

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:00 o'clock, Thursday, September 18, 1969

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): possible or not, so I would ask the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition what his inclination would be. I note that there's a few of his members absent. They may have forgotten about being here at 2:00 o'clock, and I'm just wondering whether if we just relax until 2:30 and then start with it if this would meet with the convenience of my honourable friend.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Official Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, either approach would be satisfactory to us. We gave unanimous consent last night at the House to have the House sit at 2:00 o'clock so that I think we would be quite free and within our rights to proceed if it was desired, although some of our colleagues aren't here.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, we're agreeable to beginning now if members are in agreement. Perhaps we could adjourn at 5:30, 20 minutes earlier, so we could brace ourselves for my honourable friend the Minister of Finance's speech tonight.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we will not need to be braced for my honourable friend the Minister of Finance's contribution to the debate. I'm sure that it will be well received in the whole of the Province of Manitoba.

With the consent of the honourable members, possibly we can go into routine proceedings now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed, if the Honourable Member for Lakeside is not present this means that I'll probably be the first one on the Order Paper, and I would like a little more time to gather my notes.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, just on the point brought up on the point of order of the Leader of the Liberal Party, he got his 20 or 25 minutes last night. I think that this would just make up for the extra half hour he got off last night in terms of things. But if you haven't got unanimous consent now, I don't know what your position is in relation to the decision that was made by the House last night.

MR. PAULLEY: Well possibly. . . .

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): May I make a suggestion. Let's do what we normally do under these circumstances and argue about it until 2:30, and then we can. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Well possibly, Mr. Speaker, if I may just indicate what we are hopeful of doing today as far as the order of business is concerned. I have scouted with the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, as to how we would like to proceed today, and that would be at this time to go into the routine proceedings and to call for the second readings of bills, then to call the resolution proposed by myself dealing with the sittings of the House, and go into Committee of Supply on the Department of Agriculture estimates. And the reason for the Department of Agriculture estimates is, Mr. Speaker, members are all aware that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is attending a conference of Ministers of Mines and Natural Resources in the west. And then at the hour of 5:30 come out of Committee of Supply in order that we may hear the Minister of Finance in the presentation of his budget, which I would expect would then be adjourned by the Leader of the Opposition, or whoever he has designated as the critic for the official opposition on the budget. And then what would require unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, would be that we would go back into Committee of Supply to continue the consideration of supply until 10:00 o'clock this evening. The reason that we would require unanimous consent is of course because once the Committee of Supply rises you cannot go back into that Committee unless we have unanimous consent, and it is my opinion - rightly or wrongly - that having scouted the members opposite that this would be agreeable to them.

Now this is generally the suggested order of business for today. By this way we will go through until 10:00 o'clock this evening. And also may I say, Mr. Speaker, it would be the intention that if we do not finish Agriculture today and the estimates of that department, that we would continue the consideration of the estimates of Agriculture until they are completed before we go back into further consideration of Mines and Natural Resources in order that there would be no split-up. It would not be our intention say, for instance, to go into Agriculture and finish halfway and then go back into Mines and Natural Resources, but to complete Agriculture, or if indeed, Mr. Speaker, we start any other department, to complete that department before we go back into Mines and Natural Resources so that we don't have two or three different departments

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... in suspense.

Now that's my recommendation and the recommendation of the government for the procedure today.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I'm expected to fill another five minutes....

MR. PAULLEY: I tried my best.

MR. WEIR: on the point of order or not, but may I just say that it would appear to make for the efficient workings of the Legislature and our group is always in support of that and we agree.

MR. PAULLEY: Fine.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we.....

MR. FROESE: No objection.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we have the unanimous consent to proceed with the routine business and Orders of the Day.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their second report.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 16, An Act respecting The Keystone Centre.

No. 27, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Finance, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left where we have 51 students of Grade 5 standing of the Oakbank School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Yaremy and Miss Albrecht. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

We also have with us 23 students from the Journalism Class from the Manitoba Institute of Applied Arts. These students are under the direction of Mr. O. E. Sprunt. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable First Minister.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, last week a former member of this Legislative Assembly passed away, and as is the custom of this House, it would be appropriate for me and others to say a few words in his memory. I refer to the late Michael Sawchuk who was in the late 1940's a member of this House as member of the Legislative Assembly for Ethelbert Plains. Although I don't believe that any member here today was a member of the House at that time, nevertheless I do believe that quite a number of honourable members here were personally acquainted with the late Michael Sawchuk.

He was born in 1911 near Fork River, Manitoba, and educated in schools in that region of Manitoba. He was a graduate of the Dauphin Normal School, and for a period of a few years actively pursued his profession as a teacher.

I believe that it was in 1945 that he was elected to this Legislature and served here for a full term. In addition to his duties as a member of this Assembly, the late Michael Sawchuk was quite active in community activity - rural youth training, 4-H club work, red cross work,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.)... a member for some period of time of the Manitoba Teachers Association. He happened to be a member of the political party which my colleagues and I on this side of the House are members of, the predecessor party, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation.

It is my understanding that the late Michael Sawchuk, following his term in this Legislature, continued to live and to work in the community of Dauphin, that is from 1950 or '51 on until the time of his passing last week.

I can say that I personally was quite well acquainted with the late Mr. Sawchuk, having known him for approximately the past ten years. He was, it is true, a keen supporter of what one might call the Democratic left in politics. He was, in addition, the sort of active citizen in politics who approached the political process with a rather happy and jolly frame of mind. One could almost refer to him as being a happy warrior in politics, but not one to leave any bitter feelings or to carry any grudges.

Obviously when he came into this Legislature he was a young man, being only 34 years of age, and when he left this Legislature to just resume as a private citizen he was still a young man, being only 38 or 39 at the time. The work of this House I know for a fact interested him greatly because in recent years that I have known him he was always prone to ask me what the Legislature was up to, what it's main business at hand was, and he always used to like to ask me whenever we did meet how one particular MLA or another MLA was in terms of health and so on. So that obviously in his four years in this Assembly he had come to look upon this place as a very important focal point of democracy and the good life. He must obviously have looked upon this House as a place where comradeship and friendship could be built. I think it should be said that this Assembly left lingering memories with the late Michael Sawchuk, even though he may not have been here more than just the one term.

Mr. Speaker, I think it can be said that his life, whether it was as a young teacher or as a member of this Assembly, or following that all through the '50s and '60s as a full and active member of the Dauphin community, that Michael Sawchuk's life was the full life, and his service here in this House made his life all the more full and interesting. Upon his passing, needless to say the family and friends experience a feeling of loss, a sense of bereavement.

I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, that this House convey to the family of the late Michael M. Sawchuk, who served as a Member of the Legislative Assembly, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to say a few words at this time in respect to the passing of one Michael Sawchuk, better known to most of his friends as Mickey. Mickey was one of my constituents and a very close friend and relative, and although he was rather small in stature, I would say that he was very big at heart throughout the years that he lived on this earth.

As the Premier has already mentioned, his profession was school teacher and for a short period of time, four or five years, he was a member of this Legislature. But during the time that he taught school he was very interested in the youth training program with young boys and girls in regards to gymnastics, along with baseball, hockey and curling and so on, and he used to take this on without pay after the regular school hours several days a week. He was an active member in the Elks organization; a great promoter at Little Theatre; and of course his main love was politics.

I would say that I don't think I've ever met a man, or do I know of a person who was so well known throughout not only the area around Dauphin but throughout Manitoba and in other provinces as well. He was the kind of a man who made friends very easily, and I would say that not only the constituency of Dauphin but the Province of Manitoba suffered a great loss when we lost Mickey Sawchuk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and associate the feelings of our Party with those of the mover and seconder of this resolution. Mickey Sawchuk was personally known to me through athletics. We're going to miss his voice on radio in the parkland area. He carried that noon sportscast about as capable, with the help of the announcer, and became a very well known figure throughout the region. The initiative and the drive of the

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.)... man to try and make the world a little better than he found it is one that I recognize and I think Manitoba is going to suffer a great loss.

I was in Dauphin the time that he received the award of Master Salesman - I think in 1964 - from General Motors, received national recognition in Manitoba. And indeed the constituency that I represent has lost a very prominent citizen and we associate our feelings with the regrets that are extended to the family.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my group also would like to join with the mover and the seconder in this message to the family. I don't believe that any of our group had the pleasure of associating or sitting with the late Mr. Sawchuk, but from what we have heard of this fine gentleman he will be sorely missed in his community, and we join in the expression of sympathy to the family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, not having known the late Mr. Sawchuk, nevertheless I too would like to associate with other members in extending condolences to the bereaved family.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I don't usually speak to these but I happen to know Mickey very well, and while it is a solemn moment, I don't think in knowing Mickey that he would like to think of this as too much of a solemn wake. I always remember him as a man, a short man on the end of a big cigar, and he used to give us all a bad time. Mickey was enthusiastic in whatever he did and I believe he meant whatever he said. The only thing I held against him was he was a member of the CCF at that time and he always reminded me of the fact that I didn't belong to that Party.

I don't think that Mickey would like us to feel today that this should be too solemn a moment. I know his family and friends will miss him, but certainly Mickey was a man we all enjoyed, whether it was at the sports arena, whether it was on the street or the coffee breaks, wherever it may be, Mickey was the salesman of the year in whatever he took on. I feel that rather -- being sorry of the fact that Mickey is now gone, I truly say to you, Mr. Speaker, that he was a source of amusement and joy to all of us who knew him.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Does a change in priorities of the construction of the Nelson River power plant, does it endanger any chance of obtaining a uranium enrichment plant for that project?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe so. I don't believe so at all.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has any attempts been made by the Department of Industry and Commerce to encourage such a development?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Industry and Commerce is carrying out a process of negotiation and consultation with the Federal Government and with interested groups.

HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the First Minister. Yesterday in the absence of the First Minister, I addressed a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Today, I will now direct the same question to the First Minister, and I would ask the First Minister, has this government received any additional reports on the Nelson River development phase of Hydro, and if so, will these reports be tabled in this House?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question is whether the government has received any additional reports in addition to the Cass-Beggs report, and the answer to that is the government has not requested any additional reports nor had it received any. I happen to have received one personally, but it wasn't on request and therefore it's not regarded as a government document and my colleagues in fact don't have it either.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is it the intention of the government to amend the Municipal Act this session to allow people of 18 years of age to vote in municipal elections?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): This session?

MR. PATRICK: Yes.

MR. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I address a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the intention - a supplementary question - is it the intention to include this in subsequent legislation?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that's a policy decision that will be determined in due course.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to answer the question posed to me yesterday by the Honourable Member for St. Vital in respect to the present amount of outstanding debentures in the province, and as to whether or not there had been a change since the last report given in the House by myself. In my last report I had indicated \$8,851,000 outstanding. My information is that at the present time there is \$8,736,000 outstanding. The change is in respect to the sale of debentures in Arborg and Tuxedo totalling \$219,000 and the addition of debentures re Portage la Prairie in the sum of \$104,000.

