

Name	Electoral Division	Address
ALEXANDER, Keith	Roblin	Roblin, Man.
BAIZLEY, Obie	Osborne	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
BJORNSON, Oscar F.	Lac du Bonnet	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
CAMPBELL, D. L.	Lakeside	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARROLL, Hon. J.B.	The Pas	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron	Portage la Prairie	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man.
CORBETT, A. H.	Swan River	Swan River, Man.
COWAN, James, Q.C.	Winnipeg Centre	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
DESJARDINS, Laurent	St. Boniface	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
DOW, E. I.	Turtle Mountain	Boissevain, Man.
EVANS, Hon. Gurney	Fort Rouge	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORBES, Mrs. Thelma	Cypress	Rathwell, Man.
FROESE, J. M.	Rhineland	Winkler, Man.
GRAY, Morris A.	Inkster	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
GROVES, Fred	St. Vital	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
GUTTORMSON, Elman	St. George	Lundar, Man.
HAMILTON, William Homer	Dufferin	Sperling, Man.
HARRIS, Lemuel	Logan	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
HARRISON, Hon. Abram W.	Rock Lake	Holmfild, Man.
HAWRYLUK, J. M.	Burrows	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C.	Selkirk	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C.	Ethelbert Plains	Ethelbert, Man.
HUTTON, Hon. George	Rockwood-Iberville	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
INGEBRIGTSON, J. E.	Churchill	Churchill, Man.
JEANNOTTE, J. E.	Rupertsland	Meadow Portage, Man.
JOHNSON, Hon. George	Gimli	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
JOHNSON, Geo. Wm.	Assiniboia	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
KLYM, Fred T.	Springfield	Beausejour, Man.
LISSAMAN, R. O.	Brandon	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C.	Fort Garry	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MARTIN, W. G.	St. Matthews	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
McKELLAR, M. E.	Souris-Lansdowne	Nesbitt, Man.
McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C.	Dauphin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MOLGAT, Gildas	Ste. Rose	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne	Pembina	Manitou, Man.
ORLIKOW, David	St. John's	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
PAULLEY, Russell	Radisson	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
PETERS, S.	Elmwood	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
PREFONTAINE, Edmond	Carillon	St. Pierre, Man.
REID, A. J.	Kildonan	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
ROBERTS, Stan	La Verendrye	Niverville, Man.
ROBLIN, Hon. Duff	Wolseley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SCARTH, W.B., Q.C.	River Heights	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
SCHREYER, E. R.	Brokenhead	Beausejour, Man.
SEABORN, Richard	Wellington	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
SHEWMAN, Harry P.	Morris	Morris, Man.
SHOEMAKER, Nelson	Gladstone	Neepawa, Man.
SPELLIE, Robert Gordon	Birtle-Russell	Russell, Man.
STANES, D. M.	St. James	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
STRICKLAND, B. P.	Hamiota	Hamiota, Man.
TANCHAK, John P.	Emerson	Ridgeville, Man.
THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C.	Virden	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WAGNER, Peter	Fisher	Fisher Branch, Man.
WATT, J. D.	Arthur	Reston, Man.
WEIR, Walter	Minnedosa	Minnedosa, Man.
WITNEY, Hon. Charles H.	Flin Flon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WRIGHT, Arthur E.	Seven Oaks	4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 8th, 1961

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Bruce Kenneth Pell and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Breezy Bend Country Club.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees

Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education)(Dauphin) presented Bill No. 35, an Act to amend The Public Libraries Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable the Minister of Education -- I believe that this isn't the proper place for the motion.

MR. McLEAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health & Public Welfare)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table a reply to a question of the House dated Monday, February 27th, by the Honourable Member for Radisson; and a reply to a question of the House dated Monday, February 27th, by the Honourable Member for Fisher; and a question of the House dated Monday, February 27th, by the Honourable Member for St. John's.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a return to an Order of the House, No. 1 in the name of the Honourable the Member for Radisson. I would also like to lay on the table a copy of the annual wage and salary survey that is done by the Department of Labour in co-operation with the Federal Department of Labour, and gives statistics with respect to wages and hours of work as at September, 1960.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you and the other members of the House, a very important and beautiful delegation from northern Manitoba. I'm speaking of the Fur Queen who was elected at the Northern Manitoba Trappers Festival a few weeks ago, Miss Stella Yaworski, and her Princesses who are Miss Sandra Third of the new town of Thompson -- Miss Dianne Keddie is one of the Princesses representing the RCAF station in Cranberry Portage, and we have Miss Myrna Purdy representing another famous northern community, Flin Flon. They have with them a chaperone, Mrs. Terry Anka from The Pas. Now I would like to just say a word about these young ladies. I think it's fair to say that the large portion of the success of the Trappers Festival is dependent upon the promotion and the financial contribution which is stimulated as a result of the competition for the Fur Queen of the North. She's also selected, of course, on her beauty and personality, and I'm sure you will agree that all of these girls well qualify as the queens of Northern Manitoba. I'd like to say that -- (Interjection) -- Well you may have an opportunity a little later. The girls have some free time, I understand.

I'd like to also say that the Fur Queen herself plays a very useful and important role in promoting all of Manitoba at a date later this year when she will appear with the other representative of the Department of Industry and Commerce at the Sportsmen Show somewhere to the south, and does a very fine job of promoting Manitoba at this very important event. Now the Fur Queen is a life-long resident of The Pas. She is also an employee of my colleague to my right here, the Minister of Health. She works for the department in The Pas as a stenographer in the Department of Health and Public Welfare. I'd like to extend a very warm welcome to the House today and wish you every success in your reign as Fur Queen and the same, of course, goes to your Princesses in the year ahead.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition)(Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Carillon tried his best to be allowed to speak on behalf of our party on this occasion, but I recognize that this was one of the times when the privileges of leadership should be recognized. I would like on behalf of our group to join with the Honourable the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.).....Minister in the welcome that he has extended to the Fur Queen, and her Princesses, and chaperone, and even looking at them from this distance, which I hope will be cut down in the future in pursuance of the Honourable Minister's suggestion, I would say that this is the first time that I have ever felt that some other constituency could vie with the constituency of Lakeside in its production. I think that all of us would agree that the Minister representing that constituency has something to be very proud of today. We join with him in his welcome, and we trust that the Queen and the Princesses will have a very pleasant time here this afternoon, and later during their free time.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, unaccustomed as I am to voicing formalities in this Chamber, I nevertheless find it not difficult to extend a warm welcome to the rather winning representation from the north country. I'd like to say that if this were the same time last year I would probably try to get their phone numbers, but there's not much use now. I would like, on behalf of our group, to welcome them to this Assembly.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we have also in the gallery with us this afternoon some 70 students from Grade VII in Gordon Bell School, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Gaston and Mrs. Brown. I have the distinction, Sir, of representing the constituency in which this school is located, and it gives me a good deal of pleasure to welcome them to our Assembly this afternoon and hope that their view of our proceedings will give them some information about the way in which Parliamentary democracy is conducted and the procedure in this legislature, and that in that way they will be able to take an interest in the public affairs of their province. I'm delighted to have the opportunity, Sir, of welcoming the teachers and pupils from Gordon Bell School.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to introduce to you and the members, a group of students on your right hand side. They hail from the fair constituency of Kildonan, which I represent, and they attend Melrose School. My honourable colleague the Member for Burrows is their principal. They number 35 and they are accompanied here by their fair teacher, Miss Brisley. I hope their stay with us is pleasant and educational; and through you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of the House, I greet them with a hearty and warm welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, we pride ourselves in this Assembly on keeping all records straight. I would like to refer to an error which appeared in the record of debates and proceedings, Hansard, of yesterday's session. At the close of the session the Hansard says that Mr. Chairman said "committee rise and report, call in the speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again." Mr. Speaker, what actually happened was that I addressed you and said that the "Committee of Supply is considering a certain resolution and has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again."

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that I am glad the the honourable the Chairman of the Committee did regard it as progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Mr. McLEAN presented Bill No. 35, an Act to amend The Public Libraries Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, there are just two provisions here. Under The Public Libraries Act there is provision made for an Advisory Board and it is considered necessary, and in the public interest, to provide that no person may be appointed for more than two terms, each term being three years on that Board, without there having elapsed some period of time between appointments. In other words, one person could, if it met the wishes of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, be a member of the Board for six years and then could not be a member again until some time had elapsed. This brings this board into line with provisions which apply to many other boards.

The second provision is one which would enable a municipality in the case of a Municipal Library, or municipalities in the case of a Regional Library, to have a by-law for the purpose

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) of borrowing money to provide a building for housing the library. In the case of regional libraries, of course, it would have to be all of the libraries participating in the region and would be subject to all the other requirements as far as borrowing money by municipal corporations is concerned. We bring this amendment forward because in the opinion of legal counsel the municipalities do not now have that authority, or rather perhaps I should put it, there is some doubt whether they have that authority or not, and this amendment, if passed, will make that beyond any question.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, it was the first provision that the Honourable the Minister mentioned that attracted my attention, because when I glanced over the bill I was interested to see that there is a limitation being put on the appointment of the members of the Advisory Board. I realize that it is not necessary for the Minister or the Government to explain to the House just their reasons for taking an action of this kind. The Minister has said that that is in conformity with what obtains on several other Boards. Personally I don't know that that is a good reason in itself. It seemed to me, at first glance, that there might be occasions where it was advisable to reappoint the same person, or persons, even though they might have served some considerable length of time, because I think that in this matter, as some others, even including membership in this house perhaps, that maybe a person's usefulness does not deteriorate, too quickly at least, with added years of service. Some people I know make almost a life work of their connections with libraries and their operation and expansion, and I was just thinking that it might be worthwhile, at least, to examine more closely into the reasons of why this is being done. However, that's not an intention of opposing second reading of the bill and perhaps when it gets to the committee stage, if the Minister doesn't answer at the present time, that we could go further into it.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I will acknowledge that there could be a difference of opinion on this matter. I think, however, there is a distinction to be made between the case where a person is appointed by a governing body, such as represented by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and the case where a person is elected, because of course, the process of election imposes the necessary sanction of public approval. It is my opinion, and I give it for nothing more than my own opinion, that in boards of this nature, of an advisory character which do not have the responsibility for administering policy, that it is advisable to have a limitation in order to ensure that from time to time new people with fresh ideas are brought to bear on it. This happens to be an opinion which I have with respect to all such boards, not only this, and I can offer it as nothing more than my own firm conviction from, oh some experience, that it's good for the public welfare.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask the Honourable Minister a question, Mr. Speaker? I assume that in this case, and in the other that the Honourable the Minister speaks of, his objection to a continuance does not arise from the fact that these appointments might have been made by a preceding government.

MR. McLEAN: No.

Mr. Speaker put the question, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department VI --1 (a) -- Passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to enquire if the Minister at this time wished to make any further statement, because it is my intention to make some further remarks with regard to the debate that was still in progress when we rose last evening.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all of us who were here for the committee sitting last evening would perhaps feel that we didn't need to spend much more time, and certainly I shall not take much time on the subject matter that was under discussion when we rose, but because I have had only the briefest time to even glance at the record of last evening's proceedings, I simply am not prepared to comment fully on the statement of the Honourable the First

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....Minister. From the quick look that I have had at it, coupled with my remembrance of what he said last evening, I must say that it seems to me that the First Minister said last evening almost exactly the same thing that I protested against the Minister of Agriculture saying on the TV interview. I hope I shall not have to do it again, but I certainly do not want the record to remain as it is, with these statements still unchallenged; and in this case, it's the Honourable, the First Minister.

