

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, March 30, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): I beg to present the petition of the Portage Industrial Exhibition Association praying for the passing of an Act to amend the Portage Industrial Association Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to take the time of this House in debating this particular motion in any great detail or in any great depth. I think it's obvious that the Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development should be received by this House.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the members of the House that the previous government in all its years in office did not see fit to set up such a committee to examine the problems of economic development of this province. Now this committee has met and has considered the avenues which should be explored in attempting to foster and promote the economic growth of the Province of Manitoba. Many useful problems were outlined, many useful questions were put on the table by this committee, and indeed the Honourable Member from River Heights himself suggested some of the items which the committee should explore and consider.

The committee has agreed, and this is outlined in the report submitted by the Honourable Member from Osborne, that we consider questions such as the amount of Capital Supply; how can we improve the supply of capital in the province so as to ensure a greater amount of investment in this province. We agreed in committee that we would consider the whole question of energy development, the development of electric power and its impact on economic growth. However we decided, among other things, one of the first things we should look at is the pattern of growth over the past decade, over the past ten years to detect trends to see where we failed and where we may improve our ways, and this we decided and we thought was the most useful way of beginning the work of this committee.

I would also remind the members of the House that the committee itself, the report itself, the committee itself felt that it should be reconstituted and that it should carry on and consider these various items that I refer to. And there are other important matters relating to economic development which this committee in future will concern itself with. I suggest to the members of the House that the report be received and let's get on with the job.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. -- (Interjection) -- (Stands)

The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. -- (Interjection) -- (Stands)

Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West) introduced Bill No. 26, an Act to validate certain by-laws of the City of Brandon and the Rural Municipality of Cornwallis and to enlarge the boundaries of the City of Brandon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I see he's not in his place. My question was for the Minister of Government Services. Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister can hear me while he's moving back to his seat. I wonder if the Minister could advise the House of the intended purpose of the Government of Manitoba for the use of the Auditorium, on which offers to purchase and offers to sell appear to have been flying back and forth in the last day or two.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Government Services)(Transcona): I beg your pardon?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: NDP rallies?

MR. PAULLEY: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if I may make a comment insofar as the remarks of my friend the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party, as a result of a conference there in the Auditorium last year we became the Government of Manitoba, for which we are truly thankful and I'm sure so are the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Minister replying to the question put by the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition?

MR. PAULLEY: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was replying to the questions put by both of my honourable gentlemen, only I started with the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party, going from the bottom up. -- (Interjection) -- I too, Mr. Speaker. I would say to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition that there has been, as I understand it, some speculation and some consultations for a considerable period of time between the Government of Manitoba under the previous regime and the present regime for the possibility of taking over the Civic Auditorium, which is in possession of course of the City of Winnipeg, by the Provincial Government. I say to my honourable friend that negotiations are continuing between the Government of Manitoba, the Mayor and Council of the City of Winnipeg which have not yet been concluded, whereby there is the possibility, subject to satisfactory arrangements, for the Province of Manitoba to take over the facility known as the Civic Auditorium in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if - a supplementary question - I might enquire what the intended use would be of the building. I think that's really where I started out.

MR. PAULLEY: The intended use of the Auditorium, if satisfactory negotiations are concluded, will be to the benefit of the people of Manitoba.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Is the government negotiating for any other properties that are within the area at the present time?

MR. PAULLEY: Not precisely, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make two announcements. First, I would like to advise the House that federal-provincial funds totalling \$3.9 million will be available to Winnipeg for acquisition of the Midland Railway property and for development around the Centennial Centre. I have advised the Mayor of Winnipeg by letter today that the Federal Government has indicated that it is prepared to make \$2.6 million available for the urban renewal schemes in the two areas. The province's commitment is \$1.3 million. I've requested the city to prepare, as soon as possible, schemes covering the implementation of the two urban renewal plans. Cost-sharing of the projects is based on 50 percent federal, 25 percent provincial and 25 percent City of Winnipeg. Acquisition of a mile and one-eighth mile stretch of the Midland Railway and clearing of the area for development is expected to cost \$4 million, with the cost-sharing set at \$2 million federal, one million provincial and one million city. A further \$1.2 million, including 600,000 federal, 300,000 provincial and 300,000 city is earmarked for a scheme involving the Manitoba Theatre Centre and Urban Renewal Area No. 3. Actual cost figures for this scheme will soon be known and will form the basis for the three-level agreement for this.

Now also I'd like to announce that the Manitoba Government will assume operating losses incurred by municipalities in those public housing schemes controlled by the province. It is estimated 900 to 1,000 public housing units will be built or plans prepared in the 1970-71 fiscal year. The new assistance program does not require municipalities to contribute toward any

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) operating losses incurred in future years on units constructed by the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation in various Manitoba municipalities during the year 1970. The policy applies for 1970 only and will be reviewed prior to the start of the 1971 program in order to decide if it can be continued or if some other arrangements to cover operating losses will be necessary. Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation would continue to work with municipalities in assessing their individual needs and in ensuring that construction undertaken meets all local regulations and zoning requirements. I hope that as a result of this change in policy it will be possible to proceed with the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation 1970 program at a quicker pace in order to ensure that the housing units will be available to those in need at as early a date as possible.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, two questions. One on the first statement and I appreciate, if I may say, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the announcement that the Minister has made. I think that this is a result of plans that were in progress prior to the announced Government of Canada freeze and that special consideration was asked of them in that light. I'm assuming that they're essentially the same structure as was working in discussion along those lines.

The second question would be: does the Minister have any estimate of what the anticipated subsidy would be required related to his second announcement in the current fiscal year.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, insofar as the present fiscal year there will be no monies involved to any extent due to the fact that practically all the housing units started will be this year. I can obtain the information - roughly speaking it's somewhere in the area of 125 to 130 thousand would be the actual cost, but I will obtain the exact information for you.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I would like to ask the Minister, has the study by a committee commissioned last session by the Minister to investigate changes in trailer and camping facilities at the various provincial parks and camping sites now been completed?

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism & Recreation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is yes, and the report will be forthcoming in a couple of days.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will that report be tabled in the House?

MR. BURTNIAK: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister tell us has the government withdrawn its support for the Turtle Mountain Resource and Conservation District?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I think that that is a matter that could be dealt with during the course of my estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister -- has the honourable member a supplementary question?

MR. WATT: . . . question. Can the Minister not tell us definitely if any move has been made to restrict the activities of the Resource Conservation District in the south central area before his estimates are proceeded with further?

MR. USKIW: Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it is a proper subject for discussion during the estimates.

MR. WATT: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it not proper to answer that question at this time?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of reminding the members of the House and the public of Manitoba that one of the finest agricultural fairs in the world is now being held in the good city of Brandon, the Manitoba Winter Fair, all of this week. Unfortunately, the Minister of Agriculture will be tied up with his estimates today and this evening and therefore he has asked me to do the honours of officially opening the Fair on behalf of the government, and it is indeed my pleasure to do so. And I certainly again extend to all the members of the House and to all the people of Manitoba a kind and cordial invitation to attend this very fine winter fair.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. AL. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, you'll recall that I announced to the House that there was an error in the report which I filed - it was a typographical error - to the report of the Chief Inspector of the Liquor Control Commission and I have copies, or a little memorandum to be attached to the Return. It's a correction on Page 21. The figure that reads \$188,897. 51 should read 118 thousand. It's a typographical error and I have the memorandum here in sufficient copies for the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Is he in a position to tell the House anything more about the proposed second national park in Manitoba?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, that question was asked before and we've been contacting Ottawa on several occasions. We've had quite a bit of correspondence on that but so far, until further studies which are being made at the present time are completed, we cannot say for sure just . . .

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Health and Social Services. I have copies here for the Leader of the Official Opposition and a copy for the Leader of the Liberal Party and for the Honourable Member of Rhineland and the Honourable Member of Churchill. -- (Interjection) -- St. Boniface? Well we kept one for ourselves and this green ribbon too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed either to the First Minister or the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the fact that the government has allowed the term of office of the directors of the Manitoba Development Fund to expire, in view of the fact that there was not a full meeting with the Board of Directors before such an announcement was made or before such a decision was made, does either the Minister of Industry and Commerce or the First Minister consider this a reasonable and prudent course of action on their part?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . an expression of opinion. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Municipal Affairs advise us as to the amount of all funds to date that the province or the Local Government District of Churchill is holding in trust for the community of Churchill?

MR. PAWLEY: The question was to be taken as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report for 1969 for the Department of Highways, and I'd like to indicate at this time that this report has been sent out by mail to all the members of the House about a month ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is addressed to the Minister of Transportation. I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether since his appointment and assumption of the office of the Ministry of Transportation he has had or held a meeting with the full Board of the Manitoba Transportation Commission.

MR. BOROWSKI: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member for River Heights a supplementary question?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I did not hear the answer.

MR. BOROWSKI: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he could indicate that since assuming his office he has had a meeting with the full Board of the Manitoba Transportation Commission? And I would also direct my question to the Railway Commissioner, the Minister of Government Services, and ask whether he, since assuming his office, has had a meeting with the Manitoba Transportation Commission.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, that's a question concerning internal operating methods of this government which the honourable gentleman need not expect an answer to.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order, that is not I believe internal; this is a board, an agency set up by the government which operates independent of the government and which the Ministers I referred to are responsible for answering for these Boards in the House, and on the point of order I believe this is a proper question. In case there's any question on the other side what my question is, may I simply address my question again to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and ask whether, since he has assumed his portfolio, has he met with the full complement of the Manitoba Transportation Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Could the Minister of Municipal Affairs advise us if the Local Government District of Churchill will be investing any money in water and sewer services this year?

MR. PAWLEY: I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether maybe I'll get an answer or not, the Ministers seem to be refusing today to answer questions. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government or the Minister announced its new policy, or any policy changes to the Turtle Mountain Resource and Conservation Committee or the seven municipalities involved?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I outlined a few minutes ago that this is a subject matter that can be dealt with during the course of my estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether, since assuming his portfolio, he has met with the full complement of the Manitoba Export Corporation, the Manitoba Design Institute and the Manitoba Research Council? Has he met with either one of these groups?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have met with individuals, key individuals belonging to all of these groups. I might also add that as of April 1st there will be a new board for the Manitoba Development Fund and I am pleased to announce that on the very first day of meeting there will be a lengthy meeting between myself and the members of the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Fund. I would repeat, I have been in contact with individual members of the previous named bodies.

While I'm on my feet I'd like to attempt to answer, if I may, a question raised by the Honourable Member for River Heights with regard to the proposed 33,000 new jobs that he estimates had to be created within the next three years. There was a question to this effect about a week or so ago. It would be interesting to know how the honourable member arrived at the figure of 11,000 jobs per year. It is certainly not an extension of trends established in the province during the past few years. Between 1961 and 1969 the total number of jobs in Manitoba increased by 60,000 jobs, or 7,500 jobs per annum, but we all remember how depressed were both Manitoba and Canada in 1961 when unemployment was rife and climatic conditions almost caused a complete crop failure in the province. Well, let's consider more recent years, and I hope the honourable member's listening . . .

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that question was not asked that the Honourable Minister is answering right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member please state his point of order.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The question that the Honourable Minister has referred to was never asked in the House. He's making a statement, and I have no objections to his making a statement, but I think it should be understood that in making a statement, leave should be given for a reply to be made.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I distinctly remember the former Minister getting up on his feet several times asking how various jobs were being created, were to be created, and he referred to specific numbers, and I'm trying to throw a little . . .