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

MR. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister of Municipal Affairs for that information. May I request of the Minister if he has a figure available for the amount of debenture that will be issued, possibly in the year 1970, to cover centennial projects.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, may I call to your attention and the members of the House of the presence in the loge to my right of one whose father was a member of the Legislature in this House from Brandon, and who is a former member of the Federal Government's Cabinet as Minister of Northern Affairs and is now the distinguished representative of Brandon-Souris, the Honourable Walter Dinsdale.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (CONTINUED)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services and ask him whether he has any good news to report to the House as a result of his meeting with federal housing officials in Ottawa. -- (Interjection) --

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance's answer is very subjective as to whether that is good news or not. I'm only able to report that the meeting was held. We felt - and I have been advised by the various municipal people who were in attendance - that the Manitoba position and the municipal position was put in as satisfactory a way as was possible. There will have to be further information supplied to the Minister for the Federal Government and then we will have to wait as to the final decision by that government with respect to the pending Manitoba projects.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did you find out the reason for the apparent discrepancy in the . . . by Ottawa with the province . . . \$10.00, \$5.00 difference as between Ontario and Manitoba?

MR. GREEN: Is the honourable member referring to housing or urban renewals, because we were dealing with urban renewing figures in Ottawa.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm referring to housing and urban renewal, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I understand the honourable member's question, but with regard to the amounts of monies that have been spent by various provinces, the reasons given for the discrepancies in the amount of money that Ottawa has advanced is merely that certain provinces had their schemes prepared earlier and proceeded with them at an earlier date, so that those provinces that went ahead faster managed to obtain more federal money. This was in fact one of the main issues which was presented to the Minister at the time.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Federal Government provide any opportunity for those provinces who perhaps started late to catch up in that respect?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, those are the questions that were asked by this government to the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, last week some time the Honourable Member for River

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.)... Heights asked a question as to whether or not the Department of Industry and Commerce has made any arrangements with North West Orient Airlines for an all-weather tunnel at the airport. The answer is that for the past two years North West Airlines has been investigating the provision of second level loading, that is to say, all-weather ramp facilities at the Winnipeg International Airport. Second level loading is normally used only in conjunction with jet aircraft. Now that North West is providing all jet service to and from Winnipeg, loading passengers will present no real problem. The operation does not lend itself easily to unloading as deplaning passengers have to go to the lower level to clear customs and immigration because of the nature of the architectural design of the Winnipeg International Airport. There are many higher revenue points than Winnipeg served by North West which do not have second level loading as yet. The airline investment to provide the second level loading to support facilities is approximately \$100,000, about five percent of North West's total annual revenue from their Winnipeg operations. North West has considered various proposals, such as sharing existing installations, but so far have been unable to make the necessary arrangements because of conflicting scheduling of aircraft.

Another question, while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, was asked by the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party, asking whether or not there have been any new enquiries from industries wishing to locate in the Portage la Prairie and Steinbach areas as a result of the new federal designated regions programming. The answer to that question is yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Transport. Is the Minister opposed to TransAir in its attempt to obtain rights for Winnipeg to Toronto runs?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Yes?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wondered if the Minister was going to answer my question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to either the First Minister or the Minister of Health and Social Services. Is the government giving any consideration to the establishment of a provincial house financing organization that would have comparable responsibilities to CMHC?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm able to advise only that the province is now operating under the existing legislation whereby it is able to co-operate with the CMHC in financing the construction of homes, but I'm not able to announce a change in any of the existing policies at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the First Minister. Is the government opposed to TransAir in its attempt to obtain rights from Winnipeg to Toronto?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, whatever would give my honourable friend that idea?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. I asked him a question the other day, but could he ascertain for us today the surplus, if any, the government had as at March 31st of 1969?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): I suppose I should say I'll try.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, and in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources I direct my question to the First Minister. Has he had any indication of unsatisfactory settlements insofar as assistance for flood damage in the Souris or the Assiniboine or Red River valley as a result of the flooding of last spring, and if so, what is the intention of the government in these.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have received no such indication personally, but I'll be happy to take the question as notice and bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would direct to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Is he aware of the announced conflict of dates between the Red River Exhibition for 1970 and the traditional dates of the Manitoba Provincial Exhibition at Brandon, and if so, does he contemplate any action in this respect?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I want to

(MR. USKIW cont'd.)... point out that in this connection action has been taken about a month ago. I have had meetings with the various parties concerned - the Red River Exhibition, the Provincial Exhibition, Brandon people, and indeed with Royal American Shows in Minneapolis - with regard to scheduling of events across Canada. We have not concluded these discussions and when we will perhaps we might be in a position to indicate what is the arrangement for next year.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the Minister also concerned with the possible effect on other regional exhibitions this might have if the Brandon Provincial Exhibition were having to postpone their dates? This would have a back-up effect on Portage and Carman and Dauphin and other exhibitions.

MR. USKIW: It's because of my concern, Mr. Speaker, that I have initiated the discussions which I referred to a moment ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Agriculture in this connection. Does the Minister of Agriculture support maintaining the dates that Brandon Exhibition have enjoyed and have been maintained for the past, I believe, about 50 years?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think we have to appreciate the fact that there are many problems entering into the picture. It's not a question of whether one supports a position that was upheld. I tend to sympathize with their position but I don't know that we can resolve it to the satisfaction of all concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs)(Wellington): Mr. Speaker, the other day when I was making announcements of various centennial activities taking place throughout the province, I reported that the World Hockey Tournament would be held here in Winnipeg but I gave the incorrect dates. I wish to correct that. The World Hockey Tournament will be held in Winnipeg from March 22nd to 29th inclusive, and the McDonald Brier Canadian Curling Championships will be held here in Winnipeg from March 1st to March 7th.

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

MR. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Can the Minister confirm that the Provincial Government is going to enter or provide financial assistance for a float in the Grey Cup Parade?

MR. BURTONIAK: I don't think I'm prepared to answer that question at the present time because there's been no announcement made as yet. This is something that we're considering, and perhaps if that's the decision that will be reached, I'll make the announcement at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. As you know, the National Hockey Team just completed a tour in Europe and they were more successful than they have been in previous years. Has the Minister been able to congratulate them in any way?

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, the answer is "no" to that. Perhaps it's an oversight on my part and I apologize for that, but the thing that perhaps I should mention too is - sure, maybe they should be congratulated for their showing - but this is not the team that I don't think is going to represent Canada in the competition here in Winnipeg in March. However, as I say, that has nothing to do as far as congratulations are concerned, but I must admit I did not do anything in that respect.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading of Government Bills. The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. WEIR: The member for Lakeside isn't here again. I don't know, under our circumstances today, whether it would be possible to come back to this following the Budget tonight before going into Supply or not.

MR. PAULLEY: We could, Mr. Speaker, in answer to my honourable friend, by unanimous consent, and I would appreciate receiving that in order that we may progress the Bill and the request will be made this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.) The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Government Services. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg your indulgence to have this matter stand.

MR. PAULLEY: With all due respect, I suggest to my honourable friend that here, too,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... we're anxious to get the bills into committee as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, before I commence I should say that I awoke with a very bad headache today. I tried to cure it with aspirins but so far I have not been completely successful. I don't know what the reason was, whether it's because this was Budget day and we might have some bad news or whether it's some other cause.

The bill before us is dealing with the matter of giving allowances to certain party leaders and apparently some of them are waiting very anxiously for their cheques I'm told, or at least I understand, and that the Minister concerned was very concerned to see this Bill go through.

-- (Interjection) -- The House Leader of the Liberal Party says, "Well there's some money in the kitty left." Maybe that's a good condition too.

The matter of the content of the Bill up until this time was more or less contained in our rules, that certain portions of the present bill defining as to Opposition parties and so on is contained in the rules and the Speaker as a result is abiding by that as to who is recognized as a leader of a political party, an official party in the opposition. There are also other sections, one dealing with having to do with the indemnities that will be paid to members of this session, and there again on that particular section I'll have something to say as well.

To me, it appears that we're definitely discriminating. I've mentioned this on past occasions. Over the years we've had several committees appointed to look at the rules and bring in amendments or changes to the rules that apply to this House, and on those occasions I've voiced my opinion and that of our party in connection with the provisions that are in it. As members all know, our party, the Social Credit Party is not recognized under the rules. This is simply because the rules say that you have to have four elected members in this House in order to be recognized. Unless you have that you're not recognized and I don't think this is a fair situation. This is a very autocratic decision that was made by members of a previous House and which have been condoned and are being condoned, not only condoned but they're even incorporated in the new proposed Bill, and I take exception to this. If the House Leader of the Liberal Party had accepted the Speakership, even their party would not be recognized as an opposition party in this House at the present time, and I'm sure that their group would not like the idea of not being recognized nor that their leader, whoever he would be on that occasion, would not get any allowance whatever. I think this just goes to show that this is a very arbitrary decision.

Then, too, I wasn't even consulted when the matter was discussed as to whether this should be brought forward and that it should be incorporated in the Bill. No doubt other parties were, because from the press reports certainly they decided on the indemnity that would be paid to members for this session, and there too I take exception because I feel this is not a special session, I feel that this is a regular session.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, that is not a correct statement that my honourable friend has made. I know he didn't make the statement knowingly to misinform but that is not a correct statement, the fact that the indemnities of the members were set by all-party consultation.

MR. FROESE: I accept that correction. I drew that conclusion from the press reports that were in the papers at that time and I could not arrive at any other conclusion but that. I certainly accept the House Leader of the Liberal Party for his statement that he was not aware and he was not part and party to it. So this definitely excludes them, but even though I feel that matters of this type...

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I just wonder if we all have to exclude ourselves one at a time?

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised that the Leader of the Official Opposition party was not party to it. I welcome that too because now at least I know who made the decision and whether it was strictly a government decision or not, so I welcome the comments of the two leaders.

As far as I'm concerned, this is a regular session of the Legislature. This is the first regular session, and I do hope to amend the resolution that is presently before us on another occasion, bringing the matter up for discussion so that we will have a full discussion in connection with that at a later date.

Our party is definitely a political party that is being recognized right across Canada. Our party is the party in power both in Alberta and British Columbia, and who have a very able

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... administration. In fact these two provinces I think are an example to other provinces in Canada. They have certainly the most prosperity and they draw people to their province, and I think this is to a large extent due to the policies that they've brought forward in their government and that they're encouraging, and certainly we cannot grade them down in any way.

Then too I'm just wondering, having this Bill before us, whether the B.C. election has any bearing on this action or not; whether in the future Social Credit might be the one that eventually might defeat the NDP in Manitoba. Who knows? Certainly if this government and the previous government had adopted some of the policies that I brought forward that should be implemented here in Manitoba - take the matter of farm-stored grain - our people would have benefitted tremendously and even the government would have benefitted because farmers under that legislation, if it had been brought in, would have stood to gain. They would have sold their wheat by now; they would have cashed in on the higher price where they now lose at least \$20 million. This would have paid to establish the facilities for stored grain in Manitoba and it wouldn't have cost them any additional money. This is what they have foregone.

