

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o' clock, Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might take a moment and introduce our young guests today. We have 14 students of Grade 12 standing from the Beaver Brae School, Kenora, Ontario. These students are under the direction of Mr. Degagne and Mr. Pitz. This school is located in Kenora, Ontario, as I said a moment ago, and visiting Winnipeg and the Legislative Assembly today.

We also have with us 55 students of Grades 10 and 12 standing from the Lorette Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Sabourin and Mr. Shewchuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

We also have with us 60 students of Grade 6 standing from the Robertson School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kowalchuk and Mrs. Glendinning. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

I am sure the honourable members would wish me to welcome back one of the honourable members after his long sojourn in the hospital, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. It's a pleasure indeed to see you, Sir.

MR. J. E. JEANNOTTE (Rupertsland): I wish to thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for your very kind welcome, and to also take the opportunity to thank all the honourable members for their good wishes, for the cards, the signatures on this Get Well card that I received - it was a lovely card; and to assure you that I have missed you all, I've missed my seat, and I was extremely happy to hear of the good wishes that came - some of them came by personal cards, others on this card. My wife said that she never answered so many cards in her life as she did on this occasion. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if the Leader of the House is in a position now to advise the House, in reply to the question of the Leader of the NDP of last night, when the Public Utilities Committee will be called.

MR. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, it will be announced in due course. I don't know at the moment.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Could I ask a supplementary question, unless the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has one, and it might be the same one.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I was going to follow up really on the question that was asked last night as well. Will, when it is called, will the House have assurance that transcribing equipment will be there as it was in the past, the hearings in 1966?

MR. EVANS: No, I have no information to offer on that subject.

MR. PAULLEY: My supplemental question is somewhat different and I'm disappointed in the answer of the Honourable the House Leader to the last question. My other is: Will the government undertake to inform the public ahead of the calling of the meeting in order that they may make arrangements for attendance at the committee meeting, for I'm sure there is some considerable public interest in Bill 15.

MR. EVANS: The usual notice will be provided.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the First Minister. Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation at this session with respect to regional bargaining between teachers and school boards?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, the notice of legislation that we intended to have put forward were contained within the Throne Speech, and it could be

1986

May 7, 1969

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . that it might refer to matters of that kind. I am afraid the honourable member will have to wait and see.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB FROESE (Rhineland): I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Has a White Paper been circulated recently in connection with education?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education)(St. Vital): No, not from me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

#### MATTERS OF URGENGE AND GRIEVANCES

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that leave be given to move the adjournment of this House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance on the following subject matter: The Manitoba farm income crisis arising from the lack of grain sales, low delivery quotas, loss of income to potato growers who were unable to harvest their crop last year due to wet conditions as well as ridiculously low prices that potato growers have been receiving throughout the entire marketing season. The current crisis, not only affecting the producers of agricultural products, is having a serious effect on other sectors of the Manitoba economy such as the sales of fertilizer, farm machinery, automobiles and so forth.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave of the House to proceed? (Agreed.) The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I know that I don't have to remind the members of the House that we do have a serious problem before us in Manitoba, as indeed farmers throughout Canada are facing today, but I want to draw to the attention of the House that we in Manitoba have a responsibility to fulfill to our primary producers and that the situation is such that some action should be taken to alleviate the financial crisis facing the industry, at least insofar as Manitoba is concerned, and I know that it's much broader than that.

Just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I assume you will recall the report in the newspapers telling us that the Government of France has sold some 20 some-odd millions of bushels of grain to the Government of China at \$1.25 a bushel, which is substantially below the International Grains Arrangement prices, and that as a result of this sale it is quite probable that Canada again has missed the boat in selling additional quantities of wheat which indeed, Mr. Speaker, we should be selling if we are going to put the dollars into the pockets of our wheat producers in the prairies and indeed in Manitoba.

We cannot sit idly by, Mr. Speaker, and allow these markets to deteriorate. Canada has had a very dismal record in the past year or two insofar as the sales of wheat is concerned and it's high time that someone took some action to alleviate this situation. I know that the producers of the prairie provinces cannot cope with this situation alone; I know that they are in desperate financial circumstances. We have had examples of meetings throughout the province passing resolutions urging governments to take some action, interim or otherwise, to deal with the current crisis, and yesterday's report, Mr. Speaker, just sort of, in my opinion, is the straw that broke the camel's back and I decided last night when I read the report that I am going to move in some direction to try and get the matter discussed in the Legislature, hopefully that the Legislature will adopt some resolution which would help or alleviate the current crisis as far as the Manitoba farmers are concerned.

I know that the National Farmers' Union is currently in Ottawa presenting its views on matters of urgency, but I thought that in light of that fact we should follow up - we should follow up from the Legislature of Manitoba, as indeed I'm sure is being done in the other two prairie legislatures, in urging our Federal Government to enter into some sort of arrangement whereby we can help the farmers overcome this current crises. I checked with the Canadian Wheat Board this morning and I find a number of things that are serious insofar as the farmers are concerned, one of them being that we have a very low delivery quota situation in Manitoba. We have 53 points in Manitoba still on the unit system, 93 points on a one bushel quota, 66 points on a two bushel quota, 70 points on a three bushel quota, 42 points on a four bushel quota. Now, Mr. Speaker, although we have some points at a four bushel quota or three and two and so forth, I find that the Wheat Board tells me that this is purely artificial, it's a quota on paper, and that in many instances they do not have the boxcars to take the grain out of those respective areas and that in fact the quota is meaningless in the sense that the farmers are

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . still unable to deliver against that quota - or to fill that quota.

So we do have a critical situation. It is the month of May, Mr. Speaker, and some farmers are already on the land trying to put in a new crop, or at least to prepare their land for another crop, and they are in somewhat of a dilemma as to what they should be growing this year. It seems no matter in what direction they turn they find themselves in a position of probably ending up with a surplus situation in light of the present market situation. And the reason for that, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, is the fact that we are being undermined throughout the world in the market place and that there has to be some governmental intervention if we are going to cope with the situation in the way that it ought to be done and in the way that will be meaningful to the producers of Manitoba.

Quotas, Mr. Speaker, are something that we are all concerned about. I would hope that we could get back to the time where we don't have to worry about quotas, where the government through a change in policy would instruct the Canadian Wheat Board -- or give the Canadian Wheat Board more power to go into the direct purchase of commodities regardless of the market situation. So that it is the Wheat Board, through the assistance of the Government of Canada, that would carry the load of a surplus commodity as opposed to the producers themselves, and that the producer would receive his income for the year regardless of the amount of delivery in that particular year. It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the legislators of this land took issue with the problems that are besetting our producers, and I don't think that we in this House ought to be the ones to be accused of procrastination when we recognize that it is indeed a serious problem. I don't think I have to convince many members on either side of the House as to the seriousness of the situation. I know that when I talked to farmers throughout my own constituency, and throughout other constituencies, they simply asked me, what do you think we should do?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have the ultimate answer but I know that something must be done, and to initiate some movement I suggest to the Legislature that we ought to adopt a resolution - or a position, and that this position should be conveyed to the senior government in Ottawa and that we ought to have an early, if not a permanent solution, an interim solution to the problem. The farm machinery dealers and the companies tell me that their sales are dropping rapidly - and it's no wonder. The fertilizer dealers will tell you the same thing, that farmers have curtailed their purchases significantly, and I am sure that if you go into any small rural community, Mr. Speaker, you will find the average businessman is somewhat in the doldrums; he doesn't know just what to expect. He realizes the income situation in his immediate area and he too is concerned that the agricultural producer is in fact on the verge of bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, we can't afford this. We can't afford this because the whole economy of Manitoba is largely dependent on agriculture, largely dependent in the sense that we either have industries servicing the agricultural sector with machinery and supplies or that we are also in the business of processing primary products that our farmers produce. So that it is an interdependent thing. Everyone has an interest in the well-being of our producers in Manitoba, and because of that fact, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that every member of this Legislature would come to grips with this current situation. Be it an interim proposal, Mr. Speaker, matters not to me as long as it is something to tide us over until we can do something more definite in the future.

If we look at the situation in Europe, we see that the French government subsidizes their barley producers by \$1.23 a bushel, Mr. Speaker. That is more money in subsidy per bushel than our Canadian farmer received for his barley last year. Surely we can't expect our producers to compete against this kind of thing. We can't afford to compete with the treasuries of other countries, we have to have some form of governmental direction and governmental involvement in the agricultural industry. We look at the price of wheat in France, the farmer receives, it's something in the neighbourhood of \$2.55 a bushel, something like a dollar more than we are getting for our wheat at the present time. We know that the French treasury is assuring these prices to the farmers, but at the same time they are prepared to undercut us in the market place to the extent of offering wheat at \$1.25 a bushel.

Mr. Speaker, we did have arrangements with the Government of China for a number of years, arrangements that would have provided for that country many millions of bushels of Canadian wheat. I fail to see why we weren't taking action in time to prevent another country from taking away from us that market which we developed some years ago. I think we have been sitting on our laurels, Mr. Speaker; probably the government at Ottawa is a lot to blame

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . on this issue; the Canadian Wheat Board probably is not doing as much as it could do in this connection; but I want to say to you that it is time that the legislators of the provinces, the prairie provinces, and the government of Ottawa got together and decided that they are going to take some positive action.

The question of boxcars, Mr. Speaker, is an important one because the lack of boxcars is one of the reasons why we have points that have high delivery quotas but are still unable to deliver - and this is information coming from the Canadian Wheat Board as of this morning. There has to be some action taken here, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to get movement and put our farmers in a position of being able to put their crops in this year, whatever they may be, and to launch into a new year of production.

The special crops, Mr. Speaker, have had a very serious setback, that is the growers of special crops, due to the weather conditions of last fall. I know I made this point in the House during the estimates; I know the government was considering some action on this question and hopefully is still considering. I would like to know whether the Premier is prepared to give us some statement as to what he intends to do with a recent brief that was presented to him by the Vegetable Growers Association. I think it's time that the growers knew the position of government policy in this respect, in the sense that they do have to go into the financing of another crop year, and it is something that we ought not to delay for too many days.

I could go on for a great length of time, Mr. Speaker. My suggestion to the House is that the Premier undertake to convene a meeting with the Prime Minister, the other prairie provinces, and in fact that he should do so with the help of the two opposition parties in the House; that we unanimously endorse a resolution suggesting that we send a delegation to Ottawa to discuss with the Federal Government this current crisis, and hopefully that we can get some movement early enough to be of some value to the producers before they are faced with the burden of financing this year's production.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this subject because certainly what the Honourable Member from Brokenhead has brought to the floor of the House at this moment is certainly a matter that is of interest to everyone, and it's certainly a serious one.

I'm the first one to recognize, Mr. Speaker, that most of the responsibility is federal. However, certainly the provincial government should take some action in making sure that it brings to the attention of the Federal Government the problem as it is. I think Manitoba at this time is probably one of the prairie provinces that is suffering the most, because besides all the effects of the difficulty in selling our products, we are saddled with the fact that we have a flood in this province which is affecting indeed many of our producers.

One of the suggestions that I would make at this time - a specific one - is the reinstatement of the flood committee. There are still many farmers who haven't been able to take advantage of the offers of this committee, that is compensation for moving buildings and so on, and the fact that we again have a flood this spring points out that there is still a need for this committee and I certainly suggest that the government reinstate the flood board as soon as they can.

Another group who is certainly suffering immensely at this time is our market gardeners alongside the Red River, and many of them have their plants still in the greenhouses. They just can't move them on to the land and they are certainly being affected most strenuously at this time by the fact that their particular plants will have to be transplanted at a later date which will in turn give a lesser value to their crops later.