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order, so the Honourable Minister will recall what I asked, I asked him how many new jobs will be required this year. I have made statements in the House in connection with the speeches in connection with the Reply to the Speech from the Throne, but in any case they were not specifically asked of him. I have no objection to in fact his answer and I have no objection to his making a statement; I would only want that the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) courtesy be given for leave to be able to reply to his statement.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am getting to the reply to the question as to how many jobs had to be created. The honourable member did make a reference to 33,000 jobs over three years, or 11,000 per annum, so I don't care whether he considers it a statement or an answer to his question, I think this is important information that's useful for the people of Manitoba to have.

MR. SPEAKER: Do I understand it then that the Honourable Minister is answering a question and also making a statement?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister may proceed.

MR. EVANS: At any rate if I may go back, between 1965 and 1969 the increase in employment in Manitoba was 17,000, or roughly 4,000 jobs per annum - that's 4,000 jobs per annum between 1965 and 1969, yet the Member for River Heights now suggests an increase of 11,000 jobs per annum. I suggest his faith that the present administration should be able to create jobs at roughly three times the rate of the previous administration is, to say the least, very touching. To the best of my knowledge, the former administration never committed itself to stating annual increases in employment. This was presumably because of the inherent difficulties in making such a forecast.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Minister that he confine his statement or remarks as related to the statement which he indicates that he is making, to a statement as such, to an announcement, whatever the announcement is that the Honourable Minister wishes to make, rather than enter into argument and debate with other members in the House.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I will simply conclude by stating that we are not breaking precedents in this matter and that I can assure the honourable members that the provincial government will make every effort in a search for employment opportunities for Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to, by leave, reply to the Honourable Minister's statement. -- (Interjection) --

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on a point or order, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any courtesy extended to the other side should be extended to this side.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe that the right procedure now would be for the honourable member to ask leave to reply. -- (Interjection) -- All right, I get the point. I believe the honourable member should be allowed to reply because the Honourable Minister's answer really was more in the nature of a statement on motions. I think there should be reciprocity.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe our rules do provide for the opportunity to reply to a statement made by a Minister. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in one of the first addresses the First Minister gave in his capacity as Premier of this province, he indicated that he would not look backwards but he would look forward in his actions. -- (Interjection) -- Well, possibly upwards, but he certainly would look forward. It seemed to me that that should be considered by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who in answering the question - and not correctly - in answering the questions continues to want to look backwards when we want to deal with the future. The information of the 33,000 jobs required in the next three years comes from the TED Report, and if the Minister of Industry and Commerce isn't aware of that, and if he's not prepared to accept it and if he's suggesting that the statistics are incorrect or not obtainable, then I think he should indicate that to the House.

Now the TED Report is a document that some on the opposite side would like to ignore. There are even some who consider it a political document and are going to use it only when it suits their purposes. The Minister of Transportation says it's a document made from the work of 400 Conservative stooges. The First Minister, in his address in New York, gave credence to the fact that it was handled by people who contributed quite generously and who contributed in a very real manner to the determination of the opportunities and guidelines for Manitoba.

I would suggest to the Minister of Industry and Commerce that he first read the TED Report; and secondly, after reading the TED Report, he should make the assessment of the job requirements as they suggest, because both in population movement and in job requirements, a very essential ingredient is necessary if we are going to achieve the real gain for the people of

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) Manitoba. And the real gain will come in the rise in the per capita income of our people and that will come, and can only come if in fact there are enough job opportunities created, that there's growth in our population and if productivity gains are made. It will not occur through any other action other than what I've referred to.

I suggest to the Minister of Industry and Commerce that before he belittles this side for suggesting a figure which he may himself not be prepared to accept as a figure that he wants to work towards, he should first of all understand the situation and should in fact familiarize himself with the work of the TED Report, which was an extension of the COMEF Report, and which gave the basic guidelines and the incentive and the determination of what had to be done. Because, in fact, if we do not have the job opportunities established as proposed in the TED Report and the 33,000 jobs are not developed and created - and I recognize again that government does not create the jobs; government creates the climate in which the individual entrepreneur in his actions creates the jobs, and that I think is accepted on the other side. Even though we may have a few jobs created by a few Crown Corporations if we are successful in getting one started, even in that respect may I suggest that it will not occur, and if the jobs do not occur, then the problem will be movement out of the province; the problem will be loss of population; the problem will be that the per capita income will not rise and that there will not in fact be the real gain for our people in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised to find that we have a new use for the question period before the Orders of the Day, when various members can get up and make highly political speeches. I think we should take the advice of my friend the Minister of Agriculture and say that this is a matter for the estimates, and if my Honourable Member for River Heights wishes to continue the Throne Speech at that time, that's the place for it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. Can he indicate when we might expect to receive Volumes 2 and 3 of the Crippen Acres Report?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): With regard to those volumes, I have been discussing them with my department and there's no difficulty about tabling the volumes but the expense of reproducing them is quite high, and what I wanted to do is show them to my honourable friend and if he still thinks they should be reproduced at the cost involved, then the government will have to consider doing that. But I'm getting copies of them to show you. My intention at this time is to have them available in the Legislative Library because I don't think they're the kind of volumes which you will want continuously to peruse because of the material they contain. If, after seeing them, and after I tell you what it costs to produce you still want us to do so, we will consider it. But there's no difficulty about tabling them.

MR. CRAIK: . . . understand that you have them in your possession now?

MR. GREEN: Yes. You say I have them in my possession; they are in the possession of the government. I've asked for copies of them so that you can see what's in them, to see whether it's worthwhile spending the kind of money that's necessary to reproduce them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, can he indicate when the Underwood-McLellan Report might be available and whether it's in possession now?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that's the property of the Minister in charge of Hydro, the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. John's): Mr. Speaker, just to follow through. I've not yet been informed that that report is ready. When I am informed I will know about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Transportation. I wonder if he could advise us of the approximate date of the completion of construction or reconstruction of the bridge across the Red River on Highway 201? Some people are concerned about this in view of the nearness to the break-up of the river.

MR. BOROWSKI: I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister and ask that it be then channelled to the appropriate Ministers rather than ask them directly myself. I wonder if the following speeches that were made in the last few weeks could be tabled in the House - that is the texts or copies of the speeches - the speech of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture before the East-Man Development Corporation; the speech of the Minister of Industry and Commerce before the Pembina Valley Development Corporation; and the speech of the First Minister before the St. James-Assiniboia Chamber of Commerce.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, it is not my usual habit to speak from a prepared text, Mr. Speaker, and I'm afraid that that couldn't be accommodated. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not believe the Honourable Minister has a point of privilege.

MR. USKIW: All right. I thought I would inform the member that that can't be done.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the former House Leader said it is not a proper question before Orders of the Day. I may refresh his memory and indicate that many times, when we were in government, members on the opposite side asked and they were accommodated where -- (Interjection) -- no, no, they were accommodated. I would only ask that he allow the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to act as the House Leader and allow him the opportunity of expressing the opinion of the government one way or the other. My question was addressed to the First Minister and I would ask that he reply.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has asked for a copy of the text of certain speeches. My colleague the Minister of Agriculture has already indicated that he was speaking from just outlined notes, if that. I don't know in the case of my other colleague. In my own case I was speaking extemporaneously. On occasions when I do use prepared script, if my honourable friend were to ask, I would undertake to make it available.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the Honourable First Minister. When I arrived at this House today I noticed a picket in front of the door. I was just wondering if this was a new Cabinet Minister training program that this government had effected.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what kind of ticket my honourable friend is referring to -- (Interjection) -- Oh, a picket. Well, I don't know what kind of picket it was.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services. Can he indicate whether all the publications or statements put out by the Information Services Branch are filed some place for public viewing or are some of them sent to members of the Legislature, some of them kept, or what is the procedure? Can he indicate whether in fact all the statements put out by the Information Branch are open for viewing some place?

MR. PAULLEY: I believe, Mr. Speaker, the answer would be that if my honourable friend would recall the period of time when he happened to be - for a short period of time, maybe too long - a member of the Cabinet, this information was available. At that time I happened to be the recipient as a leader of an Opposition Party of most of the material that was sent out from Information. We have no secrets.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the question. I just wanted to know if it is filed some place, if the official publications that are sent out to the public or the news media or elsewhere are actually filed some place where they can be viewed?

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes, Mr. Speaker and if my honourable friend is not on the mailing list, if he gives me a memo, I would see that he's placed on the mailing list, as indeed I was, to receive the bulletins sent out by the Information Services.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I ask again the question. Again, is there somewhere in the building or elsewhere a file kept that is open to the members or the public to see all publications that are put out by the Information Services.

MR. PAULLEY: I would say to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, there has been no change of policy.

MR. CRAIK: I would just like my question answered. If, in fact, some place in the building a person can view all the statements made by the Information Services.

MR. PAULLEY: I would say to my honourable friend for the first time, and I hope I penetrate this time, they are available for my honourable friend.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, might I enquire whether all press releases are sent out to the mailing list? Are we to assume that members of this House and others that are on the mailing list get copies of all press releases?

MR. PAULLEY: My friend can assume what he likes. As far as I am aware there has been no change in policy as far as the press and administration is concerned, and I would say to my honourable friend if through inadvertance or some other reason my honourable friend has been skipped because of a news release, if he draws it to my attention as the Minister responsible, I would be more than glad to see that he obtains a copy of the said news release.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister of propaganda, or Minister of Government Services, would indicate to the House whether the list to whom the Information Services are sent has been altered in any way or amended since his assuming office.

MR. PAULLEY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say to my honourable friend that I will take a look at it very very closely to see if I can reduce the cost to the Treasury of the Province of Manitoba, and not to the degree that was the policy of my honourable friend who at one time was, I believe, if I remember correctly, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the largest propaganda machine that Manitoba ever had.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, I want to advise my honourable friend that I am no longer on the list and I was at one time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, last week I asked a question of the Minister of Health and I would redirect the question to him and also to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. With respect to the Assiniboine Feeders Corporation, could either one of the ministers tell us if the government is going to give any financial aid to this organization or any other aid, and if so, what is it.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the question is well taken. We have had a meeting with this group and the government will do everything in its power to assist it, including the offering of adequate financial assistance.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister give us more details on the aid?

MR. EVANS: Well, I would say aid to the extent of covering various expenses involved with the cost involved with the move. Is that all right?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the aid be offered because of a mistake made by some government employee in offering advice?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the last question posed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, perhaps he could in turn be a little more specific. He was asking us to be more specific in our replies; perhaps he could be a little more specific in his questions.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I will try to help, Mr. Speaker. The reason for the question is if a mistake had been made by a department or an employee of the government, perhaps it should be known so that other operations such as this will not expect similar aid unless there has been a mistake made.

MR. SCHREYER: That would be a fair assumption, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. Can the Minister indicate as to whether or not any discussions have been held with representatives of the Metropolitan Corporation relative to the collection and disposal of refuse in Metropolitan Winnipeg area?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with quite a few municipalities in the Greater Winnipeg area on this subject. There is nothing definite so far as an answer on our part for the time being. It is still pending, and if a decision comes forth on the part of government you will be made aware of it.

MR. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate if at this point and time any costs have in fact been brought down in making a comparison with the present services and any anticipated future collections?

MR. TOUPIN: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. The only thing that I can say is that some municipalities do have to acquire land to actually get the facilities that they need now. If our decision is still pending a year or so from now, we will definitely have to look at what these different municipalities have acquired.

