

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, February 8, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
 Reading and Receiving Petitions  
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees  
 Notices of Motion  
 Introduction of Bills

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may direct the attention of the members to the gallery. On my right there are 50 students of Grade 11 standing from the Windsor Park School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Hutton and Mrs. Stemshorn. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

On my left in the gallery we welcome 50 students of Grade 8 standing from the St. Norbert School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Beaumont, Mr. Bosc, and Mr. Vermette. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Attorney-General. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some comment on a question asked me by the Member for St. George yesterday in connection with information at the time the budget speech was delivered. I would like to repeat his first question. "Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Is it correct that the contents of the budget, including the tax changes announced last night, were mailed out yesterday afternoon to the media throughout the province?" My answer, "No, Mr. Speaker," was correct. "Mr. Guttormson: I wonder if we might have a subsequent question. Can the Minister indicate when it was mailed out?" My answer: "So far as I'm aware it was not mailed out." The budget was at no time mailed out. That last remark of mine I offer now; it is not quoted from Hansard. "Mr. Guttormson: Mr. Speaker, a moment ago I asked the Provincial Treasurer if he had sent out copies of the budget speech and the contents yesterday and he advised me 'no'. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a release" - honourable members will be aware that he is now referring to a completely different matter, not the contents of the budget but a release. I draw attention to that fact. So he is now referring to "a release from the government dated February 6th, which reads, 'A 5 percent provincial sales tax will go into effect June 1st throughout Manitoba, Provincial Treasurer Gurney Evans told the Legislature Monday'." That's a quotation from the press release.

Then Mr. Guttormson says, "I checked the postmark of the document it arrived in, and it was postmarked around 5 o'clock or before yesterday afternoon." I draw attention to the fact that it wasn't a postmark, it was a mark made by the meter machine downstairs which puts the postage on it, and such a machine does not put on the time of the postmarking. I said I would look into the matter. I would like to tell you, Sir, what occurred. News releases were prepared on Monday and run off in the afternoon by the Queen's Printer right in the Legislative Building, collated, placed in envelopes and returned to the Information Services Branch. The Director of Information Services took all envelopes to the mailing room in the Legislative Building where they were mailed and metered. The Director remained during this process to ensure that all envelopes were accounted for. He then took the metered envelopes containing the releases back to his office where they were locked up until after the delivery of the budget in the House. At approximately 9:30 p. m. Monday evening, after the budget address had been delivered, the envelopes were taken to the central Post Office, Graham Avenue, for mailing. They were carried there and placed in the Central Post Office direct. They were not released by the Director of Information until after the budget address had been completed.

That is a statement of what occurred and the measures that were taken to ensure the confidential nature of the information. I think my honourable friend was confused by the fact that postage was affixed to the envelopes before the Post Office in the building here closed, but that process was under the direct supervision of the Director of Information at all times. He took the envelopes back into his possession, locked them up until 9:30, well after the time I had completed my address.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I accept the explanation given by the Provincial Treasurer regarding the postmark. I was advised, and I think correctly that

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) . . . . . when it was fixed that -- as he explains, they were taken back to the office and then mailed again, but I think my information was correct inasmuch as the fixing of the stamps, but they were not let out at that time.

MR. EVANS: That's right.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health. Is the Minister doing everything in his power to convince the citizen members of the governing board of General Hospital to reconsider their decision of resigning from said board? And a subsequent question: would the Minister consider calling a meeting of all administrators of the Metro area, as well as all other administrators of hospitals in Manitoba that are interested, and at this meeting discuss the budgets and all related matters and, if such a meeting was called, could the members of this House who are interested be invited?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question, the meetings are going on with the citizen members of the board and there is another meeting being scheduled at a later date. In answer to the second question, the answer is no.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the meetings - is that between the department and the administrators or the Manitoba Hospital Commission? I wonder if he'd elaborate why he doesn't want to call a meeting and give the information to the members.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the matter of the budgets of all the hospitals is under consideration by the hospital commission at the present time and is being done in accordance with The Hospital Services Act.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the First Minister. Will the government, in view of the action taken by the members of the governing board, review the appeal submitted by hospitals to the Manitoba Hospital Commission? When I'm talking about reviews I mean the Cabinet itself. A subsequent question: and if so, will the final decision be based on the genuine need and realistic demands of the hospitals, and if it is found that the hospital demands are reasonable and necessary to carry on in a progressive way without reduction of services, notwithstanding the statement made in this House by the Minister of Health re the maximum increase to be allowed, will the government consider increasing, by a necessary and realistic amount, the budget of the said hospitals?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I'm at a loss to know what the exact situation is with respect to the status of the citizen members of the Board of the General Hospital because I have a statement handed to me by the Chairman of the Board on Tuesday, about lunch time, which reads as follows: "I understand that a statement was made to the Manitoba Legislature during the evening of February 6th that the Board of Trustees of the Winnipeg General Hospital had resigned. This is not so and the hospital board have not resigned. Hospital trustees are negotiating with the Government of Manitoba as to the monies required for the hospital's 1967 operation." That statement, as far as I know, represents the facts as they stand today. If there's something else that's happened I've received no official notification from the board of anything other than what I have just communicated to the House.

Now we are meeting with the board -- the Hospital Commission and the board will be meeting under what I trust will be the good auspices of some of my colleagues and myself in the near future, at which time we will discuss the whole problem to determine what the correct solution would be that takes into account what is required for the health and welfare of the citizens and also the considerations that are necessarily involved with respect to finances. I think that's the best answer that I can give at the present time and as soon as some definitive arrangement has been reached with respect to the matter, I'm sure that will be made known.

MR. DESJARDINS: Does the Minister mean by that that the meeting will be between the Members of the Cabinet. This is the important thing. I know they're meeting with the Hospital Commission, but I think in view of what's happening the Minister himself should meet. And the other question I am repeating: is there a possibility that a realistic amount, the necessary amount will be given if it's found so, notwithstanding the statement of the Minister?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, the meeting will be held under my own personal auspices. I expect I will be there and I am sure, as well, that what we are trying to do is to find the right answer to the question, and all relevant factors will be taken into consideration to arrive at what is a fair and equitable solution in the general public interest.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . . will not be final then.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . Honourable the Minister of Education. Given an increasing interest shown by the schools in the teaching of music, instruction with musical instruments and the formation of bands, is the Minister giving any consideration to making musical instruments available to the schools in the same manner as textbooks where proper instruction and facilities and demand would warrant it?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, as you know, in the new Foundation Program instructional supplies are up about four times what they were, and every consideration will be given to including musical instruments as legitimate items under that instructional supply item.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave of the House to make a short statement about future business of the House and timings of our sittings, if that would be agreeable.

Mr. Speaker, it would be the government's intention to propose to the Members of the House that in view of the extensive campaign that is presently under way with respect to single district divisions and the interest of all Members of the Legislature in that campaign and in the success of that campaign, that some time should be given to permit all honourable members to take part in the campaign. I can say that from information given to me by the Minister of Education there will be altogether some 312, 313 or 314 meetings slated for the single district division in various parts of Manitoba, and I'm told that already some 112 meetings have been held, only a small number of which could be attended by Members of the Legislature because we are of course engaged in our regular responsibilities here. Having regard to the importance of this campaign and to the support which has been expressed on all sides of the House for the concept, it would be the government's proposal to suggest that the House adjourn during the week of February 27th, thereby giving honourable members an opportunity to return to their constituencies and take whatever part they wish in the campaign that is going on.

In addition, the Minister of Education will be providing us very shortly with a list of all of the meetings that will be occurring from this time forward in order that honourable members will all have the full schedule of meetings and will thereby be able to avail themselves of this schedule in order to permit whatever participation they wish in the schedule of meetings that is occurring. I put this forward as a suggestion by the government which we would propose to follow.