Certainly the fact that France has made a large sale to China is affecting every farmer in this country. The fact that the prices have been cut is certainly serious, and again as much as it is the responsibility of the Federal Government, I think the province here should take some action in conjunction with the other prairie provinces. I would even say that we should probably at this time have a gathering together of all the able minds of the western provinces to come to a conclusion as to what really should be done. I certainly don't stand here trying to say that I have the solution. However, it's a fact that we have to face; grain is being sold cheaper than the world prices, the agreed prices. Whoever is responsible, it should be dealt with, and I think in this case it is the duty of the government to bring together the experts, the farmers, the other governments, and face the problem face to face. Whether we should have subsidies, whether we should have agreements between countries as to what we should grow

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.) . . . . so as to ascertain some kind of a reasonable market for the majority of our products, is something that I am not able to define. But certainly one way of approaching it is getting together all the people that are involved, whether it be production, sales, exportation or transportation, but we should get all these minds together - and I don't mean only Canada because this is a world situation, but we in Canada are certainly affected probably more than any other country in the world.

As I said during the estimates, I think it is most important that the government have the necessary people look into the future markets of our products and advise our people of such. As the Honourable Member from Brokenhead has said, and I'm sure this is true for every rural member in his constituency, farmers at this time are asking: What should I seed? And again I'm not trying to say that the Minister of Agriculture has at his fingertips all the needs of the different countries, different provinces, as to exactly the amount that is needed, but certainly he has at his service - and if he hasn't, he should get the people that will be able to give him such advice as to advise the farmers as to the needs in the different markets in the near future.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to stress that this is indeed a matter of great importance, and in my opinion I don't think we should just quarrel about it but we should try and get together as many people as possible to try and find as long lasting as is possible to find in this condition, as to what the needs will be so that we can produce what we will be able to sell. As I said in my opening statement, I don't have the answer, but we have to face the fact that grain is moving right now at prices under the world agreed market, and this is something that we have to face. Whether it is by subsidies, whether it is by agreements or whether it is by a reduction in production, I am not in a position, I don't feel that I have the knowledge to give the answer, but certainly it's only by putting together the people that are knowledgeable in those fields that we can come to some understanding so that we don't just cut one another's throat. I don't think this is beneficial to any country in the long run. I think if we have some agreement that we are willing to work together as to the kind of production that should exist in order to supply some other parts, I think it would be beneficial to all. This has to start somewhere and I think the government of this province has a specific duty in making sure that the views of the people in the province, that the views of the people who are in the know, are put together so as to give a unified opinion from the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur): I'd just like to make a few remarks and a few comments on the remarks that have been made by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead and the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I am not on my feet to disagree with the presentations that they have made here this afternoon in respect of the problems of the farmers in Western Canada, and I think that I should say that practically everything that they have said is true in respect to our present problems.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that as Minister of Agriculture I have already forwarded to the Federal Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Olson, the resolution that was passed in this House in respect of assistance, in a form which of course I agree that we did not all agree on in the House, and I just want to make a comment on this without the intention of getting into the debate on two price system or acreage payments, Mr. Speaker.

But I want to point out here first - first, that I would like to correct press reports that went out which quoted me as having said that 11,000 farmers in the province did not grow grain. I did not say that, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the press to have this corrected. I already have directed a protest to some of the press people already because there is a vast difference in the intent of what I was saying that day.

Again I reiterate that there is assistance needed at this moment as far as western farmers, and particularly Manitoba farmers insofar as we are concerned at the moment, and in the resolution that I have forwarded to Mr. Olson, behind this was the intention that it would be of assistance to all farmers who were in trouble, not only the wheat growers but the people who are growing oats and barley.

Now I don't want to belabour this point, but I wish to point out to all honourable members that we have not simply been sitting watching and letting the issues go by and ignoring the problems as has been pointed out by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I have been in contact with the Ministers of Agriculture from the other prairie provinces as recently as this morning, when I had a lengthy discussion with Mr. Rusty, the Minister of Agriculture for

(MR. WATT cont'd.) . . . . Alberta. He is getting in contact with Mr. Doug McFarland, the Minister of Agriculture from Saskatchewan this afternoon, and I expect to meet Mr. McFarland in Winnipeg on Saturday afternoon and we are jointly forwarding a request to meet with Mr. Olson in Ottawa to discuss the problems specifically that we have been discussing here this afternoon, and particularly the situation insofar as grain sales are concerned and what the farmers are up against at the moment.

It is true that we appear to be sliding into a deeper hole all the time insofar as our grain sales are concerned, and I must join with the honourable members opposite in registering protest insofar as the loss of sales are concerned, and particularly the huge sale that was made recently by France to China. I'm informed as late as this morning that there is another disastrous tie-up in the Vancouver port, again affecting the grain situation across the three prairie provinces.

I just point these things out, Mr. Speaker, to let honourable members know, and the farmers of Manitoba, that we are not idly sitting by. We hope that we will get some results from a meeting with Mr. Olson when this can be arranged. There is a general meeting called now for the 20th of May for all Ministers of Agriculture across the Dominion. I have requested that this issue be taken up at that time - an individual request, this was not a joint request of the three prairie provinces that I spoke of a few moments ago. Depending on whether this will be accepted into general discussion at that meeting, I'm not particularly concerned, because I would expect that Mr. Olson would be giving us an interview prior to that time.

Now the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has mentioned assistance to farmers suffering crop loss in particular instances, and I want to point out to him that I appreciate the problem that these people have before them now, but I also appreciate the problem of the farmers the Honourable Member for La Verendrye mentioned a few moments ago whose land some of which is presently under about 10 feet of water, and who informed me that it will be hopeless to plant a crop this year. I would also like to point out to the Member for Brokenhead that I have also been petitioned by grain farmers in the western part of the province who have land buried in from 8 to 10 feet of water right now and they indicate that it will be hopeless to plant a crop. I point out to the honourable members of the House that there are problems in every direction and it's pretty difficult to come up with answers that will allow for immediate relief.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, the National Grains Council that has recently been formed would by now have been making strong representation to the Federal Government or to the Canadian Wheat Board in respect of some of the problems that have arisen insofar as our grain sales and our grain handling are concerned, but realizing of course that they are a comparatively young Commission. We may be hearing from them in the near future.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is about all I have to say at the moment, but I just point out to the honourable members that we on this side of the House are quite aware and appreciate the problems insofar as agriculture is concerned at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): As a farmer myself, I would like to just say a few words in this very important subject that the Honourable Member from Brokenhead brought up, and also speeches by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead and our Minister of Agriculture. I think it is a very good thing this debate has been initiated because this problem is getting more serious, and representing people in a rural area who are predominantly involved in growing grain, it becomes a more serious problem than in mixed farming areas.

At the present time in my area we are one of those points who have had no quota; we're still on a unit. As the Member for Brokenhead mentioned, 57 towns in the Province of Manitoba are still on the unit basis. One of the things that I can't understand, 8 miles away from where I live, on the CNR line there are two points, Wawanesa and Rounthwaite, and I'm sure Rounthwaite is on the three bushel and Wawanesa is going on a three. In fact they have enough room for three bushel quota. And one of the things that bothers me is why one railroad seems to be having so many empty boxcars and the other railroad has no boxcars. We're presently in our tenth month of the crop year and only in the neighbourhood of around 11 weeks away from the end of the crop year, the 31st of July, and it would appear that there be little or no chance of getting more than the four bushel quota in our area, and for those who are trying to pay their expenses selling only a four bushel quota - well, it's just not possible to operate.

Many of the statements that have been made are quite true. What is a farmer going to sow? And let's look at it, the wheat problem is only one aspect of the over-all problem.

May 7, 1969

1991

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) The oat problem is just as serious to people that are growing oats. Myself, I've got a big shed full of them at home. The people that are growing barley, who normally would sell a car of malting barley, nobody wants the barley. I don't know if all the beer drinkers have stopped drinking beer or what's happened, but over a period of eight months there's no malting barley shipped. This is a very important problem, I would say, because it isn't necessary that you have a section of land or a half-section of land, if you have sufficient barley and it's the right quality the malting companies will take it, which adds greatly to the income of the individual farmer.

The only bright spot in this past year of operation in farming has been flax. Now everybody knows this year everybody's going to grow flax, so here we are back in the same old problem in flax and we haven't got a bright spot that we can look forward to. The sale of mustard, which was very encouraging to the average farmer this past year at six cents a pound for a top grade mustard, there's mustard sticking out of everybody's ears so the price has dropped to four cents which makes it actually impossible to grow and make any kind of a profit. In fact most of the contracts have been cut back.

So here we are caught in the squeeze and then, to make matters worse, along comes France and really destroys the International Grains Agreement. Now this International Grains Agreement, I think many of us thought two years ago when we were talking about this that this was the answer to our problems. At \$1.95 minimum price, it looked like the answer to our problems to overcome some of the huge losses than many farmers were going into, buying land at high prices, paying high taxes and having to finance their whole operation. But here we are now, many farmers are selling wheat at \$1.00 a bushel. In fact I've heard many of them are selling at 80 cents in order to pay some of their running expenses and try to get a crop in.

Well, I can imagine what is going to happen. Many many farmers are going to go broke with their granaries full; in fact not only with their granaries full, but the grain out on the ground piled up everywhere this coming fall, because within 100 days of right now we're going to be out with the combines and there still won't be any boxcars. There won't be any because at the present time there's 2,000 boxcars at the terminals, at the United Grain Growers and Pool terminals at the Lakehead. And if these were all unloaded - well, they can't be unloaded because there's no place to put all this grain - there's just no place. There's no export going out of the Lakehead at all. The only exports that's going out is out of Vancouver, and as the Minister mentioned, this real tie-up has really balled things up again because they've got ships and no grain. So what happens? They put an embargo on our line starting Monday morning, take all the cars off our line, the CPR from Souris to Winnipeg, taking the cars up to Saskatchewan and Alberta to take No. 2 Northern to Vancouver to counteract that problem.

But how on earth the farmers can exist is more than I'll ever know. I can remember the '30s quite vividly and the expenses were nil compared with what they are now. You didn't have to pay a Hydro bill and you didn't have to use the telephone because you didn't have a telephone - you couldn't afford it. But in today's pattern of society these things are a must. We can't get along without them so our expenses are going to continue. The matter of fertilizer was brought up and rightly so. You have two choices; you either don't put any fertilizer in the box at all or you shut it down to the point where you can afford it. And I think I'm going to do that very same thing, I'm going to shut it down. Instead of sowing 60 pounds an acre I'll sow 30 pounds of fertilizer and try to limit my cost. But you can't just stop farming. You've got to farm right if you're going to farm at all, and I think this is what most farmers are doing.

So I'd just like to say that I think this debate is very good, and I would like to congratulate our Minister here for negotiating with the other prairie Ministers of Agriculture and I hope that their meeting with the Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable Mr. Olson at Ottawa, will bring some results.

But one thing I would like to ask of our Minister of Agriculture is to have the Canadian Wheat Board put back under the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa. It's a shame that a member from Quebec, a member from Quebec who is Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the Government of Canada, is handling the Canadian Wheat Board. He does not know our problems, he's not conversant with them; and goodness knows we need the best men who are conversant with our problems in western Canada who can get down and do the job that we require.