MR. HARDY: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Am I to assume - and I can appreciate I can assume anything - that no decision will be made, if I understand correctly, for a year or a year and a half.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, this is actually not for me to say. This is policy and I can't say when policy will be established.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: It has been drawn to my attention that we have with us this afternoon, twenty-five members of the Flin Flon Chapter of Demolays and they are here under the direction of Mr. Jacoban and Mr. Chartrand. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Transportation. He indicated over the week-end that there was a possibility of reviving the Roads to Resources Program in the north, and I was wondering if he could advise the House if he has had any discussions with the Federal Government with a view to their participation in this program.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this with the Federal Government and various ministers since taking office, and I might add that the Premier when he went to Ottawa some time last fall brought this up as one of the subjects for discussion. I can't say at what stage we are. Ottawa is very difficult to deal with, as our member knows. It is my hope that sometime within the next twelve months we will not only get money to develop Roads to Resources but that we will get money to develop roads to reserves also.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Honourable Member for Churchill asked certain questions about the beverage room operation in the single men's camp at Hydro at Kettle Rapids. He also has two Addresses for Papers coming up, but on behalf of Hydro I have every intention of accepting it. I thought possibly I would be permitted to answer the questions asked by the honourable member in the House and then he can decide whether he wants to debate his Addresses or not. So that I would respond to the questions which he asked in the House in the following way.

I am informed that tenders were called for the provision of catering service some time at the beginning of the Kettle Rapids project. The tender from the firm Crawley and McCracken was accepted; and is in continuing operation, but in that tender there was no reference to the operation of a beverage room. Apparently negotiations had been conducted with a Marcel Chartier who owned the hotel and beverage room in Gillam prior to the commencement of the operation and he entered into a contract with Hydro which provided that he would build a new hotel and a beverage room in Gillam and would also operate a beverage room in premises to be built by Hydro in the camp at the project. His rent for the premises in that camp was a basic \$30,000 a year with an upwards escalation when gross sales exceeded a quarter of a million dollars. Under the terms of the operation, Chartier had the right to discontinue his operation of the beverage room under certain circumstances and he exercised that right on January 17.

I am informed further that following his decision to close the beverage room, Hydro asked for proposals from any interested parties for the operation, or alternatively the management of the beverage room on a year-round basis in the event of Hydro being granted a license for the operation of the beverage room for which it was then applying. A proposal had been received from Crawley and McCracken involving a management fee of \$1,000 a month which was considered most favorable by Hydro and it was indicated that they would be the intended managers during the license hearings. The proposal from Crawley and McCracken apparently had no bearing on their continuing contract for catering service at the project.

Apparently Manitoba Hydro made a decision later to operate the beverage room in the camp on a seasonal rather than a year-round basis, and there is no proposal for this type of operation that has as yet been received. With that information that I have received and I now put on record, the honourable member can now decide what he wants to do with the motion coming up.

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

MR. GRAHAM: In light of the information that the Minister of Finance has given us, could the Minister indicate in the original agreement of roughly \$30,000 per year, was there not an implied level of employment that Hydro was to maintain which was the basis for which that rent was set?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have given the member and the House all the information I have on the subject.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, could we request a copy of that information that the Minister read just now rather than wait until tomorrow in the Hansard?

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I move that a humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence between the Manitoba Government, the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, the Manitoba Liquor Commission, or by anyone acting on their behalf, relative to the supply of catering services and supply of alcoholic beverages in the Gillam area since the beginning of the Kettle Rapids Hydro Project.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this and so I would ask that it stand until Private Member's Day.

MR. SPEAKER: Till Tuesday, Private Member's Day (Agreed.) The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: May I ask the indulgence of the House to allow this to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed.) The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Birtle-Russell, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing:

- (1) What provincial funds are being applied to family planning programs?
- (2) How much money is involved?
- (3) In what types of programs is the money being spent?
- (4) By what organizations?
- (5) What requests for funds for family planning activities have been received by the Provincial Government?

(6) What organizations made these requests?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye, that an Order for the House do issue for a return showing the following information:

With respect to the Manitoba Development Fund loans made to: James Bertram and Sons Ltd., M. P. Industrial Mills Ltd., Pack River Company, Churchill Forest Industries,

- (1) What is the name of the legal firm who acted on behalf of the Manitoba Development Fund in each case?
- (2) What has been paid by the Manitoba Development Fund in amount of fees in each case?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we will endeavour to provide the House with this information.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like you to call Bill No. 29. The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following bill: Bill No. 29, an Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for Capital purposes and authorize the borrowing of same.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member from Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, before we start considering the Bill, I wonder if the Minister

(MR. WEIR cont'd) has had any communication from the Member for Rhineland who was interested in this Bill on Thursday and wanted this adjourned until today. I haven't seen him here. Is there any communication or anything?

MR. CHERNIACK: None whatsoever, Mr. Chairman. I must admit I was not readily available over the week-end, but there is none on my desk and no indication of any kind. I also don't have any unanswered questions that I am aware of on this.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I should perhaps mention that Mr. Froese telephoned and asked if these two could be kept over. I don't know what the intention is of . . .

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, to be helpful, because I know the position that the government finds itself in and I think they need a lead from this side of the House, I think that my position would be that I would support a standing of it at some point today until tomorrow, with the understanding that they have a deadline to meet and that they would receive our support in the closing of the debate before tomorrow night is finished, because I think that they made a reasonable request in terms of it. I've disagreed with the procedure that they've taken in getting us to this point but I think that I could give the assurance from this side that if we wanted to leave it at this stage for the Member for Rhineland that certainly support in reaching its climax by tomorrow evening would be received from our group in the House.

MR. BARKMAN: This would certainly be agreeable to us, and of course this action will depend on what the Minister may decide.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I was going to only thank the honourable members who've just indicated their cooperation, but in view of the editorial comment that was made by the Leader of the Opposition I do want to point out that I did have to get this in today in order to have it for tomorrow in the event that there was any further delay, but certainly on the understanding that I've now received that this matter will stand, then I would like your direction either of two ways. Either I would at this point move that the committee rise and have this down for tomorrow, or possibly by leave, should the Member for Rhineland arrive today, then possibly if the Clerk indicates that this is possible, by leave, I assume it is, we might be able to go back into Committee today. But other than that, if the Member for Rhineland does not arrive today then I would propose that -- there is private members' day tomorrow afternoon, is it? -- in which case we'll be taking it right into the evening and on the understanding then that we -- well hopefully if there is any problem I'll take my chances on it not passing tomorrow, but in view of the cooperation indicated I move that the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee wishes to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. GREEN: May we now proceed to second readings of government bills, Bill No. 8.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 8, an Act to amend the Garage Keepers Act. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI presented Bill No. 8, an Act to amend the Garage Keepers Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the bill is a very simple one and it will just take me a couple of minutes to explain it. It simply deals with matters when a person takes a car into a garage the garage keeper under the present Act has ten days to file a lien. All we're doing here is extending it to twenty days which will be of some benefit to the garage keeper and I think that it may be some benefit to the party involved, because under the present situation if he doesn't raise the money in ten days the garage keeper is forced to file a lien. If it's extended to twenty days it will give the owner of the car an additional ten days to raise the money and come back and pay the garage, and it will save the garage keeper some money from filing a lien. So really all that it is is doubling the time allowed for filing a lien, and I may point out that the same Act or the same time limit exists in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the lucid explanation given by the Minister, I don't think there's any particular reason why we should hold this over. We're agreeable to let it go right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't intend to hold it up for more than about a minute and a half. I'm sure that the Minister has done a lot of thinking in regards to changing it from ten days to twenty days and perhaps has received some of his information through some of the automobile dealers, but with some of the complex bookkeeping that some of the organizations have today I'm just wondering if twenty days is really enough, but perhaps he has some information on that.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be closing debate at this point.

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

MR. GRAHAM: In view of the change from ten to twenty days, I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation if there is any contravention or discrepancy between this and the Consumer Protection Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer the last question. I assume since our legal department is dealing with it that there couldn't possibly be any problem. I'd like to correct one item. I was just glancing at a memo I received from the Registrar. The same legislation exists in British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario. Saskatchewan apparently does not have it. Now -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

A MEMBER: That doesn't necessarily make it foolproof.

MR. BOROWSKI: No, that's right. Nothing is foolproof. We are simply trying to improve the legislation. As far as the twenty day period is concerned I suppose that you can -- you know there's no limit on it, you can go to thirty days or forty days, but I think you'd have a problem possibly where transients are concerned. I'm thinking particularly of towns where they have a high population turnover like Flin Flon, The Pas, Thompson. By the time it was legal for them to go ahead and put a lien on the thing the guy may be long gone. So you have to have a happy medium some place and we think that twenty days is sufficient. The other thing that I think we have to bear in mind is that uniformity is a good thing. This is not something that I intend to live by 100 percent, but I think whenever possible if we can get uniform legislation I think it will be to the benefit of all.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 9. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI presented Bill No. 9, an Act to amend The Highways Protection Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, again it's a very simple bill and it's something that has come about as a result of twinning of highways and also I suppose due partly to the perimeter, where every time you get controlled highways you have to have controlled access and service roads. What this bill does is give authority to the Motor Transport Board to deal with these matters. Apparently the way the wording is in the Act at the moment, there's some question when a person makes an application to have an access, whether it's for a garage or motel or for a dwelling onto a service road. At the present time we have two bodies that deal with it. One is our own Department which is the Director of Planning and Design and the other body that deals with it is the Highway Traffic and Motor Transport Board. Apparently there has been some question as to who should deal with it. It's causing some concern among people who have to make application and it's making it difficult for our people to decide at which time it should go to one body or the other one.

By passing the three parts of this legislation it's going to make it very clear that in the future if you want to make an application for access to a service road, from the service road to a highway, you will apply to the Traffic Board. I like that idea because it takes it out of the political arena. The person that applies now, half of the applications go to the Director of Planning and Design which really, if it's a critical thing, he has to phone me up and I have to make a decision, and if it happens to be a New Democrat that's applying for an access I'm put in a very embarrassing position. I would rather have it that the Board makes the decision and

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) if it's good or bad I couldn't care less. They'll make that decision and they'll be responsible to answer for it. I think that this is probably the best part of it, that it will give the Board the right to make these decisions without going to elected bureaucrats that may be swayed by one political affiliation.

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

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, when I first looked over the bill I thought it was quite a straightforward application for some definitions; the entrance to a highway and exit from a highway and a service road are new terminology insofar as highway construction is concerned. But after listening to the Minister's explanation, I'm beginning to wonder now if there isn't some ulterior motive in asking for these amendments. However, because the Minister is a straightforward type of person and one would never suspect him of doing anything devious, we're going to accept this bill at its face value and if there are any questions that we want to ask on it we can do that in the Committee when the bill appears before Law Amendments. At this time, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to allow this to go for second reading.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, may we now proceed to second readings of public bills starting with No. 6 at the top of Page 4 of the Order Paper.

PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 6, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL presented Bill No. 6, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MCGILL: ~~Mr. Speaker, I think in this instance I can be very brief.~~ The intent of the bill is to enable the City of Brandon to grant reductions in transit rates to certain groups of people when it appears to the City Council that this would be a proper move, and the bill would enable the city to proceed with such reductions for such definite groups without frequent recourse to the Public Utilities Board. I think that this legislation would put the City of Brandon in much the same position as the City of Winnipeg is now positioned, and they are at this moment particularly concerned with transit fares for people in receipt of old age pensions.

