



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

STANDING COMMITTEE

on

AGRICULTURE

31-32 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mr. A. Anstett
Constituency of Springfield



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 14 - 3:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 7 JUNE, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Tuesday, 7 June, 1983

TIME — 3:00 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRMAN — Mr. Andy Anstett (Springfield)

ATTENDANCE — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Bucklaschuk, Plohman, Uruski and Uskiw.

Messrs. Anstett, Downey, Gourlay, Harapiak, Manness and McKenzie.

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Government Resolution passed on March 15, 1983 with respect to the Western Transportation Initiative proposed by the Government of Canada.

* * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee, come to order. Gentlemen, we have a quorum.

The business before us is a draft report tabled before the committee at our meeting on May 26th. On June 2nd, there were some proposed amendments to that report put forward by, I believe, Mr. Manness at that time. Mr. Uskiw undertook to review those proposed amendments and to report back to the committee.

Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we have looked at the package and we're not terribly upset with a good deal of the amendments, but I think that the way in which we'll proceed will be by way of introducing our set of amendments and, of course, considering the amendments from any member of the committee as we move along, based on the first submission that we had tabled. I'm not sure that there's much more I should add to that. I think that pretty well sums it up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw, I think that's what we had agreed to at the last meeting, that the only way to proceed so that we weren't dealing with more than one report was to proceed page-by-page or paragraph-by-paragraph and either adopt or amend each paragraph to incorporate amendments suggested by either side.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I fully understand that procedure. I suppose, I don't know which report though that we will be basing our discussion and our amendments on. Is it the former one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is technically only one draft report before the committee. Because the committee

cannot entertain two motions at one time, the draft report which is before the committee is the one Mr. Uskiw tabled on May 26th. The subsequent document which was tabled by yourself, Mr. Manness, I said last week I would treat as a series of proposed amendments to the report so that procedurally we could handle the two proposals.

Mr. Uskiw, you're distributing something to the committee. Would you care to provide the Chairman with a copy?

HON. S. USKIW: Just as a courtesy, Mr. Chairman, rather than an obligation, I'm giving the members of the committee the benefit of the amendment package that we are intending to move so that they will be able to read them in context, if you like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that the Chairman will have some idea of what's happening in committee, would it possible to supply the Chairman with a copy?

HON. S. USKIW: That's a good idea. Do we have an extra one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, just so I'm clear on what we are dealing with here, could I as well have a copy of the initial report - I don't have my copy with me - the initial report that was tabled by the government?

The second question, Mr. Chairman, the amendments that have been distributed by the Minister at this point, are they now to fit in with that initial report that was presented by the government members of the committee, or where does the recommendations, or the amendments that were submitted last week by the Opposition, where does that stand? I'm totally at a loss for where we're at here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey, as I just advised Mr. Manness, what we have before us - as a committee - is a draft report tabled by Mr. Uskiw, and moved by him on May 26th. Additionally, we now have in front of us, as of May 26th, a series of amendments - in report format - tabled in the committee by Mr. Manness, to be held over to today's meeting; and as of today a series of amendments just placed before the committee by Mr. Uskiw, which I don't have a copy at this point but I gather one is coming, which I believe incorporates Mr. Uskiw's proposed amendments; and I take it it's assumed that any amendments to be proposed by Mr. Manness to incorporate his concerns will be moved by him.

Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Just one point of clarification. Our amendments - some of them at least - are predicated

on the amendments that were put forward by Mr. Manness, as being acceptable to the committee, and some not, that's right. But some of them are predicated on the Opposition moving their amendments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, maybe we're probably best to just begin to see how far we can proceed along with that.

HON. S. USKIW: And start going section by section.

MR. C. MANNES: That's right. Paragraph by paragraph would probably be the best.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 1, are there any amendments on Page 1?

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I move - I believe it would be Paragraph 3, the last sentence - that an amendment be made reading, and I quote,

"Among them were representations by the major farm organizations, Canadian National Railways, and local organizations."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Manness that the words, "Local Elevator Associations, National Farmers Union locals, and other local organizations," be struck out and be replaced by the words, "and local organizations." Is there any discussion? Is that agreed? (Agreed) Agreed and so ordered, as amended.

Is there any further discussion on Page 1? Page 1 of the Report—pass; Page 1, as amended—pass.

Page 2 of the Report, any discussion or amendments? Page 2 of the Report—pass, as drafted.

Page 3 of the Report.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to draw attention to the last paragraph.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 3.

MR. C. MANNES: I'm trying to determine the sentence, I can't. I'll say the sixth line from the bottom, the reference in the parenthesis be removed. That would be a motion that I would make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Manness that the phrase in parenthesis in Paragraph 3, of Page 3, be struck out. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Uruski.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, can the honourable member indicate whether or not that description there which has been generally made by some groups, namely the NFU, have made that kind of a point and alluding to the Federal Government's plan as having the evolution to, in fact, eliminate the orderly marketing system of the Canadian Wheat Board. Surely the honourable member is in favour of the orderly marketing system for grains and recognizes that that general proposition has been made by those kind of groups.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may be allowed the floor.

If Mr. Manness would explain to us just why it is that he wishes to amend this section, then we'd debate it on those terms.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe Mr. Manness was about to do that.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was. I would like to lay before the committee my concern of those words in parenthesis.