Now I would like to just read one little article here. It's printed by James Richardson and Sons and it really brings out one particular issue. And here we have a Cabinet Minister of Ottawa and I don't think -- I know we have 13 members in the House of Commons and I think they're doing a fair good job of bringing this before the government, but I wish our Minister of

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) . . . . - I forget what department he handles - but I wish he'd read this very article because it explains fully what some of our problems are. It says, in the Winnipeg Tribune, Saturday, May 3rd: "Barley shipments are a pitiful 6,200,000 bushels which compares with 26,700,000 last year, mostly because of the pricing policy of the Canadian Wheat Board, regardless of all the talk about huge French subsidies." I think that explains the barley situation very fully. Maybe I can hand this to the Minister of Agriculture and he could ask Mr. Olson what he thinks of that article. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you on allowing the motion to be debated, or to adjourn the House to provide a debate on this very important subject. It is a very very important subject. The fact that the Minister of Agriculture and the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne and the Deputy Speaker have been fit to endorse everything that has been said from this side of the House on this particular subject matter, but it appears to me that both the Minister of Agriculture and the Member for Souris-Lansdowne were once again laying most of the blame for the plight that the farmer is in at the foot of the federal government, and it is true that a great deal of the responsibility rests there. However, anyone that fought the 1958 and '59 elections like I did, and my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne did - not so for my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture because I don't think he came in until 1962 was it, or 1959 - but anyway, their nine-plank platform of that day started right out - the platform of the Conservative Government - started out this way. "The Campbell Government has abandoned the Manitoba farmers to the pressure of the cost-price squeeze. The Liberal Leader has said that there is very little the provincial government can do to help. Just as the Ottawa Liberals were dismissed from office for their failure to deal with farm problems under their federal jurisdiction, so should the Campbell Government be dismissed for its failure to deal with agricultural problems within the provincial jurisdiction."

A MEMBER: They didn't say that.

MR. SHOEMAKER: They said that and they bought thousands and thousands and thousands of these propaganda sheets back in 1958. Well now they're saying, well there isn't too much that the provincial government can do but talk.

A MEMBER: They're saying what Campbell said.

MR. SHOEMAKER: They're saying exactly what Campbell said, so by the same token then I suggest that they should be dismissed from office for their failure to deal with the cost-price squeeze. This is exactly what they said about the former Campbell Government. You know, Mr. . . . .

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I don't recall, in the remarks that I made, laying the direct blame to the federal government for the problems that we're in now. I pointed out that we were in the act of arranging a meeting with the Federal Minister to discuss the problems here. I say that there are problems and that somebody is at fault insofar as grain sales are concerned, and I'm not sure who it is but I know somebody is. And further, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the remarks that I have made, I don't think that there is any foundation to start a political battle here now when we're supposed to be talking about the problems of the farmers of western Canada.

MR. SHOEMAKER: That's exactly what we're talking about - that's exactly what we are talking about, but as my honourable friend the former Premier said, you can't leave these kind of things to protracted discussion. You just can't do it; you've got to properly identify and eliminate them. This is what Duff Roblin said. So it's not good enough to identify them and you can't leave them to protracted debate; it's just no good. You've got to do a lot more than debate them, and so, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this government should do a lot more than they are presently doing to alleviate the situation.

My honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne said that the farmer has found himself in a position that makes it not possible for him to operate - or words to that effect - and that it appeared on the surface as if he could go broke with full granaries. Now my guess is, and I know my honourable friend has just built about a \$7,000 storage granary - seven or 10,000 bushel storage granary - and I believe that up to this moment that his government has not even conceded to rebate the \$200 sales tax that he requested them to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I knew it would come. I have to remind the honourable gentleman that nowhere in this motion do I see sales tax or other things that he's talking about. I think he was talking about something that was in the press before the rains came, so



(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . I depend on his usual co-operation.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, but I'll tell you one thing the sales tax didn't do; it didn't help the cost-price squeeze. That's what I'm saying, it did nothing to alleviate the cost-price squeeze, and I'm sure that my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne would appreciate it if he would get a cheque for \$200 on that granary that he built last fall, and I hope that the government will give him the \$200. At least it will be equal to the \$200 acreage payment that Diefenbaker paid and everybody thought was fine and dandy in those days.

Mr. Speaker, last week one day, on April 29th, everyone received a huge section in - I think it was the Tribune, probably the Free Press had the same thing - called "Manitoba Progress", and I suppose it was put out principally by the Department of Industry and Commerce to point up to everybody in the Province of Manitoba that everything was just booming right and left and centre, and about the only thing that I could find in respect to agriculture was a black-looking column that I suppose is intended to depict the black position the farmer finds himself in today. But here's what it says: "Manitoba's Biggest Business. Manitoba farmers will produce nearly half a billion dollars worth of food this year. That's more production than any other single industry in the province, but agriculture is more to Manitoba than wheat and meat, agriculture is \$50 million in farm machinery sales; 200,000 tons of commercial fertilizer; \$20 million worth of feed; 5 million herbicide-treated field crop acres. Manitoba farmers spent \$250 million to produce the 1968 crop, twice as much as they spent in 1948." That's exactly what it says here.

Now this advertisement that I suppose was paid for - yes it is - by the Department of Agriculture - and I suppose that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture authorized the final okay for this to appear in that section of the Tribune - is making an admission that it cost the farmer last year over twice as much to produce his crop as it did in 1948. That's what it says. "Manitoba farmers spent \$250 million to produce the 1968 crop, more than twice as much as they spent in 1948." Well, I suppose that's a fact. Anyway, my honourable friend authorized it - the ad - and paid for the ad. Isn't that an admission that nothing has been done to alleviate the cost-price squeeze? Because if my memory serves me correctly the price of wheat in 1948 wasn't too far from the price of wheat today. I'm not certain, but my guess is that there's lots of wheat being sold today at less than the 1948 price, and yet this is the ad that my honourable friend paid for to tell the people of Manitoba that (1) Agriculture is our major industry; and (2) they have done nothing to alleviate the cost-price squeeze.

When my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture talks about meeting with the federal authority, and he met with them I think - when was that? - about April 18th and made a presentation or a submission to the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons when they were in Winnipeg on that day, and on Page 2 of that report he says exactly what he said today nearly. I just want to quote one paragraph: "Rising costs of the items required for modern farming, coupled with fluctuating but not generally increasing prices for the products sold, have placed the farmer in a difficult squeeze. He has responded to this situation in two ways; one, he has reduced the costs of growing an acre of grain and a pound of meat, and two, he has expanded the size of his operation to offset the dwindling returns on each unit of product." My honourable friend's saying this but he hasn't said what he's going to do about alleviating it. That's the sad part of it.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, how many farmers appeared before the House of Commons Agricultural Committee in this province. I don't recall ever having seen that in print, but in Saskatchewan there were 18,000 farmers that appeared before that committee. That's a lot of farmers -- 18,000 farmers attended 24 meetings before that committee to acquaint the members of the House of Commons with farm conditions in the west. Now when you get 18,000 farmers on your back telling you the same thing, there must be a real problem, there's no question about that.

And so, Mr. Speaker, while I admit that the Federal Government has a responsibility in this field, I still say there are several ways that this government can help the farmer. There's one way they can help the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, they can give him a cheque for \$200.00 that he made application for the rebate on his granary. That's one little thing they can do to recognize to some extent that the farmer is caught in this cost-price squeeze, and to recognize that the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne and a lot of other farmers not being able to sell their grain - I think in my honourable friend's case it is not wheat but oats - it's still money, not money in the bank but money in the granary, and as

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . my honourable friend said, he could go broke with his granaries full of grain. So this government when it comes along to voting on this resolution of mine in respect to rebating the sales tax on granaries, I hope that they will all see fit to vote in the affirmative on that. And there are many many other areas in which this government can do something to alleviate the plight of the farmer.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services)(Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I can't help but rise to my feet after I heard the Member for - wherever he is from, Gladstone or whatever it is - because all he does is talk, talk, talk, and it just makes me boil to sit and listen to him year after year come out and suggest such things as he does when he could do a lot of his talking to his own people down in Ottawa, because what the farmer in this country needs is sales and it's your colleagues down there who better see to it that we get some. -- (Interjection) -- Never mind, I've got the floor now. You just keep quiet. I didn't interrupt you while you were speaking. Never mind holding it up. That's all you're good for is to gather a bit of stuff that comes -- there'd be better use for it too than you have. But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. -- (Interjection) -- Never mind him, I can handle him. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MRS. FORBES: Well, if it's your wish, fine.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the help of the honourable lady, I know she's quite capable and she still has the floor.

MRS. FORBES: Thank you. But I want to tell the Honourable Member from Gladstone that when every time he gets up here if he remembers what the Minister of Agriculture said last year to the people of the prairie provinces. "You grow it, we'll sell it." That's what he said -- (Interjection) -- Certainly he said that. Never mind Hamilton, he did it. But nevertheless, last year many of the farmers in Manitoba, as well as the western provinces, sowed it on the faith that they had come out and said, "You sow it, we'll sell it." -- (Interjection) -- Never mind Selkirk getting into it either. You weren't farming as well, but just the same that's what he said last year and I'm telling you that's all we need to say in the House this year, is that we will attempt to do what they are suggesting to us but they better come through with their end of it.

I deplore the fact that you stand up in this House every year and say: "If you do what I say, give them back their sales tax on the federal or the provincial" -- if you sell it the farmers won't ask you for a rebate on the sales tax. They'll meet their obligations and they're willing to do it. But if you go to tell any farmer who is an up and coming farmer today that the difference in his operation is going to be so great because he gets back \$100.00 or \$200.00 on sales tax, you're so far behind us that you are not with it at all, because this doesn't make any difference really. A good many of these things accumulated does, but they're not out asking and pleading for these small handouts. They have ample help from my friend the Minister of Agriculture's Department in help, in guidelines on what to do, in fertilizers, in soil testing and all the things that we have attempted to do for them. They can grow it and they know their farms. They don't need any of us in this House to stand up and tell them what to do with their acreage; they know what to do. But, Mr. Speaker, today every farmer in this country has only one question on his lips and that is: What can I sow? He doesn't know what to sow because there are no markets.

Now I certainly agree with the Member from Lakeside when he said that there is little that we can do so far as this portion of agriculture is concerned. I agree with him 100 percent because this is in the hands of those in eastern Canada. We all recognize that and I think that that's where the problem stands. We'll grow it, we don't have our problems that way, but it's up to them to sell it, to find markets and they've failed dismally. And believe me, I want to say again on the part of every farmer in Manitoba, he's not there with his hand out for little handouts; he's there asking for the governments to take their part and do their part and live up to their word when they say: You sow it, we'll sell it. Their problem is to find markets, and believe me they lost markets, and the Honourable Member for Brokenhead was quite right today when he brought this issue before us and said that we've lost a market again. There is no opportunity at all. There is no faith left in the farmer if he can't believe the people that he has sent down there to do the job for us, and that is to sell the grain.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

May 7, 1969

1995

MR. SHOEMAKER: I just want to ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Directed to whom?

MR. SHOEMAKER: To the Minister of Government Services.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if she's prepared to accept it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Oh sure.

MRS. FORBES: Yes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Two questions. Does she -- (Interjection) -- Well then I'll phrase it into one. Does my honourable friend really believe that Alvin Hamilton had a magic formula for selling wheat; and if so, why does he not reveal it to the present government?

MR. FORBES: I don't believe he had any magic formula at all; I just know that he sold it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to express my sincere appreciation to you for accepting this motion at this time, as you probably are well aware now that several weeks ago there was one attempt made by me to have a discussion of a similar nature in this House. However, at that time I was not as successful as my colleague has been today.

It is always of great interest to me to listen to the Honourable the Minister of Government Services when she participates in a spirited type of a debate on items of agriculture. I was extremely happy to hear that she said that the farmers are not interested in small handouts, they want something more concrete. Mr. Speaker, it was only a few short days ago that this very government supported a measure of small handouts when they supported the principle of paying western farmers acreage payments in lieu of a two-price system. A two-price system would have been a meaningful thing. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, a two-price system has now been requested by some 78 percent of the farmers in western Canada. The Manitoba Pool Elevators conventions have now for many years endorsed the two-price system and they comprise some 52 percent of the farmers of western Canada. In addition to that, the United Grain Growers convention last year also endorsed the two-price system, which combined makes a total of about 78 percent of the western farmers.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Manitoba Pool Elevators are also talking about an acreage payment.