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

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I really was in error and hadn't intended to go to the public bills introduced by private members. Now one has been proceeded with but I would really prefer if we could go back to government business which is what we should be doing and to call the Supply motion, if honourable members don't object a great deal. I hadn't intended to go to the private members' bills which are normally on Private Members' Day.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.) The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with the Department of Agriculture on the first item, the Minister's Salary. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture in trying to fulfill his duties, but I must warn him that I cannot be quite as agreeable with him at this time as I was last fall. And also, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go on record in congratulating that wonderful group of people involved with the Department of Agriculture and of course that includes so many, not just our rural representatives but so many in the agriculture service either here in this building or at the universities or elsewhere. I

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) sometimes wonder why so many capable people had to adopt such a complex situation as we have in agriculture today. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly not like at this time to forget to compliment the many 4-H members all across Manitoba. I understand that there are over 38,000 adults and youths that were contacted during a one-year period, and this to me is not politics; it's individuals participating and trying to do something for their communities.

I was rather disappointed to receive the annual agriculture report of 1968-69 only last Tuesday when we only have five or six more days and perhaps we'd be wishing to see the 1969-70 report at this time, but I imagine that this is one of the things that can be looked into and perhaps in the future can be improved upon.

Mr. Chairman, in thinking back to last fall's session when I just did not have the audacity to attack the Minister, and knowing him from the days when he was in the opposition I felt and I still feel today that his intentions of trying to be a good Minister, to serve agriculture, and will try and serve the agricultural field well. However, I think he will by now agree with me that it is one thing to criticize things and another thing to find a solution, and by now perhaps he is grasping for solutions instead of grasping for ideas to criticize. I don't blame him because unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, I'm not so sure, I'm still in that position where I'm looking for things to criticize at times.

Mr. Chairman, I should perhaps be the last person in this House to speak on agriculture doom or gloom, especially coming from the constituency of La Verendrye where we feel we still have quite a few bright spots in our favour, and fortunately my constituency has not been affected as adversely as many other parts of Manitoba. But believe it or not, there still are quite a few bright spots left in Manitoba but there are also a lot of problems, as all of us know and have heard from time to time, and not just those looming on the horizon but also appearing as some of our very immediate problems. Last fall I mentioned one of the problems that some of our farmers were encountering as far as buying their equipment, and I was basically thinking of tractors, and it seems that while the story has been somewhat hushed up by now, perhaps when the reports of the Task Force and some of the committees come out, we can maybe hear more on this subject.

I want at this time, Mr. Chairman, to compliment the Minister and his department in seeing fit to establish, or at least making plans to establish some of the veterinary clinics. I know that very much could be said in this respect in fact from each constituency. This is something that just had to be looked into. I don't know what the plans are or what the plans are going to be, and when the Minister last year jovially expressed the thought of perhaps we are entering an age of veticare, and while I don't really think that it was a serious suggestion, it may be closer than we think. I hope we can hear more as we progress with the estimates on this subject because I'm one of those that believe that either clinics or veterinary help is part of the lifeblood and success of any community, and certainly many of the problems that are encountered with livestock in agriculture farmers' income is certainly based on this element.

I was rather disappointed to see the reports of our Provincial Soils Training Service. Here again I wish we had the latest report because apparently the 1967-68 tests show that perhaps less than 11 - I should say the 1968-69 - fewer than 21,000 tests were made compared to over 33,000 in the period of 1967-68. Now there may be various reasons for this; I don't know. It may be that our agriculture situation is becoming so grim that perhaps we cannot really blame some of the farmers for not showing quite the interest that they did at one time, especially not too long ago when our prices were on a different level than they are today.

I was happy to hear that loan assistance will be given to some of our fur farmers. I think these people have been taking a rapping for quite a few years now and I think a rapping far beyond what many of us are aware. I know that in my area, and especially quite a few spots in the area of the Honourable Member for Emerson, we've had a lot of problems in this respect and I hope that this loan assistance will be made available to this industry. Instead of declining, this is one of the industries that I feel should definitely be growing. I think that we all know that our weather conditions and other factors make Manitoba perhaps one of the better areas for expanding in the fur industry. A lot has been said about raising different coloured mink and what have you, and still they tell me that Sweden and Canada are two of the finest areas to be able to grow these animals. I'd like to encourage the Minister that more research should be dealt with by this government, not just on the basis of testing low cost feeds but also in regard to marketing some of these furs.

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd)

The loan assistance that was mentioned by the Honourable Minister the other day, or some time ago, definitely is essential and I hope it is a step in the right direction, that some credit through the Agricultural Credit Corporation must be granted and I believe it will be granted wherever possible because these fur farmers very often go through periods of real drought, if you wish to call it that way. I'm happy to hear that while there are quite a few reports, as I mentioned before in the Honourable Member for Emerson's area, I hear now that some of the reports are perhaps not as serious, that they are not going to be quitting completely and at least are keeping some of their better stock on hand.

Mr. Chairman, I was very happy to see that at least two new crops have been added to the insurance program. I don't think anybody can brag too much as far as adding hail insurance is concerned because I think it was long overdue. I'm glad to see that tame buckwheat, while perhaps may not be grown in many of the constituencies represented, but I'm glad to see that added because it can be quite a hazard with the frost conditions and other things entering, which by the way is a common danger and I hope it will be covered. And also the fact that grain corn will now be added in - not all of the areas, I understand, but most of the areas - and I think this will help a lot of districts in the near future.

I think the insurance reserve fund has reached the stage where the Agriculture Department can certainly look forward to taking a few more chances in giving a little more help as far as the insurance is concerned, especially in certain areas that are not wealthy, and I hope that the Minister will look into this, because this is an element that if the money is starting to accumulate, surely we can give more coverage in many fields such as wheat, oats, barley, rapeseed and many of the other special crops.

I was very enthused about the representation made by the Manitoba Stock Growers Association and also the Manitoba Farm Bureau. I'm sure the Minister must have been enthused - at least I hope he is because there are a number of recommendations in their reports that can certainly be made to good use so far as agriculture is concerned. It seems to me that these groups are perhaps one of the few associations left that are still willing to toe their own line and not ask for too much help as far as government help is concerned, and it seems that they wish to make a success without asking for everything. I think they're very much aware that even in their situation at this time, as the financial situation of our agriculture people continues to decline, I'm sure that their problems are increasing and not declining. But they have been willing and they have been a group of people striving to diversify and striving to make the necessary farming operation changes in the hope of being able to bring more cash to their operations.

I think they are also very much aware that with the declining prices of grain that their burdens have increased. While we are inclined to think very often because of the grains having a lesser price than some time ago, and we don't have to go back too far in time really, that these people should be floating on easy street, and I think we realize by the brief they presented to all of us that this is certainly not true, and I'm sure that they're very concerned as to what kind of advance or percentage of increases will be allowed - and I maybe shouldn't use the term "allowed", it's perhaps not a matter of allowing or not allowing - but they are certainly concerned at some of the industries expanding faster than would be good for the whole enterprise.

I think also, Mr. Chairman, that they certainly pointed out to the Minister, because they did in their brief, that they are very much concerned of so many things, and while it may not be in order to mention the estate tax, and some of the educational problems or for that matter the White Paper, these are some of the problems that not only exist with them but exist and just add to more woe than's already existing. But we must give them credit that they are a group that take the trouble of finding out, doing some of their own investigation and finding out some of their problems and are not afraid to spend some of their own money to improve themselves. I'm sure that the Minister's aware that they hope that their industry will not be increasing by greater amounts than seven percent - I think one of the members mentioned that the other day - but it was also mentioned in their brief. So they must be concerned, and are concerned I'm sure, that they won't be finding themselves with all the huge expenditures that they have had. I'm sure they're wondering while they may be sitting fairly well today, just what is going to happen to them with the grain situation moving in on them and I hope that something can be done to help control part of this situation.

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.)

It reminded me, Mr. Chairman, just a couple of years ago, and perhaps not even that long, when the present Minister of Agriculture brought in a resolution concerning the world situation of marketing, when he specifically mentioned - and I know it's been mentioned in this House several times - that when two-thirds of the people of the world go to bed hungry, surely we must find a way of marketing, a way of advocating sales to people who are so desperately in need. Well, in fact at this point, Mr. Chairman, I think the present Minister holds quite a record of forming resolutions and being very much concerned about our Food Marketing Research Branch and the two-price wheat system that him and I agreed on, although we might admit perhaps that \$3.00 is rather a high figure at this time on the first 2,000 bushels, but I think he would agree with me that the time has now come - and I think basically we agreed on most of those resolutions we had at that time - that the time has now come that the Minister has these tools in his hands; the Minister has this help available to a great extent; and I hope since these facilities are now finally available to you, I hope that you will make use of them. I realize that as far as your help is concerned, concerning the help from the Cabinet in the agricultural field, it may be limited, and probably even your agriculture help as far as the back-benchers may be limited to a great extent, but you certainly cannot say that you have not the material as far as the department is concerned and I hope that some of these resolutions that have come up in the past will be acted on and I have the confidence that they will.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I should be saying a few words as far as the Credit Union Societies are concerned. (For some reason that didn't taste like water, but I guess it is). There was one step taken in the one Bill that came up the other day as far as changing the rate of interest and I was happy to see this, but with so many of our credit unions having assets of over \$10 million and more, I just can't really see that it's fair to this Minister, fair to the Minister of Agriculture, that these credit unions should be handled under the Department of Agriculture. I've said this several times and I hope eventually it'll catch on and maybe there can be a change. And there's no reflection that there's anything wrong with the Agriculture Department handling this, but I think it should be handled on a different basis and I don't believe that the Minister should have to be a chartered accountant or what have you to understand some of the problems that come up in agriculture when they're really problems of a different nature.

Mr. Chairman, naturally we are still very much aware as far as agriculture is concerned, it is still our largest single industry in Manitoba and sometimes it makes you wonder - and I think we have to agree that the responsibility of a successful agricultural program in Manitoba depends so much on the Federal Government, if we like it or not, that sometimes it is hard to draw a line as to how far we should go in Manitoba.

I want to encourage the present Minister - not only encourage but I want to suggest to him in very strong terms that what he was advocating in criticism when he was on this side of the House that something should be done - and again I repeat - that some of the tools are now in your hands, Mr. Minister, and I hope that we are going to really go after this problem and take advantage of your sincere enthusiasm and your desire to help solve them, but I believe they are now in your hands and some of these problems must be solved.

I guess, Mr. Chairman, I could spend quite a bit of time talking about getting research for dairy programs and I think they need some discussion. I have a little bit more that I wish to say about them later on, but talking along the line of marketing in the Throne Speech, I should first perhaps say this, that as far as some of our subsidy programs are concerned - a lot could be said and these definitely include our federal subsidies - I believe that problems are being created. I can't say that they're causing as much of a problem in my own constituency as they must across Manitoba, but here again I think western Canada imported what? - approximately perhaps 50 million pounds of butter last year. I don't know what share of that is Manitoba's, but if we get to that point surely we can encourage the type of farmers that the Minister was talking about the other day to perhaps go into small dairy operations.

But also talking along the line of marketing, in the Throne Speech we read that a major program of market development will be established. In addition, a modern electronic mail and farm accounting system will be made available to farmers to help them make the complex management decisions which confront them. This is fine and they are beautiful words and I hope the intention is right here, but in an area so broad and so vast, I don't know how any provincial government for that matter can begin to perhaps not solve the largest percentage of these problems but surely we can begin, and I hope it is the intention of this government to do so.

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.)