I should also mention while I'm on my feet, in connection with the business of the House, that it would be the intention of the government after the Department of Welfare estimates are called to have next in line the Department of Tourism and Recreation, following that the Department of Northern Affairs and following that the Department of Highways. I'll repeat those: after the Department of Welfare, the Department of Tourism and Recreation then the Department of Northern Affairs - the Commissioner of Northern Affairs Branch, and then after that the Department of Highways.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the refusal of the Minister, I wonder if it is within your power to try to organize a meeting with the administrators of the Metro area and the interested members of this House for the welfare of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you referring that question to me?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes I was, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if it was within your power to try to organize this meeting between the administrators and the interested MLAs.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll take that question under advisement and give a reply. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by the Honourable the Attorney-General, I have no calendar with me and so I don't know when the 27th is, whether it's at the beginning of the week or not. I would prefer that we be given a definite date so that members in this House can schedule their meetings. If we say during the week we do not know what date.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I thought I was clear; I said the week of February 27th. That would mean the House would not be sitting on the following dates: Monday, February the 27th, Tuesday the 28th, Wednesday the 1st of March, Thursday the 2nd of March, Friday the 3rd of March, and the House would then resume on the following Monday.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, if I may, a word on the statement of the Honourable the Attorney-General in respect of the closing down of the House. I realize that generally speaking this is within the prerogative

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . of the government. I question somewhat in my mind as to the necessity of the closing down of all of the business of Manitoba, and in saying that I want it clearly understood I am not in any way trying to belittle the endeavours of the Department of Education or the government in respect of the referendum which is to be placed before a large portion of the citizens of Manitoba. I want to re-emphasize to the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, the position that I have taken on behalf of the group I have the honour to lead, and that is full co-operation to the government and to the citizens of Manitoba in respect of the referendum. We pledged our co-operation to the government at that time and I reaffirm that co-operation, and that co-operation extended to all necessary steps in order that the business of the Department of Education and the referendum could be carried on on a co-operative basis.

However, as I say, Mr. Speaker, we think that the rest of the business of Manitoba within this Legislature could be carried on in the week of February the 27th without the necessity of closing down and still at the same time I think we could fulfill our promise and our pledge of co-operation in respect of the referendum while we're still in session.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I take an entirely different attitude to the suggestion of the government than does the Leader of the NDP. I think we have to realize first of all that the House has been sitting this year a full month ahead of our normal schedule in any case. We had a two-week session prior to Christmas and we opened in the middle of January, and in past years the House did not start in any case usually until well into February, so I cannot see in what way the affairs of Manitoba will be held up by a week to discuss this matter in the province. I think instead that the welfare of the children of the province are here at stake and there should be every opportunity for the citizens to find out about this vote.

I regret to see that there is an apparent lack of interest on the part of many of the voters. I noticed that the Honourable the Minister of Education was in Brandon the other night and I believe there was a very small turnout at his meeting, if I gather the news from the Brandon Sun correctly. I notice that he shakes his head. I saw a copy of the Brandon Sun that indicated a very small turnout. Well if this is an indication, then there is a job to be done and I think that it is important that there be a full explanation - let the public decide but let there be a full explanation and opportunity for the members to be in their constituencies. I cannot see in what way the business of Manitoba would be held up. We have been in session much earlier than usual; there has been no hold-up that I know of; and so I am prepared to support the suggestion that there be this week in which the members can participate.

MR. LYON: I wish to thank the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the New Democratic Party for their co-operation. It is most helpful.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking on the statement of the Minister. I think I'm quite in order yet because I was asking for information before. I would like to say this, that I feel that one week isn't enough and that we should have more time than what is proposed by the government as such. I have had a couple of meetings and I've had a number of requests already for other meetings, and I certainly would like more time than one week to give information to the people because already people are making enquiries and feel that they are not getting the full story from the government.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour concerning the wages in the heavy construction industry. It's my understanding that the Cabinet is on the verge of passing an Order-in-Council which would declare that there would be a standard 60 hours a week - work week - in the heavy construction industry, and I would like the Minister's assurance either that that is not so or that there will be an opportunity to discuss this matter.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the honourable member's question as notice.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have another question to the Minister of Labour respecting The Employment Standards Act. It is my information that the Manitoba Labour Board is considering permitting employees of municipalities to be employed up to a total of 120 hours in two weeks without payment of overtime, which theoretically, Mr. Speaker, could be 120 hours a week without overtime, and I just wonder whether the Minister can assure us that such a work week is not going to get the favour of his department.

MR. BAIZLEY: Again, Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report for the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba; the Annual Report of the Provincial Sanitary Control Commission; and the Annual Report of the Department of Health.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. Does the Minister think that in view of the new changes in The Highway Traffic Act which prohibits funeral processions from going through red lights, unless they are escorted by I believe a police escort, does he think these changes have been adequately publicized for funeral directors and for the general public.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I answer the question as Minister of Public Utilities since it's in that department that The Highway Traffic Act is looked after. In answering the question, I believe that we have given adequate publicity to this. At the request of the Honourable Member from Elmwood we circulated all people engaged in the business of conducting funerals, and I would think there would hardly be anyone else who would need to have the matter drawn specifically to his or her attention, and of course it's part of the law and at least the various police forces are familiar with it.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Is it not also proper to inform the public of this change, and has this been done?

MR. SPEAKER: If I may interrupt the proceedings for a moment, I have in my hands a very important message addressed to this House from the State of North Dakota, the contents of which I would like to convey to the Assembly. It's headed: "Fortieth Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota, begun and held at the Capitol in the City of Bismarck, on Tuesday, the third day of January, 1967.

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION "T"

A concurrent resolution commending the great nation of Canada for her one hundred years of progress in this her Centennial Year 1967.

WHEREAS, on July 1, 1867, the new nation of Canada was formed; and

WHEREAS, Canada and the United States share the longest undefended border in the world, a border marked not by armaments but by a beautiful Peach Garden which is located between the two countries and lies in Manitoba, one of the Provinces of Canada, and North Dakota, one of the States of the United States; and

WHEREAS, this border is also shared by the Canadian Province of Saskatchewan and the State of North Dakota; and

WHEREAS, the citizens of North Dakota take much pride in friendly association with the citizens of these two great border provinces and the great nation of which they are part; and

WHEREAS, Canada in 1967 celebrates her Centennial Year with an International Exhibition, - EXPO '67 - in her historic city of Montreal and with many other important events throughout her nation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

That Canada, as a nation, and her citizens, as a people, be commended for their great progress in all fields of human endeavour and for the high honour, respect and esteem in which they are held by their neighbours, the citizens of the State of North Dakota;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution be printed in the journal and that a properly enrolled copy be sent by the Secretary of State to: The Honourable Lester B. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada; The Honourable Dufferin Roblin, Premier of the Province of Manitoba; The Honourable W. R. Thatcher, Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan; The Legislative Assembly, Province of Manitoba; The Legislative Assembly, Province of Saskatchewan. Signed by Gordon S. Aamott, Speaker of House; G. R. Gilbreath, Chief Clerk of the House; Charles Tighe, President of the Senate; Leo Leidholm, Secretary of the Senate."

I'm sure the honourable members would wish me to acknowledge with deep appreciation this very kind gesture of the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think the members of the House would expect me to respond to your suggestion that you should reply to this friendly and fraternal greeting from our friends in the State of North Dakota, the United States of America; and I am sure that we would all with one heart and mind agree that it would be entirely appropriate if you were to

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) . . . . convey to them our deep appreciation of their thoughtfulness in communicating with us in the way that they have. The Pony Express from Bismarck to your office is a little better than the one to my office because your communication arrived before apparently a similar destined for me.