I'm looking at page 616 of yesterday's Hansard, and though I admit that some of these remarks are out of context in that I'm not reading the whole portion of the speech, yet I don't think they are out of context in the sense of giving an incorrect interpretation to my honourable friend's words. If he feels that they are, then I'd certainly be glad to read as much as he wishes of the actual script. But about the middle of the page, the Honourable the First Minister, is reported as saying, "We have not said to this man, 'leave your property now; you can't live on this anymore, you're through.' We didn't shove him out the door and cut off his living and neither, Mr. Chairman, did we confront him with an ultimatum as to price, but that is what we would have done if we were to follow" -- and then there is an interjection and then the First Minister says -- "absolutely." I pause here, Mr. Chairman, to sympathize with you in your position as chairman, because it is difficult for you when we have too many of these interruptions, and I'm afraid in this case that the sense has been somewhat disturbed thereby because the Hansard record was not able to get all of the exchanges that took place. But the First Minister continues, "we would have within 30 days, if my honourable friends" -- and he was speaking to the Leader of the CCF Party -- "if my honourable friend's interpretations were right, we would have to submit a price and give him an ultimatum as to price." Then down at the bottom of the next paragraph, "Now if we had come in and said -- done any of those things charged against us of depriving them of the right of use of their property; if we had come in with a 30-day ultimatum as to price and presented them with that, then I think probably we would be open to some criticism." Then over on the next page, near the top of page 617, there is this sentence, "We're not trying to hustle them into a deal, as we would be compelled to do if we took the advice opposite." It's because of the advice opposite that I get into the act for I was one of the ones who spoke, as well as my honourable friend the Leader of the CCF Party. And then down a little more than the middle of the page, "Now the point that my honourable friends opposite seem to hand their arguments on is whether what we're doing is legal or not."

Mr. Chairman, so far as one of my honourable friends opposite is concerned, I deny that completely. We have mentioned the legality, that's true. We dealt with the question of legality, but certainly not in my case was that considered the main point. The main point is the fairness of what has been done, and the recommendation that we make that there should have been approach made to these people and negotiation before the filing of a plan. I know there are objections; I know there are some qualifications that can properly be put to that procedure; but I still say that that is a much preferable way to the way that was adopted. I dispute completely my honourable friends suggestion that, reading it again, "Now the point that my honourable friends opposite seem to hang their arguments on is whether what we're doing is legal or not." Well that is not the main point at issue. Then at the end of that paragraph, "People talk about Magna Carta. How easy it would have been to fasten on that 30-day clause and give them any old price and say, 'you're out; if you don't like it, take it to the Courts.'" Then lower down the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party interjects, "But that 30-day clause would not have stopped negotiations." And the Honourable the First Minister says, "Oh, yes it would." Now, Mr. Chairman, surely the act is clear in this regard at least, that the so-called 30 day clause would not have stopped negotiations. It does not stop negotiations. One does not have to be a lawyer, and I can understand the differences of opinion that are expressed by the lawyers, but one does not have to be a lawyer to see that it does not stop negotiations. My honourable friend, the First Minister is just plain wrong when he mentions that. I suggest to him that he can't find anyone, anyone -- lawyer or layman, who will agree with him in that interpretation.

And so my protest once again, as it was last evening, is that the Honourable the First Minister has joined with the Minister of Agriculture in conveying a completely erroneous impression as to what we in this group, and I speak only for ourselves, have been trying to convey. We're not recommending a procedure that would have put a 30-day clause in, because that's not

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.), . . . what the act says. Now if my honourable friends wish to debate the question from the legal point of view, I'm quite willing to do that too. We can read the act. The act is plain, I think, to any layman, let alone a lawyer, that you can continue to negotiate beyond the time of that 30 days. True, the farmer must file notice of his disagreement with the price that is offered. He must file that and he must file that within 30 days, that's true, but that does not end the procedure. The department can still negotiate with him. It doesn't even say how long those negotiations can continue. It does not end; there's not a 30-day clause.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, as I said last night, I'm not a lawyer and I am not going to argue this 30-day point at any length. As I understand it, in the little experience that I have had with expropriation, if a tentative offer had been made theoretically by the minister, and I think we have to look at the practical aspects of what has been advocated -- and I want to make this clear so far as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is concerned -- he did not get himself down on Hansard as advocating a tentative offer; it was the Leader of the CCF, but he did associate himself with the remarks made by the Honourable Leader of the CCF. But let's look at the way it worked out practically. You can talk about theory all you like, but we're dealing with people. I would have made a tentative offer, and as I stated last evening it would have been a conservative offer, and the farmer would have been outraged -- or the property owner. He would have been outraged, because everybody feels that his own piece of sod is the best piece of sod in the world, and he is completely justified in thinking so; but he would have been outraged. In all likelihood he would have come back to me with an offer that probably would have been outrageous as the one I had made to him. And then I, as Minister, would consider his offer and I'd say, "I can't do it." I would notify him of this and then he has 60 days in which to apply for arbitration. He has 60 days after that to give notice that he wants to go to arbitration.

Well all this talk about a theoretical approach to this question aside; let's look at the practical --- of problems and complications in trying to purchase a right-of-way of the size, with a number of people involved, with a number of properties involved, with the complications of ownership and tenancy and so on that are involved. We tried to do the practical thing and I still believe that we did the right thing. True, we expropriated the land. We notified -- upon expropriation we notified the farmer or the owner that his land had been expropriated and that we were ready to do business with him; we wanted to negotiate with him; that this land wouldn't be used for some time or taken into construction for some time; that we would like him to stay on as the tenant. It would give him time to make the arrangements that he necessarily would have to make to make his move. It would give him time to do some thinking about the price that he wanted for his property. As a matter of fact, these people are saying to our representatives who are dealing with them today, "How long do we have? Can we have two or three weeks? Can we have a month to think this thing over?" This is what they are saying to our representatives, and we're saying, "yes, take the time." I'm not going to suggest that the opposition, and especially the Leader of the CCF, were suggesting on purpose that we do something that was going to get us into a lot of trouble. I think that he just didn't realize, when he made this statement in the House what he was suggesting and what the practical results would have been if we had followed his advice and the policy that he recommends -- and this would have happened. It does not necessarily have to happen, but it would have happened because of the reaction of human beings and taking into consideration what human nature is, and I think governments have to.

I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has stated that he is not so interested in the fine legal aspects as of the overall effect of what we are doing; and let me assure him that this was what we were concerned about -- the overall effect of our procedure -- and we think it has been relatively good. I suggested last evening in a reply to a statement made by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead when he brought up the -- I suggested there was more commotion in the Chamber than there was on the floodway property -- and he notified us of the meeting at Gonor. Well the fact of the matter is that the people in the Gonor area are not affected as yet by expropriation. I am sure that they are troubled by the rumours that do go on, and let's face it, there's always rumours when an undertaking of this kind is taken up. They're probably troubled and we're going to send out two of our top men to that meeting to

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)....try and give them information that will satisfy them and will satisfy the questions that they have on their minds.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister wouldn't mind an interruption, the meeting will be held on Tuesday and I was asked to invite the Minister or someone from his staff. That's at 8:00 p. m. Tuesday

MR. HUTTON: That's fine and someone will be there. The number of people who have been affected by expropriation up to this point are 104 property owners -- 104 property owners whose land has been expropriated. All of these people have been approached. Five properties which involved seven families have been settled; compensation has been paid; all the arrangements made. I think here is a perfect example of some of the intricate negotiations that you must carry on in getting title to this property and final settlement -- five properties with seven families involved, and so it takes a bit of sorting out to make sure that everybody involved gets fair treatment and is looked after. Seventy owners out of the 104 owners have agreed to lease us. Now we are not batting a 100 percent as yet, but we've only been negotiating for a short time, and I think 70 out of 104 owners to have reached agreement on the question of leasing the land is a pretty good batting average. Fifteen more owners are under actual negotiation and we expect a complete settlement at any time. Now this about tells the story. We're dealing as yet with 104 property owners.

Now the question of what might be troubling the people at Gonor. There are a number of things that are probably bothering these people. One is that many of these holdings, being river lots, are long and narrow and limited acreage; and when we take out the right-of-way, it could bring their acreage down below 40 acres and make their buildings and improvements taxable. That's one thing that could be troubling them. Another thing that is likely troubling them is the fact that we're going to cut their property in half, and they may be wondering what they are going to do with the tail end of it on the other side of the floodway; and the question of crossings and bridges -- they know very well that we can't give everyone a bridge over a floodway of this size, so these people are probably worrying about this; and they are good legitimate points to be concerned over. I think that it is fair to say that the Property Purchasing Committee are prepared to buy out these properties that are cut off, and I trust that this will all be explained to these people. But I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the people, unlike the members here in the legislature, are concerned about the practical aspects and ramifications of the floodway and the way it's going to affect them and they're not really much concerned about some legal technicality which we can't establish to be right or wrong within this Legislative Chamber. On the question of speculation, I might mention that there has been some speculation in spite of everything that we have done, and I am afraid that there are ways and means of doing these things that are pretty hard to catch in a court of law. There has been building -- and -- I'm not saying necessarily that the people who have built in the location where the floodway is going within the past year have done so on speculation, but there has been building and it was things like this that we must guard against, if possible.

I would like to mention one other point. We are endeavouring to be fair with these people and there is, at the present time, amendments to The Expropriation Act under consideration, so that we will be enabled to make an interim payment to these people to facilitate the adjustments that they will have to make. I can't say any more about it than that right now, but it is and has been for some time under consideration, so that we can help these people. I don't think that there's any more that I can add at this time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister is usually, in my opinion, a very good advocate of his position and I give him credit for that. I'm not thin-skinned and I don't think that he's trying to irritate me deliberately, but just near the end of his remarks he said once again, that he thought that people out in that territory, unlike the members of the legislature.....

MR. HUTTON: I'm sorry, I should have excluded you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, but my honourable friend doesn't exclude me and the Honourable the First Minister didn't exclude me, and I'm not thin-skinned, but I do not propose to sit here and have anyone suggest that we're being impractical about this or that we are concerned over legal technicalities. The legal technicalities are something that I'm quite willing to leave to the lawyers. To me they're very clear. But I do not want my honourable friend, by

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....referring to the opposition in general or the members of the opposition, to say that we're not interested in the practical effects. I am interested in the practical effects. It's because I'm arguing the practical considerations that I think that the practical way to do was to go and negotiate with these people first. My honourable friend says that they're negotiating with them now about leases. Well, of course, they can do that very well.

MR. HUTTON:.....deal. We're negotiating.....

MR. CAMPBELL: And about claims as well, of course. But my argument is that negotiations could have taken place and should have taken place first. Now I know that there's the practical side in opposition to that. I'm not trying to belittle that. My honourable friend says that if he had made a proposal to the farmers with regard to price it would likely have been a conservative price, and that the farmers would likely have been outraged by it; and he would probably have been outraged by their counter-claims. Now I don't think it would be necessary--I agree that it would be a conservative price that would be given, but I don't see that it would likely be one that would outrage the farmers because the Minister mentioned the two gentlemen who are heading up this work, C.E. Joslyn and A.R. Purchase, those are well-qualified men; they're able men. I'm sure that they could arrive at a price that would at least not be an outrageous one. It mightn't satisfy everybody, I agree with my honourable friend on that, but I would think it would be at least a fair basis to start on and that it would be better to have some basis such as that than nothing at all but a bald letter saying, "we now own your farm, do you want to rent it from us?" Well that's what the letter said. In many cases it was the first, the very first intimation that they had. Of course they had seen people out there--field parties. Of course they had, but the location of the floodway proper was not known with definiteness. That was quite understandable, and this was the very first intimation they had with regard to their own properties. Now I am trying to be practical; I'm not trying to be technical. I simply counsel my honourable friend the Minister and the First Minister to include me out and include our party out if you're going to be making statements of that kind.