I believe that up to this point a fair job has been done in presenting fairly objectively comments by the various organizations, and I believe that the words preceding the parenthesis say virtually the same thing in an objective form and I do not see the need to spell that out in further detail and therefore to bring in an element of subjectivity into the report at this point in time. So, I really question the need for further expansion of the preceding words which make it quite clear really what the position is of the National Farm Union in this regard.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the only problem I have with that is that the member is objecting to including in a paragraph something that was, in fact stated, and it's quoted here verbatim and is part of our transcript so that in essence I don't know the logic of wanting it out, other than political preference if you like, and the member is entitled to that from his perspective, but it certainly isn't out of context of the submission that was received by the committee on a word-for-word basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion? Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to belabour the point. I just feel that the comment has been made previous to it as to what the position is and why they feel the payment through a central committee might - when I say, they, the National Farm Union - undermine the Canadian Wheat Board. I just feel there is really no value to further qualifying that particular statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uruski.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, if one goes through the description while it is implied, and this whole paragraph deals with the NFU submission clearly. It's been pointed out within the brief and submission that was made by the representative of the National Farmers Union for Manitoba, that statement as being the natural evolution in stages as they saw it, was in fact stated there. The paragraph while it deals with the question, it certainly puts a clear note on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there further discussion? Are you ready for the question? All those in favour of the amendment - one, two, three. I don't believe Mr. McKenzie's a member of the committee.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, he is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. One, two, three, four. All those opposed to the amendment.

MADAM CLERK: One, two, three, four.

HON. S. USKIW: You have a job to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair votes opposed to the amendment.

Any further discussion or amendments on Page 3? Page 3—pass.

Page 4. Any discussion or proposed amendments for Page 4?

MR. H. HARAPIAK: I have an amendment on the second paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does this precede an amendment by Mr. Manness, just so we do things in proper order? I realize members have several documents in front of them, and I don't have all of those documents.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, my first amendment would also be on Paragraph 2. Therefore, in deference, I'll wait to hear what the government member has to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harapiak.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: I move after "the Crow rate," the following amendment:

"When questioned, however, many of the individual farmers indicated that they would find it easier to accept increases in transportation costs if the increases in freight rates were tied to increases in the price of grain, provided also that the increases in freight rates would bring about improvements in the railway transportation system."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Harapiak, the amendment as read. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I beg for 30 seconds to digest this.

Mr. Chairman, I believe members of our side have some difficulty with the very first sentence where it is indicated or where it is written that most of the individuals appearing before your committee were also opposed to tampering with the Crow rate.

I feel, firstly, that isn't at all a categorical statement which is not totally correct. I also feel that many of the individuals appearing before the committee maybe did not have direct farming interest at stake and therefore I feel that in spite of the qualification that has been added by the amendment brought forward by the Member for The Pas, I still believe that to try and marry the first sentence plus the amended part, that still the intent of the first sentence is not correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just to raise a point of order before we get into a problem here in the committee, I would

point out, Mr. Manness, that the sentence that currently exists in Mr. Uskiw's proposed report is not under debate at the present time. It's the amendment which would add an additional two sentences, I believe, or is it an additional sentence? If we choose to pass that, we could then go back to this initial sentence. Otherwise, we're going to be debating two separate things within the same paragraph, unless it's the committee's will and pleasure to debate the whole paragraph at a time.

I'm at the committee's will and pleasure, but this is going to be difficult, because we've really got several documents here and I think it's going to be best if I try and keep discussion directly to the amendment we are discussing each time, or we're going to have a real mess. I know.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, certainly we'll abide by that. I think as a group we're certainly prepared to accept the amendment. However, I don't know if this is the time or not to deal with the sentence preceding that. I would think it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manness, the question before us now is an amendment. Then after the amendment passes, if it does, I will put the question on the whole paragraph. When I put the whole question on the whole paragraph, an amendment to the first sentence would then be in order.

MR. C. MANNES: Proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question on the amendment proposed by Mr. Harapiak. Is it agreed? Mr. Harapiak.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I believe the questions raised by the Member for Morris really pertains to this amendment, and I think the amendment fits in. When we did go out to speak to the people during the hearings, their thoughts are reflected in that amendment that we added at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe, Mr. Harapiak, if I can clarify, Mr. Manness is not objecting to the amendment but wishes to raise the original introductory sentence to that paragraph, what will become the first sentence to that paragraph after the amendment passes. I think he's agreeing to the proposed amendment. Mr. Manness, is that correct?

MR. C. MANNES: Well, that's correct, Mr. Chairman, and had I had the chance to review the amendment before you had asked the question, I certainly would have insisted that the committee consider the first sentence first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would have been most appropriate but the amendment was already moved. Are you ready for the question on the amendment by Mr. Harapiak? Is it agreed? (Agreed).

Agreed and so ordered.

HON. S. USKIW: Did you want to speak to the amendment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee prepared to pass Paragraph 2 on Page 4, Mr. Downey?

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman. The Opposition members of the committee would like to remove the first sentence of that paragraph.

"Most of the individuals appearing before your committee were also opposed to tampering with the Crow rate." We would like to see it removed from that paragraph. I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey has moved that the first sentence of Paragraph 2, on Page 4, as amended, be removed. Discussion?

Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: I wonder whether Mr. Downey would care to give us the benefit of his views as to why the motion. As I understand it the motion reflects exactly what took place. That is, if one wants to look at the transcript I believe the inclusion of those two lines are, in fact, a calculation of briefs presented in which case the majority expressed this opinion. So, I think it's factual or accurate and the transcript will substantiate that, and I'm wondering whether there is some other motivation that the member wants to draw to our attention that gives some credibility to why the argument, that it should be removed.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to respond to that. As you may be aware, if he goes to the proposed changes that were recommended by the Opposition that we felt most of the individuals appearing before the committee were concerned with the provisions of the Pepin proposal. They, in my estimation, did not outright object to, and if the Minister can provide evidence of that from Hansard so I would be prepared to yield to that. But the statement that's being made in this sentence is that, "Most individuals appearing before the committee were also opposed to tampering with the Crow rate." The very fact, Mr. Chairman, that they were appearing before the committee to discuss the Pepin proposal was proof enough to me that they were prepared to discuss it, and the same group of people that he is saying were opposed to tampering with the Crow rate, refused to go to meet with Gilson on invitation, yet came to discuss that very issue with our committee, which is evidence enough to me, that they were prepared to discuss the Pepin proposal. So, I leave that as it is, Mr. Chairman, and don't think we should dwell too long on it.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, I just wanted to apprise members of the committee of the fact that of the individual briefs that were received by the committee, 24 of them made that point. That's 24 out of 30 made that point. Now, they also, after cross-examination, qualified their original submission by way of the amendment that we are proposing. So, in essence, what we are doing here, is on the first two lines, we're demonstrating what was in their original submission and then in the amendment, we're trying to show that upon questioning further, they modified their position, so it's in full context - the briefs that were received in written form and then the subsequent cross-examination that took place.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I think the Minister of Highways has explained it fairly well. I thought, when I first read that amended paragraph over, it was ambiguous, it's just on the sort of - I think the Minister has explained that it's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proposed amendment by Mr. Downey to strike out the first sentence of the second paragraph on Page 4, as amended. All those in favour of the question, please say Aye. Do you want a count on every question, or just a voice vote? All those in favour of the amendment please say Aye. All those opposed please say Nay. In my opinion the Nays have it.

I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'd now like to ask a question without reference to any paragraph. I hope I'm in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly. We're on Page 4.

MR. C. MANNES: Yes, and I ask a question of the Minister, as to why no review of the CN position is included in this report? Because it would seem to me, the logical sequence of reporting as to what various organizations and individuals expressed - as far as opinions - should be also followed by a reference to what Canadian National brought forward to our committee. I do not see that, and I question as to whether it was left out for any expressed reason?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, if I have the right copy here, I believe Paragraph 4 on Page 4 deals with that, indicating support for the Pepin proposal on the part of the Manitoba Cattle Producers, Palliser Wheat Growers, Canadian National Railways, Manitoba Trucking, Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and the Liberal Party of Manitoba.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have some difficulty in that. I find it hard to believe that the Canadian National Railway, being such an important player in this whole exercise, could be lumped in with the various organizations. Certainly they may agree to the proposals, but I would think that they would deserve the same time and space devoted to their position, and the reasons for their support; as indeed, some of our large Manitoba Pool, for instance, and NFU have in expressing concerns and qualifications as to their support or opposition to the Pepin proposals.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with what the member is suggesting. The only thing is the value of it, I'm not certain of. The CPR and the CNR are the prime beneficiaries of the Pepin proposal. They have nothing to lose and everything to gain, and therefore, they appeared before this committee supporting the Pepin plan, because that plan moves them into compensatory freight rates for the movement of grain. There's nothing else that has to be said. I mean, that position speaks for itself. I don't know that it needs any elaboration, although I have no particular objection, if you want to take up more space and more paper, but we all accept the fact that the railways want

those changes. They've lobbied for them. To make their argument for them, I don't know that it's the role of this committee, to make their argument for them. They've made it quite well. We understand it. Our job is to . . .

A MEMBER: Support it.

HON. S. USKIW: That's right, and we are saying that in Paragraph 4. If anyone wants to pursue it in some depth, I think they can do it by way of the transcript, but I don't see much value to broadening the document that we are going to be presenting to the Assembly, by way of including substantive explanation as to the CN and CP position.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there is one other point that I think should be made; that the CPR did not appear before a committee, and it seems that for another beneficiary, who probably could demonstrate - I think, as you have said - could demonstrate need for the change, that the CNR has really been the front runner, on behalf of both railways. I think it was expressed, whether it was by submission, or also by members of this committee, that it was unfortunate that the position of the CPR was, as well, not put forward to our committee and to put both - while we generally know their position - they have not come out publicly to this committee and stated it, but certainly the CNR has come out publicly and stated their position and is highlighted here.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly am not here to support CPR's decision not to appear at this committee, or to defend them, and I'm not here to defend CN's development of their argument either. I could really, I suppose, care less how they develop their argument as to reaching the conclusion by that company, that they support the Pepin proposal.

My only concern is that they are a major organization involved in this whole debate and out of courtesy, they should be shown the same respect, as far as having their views, given some further broadening, and some further review within this report, and nothing more. I'm not here to support the development of their argument.

HON. B. URUSKI: There is a problem with what you're saying - if I might, Mr. Chairman. Because if we take out, as you are suggesting in your Page 4, we are even doing less than what was put forward in the original brief. We are at least, we are and maybe we're not giving them - or haven't given them the stature, but you're actually taking them out completely. You're deleting their position and if, taking your argument, we actually should not be removing it, as suggested in your paper that was given to the committee, because you have removed their position completely. Their name is struck out in your Page 4 of your amendments to the committee.