I shall certainly reply on behalf of the government and perhaps I might be bold enough to also say that as well as the interesting event in the Province of Quebec in the City of Montreal to which they refer, that we would also like them to take note of the Pan American Games that will be held in Winnipeg at the same time, but be that as it may, Sir, I'm sure the House is grateful for your having read this communication to us and I know we would all join in asking you to reciprocate in kind.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I want to echo completely the words of the First Minister in our expression of appreciation to our American friends. I would not want my comments to be in any way construed as critical of their message to us, but I think that the very fact that the Pan Am Games were not mentioned is one that the Minister in charge here in Manitoba ought to take note of insofar as our internal activities in the province. There appears to be a failure of communication on the part of the committee and I would hope that, far from being critical of our American friends, we might take this as an example of the things that we need to do within the province if this event is to be successful.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, acting for our group in place of our leader, it gives me great pleasure as a member of the House to acknowledge and to recognize the greetings sent by the State of North Dakota to our Legislature and to our province.

The reason for my rising is that I have had some rather long and very happy relationships with the State of North Dakota - I say relationships - my mother was born in North Dakota in a small town called G. . . . . My father spent all his boyhood years in North Dakota and I have a great many friends in the northern part of the state where of course, who else, the Icelandic people settled. They have found North Dakota to be one of the better places in which Icelanders pioneered and they have spent many happy, very productive years in that state. It gives me pleasure to add to what others have said in recognizing and thanking the State of North Dakota for their greetings.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): I'd just like to add to what has been said. It seems to me most encouraging that we hear from the State of North Dakota that they think well of us, because I'm just wondering after the people of this province, having seen both the estimates and heard the budget speech, if they do.

MR. MOLGAT: Before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. The other evening when I spoke on the matter of the General Hospital Board my honourable friend, in the course of the debate, stated particularly that he was very happy to have the debate continue, particularly as he had just been informed the board had not resigned and he read us a letter today.

Is he aware of the statements that have been made by a number of other members of the board, and I refer him particularly to an article today in The Winnipeg Tribune indicating the following, and I'm quoting regarding a meeting last Friday, "The citizen board members said they felt this budgetary procedure was an exercise in futility which they had gone through before and could not go through again. They then decided unanimously to resign and asked Mr. Johnston if he wanted their resignation in writing. Mr. Johnston said this was not necessary. As long as he knew they did not wish to continue their work for the hospital, he said he would receive the resignations verbally and use them when the time is right." Is the Minister aware that this was so on Friday?

MR. ROBLIN: No, Mr. Speaker, I was not aware. I met with Mr. Johnston the following morning - the Saturday morning - with him and a committee of four or five of the directors of the hospital and no such information was given to me. Furthermore, on the Tuesday following I received another thing that's headed "Statement from Arthur E. Johnston, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Winnipeg General Hospital," and I just read it to the House a few minutes ago. So that is the sum of my knowledge on the subject.

I don't know really why we beat this horse to death anyway, because if these gentlemen are going to resign no doubt they will on a suitable occasion, and our job is to try and get a workmanlike and suitable solution to the problem we face and not worry about resignations. So I am not worrying about resignations. I'm worrying, and I'm interested in getting a practical solution to the problem which they and the Hospital Commission face. I have sufficient confidence in the good judgment and the common sense and the good will, both of the Commission

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) . . . . and the Board of Trustees, to believe that such an arrangement can be reached and my honourable friend can rest assured that we're going to do our best to arrive at such a happy conclusion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his statement and that is exactly the conclusion I want to reach as well. Now is the government then presently meeting with the Board itself? Is it correct that it is receiving a report directly from the Board, by-passing the Hospital Commission and dealing directly?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. We are dealing with the Hospital Commission and the Board and we will be meeting very shortly to discuss these problems. The government has no intention - I want to make this abundantly clear - the government has no intention of by-passing the Hospital Commission because by statute they are instructed to undertake certain procedures and we have no authority or power to interfere with the statute. The statute must be observed. What we are doing is trying to use our good offices to arrange a meeting of minds a little sooner than might otherwise be the case between the Hospital Board and the Hospital Commission.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Will the First Minister undertake to do the same for other hospital boards who approach him on the same basis?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I hope we treat everybody in the province equitably.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Honourable Minister of Health. He indicated some time ago that he would bring in legislation with regard to the dental profession and the denturists. Could he inform the House when he expects that legislation to appear.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I can't give you an exact date as to when it will appear. It's being considered at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the Minister to follow the recommendations of the committee, which he headed I think for some two or three years, and made recommendations to his department?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, when the legislation comes forward my honourable member will see everything that he wants to see as to what we're going to recommend.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare. Are the services that are rendered by the chiropractors and the denturists covered under a Medicare card presently?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question while the Minister is checking it. Are the services of an optometrist covered under a Medicare card.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing:

1. The number of students enrolled at the Manitoba Dental and Medical Colleges in each of the last 3 years (including the current year).
2. The number of graduates in each of the last 3 years.
3. The number of the above who remained to practice in Manitoba after graduation.
4. The number of doctors and dentists coming into Manitoba in each of the last 3 years.
5. The number of doctors and dentists in Manitoba who retired in each of the last 3 years.
6. What incentives, if any, are given to Manitoba students to enroll in Manitoba Dental and Medical Colleges and to remain here in practice.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: -- I wonder if I could have the attention of the House whilst I read this.

(Balance of motion read by Mr. Speaker.)

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, the result of the disposition of Bill 100 last year by this House has prompted me to put the Order for Return in that you have just read. I'm sure that every member of the House that was then elected - there are a number of new ones, it is true - will remember with as much interest as I did of the fate of Bill 100. Incidentally, Mr.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . Speaker, I think Bill 100 and the treatment that the House gave it pretty well assured my return to the House at the election in June, but I don't want to thank the House for that factor. However, since -- (Interjection) -- yes, it would have been better to have what the citizens of Neepawa were asking for by way of Bill 100, because as you remember yourself, Mr. Speaker, Bill 100 simply said that Whereas the citizens of Neepawa like a lot of other communities and centres in the province were finding it most difficult to obtain dental and medical and other personnel to look after the health and welfare of the community, that they were asking that permission be given by the House to let them build a medical clinic, and they thought by building it that this would in some way attract doctors and dentists to the area, and indeed I had the support of some members of the government. My honourable friend the Member for Brandon saw fit to vote with me in committee as did the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, and one or two more I believe.

But since that time, since that time I asked for and received from the Department of Industry and Commerce a summary - it's called a summary I suppose of the trading areas of 12 communities that were under microscope by the department. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that back in 1965 we received a news bulletin or a release from the Information Services that 12 Manitoba towns were under microscope, and it said, "The business makeup of 12 Manitoba communities will be subjected to a searching analysis during the next year to determine if they have achieved their full potential in respect to drawing people within their orbit and if they are providing adequate services."

Now they finally made the survey and reported their findings to the communities - the 12 of them, and I have the whole 12 reports in front of me - and the question put -- incidentally, no doubt this survey went on in your own constituency, Mr. Speaker, as it did in many others. But a questionnaire was sent out to, oh, I think about 10 percent of the people that shopped in these areas at random and they asked several questions. They did the same in every community, and in Neepawa for instance there was something like 1,300 questionnaires went out, of which quite a number returned the questionnaire completed, and in this case and in most every case the department said that the number of returns received was very very encouraging.

The question asked was: "If you are not doing all of your shopping in the area in which you live now, what has prompted you to go outside to do your shopping." This was really what they were asking, and of course many of them said that they had to go outside of their own communities in order to obtain services that were not readily available to them, and they were to list in order those services that were lacking in their own community, and they said, "having to go outside of their community to obtain these services, they took their wife and family along with them and as a result did a lot of shopping outside of those areas." That's what they said. High up on the list in every case as services desired and required by the community, and improvements desired, was dentists and doctors.