MR. HUTTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition disassociate himself with the statement made by the Honourable Leader of the CCF, that we should have had a statement, "We are prepared to make you an offer of 'X' number of dollars." If he'll disassociate himself with that statement which is down in Hansard, we will say that he has not part in this.

MR. CAMPBELL: I haven't had an opportunity to read what he said.

MR. HUTTON: I'll read what the Honourable Leader of the CCF had to say.

MR. CAMPBELL: What page?

MR. HUTTON: On page 544, March 6th.

MR. CAMPBELL: I haven't got that one here. I'll listen.

MR. HUTTON: He said: "Because it appears to me that there is no doubt at all in that section" -- down about two-thirds of the way -- "that on the filing of the plan, which was done, the Minister should be in a position to say to the people whose land is affected, 'We are prepared to make you an offer of 'X' number of dollars'. I would agree, Mr. Chairman, that it might only be a tentative figure, subject to negotiation, but the fact of the matter is that in respect of expropriation of the properties for the floodway, those that were affected were first of all told that the expropriation had taken place," and so on, "we don't know what you're going to get for it so we can't tell you." This is his criticism.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have to repeat that that isn't the place where I would like to start. I think that there should have been negotiation before that. I think there should have been negotiation with the farmers prior to the filing of the plan, but I certainly do agree with the Leader of the CCF Party that once you've filed the plan and thereby actually took ownership of the property, I agree that then you should have made an offer at that time because that's what the act says. The act says you shall make an offer at that time.

MR. HUTTON: But you're back on a legal point again.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's right. My honourable friend forces me back on the legal point again.

MR. HUTTON: I thought that you agreed that we weren't interested on the legal point. That's what you said.

MR. CAMPBELL: I say it's not the most important point, but when my honourable friend

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.).....asked me that question, then I have to come back to what the Act says, and the Act says that you, having done what you did, then you must make the offer.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with 1 (a), and I hope that maybe I can disrupt this floodway. Even the lawyers do not see eye to eye. They don't seem to understand one another. However, no wonder the Minister of Agriculture said yesterday that I don't understand and I'm a poor leader and so on and so forth. Even the paper had me quoted that it's hard to understand me, but anyhow at least I satisfy the people in the paper department that at least I'm amusing to them. At least somebody in this House is satisfied when I get up to speak, if I cannot convince the members. However, Mr. Chairman, I was speaking the other day and I was hoping that the Minister would be able to answer some of the questions I was putting forth on Fish Lake and Dennis Lake and Icelandic River. What has been accomplished in that manner? I also mentioned this pork surplus, that Klik was distributed, and how it was done and so on and so forth. Actually I have here, and it's a coincidence that we are on such an item -- when I was speaking on bridges, and as the paper quotes that it's hard to understand me, possibly the people out in my area they understand me and I had hoped that the Minister understands what I'm trying to say on these bridges -- and so here I received just this afternoon a petition, and I shall read it to the honourable members, and I wish the page boy would take it right across the House to the Minister and I believe he will understand what I am trying to say.

March 6, 1961 -- The Honourable Minister of Public Works -- oh, that's public works, well it should read, Minister of Agriculture and Conservation because he is the honourable member from that department. However, I'll cross that out myself. "We, the undersigned ratepayers of Laval School District and residents, hereby petition and urge the Minister of Public Works -- here again it should have correction -- and his government for urgently needed bridge across the river at the location as follows, east of Section 31-24-1 W, which will enable our school children to get to school without any difficulty. Also, this above bridge will connect the district on both sides of the river. As of now, some children have to detour four miles before reaching their school. We hope that the Honourable Minister and his government will acknowledge the necessity of this project this year, 1961."

Well, Mr. Chairman, the people out there seem to understand me and I understand them. However, I spoke last year on these bridges and I took the time off to look up the Hansard this morning. Last year when I was urging the Minister to give consideration to such bridges, he promised me, and his quotation was very short, "we'll take that into consideration". Hansard, February 22nd, 1960, page 787.

Now he took it under consideration, I am sure, and any conclusion did he come to -- anything concrete about what's going to happen for such bridges and to my area?

MR. HUTTON: It was taken under consideration with a lot of other projects that were brought to my attention during the year. I don't know whether -- if you consider the action that was taken as a conclusion, it would appear that nothing is to be done, but I don't think that is the case. It's probably like a lot of other projects that we have in this department under Water Control and Conservation. It probably has to wait its turn.

MR. WAGNER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not draw my conclusion on consideration as the final word. But what I'm driving at and the people in my area are, that since the new government was elected and the new Minister and the new member, that we are going to go out and do something; we are going to go ahead with Manitoba; so naturally I don't want to leave that inference -- that's the common word now -- to the Minister, that under consideration it's not going to be done. But I'm hoping at least that he gave it thought, and maybe at least certain steps, that this situation will be alleviated. Naturally I'm questioned from day to day, what has been considered. That's all.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, coming back to the floodway again, last night when the Minister was speaking he said that there were several of the claims that had been settled. I asked him if he could get the figures for us and he thought he would get them by today. Has he got figures?

MR. HUTTON: I've already given them.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm sorry, I missed it. What was the number?

MR. HUTTON: Five settlements involving seven families have been made; 15 are nearing

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.). . . . completion; 70 of the 104 owners have signed agreements to lease the property until they are needed. I pointed out, also, that the total number of people affected by expropriation to date is 104 -- the total number of property owners is 104.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, as I understand the Act, the province would pay interest on any money owing to these farmers from the time the expropriation is undertaken until such time the offer is accepted. Is that correct?

MR. HUTTON: I don't want to answer that. I think that is not correct, but I am not sure. I wouldn't want to be quoted on it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, last night when the First Minister was speaking on this, he mentioned some of my comments -- I'm sorry that I wasn't here to participate at that particular point of his speech. He mentioned that we were working on a very -- or I was working on a very narrow foundation. Well I don't agree with my honourable friend's statement in this regard. I am not suggesting that there is any malice in what has been done in this thing, but I do think there has been a very considerable amount of mismanagement, and he can squirm around all he wants on that one -- I still claim that that's the case. My honourable friend, once again, has been trying to prove that he is doing great things and rushing boldly into projects, and here again he has bungled this by that very reason. This whole matter that has arisen now is a result of mismanagement on my honourable friend's behalf. The complete uproar is based strictly on that, that instead of handling this thing in a proper businesslike and diplomatic fashion, they've rushed forth, and now we have the troubles that have arisen.

In that regard I would like to point out one other item in particular. I went out and had a look last week at some of this proposed floodway land and I find in one location, and I may be wrong on this because I am not equipped with the maps showing exactly where it is going to go, but from all the information that I can get, there is a brand new hydro line coming across the countryside reaching about half-way into the proposed floodway and turning directly south right down the channel of the floodway for a distance it appeared to me -- oh, a mile and a half or two miles. Now, Mr. Chairman, this isn't the hydro line that was built two years ago. It's still under construction -- there is still some work going on on this very line. It was built, as far as I can see, during the past summer. There are still indications along the base of the towers where equipment has recently been operating. Now if my honourable friends are handling this in a businesslike fashion, why are they proceeding to build hydro lines directly in the path of the proposed floodway?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think I should say at the outset that I simply don't accept my honourable friend's criticism. I don't think it is justified by the facts. I don't think there is any bungle here. I think that when we have listened to the Minister recite the progress that has been made in dealing with the people concerned, it is obvious that they are being dealt with in a satisfactory manner; that their full rights are preserved under this matter; and they're getting a proper and a square deal from this administration. I simply don't agree at all that there has been any bungle of the sort that my honourable friend states. I rather think that if he were doing it, he might do it in exactly the same way after he considered all the facts.

As for the hydro line -- naturally I am not in a position to make a positive statement about that off the cuff. All I can say is that the Public Utilities and the Department of Public Works have been kept fully informed as to the location possibilities in respect to this floodway, and I have sufficient confidence in the good judgment of the Managers of those utilities to believe that they would not knowingly build a new hydro line in the place where the floodway is going to be built. Now they have the information as far as we were able to give it to them as to where this was to go, and I feel confident that they have used ordinary common sense and that they're not guilty of any such particular thing that has been mentioned.

While I am on my feet, I just want to deal with the point that the Leader of the Opposition raised. By reading the statute in respect of this matter, one can draw one's own conclusions. Under section 14 (1) where any person so entitled or served with a notice is dissatisfied with the amount offered, he shall, within one month from the date of the notice, notify the Minister of the fact in writing, and shall in his notice name the amount which he claims and make a full statement of the facts in support of his claim. (2) If no such notification is received by the Minister within the period mentioned, the person entitled to compensation shall be deemed to be satisfied with and shall accept the amount set out in the notice from the Minister. Going on

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....further -- there is another step in the procedure before you get into the Court. 17 (1) The claimant if dissatisfied with the decision of the Minister may, within 60 days after the registration of the notice of decision, give notice in writing to the Minister, which may be by registered letter, that he desires to submit the claim to arbitration. The claim shall thereupon be submitted by the Minister to arbitration by a judge and The Arbitration Act shall, subject to this act, apply to the proceedings thereon. And then again-- No. 18. Where the claimant fails within a period of 60 days to notify the Minister and make the deposit required by this Act, he shall be deemed to have accepted the Minister's decision and shall not thereafter question it. Now that clearly sets out that once you embark upon this procedure of notice, you have tied yourself to a timetable which must be strictly adhered to if you are going to take benefit of the proceedings under this act; and that, I think, is a point which bears on the argument under discussion and, in my opinion, is a valid one for me to make at this time. But I want to reiterate what I said, Mr. Chairman, that I do not believe that it has been shown by anybody who has spoken in this debate that we have abridged the rights of the people who are connected with this matter. I think that the explanation given by the Minister of the activities of the Floodway Purchase Committee, after all upon whose advice and very good advice, I think, we have been acting in this matter; when you get the story of the progress of the settlements and the status of the negotiations with these various people as we have had it this afternoon; one can see that we are coming to a fair and equitable conclusion with respect to people who are affected by this matter.

Regarding the point of law, I am not going to rehash it again, but I still maintain our view that we put forward before, that legally our course is right. Now if it's not right it can be taken to the Courts and somebody can find out. I understand the statement was made last night that it would be taken to the Courts. I would certainly be happy to see that because that's one way in which this matter can be settled. We're not going to settle it here. I think in repeating what I said that we have acted properly within the law and that, more important than that even, we have dealt fairly with these people concerned; that settlements are in progress and are being made; and that it is my hope that we will wind up with practically no litigation, very little litigation indeed. It seems to me that's the point that we should consider, that this matter is working out in a satisfactory way to the people concerned as indicated by the progress that the Flood Purchase Committee has made.