Following that logic, we should actually expand on their position, not remove them, as you have done in your Page 4. You know, really, you've removed it in your Page 4 - that's why I was having a bit of a problem with what you're saying. I don't disagree; that if you wanted to highlight them more, why would you remove

them out of your paper in the amendments that you submitted to us? So, maybe we haven't given them the limelight that you might want to see, but certainly we haven't removed them as it's noted in your paper.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, that's a very good question. I thank the Minister for bringing that to my attention. It's the first time I noticed it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manness, I point out that your proposal eliminates both the Canadian National Railway and Manitoba Trucking Association, so we thought that you would be proposing that amendment.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well certainly, no there was - as I try to recollect I cannot for the best of my knowledge understand why they've been pulled out. Certainly it was my intention to bring forward to the committee the view that the CN position, again out of courtesy, should be given its own Paragraph.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a proposed amendment to the report to expand on the CN position?

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I do not. I feel though that some discussion should be given by this committee to including that. I certainly would be prepared to draft one, I haven't to this point, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your will and pleasure, gentleman? Should we proceed and at that point at which Mr. Manness would like to suggest an amendment, we can then discuss such an amendment?
Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering what the value of that is. There's a nuance there that I'm not picking up, I suppose. The statement in the report to the effect that the CN supports the changes, tells everything that one needs to know about the CN position. If one wants to research it in depth, all they have to do is look at the transcript to see the basis on which they make that argument. We know what the Pepin proposal is. We know who the beneficiaries are, they're the railways essentially. They're No 1 on the list as beneficiaries. To explain why that must be there, I don't think needs to be in the report.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is partly correct. The CNR does, I guess, through the broad sense support the Pepin proposal. If we go through their brief in detail, we'll find certain areas where they differ somewhat also and to them which are very major, and so I don't think it's completely accurate or true to say that indeed they're in total support of the Pepin proposal, because that's just not the case.

Again, that being the fact I think that I rest upon my previous argument that, out of courtesy and the fact that they presented two briefs to us and that they are a major player in this whole game, some objective view be given of their brief.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we proceed to approve Page 5, paragraph-by-paragraph? We finished with

Paragraph 2 and then if - I'm looking at the bottom of the page for the next page references. Page 4, Paragraph 3, and then if there are amendments with regard to CN or any other topics, they can then be moved at that time. Paragraph 3—pass.

Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Paragraph 3, the original report that was presented by the government members. Paragraph 3, on Page 4, "Organizations expressing support for positions taken by MPE included Rhineland Agricultural Society, the Red River Young Farmers Club, and the Farmers Advisory Board of the CSP.

They were supporting MPE or was that support of the Farm Bureau? My memory isn't good enough to remember. Was that stated on the record during those hearings?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uruski.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Just a point of clarification really, because I want to be accurate and that something I want.

HON. B. URUSKI: In fact, their position maybe even went beyond the Pool position, but basically they were — (Interjection) — Well, but they certainly supported the Pool. The only point that I recall is that they saw, unlike other groups, the advancement of special crops; they saw the demise of special crops in their position vis-a-vis with the changes in the Crow rate in their submissions and questions. They followed the Pool position very closely, but in terms of special crops they highlighted the area of special crops in their presentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I thought there might be agreement on this paragraph since it's the same in both proposals. Is there further discussion?

Paragraph 3, Page 4—pass; Paragraph 4, Page 4.

I believe the only difference between the two proposals was the elimination of Canadian National Railways and the Manitoba Trucking Association. I believe Mr. Manness has clarified that as an oversight.

Paragraph 4, Page 4—pass.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, again I'm not going to belabor this point, but I would like some decision to be made, some formal decision by this committee as to whether indeed Canadian National Railways received their own paragraph. Then once we determine that then, of course, the decision regarding this paragraph will be easy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is proposed by Mr. Manness that a new paragraph, between Paragraphs 4 and 5, describing the CN position be inserted.

All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye. Those opposed to the amendment, please say nay. I declare the amendment lost.

Page 4, Paragraph 4—pass; Page 4, Paragraph 5, one sentence—pass; Page 4, Paragraph 6.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, can we have time. Oh, I believe there is an amendment to come forward, we'll have that read into the record first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harapiak.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: I'll move the amendment: "The NFU and other defenders of the Crow feel that it was a mistake for farm organizations to negotiate over the Crow rate, because once the process has been set in motion it cannot be stopped. In their view, the organization should not be surprised that the outcome was not what they expected and not what they wanted."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any discussion on the amendment proposed by Mr. Harapiak?

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have potentially quite a serious difference of opinion here. I would like the government member to tell us specifically why, in their view, the National Farm Union is synonymous with the defenders of the Crow. Certainly, I heard many other people defend the Crow; however you define the Crow, I might say. There are 10 or 12 different ways of defining the Crow. I think it would be a terrible disservice and a dishonest statement of fact if indeed it was left on the record that the NFU position is synonymous with the comment that they are the defenders of the Crow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the motion proposes the words "the NFU and other defenders of the Crow," which is an improvement over what it was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uruski.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, again I just find a bit of difficulty. I think the member would realize when he looks at his own copy that we tried to accommodate the suggestion made by the honourable member, where in the original draft we did not talk about any specific group as being a defender. It was the honourable member, in his submission, talked about the NFU point of view and the defender. We tried to accommodate because it wasn't only the NFU who, in their submissions, were indicating that they defended the Crow, there were other submissions who were not NFU members who defended the Crow.