Now in Neepawa for instance the improvements that were desired -- I see my honourable friend the Minister of Education shaking his head in the negative and I don't know what that means. I wonder if he has not received these copies. The improvements desired, listed in order of most frequent mention: 68% of those persons that replied to the questionnaire said they needed dentists; 58% said doctors; and 24% said optometrists; and they said they had to go outside of Neepawa to obtain these services and when they went out they made other purchases.

I'm not going to take time now to go into detail because I have a resolution on this subject matter on the Order Paper and at that time I intend to go through each and every one of these in my forty minutes at my disposal and again when I close the debate, to point up that there is a great need in the rural areas of this province for more doctors and dentists and nurses. I'm not only saying this, this is what the government is saying in these reports that they tabled. In fact I don't think they tabled them, I asked for them because I wanted them to support my arguments, and I find there's nothing more helpful to support my arguments than statements that are made by the honourable friends opposite because they have an awful time getting off the hook when you quote them and use all of their arguments to support yours.

We did have an excellent plan, or we thought we had, to correct this situation in Neepawa by Bill No. 100 and the government turned it down, and they indicated after it was turned down in committee that they had an alternative to it. They said don't run away mad because we think there is another way. Well, prior to the election and during the election I tried to find out what that alternative was and I have yet to find out what it was. So I'm beginning to think that they haven't got an alternative, but as I said, Mr. Speaker, I will go into this subject matter



(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . in more detail when I get to the resolution that I have in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I'm glad you gave the honourable member an opportunity to make his speech on last year's Bill No. 100 because I'm quite prepared to make a speech on that as well. But I think that it would be more acceptable if I dealt mainly with the Order for Return than for this extended problem posed by the honourable member, only I must point out as I did last year that it is often amusing to see a member of the Liberal Party rise to the occasion and say, "Well private enterprise is not looking after the provision of adequate space for the necessary services to be provided to our communities so we want our local community to be able to do so and provide the space of that type facility for the medical requirements of the community." I'm quite sure that I would support it. I don't know whether members of the party I refer to would have supported it to that extent.

Dealing more specifically with the Order for Return, Mr. Speaker, I had in mind a somewhat similar order to put in and it won't be necessary now, on the assumption that the Honourable Minister in accepting the Order will literally accept some of the wording. When it speaks of students enrolled and of graduates, I would hope that there will be included in the report those students and those graduates who are not necessarily doctors or dentists but who graduate in other para-medical or para-dental fields. I don't quite know how this applies in the Medical College but I know that hygienists are being enrolled at the Dental School and are graduating, and I would hope that in the reply that we receive mention will be made of numbers of hygienists or any other type of auxiliary services that are being trained through the Dental College. Now I think there's chairside assistants as well. I'm not sure of that, Mr. Speaker, but I feel that within the wording itself that there could be the added information regarding students and graduates who are not only graduates as dentists and doctors.

I feel also that this gives me an opportunity to add a few questions dealing with the teaching staffs at both these colleges. I am under the impression that there has been an unusual turnover in both colleges of the teaching staff and I think it would be worthwhile for us to have a report on what the turnover has been. I think it would be of interest to know what the establishment was in each of the last three years and what the turnover was in each college in those years to see whether or not the teaching staff is staying to a large extent or whether it is in fact turning over. I make no comment because I do not know what the reasons for such turnover might be and whether it is really a problem, and certainly I could not guess whether it is a question of calibre or of salary or what is the problem. I don't want to suggest yet -- I don't want to state that there is a problem until we get the reply to these additional questions which I propose to ask and I hope that the government will agree to answer them.

I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, That the motion be amended by adding thereto the following words and figures: 7. The number of teaching staff at each college in November of the last three years. 8. The number of turnover in each college in each of the years.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a question I would have to get, as far as my Department and activities are concerned, probably have to get from the University of Manitoba and I could make every attempt to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, we have no objections at all to the addition of these questions to the list submitted by my colleague the Member for Gladstone. The question here that's been added I think may give us some idea as to what steps are taken by the province or what is happening at the college itself to increase its efficiency, and this naturally will - provided they are taking the right steps - should assist in the object that we have, and that is seeing to it there is more medical staff in the rural parts of the province where there is a real shortage. There are many areas of the province where you have to go a hundred miles to find a dentist. There are sections with absolutely no medical staff. There are a number of areas in the province today where the local hospitals are finding extreme difficulty in obtaining doctors, and I'm sure both the Minister of Education who has just spoken, who himself is a medical doctor, knows this as well as the Minister of Health. So our concern is to see what steps the province is taking to ensure the adequacy of medical and dental staff throughout the province. The concentration of such staff in the major centres, in particular in Winnipeg, does provide for specialization, it is true, in such a centre, but in the other parts of the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . province it means that even basic services at times are not available.

So I would hope that the Minister can supply us with this information very soon. I'm sure that the Medical College and the Dental College have it available immediately in their records. If it could be submitted in this way we could then have a useful debate when my colleague the Member for Gladstone has his resolution before us as to the steps that need to be taken by the province to improve these medical services throughout Manitoba.

MR. WITNEY: I have no objection to the questions so far as they pertain to the Department of Health and the Honourable the Minister of Education has commented upon his. I would just like to make the comment though, after listening to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that perhaps we should refer to some of the comments I made at the time that we were speaking about the estimates of the Department of Health, because I would like to just repeat briefly where we have groupings of doctors at the present time, and I listed a number of places in the province and they were quite substantial, and I just draw your attention to them again and you could add even more places than I gave on that particular evening. So unless there's any unfortunate connotation that we have no doctors in the rural parts of Manitoba, I should just like to make that comment at this time and certainly when the debate is taking place on the resolution I'll probably have more to say about the matter then.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I could speak to the Clerk for a moment. -- We are now calling for a vote on the main motion as amended.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable . . . .

MR. LYON: I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, because under the rules the time begins to count from the day on which the budget speech is given, whether my honourable friend would have any objection if anyone else wished to speak. Of course we have no objection to agreeing to his suggestion that the matter stand, but I just wondered if he would have any objection to enquiring as to whether other members might wish to participate.

MR. MOLGAT: I quite appreciate the situation, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly have no intention of preventing anyone else from speaking. In fact, I have spoken to the Leader of the NDP and the Member for Rhineland and told them exactly what I was doing so they are in touch, but I have no objection if anyone else wishes to speak.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the statement of the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition is correct. We have been in consultation. It is our intention to adhere to tradition and follow the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I'm sure it won't be on the ninth day as far as the rules of the House are concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 17. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: Would the House grant leave for this to stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 24. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would ask if this matter might be allowed to stand please.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion that the House resolve itself into committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move 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, and my seconder is the Minister of Agriculture.

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 Arthur in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Agriculture 1 (a)-- The Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): I've had a number of phone calls and I wondered, in view of the number of farmers that have made this request to myself and other members and the fact that they start working their lands or hauling their grain, etc., as soon as possible in the Spring - in many cases it's before May 1st - would the Minister consider granting the use of purple gas in licensed farm trucks on or about April 1st?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): I think I'd have to handle that question first for the honourable member. This is obviously a budgetary type of a question, and I think from the estimates that have been put before the House, and indeed the revenues expected, we're obviously working on a pretty tight basis and I would have to say that the cancellations made by the Treasury are from May 1st and that's how the matter would stand.

MR. DAWSON: Your answer would be "No".

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: You would not consider it?

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: You would or would not. You would not consider it.

MR. ENNS: I think I'm wearing a purple heart for the farmers in Manitoba right about now anyway, so coming from May 1st we'll accept it at that.

The other evening I was just at the beginning of referring to some of the questions put to me during the course of debate and I didn't get very far. The Honourable Member from Gladstone was asking me about my philosophy with respect to corporate farms and I don't want to skirt the issue, he was of course specifically referring to the Friendly Family Farms organization. I believe the answer I gave him the other night on that is all that I would care to say about that specific situation, but indeed the question of corporate farms and their place and the problems that they impose to rural Manitoba as such is something which I'd be prepared to comment very briefly on. If the honourable member would want to call it philosophy, I don't know. I don't really think that that kind of a term could be attributed to whatever I have to say, but if I have -- and I hope to influence the Department of Agriculture's emphasis or direction in this instance over the next few years that I have the privilege of serving as its Minister.