Certainly there are many matters where our party differs from the present official party in power, so that there is an alternative to what they're doing. In that connection, certainly we should be rated as a political party and should be recognized in this House.

I certainly intend to amend the bill that is before us. I do hope that it will not be ruled out of order again as it seems to be the order of the day by now, because I intend to introduce the following amendment to the bill, and I think I should read it for the benefit of the members so that when the bill comes into committee they'll have some idea as to what I intend to do. I intend to amend Section 60 (b) - 60, subsection (6)(b) to the following: That the following words be inserted after the word "members" in the third line of Section 60, subsection (6)(b) "or less than four members, provided the party has been represented in two or more consecutive Legislatures". I feel that even though we do not have the four members as required under the rules and will be required under this bill, that if the party has had representation in the House for two or more consecutive Legislatures, certainly they should be recognized as such in this House, and I think this is something that other members should consider. I think it is one that deserves support and I see no need why we should be discriminated against year after year. Certainly as other leaders are getting additional allowances to help them, likewise our party needs the same because there are extra duties, extra work involved.

Then too the matter was raised here of the committee work. I'm just on a few committees so I will attend committee meetings of other committees. I do this in order to be informed. I do this in order to be up-to-date on what is going on. I do this in order to get the necessary reports that are being submitted by representations from outside the House, and this will mean that this will be an additional cost. I have been paying it all these years and certainly this deserves some consideration. I do hope that at least the Clerk will continue to send notices to us, as in the past, when committee meetings are held where members are not on that particular committee. I think this is a very good thing that the previous government did and I hope that this will be carried on by the present administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must voice my protest to the contents of the bill in this regard and I do hope that the government will give consideration to the amendment when I do propose it. I hope also that we're not going to proceed immediately after into Committee of the Whole so that I'll have a better chance of preparing it and placing it properly before the committee.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I do want to express my appreciation to the Honourable Member from Rhineland for having spoken today in spite of the fact that he is not feeling well, and I do appreciate the fact that he made the effort. I want to reject any statements that he made about arbitrary decisions having been made regarding recognition of opposition parties. I know that this has been a matter of some considerable discussion in the past and I believe there was a committee that was established for the purpose. I think there was a great deal of discussion, and even disagreement, before the committee came up with the rule that he refers to, and I don't see how it can be arbitrary when it was a committee of the Legislature that made the decision.

As to the question of the reduced indemnities, that was a decision of this government and the honourable member is wrong in suggesting that the leaders of the two opposition parties had agreed in advance to this reduction and I think they both indicated that that was so. Frankly,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)... I don't believe there was any press report that would have interpreted otherwise than that they had not agreed in advance to the reduction. I think that's a correct statement on behalf of the other parties.

I would indicate to the honourable member that it is our proposal that tomorrow morning we will call Committee of the Whole House. I previously indicated that this bill, in accordance with tradition, will be sent direct to the Committee of the Whole for review rather than outside of the House, and it is proposed, as was indicated in Law Amendments today, that there are several bills which are urgent and it is expected that tomorrow morning we will be able to call Committee of the Whole House and I would hope to -- well I planned that this bill should appear before committee so that it might receive Royal Assent as quickly as possible for reasons that have already been referred to.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House in having this matter stand in the name of the Honourable Member.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.) Second readings. Bill No. 36. The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would kindly allow both Bills 36 and 37 to stand in the Honourable Minister's name.

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.) The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would mind calling the adjourned debate on the resolution of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I understand that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is prepared to go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether to interpret this enthusiasm to just being so pleased that I finally got around to presenting my remarks.

I wanted to express a word of caution when the committee begins to study the Landlords and Tenants Act, and I certainly assume that this will be done. I would just like to express some caution that we resist the temptation to feel that the tenant is always the person who is put upon.

Now I was a member of the committee of City Council in Winnipeg which held hearings last spring on this Landlord and Tenant Act. We found that both partners to a lease have very serious problems. Some of them are absolutely ridiculous, and at times the hearings took on something of the aspect of comic opera. For instance, we heard from a landlord who complained that his tenants had had a rather wild party. They had thrown a bottle through the plate glass window in the living room, and the following day, because their rented premises had a broken window, they phoned the Health Department and had the Health Department demand from the landlord that he repair this window immediately.

Now in another instance the tenant had not paid his water bill and had walked out owing still something like \$60.00 on his water bill. Now this was immediately put on the tax bill of the landlord, the owner of the property.

We heard indications that there were instances of racial and religious discrimination. Now I think that we all agree that people are entitled to warm, safe and clean housing, and certainly this is something which must be protected.

Evictions were another great problem to people. They would secure very short notice. Bailiffs on occasion would arrive at all sorts of odd hours without any notice and simply remove furniture. Now the amount of material that they took away bore no relationship to the amount of the debt owing from the tenant. For instance, in one case a woman was about two or three days late with about half their monthly rent payment and the bailiff came and took her \$4,000 car.

On the other hand, tenants will walk out owing considerable rent and give absolutely no notice, and the apartment then is vacant for a few more days.

I think that the members of this committee, when they sit, will find the representations

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.)... will be very revealing of human frailties, and they certainly will understand that it's pretty difficult for a landlord and tenants to feel very much affection for each other. I think there are times when they will find such hearings outright amusing.

So I make this caution then, that we must listen seriously to the problems of both partners to a lease. With this caution, I think perhaps I have made my main point. This Landlord and Tenant Act is archaic. The people who resort to it for information are unable to interpret the meanings of the various sections. I think that a review is certainly in order and we'd be quite prepared to support this.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): The honourable member said that every person was entitled to warm, clean, decent housing. I wonder if the honourable member would tell us that if everybody cannot afford warm, decent clean housing, whether this would be the responsibility of the government to provide warm, decent, clean housing for those who can't afford to provide them for themselves at the going prices.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a pretty broad statement to make. I think that you have to relate this to the amounts of money available for such purposes. Certainly the City of Winnipeg is in the public housing, or low income housing market at the present time. Land is very scarce in the City of Winnipeg and this is one reason that we were so concerned about completing negotiations for securing the Midland Railway property because some public housing should go into that land.

I don't think this is a question that can be answered yes or no. I think we're trying, but because of the severe shortage of housing, the fact that we can't offer better housing in some instances, the City of Winnipeg itself has to allow the people who are on welfare to live in sub-standard housing. So they're in this awkward position of sort of subsidizing the slum landlord.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate support for the motion. Before the Throne Speech was - the contents were known at the beginning of the session, our group did have a resolution on this same subject matter and I compliment the government on taking some action in this regard.

It's well known now that apartment and rental accommodation living is becoming more a way of life in Canada because of the high cost of ownership and because of the mobile factor in Canadian life. So I think that this review is timely and I think it will help to relieve some injustices that are presently occurring. I'm inclined to agree with the Member for Fort Rouge when she stated that there were problems in this area that had to be treated carefully.

I would hope that on the matter of what is known as a deposit, or caution money that many apartment owners demand from their tenants now, that this problem will be looked at. I don't think that the owner has the right to hold money and then on his own decision decide whether to return all or part, especially when the tenant has no recourse other than to go to law, and if we're talking about a small amount like \$50.00, well many people are inclined to let it go. But this is an abuse that should be corrected. Perhaps some government bureau should hold the money in trust and when the tenant moves out, if they cannot agree - the tenant and the landlord - well then an independent agency or person would make a judgment.

I'd just like to add those few words, Mr. Speaker, that we are in complete support of this measure.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister will be closing debate.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, if there isn't anybody else who wants to speak on this, I will be closing debate.

I wish to thank the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party for their comments. I can assure the members of this House that as a member of this Committee that both sides will be looked at; the rights of the tenants and the rights of the landlords. If the Act existing now is archaic, it is probably for both parties concerned, and I do hope that all members who are assigned to this committee will do their best to see that we render justice to all. Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we are addressing ourselves to what is known as the

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.)... guillotine motion or the speed-up motion which has always been employed by governments, both federally and provincially, that I'm aware of.

But I believe the Leader of the Official Opposition had a point when he said that the introduction of this motion at this time is not timely. It's well known that the government is in a hurry to have the work of the House finished and we can understand that they have other problems that they would like to spend more of their time at. I can appreciate that, but I still believe that the motion has been presented too early in the session.

For example, the Honourable Member for Rhineland has mentioned the difficulties of being a single member of a party where he tries to take his responsibilities in a serious manner and take an interest in all business that is before the House. Also, we have in the House our party, which is a small party in numbers, and even to divide up the work and to try and do a conscientious job is rather difficult if long hours are going to be imposed on the members of the House. Again, we have another independent in the House who takes an active part, and I believe that this would be a penalty imposed upon members who take a sincere and conscientious interest in their work. So I'm inclined to agree with the Leader of the Official Opposition that the motion was ill-timed in its introduction, nor do I think it should have been introduced before the Committee of Supply has finished its work.

I am not in agreement with giving arbitrary powers to the House Leader or the governing party to impose unduly long hours of work. And I don't say this because the members in the House are afraid of work, I say it because when members have become tired they also become short-tempered, they also suffer from impaired judgment at times, and the combination of these leads to some -- at times it can lead to poor legislation; it can lead to the hasty introduction of amendments that maybe were not considered at length.

So, Mr. Speaker, our party are opposed to the timing of this resolution, and for that reason I have an amendment prepared that I would like to make at this time. -- (Interjection) -- One of the members had mentioned the number of times a day that we should be required to sit. I believe the members of this House are prepared to sit three times a day if necessary but they are not prepared to sit day and night, and I think that's too much to ask. So my amendment takes into account the objections that I have raised.

So, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that the motion be amended by:

- (1) Deleting the words "for the remainder of the session" in the first line and substituting the following: "Until the Committee of Supply has completed its work under the present rules."
- (2) By inserting the following after the period in the third line: "to 10:00 o'clock P.M."
- (3) By substituting the word "Friday" for the word "Saturday" in the fifth line.
- (4) By deleting all the words between the second comma in the fifth line and the comma in the seventh line.
- (5) By substituting the period at the end of the eighth line with a comma and by adding the following: "except for Tuesday and Friday between 2:30 and 5:30 p.m., which shall be devoted to Private Members' business."

Mr. Speaker, before you -- you appear to be about to make a ruling on the point of order. May I suggest to you, Sir, that the motion is from the 1968 statutes and was introduced by the then Leader of the New Democratic Party and it passed at that time.

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

MR. FROESE: If no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may be permitted to say a word or two on it before my honourable friend takes the adjournment. It might even save a speech.

As has already been indicated, the contents of this resolution has been taken from the Journals of 1968, and as the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party indicates, the motion was proposed by myself at that particular time as an amendment to the self-same motion that I proposed originally the other day. The government at that time, led I believe by my honourable friend, or his predecessor, but in any case the then House Leader, the former Attorney-General, accepted the proposition as being an alternative to the original motion, a very reasonable amendment, and I'm happy to know that the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party in this House declares such to be reasonable, as I do today.