We looked at the submission the honourable member put forward and we tried to reach a compromise that might be acceptable to the honourable member by trying to accommodate the statement that he made in his report on Page 4 and what was in the original report, and that's where we came up with this statement. That's why I find difficulty now with some opposition to the change.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, my original problem was really, in my own mind, understanding fully what the phrase "defender of the Crow" meant. I then would

ask government members to tell me explicitly what is meant by the "defenders of the Crow".

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I can offer an opinion. Defenders of the Crow, in my opinion, would be those that wanted the Crow rate to be maintained. Now, just to help the Member for Morris out, we thought we were more accommodating with our amendment than what his own suggested amendment was going to do here. In the member's amendment he singles out the NFU. All we did was added the words "and other defenders of the Crow".

From my point of view, our amendment helps support your original concern. We could have spent less time agonizing over it.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: You mean improving the Crow, or tearing it all apart, or what? I'm lost.

HON. S. USKIW: Have you got a copy of your old one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harapiak.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I again suggest support of the Minister of Transportation's view that we are just taking into consideration the Member for Morris' presentation - or amendment - and just to get some support, there were 14 organizations during our hearings, 14 individuals, who supported the view that we should not be negotiating the Crow.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I realize that there was some common ground between the NFU and other people who had an opinion against the Pepin proposals. I don't think it's fair to include those people that had concerns about the Pepin proposal to delineate them as defenders of the Crow, therefore I do not believe that they should be put in the same phrase. That's why, originally, when we brought forward our attempted amendment that we said, and we agreed, that the NFU felt it was a mistake for farm organizations to negotiate over the Crow rate. That was an accurate factual statement and one that we feel should be left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manness, if I can take some liberty as Chairman of the Committee to seek to resolve the difference on this point, the amendment reads - and I've examined both the original motion by Mr. Uskiw and your proposed amendment and now the amendment moved by Mr. Harapiak - would you consider moving a sub-amendment to the amendment by Mr. Harapiak which would change the wording to read as follows: "The NFU and other opponents of the Pepin proposal." In other words, would that satisfy your concern? I'm just looking for some common ground here.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I see what you're trying to do and it's an honest attempt, but then you read that further, and of course these other people that had a position that was opposite to Pepin's proposals may have not felt it was a mistake for farm organizations to negotiate over the Crow rate. So what you're

attempting to do is fine in the first instance; but as you read further on through the amended paragraph, it doesn't necessarily fit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would your sub-amendment read more correctly then if it read "and some other opponents of the Pepin proposal"? I'm running into trouble with my proposed sub-amendment for you from some of my colleagues.

Mr. Bucklaschuk.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering if we could accomplish what we want here by amending that amendment by deleting the words, "defenders of the" and having it read, "The NFU and others supporting the retention of the Crow." Is that basically what we're getting at?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Member for Morris and his colleagues, there are 14 submissions that align themselves up with the NFU submission on that very point. Of the total submissions, 14 of them made that point. So other defenders of the Crow are those that were there as individuals but who made the same point. We're not attributing that to those that didn't line up on that side of the ledger. There are many that said, yes, we may consider change if this, that and the other, but we're not talking about those. We're only talking about those that expressed the viewpoint that we should have never started the process of negotiation.

MR. C. MANNES: Agreed, Mr. Chairman, I understand the Minister's point but if he reads the last sentence in that amended paragraph, he says, "In their view the organization should not be surprised that the outcome was not what they expected and not what they wanted." I heard that from only one organization, that was the NFU. I didn't hear that expressed by any of the other 14 groups. So therefore I do not believe that we can say what the Minister indicated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Plohman.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I would just defer, I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a quote from any brief. It is a statement that is made that sums up the feelings, Mr. Chairman, but not a quote from any. It's a paraphrase, it's not a quote from any particular brief, it's not quoting any brief. Although it was in quotations, I believe in the first draft, it is not in quotations now. It is not a quote taken from any particular brief.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, we can point to specific instances when Mr. Gourlay questioned Mrs. Minish. She quite clearly said, "I can only speak on behalf of the Big Woody Women's Institute, I'm not speaking on behalf of the Manitoba Women's Institute on this and I believe I can make it abundantly clear that our women's institute is opposed to any changes in The Crowsnest Pass Agreement at this time."

Then Mr. Harder, in his comments also, as a pool delegate, "I have to accept some of the responsibility for entering into negotiations in the first place. But the way that things stand now, one would be a lunatic to

think that there ever was, or ever was meant to be any negotiations."

Also Mr. Cowling and Mr. Hamilton, in their comments, have stated that position, that we should have never entered into negotiations on the Crow.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, that's right, I remember those well. They fit in and they support the argument of the government on using their definition, that there are "other defenders of the Crow" in the first sentence. However, in the next sentence, I only heard it expressed by one organization that said, that people should not be surprised at the outcome. — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I cannot ensure that we'll have a readable transcript unless I recognize members. Mr. Manness, were you finished?

Mr. Uruski.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, just to follow up, I just heard the Member from The Pas quote Mr. Harder, who, and I paraphrase, talked about, you'd have to be a lunatic to think that there was any negotiations and the element of not being surprised certainly was very clear in his remarks as to what he meant as one. But the Member for The Pas has some of the other references, and if necessary, they can be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: I know the concern of the Member for Morris, but I would want to draw to his attention, or at least to his memory bank, the fact that Mr. Cowling in Grandview made the point that once they got into negotiations they were stick handled all the way through by the Government of Canada and by the railways and so on and so on. This particular amendment does not imply a quote. It's merely paraphrasing what was being said or the opinions that those people expressed on the process. So it's not as if we're saying that these are direct quotes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bucklaschuk, you had a suggested amendment which might resolve this difference earlier. I don't think most members heard it.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, I suggested deleting the word "defenders" and simply amending it to read "others supporting the retention of the Crow." Maybe that clarifies what we mean by defenders.

