

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, May 21, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): On the matter of petitions to government and to this Assembly, it is my understanding that today there is a large delegation from the City of Brandon who have a petition dealing with the medical situation in the City of Brandon wherein all of the doctors in Brandon have opted-out of our Medicare scheme. It is my understanding that the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services was to have been given, or did receive a petition on behalf of a large number of the citizens of Brandon enjoining and entreating him to take certain action in order that the citizens of Brandon may be treated similarly to those communities in which they have a choice between opted-in and opted-out doctors under the scheme. If the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services - if I am in error, if he has not received that petition, I would be more than glad to supply him, through you, Mr. Speaker, with the said petition - if my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Social Services will recognize that he has, if indeed he has of course received this petition, then I may keep my copies for my own record. My main purpose in rising of course, Mr. Speaker, is to draw to the attention of the House the situation prevailing in the city of Brandon and ask my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Social Services whether this matter has now been drawn to his attention by a petition representing, as I understand it, almost a quarter of the citizens of the City of Brandon.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I met with the delegation from Brandon over the dinner hour, the hour that we had, and also with members of the Medical Insurance Corporation who were with me during the presentation. I have received this petition and had a short discussion with the delegation and have taken the matter under advisement, as has the Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. I beg your pardon, I'm a little ahead of myself. Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Orders of the Day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Before the Orders of the Day, in the absence of the First Minister, I would like to address a question to the House leader. I asked the question this morning in committee when the committee rose, whether we could have an assurance from the Chairman of the committee whether the Committee of Public Utilities would in fact meet again and whether that committee would have the presentation of the lawyer representing the Indian people from South Indian Lake who have come here from some 650 miles to present their case to the committee. Could he confirm now whether he will assure the House that the committee will meet and will have an opportunity to be heard?

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, that's a question that is quite appropriate in the committee but rather inappropriate in here, because we are not responsible for the committee's procedures.

MR. MOLGAT: Well then, Mr. Chairman, it seems impossible to get an answer in the committee; it seems to be impossible to get an answer here. My next question is: Will the Minister confirm or deny that this House is going to continue sitting through its regular work and complete the work presently on the Order Paper?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if we can ever get off the question period and the Orders of the Day, we'll give my friend all the work that he can do and his colleagues can do, and his friends from the NDP, for a long long time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill. Order please. The Leader of the Opposition has a supplementary I take it.

MR. MOLGAT: The Leader of the House, Mr. Chairman, referred to the work that will have to be done. I recognize that, and I am referring to the work of the House. Will he confirm that the work of the House will be completed in this House?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, for the last two and a half months I have been trying to get the work of the House completed; not very successfully, I must say.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to the Minister that the first thing to do is to bring the work forward. For example, second reading of bills has been sitting now for a month.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. Yesterday I mentioned that taxi drivers or taxi companies are paying below the minimum wage, and the Minister had indicated that this was incorrect. I have checked it out and I find that the taxi drivers are receiving \$1.02 per hour, which is 23 cents below the minimum wage, and overtime is being paid at the rate of only \$1.00 per hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. During his estimates there was a number of questions I posed and he assured me that he would get those answers for me. Can he inform the House when I will have those.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, one of the questions the honourable member asked was the number of probation officers, or what was an ideal number of probation officers -- clients per probation officer. In discussing this with my officials and staff, I am told that 35 to 40 is a realistic caseload, but in talking to some of the staff this varies, as one can understand, from the nature of the case. You can spend a lot of time on one case in any particular week, but these were generally the figures given to me.

Re the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry society, the grant this year was approximately \$17,400.00.

MR. FOX: If the Honourable Minister will check, my question also said specifically: What was the present caseload of his officers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): . . . address a question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. Could the Honourable Minister give us any idea as to the percentage of a probation officer's time which is spent in writing reports.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. -- (Interjection)-- Order please. The Honourable Member for Selkirk -- you had a comment?

MR. HILLHOUSE: I asked a question of the Minister. I wonder if he was going to answer?

MR. JOHNSON: . . . my assent. I'll try and find out the information.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the House Leader when he is finished his private conversation. -- (Interjection) -- Thank you, I'm glad that's ended. I would like to ask my honourable friend how many more bills the government intends to introduce for the consideration during this session?

MR. LYON: . . . figure for my honourable friend as soon as possible. The question was asked the other day and I undertook to get it. I'll try to have that information, if not later today then certainly tomorrow.

MR. PAULLEY: I would like to ask another question of the Honourable Leader of the House, Mr. Speaker. Can he indicate to the House when His Honour may be giving Royal Assent to the Bill dealing with The Electoral Divisions Act?

MR. LYON: I thought that question had been answered in ad nauseam two or three times. The usual time when these bills are brought before His Honour for his approval.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask my honourable friend what he means "at the usual time"?

MR. LYON: I don't share the same apprehensions as my honourable friend has about certain rumours that are appearing in the paper, so when I say the usual time, I mean the usual time.

MR. PAULLEY: I assure my honourable friend I fear no apprehensions either, Mr. Speaker, I'm awaiting the decision of my honourable friend with glee and anticipation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. The Minister earlier in the session promised that legislation permitting Indians on reserves to vote and to be members of school boards will be passed at this session. Would he indicate whether that undertaking will be kept?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education)(St. Vital): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the First Minister, I would like to direct a question to the House Leader. Senator Thorvaldson was reported to have said that he condemned the provincial government's constitutional proposals regarding the Senate as being "creeping congressionalism". I wonder if the House Leader has any comment on that.

MR. LYON: I haven't seen the Senator's remarks and I couldn't comment on it, no.

MR. DOERN: Well, a supplementary question. Were the Manitoba proposals on the Senate suggesting a six-year appointed term or an elected term?

MR. LYON: The brief is self-explanatory. I wouldn't propose to try to recall at this moment everything that was in it, but it's available and my honourable friend has a copy of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the House Leader. In reply to a question by the Leader of the New Democratic Party a few moments ago as to the number of bills, the Minister said that he would try and get the answer for him. I would just like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that on Friday of last week I asked the Leader of the House: "Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate how many more government bills have not yet been introduced in the House?" The Minister replied, "I'll try to get that figure for my honourable friend. I am not sure of the number offhand, I'll get it for him." That was Friday of last week; it is now Wednesday of this week. Does the government not know how many bills it intends to introduce?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I alluded to that fact when I was responding to the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. Unfortunately, I was ill at home yesterday and didn't have the opportunity to be in the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Then I wish my honourable friend better health. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Transport. Could he advise us when we will get the transcripts from the hearings of the Public Utilities Committee?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, it might be this afternoon, certainly it would be tomorrow morning if not this afternoon.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have noticed the absence of the Honourable the First Minister. He was quite solicitous of my health during my absence from the House. I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the House Leader. Is the absence of the First Minister due to some inadvertent illness, in which case I would be more than pleased to send him a get-well card.

MR. LYON: No, I'm sure his absence is not attributable to any illness on his part. My honourable friend might well think that his continued absence might cause some illness on the part of other people.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, with an ill government for so long, I can well imagine the answer given to me by my honourable friend the House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if there is anything being accomplished by this House with this constant fencing across the floor. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Finance indicate whether it's necessary for a coin dealer to charge sales tax on a silver dollar, say it's selling for \$1.25.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): I'll enquire. I haven't got all of the regulations in my mind - I'll enquire and reply later.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister for Consumer Affairs who said last week that he expected that this week he would be presenting the Consumer Protection Bill. Can we expect it in the next day or two?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(The Pas): I'm still hopeful, Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might take a moment and introduce our young guests that are with us today. We have 90 students of Grade 8 standing of the Robert Smith School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Hollinger, Mr. Sarchuk, Mr. Marrone and Mrs. Derewianchuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I undertook to provide a copy of notes re the Estate Tax Rebate Act to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and as is customary in these cases I would like to provide a copy for the Member from Rhineland. I might say that I think this is a work of super arrogance, that when a matter is recorded in Hansard, it's recorded in Hansard for the purpose of being made available to the members.

Then I would like to reply to a question for the Member for Portage la Prairie when he enquired about an audited annual report, or final audited report of the Easterville resettlement project. I have made enquiries through my department and I am told that there is no such report.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister undertake to request such a report and make it available to the members? It seems to me this is highly unusual for a committee to have the spending of over 3 million dollars and not have to account for it officially.

MR. EVANS: It's really not a matter of my responsibility in my department and I can not undertake to provide a report of that kind.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the request of the responsible Minister. I plead ignorance; I do not know which Minister it should be.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage. A further supplementary?

MR. JOHNSTON: I have a separate question to another Minister, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps this question could be addressed to the Honourable Minister of Finance. Is there a raise contemplated for the Provincial Civil Service in the near future?

MR. EVANS: The Civil Service have rights of collective bargaining and at this time of year discussions are entered into. At the present time I have no further statement to make.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education and Youth. Can the Honourable Minister indicate when we might have the printed copies of the two bills dealing with reorganization of the Public Schools Finance Board, and also that, as I understand it, dealing with teachers' negotiations, when we might have then on our desks for our consideration?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, they were being printed and I don't know whether they will be here today or not.

MR. PAULLEY: Can the Minister indicate when they will be here? I can understand him not knowing if and when or if and but, but is there any indication at all when they will be on our desks for our perusal and contemplation?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday I was hopeful they would be here today, so I guess I'll have to hoist it by one day if they don't.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: I have a supplementary question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance concerning my question about civil servants' wages. Could the Minister inform the House when the agreement runs out that he just mentioned?

MR. EVANS: Not from memory. I'll enquire.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the House Leader. There are a considerable number of Bills that have passed second reading and normally would be in Law Amendments Committee. Can my honourable friend the House Leader indicate when Law Amendments Committee will meet to consider the Bills that have received approval in principle from the House?

MR. LYON: That matter is under consideration at the present time.

MR. PAULLEY: Might I ask my honourable friend, under whose consideration?

MR. LYON: Well, under mine and others, because there are other Committees meeting as my honourable friend is aware, and it's a question of timing, getting the Committees ready to meet and having sufficient work for them to do when they do meet.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could he give this House assurance that the Bill which would allow reduced transit fares for pensioners will be passed at this session.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, that Bill will be considered with other Bills that are before the House.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. In the past there has been a permanent Home Economist stationed in the Portage la Prairie Ag Rep office. Presently the Home Economist is serving on a part-time basis there. Is it the intention of the government to re-establish a permanent Home Economist in Portage?

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur): I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable the First Minister, I really don't know who would be in a position to answer the question I now raise. It deals with the Languages Act of the Federal Government. The Honourable the Federal Minister of Justice has indicated that changes will be made in the Bill to accommodate the representations made from the west. In the absence of the Honourable the First Minister, I would like to ask the House Leader or the Deputy First Minister, whoever he or she may be, whether this meets with the satisfaction of the Government of Manitoba.

MR. LYON: The amendments which Mr. Turner introduced, or debated yesterday in the House of Commons, I understand are in the mail now to us, and once we've had an opportunity to see them and have them reviewed by the legal officers we might then be in a position to answer my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Welfare et al. In the committee this morning I was informed by the Minister of Tourism that the Minister of Health had made a comprehensive report to the House as to the cost, the total cost of welfare for the relocation of the Indian Band at Easterville. I cannot find that comprehensive report. I wonder if my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Welfare could inform the House now, or inform the House of the Hansard in which he made that comprehensive report to the House.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . find it, Mr. Speaker. I made a statement on that during my estimates. I'll have to check the Hansard myself to find the figures.