Mr. Chairman, what the Throne Speech refers to when they refer to certain technical and financial assistance can be made available to municipalities who wish to undertake conservation programs, if it is the intention or perhaps it is the intention to preserve the natural resources and maintain the productivity of our agriculture base, I would like to hear more about this program. While the Minister has elaborated somewhat I think it certainly needs more information. I was certainly in accordance with my colleague the House Leader when he mentioned the other day, in his reply to the Throne Speech, that this government must intensify its efforts to give leadership in the field of diversification of crops, must continue with its farm management program, some principal advice from the university and others; and again I say, these are lovely words and good intentions, but I believe the time has come when we need more than just words.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to say very little concerning some of the suggestions made by the Federal Government as far as our quota system is concerned, not just because I'm partly embarrassed by the type of program that they've come out. I was astounded -- the more you seem to study this thing, I think it'll perhaps help fewer people than was intended in the first place and I'm sure by now it will, and I don't want to be going into this at great length because it's not this Minister's fault, but I do wish to go on record that unless certain changes are made I can certainly not accept these suggestions regardless from what government they come, whether they be Liberal government in Ottawa or elsewhere, although I do admit and I'm happy to see, at least there was some suggestion, at least some correspondence with the western Canada, that they realize now that there are farmers living in western Canada and this is appreciated. But unless there's certain changes made - stories like the Honourable Member for Rhineland mentioned, that this would perhaps give \$50 million worth of cash to Manitoba than before or the Honourable Member for Gladstone mentioned the other day and he talked of a figure that would perhaps only inject approximately \$5 million, and I understand he's already changed that figure to a lower figure by now - then we have some problems. But I am glad that at least they recognize that there are these provinces in Canada; now perhaps one of these days we can do something to help them.

I was also very appalled the other day when I heard the fact that 130 - 140 - 120 millions - take whatever figure you like - that it would practically only, you might say the way it looks at this stage, practically most of this help - and this could turn out to be 30 million, who knows - most of it will be going to Saskatchewan, and I'm glad to see it go to Saskatchewan but in the meantime we're also concerned about our problems in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few words to say on something that I'm not really sure if I'm capable of bringing out, but I was glad to be able to read the Manitoba brief on pricing on non-quota feed grains that was presented to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture, I believe last week; in fact, I guess it's about a week ago tomorrow, and I appreciated receiving a copy, and while I must say at the outset that I am not completely happy with the idea of suggesting to the Federal Government that these are the things which should be done, I for one cannot go along with quite a few of these ideas although at this point I must say that I may be speaking for myself. I have not caucused this thing in regards to my attitude or ideas on this, but I am very much concerned as an individual and very much concerned not only for my constituency, I'm sure that this will apply in quite a few constituencies, and I do appreciate that the Minister and his group at least took the trouble of making the Federal Government aware that there were problems in western Canada, and especially as far as feed grains were concerned, but I cannot agree with some of the thoughts that were presented to the Federal Government in this brief, or presented by his colleagues, and I guess, Mr. Chairman, that none of us really want to take the time to review the whole situation, just how it started.

I might say this, that perhaps in 1948, if we want to go back to that time, when things started to take their natural course after the last war, and I'm sure I don't have to go along the line and talk of the temporary Wheat Reserves Act of 1956 and of course the then famous Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act of 1957. It seemed that while these Acts were passed and while we had the dry year - not only at home, also abroad - of 1961, and as the years rolled by, either we had crop failures or people like Alvin Hamilton, perhaps I could use the word "boasted" that they could sell the wheat and perhaps he did, I don't intend to go into that argument, and we could possibly even mention the fact that at some time there was a little noise out of the Honourable Mr. Sharp that perhaps we should just be a little bit cautious about growing wheat at some stage or other, but things regardless were still not really going too bad

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) as far as the agricultural situation was concerned, and of course they still picked up or went fairly well when the rush in the Chinese sales came about, and we managed quite well till 1968. And even in 1968 companies were still spending millions of dollars on fertilizer plants, warehouses, farm supply houses. Everybody was talking soils tests, continuous cropping; cow-calf operations weren't really operating well; big tractors, big combines and a lot of easy credit. Yes, Mr. Chairman, everything seemed to be going fairly well till then. And then, of course, things started changing and they have changed drastically where we're experiencing one of the worst agricultural recesses perhaps in the history of Canada.

Perhaps part of this blame lies with the Canadian Wheat Board, perhaps some of it with the Federal Government, perhaps some of it with the Provincial Government, and perhaps some of it even with the individual farmer, or the individual producer or operator himself. But today finally the word is out: grow less wheat or grow none at all. And this -- Mr. Chairman, all I intend to point out on that point is this: that it has turned out to be a rather lousy long-range program and I think it should be the intention of this government and the Federal Government that we must and should encourage a program of a different type of a long-range program certainly that could work out different than this one has worked out.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe these were some of the reasons. I'm sure that we could go on and talk about some of the things that happened in '59; and of course the famous bill of 1960 that the Honourable Member of Morris was so active with, I'm sure that this could be brought into the records, but I don't really see that -- it's perhaps not necessary to dwell on that. But I'd like to say that perhaps these were some of the reasons why the brief by the Manitoba Government on pricing of non-quota feed grains was presented to the House of Commons or the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Well, Mr. Chairman, in this brief I find myself in disagreement with quite a few of the requests made by this government. As I said before, I say so on my own behalf and not necessarily on behalf of my colleagues, and I'm referring to, Mr. Chairman, the position taken by this government concerning the request that feed mills be not allowed to operate under the same basis as they are operating now. And the fact, as I started out before -- 1948 I believe it was, this is when the Wheat Board got all the powers of handling oats and barley, and then of course during the '50's we had no regulations really, and then the one I was referring to, 1960, where the Wheat Board provided for the exemption of deliveries of feed grains to the mills, those mills designated by the Board, one of the reasons, of course, being it would be hard to police and control feed mills which were selling outside of the regulations of the Board.

Now, Mr. Chairman, up to here I agree, but the brief goes on to say or intimate that feed mills having this kind of a setup are partly the cause of distress prices where barley and oats are concerned, and therefore the brief is asking that the situation be brought under full control of the Canadian Wheat Board, and also large feed lots, large livestock production units controlled by non-farm corporate business. Now my quarrel is not with the latter. I don't wish to bring that out. I think this is fair enough, but my concern lies with not letting the feed mills operate freely. I don't intend to go into the brief at this time -- I believe most of the members perhaps have one anyway and if they don't I'm sure they can acquire one from the Minister, but, Mr. Chairman, as the Chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board has quite often indicated or said, under the present system as it now stands we have the right to sell between farmer and farmer, we have the right to sell between farmer and feed mill, and we have the right to sell to the Canadian Wheat Board, and I fully agree that prices of feed grains, and for that matter all grains, are far below what they should be. I fully agree with that. There's no question and anybody would be a fool not to agree with that. But I feel it's hardly fair to blame feed mills for these so-called distress prices of today. Well, the fact that you're not blaming them, if you ask that they be under full control perhaps this is an indirect way of blaming them, but I wish to point out and it's my opinion as far as the feed mill prices are concerned -- they reflect, -- I agree with that -- they certainly reflect on prices, but I for one do not believe that feed mills set. They reflect, I'll admit, but they do not set the grain prices, and I think it's just merely a myth to think that in the minds of many people or perhaps, well say many people -- these feed mill operators are being picked out as a scapegoat for distress grain prices of today, and I hope -- if I misunderstood this I've read the brief wrong, and it's my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the feed mills that I know, and I know quite a few ones --

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) (Interjection) -- yes, there are about 14, 15, 16 feed mills around the Niverville, Grunthal, Landmark, Steinback area and not only that, they are a very competitive group. There is keen competition there and they're not hurting the prices at all.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Don't use the word "competitive".

MR. BARKMAN: And they have competition amongst themselves. Not only are they a vital thing in building up the rural community, they actually - and I hope it's not a square word - they actually help create business and opportunities for the farmer in that particular area. I don't know how many feed mills there are in Manitoba but I can just say, as far as ours are concerned, in many cases grain is taken for trade, such as fertilizers, farm implements, and one could name a number of articles.

Mr. Chairman, I remember the former Member for I believe it was Ethelbert Plains, taking a complete different view than I do here today, and I wonder if the present Minister or the former member - and I'm not here to try and blame Mr. Kawchak for anything when he's gone - I'm really wondering if we're referring to the same type of feed mill operation that they must have been when they spoke against a certain resolution, I believe it was in 1967 or '68 I'm not sure. I'm wondering if we're really referring to the same type of operation; and I can also remember the former member for Lakeside, Mr. Campbell, saying that he had been of the same opinion, that as far as he was concerned he agreed with the two honourable gentlemen at one time, but after studying the situation and accepting the conditions of grain sales today, he had changed his mind. And there, Mr. Chairman, when a great mind like that changes, I believe there must be many reasons for it, leave alone the fact that people of the Manitoba Farm Bureau and other organizations are quite firm in saying that this is one of the steps that should not take place. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I'm inclined to suggest that if you're looking for an active farming community make sure you have some feed mill competition in that area. To me, most feed mills are an incentive to help move more grain or to encourage small live-stock operations who cannot afford some of the equipment that is needed to mix their modern dry feeds, or modern-day feeds, whatever you wish to call them. I'm of the firm belief that they improve and encourage their own operations, and I think the idea that feed mills are encouraging distress prices is nearly in every case completely false. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I doubt if really many members are familiar with some of the rules laid down by the Canadian Wheat Board that feed mills have to adhere to, and I'd like to at this time just point out a few - I shall not be long on this; I don't intend to read the whole thing - but here is the brief that was sent in by the rural feed mills of Manitoba and Alberta and presented last Tuesday.

But to point out under what strict rules some of these feed mills operate, it astonished me when I read this for the first time. And here are some of the conditions that a feed mill operator has to comply with. 1. Only to purchase grain from a permit holder. 2. To record the correct quantity of grain bought in the permit book of the seller. 3. Only to sell the grain in the form of processed food within the province in which the mill is located. 4. To provide the Canadian Wheat Board with such statistics of its operation as the Board requires; and 5. To post on its premises the prices at which it offers to buy grain from permit holders. This brief shows . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . point out to the member that he has about five minutes left.

MR. BARKMAN: In that case I shall hurry, Mr. Chairman, but I wish to point out in this report it isn't just by mere sheer luck that feed mill operators operate. They have to offer an efficient operation or they just would not be able to satisfy the Canadian Wheat Board regulations. I'd like to perhaps point out one or two things in here that I thought were of main importance when we keep on talking about feed mills causing or reflecting on prices, and I thought the one item that they had in their brief here - and I wish to find that; I figure this statement of this paragraph they had in there was about as true as the fact that they were setting prices, and it says here: "To blame the rural feed mills for the present low prices of farmer to farmer sales is like blaming the low reading on a thermometer for causing the cold weather rather than the cold weather causing the low reading on the thermometer." And I think that's just about as factual as you can get any example. I'm not going to go into the brief - I was before - but they have to have their prices. They are fixed and they have to be posted. When I say "fixed" that could be taken the other way. They have to be fixed to this poster and the prices of course are on a very competitive basis.

Now I believe, again, either the producer or the purchaser for that matter, they do get

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) full protection and there is keen competition, and I wish to conclude on this matter, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out again, in my opinion, and I'm sure that I don't have to say that it's also the opinion of the feed mills, but the grain prices are reflected by their sales but certainly they do not set prices, and in fact, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the whole matter -- I'm glad that this government took concern on the issue but I thought it was my duty to say something on this and I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Morris is much more capable and knowledgeable on this subject than I am, but it is a concern to many growing communities and I wish that this had not been protested in the brief.