HON. S. USKIW: It's the same thing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: It's the same thing, but the Member for Morris had raised that one could define "defenders" in about 10 or 12 different ways, I believe, or - no, it was the Crow rate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion? Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I need another few seconds on that, but on the surface I think that could be accepted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manness, would you take a few seconds then and when you're ready move a sub-amendment, or ask Mr. Bucklaschuk to move it?

Mr. Bucklaschuk, are you prepared to move an amendment, seconded by Mr. Manness? No seconders are required in committee.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I will propose a sub-amendment then that the words "other defenders" be deleted and in their place the words "others supporting the retention" be added. So that the sentence will read, "The N.F.U. and others supporting the retention of the Crow feel that it was a mistake for farm organizations to negotiate over the Crow rate".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The sub-amendment by Mr. Bucklaschuk as moved. All those agreed? (Agreed)

The amendment as amended by Mr. Bucklaschuk's motion, moved by Mr. Harapiak, are you ready for the question? Agreed? (Agreed)

Paragraph 6, Page 4 as amended—pass; Paragraph 7, Page 4 - anyone have any amendments or is there any discussion?

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would propose . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It appears to be the same in this . . .

MR. C. MANNES: I would propose that the wording that was used in the preceding paragraph also apply to Paragraph 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Manness that the first sentence in Paragraph 7, Page 4 be amended to read, "Deep as the division between those supporting the retention of the Crow rate and the other two groups may be," etc. So that means the words "the defenders" would be struck out and the words "those supporting the retention" would be substituted therefor. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

Paragraph 7, Page 4, as amended—pass; Page 4—pass.

That's almost half-way. Page 5, Paragraph 1.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering why the committee has taken upon itself to make the subjective statement that it has in the last sentence of that paragraph.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can shorten this. We agreed to delete that sentence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manness, would you then move your amendment?

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the last sentence in the first paragraph on Page 5 be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Manness that the last sentence on the first paragraph on Page 5 be deleted. Is it agreed? (Agreed)

Paragraph 1, Page 5, pass, as amended—pass;
Paragraph 2, Page 5.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would also move that the second paragraph be deleted in totality. In my view, again this is a subjective statement which we cannot accept.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion?

Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: We will agree with that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Manness that Paragraph 2, Page 5 be deleted. Is it agreed? (Agreed)

Paragraph 3 on Page 5 now becomes Paragraph 2, and I will treat it as such just so members know to which I am referring.

New Paragraph 2, Page 5.

Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to move into a general discussion on the quoting of many sections from the Grandview brief as presented by Mr. Cowling - was it? - I believe. I guess I'm, in my own mind, having difficulty wondering why the committee has chosen to use Mr. Cowling's interpretations or question Dr. Gilson's assumptions, and really what reference that has to the terms of reference that we went into the country to try and administer.

I think that we could have quoted vast parts of his brief, because I think we all found it as very educational, certainly one that was easy to comprehend. But I'm wondering how and why the committee chose to pull out these basic supposedly "erroneous assumptions" as they apply to the Gilson process. It seems to me that we went out to deal with Pepin's proposal. I wonder why we find ourselves right back to the early stages of dealing with Gilson.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, as I recall it, that particular reference was a key element as an expression of a different point of view. I think that it was worthy of mentioning in this report. I don't know how many members recall the presentation, but I certainly recall that one as being one of the most outstanding presentations. We tried to show the variations of opinion by including the various propositions of the various groups. I think it would be wrong not including those of Mr. Cowling who presented such a comprehensive brief.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uruski.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it was very clear that of any of the presentations that were made, the most exhaustive review and analysis of the situation was made in an intimate way by Mr. Cowling. I think members of the committee will recall that he, just in his presentation, all but touched on the key elements. One had to go and delve into his presentations in detail to examine the depth in which he analyzed the situation, really put it forward and saw through the proposal and it was very clear of any one farmer in rural Manitoba.

He certainly sat back and saw through it for what it was.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not disagree with what the Minister of Agriculture has just said, but what I see here is an attempt by the committee to bring into question the whole reason for looking into the Crow.

HON. S. USKIW: What he brought into question.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manness, carry on. Just ignore the interruptions from the peanut gallery.

MR. C. MANNES: Interjections aside, of course, he brought it in, but the point being we have a case here of selective removal of evidence presented to us and I'm not opposed to what has been presented, but certainly, if one leaves it there, a reader would be of the opinion that Mr. Cowling was totally opposed to looking at the whole question and that certainly was not the case. Mr. Cowling was, in asking questions of the committee, also asking questions of himself if I remember correctly. He, himself, did not totally know what the conclusion or the logical end would be, and he addressed other concerns. He fully recognized the value of carrying over grain on his farm and that indeed we had a problem here and something needed to be done, but that isn't highlighted anywhere in great detail.

So I'm not opposed to what has been brought forward, it has some meaning, but I still say that it leaves one, after you've gone through the major quotes, to believe that he is in opposition totally, to changing the Crow, and that's not accurate.

HON. S. USKIW: If you read the total section involving that particular brief or the total report rather, having to do with that brief, you will find that there is a disclaimer to that notion, the notion that he is totally opposed. On Paragraph 2, of Page 5, the matter was put most succinctly before your committee by a farmer from Grandview who emphasized that he was not opposed to changes in the Crow rate and then he expressed these concerns. So if you read it in full context I think it's quite proper.