And I want to say to my honourable friends, despite their admonition, dealing with the original motion, that they were in the self-same spot that I was when both governments, both Liberal and Conservative governments were on this side of the House. So the motion that I

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... originally proposed, Mr. Speaker, is no different than the previous Liberal administration of the former Premier of the Liberal Party, Douglas L. Campbell, and the Conservative Party, both under the Honourable Dufferin Roblin and my friend opposite. I remember many a hassle that we had over the sittings of the House and the long hours that we worked, and I appreciate the remarks of my friend the Member for Portage la Prairie because I can recall, Mr. Speaker, sitting in this House until three and four o'clock in the morning with a nightcap - which, incidentally, was presented to me by that great City of St. Boniface. I can recall that very very vividly and I agree with my honourable friends opposite when they speak of how one gets edgy after being in here for such long periods of time, serving two days really in one, and that was not the intention of the government in proposing the original motion, because after all, experience is a very good teacher.

I would suggest to my honourable friend the Leader of the Official Opposition that he must be reading some of my speeches when he compiled his own contribution to the debate the other day because I could almost picture them coming from myself when I sat just a few seats down, except for one observation that he made, the effect on the Budget speech. I want to assure my honourable friend that there's no desire on our part to cut down the rights of anybody to participate in the Budget debate. -- (Interjection) -- I don't think so, Mr. Speaker, in reply to my honourable friend. It could conceivably have had, I admit.

But one of the things that it does achieve is to give more flexibility in the operation of the House, particularly after the introduction of the Budget. Not curtailment, it gives an opportunity to more people to participate. And another thing too, Mr. Speaker, that this type of a resolution does give to us is an opportunity to progress bills and legislation itself. And I want to say to my honourable friend the Leader of the Official Opposition that this resolution was introduced, I believe last year, after we had entered into Committee of Ways and Means and it didn't have the effect that my honourable friend is worried about, and before the Committee of Supply was terminated and that is the reason that the phrase is in the amendment making reference to Committee of Supply.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I compliment my honourable friend the House Leader of the Liberal Party in going back over Journals and finding the words of wisdom of the present House Leader of the government and making this as a suggestion as to the procedure of the House, and I want to assure all honourable members that we do not intend to curtail a free discussion on the propositions contained in the Budget to be introduced this evening by the Minister of Finance.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, is he going to support the amendment?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I indicated, Mr. Speaker, I believe, that we would support the amendment.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I think I'd like to say a word or two here now because our honourable friend talks about the speeches that he made in terms of this particular resolution before and I think mine were somewhat different because I indicated that there would be a time in the session at which it would be desirable in terms of the efficiency of the House to bring in the resolution, and I'm surprised particularly at this session that this amendment is here. I looked up the amendment too and I considered using it yesterday and I decided against it. The reason I decided against it was I had a belief that with the amount of committee work that we have we might very well be finished with Law Amendments Committee before we've concluded with estimates and that there would be no work left unless through the graciousness of the government, or in the wisdom of the government they called the Public Utilities Committee so that we can have some discussions in that committee. But when Law Amendments Committee is finished and there isn't sufficient work in other respects, then it would be reasonable to sit in the House and spend the mornings on estimates, even before the estimates are concluded.

This isn't a normal situation that we've got at this session of the Legislature and that's why I thought maybe some special treatment was deserved for it, but not the kind of special treatment that was being presented by the House Leader. It could have been done at a different time of day, different time in the session. So, Mr. Speaker, with it meeting the consensus of the other members of the House, we too will support the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Churchill, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member for Rhineland would... before his adjournment and then take the adjournment. I'd just like to say a few words,

(MR. WATT cont'd.)... Mr. Speaker, and I'm not sure whether I'm going to be speaking on the main motion or the amendment because I'm not quite sure whether the House Leader was speaking on the main motion or the amendment. But I do want to point out to him that I recall sittings when we have sat till about three o'clock in the morning and my honourable friend was very amiable at that time and I can recall him smiling and going through bills at about 2:30 in the morning and then coming into the House at 9:30 on the following morning and just blasting the government for everything, for being arbitrary and forcing legislation through without time for proper discussion.

However, I don't want to belabour this point but I do want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that if the introduction of this resolution at this time is untimely, I should say that the calling of the House at the time that it was called was much more untimely insofar as agriculture in the Province of Manitoba is concerned. I can recall, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, the Premier of the Province of Manitoba saying on TV and to the press, after this government was installed in the Province of Manitoba that the House would be called at an early date in order that the session would be completed before harvest was begun. The session was called, Mr. Speaker, just about the day that harvest was getting in full swing in the Province of Manitoba.

Now there are nine, including myself, nine of us in the Conservative caucus who are directly involved in agriculture, and I'm sure that I have the support of my eight colleagues that are directly involved in agriculture when I say that the sacrifice insofar as this session is concerned rests on the shoulders of this party. Most of us have made arrangements at a cost, either to hire equipment or labour, to take our crops off. Most of us now are in a position where most of our harvest, or to a large extent, has been completed, but the work of the House is not completed, Mr. Speaker, and insofar as I'm concerned now, we can sit here until we get some of the answers that we have been asking for. We have been asking the Minister of Agriculture for answers for what he intends to do insofar as the agricultural crisis is concerned and we have -- (Interjection) -- I'll be speaking on that when they come -- and we have been asking the House Leader, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Premier of the province for answers for the correct decision insofar as South Indian Lake is concerned, and insofar as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, we can now sit here until we get some of these answers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I rise to take a great deal of exception to the remarks that were just made, because if it wasn't for the fact that the previous administration, the fact that they abdicated their role, we wouldn't be here at this time, Mr. Speaker. The facts of the matter are, Mr. Speaker, that we are here dealing with their estimates and their program essentially, and we have not had an opportunity to develop a program of our own in the meantime. And I want to point out to my honourable friend the Member for Arthur that if there's any irresponsibility in procedure at this stage of the game it rests on that side of the House, and my honourable friend should be content to agree to the suggestion that has been made from this side that we ought to speed up things to get their legislation out of the way, which should have been out of the way three months ago, and that we may be prepared to carry on our own program and introduce our own estimates in the next session.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): (not audible)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I too endorse the resolution that is before us. I know a lot of work has been done by the previous committee, many meetings were held where considerations were given to new proposals and to revisions; the suggestion by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and getting outside people on the, not necessarily on the committee, but to be present, I think these people will have a chance to review the Act when it will come before the House at a following session. This is not to say that I'm objecting to the suggestion but I think just for honourable members' sake and for the sake of the public that there will be an opportunity given to these municipal people to, at least I hope, to the new legislation that will be coming forward. I think once the committee has arrived at a complete proposal that maybe we could have the permission of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council that this proposal would then be distributed to the various municipalities so that they could consider it and probably be ready to

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... make the representation when the House next meets and when this report will then be officially before them as a result.

MR. PAULLEY: I thank the honourable members for their participation in this debate and their support of the resolution. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye referred to wording in the resolution. I'm sure that it may be quite different from one or two of the other resolutions but the intent is exactly the same, that the committee be empowered. I'm sure he's also aware that the committee has already been selected and has been placed on the Votes and Proceedings. As far as the point of outside consultations I'm sure that the Manitoba Urban Association and the Municipal Association, and may I suggest even the School Associations would be free to sit in as observers and possibly would be called by the committee, and of course the conduct, Mr. Speaker, of the committee is the premise of the committee itself.

The reference to the legal fraternity -- the Minister of Municipal Affairs is of the legal fraternity, he'll be serving on the committee. I don't know whether my friend from La Verendrye has too much aversions to lawyers. I can't tell him offhand how many lawyers have been selected to the committee, but I'm sure that we'll all in this House join in trusting and hoping that out of this a committee for the next session if it's humanly possible that we do have a consolidation and revision of the Acts referred to in this resolution. It is desired; I know from my own experience as a Mayor over a number of years it's been pretty tough to keep up to what is and what isn't insofar as the Municipal Act is concerned. I thank the members for their suggestion. I'm hopeful that at least during this session there could be called a committee to set up the organization so that they could meet just as quickly as possible following prorogation.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, due to the absence of government members, I move the House do now adjourn. Seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order: For the information of some of the members who were absent, the motion before us is for the adjournment of the House which I had declared lost on a voice vote. I do not believe that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland has a right to enter the House at this point.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, has the Speaker ruled indeed that the member is not dressed in accordance with the rule.

MR. SPEAKER: No, it has nothing to do with dress. He came in after the bell. He came in after the bell.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): . . . occupies the seat of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and does not vote?

MR. SCHREYER: Again in order to perhaps - I was going to ask Your Honour to explain the reason why the Honourable Member for Rupertsland might not be in order if intended to vote? Since he has removed himself from the Chamber the question becomes academic.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in support of the motion please rise:

A standing counted vote was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Watt, Craik, McKellar, Johnston (Portage), Froese, Bilton, Sherman, Jorgenson, Patrick, Barkman, Beard, Girard, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Graham, McGill, Ferguson, Moug, Hardy, Henderson, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Honourable Messrs. Schreyer, Petursson, Green, Paulley, Cherniack, Mackling, Uskiw, Miller, Toupin, Burtiak, Borowski, Pawley; Messrs. Fox, Desjardins, Barrow, Boyce, Gonick, Gottfried, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Malinowski, Shafransky, Turnbull, Uruski, Doern.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before that motion was called, which of course is always in order, I believe I was just finishing up on the resolution standing in my name and I had expressed my appreciation of the unanimity of the House in progressing the business of the House and progressing this resolution dealing with municipal affairs and the establishment of a committee. So once again, Mr. Speaker, may I express my appreciation, my thanks for the co-operation of the House and indicate that the committee should get together as quickly as possible in order to lay the plans for the continuation of the committee after recess.

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

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.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, in rising to have a word or two to say about this motion, I would like first of all to thank the Member for Portage la Prairie, the Leader of the Liberal Party, for bringing the First Minister back into the House. I don't know that I'd have gone to such drastic measures to have accomplished it, but nevertheless I am pleased that he is here. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, on more than one occasion, on more than one occasion I'm sure. But that's okay because really I don't want to take up a lot of time in the House at this time, but I didn't know of another opportunity at which I might have a word or two to say and do it within the rules of the House.

It has to do, Mr. Speaker, with the filling of the position of the role of Ombudsman for the Province of Manitoba. And while I know this is an opportunity for grievances I really don't want to establish it as a grievance, although I think I could, because I really don't think that the way we're operating is going to provide us with the best Ombudsman that we could have in the Province of Manitoba. I don't like particularly the fact that when approaches are made to people, public announcements are made about so and so being offered, and so and so being turned down and the difficulties we're having in this field. But rather than complain about that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a positive suggestion to the government.

