve Canada's balance of payment position;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government of Canada to consider the establishment of a Food Marketing Research Branch under the Department of Agriculture, or Trade and Commerce, to have responsibility for market research and in particular the following:

(a) Total world food need.

(b) Total world food consumption.

(c) Trend in world food consumption.

(d) Improving our trading arrangements with food importing countries.

(e) Economic development of underprivileged countries and how this will change food habits.

(f) Canada's contribution in foreign aid.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion in this House and indeed in the House of Commons on the question of how to properly distribute world food, and indeed how to distribute it in light of the fact that we have, on the one hand, tremendous surpluses of food commodities, and on the other hand an unmet need in various nations of the world for that particular commodity, and I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a simple solution to the problem, but I think that the resolution which I have proposed this afternoon has a great deal of merit and ought to be positively considered by all members of this House. I don't think it is a resolution, Mr. Speaker, that ought to be approached on the basis of political philosophy because it isn't that kind of a resolution. I think it's a resolution of straight, good, common sense, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that this is one of the resolutions that would command the attention of all members of the House regardless of political party, and that they indeed participate in the deliberations and discussions of this question in a positive vein, hopefully that this will be one of those resolutions that would meet the approval of the House unanimously. Now Mr. Speaker, I have designated a number of areas that ought to be closely studied, and I have suggested in this resolution that we have an established Food Marketing Research Branch within either the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Trade and Commerce at the federal level, and this is certainly a federal problem, Mr. Speaker, in that we have a great deal more production of food commodities in this country than indeed the population of this country can consume, and for that reason it does belong in the area of federal agricultural programming. But regardless of that, Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I must interrupt the honourable gentleman and remind him that it's now 5:30. I'm sure he wishes to continue when the item comes forward next.

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. LYON: I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.