I agree with you, if you didn't tie the two together that the Member for Morris would have a valid point. He is going along with the need for change, but then he makes these observations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion? Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we can accept it as information provided to the committee. I guess the one difficulty that I have is that we are over-accepting what one individual had said albeit whether the more informative than others, is room for debate. We all appreciated the presentation that he made. One could make the argument in reverse that you have made for not including what the CN had said. We gave them honourable mention at one point in the report, but no content of what they had said, and here we've now overdone it in the other degree to point out what one

individual had said, and you know, I guess to me, those three parts that have been singled out here are a little bit out of the - I should put it this way - not totally reflecting what was said by that individual . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Mr. Uruski, I'll put you on the list.

MR. J. DOWNEY: If I would have tried to accurately assess in a very short comment what the individual had said when it came to making the changes that he probably put it this way, that he was a United Grain Growers member and supported the Pool position on the Crow change, and I think it would have been a little more fair assessment of the whole presentation that he made in summing it up for the committee report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there further discussion on Paragraph 2, Page 5, or are there any proposed amendments?

Paragraph 2, Page 5 - Mr. Manness.
Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would therefore then like to make a motion to delete all references. Where we say the matter was put succinctly before a committee by a farmer from Grandview who emphasizes he is not opposed to the Crow rate change and then add the part that I suggested, that his position as a member of United Grain Growers, he did not support the grain growers, but, in fact, supported Manitoba Pool position. Period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not completely clear on the proposed amendment. Mr. Downey, could you run it by me one more time?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Okay. That the matter was put most succinctly before your committee by a farmer from Grandview who emphasized he was not opposed to change in the Crow rate, that he was a United Grain Growers member, but took the Manitoba Pool Elevators' position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey, just so I can be sure on what you're proposing. You're proposing that in Paragraph 2, of Page 5, that after the words, "in the Crow rate" in the third line thereof, you're proposing the period become a comma, and we add the words, "and that although he was a member of United Grain Growers, he supported the Manitoba Pool Elevators' position."

Is everyone clear on the amendment?

Are you ready for the question? All those in favour of the amendment please say Aye; all those opposed to the amendment please say, Nay. In my opinion the Nays have it.

Page 5, Paragraph 2, further discussion—pass; Page 5, Paragraph 2, Sub-paragraph 1—pass; Sub-paragraph 2—pass; Sub-paragraph 3—pass. Page 5—pass as amended.

Page 6, Paragraph 1, including the extensive quote.
Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, I would like members of the committee to tell me what the convincing evidence

was that the Grandview farmer gave to support his argument?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you repeat your question please, Mr. Manness?

MR. C. MANNESS: I would like some members of the committee to give to me the convincing evidence that the Grandview farmer brought forward to support his allegation that Dr. Gilson's assumptions were erroneous.

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, if one just reads the quotes that are there, it's very clear as to what he was saying. He saw through the whole thing. I mean, he basically put it succinctly and all you have to do is read the quote. They've been stick-handled in the process because they've gone from bottom line to bottom line to bottom line and going back to the original assumption that the only reason - and he puts it very well - the only reason that farmers and farm organizations went to the bargaining table is that they also wanted a revitalization of the railway system. Everyone in Western Canada, and now I end his quote and say, everyone in Western Canada who is in the grain business and requires the railways to ship grain is totally in agreement that the railway needs to be upgraded and there has to be adequate capacity to ship, but not only grain and not at the expense of the farmers. And he was putting it very succinctly in terms of the weaknesses of the assumptions.

The other assumption, of course, was the expansion of the livestock industry which - I guess he must have read the document that was prepared for your administration, which we subsequently mailed to all permit holders, I believe - the Minister might correct me - the Tyrchniewicz Study which coincided and foresaw the implications of changes on the livestock industry or the benefits that were not there that have been touted about since then.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Chairman, my concern is with the second, third, fourth word and fifth word of that first sentence, "The farmer produced convincing evidence." If we were in a court of law, of course, we would expect some statistical evidence or some factual evidence. I didn't see that. I saw a commentary that tried to address the assumptions spelled out earlier.

I think that I was not terribly convinced because of the argument that indeed Gilson's assumptions were erroneous. I was not terribly convinced at all, so I would have then to move that be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manness, just so I'm clear on what you are suggesting, are you suggesting the word "evidence" be replaced by the word "argument," or can you give me a more specific amendment?

MR. C. MANNESS: That's right. Let me see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't believe we could just strike out the word "evidence" and replace it with "argument." We would lose something in the syntax.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, "The farmer provided a strong argument . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: "The farmer made a convincing argument . . ." You want to remove both the words "convincing" and "evidence" and replace - "produced convincing evidence" be struck out and the words "made a strong argument to show the weaknesses of the assumptions."

HON. S. USKIW: That's fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Manness that the words "produced convincing evidence" be struck out and the words "made a strong argument" be substituted therefor. Further discussion? Ready for the question on the amendment? Is it agreed? (Agreed)

Paragraph 1 on Page 6, as amended—pass; subparagraph 1 on Page 6 which is the quote—pass. Mr. Downey on the quote in Paragraph 1.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Okay, I'm sorry. Proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Paragraph 2 which starts with "Your Committee . . ." - Mr. Harapiak.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: I have an amendment that Paragraph 3 on Page 6 be amended by striking out in the first line thereof the words "could not agree more" and replace them with the words "respects the logic of that argument."