MR. CAMPBELL: The Honourable the First Minister said that he was not going to argue the legal point, but he just read onto the record sections of the act, and I would like to ask him if the very sections or parts of them that he read onto the record just now, do they not disprove completely the claim that he was making last evening that the course advocated from this side of the House compelled settlement in 30 days?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I will have to agree with my honourable friend that the act does not compel settlement within 30 days, but it does set up a timetable which does compel settlement, you can take it either 60 days or 90, depending on the action taken -- well 90 is the maximum time. It depends on how one interprets the phrase, "notice of decision". If that is the Minister's first notice under the act, then it is 60 days; otherwise it is 90. The question of days may seem important to my honourable friend, but to my mind it's the principle in which we find ourselves here, that once we set the "procedure of notice" underway, then we're tied to this timetable. Our stand has been that we are being just as fair, in fact perhaps fairer to the people concerned, to avoid getting them into this straight-jacket of time so that settlements can be made without undue pressure or without undue haste, considering the magnitude of the proposal. Now I still maintain, I maintain it firmly, that that policy is a sound one; that it's fair to the people concerned, in fact it may be thought to be fairer, because it doesn't bring them within the ambit of this time element which is embedded in the act. Now what's been overlooked in this thing, particularly in connection with this question of rentals, is that it is not going to be 90 days when the government has to take over this property in the physical sense of starting to dig or starting to carry out these public works. It's going to be a period much longer than 90 days before that happens. There is no necessity for these people to leave their homes in any urgent way. That is why the whole device of giving them the opportunity to lease their land was put into this arrangement of ours, so that the people concerned would have all the time in the world in which to make their arrangements, because we knew it would be

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.). . . . some time before we could actually do more than mark out the property concerned and get on with the engineering considerations which follow from the selection of the property. There is no need to have this rush. There is no need to put this 90 day or 60 day, whatever it is, straight-jacket upon them. Why should we, when we can leave the matter open and allow time for reasonable negotiations to take place with these people. Now that's our stand and we think it's fair. We think it is imminently fair to those concerned. It doesn't do them an injustice, in fact, it gives them more time than the act would allow under the other system to carry out the negotiations that have to take place. I submit that there is nothing wrong with that. I submit that it is reasonable under the circumstances and I submit that it does not abridge the rights of the people concerned.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I submit that it's not the best way, because the best way, the way that would have avoided the difficulty about curtailing the time that was open to these folks for negotiation, was to approach them before this plan was filed, not afterwards. However, my honourable friend says that the number of days seems to be an important point with me. Yes, it is and the reason that it's important to me, the reason that I'm arguing the point at the moment is that because my honourable friend the First Minister in his remarks last night, continued to criticize we folk in the opposition, because he said that we were putting them in a straight-jacket of 30 days. Now he submits that it's either 60 or 90 days, but last evening it was 30 days. The Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party tried to tell him that was wrong last night, but he wouldn't accept that. Now today he admits that it's either 60 or 90 days. It is 90 days maximum, and my honourable friend last night was arguing -- it's here on the record -- that it was 30 days. Will he admit now that he was wrong last night?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that goes to show what happens when somebody like the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the CCF Party and myself get engaged in a discussion of law. We have to admit that neither of us are well versed in the statutes of the province, in the sense that some of the other gentlemen around here are. I am quite willing to admit it's not 30 days. I don't think it makes the slightest difference to the point that I was trying to make, as to whether it's 30 days or 60 or 90. To me it's all one, because it does start the machinery going and it does put that time limit on the discussions and on the situation with which the land owners are faced. When there is no need to do that, why do it? That's my point. When there's no need to do it, why do it? I'm quite willing to admit it's not 30 days, if it makes anyone over there feel any better. I myself have read the statutes out onto the record of the House and I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that I was wrong last night in connection with 30 days, but I say that I'm right in the principle that I'm trying to establish.

MR. CAMPBELL: A point of advice to my honourable friend is to not be so positive when he's telling my other honourable friend the Leader of the CCF Party that he knows what he's talking about. He says last night, "Oh yes it would." Certainly, he knew last night; today he doesn't know.

MR. ROBLIN: I'll undertake not to be so positive, Mr. Chairman, just as soon as I see a similar line of thought running through the argument of my honourable friend.

MR. CAMPBELL: The difference is, that I turn out to be right in my interpretation.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF)(Radisson): Mr. Chairman, if I may get into this just slightly, and I might say that I had hoped -- I was late as you possibly noticed getting into the House -- I had hoped that the floodway would have been built by the time that I had arrived. However, I do think that this has been rather thoroughly aired and I'm not supporting the government about getting on with its business. I listened with great interest to the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the House in respect that they think they're right. I'm still convinced that we on this side are right. I'm still convinced, despite the last remarks of my honourable friend the Premier, that there has been a restriction placed on the people in connection with this floodway and the expropriation of the property. While he may be perfectly true when he says that the people had the rights, or could make a lease agreement and it may last for a considerable period of time, the fact of the matter still remains that they still don't know, although as the Minister indicated this afternoon, a number of them now are beginning to find out what the value of their property or what the offer of the property is to them. I suggest that there has been some discomfort, particularly with the people, in that they didn't know what they were going to get; they couldn't make their plans to move.

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....Now then the Premier says that this may be for a considerable length of time before they're actually requested to move. That's true, but these people in the meantime have to make provisions for moving. Now I'm glad that, at least in one small part, the Premier has agreed with my contention on this 30 day business. I would respectfully suggest to the Attorney-General that he might take a look at this Act. There may be points within the Act that are not clear enough, that allows railroad lawyers, like myself, to find points in it that appear to be detrimental to the people. Now I do say in all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, that I think the matter has been aired quite fully. Again I say, and I don't want my honourable friend opposite to jump up and say that this is not so, I do think that we were justified in raising this question before the committee. I do think that we have proved, to some degree at least, our contentions in this regard.

As a matter of fact this morning, Mr. Chairman, I found out one of the -- I understand one of the prices that has been offered on this land was \$125, I think the first offer per acre; and subsequently, and it may be one that's being accepted that the Minister of Agriculture referred to, the price is \$160 per acre. A quarter of a mile or so away from there, I was told this morning, and I can't vouch for the authoritativeness of this statement, that some property was sold at \$1,000 an acre. Now that's just what I heard this morning. Now I'm not placing too much reliance in the whole thing. I think the figures that I give insofar as the actual property under expropriation is concerned are fairly well correct.

But there is one thing, when we were talking last night we were talking about the question of speculation. I just want to point this out, that it appears as though plans had been filed for certain properties up to a point and the others are going to continue. I suggest that it may have been better, and it may have been impossible to do what I am going to suggest now. In order to prevent any speculation at all, had the plan for the whole floodway been possible to file and owners notified of the proceedings of expropriation as laid down in the Act, it might have been better for all concerned. So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, and I'm not supporting the government when I say this, I think the matter has been very well aired in the House. Again I say, we've had a lot of support for the arguments on this side of the House and, at least for once in this Session, there has been a coalition of ideas between the Liberal Party and that of the CCF.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a).

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate that the First Minister can't know the location of every Hydro construction line in Manitoba and I didn't expect him to have the answer for me today. I wonder if he would look into that for me though, or have the department look into it, the location of that line and the date of construction, to see if my information is correct.

MR. ROBLIN: Why certainly, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder also, Mr. Chairman, if it would be possible for the members to get maps of the proposed floodway for those portions that have already been settled. I'm not asking for any where there is a possibility of speculation, or the department hasn't settled. But for those portions where expropriations have been undertaken, if we could get the maps giving us a description of the location.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) - Passed.

MR. E.I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): For a moment, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to get out into the west part of the province and point out that there are floodways and flood conditions out there that possibly the Minister may have the answers to now, or may not. What I would like to mention is something that has, and I can't altogether say that it's this government's fault -- I can go back for some 45 years -- but we have a condition out there on the Whitewater Marsh area which, when high water marks, which it has been this last few years, the wind moves the water many miles, both all around the marsh and does a considerable amount of damage in flooding to good farm land. Now I think we'll all agree, Sir, that man sometimes, when he starts monkeying with nature, he disrupts nature's process. As a small boy, I can remember that Whitewater Marsh did have a natural outlet. As years go by it is sometimes forgotten and sometimes many arguments are developed, the fact that you're right or wrong. I would like to bring this before the House that, in 1947, I had the opportunity of getting the service of the Mapping Survey of Ottawa to make photographic maps of this particular area. And, I guess as typical of most governments, sometimes they're a little slow, but these maps

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.) were not produced for publication until 1959. Now it's very clear, Sir, that in these maps, if they're looked at, that there is a natural outlet that controls the level of this particular swamp. And right here, Sir, I would like it to be made very clear, because I have been accused that in promoting the control of this particular marsh, that I am advocating draining it. Now that is not true. I am advocating, Sir, that for a very, very small expense -- and here I am applying what I think is my common sense against some of the technical men who disagree with me -- for a very, very small expense, I would say, less than a mile or a mile and a quarter of the small ditch being built through two properties, the level of this marsh could be controlled. The municipality involved has already made an application to the proper authorities, and they answer back that a study is being made. However, be that as it may, and when the study may come through, I would like to just present to the Minister and ask for as fast action as possible, because this does affect quite a number of sections of good farming land. It's not controllable unless there is an outlet provided, of which nature did have, and which man destroyed.

Now while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, and I think I can say this without bragging, that in my constituency we do have the response of the farm people and the co-operation of parents and farm boys and girls in activities of the 4-H Clubs. Proof of that activity is such that this year, the agricultural year ending when the judging was done, the Boissevain Seed Club have topped the province again this year, which makes five years out of the past six that they have won the provincial title. The Turtle Mountain Beef Club has, in 1959 and 1960, been the provincial winners of that particular group; and we do have, in mentioning this I just wish to bring up the fact that the organizing and sponsoring body behind this is the Agricultural Society of that particular area. In all, they sponsor a considerable number of 4-H Clubs of both boys and girls, and at this time I am not satisfied with the proposals that are in legislation now for capital construction assistance to these Agricultural Societies to improve their grounds, principally to assist the societies in their work, and also to give the assistance to the 4-H Clubs. I mentioned this last year and I don't hesitate to come back at it again, "A" and "B" Class Circuits do get federal construction grants upwards of \$100,000 a year matching grants. I believe it was two years ago that the Provincial Government did establish capital construction grants to "C" Class Fairs on the basis of \$1,500 per year for six years, I believe. Now the Turtle Mountain Agricultural Society has for over a number of years been promoting some kind of capital assistance to improve their buildings, their grounds, and their workshop if you will, not only to assist the work of the society but principally of some place that they could take the 4-H Clubs on their rally days under cover. We have as many as 2,000, 3,000 boys and girls on Rally Day, who congregate to show their various projects that they have been connected with over the year. It is very unfortunate the weather sometimes will not co-operate with the leaders and so on to establish this, and it has been most discouraging to the promoters of Rally Days that the boys and girls have been disappointed in not producing and being able to really exhibit their projects. And with this in mind, the Agricultural Society at Boissevain did, after thinking that they had failed in establishing the fact that government assistance was not adequate, they built an agricultural arena on their grounds; and the material cost to them is something like in the neighborhood of \$50,000. Now the point I want to bring out is the fact that this building, quite a large building which is used not only by the agricultural society but by the community at large and for all purposes, principally for the promotion of agriculture, was built entirely by voluntary labour, by both the men of the district and by the ladies, in over two and a half month period of time, by promoting lunches and so on and feeding them.

Now we come back to the share of the Provincial Government on a "C" Class Fair, and I believe that the "C" Class Fairs in southwestern Manitoba are as good, if maybe not better than most, in the province, and the most that we can apply for from capital construction grants is the \$1,500 in 1960 ending March 31st, and possibly we may get \$1,500 in 1961; and the point being that to build a building of that magnitude, it's very hard to stagger it over a period of six years to qualify for the full amount of money; and I'm asking the Minister if he could not give some consideration to possibly voting that on -- even if he wished to take it on a merit basis, that this society is worthy of that work or not.