MR. SHOEMAKER: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker, was it considered to be a comprehensive report on the actual cost of welfare since the re-location?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I have some of the remarks I made at that time in front of me concerning the figures, and I'd be happy to just simply point out -- I gave the number of families on assistance between April, 1959 and 1964 and between May, 1964 and April, 1969. The department advised me that 25 families received assistance in the amount of \$20,646.00. We haven't got the figures on welfare payments paid by the Federal Government in welfare. These are our responsibilities in that area, and I'd be happy to look up the statement I made in full at a later date.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm entitled to another question. Then this figure that you did quote just now does not include any monies paid out by Manitoba Hydro or any of the Crown Corporations or the Federal Government.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, it would just be Indian Affairs and ourselves who would be paying out welfare monies in that community at this time, to the best of my knowledge, but I can recheck that again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask a question

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. This is a follow-up on a question that I had asked of him last Thursday, and which I previously asked of him on the 27th of March, regarding water control on some lakes in the Bissett area. I wonder if the Minister has a reply for me yet.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, engineers from the Water Control Branch have been in contact with the delegation from this area and in fact have had an on-site inspection by the District Engineer. Currently we are aware of the state of disrepair, I suppose is what can best be termed with respect to these structures, and plans are under way in terms of what it'll take to bring them back into condition. I cannot commit the government at this time as to whether or not this will be done in -- the current year's estimates obviously didn't provide for this, but field contact has been made, and the Water Control Department is aware of the situation and I expect a further report at some time.

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

MR. GUTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. He indicated in the House in the committee meeting yesterday that the government had declared a number of wildlife management areas in the Interlake. Could he provide the members of the House with maps showing the locations of these areas?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it the intention of this government to announce a clear-cut policy in regard to flood damages in this province before this House adjourns?

MR. WATT: I guess it would depend when the House adjourns, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I would wish to draw the attention of the Minister to a point that was made in the newspapers over the weekend with reference to the meeting in Ottawa, the meeting of the three prairie Agricultural Ministers with the Minister of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa. In light of the settlement of Air Canada, is the Minister proceeding with the meeting or is the meeting cancelled?

MR. WATT: It is our intention, Mr. Speaker, to contact the Minister at Ottawa and see if another date can be set for the meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. On Thursday or Friday last week, I asked him specifically about plans for a second national park in Manitoba in the vicinity of Hecla Island, and the Minister took the various questions as notice and was going to advise the House. I wonder if he could make a statement at this time.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, that was not the question that my honourable friend asked.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Does my honourable friend want me to put the question to him again? -- (Interjection) -- You haven't got it in the Hansard for Friday? Well then I will put the question to him now, Mr. Speaker, that I put to him on Friday - I think it was Friday - and it concerns a story for the second national park for Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the honourable gentleman to get to his question as quickly as possible.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Yes. Here is the question that was put on May 16th. "Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I have just received a phone call from a lady in Neepawa who is very disturbed over a phone call that she had in regard to property on Hecla Island, I think, specifically at Gull Lake or Gull Harbour, and it has to do with the expropriation of all the private property on three large islands and two small islands in the area."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable gentleman inform the Chair, is this a lengthy question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: This was the question I put on Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: But it's not a lengthy one.

MR. SHOEMAKER: My question is: I wonder if my honourable friend the Minister could outline the program that's envisaged for that area. "Honourable J. B. Carroll (Minister

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . of Tourism and Recreation)(The Pas)" - here's his reply: "Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice." Well I'm simply asking him now, has he had notice enough to reply?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): But that's not the question you asked.

MR. CARROLL: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's an entirely different question from the allegation that was made this afternoon. I would like to just say that there has been no notice of expropriation go out with respect to any parks in that general area.

MR. SHOEMAKER: He has not answered my -- the question was simply this: "I wonder if my honourable friend the Minister could outline the program that's envisaged for the area." That's the question that was put on Friday last, so what is the program?

MR. CARROLL: Announcements will be made in due course, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a subsequent question of the Minister. It is true that a park will be located on Hecla Island, isn't it?

MR. CARROLL: When decisions are made they will be announced, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Could he indicate whether the Federal Government has given any indication as to whether a program of assistance to the farmer in Western Canada will be made available for this year?

MR. WATT: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland has a supplementary question?

MR. FROESE: Not a supplementary, I have another question. In the absence of the First Minister I would like to direct a question to the First Deputy Minister. Has the delegation been decided on that will attend the conference, the Parliamentary conference this summer?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that question might very well be directed to me. The honourable gentleman did speak to me earlier in the day and I thought that I had satisfactorily answered his question. I think the matter must rest there for the moment. If the honourable gentleman would like to speak to me about it, of course he is at liberty to do so.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Education. I've been informed that a number of high school students from the Elie High School had worked up to two weeks on the dikes before the Army were called into action, and because of their absence from school some of them are not going to be able to either write their exams or complete their year. This is according to the information that I have received yesterday. Would the Minister undertake to look into this and if these students have been penalized, if that is the correct word, would he use his good offices to give them the chance to write their exams?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if I could answer on behalf of the Minister of Health, I'd be glad to look into this for the honourable member.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, they change Ministers so often over there I was looking at the wrong Minister, but the question was for the Minister of Education.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I wish to inform my deskmate here and the Minister of Health, that that exchange between them regarding Easterville was -- you'll find it in Hansard on May 8th, Page 2057 and 2058. And while I'm on my feet, I'd like to ask the Minister where he got his information, because what we learned today does not seem to support the answer for my honourable friend about the change and the better way of life and so on. It might be better if the Minister has a chance to read this now that he knows the pages, then we might try to get at the bottom of this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I would just say that this information on the figures was obtained from my department; also the information and discussions I had with our people. As you know, we have a Community Development Officer on site, and we've had the head of our Department of Community Development involved very closely with the people in this particular area, and when I heard some of the discussions this morning, as recently as noon I asked him about the employment situation and he told me in that connection the statement I made to the honourable members insofar as he is concerned was correct; namely, that the last time they did a survey there there were two unemployed at that time. I'll get the exact date. But I thought I would inform the honourable member of that fact.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister says that the amount spent on welfare from 1964-69 was \$20,000,00. Now this might be the answer, but what I'm referring to, the Minister said that "Relocation has resulted in an upgrading of the living standards. Present housing conditions and related amenities are an improvement over what they have had in Chemahawin" - I can't speak that language, I'm sorry I can't pronounce it - "that it is generally" -- what? -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'll teach him how to say Le Pas. "It is generally agreed that the school system is an improvement over the old one, and as the member may know, there is a nursing station and so on ." But this is not what we've heard today. Somebody has not got the right information. -- (Interjection) -- What? You were only gossiping this morning? -- (Interjection) -- You were the only one telling the truth. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, we have a serious accusation here, that the member of the front bench is saying that what has been said in Committee this morning is only gossip. Is that what the member's saying? . . . except from the members of the Conservative Party?

A MEMBER: Some of it was.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, which one was? I think this is serious enough, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister should stand up and tell us what was gossip and what wasn't.

MR. CARROLL: What you're alluding to now is gossip.

MR. DESJARDINS: What was gossip?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It seems to me in spite of my appeals from time to time the oral question period is developing into debate. If there is to be any further discussion on the matter brought up by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface I would ask that the honourable gentlemen refer their remarks to the Chair.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that you should ask the Minister to withdraw those last remarks. If it's gossip that should have been decided in Committee, not in the House when the people are no longer here. This is suggesting that some of the members were lying, or just giving gossip, and I don't think this is fair.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I think my honourable friend is alluding to something that is happening in a Committee of the House that is presently sitting; certainly that must be the proper form in which to dispose of all such matters.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . my honourable friend stating that -- for his information we are no longer sitting. We were told this morning that it's just at the call of the Chair. We're trying to find out. The people that came 600 miles are trying to find out when they're going to sit. Now my honourable friend stood up in this House, where we cannot call any witnesses, any delegation, and said what we heard this morning was gossip. I think that if he wants to make this accusation he should do it in Committee and he should be man enough to withdraw these remarks this afternoon, Mr. Speaker - or name the people, the person that was gossiping.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder for clarification purposes if the Attorney-General who made the statement of gossip a few moments ago would tell us if he was referring to Mr. Courchene, the President of the Indian Brotherhood, or to Mr. Pollock who were speaking on the Easterville; which one of the two is he referring to is gossiping?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I didn't make any allegations about gossip.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, then the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Consumer and Corporate Affairs, which of the two gentlemen was he referring to?

MR. DESJARDINS: Come on, stand up and be man enough to say it. You made a comment - or withdraw it. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Minister should withdraw it if he can't name the person that is gossiping. This is a . . .

MR. LYON: Sit down.

MR. DESJARDINS: I won't sit down. And you're not the Speaker. Stand up. I won't sit down . . . and you stand up. Mr. Speaker, this Minister is not responsible if he uses this opportunity -- (Interjection) -- I am speaking on a question of order and privilege, I am speaking on a question. This Minister is saying now that this is gossip, he refused to mention, to name the person and he won't withdraw it and I think that this is not proper at all.

MR. SPEAKER: I must say that I have heard the worst gossip used many many times in this House and exception has not been taken to it, and I wonder if there's anything to be gained by continually asking that it be withdrawn. There's nothing unparliamentary about it. I don't . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . insulting the Committee, the delegation that came in front of the Committee today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister has risen. Orders of the Day.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would you please call . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like some clarification from the Minister of Tourism and Recreation of a reply he made to the Member for Gladstone regarding expropriations at Hecla Island. Did I understand him correctly to say that there were no expropriations in process?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's my understanding.

MR. MOLGAT: Next question then, Mr. Speaker. Are there some expropriations planned at Hecla Island?

MR. CARROLL: If there are to be expropriations they will be announced in the regular way.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: I was going to suggest Mr. Speaker, that we now turn to Page 4 of the Order Paper. The proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Finance that the resolutions reported from Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the resolutions reported from Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. TANCHAK: I believe it's in order for me to say a few words now, right?

MR. SPEAKER: One moment please. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Originally I had intended to bring this as a grievance, but I think this is probably my last chance because we are through with estimates and Ways and Means may not be called again, and truly - not this year anyway - and truly this is a grievance. It has to do mostly with drainage problems in the constituency of Emerson. The drainage problems have been sorely neglected in my constituency after repeated promises to improve the drainage problem in that area, in the whole of Emerson constituency, and especially in the eastern part around Vita and Zhoda and so on.

But in particular today I would like to speak of an area which has recently been flooded as a direct result of the Red River flooding. As the members are aware that when the Red River rises it backs into the Roseau River, and the Roseau River then overflows its banks and spills over rich farmlands between Arnot and Dominion City. This area that is flooded covers approximately 25 quarters of land. I spoke on this matter some four years ago, some of the members may recall, I think it was on a grievance motion at that time, but even after I have spoken on it there has been no action taken to date in this area. The members may also remember that when the Winnipeg Floodway was under discussion I had requested that the government consider the ring-diking of the towns south of Winnipeg, and not only help the citizens of Winnipeg with a floodway but also provide some assistance to the people living in these towns. At the same time, I asked the government to consider a different site for a floodway. I asked for a floodway to originate somewhere at the border near Emerson and then follow on the east side of the Red River to the Marsh River and on past Winnipeg probably where the present floodway enters the Red River again. This way the whole area would have been protected from the United States boundary right past Winnipeg, including the City of Winnipeg. But at that time I was told my some experts that it would be a tremendous cost to make this floodway. Now these people that I am talking about between Arnot and Dominion City have suffered reverses, successive reverses. In the last dozen years I think they had probably one crop - a decent crop that they picked up. Last year they were unable to pick up anything; not on account of the fall rains but on account of seasonal rains right through the whole season. There was no crop to pick up for them at all.