I would like to suggest that instead of two or three of us sitting down and trying to sort out who would be good with our limited knowledge of the people of Manitoba, that we ask the government to consider advertising the position - with qualifications or without qualifications, because it's my belief that someone who has the desire to act in this all important function that we may or may not be acquainted with may very well be the best individual to fill this function.

I would like to suggest that after advertising that this House set up an all party committee, just a small committee, representative of the groups in the House, with the responsibility of having in-camera or private interviews with the people that they feel are desirable to have interviews with; encouraging them to express what they believe the role of the ombudsman to be; finding out from them what they've got - they may have some ideas that we haven't thought of as yet; and to give this committee power to invite others, invite others who may not have taken the initiative themselves to apply in terms of the role of ombudsman, and thereby hopefully accomplish through an all party committee the achievement of finding the person who can best fill this role. And it's with a sincere desire to hopefully find a method where this could take place that I present this suggestion to the government, and I use up my right to speak on this motion all through the rest of the session. I might say that I did it grudgingly, but I wanted to do it in a manner that it could be positively considered and discussed and hopefully maybe find a method that will arrive at the proper conclusion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, . . . realize too that in replying to my honourable friend that I will exhaust my rights for the balance of this session to speak on a matter of a grievance going into Committee of Supply.

I don't think that there is any member of this House that will take any great exception to the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. But I think in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out to my honourable friend, and to all and sundry, that we have before us at the present time in the Committee now, a Law Amendments Committee, a bill establishing the office of Ombudsman. So the legal and technical and parliamentary position is, Mr. Speaker, that until such time as that bill has been considered in Law Amendments, brought back into this House and considered, given third reading and given Royal Assent we really have no right or law, in my opinion, to name an ombudsman per se. What would be the position of this Assembly if in effect we named an ombudsman and then sufficient members of this House defeated the proposition in Law Amendments? I'm sure my honourable friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, would be the very first to chastise us for having the presumption of acting on legislation that had not met with approval of the House in its entirety.

Now I know my honourable friends, Mr. Speaker, may turn around and say that we all spoke and gave our approval in principle to the bill; but I know of bills, Mr. Speaker, that have been given approval in principle on second reading and have been defeated in committee, and have been defeated on third reading. Now I just raise this point, Mr. Speaker. It may be that

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) my honourable friend the Leader of the Official Opposition may say well it's just technicalities and this, that and the other. But I must tell him - I don't think I need to tell him - that be that so or be it otherwise, this is how the due process of democracy operates. And while we appreciate, I am sure, the remarks of my honourable friend, I think that it is only proper to point out the facts of parliamentary procedure, at least as I understand them, to my honourable friend.

I know from past experience in some instances the suggestions and recommendations as contained in the remarks of my honourable friend have been done sometimes to the chagrin of legislative bodies at the various levels in the Province of Manitoba. I do not quarrel with my honourable friend in his overall assessment and suggestions; but I do point out to him, Mr. Speaker, and to members of the Assembly the situation that could occur if an appointment was made prior to the passage of the Legislature - or if in effect advertisements were made to fill a position as yet uncreated.

I'm sure that my honourable friend will not fault the First Minister or the government or anyone else for going on scouting excursions for individuals - and there has been a lot of speculation I'm aware, as to the person who may be the choice for the position of ombudsman. So I, too, like my honourable friend now will have to keep quiet on going into Committee of Supply because we have exhausted our rights. But I thought that it would only be proper for me to point out what could possibly be a technical or political situation if my honourable friend's suggestions were adopted.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know how my suggestion would vary from the earlier announced intention of the First Minister to have named the individual to be ombudsman at the end of last week, or at the end of this coming week?

My suggestion, -- well I'd better not because I'd be breaking the rules.

MR. PAULLEY: Possibly, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not really answering for my leader in saying this, but it could conceivably be - with or without the lustre of my honourable friend from Riel - could conceivably be that my leader had hoped that the conduct of the House may have made it possible for the legislation to have passed in order that that may have been achieved.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit another question?

MR. PAULLEY: Surely.

MR. WEIR: Would it not be possible that the legislation could be passed before the ad was put in the paper?

MR. PAULLEY: It might be an idea.

MR. SPEAKER put the question 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: I believe that we had agreed to go into the Department of Agriculture next. Resolution 6 (1) (a). The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I take a great deal of pleasure in finding myself in this position at this particular time, although I want to point out that it is not because of the responsibility of having to do the job that should have been done some three or four months ago.

I want to point out to honourable members that we have debated the estimates of this department for some seven hours during the last session of the last legislature, and for that reason I don't anticipate we are going to have a great deal of debate at this point.

I want to, however, point out that since taking office I have developed a great deal of confidence in the personnel within my department; certainly appreciative of their confidence and with that kind of expertise I'm sure that any new program that may develop we have the capacity to bring them about and to present them to you.

I want to say to the previous administration that to be truly responsible at this time I would anticipate that debate be very short and to the point, regardless of the fact that we do have serious problems in agriculture which I certainly recognize. But keeping in mind that these are estimates which are not my estimates, but which are the estimates of my honourable friends opposite, and which have had ample debate on all the points contained therein.

I don't intend to make any announcement of policy positions at this point but simply to suggest that the floor is yours; hopefully we might pass the estimates by 5:30 today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well the Minister is certainly optimistic. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to say that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture is much less vocal now than he was when he was on this side of the House, and I'm surprised at the short statement that he has just made on the estimates.

I don't propose, Mr. Chairman, to debate the estimates but I want to point out to my honourable friend that the estimates did pass the House, and that actually when the House dissolved or adjourned last spring agricultural estimates were stuck on concurrence and it was on that point actually on agriculture, and agricultural policies that the House did adjourn. I think the Honourable the Minister - the present Minister of Agriculture - made the second last speech in the House, and I believe I made the last one in which I made some remarks that my honourable friend probably remembers.

But I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I do congratulate the Honourable the Minister on his appointment to the Department of Agriculture, and I'm sure that he will do his best in that area. I concur with him, of course, in the confidence in the staff that he still has in his department that were in the department when I was there. I must say that they are outstanding people insofar as agriculture is concerned, and I think that if I do at some time or other, or have already voiced some concern about the present Minister of Agriculture, I certainly do not express this concern insofar as the department. But I do say again that I believe that the Minister will do his best in this department in the short time that he will have to sit as Minister of Agriculture.

I want to make just a few remarks insofar as agriculture is concerned in the Province of Manitoba. I believe, Mr. Chairman, when I left the department that I could very honestly say that in most areas of agriculture the Province of Manitoba is in a pretty healthy situation, insofar as the production of meat, poultry, beef and cattle, and as I pointed out in my opening remarks when I did introduce already at one time these estimates, that we have no problem or no real problem in these areas of agriculture.

I mentioned of course special crops but, of course, we still have, and projected greatly, I believe, since I left the office of the Department of Agriculture, the problem in the area of grain marketing.

In the overall picture the production of agriculture in the province has built up through the years, through almost the past hundred years, from a figure I believe that is on a plaque near the door of the honourable the Minister's office - I believe it was 463 1/2 bushels of wheat the first exports from this province. At the end of 1968 production of agriculture in the Province of Manitoba had built up to a billion dollar industry. The production of meat of course does actually represent a large portion of this production but I believe our greatest production in agriculture is still in the area of cereal grains, and here wherein lies our problem.

During my farming time, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have -- in fact I shouldn't say I believe, I have experienced three gluts insofar as grain production is concerned. Back about 1941 and '42 we believed that the bottom had fallen out of that particular industry; again in the middle '50s when the world surplus had built up to 2 1/2 billion bushels of grain; and again we find ourselves with a glut, but surprising probably to some members of the legislature, not quite as big a world glut at the moment, or that is at the 31st of July of 1969 that it was back in the middle fifties or the late fifties.

We have as of July 31st about a two billion bushel carry-over in all the exporting countries of the world. This represents, Mr. Chairman, three percent of the total production and consumption of cereal grains in the world. So we're talking in terms of world surplus of three percent of the production and consumption in the world, and it is my opinion that properly handled with the initiative to go out and sell grain, to find markets and to establish new markets, that the surplus can be moved. And I want to ask the Minister what he has been doing so far as the relationship with the Federal Government in this area.

I can recall, Mr. Chairman, when I was berated, as Minister of Agriculture, by the present Minister for not taking enough action regarding research and putting pressure on the Federal Government to do something about marketing and the movement of our grain. The Minister has been to a conference in New Brunswick where my understanding was, when I was Minister, that there would be the area or the time that all Ministers of Agriculture across Canada would discuss and come up with some approach, if you will, to the problems of agriculture in their various provinces, and I'm sorry to say that I have not heard any report from

(MR. WATT cont'd) the Minister in regard to that conference outside of the fact that he did indicate through the press that he had advanced to the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa a proposition whereby cash advances would be made available to all farmers in western Canada regardless of their acreage. This apparently has not been taken notice of in Ottawa and I'm wondering what steps the Minister has or intends to take in this direction.

I think one of our biggest problems at the moment, Mr. Chairman, particularly insofar as the grain producer is concerned, is his cash position. The Minister has announced the intention to change direction insofar as the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation is concerned. During my time as Minister and that of the former Minister, the present Member for Lakeside, we had changed the direction from direct capital loan to production loans guaranteed through the banks, and it is my understanding at the moment, Mr. Chairman, that this program has not been quite as effective as what we had hoped that it would be because of the present cash shortage. My understanding from the banks is that the money available to the banks to loan to farmers is restricted to the point -- or a comparatively small portion of that money is being guaranteed through the Manitoba Credit Corporation. I want to suggest to the Honourable Minister that he might possibly look in the direction of direct capital loans, or production loans through the Manitoba Credit Corporation, rather than his announced intention of going back into capital loans or long term loaning insofar as purchase of land is concerned. Our problem at the moment is not the purchase of land but it's to hang on to the land and to develop the production of what we have now. I make this suggestion to the Minister and I hope that he would give some consideration through his Credit Corporation to direct production loans to the farmers of Manitoba, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be well advised if he considered this aspect of loaning in terms of diversification. One of our problems today is to divert production from that of grain to the production of meat, and I think we're all agreed that it is very difficult at this time, considering particularly in the beef industry the establishment of cow-calf operations, in the development of particularly the cattle industry in the province.

Much has been said about the two price system, Mr. Chairman, which we now have in effect established by the Federal Government through the Canadian Wheat Board some time ago, and I want to reiterate my position so far as the two-price system is concerned. It has absolutely no effect on the capital position of the farmer at the moment. It's hard to say when and what relief this so-called two-price system will bring to the farmers. Again, I want to point out that our problem is now an immediate, and as I have said before, the mechanics are set up now through the Canadian Wheat Board for direct acreage payments to farmers that could be implemented immediately and that it would affect all farmers that have a problem at the moment.