There are two problems. If, on the one hand, our only function was to provide for the desperately needed food and food production, as was underlined by the Honourable Member from Lakeside the other night so graphically, then the problem would be relatively simplified for us; we would concentrate our efforts to producing more and more food and that would be the whole gist of it. On the other hand, if the provincial Department of Agriculture has to concern itself with the rural people that it's involved with and that it's dealing with, again if this was our primary function our job would be considerably simplified. The danger in this lies of course that we would tend to look or strive to a status quo position, not recognizing technological breakthroughs in the agricultural industry and so forth, but rather protecting the human element in our agricultural society from any adjustment or change that could in some way be harmful to them. I would think that in just the very briefest of terms and very simply, that what makes the job of Minister of Agriculture a job and an important one in this province and indeed in any other province of Manitoba is the position that of course the department likes to proceed with is a careful balance of the two, that is that we accept the responsibility of producing food, and more food, and at the same time we accept the responsibility of looking after the social and the human adjustments of those farmers, those rural people that through the times have looked upon their Department of Agriculture to look after their interests in far-ranging fields. Having said that, I will go on to more specific questions.

The Honourable Member from Gladstone felt that the project that the ARDA program got itself engaged in with respect to the blueberry problem - or blueberry research program in Manitoba was something that was perhaps really not in order. I would have to say that that of course makes the agricultural estimates as interesting as they are, even to our urban members, in that we can go from blueberries to Bang's disease, back to hogs and the problems of rape-seed production. And while I don't want to take the matter that facetiously, I would have to point out to the Honourable Member of Gladstone that the blueberry industry is indeed a quarter of a million dollar industry in Manitoba and for many persons in the southeastern and in the fringe areas this represents a very substantial means of income during the summer months,

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . and from reports that we hear in the Maritimes, this is indeed a multi-million dollar business. I fail to see any reason why we should not look at our possibilities in this field. Indeed, I think it shows a little bit of imagination on the part of the people that are carrying out this program.

Now he went on to speak at some length with respect to -- I shouldn't say some length, but he mentioned, I suppose for my benefit because I understand too that this is from time to time a favourite subject, the propaganda department that is attached to the Department of Agriculture. I really don't feel that that remark is called for or that it can be substantiated. I have a series of these notices that he refers to here. It relates such things as . . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: . . . . Minister to the orange sheets more than these, the orange ones that emanate from the Information Services, that quite apart from my . . . .

MR. ENNS: Well, I'm glad that the Member from Gladstone referred to the orange sheets because really my only remark about these, other than the fact that they do provide a service -- and indeed my colleague from Souris-Lansdowne made a point of remarking, and I agree with him, how important it is to get our research facilities back to the farm. It's no good having research unto research itself, and we've heard a lot about research in this House. It's only good to us when it gets to our farms, and what other ways are you going to have it distributed and disseminated other than when you print it. The only other comment I could offer with respect to its being called a propaganda sheet, I notice that the colours that I have here and the colour that the Honourable Member from Gladstone mentions, the colour blue is conspicuously absent which could in any way refer to our particular Party or stripe.

Now, he went on to talk about railway abandonment and the problems that this may cause with respect to farmers having to truck their grain greater distances. I would feel inclined to say that any efforts or credits money-wise and so forth that we may be going after in this respect should accrue to my honourable friend the Minister of Highways in seeing that the highway and the transportation system in this province gets their dollars where they need them. But I don't really think that the Honourable Member from Gladstone suggests, as he did, that we give them a subsidy for hauling this freight for, he said I believe for four or five years, that we could realistically pull back from that position at a later date. Somehow these subsidies, once given, they have a tendency of hanging pretty tough.

Now, he further mentioned the problem of ARDA again, and mainly he felt that too much money was being spent on research. I have some further comments that I would be prepared to make on ARDA and I don't by any means feel that it is above reproach or criticism. There is no doubt a fair amount that can be criticized, but with this specific question that the member from Gladstone referred to about research -- and here I find it so interesting that I really don't have to answer too many of these questions, they have a tendency of answering themselves within the questions asked by different members.

The Member from Turtle Mountain just after him, got up and made a very legitimate request as to what the department was doing with respect to research and findings and looking into for irrigation purposes in the southwest part of the province. It's a very legitimate question, a question that we should be concerning ourselves with, and I would refer the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to Page 7 in this ARDA book where we have, first of all, the very first research project. "Very little is known of the extent, locality and quality of Manitoba's underground water supply. This program involves the drilling of test wells, an analysis of soil layers and of underground water to determine how much there is and how good it is - an inventory of all this information to make it readily available for the rural folk and municipalities. Now, this is a very broad program that is of benefit to the towns and municipalities that are looking for water as well as any potential research or irrigation purposes that it could be used for.

More specifically to the Member of Turtle Mountain's question, you could turn to Page 18, I believe, in this booklet and I think that is a little closer to his home territory where we have some \$49,000 allocated to produce studies in the Melita area investigating the possibilities of using underground water for crop irrigation purposes. And further to that, if the Member from Turtle Mountain is further interested in this, there is a further amount in my estimates that will appear -- the department is actually engaged in conducting a kind of an experimental program there. It will show up in my estimates and I would be happy to go into this matter further at that time. Now, this is what I mean - on the one hand, where research is considered redundant; on the other hand, where it's being asked for.

The other issues that were raised by the Honourable Member of Turtle Mountain are his

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . complaint or his suggestion that perhaps the areas that our home economists serve are large, and I would have to agree with him. They are large and I don't think that members in the House generally, or all too many don't know that these girls have quite a job on their hands. Most of their activities are centred in the winter months; they're involved in a lot of winter driving; their areas are large and certainly I would like to see an improvement in our program here, perhaps some additional staff when and if the budget limitations allow this. I would have to add that in this particular instance, I join my honourable colleague the Minister of Health, or indeed the Minister of Education, that whenever we employ these fairer sex in our employment that we are subject to the vagaries or the problems of having them vanish on us from time to time and come into the field of homemakers and so forth, and this occurs to us in this department too.

He went on to talk at some length with respect to the contribution he felt the department, the government indeed was making with their efforts to support the 4H Clubs, the prize moneys, different fairs and so forth, and certainly I think we are on very mutual and common ground here. I don't think there's any question of the validity, of the importance of these programs, and I would hope very sincerely that in the future that we can see an improvement here. Indeed I hope this might be done very soon.

The question of large fairs, or the tendency to having these smaller fairs die out in favour of larger fairs, again I would submit that this is not something that's restricted just to fairs alone; this is all, fortunately or unfortunately depending on which side you want to stand on, that this is a trend that happens in many of our aspects of rural living and I don't think we can spend too much time overly concerning ourselves about this problem. Where a small fair is active and is showing by its support and membership and its capability to continue, certainly the Department of Agriculture will always be there to assist them in any way that we can.

Now the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain also brought up the problem of Bang's disease and he noted in my estimates that we show a decrease in this allotment. That decrease is accountable primarily because we hope - or rather I should say I hope to introduce to this House legislation that would take the compulsory feature of vaccinating heifer calves out of the legislation and put it on a voluntary basis. We do so on the advice of the federal and provincial veterinary authorities who believe that the control or the incidence of this disease is such that we can afford to do so.