Now this year they are in a worse situation, because the land that has been flooded, although the Red River has receded the waters flooding out of the Red River and back within the

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) . . . confines of the Red River banks, but the water in this area, between Arnot and Dominion City, has just started receding into the different rivers, and it looks like this year, by the time the water is drained off this area, these farmers will not be able to get out on their land. It will be too late, too wet and too late. So what happens? In about 12 years they had one fair crop. The people are desperate in this area, they are trying to make a living, they're trying to stay off welfare, but if nothing is done for these people, if there's no suitable drainage, they have no hope whatsoever. In the last three floods, which were not of major proportions, it was a major disaster for these people in the area that I'm speaking about now. They have no grain to sell because they had no crop last year; they have no cash on hand and they have no hope of seeding; it is too wet. Most of these farmers are grain farmers because the land is not suitable for mixed farming, especially for livestock, it is too heavy. So something must be done for these people. I would imagine that a long term solution would be to provide drainage down the Marsh River; or the engineers may after consideration, may decide drainage is a must. Because these people will be forced to leave their land. Some of them haven't paid their taxes on the second year now and their land might be up for tax sale; they can not pay their taxes. I'm sure they didn't pay last fall and they probably will not be able to pay their tax this coming fall. The long term solution as I said would be some proper form of drainage and I would imagine that it's up to the Minister with his engineers to look into this.

Now a short term solution - I'm sure that the municipalities concerned, and this concerns the municipality of Montcalm and Franklin because part of it, as the Honourable Member for Rhineland has mentioned before, there is a nub that extends across the river on the eastern side, so part of it is in Montcalm, part of it is in Franklin. There must be some financial help provided for these people, because they cannot exist, they must have some help to clean up. I understand the Minister telling us yesterday that the government is considering some kind of financial help suffered as a result of the flooding of the Red River. What the policy will be I imagine we will have to wait. They must have some cash to pay tax or else they will be off their land and they must have cash for ordinary necessities of life.

I could tell the Honourable Minister now that both of the municipalities have requested me today - and I haven't had a chance to speak to the Minister involved - have requested for a delegation as soon as possible; both Franklin municipality and the Municipality of Montcalm would like to meet with the Minister as soon as possible to discuss these problems with him. I'm not trying to be critical but I'm trying to plead with the government to do something for these people, because these people are desperate. I hope that I'll be able to meet with the Minister right after this and maybe we can arrange for a delegation to meet with the Minister soon. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk.

MR. CLERK: 1. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$700,846.00 for Legislation, Resolution 1 and 2, for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1970.

2. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,290,329.00 for Executive Council, Resolutions 3 to 5, for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1970.

3. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,943,019.00 for Agriculture, Resolution No. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. VIELFAURE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon that while concurring in Resolution No. 6, this House regrets that the government has, by voting against a two-price wheat policy, demonstrated that it is unwilling to take necessary measures to alleviate the cost-price squeeze in agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. VIELFAURE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this resolution. It has been fairly well debated through Private Members' day and then under the estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

If we look back, Mr. Speaker, over the last three years, we find that indeed this government hasn't paid too much attention to the agricultural segment of our society. Really after the 1966 election we were for quite some time with only an Acting Minister of Agriculture and indeed through that time very little was done as far as policy in that field. Then we had a temporary Minister of Agriculture who after a short time was appointed Minister of Mines and

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd) Natural Resources, and then again we now have a new Minister of Agriculture, and if you look back certainly there has been indeed very little done in alleviating what this particular government has advocated for many years that it would do, and that is, alleviating the cost-price squeeze.

So, Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to bring it before this House that it is our opinion that indeed this government has not done hardly anything to really alleviate the cost-price squeeze; and furthermore doesn't seem to have too much intention of adopting any significant policies, and this certainly has been demonstrated by the different votes that were taken on resolutions pertaining to agriculture and specially the one pertaining to the two-price wheat system.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Honourable Member from La Verendrye who has just spoken on this concurrent resolution. I regret very very much that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat. In the estimates we have before us we have an appropriation of almost ten millions of dollars devoted to the Department of Agriculture, and if my calculations are correct, we have 13 members of government in their seats at the present time when we are dealing with one of the most pressing problems facing Manitoba. It has been suggested in some quarters over the last few days that the Honourable the First Minister and his gang opposite may be contemplating appealing to the people of Manitoba for support. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Treasury, and their henchmen opposite, have indicated time after time that agriculture is still the base industry in the Province of Manitoba, and that while we have had some change in the base toward manufacturing and industry, they still confess, or give lip service to the problems of agriculture. It is historic in this House, at least since I have had the honour of being one of the representatives in this House, that we consider in all seriousness the problems of agriculture, and yet it does seem to me that by the very absence of so many members opposite that their lip service gives lie to their interests. Because after all, what are the problems in agriculture? The basic problem in agriculture, as far as Manitoba, still is to give to our agricultural industry a fair return for their labours in order that they may be full participants in the affluence that we claim that we have in Canada.

One of the methods by which this can be achieved is the suggestion contained in the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye; namely, the establishment of a two-price system for wheat. I think I would be correct in saying, Mr. Speaker, it's taken many years with the various political parties and the various farm organizations to get them - some of them at least - to even consider a two-price system for wheat in Canada. I recall on a number of occasions when the members of my group, the New Democratic Party and its predecessor the CCF Party, brought into this House resolutions endeavouring to establish a two-price system for wheat and we have met with rejection after rejection. Now the Liberal Party, or at least certain segments of the Liberal Party both here in Manitoba and in Canada, have come to the conclusion that what we have been fighting for, or advocating over the years, was worthwhile and we have support now in other quarters as well.

I recall at one time our farm organization basically rejected the concept of a two-price system for wheat in that they were more concerned with parity prices being arrived at by some other methodology. I recall standing in this House some years ago and having members opposite say to me: "Well, you represent labour; what is labour going to think of a two-price system for wheat, because if we have a two-price system for wheat, it's obvious that the domestic purchaser must of necessity pay more in order to give to the farmer and the agricultural producer a fair return." And I've said at that time, and I repeat now, that as far as organized labour is concerned, it has gone on record historically of being quite prepared to share whatever affluence we may have with our agricultural industry.

The Manitoba Federation of Labour has passed resolution after resolution agreeing with the concept of all of us being part of Canada and all of us being a part of Manitoba and that we are prepared, if indeed I stand - and this is not correct in its entirety - that if I stand now ostensibly as a representative for labour dealing with an agricultural question, I make no apologies at all because I am sure that as I stand here that I have the united support of organized labour in the interests of the agricultural community, our fellow Manitobans and our fellow Canadians. The Canadian Labour Congress likewise has passed resolutions in support of the principles contained within this resolution. Now if we could only get the so-called

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) representatives of the farmer who are sitting opposite in this House to agree to this concept, maybe the farmers would be placed in a position where they were getting a fair return for their labour.

Just the other week I made certain suggestions dealing with the surplus of our cereal grain crops that we have, of the reduction of our contributions to so-called national defence estimates. I made the suggestion, I am sure you will recall, Mr. Speaker, at that time, that if we cut back on our national defence expropriation we would be able to go across the periphery of Canada and into the world itself and make a contribution for the well-being of our less privileged citizens in this great community we call the globe. We are pleased today with what is happening. The Astronauts on their trip to the moon - we praise them and we honour them, and yet at the same time, at the same time, we haven't put our own house in order.

At the same time as we are worrying about surpluses here in the Province of Manitoba and in Canada, we have two propositions before us. We have a proposition of the full knowledge that over a third of the people in the world are going hungry to bed each night because they haven't sufficient to fill their stomachs. At the same time as we are doing that, we're getting the proposition from many quarters that the solution to our problem is to endeavour to get our agricultural industry to go more and more into the provision of livestock and curtail production in the bread of life. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in this eve of our venture into the seventies and the hundredth centennial year of the founding of this great province of ours, which has always been considered basically an agricultural province, that the proposition proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye could conceivably go a long way. As I say, after years and years of endeavouring and cajoling governments at Ottawa, we do seem to have at the present time some inclination with the federal agricultural department to give consideration to this measure.

So I suggest to my honourable friends opposite - I am happy now that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has returned to his seat - I trust and hope that he will make some contribution to this very important debate on behalf of all of the citizens of Manitoba, because I feel, Mr. Speaker, that while we are dealing ostensibly with a specific resolution dealing with agriculture, it is still a fact that as agriculture goes in Manitoba, so goes Manitoba itself. When one thinks of the relationship between labour and farmer, when one realizes that as a result of the depressed agriculture industry in Manitoba that there has been a reduction of some 18 millions of dollars in the purchase of farm equipment and farm machinery which adversely affects labour and the producer in the factory, this surely brings to home the relationship existing between agriculture and labour and industry.

And I suggest in closing, Mr. Speaker, that this government would be well advised to use its offices in supporting the contention contained in this resolution, the objective of which is of course to give to the - not give, but to provide to the agricultural industry in Manitoba and to the producers of agriculture more dollars, more cents, in order to carry on their traditional worthwhile contribution, not only to Manitoba but to the universe at large. And I appeal to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture to get into this debate, to give us the benefit of his wisdom and to join us in a real endeavour to aid in the solution of what has been a pressing problem not only for Manitoba but for Canada for so long.

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Will the honourable gentleman permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: I never refuse.

MR. GRAHAM: It astounds me, Mr. Speaker, how can this gentleman offer good advice and suggest that the farmer and labour can work hand in hand when we have every evidence that any time a major shipment of grain has come about that organized labour has blocked it through port strikes, or through grain handlers strikes. I would like this honourable gentleman to ratify that.

MR. PAULLEY: I guess the question was: How can I justify the question of labour using its weapon for advancement, namely the strike, at the time of the sales of wheat or the transporting of wheat and other commodities that my honourable friend at this time seems so concerned about. I would say to my honourable friend that there have been times when labour has been at odds with its employer. The grain handlers strike was a strike against the elevators because of the opinion of the grain handlers that their wage rates were inadequate. They have the weapon of strike and they have to use it on occasions, and somebody opposite there some time ago, if I recall correctly, said that the time to use your strike weapon is when there is no transporting of grain. How ridiculous and how stupid! But this is the attitude of some of my

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) honourable friends opposite.

But I would say to my honourable friend, notwithstanding the fact that these situations of which he speaks have arisen, that here I am, one who is concerned not only with labour but also with the farming community, standing in this House appealing to my honourable friend, the member who just asked the question, to join me in an endeavour to obtain for the agricultural industry in our province a fairer return for his labour, because my honourable friend apparently has not joined in other aspects in the agricultural industry to fight for themselves. That's what I'm doing here. If my honourable friend would only fight for agriculture as I am endeavouring to do here this afternoon, I am sure that the plight of the farmer in Manitoba would be far better and that the grain handlers and others would not be considered, as they are indeed in the eyes of some, a depressed industry as well. So join me my honourable friend in an endeavour to obtain for the agricultural industry in Manitoba and Canada a fair return for the labour, and not be too critical because of the fact that on occasion labour does strike.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but listen to what was said by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, in order to try to establish in my own mind whether he had any concept of what the problem is as is created by people such as he who talk about the division of interest between labour and farming. It seems to me that he showed a complete disinterest in the problems of other aspects of the economy of the province in a straight statement that was geared only in the interests of one sectional group, and if he is the spokesman for his Party, and every one of us are spokesmen for our Party, then it would give the impression that they care not, at least he cares not about the rights of any other group, but only to attack them in an attempt to save this government for its position in regard to the rights of agriculture.