I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that I have anything further to say at this time. I asked the Minister the question the other day of what he was going to do, if anything, regarding the marketing of coarse grains in the province, and I would hope that on his salary he might have some comment to make considering the statements that he has made in the House from time to time, considering the pressure that he put on myself and the Minister before me in regard to direct sales of coarse grains to the feed mills and to the corporate bodies within the province.

With these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I will be interested in what the Minister will have to say.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: The proposal re acreage payments, is it your position that acreage payments should be made to all farmers in Manitoba?

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe there are very many farmers in the Province of Manitoba who would not, under the present situation that we have with the production of cereal grains, who would not be entitled to direct acreage payments.

MR. USKIW: A further question, Mr. Chairman. Is it your position that only Wheat Board permit holders qualify for such acreage payments?

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe there is any such thing as just a permit for wheat deliveries.

MR. USKIW: I don't believe the honourable gentleman understood my point. To be eligible for acreage payments as my honourable friend sees it, would one have to have a Canadian Wheat Board permit?

MR. WATT: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to congratulate our new Minister of Agriculture. I think he was perhaps the best man chosen in the whole group, although they have quite a fine group. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm not saying it to make anyone feel bad, I thought the Ministers preceding him, and especially those that had had no experience, did a very fine job although I am happy that the present Minister has the three years of experience in the Legislature because he's going to have to tackle a problem that's become a very complex one today.

I also wish to compliment his staff. I know it is a large staff, including our agriculture representatives, and so many of the staff that are working tirelessly towards a better solution to some of our problems so far as agriculture is concerned.

Now the Minister intimated that perhaps we could keep this a short session. I doubt that this is going to be completely possible with the kind of enthusiasm the Minister himself has, and with the alarming problem that agriculture is today, I'm afraid that this is one department where we should take as much time as possible unless - not too much time so that he cannot begin to work at some of these problems. We must consider that.

I feel rather incapable getting up as the critic of our party following people like the former Premier, the former Member for Lakeside, Mr. D. L. Campbell, whose shoes I am hardly worthy to tie leave alone trying to speak on agriculture, on the vast experience that he has had and also my friend the former Member for La Verendrye, Albert Vielfaure. However, sometimes things happen that we all don't expect and they did happen in this case, so all I can say at this time, I'm sure that many members in this House will never forget some of the things and some of the propositions that the former Member for Lakeside has given to Manitoba over the years, and while I'm sure that I cannot even begin to fill those shoes, I must say at this time I have a grave concern for the problems of agriculture.

I concur with some of the things that the Honourable Member for Arthur said. I cannot necessarily quite agree with some of the things he mentioned, but I don't think that's so important because we agree in most everything else than possibly on a few points. In this respect I do agree with the present Minister that I think the two-price system is perhaps the better thing to bring in at this time. I realize some of the conditions that he must go through in some of his areas, but this of course will not be in my hands so I don't think I shall touch that other than say that I want to go on record in agreeing with "Let's get at the two-price system first and perhaps we can improve on it to a point where the Honourable Member for Arthur, or former Minister of Agriculture can also agree."

Our present Minister of Agriculture has so often mentioned, and so did the Member for Arthur just a little while ago, that agriculture is still our largest single industry, and as the honourable member mentioned, when you talk of figures of over a billion dollars, this is nothing to be sneezed at. Therefore, I was very happy to see, or hear in the Throne Speech that there was some mention made of helping, or that some help was coming as far as agriculture was concerned. And while I am all for the help that the vegetable growers got, I hope that there will be more help coming than just for these people. With all due respect that they deserve this, I think we have other segments that are possibly more hit, or just as hard hit as these fellows were, so possibly we can also do something for the other fellows, especially our grain farmers, in the very near future.

I realize and I admit that all the problems in agriculture, or in fact very few problems of agriculture can be related to a provincial government. I am absolutely content in my mind that the more grave and more grim solutions lie in Ottawa, if we like it or not - and I'm not saying this to get this Minister off the hook nor the former Minister - I think this is very clear when we study the things as to even a like degree. But in the meantime, as this Minister has pointed out so often, let us at least do our part. I think this is where we must begin. The former Minister, in fact the former Premier, the one preceding the last Premier, Premier Roblin, also pointed out the low income that our farmers are receiving, and today agriculture is in a dilemma perhaps more so than any other department that we're going to go through the estimates during this session, regardless of how high a priority other departments should get. This is possibly one that should receive the highest priority. In fact it's getting so bad I don't think - and I don't want to discourage any farmer by saying this - I believe our conditions today in agriculture are worse than they were in the depression years, 1932 and later. I believe that the conditions are different.

Certainly we realize that there is more money around today but still less money available

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) to cover those things that have to be covered. We're out of the horse and oats days. Our tractors need fuel; we need fertilizers; we need our standard of living, our Medicare payments or telephone payments or premiums, all of these today are in a different set-up than they were in 1932, but I believe, and we know we are in a very serious position. In fact it's becoming impossible - nearly impossible. I wouldn't be a bit surprised to see our farming population decrease by at least 50 percent within the next three to five years. This is how grim I think it is. I don't want to stand up here and try to preach gloom and doom. I think that this Minister, this government, the Federal Government, Mr. Chairman, all of these must get at this problem. This is the only solution, not me standing here trying to preach gloom and doom. That is not my intention. But I know, and I agree with the Minister as he's said so often, that so many conditions should be changed and I hope this government gets the time that they will show some leadership in this respect.

Farming today is becoming a large investment. I don't have to tell any of you people coming from the rural areas this. An average farm of fifty to a hundred and fifty thousand dollars is nothing new any more. And when you start considering - leave alone considering the costs that are involved - when you consider the interest alone, just the interest alone is a lot of money, especially when everything is going in reverse.

I was happy to hear the Member for Arthur say that there are some areas or some segments of the province that appreciate a better return for their agriculture products than do most of our western farmers who are, as I said before, in a real dilemma. In fact I'm happy to represent one of those constituencies, the constituency of La Verendrye where we're fortunate enough to produce approximately two-thirds of all the milk that is consumed in the City of Winnipeg around an area of approximately 20 miles of Steinbach. And I'm happy to say that we have more diversified farming in this area, special crops, and not only in my area, also in parts of southern Manitoba as I'm sure that we'll hear from the member later. But I so vividly remember, and I must add, not that southeast Manitoba or La Verendrye hasn't got their share of problems, they possibly are being accused of buying oats a little bit too cheap these days and wheat a little bit too cheap and they're getting a good return. Thank goodness that the return is there for hogs and for poultry. But in the meantime, they have other problems as have so many that are in the field of agriculture today.

But I'd like to point out again - the Minister has said this so often and I agree with him - let us here in Manitoba at least do our part and I'm sure we can go quite a ways with that. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps one of the first duties of this Minister might be to tell our city cousins some of the dilemma that the country people are going through, that the farmers are going through. Possibly it wouldn't hurt if you told them that maybe a subsidy is in line today, much as I hate subsidies for anything leave alone agriculture goods, perhaps the time has come, because I believe, I believe that these people are going to take a different attitude if we tell them why and how, if we stop arguing why the price of bread is so high when the farmer only gets so much and why the farmer doesn't get more; not realizing that the fellow delivering the loaf of bread also, leave alone delivering this in possibly a \$4,000 van, he has his expenses and we must consider him as well as the farmer. I'd like to see, Mr. Chairman, this Minister take a step in this direction, to erase some of those problems that have been created between our city cousins and country cousins. I think it's time that we speak out boldly and I believe that he's going to find that these people will gladly respond, because naturally as soon as our farmer is put into a better buying position, it's going to reflect on their own livelihood. I have no doubt that it will help them as well as the farmer. It hurt me the last session when I heard somebody say the price of wheat should be up - it has to be, if not up, production has to be up. This is fine. But if somebody then says, the price of a loaf of bread uses only two and a half or three pounds of wheat, and this man has no cost. It goes both ways and we've got to start considering this. We need these people to help the farmer at this time and I think they are willing to help us. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the sooner they are informed, as soon as this government have their plans ready, I think the better it will be for all concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to be lengthy, but I think perhaps I would like to -- while I'd like to bring in the price squeeze as my honourable friend or my colleague from Neepawa or Gladstone so often did - the former member, I'm sorry -- I don't think -- or perhaps the English tractors or perhaps some of the many other problems. And I think they are problems, I don't think they are emergencies. I believe at this time we should consider our emergencies. I do hope that as this government

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) gets a chance to get on its feet, gets a chance to take a look at some of the things they said, leave alone what they intend to do, I think we can, we must expect some help and I think we can.

I know that the universities have done a lot towards helping our productivity situation, or better breeding improvements or improvements of grain. I realize that many people have been involved in trying to increase our productivity, but something that is very dear to me, and it has been touched in this House, and that is, I believe first of all there should be more marketing research. To bring out my point, I wish to read an article that appeared in the Carillon News and I believe was by permission of the Portage la Prairie Leader, and it goes on like this: "More Marketing Research. The current economic difficulties faced by most Canadian farmers indicate that certain phases of agriculture research in this country must be intensified. For years there has been agriculture research in Canada, normal recognition of the fact the nation's economy was originally based largely on agriculture and that there is still a broad agriculture base. Both federal and provincial governments as well as business and other agencies spend vast sums annually on agriculture research; but unfortunately this has been directed largely to the improvement of livestock and grain and to the increase in productivity. This has resulted in significant progress in these areas and it cannot be discontinued; in fact this work must be expanded. However, in the light of the increased world competition, in agriculture, it is essential that there is more research in the marketing field. The present over-supply in wheat is a case in point. Less than two years ago, for instance, Canadian farmers were told to grow more wheat; today they find a glut on the market and are being urged to go in for other types of production. It is not surprising that the farmers feel frustrated. Acting on what they should consider expert advice, they find themselves in a position from which they find it almost impossible to extricate themselves. The farmers' dilemma stresses the need for marketing research as well as research directed towards quality and productivity. It is a gap in our agriculture research program towards which all are concerned, and especially the government should direct their direction." This is so true. It's rather lengthy and I'm sorry I had to read it, but I think it's said much better than I could say it if I tried to.

Now I guess that perhaps, as again the Honourable Member for Arthur mentioned, I want to encourage this Minister - you've got to get at Ottawa, you've got to, regardless of what political stripe sits down there, you've got to get at Ottawa. I don't mean for you to come back here and start blaming all the problems on Ottawa. This is not the thing I'm trying to say. I've wondered lately when you read of the Premier of Saskatchewan trying to find his own world markets and what have you. Perhaps we've reached the point where this is good. Perhaps we should consider some of these things in the line of marketing. I'm sure that this government is concerned, they must be, and I certainly hope that they take this seriously. I think the Prairie Economics Council consisting of the three Premiers who were supposed to meet, I believe it's this September 29th -- I wish them well and I hope they get a little tougher; I think we've got to. The time has just come where we've got to put some teeth into this thing.