At this time I would like to mention again, as I did last year, the seed cleaning plants. Established last year was the grant for seed cleaning plants -- a loan revolving fund of \$30,000.

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.) Apparently it wasn't used, but down in our area which takes in the area as set out by the department, whether we are not good promoters or not I am not prepared to say, but I can say that at the moment we have not been able to meet the requirements as set out by the department to establish for a loan under this provision. It is felt by the promoters that the field of contribution is possibly too large; they're asking for too much money to be contributed. It's felt that possibly the plant, as approved by the department, is too large to satisfy the needs of that particular area; and if the Minister could give some encouragement to either satisfying the requirements as made by the original shareholders of this particular group or any group similarly, or the plant could be made smaller.

I'm somewhat disturbed, Mr. Chairman, when I read in the Free Press of March 3, of a group that the Minister made reference to, a group of home economists. Over the past number of years, Sir, and I think the Minister will bear me out in this, that for some reason or other, and I would suggest, Sir, it could be salary-wise, that we do not seem able in Manitoba to attract the girls to serve as home economists throughout the province. I believe that last year two of the offices were closed -- not operating -- and it seems that as it goes on, the summer replacements do not come back in the fall. Whether it's altogether the salary is the main point or not, I would like to with all the emphasis that I am able to do, to suggest to the Minister that the salary that he pays these girls, I don't care whether it's \$10,000 a year, it's worth it; because, contrary to my friends to my left, these girls are not working a 40 hour week. They're not working 160 hours a months, and I think that anybody that's had anything at all to observe the work that these girls do throughout the Province of Manitoba and to the good that they do throughout the farm communities, will agree with me that these girls don't stop at hours -- 200, 250 or at any time they're called upon by the community, they work. And I say do a job that the men of the province should be very proud if they could even follow them, because they are working all over the Province of Manitoba trying to promote their work of the Extension Service; and I must say doing an excellent job. And so that anything that I may do, and I'm not doing this in any type of criticism to the Minister, but I just want to point it out that there was a note in the paper, that if there's anything this House can do to assist them, I don't care whether he give them ten thousand bucks a year, for pity sakes get the 14 girls there and get them working throughout next year.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister will be glad to know, I'm sure, that I intend to preface what I have to say briefly, by paying tribute to him in at least two or three different fields. I refer in particular, Mr. Chairman, to what the Department of Agriculture and the Minister did to preserve the history of farming in Manitoba. I understand that last fall the Department of Agriculture spent in the neighborhood of \$18,000 in a building at Austin, Manitoba, to house a lot of the ancient and early farming implements

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to interrupt him, but I don't like to see the honourable member put a sum like that on record. If I'm not incorrect, the sum was \$11,200.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I thought I read in the paper where it was \$18,000. However, whatever it was it was good; and let's hope there will be more spent. You may be surprised, Mr. Chairman, to even hear me mention Austin, since it is not in the Gladstone constituency, but it does interest me very much because of the fact that several farmers in my constituency have old farming implements on exhibit there. No doubt the contribution that has been made, whatever it is, will excite new interest and a new drive in the committee who have worked so faithfully over the years to foster this very, very worthwhile project. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is prepared to extend the same type of assistance to museums in other parts of the province. Several years ago, three or four years ago, Neepawa celebrated its 75th Anniversary, and at that time it was established that we had in the Neepawa area a great deal of not only old implements but a lot of other old material that is certainly worth preserving. At that time they rented the entire school auditorium and had it literally jammed to the rafters with stuff that certainly is worth preserving, and something should be done for it. I hope that we will be able to get some kind of assistance to build a building in Neepawa to house these articles.

The other subject that I would like to commend the Minister for, and the government for, is for the very excellent briefs that they presented to the Board of Transport Commissioners.

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) I don't know whether that is the term, but -- (Interjection) -- Royal Commission on Transportation, thank you very much -- that held their hearings here about a year ago now. I read all of the briefs; I have them on file; I think they were excellent. I do wonder though, on this very same subject, Mr. Chairman, if this government is exerting the same kind of effort to foster the use of the Hudson's Bay Route. I had the pleasure, two or three months ago, of listening to the President of the Hudson's Bay Route Association at a meeting in Plumas and I learned a great deal from that. It seemed to me that perhaps, while they may have been doing a good selling job, it seemed to me that we were not using the facilities that we have there to the best of our advantage. I would like to read to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister, a resolution that came out of that meeting because it tells the story much better than I can, and I quote: "Hudson's Bay Route Resolution" -- they call it -- "Whereas the use of the Port of Churchill for the export of western wheat brings the greatest returns to the producer and offers attractive savings in hard currency to the overseas firms, thus offering a most telling inducement which should foster the sale of Canadian wheat in the difficult world marketing situation; and Whereas Churchill grain exports during the 1960 shipping season suffered a decline of almost two million bushels while those from the west coast increased by nearly four million and the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence by about one million bushels during the period August 1 to the period October 31; Therefore be it resolved that this public meeting called under the sponsorship of the Plumas Manitoba Farmers' Union to discuss the development and greater use of the Hudson's Bay Route, do request the Honourable Alvin Hamilton and his officers in the Department of Agriculture and the Canadian Wheat Board to do everything possible to plan, to restore and to exceed the 1959 level of exports through Churchill of 22 million bushels; to plan as policy, steady increases in the use of Churchill and to recommend such increases and facilities as shall permit this steady increase in the use of Churchill, and that the port will be fully prepared to service new forms of transportation and of world food bank with possible storage at Newfoundland. 2. Be it resolved that this public meeting sponsored by the Plumas MFU to discuss greater use and development of the Hudson's Bay route, do congratulate Honourable Duff Roblin and the Government of Manitoba upon the interest shown in the development and greater use of Churchill and the Bay Route, and commend and support such efforts. 2(a) Secure the fullest use of Churchill over the longest possible season. (b) Secure competitive rates over the Hudson's Bay Railroad Line for export, import and local traffic. (c) Secure the use of Churchill as a supply base by air as well as by sea for servicing part of the DEW Line, a development which could prove beneficial to the transportation, agricultural, and marketing activities in Manitoba. (d) For importing some of the Manitoba Government requirements through Churchill and to urge, where possible, such overseas purchases be imported through Churchill. We also urge that the part of the policy of the Manitoba and Dominion Governments to complete the road from Grand Rapids to connect with the Thompson Road as soon as possible and that construction to some convenient point on those roads to Churchill be commenced as soon as possible." Now, that's the end of quote, Mr. Chairman. At this meeting it was pointed out by the President of the Hudson's Bay Route Association that you can ship grain to England about six or seven cents a bushel cheaper -- that is, Manitoba grown grain in particular -- overseas about six or seven cents a bushel cheaper than you can any other way, and I'm wondering if we are using the facilities to the fullest possible advantage. Now, Mr. Chairman, I know

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): I wonder if I might just offer a word here that, inasmuch as transportation is a matter under my care, would the honourable member be happy if we postponed them until my estimates -- a discussion of the Hudson's Bay Route and the efforts taken in that connection. I would be very glad to have a full discussion on my estimates.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Very good, thank you. The resolution was touching on agriculture, so I thought perhaps --

MR. EVANS: application there, and I would agree with your points in that connection.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal very, very briefly with the floodway, and no doubt you will be surprised that a backbencher such as myself, who lives at least 100 miles removed from the floodway, would even be interested or

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) have any concern about it. But I think it is a very, very important subject. We have already been told by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, I believe, as to its size and cost. I believe he suggested that the dirt that would be removed from the floodway would be equal to one-third of the dirt that was removed in the Panama Canal. That's quite a bit. I believe there was a figure quoted of something like \$85 million as its cost, or upwards to \$100 million, so it's a pretty big item. I suggest that it will probably cost as much as the Panama Canal. I don't know what it cost at the time, but money was worth a lot more then, so I think it is a very important subject. The reports that I hear in rural Manitoba is this, "We don't care much what happens to it so long as we don't have to contribute to it." That is, there certainly will be very great objections in rural Manitoba to contributing to something of this nature. They feel, as I do, that it is most important that we find out now what the federal contribution is going to be. It is also rumoured, and we've heard that word bandied around here quite a bit the last two or three days, that this floodway will only protect some 300 homes. Now that may be a rumour, but if there is any truth in it at all, it would seem to me to be a lot cheaper to buy 300 homes than it would be to build a floodway. I heard last evening too, Mr. Chairman, that 200 people would be dispossessed as a result of the purchase of the land. If it is a fact that there will only be about 300 homes protected, then it looks to me to be a lot of nonsense to spend this kind of money on a floodway.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General): Will the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Chairman? Have you had the benefit of reading the Cost Benefit Study on the Greater Winnipeg Floodway?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Pardon me?

MR. LYON: Have you had the benefit of reading the Cost Benefit Study? Well I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member read it before he believes any of these rather ridiculous rumours that he hears.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I suggested, Mr. Chairman, that they were only rumours and I have not read the report. Now as regards the method of acquiring the land, I only want to make this comment. I have had at least 15 years experience in hail adjusting, in dealing with farmers -- adjusting their crops, and indeed, not only their crops but some of their real property. I have always considered the main point in adjusting, the factors that you must consider when adjusting, is to first adjust the insured and then adjust his loss. It looks to me as if we have conducted that rather backwards in this regard, that is, it looks to me as if the letter that has gone out to the owners of the property would make the property owners mad to start with, and then you would have a difficult time in dealing with them. Now that's the impression I'm left with after listening to all this discussion. I think it would have been much better to try and adjust the insured first and then make a settlement with him. Then again considering the experience that I had last summer, and the summer before, and the summer before, in acquiring land at Neepawa for the PFRA Dam there, and indeed for the acquiring I think of something like 68 parcels of land for the highway between Gladstone and Neepawa as they had to do, I think an error was made there. I'm not saying that it wasn't made by former governments, but two wrongs doesn't make a right. I know that when they were acquiring land for the PFRA Dam they bought some as low as \$10 an acre and I know they bought some for \$100 an acre. They bought all the \$10 an acre land first, that is, they dealt with the easy fellow to get along with first and then tackled the tough fellow last; and that has left a dirty taste in the mouth of a lot of people there. -- (Interjection) -- Well, that could be.

Now, inasmuch as all of the farm land in Manitoba has been assessed by the Provincial Assessor, and I still maintain and argue that there is a relationship between the assessed value and the real value, there must be, surely the assessed value can be used as a figure in arriving at a value of some of this land. You would have to apply a factor to it, and I think that that would be a great help in establishing the value of some of these lands. Now I know that, Mr. Chairman, in sitting on Council I happen to be Property Chairman and we would have people come in, landowners, property owners come in to appeal their taxes on the grounds that they were assessed too high; but when you wanted to buy it from them, that was a different story altogether; and I am sure the Honourable the Minister has found that out. I personally don't like the sound of the word expropriation. I don't like it at all. I have been to Mexico and seen the effects of expropriation there, where they've set up monuments all over

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) the City of Mexico. I remember, Mr. Chairman, asking our guide what does that wonderful monument stand for, and he said, "That commemorates March 17th, 1928", I think it was, "The day that we expropriated the oil industry in Mexico." And they've got other signs up over there to commemorate the day they expropriated the banks and all this kind of business. Well, I hope they don't put up a monument on this floodway to commemorate the day that they expropriated a lot of this land. I don't like the word, but it seems to me that expropriation should only take place as a last resort effort. I think that all other means should have been applied first, and then expropriation as a last resort.