I don't believe that he exhausted his right to speak, because although in asking his question he certainly made a speech, but there must be other members in the backbench especially who represent farming communities who must either, I suggest, agree by their silence with the attitude that he took - and I did notice a couple of them nod their heads when he spoke but I won't indicate who they are lest I misunderstood their nodding; maybe they were shuddering in horror with the attitude he was expressing, let's hope that's what it was - but I would think that this occasion should not go by without someone else in the backbench, representative of the agricultural community, to support or reject the statements and the implications which were set out by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. I see some of his seatmates are nodding their heads and maybe they will get up and speak on this question, and particularly on the statements which he made which I believe do nothing but separate further the agricultural and the urban areas of the province by an attitude as parochial, as narrow and as ignorant as the one which was expressed by him. So I felt that I just had to invite other members of his Party to take the position on this question, either for or against the statement he made, and I believe quite seriously that if they just let it slide and don't respond, then, by implication, I think that they must be tarred by the same brush as that with which he has tarred himself.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't see the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. Perhaps he's gone on strike because he's not in the House, but Mr. Speaker, he certainly has expressed the attitude of all of those people who over the years have tried to maintain power by creating a division between the agricultural producer and the industrial producer, and Mr. Speaker, I want to ask those people, what good has this done them? Does the situation that agriculture finds itself in today indicate that they have had some interest in this dispute which tends to place their problem at the hands of the industrial worker, because Mr. Speaker, it's not so.

The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell asked the question: Why is it that whenever the agricultural people have to ship their grain that the workers go on strike? Well, Mr. Speaker, why doesn't he ask the question appropriately. After all, a strike is a failure to consummate an economic transaction. It's a failure of one party to pay the price and the failure of the other party to accept what the other is paying. Why didn't the Member for Birtle-Russell say that when the farmer wanted to ship his grain, that the shipping companies went on strike; because they did. There would have been no stoppage of work at all if the shipping companies would have paid what the workers were asking. And Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that they necessarily should, but what the Honourable the Attorney-General is

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . laughing at is that he expects the workers to work for whatever price they're willing to pay. He said that the working man should be willing to accept what the ship owners are paying, but he won't say that the ship owners should pay whatever the wharf workers want to work at.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I want to assure my honourable friend I wasn't laughing at that, I was laughing at his dilemma and the dilemma of the NDP in attempting to answer an unanswerable question.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the very fact is that the Honourable the Attorney-General knows that the question is not answerable from his point of view. I put it to him again, and let him answer the question, let him respond to the invitation, let him respond to the invitation that was given by the member for St. John. Why does he not say that the grain handling companies went on strike just when the farmers wanted to ship their grain? The grain handling companies went on strike because they refused to pay the amount that the workers were asking. Now let him answer that question. Why is that not just as valid a proposition as saying that the men went on strike. Now he says we are faced with an unanswerable question. Well I'm giving him one which he says that it's so easy to answer that it shouldn't even be asked. Well you get up and answer it; you get up and answer the fact that there would have been no stoppage of work, either at the wharves or in the grain handling area, if the companies would have paid the price that the men were asking. Now isn't that a fact? And it's been in the interests . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I feel I must in all fairness interrupt the honourable gentleman. No mention has been made for some considerable time with regard to the contents of the Resolution, or at least the motion that is before the House. I wonder if we couldn't get back to the matter we're dealing with rather than the conversation that's been going on.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll deal with the Resolution. The Resolution is that the House request that the government has, by voting against a two-price wheat policy, demonstrated that it is unwilling to take necessary measures to alleviate the cost-price squeeze in agriculture. The answer to that was the question raised by the member for Birtle-Russell, that the problems relating to agriculture is to be blamed on the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Russell asked a question which the honourable gentleman accepted. He wasn't making a statement to that effect, he asked a question.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, now I'm going to answer the question as it relates to the steps necessary to alleviate the cost-price squeeze in agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: And so long as the honourable gentleman will refrain from discussing such matters as strikes and all this sort of thing that has nothing at all to do with the contents of the Resolution. I'm interested in the business of the House moving along at a reasonable rate.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to hear that you agree that the question of strikes has nothing to do with the cost-price squeeze in agriculture and I am sure you accept. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sure the honourable gentleman doesn't want to take my remarks out of context. He knows exactly what I mean and I don't want him to get me into his argument. That is unthinkable.

MR. GREEN: But I distinctly understood you to say, Mr. Speaker - and if I'm wrong then I'll certainly regret having misunderstood you - but I distinctly understood you to say that the question of strikes has nothing to do with the question of the cost-price squeeze in agriculture, and I agree with you, but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I know exactly what the honourable gentleman can do with words and I wish he would not take my words out of context. I was dealing entirely, in my humble opinion, with the contents of the motion before the House, and that only.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, do I understand you to say that you do agree that the question of strikes has to do something with the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable gentleman is out of order in moving in that direction and he knows it.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to be brief. I would like to deal with the problems that were raised respecting this resolution by the Member for Birtle-Russell. I wish to pose questions to the Attorney-General as to who goes on strike when grain does not move. I suggested to him that the grain handling companies went on strike. I would urge the members on that side of the House if they have any anger to spew their anger out at the grain companies. I suggest to you that when the workers went out on strike, or alleged by the

(MR. GREEN cont'd) member for Birtle-Russell to have gone out on strike, that it was really the ship owners who went on strike, and that if you have a problem with regard to the movement of grain that that problem be attributed to the people who are responsible, the people who stopped shipping, and who stopped hiring employees to handle grain. And it's just such remarks as were made by the Member for Birtle-Russell which I say, Mr. Speaker, have prevented the agricultural community, in the industrial community, from identifying the real culprit. And I suggest to the Member for Birtle-Russell that he start identifying them, that it's not the men who go on strike, it's the company who go on strike. The men are asking for a certain wage, the company refuses to pay it. You say that the men should work for whatever wages they are offered - is that correct? that what you're suggesting, that the company sets the wage and the men must work.

MR. GRAHAM: Who said that? Not me.

MR. GREEN: You said - the Member for Birtle-Russell said that when grain had to be handled, men went on strike. I suggest to him that the company went on strike.

MR. GRAHAM: I just quoted the facts.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I was rather interested in the discussion that was carried on by the last two or three speakers. It's always been intriguing to me, in my opinion - or maybe I should not express an opinion because we might get into a very lengthy debate on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, we've discussed this matter very fully on different occasions. I recall the resolutions that we had on the Order Paper some time ago in connection with the two-price system and acreage payments and I feel quite strongly on the matter of the two-price system. Our party has been endorsing this for better than 30 years and I feel it's the proper thing to do. We also had a special debate one day where many of the members participated in the agricultural situation in this province, of the squeeze that the farmers are in and how to remedy the situation. I still don't know just what this government's recommendations are to Ottawa in the way of assistance to farmers. Is this purely acreage payments? This is the amendment that they made to the motion on the two-price system. I would like to hear from them whether this is their only remedy, whether this is their recommendation to the Federal Government in the way of assistance that should be provided to the farmers of western Canada. In my opinion that doesn't go far enough. The portion of wheat that is consumed in Canada which would be sold at an additional price is not sufficient to bring the farmers out of the plight that they're in today, that we need additional help and additional support to that, and this assistance is needed now, we cannot wait indefinitely for this to come about. Here we are, it's spring, the farmers are seeding. Many of them have their bins full yet they're out seeding a new crop and are unable to sell what they have at the present time. In my own area I don't think we're off the unit system yet. There's many areas that just held the one bushel quota and this is not sufficient to pay for the going expenses let alone the cost of operation from last year, which in many cases are not being paid for as yet. I feel that it is very very urgent that we do get a program going for the farmer of Manitoba and western Canada.

We know from experience that the Federal Government devised a program whereby they're giving the automobile industry an outright gift of some \$50 million a year, from tariffs that they're collecting from the consumers of Canada, people who buy automobiles; and this is given to them. Surely enough if these industries are given that much protection we should give the farmer of western Canada some protection because he has to sell his product on the world market and he has no protection whatever, and I feel this should be changed. Surely we have the brains, we have the means of changing this and I feel that changes should be brought about. I would venture to say that some of the tariffs that are being collected by the federal government at the present time could be used for this purpose - and we know that the amount of tariffs that are collected are large. We also know from the experience during World War Two and immediately after the war when the prices of grain to other countries was high, that the farmers sold at a very low price at that time. They sold millions and millions of bushels of wheat at a low price when they could have fetched a much higher price. And it wasn't our speculators here that were making the money, it was the speculators overseas that were making the money on the grain that was sold to these countries at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I would definitely want to know from the Minister of Agriculture as to this government's policy. What are they going to recommend and what are they recommending to the

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . federal government in the way of assistance. I think we have the right as members of this Assembly to know at this time what is their recommendation going to be. Meetings will be held and no doubt the federal government must have contacted them when they were negotiating policy or assistance to the prairie farmers, that they would consult the prairie provinces' governments in this connection. I am pleading with the Minister to tell us just what are they asking for, what will they be doing as far as policy and what are they recommending to the Federal Government in this respect?

I have on previous occasions mentioned the matter of storage and I do not want to go into the whole matter again, but I feel that this is an area that we as a province could do something about. I have asked on previous occasions that if we're not prepared as a government to provide inland storage certainly we should make a request to the grain companies that they provide additional storage in the various towns so that the farmers will be able to deliver more grain. All it would do is add to the inventory of the Canadian Wheat Board, and certainly we can do something in this direction. I feel that if this government went out and provided inland storage at central points in the province that we could do this free of charge to the farmer and that we in this way could give some assistance to the farmer in Manitoba. Our province has the smallest acreage of the three prairie provinces so we can afford to do more in the way to assist our farmer in Manitoba. The total production of wheat runs around 80, 90 million bushels, whereas Saskatchewan, Alberta have probably three, four or even five times that amount to deal with; so that the problem isn't nearly as large for the Manitoba Government than of the other two prairie provinces and certainly we should be prepared to do something in this direction.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this resolution. I don't think that there is any necessity for me to get up and speak again on the two-price system for wheat, or the supposed two-price system. I pointed out already in the House in a previous debate on this issue, we could not, considering the situation insofar as Manitoba farmers are concerned, accept wheat as a basis for subsidizing western farmers at this time. And again I must say that in my opinion there is no such thing as a two-price system; there is one price. And I have said this already in the House, that is what the market will stand; anything beyond that is a subsidy, becomes a matter of what base we use for subsidy and how this subsidy is raised, whether it is raised by increasing the price of bread or simply taking money out of the Federal Treasury. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that if money is going to be taken from the Federal Treasury to subsidize western farmers that it should apply to all farmers who are in need of subsidization than they are at the moment.