MR. KAWCHUK: I'm not so sure whether my honourable friend is exactly right. However, the point I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that they have for years and years now advocated the implementation of a two-price system for wheat, which would be meaningful to the people of western Canada rather than the meagre handout that has been advocated by the Government Services Minister. It was a technique used in the early '60s and the latter '50s to bribe the people of western Canada for their vote. It was only mailed prior to elections, as you will recall, my dear gracious Minister. However, Mr. Speaker, that was not exactly the . . .

MR. PAULLEY: You tell her, Mike.

MR. KAWCHUK: Yes, I can tell -- (Interjection) -- that's right. Mr. Speaker, the issue is far more serious than that led us to believe by the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture just got finished telling us that he had made contact with the western provinces with respect to this grave issue. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has now had ample opportunity to place on record his stand and his proposed solution to meet the crisis that prevails in the farm sector of our population.

A few weeks ago, when the House of Commons Agricultural Committee met in Winnipeg at the Monarch Life Building, of the members that comprised that committee, who do you think was most concerned about the farms crisis? Not the farmer representatives on that committee, and I'm not sure where the member was from, but I remember him saying that he was a businessman and he could not understand, after hearing the briefs in western Canada, how the western farmer is staying in business under the circumstances that now prevail. That was said by a businessman who was one of the members of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. And at that time the brief presented on behalf of this government -- (Interjection) -- That's all right. You need talking to. If anybody needs it it's this government here, and if you don't believe it all you have to do is check this little pamphlet that I received in the mail during the federal campaign, and it was sent to me on behalf of the Progressive Conservative candidate in my constituency and he said some startling. . . .

A MEMBER: What did he say?

MR. KAWCHUK: Here are some of the things he said. He had some startling suggestions to make which could be borne in mind by this government, and one of those points - under Point 3 it says: "Floor prices. Institute a program of floor prices on wheat based on farmers' costs." Mr. Speaker, the price of wheat has now dropped since January 1st, 1968 by twenty-eight cents, and when that large deal was made just the other day by France to China at the price of \$1.25, I dare say that we will have further reductions in our export prices of wheat and at the present time the farmer is selling below cost, and if that trend prevails we will be selling even below our cost. This is one of the things advocated, and nowhere on here do I see the advocacy of an acreage payment to make the farmer happy, but a concrete policy which would call for the floor prices to be established which would meet the farmers' costs.

There is another point, Point No. 7: "Farm Storage. Implement a system of farm storage involving accelerated depreciation on multi-use farm buildings, and storage payments which will ensure deliveries can be made upon request by the Wheat Board." One further point, No. 11: "Establish national guidelines in co-operation with the provinces which will inform the farmer of the direction in which his industry is moving, allowing him to make the most effective use of his land, financial resources and manpower." And what did the Minister of Agriculture present in his brief to the Standing Committee on Agriculture that was here a few weeks ago? Nothing other than the abolition of the freight assistance to the eastern farmers. At the very time when the farmers of western Canada were calling for a two-price system, they were calling for the feed grains to be administered exclusively by the Canadian Wheat Board, our Minister saw fit to present an empty brief to this committee. That's precisely what happened.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture has said there is going to be a meeting held on May 20th. Mr. Speaker, what a convenient date, a date which all of us will agree probably that this House will have prorogued. During the last three sessions that I have been a member of this House we've talked about agricultural issues, we talked about the serious position the agricultural sector of society was in, and to date what has this government done to improve that situation; what have they done to put permanent progressive legislation on the statute books of Manitoba. I'm not mentioning the last ten years, I'll mention just the last three years. Precisely nothing that is meaningful.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am sure the honourable gentleman -- order please. Will the honourable gentleman resume his seat for a moment? I am sure he wouldn't wish to leave the wrong impression. The Minister did mention an agricultural meeting, as I recall it, on May 20th which the honourable gentleman mentioned. But he also mentioned at the same time, immediately thereafter or just before, that he was hoping to get the three western agricultural ministers together and meet with Mr. Olson prior to that date. I notice the honourable gentleman didn't mention that.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, in all due respect to you and your position, that if the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains said anything in which there is any dispute with the government or with what the Minister had said, then I think the objection should come from them.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, but I do notice that the Minister is not in his chair.

MR. PAULLEY: But there are - all too few of course, Mr. Speaker - but there are representatives of the government that surely can answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am not intending to enter into a debate; obviously I can't. I am simply assisting, I hope, the honourable member in a little guidance and that is all.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may. I appreciate your assistance but I'm sure my honourable friend is doing all right.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your guidance. However, I would also like to say that during a debate of this nature, if the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture had any courtesy he would remain seated in his assigned seat.

Mr. Speaker, there is probably not much point in entering into a debate with these honourable members across the way because every one of them agrees that there is something drastically wrong in the farm price structure. I recall the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, while debating a grievance with the Honourable Member for Burrows on the price of milk, he made a statement something to the effect that he wasn't getting even the minimum

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd.) . . . . wage on his farm and he thought there were many other farmers in the same position. That in itself indicates the seriousness of the situation that prevails.

However, there are a few things that we should be proposing constructively to the Federal Government. I appreciate the fact that we do not have the authority to cope with these problems in Manitoba, but we should be asking for a payment to keep summerfallow out of the wheat production, which at the present time is in a surplus position. That was one of the things that Manitoba Pool Elevators advocated, that we take out some 10 million acres of summerfallow and have the farmers receive a payment to compensate for that reduction. We should also be asking the Federal Government to guarantee that the farmers receive the minimum price agreed under the International Wheat Agreement, namely that of \$1.95 a bushel. I'm sure this is the minimum we could request.

Furthermore, in view of the situation that there are large stocks of grain on the farm, and as the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne had indicated, it's not very likely we'll have much over a four bushel quota by the time the current crop year expires, there should be some measure to compensate the farmer for storing this grain. These are some of things that this government should be advocating to the federal authorities so that they may become a reality.

I think that the boxcar situation could somewhat be rectified if the Federal Government was serious about the wheat situation. I'm not saying this could be possible with the Canadian Pacific Railways, but certainly with the Canadian National Railways, which is a public utility of the Federal Government, there could be some instructions given to that utility to allocate boxcars to points where they are badly needed. In my own particular area we have a one bushel quota, but I dare say there are 80 percent of the farmers who haven't been able to deliver that one bushel quota because of the fact that there's no space available at the local elevator.

I don't think I'll take up too much time of this House, I would only hope that the Minister would make some constructive, progressive suggestions to the Federal Government, that they can be acted upon and bring about some alleviation of the low income problem that prevails in this province.

MRS. FORBES: If we do have the two-price system for grain, could you tell the House what this would do to the cost of bread in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, the cost of bread to the consumer would be -- the increase in the cost of bread to the consumer would be almost insignificant. I think research has been done in this respect and it has been indicated that it would entail approximately a two cent per loaf increase in a 24 ounce of bread. I would further say that most consumers certainly would not object to that providing it went to the farmer and the farmer was able to purchase fertilizer, machinery, automobiles, which in turn would give employment to these people who produce these products.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat disappointing that although we have an emergency debate on the matter of the agricultural situation the Minister of Agriculture is not in the House during the course of the emergency debate. Nor for that matter the Acting Minister. Nor for that matter the Premier. And I would trust, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a reflection of the importance the government attaches to the problems of agriculture in Manitoba. I note that the Minister was present at the beginning of the debate, and has since left the House.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): After participating.

MR. MOLGAT: After participating, but . . . .

MR. LYON: After participating in the debate.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General, who recently returned from warmer climes, now says after participating, but Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency debate on the subject that the Minister is responsible for. One would think that he would at least remain here in the House during the course of the debate, and if he couldn't be here, that his Acting Minister should be. But such is not to be the case. Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- What . . .

MR. EVANS: . . . . go ahead and say it.

MR. MOLGAT: It's obvious that the Minister of Finance doesn't like this subject either, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- Well obviously my friends aren't happy about it. Well, there's been one good thing about it, it has brought out the Minister of Government Services, Mr. Speaker. And what contribution did she have to make? The contribution is: Go and tell

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . Ottawa. The old refrain, the same ones we heard from the Minister of Finance in the budget, it's all Ottawa's fault. The Minister of Government Services, her statement is go and tell Ottawa - and particularly, Mr. Speaker, for this group to go and tell Ottawa because it happens that the Ottawa government is of the same political stripe as ours. -- (Interjection) -- Well, it certainly hasn't been any help to me. Mr. Speaker, let me make one point very clear, and I'd like to repeat it once again to the honourable Minister. We are prepared at any time to stand in this House and defend Manitoba and to tell whoever is in Ottawa what needs to be done for this province, and I've never hesitated to do it, regardless of what government is in Ottawa, and I wish we had the same record on that side of the House. My honourable friend need only return to what happened in the Air Canada base when the present Minister of Finance . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would remind the honourable gentleman that he has not mentioned even the word crisis as yet. I realize that a good deal has been said, but I want to keep it out of the pit of politics if I can.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking of the emergency debate on the state of agriculture. The Minister said I should go and tell Ottawa what to do. Is that not what the Minister of Government Services said? Specifically said to this group that we should go and tell Ottawa what to do, and I'm replying.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. When I interrupted the honourable gentleman he was talking about the airport.

MR. MOLGAT: That's right. I certainly was.

MR. SPEAKER: Can't we keep with the farm products?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I am replying to the Minister of Government Services on a recommendation that she made that I should go and tell something to Ottawa, and I'm dealing . . . .

MRS. FORBES: About farming, not Air Canada. I'm talking about farming.

MR. MOLGAT: Oh, you don't want to talk about Air Canada.

MRS. FORBES: I'll talk about Air Canada any day you like.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the lady asked that I should not discuss that subject because she realizes her government failed to act, and I shall not discuss the subject.

MRS. FORBES: I told you we would talk about it any day we like when the Speaker says it's in order.

MR. MOLGAT: Very well, Mr. Speaker. I think maybe the Minister would be better advised to return to her knitting; I think it's a field where she may be more qualified.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There's really only an hour and a half of this day to go. Can we finish it in the state that we started it? The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I'm depending on you, Sir.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I must tell you it had not been my intention to enter the debate in the first place. I had asked my colleague the Member for La Verendrye, who is our critic on agriculture, to speak on behalf of the Party and I was only spurred on by the urgent request of the Minister of Government Services who asked me, specifically asked me, Mr. Speaker . . . .

MRS. FORBES: Get your regional . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might appeal to the Minister of Government Services and all concerned to allow the honourable gentleman to continue and finish his remarks. The Leader of the Opposition has the floor, and I'm depending on him not to provoke the good lady any more.

MRS. FORBES: Keep him on the subject and I'll stay out.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the last thing I would want to do is to provoke the Honourable Minister. I recognize now that she doesn't like knitting, so -- (Interjection) -- So, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the crisis in agriculture, we are not going to resolve it by sitting and saying it's Ottawa's fault or it's the province's fault.

MRS. FORBES: Right.

MR. MOLGAT: There's only one way to deal with it and that's for all the parties involved to look at the situation seriously, and it is in fact a crisis in Western Canada. And to me it is more than a crisis in Western Canada, it's a Canadian crisis. This is the real problem in our Confederation that I see, that we are still here in the west dependent on open world markets, selling our basic production in open competition, and that unfortunately other nations are not following the same course. And while our producers here have to meet

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . competition as it comes, they are not within the home market buying in the same way on an open market. In too many cases the products that people here have to buy in the west are protected by Canadian tariffs, protected under the age old national policy of tariff structure, and this is the basic problem in which we find ourselves in the west.