He asked a further more specific question about what the present status was of Bang's disease - or Brucellosis - I suppose I should call it in its proper term. We presently have the whole of the province declared as a certified area, that is less than five percent of the herds are infected, less than one percent of the cattle infected in each municipality. Further to this there are 12 municipalities who are classified as Bang's-free, that is less than one percent of the herd and less than .2 percent of the cattle affected. This is a program that I'm always happy -- I'm always happy when we can take a compulsory feature out of our government services. We feel, or we're told that the screen testing or the spot testing that will continue to take place by means of picking up dairy samples and by means of checking the cow kill at the different slaughtering houses, blood samples drawn from them, that they'll be able to check the individual herds in this manner and not have to refer by and large to general tests to any great degree. I think this will be a welcome change to the cattle people in this country. It's no question that the vaccination of heifer calves has caused some problems with respect to the sale of calves, particularly with the export of cattle to the U.S. They've often reacted positively if vaccinated at a young age and had to be supplied with certificates and so forth at the time of border crossing. Now I believe that that more or less covers some of the questions that the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain put to me.

I'd like to refer back just for a moment. The day before the Member from Ethelbert Plains gave us an impassioned plea of the farmers' plight and situation and the lack of programs or policies that this government -- I don't even think he was really blaming this government so much but more so the Federal Government in this case. I don't, as I said earlier, really want to take issue with him on that but I do take issue with him most strenuously when he makes the statement, if I have it right, when he says that farmers pooled all their resources and have produced all the grain they could possibly produce under the present circumstances. Well, I don't buy that for one minute. We're going to produce an awful lot more grain in this country and we have to. If you accept for one minute that we have reached a status quo position in agriculture, then we're in real rough trouble, and this just won't do if we're going to meet part of the demands that the Honourable Member for Lakeside just so well illustrated to

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . us the day before, and indeed you begin to read reports of different news media and what have you, while just as it was quite unconceivable a few short years ago that we would be harvesting an 800 million bushel wheat crop in this province, they're now talking about a billion bushel wheat crop coming up and it will come up. We may have our setbacks before that comes but I'm sure as I'm standing here we will in this country of ours be producing a billion and more bushels of wheat before too long.

So, I don't think, or rather I accept the fact that a good portion of our farmers, that some of our farmers are working at their maximum efforts and that they're not getting their fair return from them, but we can't sit back on that laurel and say that we've done all that we can and now it's up to somebody else to bail us out of trouble. There's lots of room for us to manoeuvre in. They tell us that the national average herd in the dairy business is eight cows. Well this just doesn't stand up, that on an eight cow herd operation we're going to supply a five or \$10,000 net income that we'd like to see our farmers have.

So we can't sidestep this issue and we certainly as farmers can't sidestep it. So I don't buy this suggestion at all. In fact why should we be different than anybody else? The industrial worker is called upon to increase his productivity; the industry at large is called upon to increase its rate of growth; we're all called upon to increase our rate of growth. I'd like to think that we farmers have done a pretty substantial job in our share of it, but we can't sit back and say we've done it and now let's have government look after us from here on in. I don't buy that for one moment and I don't think the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains really meant it in that way.

Now, in between the Member for Brokenhead arose with the problem that no doubt I'll be hearing more about and no doubt the Minister of Highways will be hearing more about, that is the question of our friends in the Lake Winnipeg area who have suffered extreme hardship, and I make no effort to hide the fact that it was extreme hardship that they suffered there with respect to flooded lands. I only refer to him again - we've just had a meeting the other day again with a group of these people on the scope of the program that the province would have to enter into when and if we can look at compensation or land acquisition of this type - the fact that a study is under way and that we would hope to have some further information on this perhaps in not too lengthy a time from now.

Now I come to my honourable Member from Rhineland who indeed -- I must say he expressed a certain kinship to me in our mutual ancestry and I find myself very close to him in this respect, but I cannot really in all seriousness buy some of the statements that he made when he referred to the present situation here with respect to our marketing problems here as bordering that of totalitarian states or indeed dictatorships and so forth. I don't really want to comment on the Marketing Commission, the particular one that he referred to. I think it's very difficult for me to do so without further prejudicing any enquiry that may come. I can appreciate the fact that in the eyes of some I have already done so, but be that as it may, I just want to point out to the member that marketing boards, as such, of any size or description are not something new or something that we have invented here. There are some 88 marketing schemes or boards in operation in Canada at the moment involving some 250,000 farmers. These are of various types - voluntary, producer-oriented, compulsory - some, you know, it just really underlines the pressing desire on the part of different consumers, different organizations to seek some way of bringing about an orderly flow, an orderly marketing of their products. Whether or not there are some specific problems, and indeed I would have to acknowledge that there no doubt are, I think I've made my own position clear on this matter. Since shortly coming into office I feel that so far as my own particular actions are concerned I made a very honest and frank attempt to meet the people that were objecting to the plan on a fair ground. My office doors were open to them. I don't think that they have necessarily or in all cases have treated me in the same manner but that's really I suppose not for me to comment on.

The Member for Rhineland dwelt at some length or read us different portions of a report, and while I am very hesitant to judge anybody by the manner of dress or indeed the manner of his speech or the colour of his hair, but when the person takes the time to pick up a pen and put down his thoughts on paper, or as in this case the typewriter, I feel that there is an area of judgment that a person can enter into and I would have to say that the particular type of literature or efforts on behalf of this particular group doesn't really commend itself to the group. I don't think it is representative of the real concern that some people obviously have in this area, but I just pointed out that while I'm not particularly concerned about when they make

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . references to the Minister here as the "know nothing" Minister, this is something that I have to accept as having entered into the fraternity here and I'm not concerned about it, but generally the tenor of the whole piece doesn't commend itself to any serious consideration and I really don't hesitate in filing it for proper consideration at a later time.

Now the questions that have been brought to date I think are pretty well covered with this reply. If I have missed any, it was only because of the time lapse and so forth.

MR. RODNEY CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to speak briefly, to take part in this debate on agriculture. I realize by looking at the Orders of the Day that over 31 hours have already been taken up in our estimates and I do not intend to take up too much of the time of this House. I was really all "hep" to go on Monday afternoon but it did seem to me that the Honourable Member for Lansdowne just refused to sit down, and first thing you knew it was 5:30. Yesterday I had to beg time off. I felt it was my place to be home yesterday with my parents who celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary. I'm sure almost everything has been said about agriculture and the Minister's salary that can be said. However, I'll try to inject one or two new points, a little humour if possible, to make this life in here enjoyable.

Now at this time, Mr. Chairman, I must congratulate the new Minister of Agriculture, I must compliment him on first of all, being elected last summer and now as Minister of Agriculture. To begin with, for a new man it is quite an accomplishment to get elected to the Legislature; and secondly to be appointed Minister of Agriculture which, to me, is the most important portfolio on the government side with regards rural Manitoba, and as far as the rest of Manitoba is concerned, it would be in a sorry state of affairs if agriculture gets in the same sort of a problem that some other segments of our industry are.

I also want to say that I feel that at least any of the members of the Department of Agriculture that I have met are certainly well up on their work and know what they're trying to do. I want to also compliment the Department on all ag reps that I have met and primarily the one who is in Russell, Mr. Bill Uhryniuk. He is not only an excellent ag rep but unlike some civil servants he is certainly an asset to the Town of Russell. He takes part in pretty near any -- whether it's a lodge or the Chamber of Commerce or anything that is asked of Mr. Uhryniuk, if he has the time he's only too prepared to help out.

Well now a few days ago when this debate opened, the Honourable Member from Brokenhead gave us an address of about 45 minutes length on agriculture. Now I know that the former member from Brokenhead who entered this Legislature quite young, while I was here before, is now in Ottawa and that if the same gentleman has these ambitions then the speech he gave the other day certainly leans towards going to Ottawa. I'm sure he can be forgiven for sort of wandering astray. He did an excellent job. But, Mr. Chairman, we are in Manitoba and so I think that the affairs of this Minister of Agriculture as far as possible -- I realize that sometimes he had to divert to Ottawa to get what we want -- but I think Manitoba is primarily our problem.