Now as regards what else I have to say on agriculture, I think I can leave it to the individual items, Mr. Chairman.

..... Continued on next page

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman I feel that I, too should contribute something towards this debate since I represent a constituency which wholly depends on agriculture on existence. I think I'll start off by being nice to our Minister, the Minister of Agriculture, say a few nice things about him. Last year I thought he was a pessimist. I see signs of more optimism this year. I see in him the potentiality of a very good Minister of Agriculture. I don't blame him for some mistakes, and maybe some things that have been done which he himself thinks were not proper; he even criticizes the Federal Government to a certain extent, some of its policies, but I'll simply say that if I have something to say, I'm not actually criticizing him because I know that he is restricted by the powers and policies of the present Conservative Government.

Now let's go back to agriculture, and I hope I'm not standing on the platform, a Conservative platform, because the Honourable Minister accuses us of talking from the Conservative platform. I had occasion to listen to a certain constituent, didn't even happen to be in my constituency, that immediately after election he was so carried away with the success of the present Conservative Party that he stood up on a truck and he kept telling the people -- he was really carried away -- he says I'll stand or fall on the Conservative platform. And one of my friends was standing beside me and he said, "You know what he's standing on in that box?" I said "no". "Well," he said, "he's standing on some homemade fertilizer directly from the barnyard." So, I really thought that he was standing on the Conservative platform at the time. Well let's get back to agriculture. We all know that instability and uncertainty of price is the greatest drawback on farm economy. That has been stressed here by previous members. Manitoba produces a great agricultural product and the Honourable Member from La Verendrye drew the attention of the House to the fact that Manitoba being a keystone province could also be the keystone in producing a better breed of cattle and hybrid seeds of different kinds. Therefore, if our products are A grades, these agricultural products surely should find a market, a suitable market for all of these products. Departments of Agriculture sometimes theorizes the solution to all the problems, the farm problems, rest on greater efficiency, and I will agree that to a certain extent they do; better managements, I'll go along with that too, a farmer must learn better management if he wants to be more economical, and greater productivity and so on. But, I will not agree that that is enough; along with that I think that most authorities are now realizing that we cannot exclude price with them; we must include price also in these. Prices have been discussed, so I'm not going to go into that, but when we talk about price it brings us down to trade. To get a fair price we must be able to trade with other nations of the world, and I say we must be prepared to trade our goods with these nations. Markets

MR. HUTTON: You tell the chaps on your left hand that, they don't believe it; they don't believe that price depends on trade.

MR. TANCHAK: I'm just being helpful right now. Markets at a fair price must be found and they must be maintained. We know that it is fundamental in Canada's resource position, economic position, that we must be a heavy exporter. Now I am just commenting on this because I do believe that the Honourable Minister will impress the fact on Ottawa that it is very important to have these markets. Our prime objective must be an insurance of a permanent export market, we should make sure that our markets stay open, not just now, but on a long term basis. I must say that I disagree with Ottawa, with the different restrictions that they are trying to place on imports from other nations who are willing and would buy more of our agricultural products, because the underdeveloped countries on this earth are fast improving their standards of living. In Asia, in Africa, India is a part of Asia, some contend that Indians will not use too much of our grain, because their constitution is so built that they cannot consume wheat, but I believe that slowly they will learn to use this nutritive food. In a few years there will be millions, millions of customers clamouring for those wonderful products that we in the prairie provinces could produce. Therefore I think that we should be alert, we should plan our strategy to meet this demand when it comes, and I believe that this demand explosion, I would like to call it, will be coming within the next 15 years and we should be prepared for that. If we are alert and we plan, we will be able to supply this great demand explosion, and again I stress that if our long-term plans are laid carefully, Canada will enjoy a level of prosperity better than she has ever known before in the future. I think that when the time comes we will not be plagued with surpluses in agricultural products, there are other products, the

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.)....forest products, the mineral products, even the oil. Just the opposite, I think we will be hard-pressed for greater production to feed these people when their standard of living rises. I really and truly honestly believe that this demand will take place and I hope that Canada will not be caught lagging.

There are many different things that I would like to talk about, but I'll just mention a few. The rest of the items I'll take up when the different item comes up. I would certainly like to mention the floodway -- its quite a worn out subject by now -- but I would like to make my stand clear, because some of my friends here in Winnipeg have accused me of being against the floodway. I say I am not against building the floodway to protect the citizens of Winnipeg; although I say that this floodway will not help the upper reaches of the Red River. It will not help the people that I represent, in Emerson, in Letellier and St. Jean; but still we must look at the other side, and the people of Winnipeg should be protected against any flood occurring similar to the last one we had. But, I would say again, as I mentioned once before, that if Manitoba is to carry this load by itself, that if Ottawa does not contribute at least 75 percent of the cost of this project, I say that rather than go it alone, we leave it alone. I'll definitely be opposing any project of such a huge magnitude if Manitoba has to go it alone; I would not agree with that.

Something else that I must also mention, and that is plumbing, because the Minister asked me a question before, whether I would advise slot machines in the outdoor buildings. No, I didn't say that at all. I simply said that it might be advisable to bring the water supply, if Manitoba had a surplus sum of money -- water supply to these people who really need the water. I did not say to go into plumbing and build up their machines and their tanks and so on in outdoor toilets, but if the Minister wishes as I said before, maybe -- just a minute I'm not going to accuse the Minister -- some of his colleagues may jump at the idea -- it might be a money making scheme. They are hard pressed for that. Again the Minister did mention that we, on this side blew, and I think his word was, "this insignificant little item" in the Throne Speech was out of proportion -- "insignificant item". Well there is only one thing that I could say that in the future the Ministry abstain from mentioning these insignificant items in the Throne Speech, if it is so insignificant. But still on the other hand, yesterday I think, the Minister took pretty near half an hour trying to explain the project.

Now there's one more item -- farm credit. I'm not going to criticize farm credit because I have had occasion to see where farm credit did help young people, and I wholly agree with that, especially father and son. I agree with that. I will not say that the other credit, the federal plan wouldn't have done just as well, with a revised federal plan, but if we have something now that is doing a fair job, I'll go along with that, but I would like to see larger sums of money at less security under greater supervision provided to young farmers who are able and capable. I would like to see that, because the government of the party before they were the government, promised to help the young farmers of Manitoba. I would like this extension made. Now one more item, I had delegations yesterday from several farmers from my constituency and they want the government to consider a flat license rate for farm trucks over 10 years old. I think the Manitoba Farmer Union had this in their brief also. At the same time I would like the Provincial Government to try and influence their colleagues in Ottawa to look into the Unemployment Insurance. I would like the Unemployment Insurance Benefits to be extended to farm help. I think at this time -- I have many other things to say, but at this time that will be all I will say, and I hope that I have put the estimates in agriculture back on the track, so it may proceed.

I wish at this time also to say that the Minister is very fortunate to inherit such a splendid staff of civil servants in all the departments of agriculture. I wish to commend all of these dedicated men and women on the excellent service that they are giving to the farmers of Manitoba. I had a lot of dealings with them in the many years back when we started our great turkey industry around Ridgeville and if it wasn't for these dedicated men as I said, in the Extension Service, in the Veterinary Laboratory and so on, I do not think that we would have been where we are now, have been as successful as the Ridgeville area is at the present time. So at this time I wish to express a great gratitude to these dedicated people. I thank you.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer some of the questions raised. I would like to say that the, I believe the Honourable Member for Emerson has made the best

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) speech on agriculture that I have ever heard anyone in his group make today. I was very happy for him to bring out this point that price depends on trade; that you can't say that price is the main thing. His reasoning and logic in this respect were excellent -- price does depend on trade. I was very happy for the reasonable kind of criticism that he levelled at the department -- and we're not above criticism at all. I like his suggestion on plumbing; the explanation he gave that he wasn't advocating that we try to make a public utility out of our sewage and plumbing program, but that he was advocating that there was room for a program that, as I understood him, would make water available in areas where it has to be brought in. The province has got a program in respect of communities, towns and so on under our Water Supply Board which I think has had a good beginning and in the future will prove to be a very successful and beneficial program. I recognize along with him, that there is a field for water supply for our farmers -- which has been met to some extent by the PFRA Program -- but I think that there is reason to look at this situation and possibly there is something more that can be done. In fact I am sure there is more that can be done to help our farmers in certain areas where access to water, adequate water supply is a problem. His comments on farm credit are the finest comments that I've heard from that side of the House. He advocates larger sums of money -- well I don't know about that -- I think it is -- we try to lend as much money as we can in order to meet the need to set up an economic unit. It would be nice if we could ask for less security and if we had a program that balanced off greater supervision against this less security but I think that we have taken a big step in Manitoba in the past two years, and I think we have to sort of digest what we have done before we enter upon a liberalization of the policy. I think we have a great deal to learn. Now it's true that down in the United States, I think about a year ago, they did amend their farm credit legislation more specifically to deal with the small farmer -- because we recognize that in our modern society and the evolution that is taking place around our towns and cities that we have a growing number of part-time farmers -- and in the United States they brought in legislation to deal with these problems associated with this circumstance. Certainly under the present regulations we are precluded from making loans in some cases to very worthy young people by the stipulations of our Act. I for one, favour in principle, the idea that we should find a way and means of getting around this, but I suggest too, that we must face up to the practical fact that it's pretty difficult for a young person today to establish themselves without any capital whatsoever on a farm even if they could get the loans, even if the loans were available. I think that their chances of survival where they didn't have at least 35 percent equity would be pretty small. In addition to that -- and maybe it's a sad comment on our society -- it does seem to be one of the indices of the ability of a person to manage a farm business enterprise.

He mentioned unemployment insurance for farm help. I think here is a field where the problems that the farmer has to face today could be alleviated to a great extent if he didn't have so much trouble acquiring help on the farm. It puts him in a very vulnerable position -- if he tries to build up his enterprise either by getting a larger unit in terms of acres or if he tries to incorporate a new production line on his farm; if he gets sick; if he happens to break a leg -- he is so vulnerable to this lack of labour, pool of labour to help on the farm. Not only that, he is put in the position where he must compete with industry and business, not even on even terms. He isn't able to offer the security that unemployment insurance offers and he must endeavor to bid for a particular man in terms of salary alone; therefore I believe he's actually paying more in wages than he might have to pay if unemployment insurance were available for farm labor. I'm in agreement with a good deal that the Member from Emerson said to us this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain brought up the question of controlling the level of water in Whitewater Marsh and this has been given consideration by our department. He intimated that he felt that it could be done at very little cost, and I would be interested in knowing what his own estimate would be of the cost of carrying out this work. I don't like to comment on something that I'm not right up to scratch on. It seemed to me that the proposal that he made and that was discussed in the department, wasn't quite as simple as what he has outlined it to be today. Nevertheless it has received consideration, and I'm sure that if he continues to treat with us on this matter that it will receive further consideration. He brought up the question of grants to agricultural societies, and he questions, he said he opposed the

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.).... grants as they're presently constituted. I think what he means is that he questions the logic on which the grants are made for construction. I can only say this, that the grants that are made to the A and B class fairs are substantial, and especially when you relate them to the grants that are made to C class fairs. But I think that we must take into consideration that the A and B class fairs are regional fairs; and because they are regional fairs they serve a far larger community than the C class fair does. Now I'm not saying the C class fair is not an important factor to a community. It performs an important function in the community, but after all, we have so much monies to distribute for these programs and we feel that the fair being the showcase -- and I know this is a hackneyed term -- being the showcase of agriculture as it is, we must expend these monies in the places where they are going to be of the most benefit. Maybe our judgment is wrong but we feel that in the case of the A and B class fair, which are regional fairs, which do attract more people, which do attract more exhibits, that we must give them substantial assistance. I don't think we have done this to the detriment of the C class fairs. We have given them assistance in maintaining their plants, and indeed in some cases they have put up new buildings, sheds and so on. We feel that the program has been of benefit to all of the fairs and we feel that we are justified in giving the extent of support that we do to the A and B class fairs because of the important role that they do play in the agricultural community in Manitoba.