Now, Mr. Speaker, basically I'm not in favour of subsidies. I don't believe in the subsidy system, but Mr. Speaker, when we are faced with the situation where on the one hand other people are receiving subsidies where we are selling on open markets, then we simply cannot leave our producers in that position. I think that the Member for Ethelbert Plains was absolutely correct a few moments ago when he said, after the Minister of Government Services spoke and she said farmers don't want subsidies, and I agree with her. -- (Interjection) -- They don't want small subsidies -- (Interjection) -- They don't want handouts. Well all right, but that very same Minister voted last - let me see, that was on the 25th of April - in favour of exactly that, Mr. Speaker. They voted strictly in favour of acreage payments rather than the two-price system which has at least some basis of logic, based on the facts and the problems that face us in Canada of having an unprotected outside market where we sell but a protected inside market where we buy. And that's the purpose of the two-price system. I'd much prefer that we didn't need it, but Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot continue in this country in the present situation.

We are faced for example right now by a major strike in Canada - the Air Mechanics strike. Well, Mr. Speaker, that won't have any direct effect on the farmers in the Province of Manitoba. It's not going to increase their cost of living that much, but let's face it, Mr. Speaker, the outcome of that strike, which will undoubtedly be an increase in wages - and I'm not questioning whether it's right or wrong, I'm merely saying that the outcome of it will undoubtedly be that in other areas further wage increases will come through, and that eventually the whole of the wage structure will increase and basically the whole of the cost structure for the farmer will increase. And he has no control whatever over that; there is absolutely nothing that he can do. And he has no control over the price of the product that he sells. Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot leave that situation like that and proceed to say, well it's Ottawa's fault or it's our fault. We have to deal with it as it is, and the two governments must get together and deal with it.

There are however, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, some things that the provincial government can do, and that is in the field of much greater information to the farmers of this province. Just imagine this spring, Mr. Speaker, a farmer trying to decide what to plant. What is he going to grow this year? He has there his fields, they are ready; he's got to pay his taxes on them; he's still going to have to meet his payments on his equipment; but what is he going to grow when his granary is full of wheat? What is he going to do? This is where the provincial government, I think, has a major responsibility. It's not an easy one, Mr. Speaker, I don't minimize the difficulty, but can the farmer himself do it? Can any farmer in Manitoba right now say: Well, what I ought to be growing is rapeseed or sunflowers or mustard seed. There is no means for each individual farmer to make that decision in the light of over-all conditions. He can make it for himself but he can't do it on the basis of really what his marketing should be.

Mr. Speaker, just look what we do within the province for manufacturers. My honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, if there's a manufacturer who wants to start producing something, will have a study made for him on the market possibilities of that product. There are studies to assist him in all sorts of areas so that the manufacturer can determine is it a wise thing to start producing that in Manitoba or is it not. And here we have thousands of farmers with the production capability, the soil, the knowledge, the machinery, but no knowledge as to what the market conditions are and no possibility of getting it, because each one is an individual unit and it has to be an over-all collection of information. So this is where it seems to me the Manitoba Government has its major responsibility. This is where it should be dealing, Mr. Speaker, not getting involved with the Minister of Government Services in recommending to members on this side of the House to go and tell Ottawa.

MRS. FORBES: Would the Honourable Member permit a question here?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, just as many as she would like.

MRS. FORBES: Just one. Would you not say that the Wheat Board should get into this as well as the Manitoba Government?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I agree. When I said governments, I don't mean just provincial government and federal government. All agencies - the Wheat Board, the Grain

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . Exchange, everyone who is dealing with agriculture must be involved in resolving the problem.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I know that I haven't got the right to speak again, but with the leave of the House I just want to point out to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that since 1961 we have been holding a Farm Outlook Conference in Brandon since 1961, at which time all members of branches of my department have been giving a full outline of crops insofar as markets are concerned, our surpluses . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the honourable gentleman has had his privilege. -- (Interjection) -- I don't require any direction from the floor, I'm quite capable of handling my situation. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't pass up this opportunity of speaking on the matter of agriculture. I've spoken on this particular matter from time to time in the House whenever the opportunity presented itself, and I am very conscious of what is happening in the province today and of the situation that we're in, and from the discussion that we've had, I know that other members are also aware of what is happening and I hope we do realize the severity of the situation.

But I would like to know from the Minister of Agriculture, he's made a statement, but I'm not completely satisfied as to just what proposals he has made or will be making to the Federal Minister of Agriculture and the other ministers when they're going to meet, because I think we should have specific proposals in mind as to what should be done. We know that if this whole industry is going shot the way it is at the present time that this will affect the whole economy of the province, and not only our province but that of the prairie provinces in total, and it will also mean that our revenue as a government will be down. Our revenues here will be affected as well, and not only that, we know that there is a population drift to other provinces, has been for years, and that if we allow the farm situation to go the way it is presently going and not arrest it, that this trend will continue and we will have a further depletion of population in Manitoba.

The gross national product definitely will be down if the farmer cannot sell his crop because this is included in the over-all income and the farmer's income, we know for a fact, already it will be down because he's unable to deliver and sell his crop, and I feel that the farming industry, the agricultural industry in Manitoba is too basic an industry to not heed and take care of and try and make it go. Certainly this will have a chain reaction that not only will the agricultural industry suffer, we will find that other industries and other aspects of our economy will be suffering as a result. The purchasing power of the people will diminish and grow smaller. This will then mean that they will be able to purchase less goods, and that in turn will bring about unemployment, and this whole chain reaction will then take place. I mentioned earlier in debate this spring, or in this session, that the Morden Manpower Office at the end of March had 1,000 unemployed people registered with them. This was unheard of in recent years and this is going to continue and increase if we do not do anything about it and correct the situation.

Certainly there's nothing at the present time changed that we cannot have another depression as we had in the 1930's. We're still under the same monetary system and policy, and we can have the same situation that we had at that time, only I think it would be much worse. I can still recall the situation at that time where people didn't even have proper clothing, children didn't even have proper clothing to go to school; that the food that the people had was very very minimum, and certainly no assortment; it was certainly just a few staple foods that they had, and we know that as a result of the scarcity of money, the medium of exchange that we need in this country to keep our economy going wasn't there. We had wheat, we had grains, we had everything but there was no medium of exchange, and this was why in Alberta at that time they brought in scrip money and tried to bring the economy back to a going basis.

Mr. Chairman, this whole problem to me seems to be one of economics and that if the other countries in this world had the necessary purchasing power that they would purchase our wheat, that we would not have surpluses the way we have them today, that there are many hungry people in this world that would be only too happy to take and buy up our surpluses but they haven't got the wherewithal to do it, and I feel that this is the other area that should be looked at and that we should give an opportunity to these countries to purchase our surpluses of grain.

Then I mentioned the specific proposals that the Minister will be making. I am interested to hear just what these proposals will be. This is the month of May. We're well advanced into



(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . May already, and if any proposals are to be made and made effective for this year, it is very high time that this be done, because if we want to take out a certain acreage out of the production of wheat, farmers should know by this time because in a few weeks' time this will be too late - the crops will be seeded, and you cannot bring into effect some of the programs that they might want to bring into effect.

Suggestions have been made by certain grain companies that acreage be taken out of wheat and that this be put to summerfallow and that a payment would be made, an acreage payment on these acres with, I think, 100 acres mentioned as a maximum per farmer.

Already we've had a discussion on the two-price system, and I have been in favour and promoted the two-price system for years and years, ever since I came into this House, and while I see and know that arbitrary decisions will have to be made in connection with the two-price system, I still feel that we should implement it and that it should be brought about in this country.

Various proposals have been made as to how to bring about or how to dole out the additional moneys that would be made available under a two-price system. Some recommend that a certain number of bushels be paid for at a higher price, and while I do not want to bring forth any proposals of my own in this respect right now, I feel that the Minister of Agriculture definitely should have some opinions and some proposals that he should propose at the time when he meets with these other Honourable Ministers, and I would like to hear from him on this very matter. Certainly, just a two-price system is not complete; it is not the complete answer and further things will have to be done.

Subsidies have also been mentioned and, if nothing can be moved, if the sales are being held up completely, I feel that further subsidies will also have to be entertained. Surely enough, we should get at the root of the trouble. There seems to be so much wrong, so much going wrong these days. The Grains Council has been mentioned and no action is being proposed there. Why this slowness? Why don't we hear from them? The Wheat Board has also been mentioned and the quota system connected with it. In our area we're still on the unit system. We still have no quota whatever. And there are many other points, as the Member for Brokenhead mentioned, there are many points with very little as far as quota is concerned, and yet we're faced in a few months with the new crop, and as the Member for Souris-Lansdowne mentioned, additional storage will have to be provided by that time. Where is the storage going to come from? And in this connection I made a proposal in this House a number of times as to what to do and what this government could do. I think we should not just look to the federal government as the saviour for everything. I think we should try and do some of this work on our own, and I feel that as far as storage is concerned that this government can take action and can do something about it, and if we had central or inland storage available that farmers would then be able to deliver grain, and at least all we would do is add to the inventory of the Wheat Board and the farmer would get paid for a certain amount of his crop.

I think, as far as the western provinces, Manitoba is in a much better position in this respect because our production is much smaller compared to Alberta and Saskatchewan, when we talk of just 90 million bushels of wheat from Manitoba compared to many hundreds of millions for Saskatchewan. So we could do something in this area and have it in readiness for the fall crop. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should not sit idly by and let this session pass and then go home and see that nothing has been done, nothing has been accomplished, and when we get home farmers will no doubt shortly receive their tax notices - and they will be record tax notices. Record taxes is what is in store for the farmers and the people of Manitoba, and with the worst conditions as far as crop sales are concerned. Surely the two do not jibe and that this is creating a very bad and very poor position for the farmers of this province, so I would urge the provincial government to do something in this connection. I would suggest that they sit at the doorsteps of the federal authorities daily, with telegrams or what have you, and urging them to do something. It's very high time that this matter be taken up and a solution be brought about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I am capable of contributing anything to the debate that has been in this Assembly this afternoon on a subject which I agree is of grave concern to every member sitting in this Legislature. The problem of the farmer today I think is recognized all across Canada as being of a very serious nature and whether or not the politicians should be involved in the argument or whether they are capable of coming up with the answer for this problem, is one I think that will be in the back of a lot of people's minds for a long time to come.

There's one thing that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, in the problem that the farmer is facing today, and I think I can safely say to you, Mr. Speaker, that nobody in this Assembly or in this province is going to starve to death in 1975 or 1985, or in fact even in the year 2000. We may all go crazy from crowding on the face of this earth due to the population explosions which are predicted by the experts, and whether or not we can separate this total picture of the food and the population one from the other, I think is one of grave concern; but I think that everybody will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that we're not going to be hungry when we are trying to sort this matter out. We're dealing with food, Mr. Speaker, which is a perishable product, and I've wondered many years from the time I was a boy on the farm, why Canadians who have the best product in the world, wheat - we grew the best wheat - and why over all those years we've continually shifted the onus of processing that product on some other country of the world. Why has Canada, over its great history, always shipped the wheat to Europe or ship it - we have never learnt to process a perishable product, food. I don't know if it's the blame of the politician or it's the blame of the grain companies, or it's the blame of the experts, but this has always been of grave concern to me and I think today that we're still facing the same basic problem that we faced 50 years ago. Why are we not processing the food in this province - wheat - and put it in a palatable form? Put it in a palatable form so that the people who are hungry, you give it to them and there it is, right in a package for them. In fact, the technology of our society today will indicate to me that you can put the food in such a parcel so that you can eat the package as well. So there we are. Half the world today is starving; we've got the food and we're not processing it.