In the Province of Manitoba, we have 11,000 farmers who do not grow wheat, 11,000 farmers, Mr. Speaker. But they do grow oats and barley and at the present time we have oats and barley piled up in this province to about the same extent as we have wheat and have no sale for it. If we're talking now about a basis for subsidy we suggest on this side of the House, and I have already informed Ottawa the position that we have taken, that debates for subsidy should be on an acreage basis that would apply to all farmers and that we would be in a position, or the Federal Government now that the subsidy could be applied immediately because they have on record through the Canadian Wheat Board the acreage of every farmer in the three prairie provinces. If a farmer is going to be subsidized to the extent of \$1,000 or 1,500 or 2,000 or whatever it might be, it can be applied through an acreage payment much more simple than it could be through a two-price system for wheat or through a basis for subsidy - of wheat used as a basis. I don't think that I could be any clearer than this. This is the position that this government takes, and if in the wisdom of the federal government, they see fit to use wheat as a basis for subsidy then . . . --(Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think there . . .

MR. USKIW: Would the Minister permit a question? The Minister has mentioned acreage payments. I'm wondering whether he would give us an idea of just what kind of payments, in amounts, or what does he really mean?

MR. WATT: If the honourable member would listen. I have already said whether the amount of subsidy was \$1,000 per farmer or \$1,500 or \$2,000, this is a matter for the federal government to decide just how much money they can afford to pay in subsidy to western farmers or if they are prepared to pay any subsidy. And I say again, that if I'm to speak for the farmers of Manitoba, it must be all the farmers of Manitoba, not just those farmers who

(MR. WATT cont'd) grow wheat.

Statistics show, or figures show - and I'm sorry I haven't got them here with me right now but using wheat as a basis for subsidy, 77% of the farmers in western Canada would benefit; but in Manitoba 65 percent of the farmers grow wheat, two-thirds of the farmers, Mr. Speaker. This would mean that the 70 percent average across the three prairie provinces since we are 65 percent would naturally increase Saskatchewan and Alberta. In other words, possibly up to 84 or 85 percent of the Alberta and Saskatchewan farmers would be benefitting from a subsidy based on wheat where Manitoba farmers would be benefitting to the extent of 65 percent, or 11,000 farmers would be out in the cold. So for this reason this is the position that I take at this moment. It may be that the federal government in their wisdom will see fit to, if anything, use wheat as a basis for subsidy, in which case Manitoba would lose considerably percentage-wise.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland has said that he doesn't know what the position of the government is in respect of assistance to farmers at the moment. He hasn't been listening to the debates; he hasn't been reading the press; or he would know that already we have made representation to Ottawa in this respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I have no wish to get into an argument with my Honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the relative merits of a two-price system for wheat or an acreage payment program. Personally, having regard to the crisis that faces many farmers in the province of Manitoba, I would be willing to accept either one, and I would accept them even if they were called a subsidy. I don't like the word subsidy either, but if that's what it's got to be called then I think there are times when farmers as well as other industries and individuals might well be subsidized - and if there ever was a time, I would think it was now, when the grain is piled up in the farmer's bin, not only from last year's crop but in many cases a large proportion of the year before last. And to me that constitutes a crisis. As I have mentioned on another occasion, and others have too in this House, I simply wonder how the farmers continue to have the fortitude and the courage under these circumstances to go out with any optimism this spring to consider their seeding plans. To have last year's and some of the year before's crop in many cases still in their hands and prospects for sale so remote at the moment and to be undertaking the great expense that there is these times to be putting in another crop, must be a dismal outlook for many of our farmers. So I would think if ever a subsidy of one kind or another were justified, it could be justified now.

But this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, deals with the two-price program. I must admit that my preference is for that plan rather than the acreage one and it seems to me that it is one that deserves more consideration than the federal government has given it, either the federal government when it was constituted by the one party or the other. I think that it is a justified proposal. I am told by those who know the industry better than I ever would, that you can say that a pound of wheat makes a pound of bread. Well now, the usual figure when they talk about a two-price system, has been 60¢, that is a cent a pound, or \$1.00, that's a cent, four-fifths a pound, something in that nature, or even \$1.20, but if you went to \$1.20 that would be 2¢ a pound as an extra. And if a pound of wheat makes a pound of bread, then that would be, according to my figuring, only 2¢ on a loaf - and that would be a substantial contribution to agriculture. Contribution, subsidy if you like, but something that would help greatly in these times. So I favour the motion. I think that the government of the province should be making more emphatic representations than I have been aware of them making to the federal government. I do not propose it as a provincial subsidy. I don't think that the province can afford to get into that kind of a program. Maybe the federal government can't afford it either these times. But if I were asked to attempt a justification of basing the policy on wheat rather than on all grains, I would say that what seems logical to me is that because wheat is the product that to the great extent enters into international trade that I think a fair and logical distinction can be made between it and the feed grains.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not in the habit of indulging in recriminations in the House and trying to get partisanship approaches established on these questions, but I did call upon my honourable friend, the Member for Gladstone once again to dig into his voluminous files and help me to refresh my memory about what it was that the Conservative Party said about our government ~~away~~ back in the dim dark days beyond recall in 1958, and luckily we are living in more

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . enlightened times now and we have this progressive government - self-styled - and things should be better. But they're not better for the agriculturalist. They may be better for a lot of other people but they're not for the agriculturalist, and I don't blame the provincial government for that because I think there is comparatively little that they can do to help the farmer. I'm in the fortunate position that the literature that my honourable friend the Member for Gladstone supplied to me, bears out that that's the same thing that I was saying years ago, because I want to read briefly from one of the publications issued at the time of the election campaign in 1958. And here's what it says, under the heading Agriculture. This is the nine point program for a greater Manitoba, and point No. 2 is Agriculture: "The Campbell government has abandoned Manitoba farmers to the pressure of the cost-price squeeze." Well, sir, the cost-price squeeze was bad enough back in 1958; but does anybody say it isn't worse now? Is there anybody that would argue that it isn't worse now? Then if it's worse now, we could be justified on the basis of this manuscript I guess in saying that the Weir government has abandoned Manitoba farmers to even more pressure from the cost-price squeeze, and on the terms under which this was written that would be a serious charge I suppose. "Then the Liberal Leader has said there is very little a provincial government can do to help." Well, I did say that and I've continued to say it all the years since, because in the realms that are most important, the realm that has been spoken of by others this afternoon, the one of helping agriculture to discharge its time-honoured commitment to feed the people of the world, the difficulties lie in the international field, not only in the national but the international field; and this is true. And even the national government in my opinion can do only so much. It's international arrangements that we need because the prospect that's been mentioned by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party is true -- it isn't right -- it isn't fair -- it isn't reasonable that we should at times with bulging granaries here, have people in so many parts of the world going to bed at night and every night hungry. But the fact is that the situation is still worse now than it was at that time and to that extent I criticize the government not for what they've failed to do but the fact that in the exuberance of the optimism of an election campaign, they made promises that they were absolutely unable to fulfill.

Perhaps Mr. Speaker, I could issue a word of warning because of these rumours that we've been hearing about. Don't make mistakes like that again. Don't make them if you're thinking of doing what the press says you're thinking of doing. Don't go out and make mistakes of that kind. Because here's what the document says: "A Liberal Leader has said there is very little a provincial government can do to help. Just as the Ottawa Liberals were dismissed from office for the failure to deal with farm problems under their federal jurisdiction, so should the Campbell government be dismissed for its failure to deal with the agricultural problems within the provincial jurisdiction." Well, if we carried that logic through we would say that the present government deserves to be dismissed from office for the same reasons. I don't think that is true. I think that they couldn't do very much about the main problems of agriculture and so I exonerate them on that particular count. But I do think that they could give support to a resolution that calls for, in principle at least, for advocacy of the two-price system or else propose an amendment to the resolution that would advocate another system. Let us show by what we do here that at least we're aware of the problem; that we're aware of the fact that agriculture in Manitoba does face a crisis now. The cost-price squeeze is worse than it was years ago. The supply situation is more onerous than it was years ago. The market situation appears to be more pessimistic than it was years ago. This in my mind constitutes a crisis and I think it's well to bring it before the House by a resolution of this kind. And couldn't we get the government to either support a two-price program - which of course the federal government would have to implement, not this government - or else propose an alternative. Why not amend this resolution if the government won't support it; amend it to recommend some other program. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- Why not do it here again, rather than vote down this motion.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I take it that the government's mind is made up and I have not a very high batting average when it comes to persuading them to change their minds, so there is nothing that I can do but recommend support of the amendment.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Member for Lakeside permit a question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, of course.

MR. WATT: In the light of the remarks that the honourable member made in a similar

(MR. WATT cont'd) debate earlier in the session - as I recall the Honourable Member for Lakeside pointed out a discussion that he had with a friend out at Portage la Prairie who had informed him that he had barley backed up on his farm as much as three years back. My question is: What would the Honourable Member for Lakeside propose in the way of assistance for this particular farmer?

MR. CAMPBELL: As people frequently say in the House and in committee, "I'm glad you asked that question." That gives me the opportunity to make another speech, as people frequently do.

First and foremost, I didn't say that the barley on the farm that I was well acquainted with was backed up for three years - it was two years: a large proportion of the 1968 crop and quite a substantial portion of the '67 - those two. And many many farmers were in that same position. Now it's a fact that that was barley and it's a fact that on that particular farm there was no wheat grown last year. But, Mr. Speaker, as my honourable friend the Minister is well aware, farmers change their program from year to year, and generally the farmer decides upon his program - and it's a tough decision I'm sure this spring - but generally speaking he decides upon his program by sitting down and looking the situation over to the best of his ability plus all the information he can get as to what grain shall I sow to get the most money per acre. Isn't that what he usually tries to figure out? And he's sometimes right, but not always. I think that even though the figures that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture quotes of a certain number of farmers that in any given year do not grow wheat, yet most of them through the years do grow some wheat in some of the years. Now this would be a factor in making their plans as to what they would grow; and I admit that at a time when wheat, oats and barley are all in a supply situation rather than a demand one, that there doesn't appear to be any great difference. But the difference in my opinion is this, as I mentioned earlier, that wheat is of those grains, the international commodity, and it's the one where the amount of export is the controlling factor; and it's the one where the national policies of other countries and other governments come into play to compete against the farmer of this country. And so I think wheat, on that basis, is put in a somewhat different category.

You might argue that on the other basis that the farmers have some opportunity to increase their livestock production and use up some of the grain. Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid to advocate that one with any too great emphasis because I have the feeling, in fact I have the certainty, that if the farmers of Manitoba as a whole, or in great majority, attempted to solve their problems by that method, then we would have, in Canada, a situation with regard to livestock products the same as we have in the grain; so that that's not the whole answer. But the other answers that I've given I think are logical ones. If my honourable friend would like to ask any more questions I would be delighted to try and answer them.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, if I could risk one more. I'm sorry I didn't let the Honourable Member for Lakeside speak first. He's prompted me to think of quite a few more things. The honourable member has suggested that a farmer plants his crop in the spring to bring in the most possible return that he can see insofar as he knows the market. Now, in the case of the farmer out at, my question, in the case of the farmer out at Portage la Prairie - and the honourable member agrees with me that there are many more like him - he didn't grow barley last year. Supposing the price of wheat is raised to three dollars a bushel we'll say, for a given amount of bushels, is he not likely to grow the maximum amount of wheat next year?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I certainly agree, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- I didn't hear the last part of the question.

MR. WATT: I'm referring to the maximum amount that would be subsidized by the federal government.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I concede that, but this would just be a factor in his overall planning. This is the reason, of course, that we have to look at the supply situation in any of these programs, and this is the reason that most of plans that are suggested with regard to a two-price system on wheat put a limit on the amount that would qualify for the extra amount of money. And I think this has to be done, because -- (Interjection) -- He would grow the limit if he felt that that was the most profitable thing to do. I think that's correct.