His remarks on seed cleaning plants should be answered. I guess it boils down to this: that we're not very satisfied with the seed cleaning plant legislation, and unless a community is in a position to establish a plant on a sound financial basis there will be no seed cleaning plants approved under the existing legislation. I will be bringing in legislation into the House and asking you to support it so that we can deal with the plant that has been established at Rivers and get that cleaned up. But we don't want any more on this basis. I was interested to hear his comments on the size, the area and the size of the plants. We have been doing a lot of work in the department on this program; doing quite a bit of research to see if we couldn't come up with a program that would be efficient, financially feasible and beneficial that we could offer. I think it's very important that the municipalities be involved in this program by some means. This is a question that has to be, and is being considered, so I think that covers the remarks I want to make on that.

Then he got down to home economists, and this is a very delightful topic. I don't blame the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain for taking the case of home economists; they are a pretty attractive, charming group of girls. I wouldn't mind championing them and I haven't much difference of opinion at all with the honourable member. I recognize that they make a tremendous contribution to the Province of Manitoba. There are 14 areas, home economist areas in the province -- which represents about three ag rep districts for each home economist, to give you some idea of the area that they have to travel over. I don't think that our difficulties in the past have been associated with salary, I think it's wrong to say that; one of our difficulties is that they have, there is a club associated with the home economists which is known as the 85 percent club. Eighty-five percent of the home economists are married. It seems to be a tradition with them and one that they try to maintain, and as a result of that we get a rash of engagements and marriages every so often. This has been our greatest difficulty; it's going to hit us hard this year again. It is true that this year our girls seem to be proving very popular in the field of education. I understand that several of them, these are graduates in the spring, have proved to be very popular with other extension services in other jurisdictions, and there's no use denying that we face a bit of a problem this spring in finding replacements. I doubt that salary alone, within any reasonable limits, could solve our problem. I know it's a consideration and it's one that is and will receive consideration. But it isn't peculiar to home economists only. I think it is fair to say that there is always difficulty in retaining top-notch -- and that's the kind we hire -- top-notch professional people.

I would say a word here on museums in respect to what the Honourable Member for Neepawa-Gladstone has said. We did make a building available to the Austin Museum for agriculture. The reason that we made the building available was that so many valuable items were lying out in the brush exposed to the elements and were, because many of them are wooden implements and tools of the past, they were deteriorating badly, and we didn't want them lost to those who come after us. So we moved in and we bought a building, which is the property of the government,

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) and is constructed on the museum site; It is leased to them for a nominal sum and they are able to store the items, the more valuable items in it. I should say that I think I would have to discourage any notion that we would extend in the Department of Agriculture, this assistance to other museums in the province, because the building is there as a government building and if there are items of value that are sitting out and deteriorating, I would expect that in the interest of posterity that they could be stored in that building. I think we must recognize also that it would be poor business to have buildings set up all over the Province of Manitoba. This grant was made from the Department of Agriculture. It wasn't a grant; I shouldn't say that. These monies were expended out of the appropriation of the Department of Agriculture and the building placed there to retain these valuable items. I think that's all I care to say at the present time.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, last Thursday hogs in Winnipeg sold on the public market for \$27.50 a hundred. At the three large packing plants in Winnipeg, they were \$26.00 a hundred. The number of hogs that were slaughtered in Manitoba last year was 764,000 hogs, and I would venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that there was a spread ranging from \$1.00 to \$1.50 a hundred in the price that the producer got for his hogs that were sold on the public market and the hogs that were sold at the packing plants. There was 85% in rough figures of hogs sold to the packing plants, and there has been quite a number of requests directed to me Mr. Chairman, to see just what could be done about the marketing of livestock in Manitoba. The plants have been getting these hogs, and one is safe in saying that they have not established the price of hogs for the producers of Manitoba. In the Union Stock Yards in St. Boniface there has been a great deal of money spent, both by the commission men and the commission firms of the Winnipeg Livestock Exchange and the Federal Government, to create an established market for livestock sold in Manitoba. There is several places, cities in the great country south of us, where there has been legislation passed prohibiting the sale of livestock directly to the packing plants; all livestock must be channeled through a public market. The low for hogs last year at the packing plants was \$16.75 and the high was \$28.00 a hundred. Now in my opinion, there should be a closer check on the truckers that are hauling this livestock to market. What I mean by that, Mr. Chairman, is these weigh bills should be filled out and the trucker given directions of where that livestock is to go before he leaves the farmer's yard.

In 1913 the Dominion Government, saw fit to put some money into establishing a public market in Manitoba, which was the City of Winnipeg, and in 1916 they brought the public markets under rules and regulations, that is that was established and are still controlled by the Dominion Government. Now these commission firms, of which there are 8, and in total there are over 100 members of the Winnipeg Livestock Exchange who are working for the interests of the farmer -- that is the livestock producers. They must be bonded and they are duty bound, according to the Act, to establish through newspapers and other mediums of news, to establish the market situation twice a day, which they are doing. I would like to see some investigation of some manner, into the marketing of the livestock for the producers of Manitoba. The Health and Animal Branch of the Dominion Government also have an interest in the marketing of livestock and the facilities that exist for the farmers. They can handle at the Union Stock Yards 15,000 cattle, 10,000 hogs. And one might wonder where does this come into the picture. It has been stated, Mr. Chairman, that it costs too much money. Well, I mentioned before the spread between hogs that are sold at the public markets and the hogs that are sold at the packers. I think that this bears investigation, and with the setup that they have that they can give the farmer very good service.

Another matter that I would like to raise is the hauling of milk. I'm told Mr. Chairman, that it is the coming thing as far as Manitoba is concerned, this tank truck hauling of milk from the producers. The situation, as I understand it, is that some of the larger dairies are reaching the stage now where before very long they will not accept any milk only that's tank hauled. There is communities where these larger tank trucks cannot get into on account of the weight of the load that they're carrying and it means in some instances the farmers had to band together to gravel certain stretches of road; whereby if they had a smaller truck hauling milk, I don't think that would be necessary. These are some of the thoughts that I would like to pass on to the government to give some consideration to. And in my opinion it's not going to be too long before the milk that's handled in Manitoba, will be handled by the milk

(Mr. Shewman, cont'd.) tank trucks. I know of one or two instances where the small districts would like to own a truck of their own and they have some trouble in obtaining licenses for this, because it happens to be a co-op setup as they term it. And to these questions I would like to bring to the attention of the Department of Agriculture that some action should be taken on them immediately. I would like to see, especially a committee, commission, or something like that, set up to look into the problem of marketing the livestock that's produced and sold in Manitoba.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Morris has brought up the subject of marketing and a day or two ago the Minister of Agriculture inferred, or stated as a matter of fact, that changes would be made in the Marketing Act, the Marketing Board Act, regarding the possibility of commodity groups, or commodities voting themselves into a Marketing Board System. Would the Honourable Minister care to remark on the changes which he has in mind.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I think that I indicated the only change of significance that is contemplated is that of changing the basis for determining a favourable vote. There is another matter that bears looking at and that is a basis for determining the eligibility of a vote; but this is a big question, it's one that I believe should be explored and investigated. I believe that before anyone is permitted to vote on a question such as this that it should be very clear that they have an economic stake in the matter. I don't think that you can get a responsible answer to a referendum of this kind unless the people in it do have a stake. I think it's a field that should be examined and I'm not going to indicate that there'll be any legislation, but it's one that is going to receive examination along with the question of determining the basis on which a favourable vote is indicated.

MR. ROBERTS: Along the same line, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would tell us if he is planning, and obviously he is planning on changing the methods of conducting a vote. Is it to make it easier for Marketing Boards to be formed or more difficult? There must be a reason for making the change.

MR. HUTTON: No, I don't think it makes it easier, I think it makes it fairer. I don't believe that anyone has a right to have his vote taken into consideration if he doesn't take the trouble to go out to the polls. At the present time with the stipulation of receiving a favourable vote of 51 percent of the registered producers, all a man has to do to defeat the scheme is to sit at home. I don't think this is fair. On the other hand, I outlined the other day that some of the reasons for having a rather high percentage required in order to indicate, a high percentage of those voting, to indicate a favourable vote, -- the reason for this, of course, is that it has been proven beyond doubt in other jurisdictions that you must have a substantial majority in favour of any one of these programs if it's going to have any hope of success. Nobody wants to get into a long period of litigation and recriminations over the setting up of such a program and I think that these circumstances could be avoided by making sure that the vast majority of the producers are in favour.

MR. ROBERTS: Well is it correct then to assume that it is your intention to make the majority required larger than the 60 percent which is now in the regulations for an approval of a Marketing Board?

MR. HUTTON: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister in his remarks also made considerable reference to the remarks made by the Honourable Member from Emerson regarding Unemployment Insurance for farmers. He stated his great sympathy for this necessity, but I would like to hear if his sympathy has extended to tangible efforts on this behalf. Have you made representation to Ottawa on this behalf? Mr. Chairman

MR. HUTTON: Yes, I don't mind answering I sometimes think that the members of the opposition look at me and assess my responsibilities as sort of a corresponding secretary for the farmers of Manitoba. That's part of my work, that is true, but I would feel that I might as well go home if all my negotiations on their behalf were confined to letter writing. I am afraid that in the case of unemployment insurance, I can't lay on the House any tangible evidence that I have been pursuing this, but it is a question that is discussed at our Dominion-Provincial Conferences -- I have attended two since coming to office. It is something that has been discussed at our Provincial Ministers' Conference, I believe, and certainly the Federal Minister,

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . both the former and the present, are aware of the fact that the Province of Manitoba, the Government of Manitoba, favours unemployment insurance for farm labour.

MR. ROBERTS: I would hope that the Minister would make considerable effort to press this point with the Government at Ottawa. I am sure he is sympathetic towards it. I don't think that this can be classified as one of the problems of farming which you as a Minister could become involved in as a secretary, because I think that this is entirely too important to be left just lying and hoping that it would take place and making reference to it once a year while at a conference in Ottawa. I do think that the matter of unemployment insurance for farm workers is one that must be pressed. It's something that 's been dangled in front of the farmer for years and years as a carrot and I think that it's too important to just bypass each year and to hope that something will be done without our seeing to it that it is done. I do think that the Province of Manitoba and the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba in particular, has some considerable responsibility in this matter -- pressing this point to the Government at Ottawa.