Whether it's the grain companies' or the farmers' problem, I'm not prepared to say. There are countries - I recognize the remark that came from the Honourable Member for Morris one evening in his contribution to the debate, when he mentioned Pakistan, who is a brand new country in the developing of the agricultural philosophy in growing grain, and they for the first time in one year, became self-sufficient in cereal grains. All of a sudden, in one year, they became self-sufficient, then the problems started. We could go on at great length from here this afternoon and we could blame everybody; we can blame the courts, we can blame the freight rates; we can blame the handling agencies or the brokers, the St. Lawrence Seaway, the federal government; we can blame the tariff, we can blame the regional disparities, and I don't think it's going to answer anything, Mr. Speaker, because this is the debate that's gone on and on and on and in my humble opinion, we're right in the same place we were 25 years ago and we're not solving the problem.

I'm just a humble guy from the country, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot for the love of me understand why the experts do not learn to process this perishable product right here in Manitoba. We got the people who can do it, and why we don't do it, I don't know. I think, in my personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, until we in Manitoba, including the Farmers, get busy with this processing of our natural - if we grow it - we've got the best of it - process it here, and at that time we'll solve all these problems - and the farmer put a processor right on his farm if necessary - and feed the hungry of the world and we'll eliminate all these debates and maybe we'll solve some of those real problems that face the farmer in this country today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the honourable member permit a question? He made a position that the farmer should process his product. I'm just wondering whether he'd like to tell this Assembly how does he expect these underdeveloped countries to pay for a processed product when they cannot afford to buy a raw product?

MR. McKENZIE: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get the question. At least I didn't understand the honourable member.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat the question. My question to the honourable member is this: How does he contemplate that these underdeveloped countries will be able to

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd) . . . . . pay for a processed product when at present they are unable to buy a raw product ?

MR. McKENZIE: I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that there's that much of a problem in the marketplace. If you have the product and the price is right, you'll sell it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN. HANUSCHAK (Burrows): . . . a question I wish to ask of the Honourable Member for Roblin. I believe he referred to wheat as being a perishable product. Now, could he inform this House which food items are less perishable than wheat is in its original form. Would he can it in some way, or what would he do with it ?

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I class all food items as perishable.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . answer period is contributing anything to the debate under . . . I don't think so.

A MEMBER: We want to know how to process wheat.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, I think it's a question of a more perishable or a less perishable product. Are there some food items he could process wheat into that would make it a less perishable product than wheat is ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, is the member going to speak again ? I wonder if I might address a question to the member who has just spoken ? Has he discussed his problem with the Minister of Industry and Commerce ?

MR. McKENZIE: No, I'm speaking from my own personal opinion. I was born on a farm, lived on a farm . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . purpose of the motion has been served. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead. Has everyone . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, no, Mr. Speaker. This is too much and too important a subject to be cut off.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There's no purpose in cutting anyone off and I did not suggest it. I called the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party a few moments ago and he didn't rise again.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and then you allowed the Honourable Member for Burrows, which is his right, to ask a question of the previous speaker, so I took my seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, indeed. And your constant questioning of the Chair, I can assure you, is not appreciated.

MR. PAULLEY: It may not be appreciated, but may be timely, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: You know the alternative, and if the honourable gentleman would care to take it, it's quite all right with me.

MR. PAULLEY: What is that alternative, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. PAULLEY: Are you going to allow me the right to speak on this important debate ?

MR. SPEAKER: I never refused the honourable gentleman.

MR. PAULLEY: Then, I trust, Mr. Speaker, you will now recognize that I am on my feet and wish to take part in this debate.

I listened with a great deal of interest to many speakers opposite dealing with this important matter of the plight of agriculture. My honourable friend the Member for Roblin just indicated that he is just a humble fellow from a rural constituency. I am just a humble fellow from a suburban constituency interested gravely in the plight of agriculture, but unlike my honourable friend, I believe that I am correct in saying, that insofar as the perishability of cereal grains and other related products are concerned, that they have found in some of the ancient tombs of the ancient patriarchs in Egypt, seeds and grains that they have been able to bring back after centuries and start growing. So I doubt very much whether the statement of my honourable friend insofar as the processing of grains is concerned holds very much water. And I also suggest to my honourable friend, as indicated by some of the questions directed to him by my colleague from Ethelbert Plains and Burrows, that if our hungry nations are unable to purchase wheat and cereals unprocessed, where will their ability come to purchase them after they have been processed ?

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

I noted that my honourable friend the Minister of Government Services was quite concerned of the effects of the two-price system of wheat on a loaf of bread in Canada. But I wonder if my honourable friend, who is not now in her seat, unfortunately, is just as concerned with the charge on the taxpayers of Canada for the exorbitant extreme cost through our tax bill for our so-called national defence budget which takes somewhere in the neighbourhood of a third or upwards of the income from the taxpayers of Canada. And in the opinion of many, including those of my Party, that if much of this outlay were devoted to supplying the underfed nations of the world with the products of our farmers and our rural constituency, two factors would be achieved. One, we would start to feed and fill the stomachs of a third of the nations, or the populations of the world that go hungry to bed every evening because of the lack of the products of our farms. I wonder what is the attitude of government in the Province of Manitoba to that? Because it is a fact; and I don't have to say it. It is well known. We're worrying here about the additional provision of storage facilities. Even the Minister of Finance of this province has suggested as a method of alleviating the problem of the farmer in order that they may store more grain, that the 5 percent sales tax on materials, building materials, be withheld or eliminated. Instead of getting down to a basis of supplying those who are in need throughout the world of the products, that we're building additional graneries to store here, instead of getting rid of the product even if it does cost us monies in order to do so.

I suggest that the government here in Manitoba being Conservative, and the government at Ottawa being Liberal, should change their approach to the whole problem, or the whole question of the disposal of our products. And I greatly fear that if we continue the process of today that it will not be long before we're back into the situation prevailing in 1932 in the depression years where they were burning coffee in Brazil because of a surplus, and burning wheat in Canada because of a surplus; and Canadians required coffee and Brazilians required wheat. The basis, I suggest, of much - or most of our problems is the failure of politicians to face up to proper solutions of the problems that we are facing today.

There are those that suggest that we should carry on a program of subsidy, that the solution to the problem of agriculture in Manitoba and in western Canada is to stop growing wheat, to go into livestock, to go into other areas, so that we can create problems in those particular areas. So that in a year or two instead of discussing the problems of agriculture and the potato farmer and the likes in this Legislature, as we are today, that in a year or two we can deal with the problem of the livestock producer because we've got a surplus of livestock. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this has been the ancient approach of both Liberal and Conservative, and a plague to them both. Because they have no concept, philosophically, of an approach to the problems at home or the problems abroad. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, we live in a rough country politically speaking, because our politicians, and possibly including the gentleman who just interrupted me, is not fully cognizant of the problems that the world as a whole is being faced with.

Look at the problems of the people of Biafra who are starving literally by the hundreds of thousands because they lack the basic necessities of life, among which is our wheat, and here our concern is the building of more facilities to store the requirements of the underprivileged peoples of the world. Here on Sunday we're going to have a march for millions in order to help out another community, St. Lucia. Provisions of dollars. At the same time again I must repeat that our problem we're discussing today is how to store our wheat and we're worrying about whether or not in the opinion of the Minister of Provincial Affairs or Government Services, or whatever her title happens to be, on whether or not those of us in this affluent Canada of ours can and will afford to pay another two cents for a loaf of bread.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to you and to the Minister and all, that men and women of goodwill - and they are of pretty goodwill across this country - would be quite prepared if the authority at Ottawa, the present one, or if it had of been the past one, had a cut down in the provisions of the implements of warfare and the creation of materials of war that are almost obsolete, at huge expenditures before -- particularly in the field of aircraft -- before they've even flown a mile. Incident after incident has been drawn to our attention of hundreds of millions of dollars spent on implements of destruction before they're even -- they become obsolete even before the date of delivery to the Department of National Defence.

I suggest to the Minister of Agriculture and to all the members of the House, irrespective of their political affiliations, to start approaching the problem of agriculture insofar as

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . dollars and cents is concerned, as to how we can put in the hands of our farmers and our producers sufficient income to allow them to continue in their production; to give them the strength that they need to continue. Our technical experts tell us that rapidly there is a reduction in the numbers of people engaged in agriculture, because agriculture is and has over the past few years become a more depressed industry yearly. Is the solution, I ask, Mr. Speaker, alternative employment? Is the solution the provision within our cities and our towns, more accommodation for the farmer and the farmer's son and daughter, and curtailment of production? And I suggest that it is not.

The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce has just received a report called TED that draws this matter to our attention. Hedlin and Menzies and other experts have been drawing this to our attention over the years. What is going to be the situation in ten or fifteen years if we continue this type of approach to the problems of agriculture? And I suggest that it could conceivably be a change in production in Canada with less and less of our citizens devoted to the production of the requirements of the world. We are informed that before too long in order to feed the hungry world it may be necessary for us to harvest the products of the ocean in kelp and other commodities from our vast oceans in order to feed the world. And here we are in this House today suggesting, by inference at least, that we have a problem that's insurmountable and that the only way we're going to solve it is by additional conferences.

I trust and hope that the Minister of Agriculture for Manitoba, before he goes into this conference that he mentioned as being on May 20th, will read some of the scientific documents that's predicting what the plight of the world is at present and will be before too long. And if he will but do that, he will go down there convinced of the necessity of putting into the pockets of our farmers and the agricultural industry sufficient financial resources to carry on the job, and instead of curtailment of production let us get rid of the products that we have.

One of our local papers just recently made an appeal to their subscribers to send monies in to buy barley by the carload to ship to starving people. The response of the people with their nickels and their dimes and their shillings was reasonably good, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if members of this House would but look at the principle of that contribution they would have no fear as suggested by the government of provincial services as to the effect on the price of a loaf of bread.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, to me the solution is not changing our products or what we produce; not going into livestock or flax or mustard, or as the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne mentioned there, that dealing with the sales of barley, a possible depletion of the amount of beer being consumed and the likes of this; let's not worry about that. But let us be humanitarians here in Manitoba, let us take a lead; and let the Minister of Agriculture on behalf of this Assembly take a lead in future conferences dealing with agriculture and say let us start producing more and more instead of less and less in all fields of requirements for human consumption. And let Canada in its affluence pay the price if necessary. And I suggest part of that price can be, by a reduction in the cost we are now bearing for an ineffective, inhuman, intolerable budget that we have at the present time for so-called national defence. If we will but look at this area, we will find the money to assist in the feeding of the ungrateful of the world. We can save literally hundreds of thousands of Biafrans; we can save hundreds of thousands in Vietnam and other countries of the world by giving to them full stomachs. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that full stomachs will be a greater weapon and a greater incentive to bringing about what we often refer to around December 25th each year when we celebrate the birth of whom we call the Prince of Peace, that there will be goodwill among all peoples and nations.

So I suggest we should thank the Honourable Member for Brokenhead for raising this matter this afternoon because of an emergency we have at the present time, and I appeal to the members of this Assembly to take into consideration some of the points at least that I have raised as a solution to the problems of agriculture: Full stomachs for the third of the world that's going hungry to bed each evening while we are waxing fat; a provision and supplying of the necessary finances to the farmers of Canada, and particularly western Canada, and less emphasis on the creation and maintenance of weapons of destruction which is the philosophy of the politician in power today, particularly at Ottawa.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Certainly.