The purpose of that, Mr. Chairman, is that it would be incomplete if we just left the quote by itself and then we struck out, as was suggested by the Member for Morris' proposal, the paragraph completely. It would be incomplete. That's why we have to have some summation of that quotation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: That's fine. I'll defer . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we would like a little more evidence. You are really dealing with the amendment now that you've introduced. I would like to deal with the whole paragraph, Mr. Chairman, not the amendment. The whole paragraph, I have some difficulty with.

HON. S. USKIW: You mean the quote? You mean Paragraphs 2 or 3?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Paragraph 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have identified the quote as a subparagraph, because it's indented. So I'm calling the paragraph that begins, "Your Committee could not agree more," the one to which the amendment is proposed, as Paragraph 2. That's the paragraph we're on.

Mr. Downey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I'll deal with that total paragraph. You say, "Some farm organizations may now wish that they had heeded the warning of Mr. Justice Emmett

Hall, but once the Crow rate is put on the negotiating table it is only a matter of time until all is lost."

I cannot recall anyone making that statement during those hearings, but we're reporting to the Legislature on what we heard, Mr. Chairman. I cannot recall hearing that brought up at the committee by any person who made presentations to us. Maybe the members of the government could provide that kind of information to this committee. Where and when did that get told to our committee? Who quoted Hall at our committee hearings?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

HON. S. USKIW: I'm not sure whether there has been a direct quote. I think there has been some reference to Emmett Hall's involvement. I'm not sure that I can pick that out of the transcript, Mr. Chairman. It may and may not have been in there, but I believe the committee is summing up on the basis of opposition and argument that was presented to the committee by various groups with quite a variation of opinion.

In summing it up, I believe the committee is saying that perhaps this is in hindsight what some people would be thinking, and therein lies the reference to Justice Emmett Hall. That's within the powers of the committee to do. As a matter of fact, this is a very small departure from transcript text, if you like, by comparison to other Commons reports and legislative committee reports, if the argument is made that it's straying somewhat from the transcript.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I can't agree with the Minister. Our job is to report on what we heard in the community, and we did not hear any reference made to Justice Emmett Hall and the statement that is made in this paragraph. We can't agree with it. I don't think it would be a reasonable statement to make to the Legislature. If the Minister is saying we should be reporting what hindsight is or try to report on what present thoughts may be of some people, that's not our job. Our job is to report what we heard. To this point, we've agreed with the amendments, but we cannot agree with this particular statement that we had any reference made to Emmett Hall's proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uruski.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure that the honourable members are indicating that the statement is factual. I mean they're not disagreeing that the statement is factual. I just want to make sure in my own mind, because we — (Interjection) — pardon me? It's not factual that he has not said this?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that maybe gets to the crux of the disagreement. While Justice Hall did not appear before the committee, certainly he is one of the most respected voices on the issue of transportation in Western Canada when it comes to transportation matters. In fact, members of the former administration staff sat on the Hall Commission and then became directors in the liaison between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Transportation, who were on the Hall Commission. Hall was very clear in his recommendations in the Transportation Report,

saying that, yes, there should be branch-line abandonment and there will be some branch-line abandonment, but the Crow rate should stay, if I'm paraphrasing him correctly. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, but it's very clear that having an authority such as Mr. Hall, who has since then made these statements, certainly can only add weight to the support that this committee recommends and frankly I have some difficulty. I wouldn't have any difficulty, the honourable members would say that, look, he never said this and it's not factual. But I'm hoping that it's not the case because there are statements that can be attributed to Justice Hall, that he has made those statements, and certainly for members whose staff, whose co-ordinator sat on the Hall Commission and whose government has indicated, or former administration indicated they supported the recommendations of Hall; and now to say we don't accept statements that he has made, I have a bit of trouble with understanding their logic in this whole matter.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I just want a clarification on that statement. I think there should be a question mark at the end of that.

Some organizations may now wish they had heeded the warning of Mr. Justice Hall, that once the Crow rate is put on the negotiating list, it's only a matter of time till all is lost, question mark. I wonder if that is what the committee wishes to get across in their report because it is a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you moving that as an amendment, Mr. McKenzie?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I wasn't at the hearings. I just raised it as a point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. McKenzie has offered a possible suggestion for an amendment, that members may wish to consider. Further discussion, Mr. Manness.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, my concern is the statement itself. As I recall Justice Hall and making reference to the Crow rate like he did in his final report, he did indicate that he had some concerns with the development of the Crow rate and any renegotiation working towards its change. That's a fact.

Never though, did I ever take out of those comments the conclusion that once the Crow rate is brought to the negotiating table, that it's only a matter of time until all is lost.

I suppose somebody is going to have to define to me, what he meant by "all". If in fact this is in quotes - if we put quotes from it and it came out of the report, I'll have to accept that. But I don't remember that and I had some involvement with that process some seven years ago.

So, firstly, I think that leaves a bad and a misinformed statement. Secondly, to accept it as fact, that all is lost, would then have to mean that a great majority of people who felt when questioned that the Crow rate should be changed are half nuts, and maybe that's what the members of the committee are trying to say, because they disagree with Hall, to be prepared to want to move to any change at all, and certainly that isn't the case. So, I totally have to reject that whole paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30, I take it it's the understanding that this committee would rise, as would a normal Supply Committee for Private Members' Hour, and I'll interrupt the proceedings of the committee and will return to the Chair at 8:00 p.m.