I would just quickly - there are a few minutes left, Mr. Chairman - I would just like to say a few things concerning some of the statements that the Minister made last Friday. I realize that we have today in our province many farmers, aged 50 - I believe the Honourable Member for Pembina said the average farmer's age was 57 but we all know that we have many farmers aged 50 or more - who do not intend to modernize or expand but who should perhaps be good operators; as was mentioned, the cow-calf operations; I'd like to add the fur farmers' operation, and I'm sure there are many others, and I hope that this government, or I wish to plead with this government, they should have a good look at these farmers and try to give them the necessary credit so that they can continue to make a proper living on their farms. Some of these people have spent all their lives without enormous investments in buildings and the like and I'm sure that we realize that they have no intention of doing so now.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that -- I wish to conclude at this time with the thought that we must have in mind. We've come to the fork, I believe, where we must have in mind two groups of agricultural people. We have the larger groups. Perhaps we should have extended the university and some of the other help - I thought the Minister indicated that not too much of that kind of help might be made available. I still think they need some help. I don't think -- the subsidy should not be considered in their respect in these larger operators, but we also have the other group. I don't think that we can just forget them. I think that these are the groups that have been around a long time and they're confused at this time, but maybe with certain help from the government - and they needn't necessarily all be in the form of subsidies - I think we can also make life enjoyable for those people.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, due to the lack of interest in the government in agriculture, I move the House do now adjourn.

A MEMBER: Ayes and nays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ayes and Nays? Call in the members. I'm sorry. I'm sort of momentarily at a loss here. Call a vote by voice on the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party that the House do now adjourn?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Liberal Party, then, is moving that the Committee rise and report.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there three members who will support this motion? Ayes and Nays. Call in the Members.

For the information of the members, there is a motion by the Leader of the Liberal Party that the Chairman leave the Chair.

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

Yeas, 22; Nays, 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

. continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas): Probably some members are wondering why I am rising to speak on Agriculture but I do represent a constituency, Mr. Chairman, that has probably the most northern farmers in the province. -- (Interjection) -- Joe says there are some in Thompson but I haven't seen them yet. Around The Pas we have the Pasquia Land Settlement and Rose Island, which are farming areas, and in the Interlake area and around the Red Rose district, and various Reserves, there are a number of farm areas in that area of my constituency. These are probably the most pioneer farmers in Manitoba, many of them opening up new lands in these areas. I'd like to congratulate the Minister on the excellent job that he has done thus far. He had certainly been most responsive to requests that I have made and his department has been very responsive.

I would just like to mention in passing that there are a number of farm projects on the Reserves in the Interlake area. There are a number of very successful cattle ranches plus other farming projects. There is one problem which I've referred to the Minister, and I would like to just bring up again, and that is the Treaty Indian people living on Reserves are not quite positive whether the new loan arrangements can apply to them, whether they are applicable to them, whether they are eligible or not.

There's another aspect of the Department of Agriculture which maybe a number of members are not familiar with and that is its involvement with Indian and Metis Co-ops in northern Manitoba. In The Pas constituency we have the Moose Lake Co-op, the Easterville Co-op, and the Dauphin River Co-op, all of which are functioning very well and have really been beneficial to the people in the communities affected. I'll have to admit that this development was begun by the previous government and that they have done something beneficial for the people of northern Manitoba in this regard. But there is one small problem in this area that I would like to bring up and it's just that the Minister has been so busy assisting the farmers of Manitoba that I haven't been able to catch his ear on this matter yet - not that he hasn't been responsive to it - and that is the problem that was reflected to me in Easterville in regards to their co-operative store which comes under the assistance of the Co-operative Department or branch of his department. The people there refer to their co-op store there as "the government store." I'm not opposed to this concept of a government store, but the people there don't seem to have full appreciation of how co-operatives work and I would hope that this branch of the department might be able to use a more developmental approach, or use an approach that will help people understand more what is involved in a consumer co-op, and how it can best work and how it really belongs to them and not to the government.

I have another question that the Minister might like to -- and I probably could have found this had I done my homework well enough and gone through all the reports, but there is reference made in the report to various inputs to the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood and the Manitoba Metis Federation, and I wonder if the Minister could inform us later if the two groups have increased, decreased or remained the same, and what is happening in that area.

The most important thing I wanted to talk on, though, and I don't think the Minister is in disagreement with me here, the most important thing I think that's happening in my area that should be changed and must be changed, is the problem of the federal-provincial Agreement, of the FRED-ARDA agreement and how it works in the Interlake of Manitoba. It is my understanding that these funds, federal and provincial funds that go into this sort of project, can go in for expenses and costs above and beyond normal costs. That is, if a municipality is spending its own money in certain areas, FRED-ARDA money can be used for physical projects above and beyond the municipal input. I understand this works this way with government districts and municipalities and other areas in the Interlake region. I also understand that the purpose of the FRED-ARDA Agreement is area development; that is, to build up within an area certain projects, to assist communities to develop infrastructure and physical projects, to develop that particular area.

Now anyone who's been in the Interlake, Mr. Chairman, knows that the most underdeveloped areas in the Interlake are the Indian Reserves. These are the areas most in need of this sort of FRED-ARDA development. Now, this is not because the people in that area are not willing to develop and do these projects; it has mostly been a problem of government approach and government attitude in these areas. Mr. Chairman, if the most serious problem in area development lies in the Reserves in that region, then certainly there's something wrong when the Reserves are the only areas not covered by the FRED-ARDA agreement in terms of

(MR. McBRIDE cont'd.)... physical development. For some reason, municipalities can be assisted; local government districts can be assisted; even provincial projects can be assisted; but any projects which would normally come under the Indian Affairs Branch cannot be assisted with FRED-ARDA money. I don't know - this is the dumbest, the most stupid thing I've seen since I've been involved in government, that this is allowed to happen and just continues. I could use other words, Mr. Chairman, but they are probably unparliamentary.

Now I know that the Minister is also concerned about this problem of the leaving of the Reserves out of physical projects in the Interlake area. I think the main problem there lies in that the majority of the money and therefore input comes from the Federal Government. For some reason they have been unwilling to get involved in the Reserves with this type of FRED-ARDA program.

I think that's pretty well the summary of my comments with regard to agriculture. I feel very uneasy talking about this subject. I'm not entirely up-to-date or familiar with it. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, this, as the Minister indicated when he opened the discussion on his estimates, is the first time that he will be piloting his own estimates through the House, that the legislative program that he intends to produce this year is essentially the philosophical approach to agriculture that the present government entertains, and that the estimates are those that have been compiled by the present government. I was rather interested in the comment that he made when he began his remarks, and all one can say is that it's most certainly a refreshing change from what we used to hear from him. I repeat this comment of his: "I want to say that agriculture, of course, is still a very important industry in the Province of Manitoba and that, despite the fact that we have some difficulties in the industry at the present time, it is my belief that it will continue to be one of the most important areas of economic activity." I ask you, Mr. Chairman, with your knowledge of the honourable gentleman, what his comments would have been had he been on this side of the House. He simply referred to "some difficulties" in the agriculture industry. Well, my goodness, what he would have said when he was on this side of the House would have filled about five Hansards, about the difficulties that agriculture does face - and there are serious difficulties. I suppose it's an indication of that philosophical approach that we can learn to expect from the Minister now, now that he has the department. He says that it will mean that the Department of Agriculture will take a much broader look and we will really get involved in the whole human problem in agro Manitoba, the main development and problems which we have to face today.

Yes, I agree it's a beautiful sentiment and I hope the Minister doesn't stumble in this because I would sincerely like to see him succeed - and I mean this sincerely - in all his efforts in attempting to improve the conditions of agriculture, but I hope that he is not unaware of the possibility that some farmers are content with their particular lot. They may not be enjoying the standards of living that many of us feel we would like to see them enjoy, but they're enjoying it. There are many farmers who are content to have some livestock, a little bit of grain, and perhaps their needs are fewer. I hope the Minister is not like the troop of Boy Scouts who came home and reported to their Troop Leader that they had succeeded in helping an old lady across the street, and the Troop Leader asked them why it took so many of them to help her across the street and they said, "Well, she didn't want to go." I hope the Minister isn't going to impose his standards on people in the rural areas, although I am frank to admit that in many cases there is a desire for some improvement amongst farmers; improvement in their standard of living; improvement of many of the conditions under which they are farming today; and I wish him well and I can assure him that he will get the full co-operation of members on this side of the House in his efforts to help farmers, but I hope sincerely that it isn't an effort to push people in a direction that they are not desirous of going.

One can get some idea of the situation in agriculture and the conditions under which farmers are currently operating when they go back over the farm income figures over past years, and I only go back to 1951, and I choose that year 1951 for a very simple reason. It happens to be the year that farmers in Manitoba - and these are Manitoba figures that I am quoting - enjoyed the highest realized net income in history.

In 1951, the highest realized net income was \$170,539,000. Now that realized net income was derived from a gross income of \$299,500,000. Now, in 1966, which indeed is the second best year that farmers have had in this country, in this province, the realized net income in

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.)... that particular year was \$168,087,000, and that was derived, Mr. Chairman, from a gross income of \$412,000,000. Now there is an increase here from \$299,500,00 to \$412,000,000 in gross income to get the same realized net income. One then gets an idea of the cost-price squeeze and the rate at which expenses have gone up. In 1968, which is the last year for which I have figures, and I presume that there are preliminary figures for 1969 out at the moment but I just haven't had the opportunity of getting them, and perhaps just as well because I would be ashamed, I suppose, to put those figures on the record, but in 1968 the realized net income of farmers in the Province of Manitoba was \$121,000,000. It's a drop from \$168,000,000 in 1966; that is, \$49,000,000 less, and yet the gross income of farmers in those two years wasn't that great a difference. The gross income in 1968 was \$410,000,000 as compared to \$412,000,000 in 1966, and as compared to \$299,500,000 in 1951.

So here you have this situation, where the gross income continues to rise and we have a tendency, or at least there is a tendency in a good many areas, to look at gross income figures and say, "My, how wonderful those farmers are doing," without taking into consideration the net income figures, and I'm using realized net income figures, and I think that there is a tendency on the part of some of our economists and some of the people who are giving out agriculture income figures to use net income rather than realized net. It must be understood that "realized net income" is different than "net income" and it differs in this respect, that it doesn't include, or it doesn't add inventory. Net income, in a year such as this, is a meaningless figure because it adds all the grain that is on the farm for which there is no income, so therefore it is a misleading figure to use, and I think that the realized net income is the proper income figure to use. It is the actual cash that a farmer has left after he has sold all the products that he has or is capable of selling and all expenses have been paid.

During this same period, 1951, to 1968, taxes, which includes property and land taxes, rose from 8.9 -- well, almost \$9,000,000 in 1951, to \$18,350,000 in 1968. That's over double that farmers are paying in taxes, but these taxes are included in the overall expenses which were, in 1951, \$128,000,000 as compared to \$288,000,000 today. In other words, the expenses of the farmers they are paying now, in order to carry on the same kind of operation, are about \$160,000,000 more than they were in 1951 -- I should say \$111,000,000. So that gives one some idea in using figures, and figures really do not tell the whole story, because it will give you an average and by that average some farmers may be doing well and some farmers may be not doing so well.