MR. WATT: At three dollars a bushel it couldn't help but be profitable.

May 21, 1969

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, it depends on what else would. . . . Might I ask my honourable friend a question. What is he suggesting to the farmers this spring that the farmers should grow?

MR. WATT: I'm planting a little of everything myself.

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

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I haven't got much to contribute to this debate. As you are probably aware by now, that the whole waterfront has been pretty adequately covered. However, I couldn't help but rise to my feet after the Honourable Minister of Agriculture had made the statement that he has already made representation to the federal government with respect to the introduction of an acreage payment, and he was somewhat dubious in his own mind as to whether or not the two-price system would benefit all the farmers and he went on to list the percentage of farmers that would benefit in Manitoba as compared to the farmers that would benefit in two other western provinces. Well I'm certain that if my honourable friend just took time off and thought this matter out, that it is quite possible to have a two-price system for all cereal grains on a basic unit of production, whether it be based on the initial unit deliveries under our quota system that defers so many bushels - "x" number of bushels be paid a certain price for oats and barley, as well as wheat; but the fact remains that the two other provinces have saw fit to go ahead with the two-price system for wheat and the pressure has not come from this government.

I think I will have to agree with the honourable member for Lakeside that insofar as the finance is concerned the provincial government is somewhat hampered insofar as direct assistance is concerned. However, there is one role that the provincial government can play and that is through their good offices can put pressure on the federal government to bring in measures that would help solve the farm income prices. Mr. Speaker, it was only a few short months ago during the by-election campaign, that this government had taken great issue with the federal government, to put all the blame on the federal government authorities, for the situation that the farmers were in at the present time, and I think it is not too much to expect this government to come out and propose a constructive program that would cope with this problem. That is the least that could be expected of this government.

And, insofar as my friend from Birtle-Russell is concerned, I regret that he is not in his own seat. When I was out in the hustings in Birtle-Russell, he made it a great issue that the farmers in his area were suffering by way of a low income from farm produce and I would just like to ask him what has he done to alleviate that situation for the two and a half months he's been in this House. Any constructive proposition that came forth from this quarter of the House has been voted against by the government; and some of those measures were such that would have helped to bring about some easing in the farm income problem.

I want to make one more comment on the subsidies, and that is, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture why is it that all other exporting countries saw no other solution but introduce a system of subsidies for the farm products to cope with the farm income problem. Certainly in Canada here, we are still a young country, but we, I think, have come to the point in our history where we must take a serious look and see why these other countries saw fit to introduce subsidies for their farm products. And I suggest to him that if he studies the situation he will come to the ultimate conclusion that that is the only answer to our farm problem. We have a two price system for fertilizer at the present time; we have a two price system for farm machinery at this present time - machinery is being sold for a certain price in Canada and the same Canadian manufacturers sell the same machinery units across the pond for a greatly reduced price. If that is feasible, there is no reason why a two price system for wheat isn't feasible.

Of course I will be supporting this motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead); Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the House is fully familiar with my views on this particular question and I don't think that it requires a great deal of saying at this point. I am going to support the motion that's before us but I simply want to indicate that the Minister of Agriculture, in coming up with some figures a moment ago, did not take proper recognition of the facts as they actually are. Why are we talking about wheat, Mr. Speaker, as being one commodity that requires some form of subsidy or otherwise? I want to point out to the Minister that wheat is in a very peculiar position as it relates to other

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . commodities; and that is, that the price levels are established at the international level, that has no relationship at all to the domestic cost of production. The Minister knows fully well that this is the case. Being a farmer himself I'm surprised that he doesn't support such a proposition.

The point he made was that if we approved of this motion, only 65 percent of our producers would benefit, that 35 percent would not. I want to point out that there may be other measures required for other commodities, Mr. Speaker, but we're dealing with the question of wheat in this particular resolution. I want to point out that the Minister should be aware, if he's not, that there are subsidies paid to other commodities. There is a dairy subsidy; there is a subsidy to the beet growers. Is he suggesting that we have another subsidy for those that are already subsidized? I don't know what his position is. I think that the best approach is to apply the necessary subsidy where it is needed. We don't need a blanket proposal such as the Minister is suggesting; because, if you make it a blanket proposition, it is not going to be meaningful for any one group because it would be too expensive a program to give out money at random without reason as to whether that is needed in that particular area of production or not.

And I can only go back to the Conservative years - I mentioned this before in this House

.....

MR. ENNS: They were pretty good years, Sam.

MR. USKIW: wherein the government at that time paid out acreage payments, Mr. Speaker, a dollar an acre up to a maximum of 200 dollars. No one on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, will convince anyone that they indeed solved the financial plight of the producers at that time. That was a bit of charity that was not wanted and was not asked for. The farmers asked for a farm policy -- (Interjection) -- They didn't need it for very long? They needed it every time the Conservative Party went to the polls. That's when they needed it

MR. WATT: We started selling wheat in

MR. USKIW: and this is the type of nonsense that I'm fed up with, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has the audacity to get up in this House and say that he is favour of some sort of vague acreage payment that he is not quite sure of, whether it should be a dollar an acre or ten dollars an acre, he's not quite made up his mind on. Now Mr. Speaker, maybe it's quite in order to have an acreage payment, I'm not going to - If he's going to put money into the hands of the producers, I'm all for it regardless of which way, but I say we must be careful. We must recognize the differences in production of different commodities and we must hit the areas that we find ourselves in a problem with. In other words, wheat is an international commodity or a commodity which is sold on the international market; it's something that we do not totally consume in Manitoba or in even Canada, and we recognize that although we maintain international price levels, or try to, that that has nothing to do with the cost of production in Manitoba. And in effect if that international price, Mr. Speaker, is below our cost of production, what we are really saying is that we are prepared to subsidize the Canadian consumer to the extent of which that international price is below the cost of production. It isn't realistic, Mr. Speaker. The Minister knows it's not realistic, but he's trying to

MR. WATT: . . . question Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. WATT: Is the Honourable Member from Brokenhead saying that the consumers in this province are buying their food too cheap?

MR. USKIW: I want to point out to my honourable friend, the Minister of Agriculture, that we indeed have a cheap food policy in this country.

MR. WATT: That is not an answer to my question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. USKIW: I don't know what kind of an answer he wants, Mr. Speaker. But insofar as the price of bread is concerned, the Minister of Agriculture knows that out of a twenty-seven cent loaf, three cents of it is made up out of the wheat content. The Minister knows that the farmer gets three cents out of every loaf, and the price of bread has multiplied many times over. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the price of wheat has gone down while the price of bread has gone up at the same time - and the Minister ought to know that if he doesn't know it. And I'm suggesting to my honourable -- (Interjection) --

MR. WATT: Is the honourable member suggesting that there should be another jump in the price of bread?

MR. USKIW: I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if there was an increase in the price of bread, and that was passed on to the primary producer, if there was, that the consumer would not feel too badly off if he knew that the benefit of that increase went directly into the hands of the farmer. How many increases have we had in the price of bread in the last ten or fifteen years? I don't think anyone took any violent action or reaction to the proposals made by the bakeries of this country when they moved the price of bread up because of so-called rising cost of production. What about the rising cost of production of producers of grain, of wheat? Surely we must recognize that they have rising costs of production, and, as a matter of fact more so than most other segments. But they are the only group, Mr. Speaker, that don't have a bargaining position and my honourable friend is not prepared to back them up. He has voted against every decent resolution that would have helped the farmer in this income crisis. He has voted against every proposal, Mr. Speaker, since he was Minister and, in fact, before he was Minister. He has not proposed one solid solution. He went down on a ride to Ottawa and never had anything to say at the farm Congress. He has no ideas, Mr. Speaker. And I said it before and I say it again that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture has failed the farming community of Manitoba. It's about time that he started to move and not allow his colleagues in the cabinet to push him around. He should tell his colleagues in the cabinet that agriculture is important in Manitoba and that the farmers ought to be given a bit of bargaining power to sustain themselves to compete in the economy. But I'm sure that the Minister of Agriculture is the last guy in the cabinet that is getting the consideration. We consider all the others first and any proposals that he may make, well they may either be dealt with later or maybe not dealt with at all. And it's quite obvious from the type of performance that we have had from the government side in matters of agriculture throughout this session and other sessions prior, that they are not prepared to cope with the problem. They are only looking forward to the day when we reduce the members in agriculture from their present numbers to about 50 percent of that number. Hopefully that if we introduce no programs, that this would happen much quicker. And this is the policy that that government is following.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be unusually brief today because I can't find my agricultural file -- and I'm not accusing any of the members opposite of stealing it either. Mr. Campbell's pinched it? Yes, well Mr. Campbell, the Honourable Member for Lakeside did raise a very good point.

Now, the resolution that is before us, Mr. Speaker, is a clear-cut brief one and it just simply says that by the government voting against that two price resolution, that they have demonstrated their refusal to deal fairly and squarely with the cost-price squeeze. Now a great deal has been said, Mr. Speaker, on the actual cost-price squeeze. We all know, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside has pointed out that it's much worse today than it was a decade ago. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Agriculture himself in drafting that ad that appeared in the "Progress Report" ten days ago, made the statement that the farmer in the current year would spend twice as much money on production as he did twenty years ago. He said that. Now the cost of wheat is certainly not double to what it was twenty years ago. In fact I don't think it's any higher today; it could even be lower today than it was twenty years ago, therefore the Minister admits by his own pen that the cost-price squeeze is much worse today than it was twenty years ago. There's no argument, Mr. Speaker, too that the government did in fact vote against the two price system. But here is something that strikes me as rather odd. About a month ago the House of Commons in Ottawa sent an agricultural committee out west to the three prairie provinces. I don't know the make-up of that agricultural committee, but I do know that it would be selected from all parties in the House. I don't know the numbers of the committee, but my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture will certainly know because he met with them. I believe the newspaper reports that that committee listened to some 24,000 farmers in Saskatchewan, or listened to their leaders and what they had to say. I don't know the number that they listened to in Manitoba, but I believe that the committee appeared at three different points in Manitoba. And as a result of the meetings that were held in the west, that committee went back to Ottawa thoroughly convinced beyond any question of doubt that the farmer was faced with a cost-price squeeze; they admitted that. And they admitted, according to newspapers' reports, that they would favour a two-price system to help initially to alleviate some of the cost-price squeeze. I'm confident, if I could lay my hands on my agricultural file, that the Conservative members of that committee, that House of Commons

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . Agricultural Committee, were the ones that reported to the press and the news media that they were satisfied that, at the moment at least, a two-price system was what they would recommend to the House of Commons following the meetings in the west.

Now it strikes me as being rather odd that this Minister of Agriculture is not in agreement with the Conservative members of the Agricultural Committee in the House of Commons, and, as has been pointed out by two or three of the previous speakers, if he or members of the government do not intend to vote for the resolution that is before us at the moment, then I would suggest that, since they agree with part of the resolution - that is the one that states that the farmer is in fact caught in the cost-price squeeze - that they amend it and in such a fashion that they can forward it to the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons that met out here recently. Then the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons will have further evidence to support their findings to the authorities back east.

And so, Mr. Speaker, with those few comments I look forward to the government either voting for the resolution or amending it in a fashion that will have some meaning.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? (Interjection) I believe the honourable gentleman has exercised his privilege when he moved this amendment.

MR. VIELFAURE: Don't you close the debate on this kind of a resolution, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I would refer the honourable gentleman to our Rule 45 on Page 22 in this connection.

Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask what rule was it that was quoted - just for my own information?