MR. McKELLAR: You mentioned you're going to take money out of defence to use this money to pay the farmers for the grain in order to turn it over to these other countries. Does

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . that mean that we're going to close down all the bases in Manitoba - Rivers, Shilo and all the other bases in order to help the Manitoba farmers out?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer my honourable friend. I'm sure, first of all, if the people who are employed at those bases today knew that the closing down of them meant peace on earth, goodwill to men, they would join me in my appeal for that process. I think that is the answer to my honourable friend and I would say again to him, what he has just said emphasizes the basic philosophical approach of his party - better to continue creating and maintaining destruction rather than to aid in bringing about construction of the human mind, the human being all across the globe.

MR. McKELLAR: Can I ask another question? Regarding the other, I was only defending my constituency. But regarding another question. He mentioned Biafra, Biafra came up very frequently in the past 12 months. They have serious problems getting food in there. How do you think you're going to get the food into Biafra?

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sure that if Canada had taken a quicker action they would have got permission sooner to fly in food to Biafra, but because of protocol, red tape in governmental and political circles, hundreds of thousands starved in the meantime while we were debating whether or not we should send a plane loaded with foodstuff into Biafra.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, my experience in this House indicates to me that the eleventh speaker on one subject in the same afternoon doesn't usually get very much attention paid to him. I'm willing, however, to risk that position - if my mathematics are correct, I haven't made an accurate count - I'm willing to risk that position because of the fact that I do consider this to be a most important discussion and if I can make even a small contribution in a very brief time, I would consider it to be well worthwhile.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was prepared on the Orders of the Day, to ask my honourable friend, the Minister of Agriculture a question dealing with a matter that he has already covered in his remarks to the House this afternoon. I was going to say to him that there was a rumour circulating yesterday and this morning on the Portage Plains that a sale of wheat - a substantial amount, something over four million bushels - was being held up at the west coast because of the fact that the wheat was not in store at Vancouver. I was going to ask my honourable friend if he had knowledge of that situation and I took note of what he said today. My information differs from what he gave to the House. I have no doubt that his information is more accurate than mine. My information was that it was not a tie-up at the port itself but that it was again the shortage of boxcars to get the wheat to the port. And if that is the situation, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this boxcar situation which plagues the country elevators and through them, the farmers, so greatly, needs another very careful review.

On the general subject, however, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at any length. The ground has been well covered and many many suggestions have been made. The one -- (interjection) -- yes, including processing - the one point of satisfaction that I can draw from part of the debate was when the Honourable Minister of Government Services expressed a vote of confidence in me personally, or in the government that I headed some years ago, by saying that she agreed with the position that had been taken. Well, I'm glad to hear my honourable friend, because I have a great respect for her opinion, establish so belatedly the fact that we were right at that time. But being right consists of only one thing, I think, Mr. Speaker; and that is admitting that the Province of Manitoba, in this very important but difficult situation, can not take the major step. It is true - as I have said repeatedly and others have mentioned today, including the Honourable Minister whom I just quoted - it is true that if action to deal with this most important but complex subject that faces us today is to be taken at all in Canada, then it has to be taken by the federal government. And it isn't necessarily political sniping or a political approach to state that fact; it is just a matter of fact.

My honourable friend, the Member for Gladstone, with his usual capacity for finding out what someone has said in the past, when he mentioned, quite properly, that in the campaign of 1958 that one of the main points of attack of my honourable friend over there, so far as agriculture was concerned, was that I had admitted that we couldn't do very much in Manitoba; that the main action in this regard had to come from Ottawa, and even as I have always maintained, internationally, even Ottawa can not act effectively in this alone. It has to be international co-operation and understanding and agreement, an agreement that is respected. If it can't be enforced, that it is respected. The tragedy of the situation, Mr. Speaker, that we must

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . . face - and again I'm not talking politics when I say this; I'm merely stating what to me seems to be a fact - the tragedy is that the government that sits opposite to us now, having said they were going to do certain things, they did those things - I give them credit for that. They put through, against my advice, but they had said they would do it and they did - they put through the Agricultural Credit Act. They put through, with the help of the federal government, the voluntary crop insurance. They put through other legislation that they had promised they were going to do, and that was the sphere in which they were operating. But the fact is that it is now admitted by everyone who has spoken here in this debate this afternoon, that in spite of those things having been done, that the situation today is a crisis. The terms of the resolution that we are debating now - the adjournment of the House - uses the word "crisis" in the agricultural situation, and no one has denied that it's a crisis. It is a crisis after the Province of Manitoba has done the things that they felt could be done. And so where does this leave the situation? It leaves it definitely up to the national government and even into international arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, the real facts of the problem that faces us today is that for the last five years - and perhaps it goes back further than five years - for one reason and another, and we don't need to try and speculate fully on the reasons, perhaps, but for one reason or another the world production of wheat has been much higher than it used to be. It's been almost twice as much - the world production - for the last five years or thereabouts. Not every year but on the average and even the poorest year has been much above the long-term average of years before. Now part of this increase has undoubtedly been due to a rising technology in other parts of the world as well as here; part of it has undoubtedly been due to the use of fertilizers to a greater extent, and part of it has been due to a proposition, that quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think has been oversold in some areas, the one that my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party was talking about a moment ago; and that is the fear of the food resources of the world not keeping up to the population increase. But whatever the reasons have been - and we can only speculate on those - different ones of us may have different opinions - the fact is that - and of course the nationalistic policies that have been mentioned by the mover of the motion this afternoon and all of these have their effect - but whatever the reasons, the fact is that world production has been high, and this leaves us in this difficult trading situation.

Now I'm not trying to defend the federal government. I'm not pleased with the action that's been taken up to date. I think they have left much to be desired, and I have no interest whatever in defending them or attempting to damn this government. This is a serious situation and it requires the best solutions that any of us can come up with; but the fact remains that for the individual farmer it is a crisis, and therefore I think it is appropriate that we should spend a whole afternoon -- and I'm quite sure that we're going to spend the whole afternoon, now that it's gone this long (not that I'm going to take very much of the time further) - but I think it's appropriate that we do spend the time discussing this matter because it is a crisis for many individual farmers, and for the farmers as a group in the Province of Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, if we agree that it's a crisis for them, then we can certainly expect that in a very short time that it will be a crisis for a lot of other people too.

The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce will find that this filters right back to his effort in a comparatively short time. Several who have spoken on this side of the House and the other, have mentioned already that the effects are being felt, with the machinery companies, with the fertilizer companies. I'm sure they must be beginning to be felt with the credit grantors in general and they will certainly filter through to the economy of the Province of Manitoba.

I am acquainted in a particular sense with one of the large farmers on the Portage Plains and I know that on his farm that he has practically all of last year's crop; he has all of the barley of last year's crop, practically all of his flax crop on the farm still, and he has the vast majority of his barley crop of the year before last, and his granaries are full on that particular farm. I was talking to him this morning -- it was he who mentioned to me this rumour that was current regarding the tie-up of boxcars, as he intimated it, at Vancouver -- and he's preparing to go out to seed. But what a prospect! With the granaries full on that particular farm - he farms other land - with them full, absolutely full, he has to think about putting in another crop. He can't escape this. He's geared to this production. And this story can be multiplied, literally thousands of times in the Province of Manitoba. So we all agree it's a crisis.

Now, what can be done? I think that perhaps we should have a discussion outside of the

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . . Chamber here where all groups could sit in together and have a discussion and let us see if we couldn't come up with a unanimous resolution that we could all send to the federal government asking for renewed activity and better acknowledgment of the situation that exists here.

The sale by France to one of the countries that's been a customer of ours has naturally agitated the situation recently, but I don't think the most of us would want to advocate that we should enter into a campaign of competition with France in that regard. I don't think the most of us would think that we should start now selling at \$1.24 1/2, or whatever that figure was. France is in such a different position to so many countries because they have the big consuming population there in their own country and the surplus means so little to them compared to what it means to us; they can engage in a policy that I think, with all due respect, we simply couldn't expect to follow in Canada. But surely there's some policy that could be advocated that would to some extent relieve the situation in the prairie provinces now. Surely, there's something in the old basic philosophy of the ever normal granary or something of this kind where certain assistance by some method can be available for the crisis years, because the crisis years seem to continue to come.

I share with my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party the view that this food will all be needed. I said a moment ago that I think perhaps that program of - the questions that were asked so widely about whether food production would be able to keep up to the population explosion was perhaps oversold at one time. Maybe it was at one time; maybe it was responsible for increased production; maybe it had its effect. But I think the basis of it is right, that the food is going to be needed; and surely it's up to the national government to make approaches in the international sphere to try and work out a solution whereby the food that is going to be needed will not have to be carried by the farmers themselves. They're simply not in a position to do it and something ought to be worked out soon.

So my only suggestion, Mr. Speaker, because it's a mighty hard problem to try and propose a solution for, my only suggestion is that maybe we might get out of the atmosphere of the Chamber here and we might get a committee of us to sit around a table outside the Assembly and see if we could come up with some adequate solution. While it won't be a solution, but we might come up with some adequate suggestions to propose to the Federal Government, to at least get them to be more aware than they appear to be at the moment, of the difficulties that are faced by the farmers of Manitoba. And if we can do even that much, Mr. Speaker, the time that has been taken this afternoon I think will not have been wasted at all; and even though the debate seems to range quite far afield at times, Mr. Speaker; and even though there is a tendency for us to talk about some matters that to you appear to be a bit extraneous, and might even try your patience once in a while when some of us stray a bit from the immediate path, yet I think there is a possibility that we could make this a worthwhile exercise, and that maybe we could all get together on some proposal that might do some good.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief and I'm really speaking in the hope that I will get a further explanation from the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne who is now listening. I'm really intrigued by a question that he put to our Leader in regard to the feeding of the hungry peoples of the world and the possibility of using our surpluses more intelligently. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that my Leader does toss out a real problem that is indeed an idealistic one. We have not yet learned even to feed our own communities. I notice from what the Member for Churchill tells me that the people in Churchill constituency are experiencing great difficulties in getting what should be their proper food supply. But the Leader of our party has dealt with a problem which has perplexed the western nations for a long time, that there are huge surpluses of food in our areas, that there are people who would want these surpluses and that we spend a great deal of money on defence but we don't spend money in such a way that we could use the same money to dispose of these surpluses to people who need some. And the Member for Souris-Lansdowne asked a very interesting question. He said would the Leader of our party agree to doing this, spending defence money to ship out these surpluses at the expense of closing down defence industries and defence bases in this country. --(Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, he still indicates that it is a problem. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a problem and one which goes far deeper than the wheat situation.

I remember speaking the first year I was in the House, in a debate involving surpluses



(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . and I said that one of the greatest causes of war is the difficulty that mankind has in transferring its surpluses to areas which are less poor. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons that we have got defence industries and defence bases, is that we have not learned to dispose, or to provide for a meaningful exchange of surpluses from one country to another. But I want to ask the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, because I think that this is a very interesting proposition. He says, or he implies, "don't get rid of the surplus food at the expense of the defence industry, because then people in defence industries are not going to be able to work." Now what he then proposed, Mr. Speaker, that in order to create more defence industry, more jobs in his constituency, more factories producing munitions, that we even place greater stringencies on the dispositions of our surpluses than we do now, because that way we could create a big defence industry. And is that what the Member for Souris-Lansdowne is proposing? Because if he's saying that then I would ask him to inform the Attorney-General of his views because that's what the Marxists say, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McKELLAR: A point of privilege Mr. Speaker. All I was saying, I have 5,000 people in my constituency and all I was saying - when I inferred about the questions of the Leader of the New Democratic Party, I wanted to know whether I was going to lose 5,000 citizens in my constituency,

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member whether the member would like to get another 5,000 constituents in his constituency by means of raising defence industry by virtue of a plan which further restricts the nations of the world from distributing the fruits of the world's progress equally amongst all of them? Because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is what the honourable member is suggesting. And if he is suggesting that, and if he is suggesting that we retain the 5,000 people operating on defence by a program which prevents us from reasonably exchanging our surpluses, then he proves what the Marxists are saying, because that's what Marxism is.