Last year we asked the Minister to call the Committee of the House together to attempt to determine where the problem areas were. I think it could be generally conceded, or accepted, that the great problem amongst farmers would be amongst those who were single crop enterprises -- wheat farmers in particular. But how many were involved? How many had access to markets outside the Canadian Wheat Board? How many were able to dispose of grain by other methods? It is a difficult thing to assume, and it would be necessary, in order to have an accurate picture and to take corrective measures, to have a far better idea of where the real problem is and who was suffering from the present crisis in agriculture.

Well, the Minister failed to call that committee together. He had the officials of his department compile some sort of a report which told us exactly what we knew anyway, and really did not get down to the nuts and bolts of this problem, and so because of this he was unable to bring about what we feel would have been the corrective measures, and I hope that it's still not too late to do something about the real problem, and no one can under-emphasize the difficulty of attempting to come to grips with the problem in the grain farming area today.

Now, the Minister talks about conflicts and the difficulty in getting to Ottawa and dealing with Ottawa on these various matters. I made a suggestion during my remarks on the Speech from the Throne in which I felt that it was time that we come to the realization that we are not going to get Ottawa to deal with these problems. The Prime Minister was out here a week or so ago and he said, he made a statement to the effect that all that the West had to do in order to get their problems recognized was to elect more Liberal members to the House of Commons from the West. Well, I've heard that before. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, in 1957, or in 1958, that did happen. All the western members were from one political party, and from that point on I would agree with the Prime Minister that you can take effective action. But what happened? What happened? Eastern Canada -- and during the course of the election campaign, and I don't want to rehash elections, but during the course of the election campaign in 1962, the big campaign issue in Eastern Canada and particularly in Toronto, was that the West was getting

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . too much from Diefenbaker. And so it doesn't really matter how many you have from this side. Eastern Canada -- and I might say it doesn't really matter what Party they're from. The fact is that Eastern Canada is not interested in dealing with the problems of the West and they have the majority of the members from that part of the country, and that is the situation, as I said during the course of my remarks on the Throne Speech Debate, that Louis Riel recognized, and we face the same situation today, and the only way I believe we can get out of that situation is to start dealing with our own problems, and as I say, over the years we have talked about, whenever agriculture was being debated in this House, everybody would give a sigh and say, well now, what a terrible thing that Ottawa has these responsibilities. Well, I'm sick and tired of having Ottawa take all these responsibilities. I think it's time that we came to grips with these problems ourselves.

Now, farm organizations - and this does not apply only to political parties. You see the same thing in farm organizations. I haven't seen the farm organization yet, even on a national basis, indeed even on a regional basis, that could really agree on a policy that really came to grips with the problems, and you have this situation in farm organizations today, really not so much in what has to be said, or what is going to be said, as to who is going to say it. We have one farm organization criticizing the other one and advocating a certain course of action, and in most cases it's a watered-down view of what really the problem is. It's watered down because they are doing their own rationalizing within the organization itself, and it just will not work. There are so many differences, between agriculture, for example, in Eastern Canada and agriculture in Western Canada. The wheat problem is peculiar to the West, the dairy problem is more largely an Eastern problem, and where it benefits Eastern Canada it can work to the disadvantage of the west. So you have this conflict all the time in agricultural policies, and it doesn't seem to me that there is going to be any change in that direction. As I said earlier, it doesn't matter who is in power. It happens not only within political parties but it happens within farm organizations as well, and they are not supposed to be political, although I sometimes. . . .

MR. USKIW: Better talk to your friends in the front row.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . wonder about that. Now the Minister seemed to attempt to create the impression, when he spoke here earlier, that a new dawn has arrived, a new era in agriculture, simply because he is now the Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Hear, Hear.

MR. JORGENSEN: What he failed to have taken into consideration is the great number of things that have been done over the years by various parties, in Ottawa and in this province. Every measure that is brought in is designed to deal with a particular problem, and the only difficulty is that the problems change, and we attempt to justify the policies that were implemented years ago by saying, well, they were good then and they must be good now. I don't think that is necessarily the case because no one can say that the particular difficulty that we're faced with today is one that we have ever faced before. It is an entirely new problem and one that has to be dealt with by, I think, a new approach, and if the Minister has the answer to that, I for one am going to be very grateful, but in the comments that I've heard him make here in this House and the brief that he sent to the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons dealing with feed grains, I don't think - I don't think that it's so much a question of a new approach that the Minister is taking as an attempt to justify his own philosophical approach to agriculture and applying his Socialistic tendencies to the solving of agricultural problems, and heavens, if there ever was evidence of how they do not work, surely it's evident in agriculture! If, for example, it was possible to solve all of the problems of the wheat farmer by a Crown corporation, then why in heaven's name doesn't the Wheat Board solve that problem? So one can't say that by nationalizing the entire industry that the problems are going to be resolved.

Here is a quote that I found that I think is very appropriate to the Minister, because he keeps using the word "rationalizing" all the time. It comes from an essay by James Robertson, an American historian, entitled "On Various Kinds of Thinking". It goes on to say: "Few of us take the pains to study the origin of our cherished convictions. We like to continue to believe that what we have been accustomed to accept is true, and the resentments aroused when doubt is cast upon any of our assumptions, lead us to seek every manner of excuse of clinging to them. The result is that most of our so-called reasoning consists in finding arguments for going on believing as we already do. The spontaneous and loyal support of our preconceptions in this process of finding good reasons to justify our routine beliefs, is known to modern psychologists as 'rationalizing'." And the reason I read this into the record is because this is the word

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.)... that seems to be a very favourite one of the Minister and this is one that leads me to be a little bit suspicious of what he is attempting to do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said in past few weeks about the Wheat Board, and the Member for LaVerendrye made some comments when he spoke about "how we got into this wheat problem." Well, I'm not one of those that's going to join the chorus of criticism against the Canadian Wheat Board because I don't think that it's the Canadian Wheat Board's fault. I think that one can, to some extent, say that perhaps some of their pricing policies were open to question. I think perhaps one can say that there might have been better results if they had recognized the problem - or recognized the potential that existed in the feed grain market. But then here again I don't think that it's the Wheat Board's fault. If you want to put the finger of blame on anyone when you're dealing with the present crisis in the wheat industry, then I think it can be placed right at the doorstep of the Federal Government during the course of the negotiations on the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations in Geneva in 1967. Just to make sure that this point is clear and just to make sure that everybody understands what has happened, we had a crop of from 30 percent. Canada's share of the international wheat market just a few years ago was 30 percent and we've maintained that average between 25 to 30 percent pretty consistently over the years and it started to drop after 1968. Today, Canada's share of that international wheat market is 18 percent as compared to the 30 percent that we once enjoyed. That, Mr. Chairman, is sufficient to account for the lag in grain sales; that is sufficient to account for the difficulty the farmers are facing today.

In an article written by Mr. Andrew Knight which appeared in the July, 1967, edition of The Executive Magazine, Mr. Knight goes on to say this - and he's dealing with the negotiations that were taking place on the cereals agreement. The article is entitled: "The Poker Hand that Failed Us. What happened out there in the four weeks between the heady days of mid-April brinkmanship and the comparative failure of the grain producing countries' case in the final package? The plain facts seem to show that the Canadian delegation at Geneva played its cards badly in an extremely expensive game of poker. In the eyes of the urbane negotiators of the major grain importing countries, the six, Britain, Japan, Canadian brinkmanship simply was not relevant to the crowd of technical disagreements to be cleared up if a comprehensive world cereals agreement was to survive. Several of them have since complained privately that the complexities of the cereal discussions involving professionals rather than diplomats as negotiators meant that this was the one sector of the Kennedy Round not suitable to poker tactics. Their distrust of the motives behind the Canadian attitude turned into outright annoyance at the whole producer country position when Australian intransigence over the price seemingly got harder as each deadline for talks approached."

Now, what happened? Apart from a sell-out to the Americans, was that because they couldn't come to any agreement because of this intransigent attitude, the International Wheat Agreement which had been in effect - and I am sure that most grain people will say it served the interests of Canada fairly well during the period that it was in existence - the International Wheat Agreement was terminated on August 1st, 1967, the beginning of the crop year, and it was not operative, there was no agreement, no agreement operative at all for an entire year during the period of the 1967-68 crop year and it wasn't until August 1st, 1968, that the new International Grains Arrangement then became operative. During that period it was all really that the Americans needed. During that period the Americans were able to move in to every Canadian market, undercutting prices because there was no floor price on prices on wheat, no floor price because there was no agreement. Despite what the Minister may say and despite what many other people may say, in my view, selling wheat in the international grain markets is not a great deal different than selling groceries in the corner grocery store. Principles of salesmanship are just as applicable. When a customer comes along he wants the quality of the product that he asks for, he wants it in the quantities that he's prepared to buy and at a price that is competitive, and if those three features of marketing are not upheld then you lose sales, and when you lose sales you don't get them back easily. The Americans knew this and the Americans knew that when they were negotiating in Geneva, but apparently everybody knew that except the Canadian negotiators, and if there is to be any blame at all attached to anyone for the present situation then I lay it squarely at the doorstep of the Federal Government in Ottawa, the present government. So we find ourselves now in the position where it's going to be necessary for us to recapture a great part of that market if we can, or alternatively, to attempt to develop new markets.

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.)

Now the Minister has made the suggestion that he is going to devote some more money to marketing research and I commend him for a gesture in that direction, but I am hopeful that his increased expenditures on marketing research does not mean that he is going to spend less on production research because I think that that would be a tragedy. In wheat research in this country - and I'm quoting from some figures that were tabled to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture of November 5th, 1968. It's rather interesting to see the amount of money that this country, and particularly the prairies, have spent in research on a commodity that is so vital to the prairies. In the total estimates provided for the Department of Agriculture Research Branch, \$2,996,000 was allocated for research on cereal grains. Now the cash receipts from farming operations from cereal grains was \$1,208,000,000, and if you want to work out a percentage of the amount of money spent in research as a percentage of total cash receipts, it amounts to 0.25 percent of the total income in cereal grains. Now that compares to the United States who spend something like 3.4 percent of their total income on cereal crops on research. We've got a long way to go. Our total research budget this year - and I checked it just the other day - is \$45 million, that is total agricultural research budget in the House of Commons compared to something like \$850 million that is being spent by the United States. It's no wonder that the Americans got it all over us like a tent when it comes to moving into markets because they're doing a competent job and they're doing a thorough job.

And I'd also point out here that in the United States 54 percent of that total research budget is supplied by industry, and that I think is much more - in fact I know - it indicates how important it is to get people involved in this whole question of research in Canada, and I can only presume that farmers felt so secure because they had the Wheat Board that they felt there was nothing else to be done, that no effort at all has been made in this country to involve farmers into participating in research programs of their own. I recall the former Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Hamilton, when to a speech to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, he made the suggestion that farmers might consider the possibility of having a deduction made from their final wheat payment of a couple of cents a bushel or so to go into a research fund. Now, Mr. Chairman, that suggestion was greeted with the most violent criticism that I've ever heard in the House of Commons by the spokesman for the Liberal Party, who at that time was Mr. Argue, and the Leader of the New Democratic Party who thought it was a terrible thing to have farmers participate in their own business, and the debate on that particular subject went over a period of about two days before it finally died down. But it's an indication of some of the steps that have been attempted by former past Ministers to involve farmers in research in their own particular industry.