MR. SPEAKER: Members not to speak twice. Replies. Rule 45 (1).

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

MR. VIELFAURE: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Molgat, Hillhouse, Campbell, Guttormson, Kawchuk, Paulley, Cherniack, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Harris, Green, Doern, Petursson, Froese, Dow, Patrick, Barkman, Vielfaure, Hanuschak, Fox, Uskiw, Borowski and Miller.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 23; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 3. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Ethelbert Plains, that while concurring in Resolution No. 6, this House regrets that the government has failed to give effective leadership in coping with the present farm income crisis.

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly you're cogitating on the same point. I'm just wondering if there is not a rather serious overlapping between the two amendments that have been proposed. I haven't, of course, had the benefit of seeing it, I've just heard it read by my honourable friend, but it would seem to cover much of the same territory. Certainly the debate. . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . the honourable member is raising a point of order, may I suggest that, Mr. Speaker, that there is a considerable difference between the two. One proposition dealt with the question of a two-price system for wheat, which is a matter that stands on its own, and the other one deals with the question of the cost-price squeeze to agriculture; that while one might have some minor bearing on the present farm income crisis, this resolution - and I say, in all due respect to my honourable friend the Leader of the House, it is a separate proposition by itself and I respectfully suggest the same to Your Honour.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I now have it in front of me and it leads me to wonder aloud whether coping - to quote the resolution moved by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead - "coping with the present farm income crisis" is really not part and parcel of alleviating the

(MR. LYON cont'd) . . . cost-price squeeze in agriculture -- (Interjection) -- I'm aware that we dealt with a two-price system and I was constantly aware while we were dealing with it that that was technically out of order because it was reflecting upon a matter that had already been decided at this session, but I decided not to raise that point in the hope that my honourable friend would be . . . , but I do think there is a serious area of overlapping here. Perhaps my honourable friend might recast it somehow, but

MR. PAULLEY: I don't think my honourable friend and colleague needs to recast it, and possibly my honourable friend the House Leader may reflect on what he's trying to put across.

MR. LYON: If my honourable friend assures me, Mr. Speaker, that none of the speeches made on this resolution will repeat any of the information given on the previous ones, then of course he will have proved his case.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I can tell my honourable friend we'll try and cajole the government into action whether some of the remarks may be repetitious or otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Does the Honourable Member for Rhineland have an opinion?

MR. FROESE: Well, I was going to raise the same point of order. Surely we could discuss dairying and so on under this motion which we couldn't do under the previous one.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentlemen for their assistance. It does, however, occur to me that there's a little difference in some directions and therefore I'm inclined to agree with it.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, it will be my attempt not to repeat too much what has been said in the previous motion, but I'm sure that my honourable friend the Attorney-General will recognize that unless he's prepared to adjourn the House until I have the benefit of Hansard, I won't be sure whether I'm repeating myself or not.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that is much broader in scope than the previous one. It has to do with the failure of the government of Manitoba - that is the Weir Government - in dealing with the farm income crisis or indeed in making any concrete proposals to the farm community to the government at Ottawa, with respect to ways and means of dealing with the problems that beset agriculture today. I want to say that the farmers of Manitoba, as are other farmers across Canada, are now in the process of sowing a new crop. I don't know how they are guessing at what they ought to be sowing. I suppose what they are doing is they're putting certain commodity items into a hat and drawing from it to determine just what commodity they are going to sow, and they're put in this position, Mr. Speaker, because of the absence of a national agricultural policy in this country. We are often the subject, or the victims of subject material that comes from our various research departments in the sense that they often advise curtailment of certain areas of production and the expansion of other areas of production, and that, as individuals, I don't know how we as farmers could determine just whether or not we will be the straw that breaks the camel's back and perhaps do too much of what has been suggested one way or the other.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a lack of an overall farm policy and although it may be desirable to reduce production in wheat for example, as has been suggested, to the extent of a ten million acre reduction, I don't know how this is going to happen unless it happens by accident, because I have no knowledge as to what my neighbour is doing and my neighbour doesn't have any knowledge of what his neighbour is doing, down the line, so we really don't know what we're going to end up with once we're through sowing this year's crop; and it could very well be, Mr. Speaker, that although we have an abundance of wheat, for example, this year, that because of the unprepared land that we have as a result of last year's weather conditions we may indeed be reducing substantially the acreage in wheat - not because of our choice but because of our circumstances. And if we add to that further reductions because of choice, I say it's possible that we may reduce our wheat acreage more than we would have wanted to, again because of an absence of a policy that is going to give the producers some direction.

Because agriculture is a national problem and a national jurisdiction, it is important that we develop policies that are meaningful and that can be understood by the farmers

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . themselves if we are going to arrive at a time or position where we eliminate the vast fluctuations of production of one commodity or another. This is something which this government has failed to recognize. We have always reacted to situations. We have never projected; we have never planned; we have never blueprinted a situation. We have never decided by policy of government that we are going to have "x" number of acres of wheat, "x" number of acres of barley and oats and peas and what have you, Mr. Speaker. We have never decided this point, and until we come to that point we will never be in a position of doing exactly the right thing by the right amount. We will never be in a position of producing the amount of production of a given commodity as it relates to the demand of that commodity at that particular time, so we will always have debates in this Legislature about what are we going to do with the dilemma that the wheat producers find themselves in, or the dilemma that the hog producers find themselves in, or the dilemma that the cattle people or the beef people find themselves in. This is something we will never overcome unless we arrive at the point where we have a national blueprint for agriculture, and this is why I have been insisting on our Minister of Agriculture for Manitoba promoting policies that will be of long standing in the business of agriculture in Manitoba, and that he should carry this through to his counterpart in Ottawa so that we do have some sense of direction, so that we don't over-produce where we shouldn't and don't also under-produce where there is a market for that commodity. I think that many speeches that were made in this House, if they were read today would reveal some of these things that have occurred in the last two or three years in this respect.

I don't want to repeat too much of what has been said on some of these issues but I do know that quite often it is the case wherein the recommendations of so-called experts, where they recommend increases or reductions in production, quite often the case is that the farming community sort of tries to out-guess the next guy and they do exactly the opposite as to what has been suggested. This quite often happens, and quite often it doesn't happen, but regardless of which way it is we always end up with a dilemma.

I recall in the 1950's where we had the same problem with grain as we have today, where the farmers were told that their whole problem was that they were not diversified, that they ought to have a little bit of grain and a little bit of cattle and a little bit of hogs, some poultry, and that this was the best agricultural base to establish - a mixed enterprise. Well I don't have to relate to my honourable friends on my left what that means. It meant that farmers had to go into expenditures to build new facilities for livestock or poultry, or other commodities which they decided to produce at that time, in order that they would solve a surplus grain situation, and Mr. Speaker, I believe it took two years after we borrowed a lot of money and invested into new enterprises, it took two years for the chickens to come home to roost, wherein we found that we not only had a surplus of a commodity which was storable, such as grain, but we ended up with a surplus of a commodity which you couldn't store, namely, on the hoof. And the prices tumbled, Mr. Speaker, and many of our farmer friends went broke as a result of it, taking the advice of our so-called experts. By taking the advice without a blueprint, without knowing what the total farm community is doing in Canada, we cannot afford to continue this type of policy, because the inputs in agriculture are too great today to be able to start jockeying around from one type of production to another from one year to another. This is something we cannot afford to do in this day and age. Maybe when we farmed with horses, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't too big a difference as to the input, but today there is a fantastic difference as to the inputs per acre of production of a given commodity, and for that reason alone, Mr. Speaker, it's not the most desirable thing to do - that is, to jump from one commodity to the other in trying to solve the problem, or trying to react to a situation of surpluses on the one hand but simply ending up with a similar situation on the other hand.

What are the prospects for those farmers that are trying to sow their crops this year? Just what do they have to look forward to? I know - I was talking to a great number of them and some say, "Well, I think that there's going to be such a strong reaction to the recommendations, I think that the farmers indeed are going to curtail wheat production, but I am going to just do the opposite." I hear people say this. "I am going to emphasize wheat production because I think that there will be so many acres chopped out of wheat production this year that wheat is going to move next year; we may not have a surplus; and I'm just going to carry on producing wheat." So, Mr. Speaker, this exemplifies the problem, and my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne and my honourable friends from Springfield and Birtle-Russell and Rock Lake, and indeed my honourable friend from Arthur, they fully well know that this is the

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . case. They couldn't stand up today and predict the acreage of any commodity that is going to be produced in this province this year, because they know that they react the same way as the average individual. So Mr. Speaker, I say that it's time the government decided to bring in some positive proposals. . .

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Positive proposals. What are they?

MR. USKIW: I'm asking you for them, my friend. I have made proposals. I have made proposals which my honourable friend rejected, but he rejected in the absence of proposals from his side of the House. It's very easy, Mr. Speaker, to be negative. It is very easy to criticise; but my honourable friend would do something for this House if he would propose an alternate solution if he's opposed to something that is suggested from this side of the House.

MR. McKELLAR: I'm going to grow potatoes.

MR. USKIW: My honourable friend says he's going to grow potatoes - I welcome him to the club; because we haven't made money in potatoes for the last three years, my friend, but regardless, we won't get into that one.

A MEMBER: How about rhubarb?

A MEMBER: Feed the wheat to the fish.

MR. USKIW: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers cannot individually decide policy that should be all-inclusive and national in scope. They cannot individually make that assessment. They need the help of the provincial government and they need the help of the federal government, and the help has not been forthcoming from this government, Mr. Speaker. The only piece of legislation that this government has brought in with respect to agriculture is to push the cost of production up. That's the only real measure of legislation in terms of additional tax burdens, vis-a-vis the sales tax, in terms of additional assessments placed on property, in the absence of solutions to the high assessments, in particular around the city of Winnipeg. They expect my farmer friends to survive when this is what they are allowing to happen? And they say "point your finger at Ottawa." My friend, they've got a lot of cleaning up to do right here in Manitoba.

This government, the Weir government - the Weir government has failed; has procrastinated. They have shelved problems - yes they have; they have not met them face to face. They have introduced some measures. For example, in this session; they have introduced some measures in this session and have given some indication that they are prepared to consider matters between sessions, but they have not passed one reasonable item of legislation in this entire session. -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend says stop talking. My honourable friend hasn't given me an opportunity to talk, Mr. Speaker, because there are some thirty bills that haven't been brought before the House yet and he says I should stop talking. My friend, I am just getting started.

A MEMBER: We can sit overtime, you know.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if this would not be an appropriate time to prevail upon the Honourable Member for Brokenhead to refrain from creating an argumentative atmosphere.

MR. USKIW: Well Mr. Speaker, I know - I know that it's true that the truth hurts and that's the only reason I'm getting some static from my left, Mr. Speaker, because I am giving them a summary of their activities for the past two or three years. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that it's non-activity - and that may be the proper term; that may be the proper term. But one specific item which they introduced not so long ago had to do with the increasing of the interest rate; in money-lending programs that this government has set up, to jack up the interest rate from 5 percent and 6 3/4 percent up to whatever the market price is on the money market today. That is an illustration of how much they have done for agriculture: admitting that there is a farm income crisis; admitting that there is a real problem, that there are many farmers on the verge of bankruptcy; pointing their finger at Ottawa and introducing legislation here that will up the cost of production in the process. This is the kind of administration we have had over here, Mr. Speaker, for the last two or three years. -- (Interjection) -- My friend, I don't need an election. I don't need an election, as my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne knows.