There are other problems federally that crop up from time to time and we, I think are aware of one at the present time: the matter of sales tax imposed by Ottawa on agricultural products -- products used agriculturally, and because we normally consider agricultural products tax free when brought in from other countries -- there are cases on which tax is being put on products used agriculturally and which I think is unfair. We have discussed in this Legislature in the last couple of years, the problem of taxing hydraulics and this is still a problem, because hydraulics are becoming more and more of a farmyard tool and they are being used in every form of farming nowadays and yet our hydraulic equipment is still being taxed. For instance the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce is aware probably that machinery is being bought for the purpose of forestry use, agricultural use, planting shrubs, trees, seedlings, at the forestry station at Hadashville recently. The hydraulics, the back hoe, the loader equipment, things like this are all being taxed, and on each unit we buy we are paying two or three hundred dollars worth of tax for the purpose of doing agricultural work. This is true in the farmyard on all hydraulics equipment; and this is true, incidentally on another very important agricultural item in constant use on the farms nowadays, and this is ventilating equipment. Ventilating equipment is also subject to taxation and yet with the type of climate we have here in Manitoba it would be folly to build a stable for livestock, for hogs, or poultry in particular, without installing ventilation equipment, yet this ventilation equipment is being taxed by Ottawa. Not being treated, in other words, as an agricultural piece of equipment, and I think that this is a field too in which the government should make some representation. Could the Minister make any statement on that?

MR. HUTTON: In the first place I -- I don't think I can agree entirely with the statement made by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that all ventilation equipment is taxed -- (Interjection) -- well maybe the fan is, but there is a discount to farmers on electric motors. For instance I had a case during the past year brought to my attention, in the case of ventilation equipment for a potato warehouse -- again I must plead that I can't remember the details, it's quite a long spell ago. I am wondering when the honourable member refers to sales tax on certain agricultural equipment, if this is equipment which is purchased with its major use agriculturally or not? Any machinery that is associated with agriculture in terms of hydraulic equipment -- and there is hardly any farm machinery being built today that hydraulic equipment is not incorporated into -- I don't think that this applies. It may apply to a back hoe, which is generally associated with construction work -- I recognize that it could very well be used in tree planting. I think he is drawing attention to the exception rather than the rule. It would be an odd thing to me with the number of farmers that I have coming to the office and not only to my office, but to the office of the Deputy Minister, that this has not been brought to our attention more than once, and I have stated the occasion -- that was in respect to sales tax on equipment coming in for a potato warehouse. I will most certainly look into the matter since he has brought it to our attention, because certainly it represents an increase, another factor in the cost of production and as such is a consideration of importance to us. I have some information that has come to my desk, which I requested from Ottawa in respect of unemployment insurance. I can say this, that I know the matter has been under study a long time, because I had occasion about four years ago to look into the matter when I happened to be in Ottawa and it seems that

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . the studies have taken an awful long time and still being held out, but I do believe that there are some real problems involved. I think that probably the experience that the Federal Government and the Unemployment Insurance Commission had in implementing unemployment insurance for the fishermen has made them a little over-cautious in attempting to extend it to the farm labour group, but I do believe that they are -- my information is that they are pursuing the matter and endeavoring to come up with an answer to it. I agree, also, that the situation in regard to farm labour doesn't look very much belayed because the Minister of Agriculture at the present time is looking for a man and he's not having too much success. So I have a personal interest in this matter.

MR. ROBERTS: I must admit that on hydraulics I was perhaps speaking in too general terms because I am aware that for certain types of hydraulics used on -- the more general types of hydraulics used on the farm they are sales tax free, although they can be criticized of course on the basis that the Government at Ottawa has placed a tariff on them within the last year or so and so of course they have gone up in price that way. There are many cases of sales tax applying on hydraulics -- on the newer types of hydraulics that are being used on farms though. In the case of ventilation equipment there was one particular invoice I have seen in the past couple of weeks it was on the case of the ventilating equipment that was installed in one stable alone, the sales tax amounting to \$200 on it, and this product was largely manufactured in Canada, so I think it's an unfortunate tax which is -- they judge it on the basis that ventilating equipment is so far not classed as agricultural supplies, and I think that this is something that we should be aware of and make representation to Ottawa on.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to the strawberry-growing program in the constituency of La Verendrye which apparently isn't really rolling yet. Unfortunately the Honourable Minister doesn't believe in inviting me to his meetings when he speaks in my constituency, but I spoke a few days before he did in Hadashville and a few days after he did. When I spoke a few days before he did in Hadashville, I encouraged the people of the district to give serious consideration to the project which was being proposed to them; and when I spoke a few days later in Hadashville I had to listen to their complaints about the program. I was there recently again and I am not convinced that the people of Hadashville are very excited about growing strawberries. When the Honourable Minister, according to my information, spoke the first time in Hadashville regarding a strawberry growth plantation referred in terms of 50 or 60 acres of strawberries being the possibility of which should be grown there. Now I understand that their proposal is somewhere in the neighborhoods of three acres and assistance being given by the Government of Manitoba is simply one of willingness to give some advice. I suggest from what I could gather from the people of the community of why they weren't too excited about this program is largely a psychological one. The people of Hadashville, as the Minister knows, they're of racial origin, originating from middle European countries and are largely very anti-Communistic and this strawberry farm idea to them proposed in the manner in which it was proposed appeared to be too close to collective farming for their liking. Where each farmer was to contribute a certain amount to a collective farm, a collective lot of strawberries to be grown, and cared for by collective families, this did not appeal to them and to their independent spirit which they've developed in Canada -- the reason they came to Canada of course, was because of this spirit -- and I do hope that this project won't fall flat for this reason. Can the Minister comment on the growth of the strawberry farm in Hadashville?

MR. HUTTON: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye mesmerizes me -- absolutely. I want to refer back here to some of the statements that he's made in the Chamber since I've attempted to introduce the estimates. Here's his opinion on markets. "None of us can say authoritatively whether a marketing board will be good or will be bad for the egg producers or for the hog producers in Manitoba at the present time. I think that we all feel this way. It has many merits and it has many things that we don't like so well about it, but to be in their situation of not having any firm opinions on marketing boards, I think is an unfortunate one, because marketing boards do exist in other provinces; marketing boards do exist in other commodities, and I think that we should have as a government -- our government should have a policy regarding marketing boards." Now that's quite a statement, Mr. Chairman. How in the world do you reconcile two points of view in much less than one paragraph? "I think we

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)....all feel this way. It has many merits and it has many things that we don't like so well about it."

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order

MR. HUTTON: It's not a point of order

MR. ROBERTS: If you're going to quote, quote the rest too, following that statement, and if you don't mind, I'll just continue with what I said that day. Following that statement I said that this government should have a policy on marketing boards -- and I wasn't calling for you to give that policy today -- I was saying that it was your duty as the Minister of Agriculture and I feel it's his duty as the Government of Manitoba, to investigate marketing boards and how they are operating in other parts of the country. I'm not probably quoting verbatim but this is what I was trying to say -- other parts of the country and other provinces in Canada and other commodities which are being handled under The Marketing Boards Act, I think that I wasn't on two sides of the fence at the same time. I was saying I was in the same position as you are, not prepared to say right now whether I'm in favour of marketing boards or not. But I'd sure find out if I was in your position whether they're good things or not.

MR. HUTTON: That's what we're endeavouring to do. Your encouragement, if that's what you can call it, to get on with the job was not needed. It was started some time ago.

There was another statement he made, I must draw the attention of the committee to. Things that we could do to help the farmers. He said that we could try to help them to be more efficient, and then he criticized, not the agricultural representatives, but the lack of leadership they were receiving. He said, "We have as I said the other night, the very unfortunate situation in the Province of Manitoba where our extension service, our agricultural representative staff is to a very large extent doing a fine job, mind you, but doing it with their heads sort of battered against the wall, because they're trying to sell to the farmers of Manitoba a greater efficiency of production of the very things of which we are producing a surplus."

Now in the first place he tells us that it would be in the interests of the farmer -- and he didn't qualify this statement; that we should help them to become more efficient -- he agreed with that; but then we're battering our heads against the wall because we are helping them to become more efficient in production of products which are already in surplus. There's another contradiction if I ever read one.

MR. ROBERTS: You know perfectly well what I was referring to of course. I was attempting to take a poke at our government at Ottawa with the restrictive trade practices who are largely responsible for the surpluses which we have, and I was saying, just as you know, that our agricultural representatives, our extension service is battling its head against the wall trying to convince the farmers to produce more efficiently products which the Government of Canada has seen to it we have a surplus of.

MR. HUTTON: There's not a word of that qualifying this statement. Not a word about Ottawa or the fact that the Federal Government policy is in contradiction to our own. This is what I've been saying, not what the Honourable Member for La Verendrye has been saying.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, it's only about three minutes to half past five and I'd like to hear about strawberries before it's recessed.

MR. HUTTON: Well, the same thing applies to strawberries. If the honourable member was really concerned about this project, I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman, if he would have made the little speech about it that he did. If these people are really concerned about the implications of a co-operative enterprise -- and I want to enlarge on this aspect of co-operation as it would work in this particular project -- if he's really concerned about that, I doubt that he would drag it out and point out to me that this is the reasons that it's not going over. I should think that he would go down there and would explain to them the principles of co-operation as they apply in this great free country of ours and the difference between that and the thing that he says they are afraid of. It seems to me that that evening that we spent down there -- we spent down there -- we were there two or three hours -- somebody would have stood up and said, "We don't like the idea of collective farms or co-operatives". At that time the people were enthusiastic. I can say that honestly. We didn't promise them 50 or 60 acres of strawberries or raspberries, we talked about a 40-acre plantation, and this plantation would have on the average, 20 acres of strawberries, once it got rolling through the initial stages, and 8 acres of raspberries. We told them that the impetus for this scheme must come from them. That the government

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) couldn't go down there and impose a co-operative that would succeed on them. I think everybody in this committee will recognize that in any project of this kind the impetus must come from the local people. We did assure them however, that we were willing to co-operate with them to the fullest extent. We had gone so far, we had investigated the situation from a cost angle, from the angle of potential profit; in the scheme, we had lined up a firm market for everything they could produce. We gave them every assurance they would get all the technical assistance that we could give them; and we've got some pretty good men in this field. We assured them that they would get some financial assistance in being established, but the impetus had to come from them. We couldn't possibly go out there and establish a co-operative. There's no justification for it at all, the people have to show us that they really want it.

Now to get down to the three acres. It became apparent, after this meeting and subsequent meetings, that we would be unable to establish this plantation in 1961, but we wanted to get it on the road. One of the factors involved was getting virus-free plants, because we know from experience in other places and here in Manitoba that the production from virus-free stock is substantially higher. It can run to six and seven times as high as from a common stock. And so even though we couldn't get the twenty acres set out this year, we felt that it was in the best interests of the community to at least get their two or three acres of this virus-free stock set out. It wouldn't cost them so much that way to get started; it wouldn't require as much initial investment. It was a matter of financing. We suggested to them that they acquire the land, and we'd give them all the help of our soil experts in picking it out, and that we would get this virus-free stock and they could set it out this year. They would be in a position in 1962 then to set out their full plantation from this pilot plot. This is what the whole thing is about. We're not backtracking at all. We're trying to avoid losing a year without any benefit to the people down there. I think it must be evident to every member of this committee that we're not taking anything away from our original commitments. We hope that this thing will go. We do, because it's got a great potential; and the three acres is a plot of virus-free plants that they can set out this year and avoid a more costly procedure, if they can't get going this year, of setting out and having to buy twenty acres of these rather expensive plants.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I have a question which probably

MR. ROBLIN: I just wonder whether other members want to speak on the Minister's salary, or whether they're ready to go on to the various items of the department.

MR. FROESE: I'd like to speak

MR. ROBLIN: Well, if there is any speeches on the salary, I'll move that the committee rise and we'll start again tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply is considering a certain resolution, has asked me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER: Seconded by whom?

MR. ALEXANDER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.