The Honourable Member for Gilbert Plains is quite concerned about the production of agriculture but in the Minister's opening remarks the other day he pointed out that through the increased management in skills and increased capital of Manitoba the total agricultural production had risen to some \$507 million, I believe was the figure. He also pointed out that some 130,000 tons of fertilizer had been used and that this will expand. This is right. But like the Honourable Member from Lakeside, unless the Good Lord deems rain at the right time fertilizer, hard work, finances and everything else is all to no avail.

But the answer to this future of agriculture and increased production has got to be fertilizer - and it's going to be fertilizer. We have a new fertilizer plant that just opened up in Brandon. Fertilizer is now being used far more extensively than it has been. There will be new fertilizer plants all over rural parts of Manitoba and I for one feel that this is the answer and I know that in our own operation we are not only using more fertilizer, we are going into the fertilizer business to try and see that more farmers will buy and use fertilizer. Fertilizer is well and good, but the right type of fertilizer has to be used on the right type of land and this is now where the Department of Agriculture comes in and they have done I think an excellent job. In their annual report on page 195, they point out the preliminary investigations and indexing of soils; soil rate zone reinspections. Investigations by field checks of requests for soil productivity rating re classification were made. Requests that required further investigations were referred to the Department of Soil Science of The University of Manitoba. The rural

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd,) . . . . municipalities involved and the number of quarter sections rated where -- and this is what I want to point out. On page 196 you will notice that the Russell municipality had 177 quarters reclassified and the closest one to this is 120, then it drops down to 80, then it's 25 - 10 - 15 - 2 - 3 and 4. Well now I just want to point out that in the Russell area we have some of the better farmers in Manitoba. They're interested, they read up and they study -- and once again a lot of this is due to Mr. Uhryniuk, the ag rep in Russell, and I'm sure that as time goes on this fertilizer will be the answer to the problem of feeding the world.

Now I find it somewhat difficult to be critical - along with being a farmer I'm also a business man and I've always maintained that to sell a certain product you must prove the product you sell is the best and not try to point out what a poor product the other man sells, whether it's automobiles, implements or whatever it may be. And so at this date I can't be too critical of the Honourable Minister because he hasn't had time enough to do anything wrong. I'm sure he has the feeling that he's going to try and do his best, and he will. However, he's only one of about 10 or 12 Cabinet Ministers so he has to be the friend of the farmer; Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Agriculture is going to make a success he has to be the farmers' friend. Well now I think he intends to do this and will do to the best of his ability, but if I'd have got over with my speech on Monday afternoon, I would have pointed out that he must insist on the rest of his associates agreeing to doing away with tax on farm fuel. Well now on Monday night, I have to compliment him -- if he's responsible, I'll give him credit -- this has already been done.

Secondly I would point out to him -- and I'm sure he must know that the farmers of rural Manitoba are not happy with Daylight Saving Time. The farmer of rural Manitoba doesn't have to work - - he works from sun-up till sunset anyway so there's no time to take off at 4 - 5 o'clock to go and play golf. If he's doing his job right, he's going out to bring the cows in and do the milking or go out and do something else. Daylight Saving Time is a very controversial subject. It's one that most politicians shun away from. I don't profess to be a politician so I'll speak my mind. -- (Interjection) -- Statesman, that's the word. Thank you, thank you very much.

Daylight Saving Time has brought many problems -- and believe it or not it also is one of the reasons why the people of Birtle-Russell re-elected me. Perhaps we're in a unique situation lying adjacent to the Saskatchewan boundary. This may affect it a little bit because there's an hour difference all summer long with the Daylight Saving Time. This is from the business point of view affected. The farmers are having trouble with their children. Believe it or not in our part of the world there's still some children on the farms; in some of these areas there aren't too many. But I know that they do not like this daylight saving time and I don't mind making it publicly here that I was elected by these people and this is the stand I am going to take: I am not for Daylight Saving Time.

Now thirdly, and this is very, very important, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to use his persuasive powers -- I'm sure he must have quite a number or he wouldn't be Minister of Agriculture -- to use these persuasive powers on his charming associate, the Minister of Municipal Affairs. This Boundaries Commission, surely to goodness this Boundaries Commission can be speeded up. I have a considerable amount of faith in it's Chairman. He, at one time was my lawyer, along with being my opponent, but it should be a full-time job and surely if these men and women went to work on this thing steady, they could do this in two or three years not five years. Good gracious when the school boundaries were set up here some years ago, I think it was the last year I was in the Legislature, it took six months to do it, six months to do it, but it was a full-time job. They worked at this consistently. Ten years ago a Boundaries Commission, a redistribution of the constituencies was set up and it's known now that this is going to have to take place. It's going to take place in 1967. They're not going to take five years to do it. They know they've got to do it and it will be done. With the schools boundaries, the -- if we use the word, county system -- redistribution of constituencies, if all this thing was melded into one -- at one time, surely it would be far more satisfactory and I think that this could be speeded up considerably. I think it would be to the advantage of the government and to everybody concerned that it does not have to take five years to bring in this report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . If I could interrupt the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. I don't believe that this comes under the item agriculture.



MR. CLEMENT: Well it comes under the Minister because he's the man that's going to have to speed it up. An old chap like me can't go and talk to her. All right so now we'll leave that.

Crop Insurance. We could stand up here and talk for half an hour on crop insurance. I had one of the more successful farmers in our part of the country come in the other day and I can assure you his political affiliation before last June was not with the party that I'm representing, and crop insurance, he gave me his facts and figures and I could bring them in here and talk for half an hour on it. I intend to go to the officer in charge of crop insurance, go through his particular problem. But he had invested something -- he made something like over \$200.00 on his crop insurance and he showed it to me in black and white where if he had had his crop he'd have had \$10,000. In other words, for what he invested I think he got \$200.00 back over what he put into it and he lost \$10,000. He said this isn't what we want. I said well what about ....

MR. ENNS: Well he had 60 percent.

MR. CLEMENT: Well he had the highest average he could get. The top. Well I think perhaps I'll bring my papers in to the Honourable Minister's office and we can look these things over.

Agricultural research I notice in the estimates has been reduced from \$300,000 to \$100,000. This of course will come up item by item. It makes you wonder why this should happen because agriculture research is very important.

ARDA. I notice also by the estimates in one place ARDA's down, another place it's up, and it looks to me in my figure it's some 130 some odd thousand dollars less than it was last year. I might be wrong but this is how I have it figured out.

The Livestock Industry. We could go into the livestock industry. The livestock industry is beginning to have it's problems. The feed for cattle has become very expensive and it is going to increase and become more expensive. The field lots are wandering farther and farther afield and when you start paying around \$1.70 or \$1.80 for wheat and \$1.25 - \$1.35 for barley, the price of beef either has to go up considerably or there's going to be less cattle, and actually in our particular area this is what is happening. Farmer after farmer is getting rid of his cow herds and without cows you certainly can't have finished beef.