Mr. Speaker, I have been out throughout the country and I know; I know what the people in the rural areas are saying, and they are telling this government to get off their fannies and get down to Ottawa and do something with the agricultural situation today. Not next week, not next month, but now, and my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture knows fully well that he has not done anything to date. He told me -- (Interjection) -- yes he made a trip to

(MR. USKIW cont'd) Vancouver at the most appropriate time -- that's right. He went on a trip to the East and he advises me that he was chairman of one meeting but he made no proposals. That is the extent of the activities of this government insofar as dealing with problems of agriculture, and if my honourable friends are going to try and suggest to anyone here that they are indeed interested in coming to solutions and to solving these problems, I have said it before and I'm going to say it again, that their solution is a process of elimination. Their solution is a process of elimination and you eliminate the problem, without introducing programs by which means the people that they want to eliminate out of agriculture are going to find other ways and means of sustaining a livelihood. In the absence of that kind of a social program, Mr. Speaker, it's very easy to say, "Squeeze them out because they are inefficient; it's time they were out of business."

I recognize that there are many farmers in this province that can't make a go of it because of the unit of production being too small. There are many of them; we recognize this; but if you want to move them out, Mr. Speaker, give us a social program that is going to deal with it adequately. Don't let them drift into the slums of Winnipeg -- and there shouldn't be any slums mind you, Mr. Speaker, but there are. Don't let them drift into the slums of Winnipeg. Don't let them come into the urban centres and work for a minimum wage that is as out-dated as this government. This is the type of government we have had for the last number of years.

SOME MEMBERS: Too long.

MR. USKIW: Too long is the answer. Too long is the answer. They have failed to come up with any suggestions. They have been negative; they have been negative and backward-thinking, as far as I am concerned, since I became a member of this Legislature.

A MEMBER: Before that.

MR. USKIW: I am told by my honourable member for Churchill that I am too kind. I want to say to my honourable friend that I thought at one time that they were a bit forward-looking because they did have some programs, at one time, of trying to deal with -- but they abandoned those programs. They abandoned them. They said that the government shouldn't be in the money-lending business -- they shouldn't be in the money-lending business. The farmers can go to the money market and pay their 8, 10 or 12 percent for their money. They abandoned the farmers at a time when the credit requirement was at its peak. That's when they walked out of it, so that the private lending institutions were able to merge upon these people and extract exorbitant interest rates. That is the position of my honourable friends to my left. So I challenge the Minister and the government to tell me just one item that they did that was so valuable to agriculture in Manitoba. The Minister, in his opening remarks when he introduced his estimates, stated that we have pushed research in production at a greater rate than we pushed research in marketing. He made this statement when he introduced his estimates, but when a resolution was put on the Order Paper and debated in this Chamber, suggesting that we ask the federal government to have a food-marketing research branch set up, my honourable friend voted against it without even debating the motion. I am told that he didn't even read it, Mr. Speaker. After expressing the need, after window dressing, Mr. Speaker, and that's all it was -- window dressing -- after expressing a need for more research into market development, they have the audacity to vote against a resolution that wasn't going to cost them any money, or the people of Manitoba, to any degree -- (Interjection) -- I said to any degree; I said to any degree. As a matter of fact, if you had that program on some years ago it would have made our people in Manitoba some money. We wouldn't have lost those sales of grain to Europe and China and the likes of that.

A MEMBER: Prove that.

MR. USKIW: Prove it? I want you, my honourable friend from Birtle-Russell, to check with Hedlin and Menzies and see what they tell you about the sales that we lost because of lack of initiative on the part of this country. -- (Interjection) -- He says "You've got the Canadian Wheat Board." I didn't say that. Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends on my left are not going to get by just chirping away, as my honourable leader often says they do. What we need is some positive proposals and we are still waiting. We are waiting the same as we are waiting for the thirty some-odd bills to come in for second reading. In this House, in this Session, there have been many proposals made dealing with agriculture and I'm just going to list them briefly. One we just dealt with a few moments ago, and that was the two-price policy for wheat -- which was a good proposal. My honourable friends aren't sure that it is. That's fine. I won't go into that one again.

(MR. USKIW cont'd)

There was a proposal to recognize the high cost of grain drying and to suggest that some form of assistance be given. My honourable friend says no. My honourable friend from Birtle-Russell took the liberty to misquote speeches that were made on this side of the House. Maybe that might make him look good in Birtle-Russell, I don't know - if they believe what he says. But I'm going to assure him that there will be others in his area that will set the record straight when the time comes. My honourable friends failed to introduce measures that would provide for a most efficient crop insurance program in Manitoba. This is something that has been debated for a good number of years and I was hopeful that my new Minister of Agriculture would undertake to broaden the scope of that program and put a little bit of efficiency into it so that the farmers could get the benefit of a cheaper insurance program. My honourable friend from Inkster says I didn't really think he would do it. Well maybe I didn't really think but I was hopeful. I was hopeful that from listening to the speeches and the presentations made from this side of the House that somehow we could convince my honourable friends on the left, but of course it isn't so.

My Honourable Minister failed to represent Manitoba at the Farm Congress. He failed to support marketing research programs; he failed in trying to bring better bargaining power to the producers of farm products in Manitoba - and this is indeed a big area. This is the area where I want to tell my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture that he ought not to take a back seat to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, because it is the farmers that he is sacrificing in the process, if he does. I know the Minister of Industry and Commerce would like to have more industry in Manitoba, processing of agricultural products; but don't do it at the expense of the producer. We want industry; that's right; I agree with that; but we must be careful that the producers of Manitoba are given the fullest consideration, that wherein they demand that they want some bargaining power that we ought to make sure that we bend backwards to give it to them so that their position is not compromised in the process.

I know the Minister of Industry and Commerce does not know the rural situation. I know that he's mainly concerned with development of industry throughout Manitoba, and that's his job and that's what he should be, but I charge my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture with the responsibility of being on the lookout so that other departments don't encroach on his area and that he take full recognition of his role in making decisions that are going to affect the primary producers of this province.

We can only go back a short while ago, Mr. Speaker, when I recall that the turkey and broiler people were at loggerheads with the government in trying to set up a turkey and broiler marketing board. It took them, I believe, about two years to get that thing off the ground, only because of procrastination, and I don't know whether one could say "back room" dealing or not. I know that there were pressures on the government not to place the control on the processing industry, and I suspect that that is why the government was reluctant to give to these producers their right in the bargaining table. We've had too many examples of this, Mr. Speaker, wherein the producers want to assemble themselves as a group to enhance their bargaining power, and the government follows with restricting that bargaining power. They follow up with measures that delay. Lack of decision is commonplace. In the process, the primary producer is being sacrificed, and this is not what I would expect from the Minister of Agriculture. He ought to know; he ought to know the feeling of the farm people of Manitoba because he, Mr. Speaker, is admittedly a farmer himself. While he may not be involved in those commodities which have made these requests, he should recognize, though, that they indeed were serious requests and that they should have been given the kind of consideration that we give to all matters of public importance.

So I say to the Minister of Agriculture that these are tough times for agriculture. The Minister has a role to play. I would hope that when he goes to Ottawa very shortly - and I'm hopeful that that meeting will be convened within the next week or so - that the Minister will make the position of Manitoba abundantly clear and that we have some decent agricultural policies forthcoming; not next year; not next year, Mr. Speaker. Now. Let's not even wait a month from now, because there are many people in the rural communities that are, if not they're almost, dependent on some form of direct assistance coming from either the provincial or provincial and federal governments jointly. The Minister has a big responsibility, and I want him to rise to the occasion so that the farmers of Manitoba will indeed have the benefit of the kind of consideration that they deserve, in light of the fact that they are a big

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) economic unit in Manitoba. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that are still the base in our economy; if we recognize the fact that we either have industries supplying the farm community or we have industries processing the farm commodities, that by and large Manitoba is still agriculturally oriented and that if we size the total picture, we are a farm province. Even in recognition of the fact that Winnipeg has about a half a million people, I'm sure that most economists, if not all, will tell you that it is still based on the rural enterprise, and that the jobs that we have in Winnipeg largely relate to the needs of the farmers around Winnipeg. The same may be said about Steinbach; the same may be said about Brandon and Selkirk, and Dauphin - you can go all the way down the line. It may not be said about Thompson perhaps, although the production of nickel is important perhaps to some degree as far as agriculture is concerned, but it does not directly relate to the agricultural community. But by and large, the total Manitoba economy surrounds itself around the well-being of the primary producers.

The Canadian economy as a whole, Mr. Speaker, if we recall just a few years ago, when we made those huge grain sales, how those grain sales helped the Canadian balance of payment situation. We must be appreciative of that fact, that that is indeed a giant contribution made on the part of the wheat producers of this country and that we ought to recognize their worth in that light. We must recognize that they are in a position whereby they are forced to sell their product on an open market, on a world market, unprotected. We must also recognize that they are forced to buy most of their commodities in a protected market, protected by way of tariffs and duties and all sorts of gimmicks that prevent them from buying as cheaply as they otherwise would do if we had no tariff walls and the likes of that.

Now I'm not going to get into any detail on tariffs but I just simply want to illustrate to the House that if we're prepared to subsidize industry, Mr. Speaker - and I don't know what the figure is; I know the figure is substantial; I recall something like a billion and a half dollars in tariff protection (it may be more than that; this was some years ago) - I know that we have the meat packing industry in Manitoba operating at about two-thirds of capacity, but they are able to show a profit. I suppose that we can say that the consumers of meat in this province are indeed subsidizing those meat packing plants; otherwise how could they make a profit if they're working on 65% of efficiency?

So Mr. Speaker, this isn't anything new. We ought to give reasonable consideration to measures that will put more dollars into the pockets of our farm community so that the total economy of Manitoba, and indeed Canada, can be improved, and this government has a vital role to play. I again want to say to the Minister of Agriculture: when you get down to Ottawa, I want to know and I want to hear about the proposals which this government has made -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend says I wouldn't understand. I challenge my honourable friend, and I'll prove to him that if he has any positive solutions I'm willing to go along. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could waste the rest of the afternoon for a few minutes in replying to my honourable little friend the "Brokenheaded" member -- have I leave of the House to speak for two minutes?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm quite capable of calling it 5:30 when that time arrives. The Minister of Agriculture has the floor.

MR. WATT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to reply very quickly to a few of the things that my honourable member has said this afternoon. I won't waste much time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WATT: All I've listened to from this side of the House all winter, Mr. Speaker, is criticism of this department and of this government. Talk about constructive criticism! I haven't heard any from that side. Damp wheat! I wonder if my honourable friends would like to say something about damp wheat for a change? We haven't heard about that for months now, but we go on and on with all this balderdash from that side of the House, and I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend, the Brokenhead Member, expects that I am going to jump at every little whim from his insidious, diabolical, aborted, distorted, confused, monstrous mind, he'll wait till the cow comes home with a pump in her udder.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. It is now 5:30. I am leaving the Chair. The House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. May I just inform the Members of the House that the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources will meet at 9:30

May 21, 1969

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) tomorrow morning in Room 254. We'll look forward to seeing all the members present.

MR. MOLGAT: Have the people been informed?

MR. McLEAN: I've been standing on my head for the last 30 minutes, trying to inform them.

MR. MOLGAT: Might I ask the Minister then, he advised us that transcripts might be available this afternoon and there are also a series of questions that I had asked of Hydro. When we rose at 12:30 the Minister indicated that he thought this information would be available. I have not received any of it yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is now past 5:30. The House is now adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.