MR. McKELLAR: May I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. GREEN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. Do you want to answer my question?

MR. McKELLAR: Does he realize that many millions of dollars of grain, flour and other foods are shipped free to many deserving countries in the world by Canada, United States, Australia and other world - are you aware of that?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm perfectly aware of it. But I go back to the question that the Member for Souris-Lansdowne asked the Leader of our Party: Would we agree to doing more of this at the expense of the defence industry which employs 5,000 constituents in his constituency. And would he go further, should we say that we should create 10,000 jobs in defence industry by further restricting the movement of surpluses from one country to another? And I repeat, Mr. Speaker, all he says is that we should retain the present 5,000 at the expense of having a policy which would distribute the surpluses. And if he's saying that, Mr. Speaker, I want to underline this, that he is saying what Marx said - that that's why we have defence industry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, would he resume his seat please.

MR. McKELLAR: Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm just beginning to wonder who put the resolution before the House, the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne or the Honourable Member for Brokenhead?

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): I'm sure it's the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I do know. But you'd never know it to hear the discussion that's going on between the two honourable gentleman. We've got quite a way from the detail before the House, I do believe. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Inkster would please -- (interjection) --

MR. GREEN: I want an answer to my question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I wasn't going to speak on this because actually there isn't very much new to say in there. We've had everything discussed from giving away grain, but I don't think that anybody really came up with any kind of a solution or anything that would really help in the present situation. We've had school teacher trial and reprimand. We are graced with one of these speeches at least once a year and I would like to tell the lady that I enjoy them very much, but I'm afraid that her emotions usually carry her away from the

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) . . . . subject and go more into political considerations -- (Interjection) -- rather than some sensible solution.

MRS. FORBES: For a turkey farmer you should know. -- (Interjection) --

A MEMBER: What's wrong with a turkey farmer?

MRS. FORBES: Not a thing.

MR. TANCHAK: We all realize that when it comes to a lady it's pretty hard to get the lady to keep quiet.

MRS. FORBES: Don't you ... because I won't keep quiet. . . . me, I'll be there.

MR. TANCHAK: No wonder, Mr. Speaker, because I think the problem is all of ours, and all of us are to blame. Maybe not only the government, but even the individuals. Sometimes we get 10 farmers together -- (Interjection) -- any kind of farmers, and they'll sit together - they discuss their problems, and they all agree that there is a crisis. But if you them for a solution you might have ten different proposals. They don't know. They're all groping. Now if you get farm groups, farm organizations and you hear one farm group proposing one solution, another farm group another solution, and they don't come with a unanimous solution on that. There are 57 members here, and I'm afraid that if some one of them proposed a solution or some kind of problem that could be solved, if it's not a party policy, you might have 57 different solutions. Nobody seems to be able to agree on any one solution to it. I think that it is time that a consensus of opinion has been formed, and maybe take this out of politics and get the different farm groups together - some of the Members of the Legislature from different governments, because even the different governments do not agree. The present government does not agree on the two-price system - voted it down. The lady Minister does not agree on subsidies or says that the farmers don't. Maybe she's right. So what do we agree on. We do not know.

I would like to draw attention that this isn't a problem that is unique to Canada. I have a clipping here from the May 4th Tribune, and what does it say? "Australia faces the most serious crisis in the history of its wheat industry". Australia is in the same position. And then it goes on to say that there are 535 million bushels left from last year and 700 million in addition to this year. There is a crisis there, too. It seems that there is a crisis in all wheat producing countries. I would like the different organizations and the farm groups and the different levels of government to stop blaming somebody else, but take part of the blame, as individuals, on ourselves, and try to get down to the root of the trouble and try to get some solution. If we were to go forward to Ottawa and suggest a solution, let us ourselves, the farm groups, the farmers and our provincial government, or if not the government, I'll use the word the Provincial Legislature, agree on some solution to it, or what we think is a solution and then present it to the Federal Government, we might get some results. But if we just keep bickering among ourselves and fighting each other here in this House, I don't think that we are accomplishing very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, we have had a worthwhile debate on the subject of agriculture this afternoon, and for that I wish to thank you for your indulgence. I know that there have been many in this debate that have strayed from the path somewhat, and I recognize the problems which you had . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might rise on a point of order. I don't believe that my honourable friend has the right to close the debate on this motion. This is a motion to adjourn the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I anticipated the point being raised by my honourable friend who has just returned from Rome and we welcome him back. May I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, a precedent has been established in this House whether or not a precedent was required or not. If we refer to Beauchesne - Beauchesne page 106, paragraph 32 on the standing orders we find the following motions are debatable; and down on (h) is included "the adjournment of the House when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance; and being a motion that is debatable, it comes within the realm of giving the mover of that motion the right to close the debate." The precedence has been established. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, my colleague for Brokenhead is perfectly in order, and I believe it has been done in the past by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. -- (Interjection) --

MR. LYON: ... point, Mr. Speaker, if it was done, it was wrongly done, because

(MR. LYON cont'd) . . . . there is no right to do it.

MR. PAULLEY: Whether it was done wrongly or not, it has established a precedence.

MR. MOLGAT: On a point of order, I would ask the Minister who is objecting to it, under what rule is he saying it is not . . .

MR. LYON: Because this is not a substantive motion. . . . quite clear.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes it is.

MR. MOLGAT: Under which?

MR. SPEAKER: I, too, have looked into this matter before we got this far. The last time we were in this situation the House will recall it was on a motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and it came 10:00 o'clock and I adjourned the House, and that ended the debate. There was no move at that time from the floor. And insofar as precedent is concerned I have looked into that, too, and I have not been able to find one, and therefore I call upon the Honourable Member for Brokenhead to proceed.

MR. USKIW: Thank you very kindly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that perhaps you might want to reconsider that because -- (Interjection) -- I'm asking Mr. Speaker to perhaps reconsider because it is not -- there may be a precedent. If there is a precedent I'd like to know what it is, Sir.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll answer the Honourable House Leader a little later, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, on a point of order, I, too, have been perplexed about this rule. I have sought in our rules an indication, or a clearcut indication there that this is not allowed, and I must say I find nothing in our rules that says that this cannot be done. But as I understand our rules, when there isn't a clear rule, then we go to the precedents of this House, and I'd like to quote the precedents the latest one is 1965, there may be later ones, but certainly 1965, the journals of that year page 105, when on a motion by myself to adjourn the House on a matter of urgent public importance there was some debate as to whether or not I should have leave to proceed. "The Honourable Mr. Roblin and Mr. Molgat having spoken, Madam Speaker then ruled the motion to be in order. Whereupon it was moved by Mr. Molgat, seconded by Mr. Campbell, that the House do now adjourn. And Mr. Molgat, Mr. Carroll, Hillhouse, Desjardins, Shoemaker, Schreyer, Guttormson, Froese and Molgat having spoken, by leave of the House the motion was withdrawn." Similarly, in the previous year, Mr. Speaker, in 1964, again on the motion by myself, exactly the same thing happened. There were only four speakers, myself first, after the motion had been accepted, Mr. Cherniack, the Honourable Mr. Roblin and Mr. Molgat having spoken. That was on the 15th of April, 1964. So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that you are correct and that the precedents of the House do indicate that this can be done. I don't believe that there's a rule that says it can't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. It seems that there is somewhat undue interruption, possibly because members opposite don't think they would like to hear what I going to tell them. -- (Interjection) -- I'm told that they do want to hear me. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not prolong the agony beyond the hour of 5:30. I simply want to summarize what has taken place. I want to remind the Minister of Agriculture that to date I have been completely dissatisfied with his performance on the subject matter and in the administration of his department, and the reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that from this side of the House we have had many positive proposals dealing with the current farm crisis, and each one of those proposals throughout the entire Session has been voted against by the government opposite, and the Minister of Agriculture on many occasions has risen to his feet and said that "you are suggesting subsidies and that I am not prepared to adopt that kind of a policy. I don't believe in the subsidy. I don't believe in the two-price system. I don't believe in changing the crop insurance legislation to guarantee more farm security and efficiency." All these things, Mr. Speaker, have been voted against. The Minister has . . .

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I haven't spoken on crop insurance.

MR. USKIW: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I may remind my honourable friend that although he hasn't spoken as Minister on the proposals that we have made on crop insurance, he has as a member of this Legislature in the past, and I'm not going to dig up the dates.

But I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, precisely to one important resolution that deals with marketing, which was proposed by myself some time ago, wherein it suggested that the Federal Government set up a food marketing agency under the Department of Agriculture or the

May 7, 1969

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . Department of Trade and Commerce, that would research the potential in the marketplace and that would encourage our producers to go into the production of commodities where they feel that the market demand is. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Minister of Agriculture of his own opening remarks during the estimates on Agriculture, on Page 1085, wherein he states as follows: "I think I should say that we have been assisted by research and new technological advances, particularly in the area of production, and it has gone far beyond the research that we have done in marketing. I am sure that most of the farmers realize that they have done their share insofar as the economy in the production of this province, and that we should be working towards more research, more stability in the area of marketing."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we look at Votes and Proceedings on Tuesday the 22nd of April, there was a vote taken on that resolution and all of the members of the government side voted against my proposal requesting the Federal Government to look into the question of marketing of agricultural products. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have great misgivings about asking the Minister and this government to do something about the current crisis because of the history of this government over the past few years, and indeed this Session. But I want to warn my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and I want to charge my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture with the responsibility that is his, namely, to go down to Ottawa and to invite the necessary people to a meeting which is going to bring this question to a head, Mr. Speaker. And it is high time he got off his laurels, Mr. Speaker, and spoke for the farmers of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, at this point may I have leave of the House to withdraw the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable gentleman mind me putting the question to the House? Would he resume his seat?

Does the honourable member have leave to withdraw his motion? Agreed? (Agreed.)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (cont'd)

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Will the Honourable Minister call a meeting of the Standing Committee on Agriculture to allow the committee to formulate recommendations to this House in connection with the subject matter that we've just discussed, and also to hear representation from outside, from the farming community, in this matter?

MR. WATT: The direction of the House is presently in the hands of the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROESE: I didn't hear the answer, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I think perhaps this would be a propitious time to draw to the attention of the House something which I'm sure that there will be unanimity on. I'm sure you have been aware of the fact that the Flin Flon Bombers have brought to Manitoba a Canadian hockey trophy. They have brought the Athol Murray Trophy. It was competed for, for the first time, in Canada this year and while unfortunately there were some unhappy events surrounding what turned out to be the last game, the Manitoba team won it fair and square. It's here in Manitoba, and I hope that you will join with me in saying thank you and expressing congratulations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs, and Commissioner of Northern Affairs) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of Day, I'd like to reply to a question put yesterday by the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain. There are 25 municipalities involved in 31 projects and there are \$7,392,104.00 in debentures that haven't been picked up.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and on a point of privilege, I would like to welcome back the Attorney-General and tell him that his absence has caused me quite a bit of concern, especially when I haven't been able to vote for my own resolution. But I think it was well worth it. I notice how much decorum and how much nicer he was . . . I think that the influence of the Vatican must have rubbed off on him and it was worth it, and I would say that I will keep on co-operating with him and when his halo gets crooked a bit, I'll help straighten him out.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Committee of the Whole House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be agreeable if you were now to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: I'd be delighted. It is now 5:30. I am leaving the Chair -- at least the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.