I might point out in going further down with these figures that a total of \$14 million was spent on research in agriculture in 1968. Oddly enough, four percent of the total income of cash receipts from fruits was spent on research compared to 0.5 in cereals; and 4.63 percent of a total income of sheep was spent in research. So it seems as though the horticulturists and the people who are involved in sheep raising are more interested in getting research for their particular industries than the people involved in grain marketing or in grain production.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that research is one of the important fields that this government could become involved in, and I hope that the Minister doesn't get so obsessed with the idea that marketing research is the answer to the problem that he forgets the real important thing. In feed grains, for example, why have we not been able to capture the European market? That market has tripled in the past ten years from about 19 million tons to about 42 or 45 million tons right now. The Americans have got it all and they got it all largely because of their efforts at Geneva, but also because they have done some production research. Here in this country barley, for example, seems to be a by-product, or feed barley seems to be a by-product of the malting trade rather than the production of barley for feed grains. As a farmer, I couldn't care less whether I get 50 cents a bushel or \$1.00 a bushel for barley. In the past, all the emphasis has been placed on price and farm organizations have been leading the farmers down the garden path on this deal. What is really important to a farmer is how much he gets per acre, how much income per acre. If I can produce twice the amount of barley on an acre, I'm prepared to sell it for half the price because my income per acre is going to be the same.

Furthermore, and what's more important, I'm going to be competitive on the international markets in that barley is going to be able to move rather than sit in the bins and rot. This is the key. This is why I suggest to the Minister that he doesn't want to become too obsessed with

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.)... the idea about marketing research that he forgets the very important part of research which involves improving better strains and better varieties, more high-yielding varieties of feed grains and better varieties of wheat, varieties of wheat that are acceptable in the world today and were not acceptable a few years ago. We must keep pace with the developments that are taking place. We must not conclude that marketing research and knowing where the markets are is the answer to the problem because it really isn't. That's part of the answer. It's good to know where the markets are, but when you know that then you still have to be competitive.

The Minister talks for example about diverting or diversifying agriculture, diversifying agriculture so that we have higher protein foods so that we're producing more beef, more hogs. Well I ask the Minister what happens if for example, and there is evidence that this is not too far away, if for example soybeans are going to be used in producing protein foods. And already this process is taking place. Are we going to be stuck with a bunch of beef in this country that can't be utilized; a bunch of hogs in this country that can't be sold? Because soybeans -- and you can bet your bottom dollar that the Americans are doing research on that and it won't be too long before a protein food will be put on the market that is competitive with beef and with pork and with poultry. Where are you then? Where are your markets? What good are your markets to you if they're going to be lost through this process?

So I warn the Minister not to underestimate the need for production research and the need to keep pace with the developments, the technological developments that are taking place in food processing industries, because they are great and they are coming about at a very rapid rate. I'm not opposed to any increased efforts in research and particularly marketing research, but it must not be at the expense of production research because that's still going to be necessary if we're to maintain, or recapture I should say, our competitive position in the world.

Now the final point that I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister's brief to the Standing Committee on Agriculture with regard to feed grains. I, along with the Member for LaVerendrye, must take strong exception to the contents of that brief, and although I haven't had an opportunity to have a copy of it, the news service has published a release on it and, on the basis of what is contained in the news service, I assume that the brief contains these recommendations. "Mr. Uskiw recommended the sale of feed grains within the designated area as defined by the Canadian Wheat Board be brought under full control of the Board." I have already outlined what I think of that kind of a position. It hasn't worked in the past, it won't work in the future and yet the Minister is advocating it. He's advocating it because, as I said earlier, he's attempting to justify the philosophical approach that the answers to the problems of agriculture are greater regimentation. I say that the answer to the agricultural problem is greater freedom from the kind of restrictions that have been imposed upon them. "He added that farmer to farmer sales should be excluded from this control or that the exemption should not be extended to include large feedlot or other livestock production units which are owned or controlled by non-farm corporate business." What nonsense! The Minister doesn't know what he's talking about when he suggests that we must maintain the farmer to farmer control. Who is going to define a farmer? Who is going to define a farmer? Is it going to be the farmer with one cow, two cows, three cows? How big do you have to be before you're excluded from this? Are you going to be making those decisions? I hope not. -- (Interjection) -- Well the only -- and perhaps maybe this is the key to the whole thing, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister has a method in his madness. It's going to require so many policemen, it's going to require so much inspection that the answer to the farm problem is to be using farmers to....

MR. MACKLING: Will the honourable member yield to a question? Are you suggesting that the farming community are basically dishonest and you must have a lot of policemen to check on the accuracy of their definition.

MR. JORGENSEN: No. The Honourable Minister better stick to his department because....

MR. MACKLING: That's what you impute.

MR. JORGENSEN: That, as everybody in this Chamber knows, is sheer nonsense.

MR. MACKLING: And so you're saying that's not what you attributed in your remarks?

MR. JORGENSEN: What I am saying -- I wish the Minister would sit down because he's making himself look awfully foolish and I wouldn't want that to happen.

MR. MACKLING: It's all right; it's you that's looking foolish.

MR. JORGENSEN: The fact is....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I would point out to the honourable member he has about five minutes remaining.

MR. JORGENSON: Well I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you have taken into consideration the -- (Interjection) -- The fact is -- perhaps what the Minister is attempting to do here is to find employment for farmers as inspectors and he'll be using them to spy on other farmers to make sure that there are no farm-to-farm sales providing that the farmer is above a certain category. I never heard anything so ridiculous in all my life and I wonder just how he intends that this suggestion is ever going to be accepted.

Final recommendation - "The Wheat Board itself is to give greater attention to feed grain sales." Well now, this is a tired old cliché, that greater attention -- I've heard this so much before, that the Wheat Board can give greater attention provided that the restrictions that the Wheat Board at the present time have are removed and they're empowered or that somebody else is given the opportunity to find the markets, to develop them and to make the sales that are necessary to get rid of grain production in western Canada. Aggressiveness - you know, Mr. Chairman, the Wheat Board have been as aggressive as any group could possibly be in the responsibilities that are entrusted to them.

But in concluding my remarks, Mr. Chairman, things have come to a rather sad situation when we have a Federal Government at Ottawa who believes that farmers should not continue in production of grain, that they should now desist in doing what comes very naturally to a farmer, and as if that isn't enough, the Minister indicated when he made his remarks at the introduction of his estimates - and he indicated this I must say in all fairness very sadly - that he had to embark on a program of removing farmers from the land. So here we have the combination of the two doing what I suppose comes naturally to them. One way, in their opinion, to solve the farm problem is to remove the farmers, and this seems to be the stated intention of both the government at Ottawa and the provincial government here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I have about 15 minutes. I don't know whether it's a good thing for me to start or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: minutes remaining.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, first I would like to congratulate the Minister on his re-appointment. Actually, there wasn't much choice, was there, because he's the only so-called farmer in the group and even at that he's a potato farmer, because he has lots of teachers and preachers and professors but he hasn't got many men that know about the farm. He may have a lot of experts but I've tried to find out the definition of an expert and I'd like to give it to you. It goes like this: -- (Interjection) -- Just a minute; you aren't going to throw me off. The definition of an expert, as I have found it, "Ex" is for something that has been, and the "spert" is for a drip under pressure. So here's the definition of an expert. I only say this really as a joke, because really I have been treated well by the people on the other side and in particular the men in his department. However, I do want to make the point that agriculture and farming don't work out on paper, and a lot of the ideas that you think work out don't work out at all because you're involved with nature and weather and all these other things, the new varieties of rust and insects, and there's so many things. So it doesn't work out on paper; you never can tell what you're getting and even when you get it you can't sell it.

I believe our problem has not been one of inefficiency and waste. On the contrary, our problem is one of over-production and efficiency. No class has shown such a degree of efficiency and no class is as willing to change as long as they feel it is for progress. They do not mind changing to livestock or special crops if they think this is the right thing. They are not like the firemen who a few years ago were laid off when the engines were converted over to diesels and thought they should still be kept on.

Although the Minister has several good things in his report - and there are many of them, in my opinion - I think that the Minister deserves very strong criticism because from the time he has been elected he hasn't called one single meeting of the agricultural committee, and I'd like him to be sure and answer this: Why has he not done this? Does he not feel that any of the opinions we have are any good? Does he not want to know what we think of the proposals to summer fallow our land two years in a row to reduce our wheat acreage? Does he not want to hear our opinions on Benson's White Paper as how it relates to the farm people? Many of the other Ministers are speaking up and relating how it affects the people in their province, and I think you have a duty too.

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd.)

And by the way, what does this government itself, where does it stand in regard to the White Paper? Very little, if any, has been said. What does saying nothing mean? I want to quote an old saying and it's this: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men stand by and do nothing." This is what we are doing with the White Paper. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Premier of our province and the Minister of Agriculture will speak up loud and clear on the subject and that they'll do it soon. Benson boo-boosed. Prime Minister Trudeau has said that the White Paper is not final and that the government will consider proposals and submissions. Let us not leave the impression with them that silence means consent.

I have here a clipping from the Tribune and it says: "London explains the tax. White Paper of harm to farmers." Does the Minister say that this has no effect on the farmers in Manitoba? And it says over here: "The builders blast the White Paper." By the way, there's also another thing in here: "Summerfallow plan criticized". However, I guess the Minister knows it all and he doesn't want to hear from anybody else.

MR. USKIW: We're enjoying it. You're speaking well. You have 40 more minutes to go.

MR. HENDERSON: I have strayed from what I probably should be saying to him as a provincial Minister but still I do believe that these things are related to the Department of Agriculture and to the farm people in our area.

I'd like to make a few comments about his livestock policy. Although it has many good things in it, such as the forgiveness clause and help to the younger farmers at a lower rate of interest, I have thought that by having to make all your debts, have all your debts consolidated, to be eligible for a loan for livestock is really of not much value to farmers. If he has a loan on a farm at 5 percent and it is amortized over a 20-year period, why should he convert this type of a loan into a loan that is going to be 7 1/4 if he's under 35, and 9 1/4 if he's older? This type of a loan is no good to anybody.

What does the Minister really think about the acreage reduction plan? Is it not going to take as many dollars to administrate it as it's going to pay out? I for one would be very happy if this amount of money that they expect to pay out would be divided amongst the farmers on an acreage basis. Under the present plan, what happens next year when all this acreage which is to be summerfallowed comes into production? They say, and it is true, that we have a surplus of oats and barley as well. Farmers will probably summer fallow more this year all right, but then what's going to happen next year when all this land comes into production?

And this is a real problem and it's the one that we should have been looking at before and we should be looking at now, and that's our markets. Everybody has to have an excuse when he makes a mistake. This is only human, but we don't have to fall for it. Why has our percentage of the world market slipped when others have gained? In 1953 we had 30 percent of the wheat market; in 1968 we had 18 or 19 percent. In barley we had 35 percent; now we have 14 percent. Oats is the worst of them all - we had 51 percent in 1953; now we have 5 percent. We are told that millions go to bed hungry every night, and we have a surplus.

Now I think that the Minister for Morris explained this well and he laid the problem where it should be - on the Federal Government. It is because we have an arrogant bureaucracy in Ottawa which do not care about us. How can we sell our wheat to countries when we will not trade with them? The large industries and corporations look after themselves and we get what is left. It's no wonder that the people in the west are meeting and are talking about one province in the west.

Coupled with this, we have had one blunder after another with the Canadian Wheat Board, the railways and the labour unions. What we need is a real shakeup, a group that will really get out and sell, and we also need different trade policies, and the selling of wheat is related to politics. Without the right politics laid down by a government, how can you expect to sell wheat?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unless the member can conclude almost momentarily, I suggest he continue his remarks this evening.

MR. HENDERSON: I'll continue after. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine. It is now 5:30; I am leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 o'clock this evening.