Mr. Chairman, another point that I wish to touch on briefly is our Vegetable Marketing situation. I think our Agriculture Minister is more aware of the problems, and I intend to say very little at this time; but it seems to me that this government, this Minister, will have to come out and take a direct positive position. I think too many things are happening right now that are confusing to the grower, either to the large grower or to the small grower. The small grower perhaps thinks he won that referendum at that time and it should solve more of his problems; it hasn't solved too many of them. But I believe the Minister will have to take a positive stand because the majority of growers, if they are in favour of a board, fine. I think we'll have to act on majority rules here, but I think the situation in Manitoba has to be and should be cleared up. The Minister knows what I'm talking of, I don't think I have to go into a lot of detail. I believe he is much more aware of the situation than I am, and I hope before either this session or very shortly, I hope he directs or tells us of a policy that is going to clear some of these clouds that are hanging in the air for most of these vegetable growers.

Another point, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to bring up is our veterinarian dilemma. I think we've reached the stage and a situation that is hardly bearable. I believe we're down from 55 veterinarians to 31 and only 20 -- (Interjection) -- 26 is it? Thank you, and I believe four or five of those are practicing in either Winnipeg or Brandon - possibly I should say other than for agriculture, direct agriculture. -- (Interjection) -- Right - and calves. But anyways, I think this government should consider perhaps setting up veterinarian units at

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) certain places, in all due respect to our agriculture representatives who are needed in nearly every area, but we have certain secluded areas -- and I'm sorry the Member for Emerson is not here, I think he has a few, I believe I have a few -- but we have certain areas where there are perhaps only four or five different kinds of problems in that locality, and perhaps it might even be wise to switch those reps to more needed areas. But I think this government should consider spending some time and money in consideration of encouraging our veterinarian population. I don't know what the solution is; if it has to be done on the nursing basis or on the school teacher basis, but I know this, farmers today often lose animals that should have been saved by veterinarian help and I for one feel that a government, and myself, are responsible for trying to help the farmer in this dilemma. -- (Interjection) -- Yes they do. I agree with the member for Churchill; they need veterinarian care and I hope they're going to get it because there's too much money, too many animals dying off because they are not getting the help at all.

Mr. Chairman, when discussing the supplementary estimates, the Minister was asked, why were only potato growers subsidized, and his answer was: nobody else -- in fact I should perhaps read it in Hansard so I don't misread it, because I was very disappointed in his statement and I hope the Minister did not mean it; but on Page 652, the following, and I quote: "As to why others weren't considered in the special crops areas which are also not covered, I may tell you that across my desk I have no other submission from any other group for assistance, so really I don't know that there was a need for assistance in any other groups if there was it hasn't come across my desk." I think and I hope that the Minister does not really mean that statement, because if he does he is certainly opening the door for direct criticism. If that is the basis of criteria he wishes to handle this department, I for one cannot just buy that. But I do believe that it was a mistake and I don't think he meant it, because he knows as well as perhaps anyone in this House, and much better, the dilemma and the situation of the farmer today, regardless if they are at his doorstep or not, and I want to give him the benefit of the doubt that I hope he didn't mean it because . . .

MR. USKIW: . . . I can appreciate the remarks of my honourable friend. I want to point out to him that I had made a number of statements; I don't know whether each one was comprehensive; but if he takes the total remarks that I made in answer to questions put, he will find that that is not the only criteria which I illustrated to the House.

MR. BARKMAN: Well, I will accept that. I hope you don't feel that I'm misquoting you because it is in Hansard, is on that page, and I'm glad if you didn't mean it that way, and I think that's the main point. It's not what you said or what I've said in my life that was not said right; it's what the attitude is, and I believe the attitude is right, and I appreciate that.

MR. USKIW: If I may at this point, on the point of privilege again, Mr. Chairman, indicate to my honourable friend, that the main reason for considering the request of potato growers was the fact that that one commodity was not covered under the crop insurance program last year, as compared to all the other major commodities production in Manitoba.

MR. BARKMAN: I will accept that. In conclusion, I think I only wish to add this -- that this department, Mr. Chairman, must act speedily. There is a dilemma; you've heard it, you know it, you've stated it, you've quoted it and you're aware of it; and I ask Mr. Chairman that the Minister and this government do all in their power to get at it as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to enter this debate. First, I would like to congratulate the Minister on his appointment. He's really got a tough job ahead of him because agriculture is really in a mess at the present time. I was very glad to hear that he's got a very competent staff with him, because in looking over at the other side I see many teachers; if I have them counted right, there's seven teachers, two professors and two preachers. Now with all due respect to these men, we still have to say that they do not understand the problem of the farmer. You can work things out on paper, but this isn't the way you can do it. -- (Interjection) -- We got them too. We haven't got the men that are actually concerned in agriculture, so I hope in this light that the agricultural committee will be able to be of considerable help to him, because after you've farmed all your life you have a pretty good idea of some of the things. So I would say on this occasion that we should quit quarreling from one side to the other and try to come up with things that are good for agriculture.

We've been talking about a cost price squeeze in agriculture for years. This has just

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) become talk and nothing has been done. It's really time that we start to do something about it. And I might say here that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture leaves us new members in considerable doubt when he tells us that these have been passed by the former conservative government and that they're not his estimates and that it shouldn't take long, because probably, maybe we should read all of Hansard. I've read parts of it, but I'll tell you, folks, it's pretty monotonous reading. It does leave us in doubt, frankly, as to what we should do and what we should say.

One message that I believe the Minister should get across is to the consumer group. My friend the Honourable Member for La Verendrye was expressing this, because I believe that we really have a big public relations' job to do with the consumers. The farmers, contrary to what some people think, have become very efficient and have produced a lot, and this is what is causing them the trouble. If we were to refer to the farm people and what they get for their labour as compared to what others get, and the consumer group are always talking about the high cost of things in relations to their wages; and I've been reading some articles on this and doing a little work on it myself and I want to go back to the days of the thirties, when labour was cheap and commodities were cheap. But in those days a man got 25¢ an hour. You could buy a pail of syrup, Beehive Golden Corn Syrup for 79¢; but this represented three hours of labour. Today you can buy a pail of the same type of syrup for \$2.10. Working this out, the one man in the thirties had to work three hours for it, and with wages what they are today a man doesn't work one hour for it. A dozen eggs were ten cents a dozen in the thirties, while labour was still at 25¢ an hour and lots of people worked for 25¢ a day those times. So he had to work a half an hour for a dozen of eggs. Now eggs are in the neighborhood of 50¢, and labour in the neighborhood of around \$2.50, so he can get five dozen eggs for the one hour's work.

The best comparison that the consumer can use is the price of beef; we've had the biggest increase in beef. But in the thirties, as far as the producer was concerned, beef on the hoof sold at five cents a pound. Now beef on the hoof sells at 30¢ a pound. This is an increase of six times the price we got in the thirties. However, when you think about that it sounds pretty good; but let's go right back to the labour thing again. Labour was 25¢ an hour then, and it's \$2.00 or \$2.50 now, so in the same number of hours he can still buy more beef than he ever could before.

I have an article here which was published in the Free Press on May 10th in which it lays out that labour is largely to blame for a lot of our higher prices, because I know the farmer hasn't got it. I'm not blaming labour, but I would hope that our Minister of Labour would take this copy and do a little studying on it.

I could easily go on to talk about other commodities, and about the worse of these is wheat and grains, but I hope that I've got the message across that it isn't the farmer that's getting the benefits or the extra money that the consumers are paying. His cash is shorter than it ever was and that the labouring people never bought more food for a working hour than they're doing today.

I don't mean to criticize without having some ideas as to what might help and the farmer at the present time has to be looked at in two different ways. He needs immediate help and he needs help in the future and in market research. On this basis I think there should be cash advances more on the line of production that a man has rather than on any amount of acreage or anything else, because the most a farmer can sell today is five bushel of wheat if he can, and he's lucky if can get \$1.50 for it. It's a total income of \$7.50 off an acre; and then if he's a renter he's got one-third that he has to give away. This cuts him back to \$5.00. According to the Department of Agriculture a few years ago - I wanted to check this closer, I know it's higher now - but it cost over \$20.00 to produce a crop on an acre. In this case for every acre that a man's seeding at the present time, he's out \$15.00. Now I don't mean that this is lost; if he's been a good farmer, he's got the grain; but at the same time he's out \$15.00 an acre at the present time. Now you know and I know that we can't continue like this. There should be loans at the present time to get this man out of his financial trouble. Nevertheless, nobody could ever borrow himself out of debt and solve his trouble that way. When labouring people work, they want and they demand their money, and they're justified in it. But when a farmer has done all that he can and produced a good crop - in fact that's where his trouble seems to come from - and then he can't sell it, he's in real trouble. He isn't altogether to blame for this himself because he was encouraged to grow more grain. In fact he was even promised in the neighbourhood of \$2.00 a bushel; so he isn't just to blame. Our farmers are

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) really willing to adjust and ready to adjust if they where to go. The big problem of course with the grain farmer is markets and I know, as all these other members that are farmers, and people connected with agriculture know, that this is the responsibility of the federal people and the Canadian Wheat Board, but it doesn't completely take it out of the provincial area.

I go along with our Honourable Minister from Churchill when he says that the people in the east have their own industries and port facilities and they don't seem to care too much about the west. They have duties and tariffs which are protecting them. This might be necessary but if they expect the farmer to sell his grain on the world market, they should take other things into consideration. Selling grain or trading with other countries has to be a two-way street and we cannot expect to keep selling to these countries if we do not trade with them. I believe it is time the people of Manitoba, probably in conjunction with the other western provinces, would try to do something about developing a sales agency in conjunction with the Canadian Wheat Board. It's the people that grow the grain - it really matters to them; they're the people that cares. And if you've ever watched any business or anybody succeed, it's the people that care about it that can make a difference, and I believe for this reason that we should become more involved in the selling of our grain.

I believe that labour, the labouring group all through, should co-ordinate far better with our sales because if you have ships in port and they're paying demurrage, they aren't happy; and if you don't have a happy customer you won't have him very long. It takes a long time to get one but it only takes a short while to lose him. Every business likes to go where it's appreciated and that's the way with the people that are buying grain from us. I deplore the strikes that have taken place when they're shipping orders for grain. We must do all that we can to see that this don't happen again.

We need a lot of marketing research and guidance on this subject. Too much emphasis has been placed on production and little or any has been placed on research. This is the cause of our trouble. To correct this we should try to diversify. In our area, people could diversify to some extent - we're one of the most diversified areas there is. We should try to shift to crops where we have a sale, such as tomatoes and peas and beans, carrots and cucumbers and other things like that. One of our greatest potentials is to convert raw materials into finished material and ship it out of Manitoba. If we can do this I feel we're moving in the right direction.

I talked about the Pembina Dam and how it would help the southern area in this regard and I want you people to regard it as very important, because when you can market what you have it not only helps that area but it helps the others, because if they're selling special crops then the others can sell grain.

If we diversify into livestock and feed lots, chicken barns and the rest of it, money has to be made available, and I believe this money should be made available at a subsidized rate of interest. We're not asking for things for nothing, but the interest rates definitely should be subsidized. We can't say that we have no money, because we have more money for education, we have more money for Medicare, we have more for welfare and other items. Agriculture is surely very important and I would say that this is one thing that should be subsidized.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture. I hope that when his term as the Minister is over he still is in the same health and looking as fit as he is now. I would also like to thank him for the dispatch he showed in coming to one of the areas in my constituency which was badly flooded. I'm sure the people in the area and myself appreciate this very much, so thank you.

I have listened to my honourable friend discussing the problems of agriculture. I missed the opportunity in the Throne Speech of explaining the virtues and beauties of the constituency that I represent so I would like to at this time explain this area to the members. Gladstone constituency is now made up of the old Gladstone constituency and part of Rock Lake and Cypress - there was three portions of it made up the Gladstone constituency. It is composed of about 1600 square miles, about 16,000 people, primarily of Anglo-Saxon descent, ethnic groups of Ukrainian, Polish, Mennonite and Hutterite. Our people are hard working, they're industrious and they're not looking for handouts, but they are seeking a fair return for their efforts with at least a minimum wage standard. The primary industry is agriculture with nearly all segments of the community relying on this industry for their livelihood. The boundaries of this constituency: the southwest corner Shilo, northwest to Mountain Road, east to

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd) Langruth on Lake Manitoba then south to Austin and back west to Shilo; so it compromises a very large portion of central Manitoba.

Carberry - the Minister will be quite interested in hearing this - is becoming recognized as the potato capital of Manitoba. The Carnation Plant located there is planning on operating seven days a week, 365 days of the year. This is one of the areas where the young people are staying on the farms; there appears to be a future for them there and along with the special crops I believe that this area is possibly one of the bright spots in Manitoba.

From Carberry north to Neepawa, the villages of Brookdale, Oberon and Wellwood are located. This is some of the most productive land in Manitoba and diversification of its use is rapidly taking place; due again mainly to the operation of the potato plant at Carberry.

Neepawa is the largest town in the constituency, the largest industry there is a salt well. It has been phased out, possibly before the first of the year, possibly any time. It may even be on the verge at any day. It also has several secondary industries, namely a trailer camp, fur factory, forest products, garment factory and a boiler processing plant.

Mountain Road to the northwest is famous for the Roman Catholic Church that was located there. It was recently destroyed by fire. This was one of the landmarks of the northwest corner of this constituency. Across to Arden where the primary source of gravel is located; nearly of all central Manitoba relies on this source for the road and construction requirements.

Across to Lake Manitoba, all through these areas, there's a very heavy concentration of cattle and from Neepawa north and across, the diversification of crops hasn't been too great. It's mostly mixed farming with fishing a supplementary income as we go over towards the lake.

Gladstone is an area, one of the oldest established towns in Manitoba, or one of the older, anyway, is again a mixed farming area with a heavy concentration of cattle.

From Austin - the Austin area is more or less famous for the Museum which is located there. This Museum has been developed by individuals - I see by the Budget there was \$6,000 allocated to its maintenance and improvement in the past year. It would be hoped that this amount or possibly more would be allocated for the year 1970, the Centennial year.

I've tried to give a brief coverage of the property of the constituency. The people are striving to adjust to present conditions but high interest rates are working a severe hardship on them. Diversification doesn't happen; it requires time, money and planning. The average age of our farmers is 55 years of age. There are many who cannot diversify and at the present land values and the demand for land, they cannot sell out either. They're obliged to stay with the farming game until such time as they are forced off their land, retire or fortunate enough to sell it.

My friend from Birtle-Russell expressed the situation in regards to wheat very adequately, I felt. However, it would appear that there is definitely something wrong with the marketing system when at a time of heavy surplus of seed grain in the west, \$30 million worth of American corn is imported into the eastern feeder markets. I feel that our Marketing Board, the Wheat Board, in their handling of oats and barley have shown no initiative whatever to move this commodity. We have sacrificed our freedom in the marketplace and I feel that possibly an alternative to it would be to put the grain back on the free market and see if we can't maybe give it away - but at least get it moving.

Now in our area, and in all the smaller towns of Manitoba, secondary industries, if they could be encouraged to locate, would certainly be a shot in the arm to the economy, because there is no way I feel that a wheat market is going to be back in the foreseeable future. Credit is going to be hard to come by. I feel that possibly one step that a Provincial Government could take might be to subsidize loans for diversification. We can't blame all of the problems or too many of the marketing problems that we find ourselves in on the provincial government; most of it is federal policy and federal certainly have not shown any initiative whatever in getting the products rolling.

Now with these few words I would like to thank the Honourable Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, while I'm not an expert on agriculture, I represent a constituency with a strong agricultural base and I would like to at this time congratulate the Minister on behalf of Roblin constituency and wish him the best in the days ahead. I, in my campaign contested the seat with Mike Kawchuk who is, of course, well known in the House and contributes a lot to the debate of agriculture, so in that vein I figure that I'm trying to replace one who was an expert and hope that my remarks will add something

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) to the estimates of the Minister.

I congratulate the First Minister on his remarks in the Speech from the Throne wherein it was stated that help is coming for the farmers of my constituency and the rest of Manitoba -- and I'm not going to elaborate on the remarks that were already brought to the attention of the Minister, of the seriousness of the situation.

I find the dairy program in my constituency through federal policy, no problem of the Minister or this government, is pretty well being phased-out completely with the quota system. It's a very serious problem. In many cases it's drawn to my attention why these people who have been in the production of dairy products for a number of years are being phased-out one after the other, and I have evidence in the locale where I live at the present time of six young farmers who have lost their quotas and now are -- that was the base or their cash income from their farming operation and will be phased-out of operation this fall and will no longer be farming.

I think the federal dairy program is one that the Minister should take a very serious look at and see if we can't readjust or come up with a policy that will put us back where we were. The number of cream cheques that I took in to my place of business was over 50 percent of the income in a day's sale in the store. Now what's going to happen when we lose these cream cheques, I don't know, but it's one that alarms me as a businessman considerably.

The market place, as far as the special crops are concerned in Roblin, is I think being utilized to the best advantage that the farmers know. We have all the various crops, special crops being grown with the exception of possibly potatoes, and they're growing them well but the market place again becomes a very serious problem.

I was pleased to see the First Minister's remarks the other day wherein he said that he is going to possibly provide the insurance for the marine aspects of the Port of Churchill, and if this in fact is a solution to at least part of the problem, that we can make use of that Port, utilize it more than we're using it at the present time, and the studies that I've done on freight rates and insurance, by utilizing this Port it seems to indicate that the farmer would have some 10 to 12 cents a bushel in his pocket, and if in fact that is one of the answers for us to be competitive on the world market today I'm all for trying it, and I hope that they do take a very serious look at it and see if maybe we can't make use of that Port more than we are at the present time.

The one that does concern me, Mr. Chairman, though is the one of the wheat situation - the world wheat situation. In the period of July, '68 to February, '69, figures that I have show that exports of wheat by the five leading countries of the world, which are United States, Canada, Australia, Argentina and Russia, they fell by some 14 percent if you compare it with the exports of the same period a year earlier. And I think, Mr. Chairman, most of the reduction was in export to countries like India, Pakistan and Japan. Possibly I think maybe exports to Japan were much the same as they were before, but in the main, some new markets appeared along the horizon this year, and I think it is encouraging while others vanished that there is a potential for new markets for Canadian wheat. I estimate, Mr. Chairman, total wheat exports in the year '68 - '69 at about 1 3/4 million bushels, and if you take a look at that you'll find it's down some one - I think the year before was 1,932 million and the year before that was well over the 2 billion in '66 and '67.

I know wheat to me, and I think wheat today is very much a buyer's market, and surely that we could implement some form of policy out of this House whereby we in Manitoba maybe have to take the leadership or offer the direction to get out of the dilemma that we are in at the present time.

We see exporters chasing sales and cutting prices, very evident this last two or three months, and I don't think any Canadian wheat producer needs to be reminded of the sad fate suffered by the International Grains Agreement in the first half of this year that is just passing out. And whether that agreement, Mr. Chairman, can be resurrected or not at this stage, I think it's problematical. If it were, I think it's doubtful, I think it's very doubtful whether it would be beneficial to the farmers of Manitoba if it was resurrected.

Representatives of the exporting nations have been meeting regularly, as the Minister well knows, for the last month, but appear to me to have come up with no progress or no solutions at all as to putting a stop to the price cutting that's going on at the present time. So, if in fact we are facing a market of price cutting, where do we go? I think the American farmers or the American policy, rightly or wrongly they believe that this is the answer to it -

September 18, 1969

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd) cutting prices. I think if there isn't some way that we can get the countries that are exporting wheat to agree to maintain a price, then it will probably mean another revision, and another reduction in fact, of the present IGA price level.

If the current situation is bad, it's bad for exporters as well as it is for buyers, because nobody at this particular time is interested to go and make a deal to buy wheat because of this problem of price cutting. Why buy today when maybe tomorrow one of these countries will have cut the price five or six bushels so I think in part of it there are a considerable number of them that are holding back at this time. I think Canada, as Manitoba, appears headed for another good crop although weather conditions over Alberta, I hear now the last day or so, indicate that they may have some problems getting their crop off there. But anyway, the size and the quality of this crop that we have with us right now is of very little importance, I think, compared to the volume of exports that face us as we sit here this afternoon.

I wonder today: what are the prospects or has the Minister, you know, in his study or this group that's bringing in the report to us, are they going to take a look or give us some ideas where Manitoba should go? What are we, you know, maintain -- is the Wheat Board doing a good job? Or what has he got as an answer for us? What have we got to tell the Government of Canada today? I think Japan will continue to be a possible market for Canadian wheat. Europe, I'm sure, will continue to be a place where we can sell wheat. But these markets, in my opinion, today are open to all comers, and unless we can find some way to get in there and take our rightful place and get our rightful share, we are going to be the losers as we have been in the past two years. And how we go about it I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, but one thing comes to me I think, Mr. Minister, real quick and that is the flexibility of the Wheat Board. I think in some ways we've got to have more flexibility than we have at the present time.

The announcement in July of the fact that we sold some 7.5 million of bushels to Peru, which is a new market for Manitoba or for Canadian wheat, under generous, very generous credit terms, was very encouraging, and wheat I say now is a buyer's market and in this situation we need somebody to go out and act as salesmen for the wheat growers of Manitoba, not people that will go around and take orders.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour I wonder if I might move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: I think the honourable member has a point. As I indicated earlier this afternoon when the House commenced, I outlined a proposal which I believe was acceptable to the House. I would like to suggest now, Mr. Chairman, that you leave the Chair and Mr. Speaker take the Chair in order that he is there for 8:00 o'clock to hear the Budget delivery of the Honourable Minister of Finance. They've changed their mind? My friend tells me he's changed his mind.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: I'm now calling it 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock tonight.