There's one other point that comes in with regards livestock and this is very important. Somebody wrote a song one time about the old grey mare ain't what she used to be; but, Mr. Chairman, the old grey mare is coming back into her orbit, perhaps in a different way than was intended. And once again if you get out our annual report here on page 18 it says "Horses". The Ayerst-McKenna Drug Company announcement locating in Western Canada activated considerable interest among horsemen in Manitoba. The agricultural representative at Brandon -- and this is what kind of amazes me, everything is Brandon. I don't see anything in here about the Department of Agriculture. Anyway we've got it -- in Brandon. Well I'm not representing Brandon but I'm sure the honourable member won't mind if I use that word -- "working closely with the Brandon Industrial Commission, did the necessary ground work to stimulate the local interest and persuade the Ayerst Company to locate in Manitoba. Fourteen meetings with an attendance of 306 were held. In addition, 372 individual contracts were made on the operations of this enterprise. It is anticipated that this enterprise could add approximately two million dollars to the agricultural economy of Manitoba." Mr. Chairman, this is right, but it is also going to affect the cattle business because if this proves out the way it appears to be doing, more and more of the pasture that has been reserved for cattle is going to go back to horses. This is a very, very promising business. I happen to know because we're in it. Last year when this was being discussed, long before I had any inclination I was going to be back "Under the Dome", I made a special trip to eastern Canada and went up north of Toronto -- there was a terrific amount of snow -- to this farmer's home. He was living in buildings that must have been built around the turn of the century, and old stone house, an old barn, the old type that were built in Ontario in those days. You go inside and if you could see those horses in the condition that they were in -- and he told me that he paid up to 75 and 80 cents for a bale of hay. Why if under these conditions, with that kind of money in hay, I don't know too much about horses but I think it's time we started to find out, and this is what happens; and now perhaps we have one of the most modern and up-to-date barns in Manitoba with horses on production, and it is paying off, believe me. And this is something, whether the Department of Agriculture had anything to do with it or not, it is here in Manitoba and this product is being tank-carred day after day, all the way from Alberta to Manitoba, and it might as well be produced

(MR. CLEMENT, cont'd) . . . . right here in this province. So this is something that I'm sure the Minister is aware of and that he will continue to do what he can for it.

Well, I think at the present time I'll reserve any more comments I have until we get into the estimates. There are quite a few of them here that seem kind of odd to me. However, once again in concluding, I do want to wish the Honourable Minister well. I hope he is able to extend the gauntlet and don't let these lawyers and doctors and what have you in the front row sit on you. Thank you very much.

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)--passed; (b)--passed; (c)--passed; (d)--passed; (e)....

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, on No. 1 (d) Canada-Manitoba ARDA agreement, I think that this is probably the appropriate time which I should use to debate the concept of ARDA and what it means to farmers in Manitoba, and if I'm out of order on that score I wish that someone would advise me, but I believe this is the proper time to debate the question of the activities of ARDA.

The ARDA program, as I understand it, has been developed between the Federal Government and the provinces of Canada. It was designed to meet the problems in rural areas of every province, be they problems of agriculture or rural residents. The program is designed to deal with those problems, mainly in the economic sense. My reference is going to be mainly to the agricultural aspects of ARDA and the name itself is defined in this way; it means Agricultural and Rehabilitation Development Act, so we're dealing with....

MR. CHAIRMAN: .... just a moment. This item is listed under both Highways and Agriculture.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): It's listed under several departments, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I wonder if the Minister of Highways would rather consider this under Highways or under Agriculture. It's listed under both departments.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa): Well Mr. Chairman, I think it's probably applicable in either department. I think probably in Agriculture is maybe as good as any.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. USKIW: In reviewing the situation which I feel has led up to the idea of ARDA, I wish to relate to a situation in my particular area, and indeed in the area of our Honourable Minister the Minister of Education, and that is the situation of the high water levels of the lake, and I suggest in this light that this is an area where ARDA could become very useful in doing something about the high water levels in Lake Winnipeg or doing something for the people that are affected by these high water levels. In my particular area, in the St. Peter-Libau area, in 1950 they had their first flood as a result of the high waters of the Red River, and of course we all remember that year - I believe the City of Winnipeg was also affected. But since that time my particular area have suffered damages as a result of high water of the Red River in 1958, 1960, 1965, 1966, and therefore it is somewhat different from the rest of the province of Manitoba or from that of the City of Winnipeg.

We also had a back-up of Lake Winnipeg in September of 1966, which created an awful lot of problems for the people in the area - farmers, businessmen, etc. In 1960, delegates from my particular constituency appeared before the Honourable the First Minister to deal with the problems of flooding in that particular section of Manitoba, and the answer they got at that time was that the province was rather financially embarrassed and that there was nothing they could consider for them in the way of assistance at that time. Later on, they had made representation to the Minister of Agriculture of that time - I believe it was George Hutton - and he also denied any consideration -- at least there was no action. A delegation appeared before the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Highways on Monday last, dealing with the same problem. They were extended sympathy, but my understanding is that again the province has told them that the province is financially embarrassed and can't deal with the problem at this time, and that they are going to continue to consider the problem. So I say we have been considering this problem since 1950, but more so since 1958, which of course is also the year in which this government was elected, and my contention is that we have had nothing but procrastination of this problem, that we're afraid to meet head-on with the problem.

We were spending millions of dollars in the course of the last number of years in developing drainage programs, developing floodways and so forth, which incidentally aggravate this very situation. They aggravate this situation because what we are doing in terms of some of these projects is funnelling more water into Lake Winnipeg at a faster rate. In the process we are creating arable land in the southwestern parts of the province. We are helping people on one hand but we are destroying a group of people on the other hand in the process. This is something that our government has not recognized.

We are intending, or we are going to spend a total of \$5 million in the development of the Birds Hill Park. Now I don't say that we shouldn't have a park at Birds Hill. Probably we should have more than the park at Birds Hill insofar as recreational facilities are concerned to service the City of Winnipeg. But it's a question of priority, and this is something that has

(MR. USKIW cont'd)..... come from the lips of the Honourable First Minister. He's always talking about priorities. And here we are using ARDA money to build recreational facilities to facilitate the urban centres, and we are neglecting to deal with problems that have developed for a number of years around the lakes in Manitoba. So if there's a question of priorities, I say that we have misused that terminology.

They say that this is a program of rehabilitation; the ARDA program is a program of rehabilitation. I would like to know who was rehabilitated in the Birds Hill Park development, when people were expropriated in order that this development could take place. People were not willing to give up their land holdings in that particular area and they were expropriated at something like \$60.00 an acre. As a matter of fact I believe that there are a number of people entering into arbitration proceedings as a result of these expropriations. So they didn't go into an area to rehabilitate anyone. Sure I can agree; it's probably a good economic development, and it's certainly going to be a wonderful facility for the City of Winnipeg and people in the surrounding area. I don't quarrel with that point. I'm only quarrelling with the point of priorities. Which comes first - entertainment or bread and butter? This is my point. We found \$5 million for the park, but we can't find any money for the people around Lake Winnipeg. Rehabilitation of people which have been flooded by high water of the Red River and Lake Winnipeg are the most important points that I think should be included in the ARDA program, and the reason I feel that they should be included under the ARDA program is because the Federal Government assists this province 50 percent in the development of ARDA programs, and in some instances 100 percent. The definition of ARDA itself - rehabilitation - should imply that we are concerned with people that have these type of problems and that these are the areas which should get first consideration, and to date we have missed the boat in this case.

By the 1965-1970 Canada-Manitoba ARDA agreement, the Federal Government is going to put up \$9.1 million, a five-year agreement. The provincial government is committing itself to \$9.1 million. Apart from other programs that they might agree to, a total of \$18.2 million is going to be spent in the next five years to ARDA programs in Manitoba, and yet I don't know, it hasn't come to light, or at least our ministers have not said what they are intending to do with the problems of the high water levels of Lake Winnipeg and so forth.

To illustrate some of the expenditures under the ARDA program to date - and this is taken out of this report, the 1965-1966 report on the ARDA development in Manitoba: Norquay Floodway, \$730,000; Hespeler Floodway, \$950,000 and so forth down the line. We have a total of \$3,439,000 spent on drainages, floodways, etc. bringing more water at a faster rate into the rivers and into the lakes, which again, I repeat, aggravates the situation at that end of the province. The water all ends up in Lake Winnipeg, Lake Manitoba and pours out into Hudson Bay. So while we are assisting many people, and I agree we should be; I don't disagree with these programs at all; but we should be careful that we don't do harm to people in the other end of the province. They're important or equally as important as the people in the south end of the province, and I don't know why anything can't be done.

The ARDA program has gone into land acquisition, and I think it might be appropriate to quote Page 15: "Land acquisition, floodland acquisition. In some areas, farm lands are periodically flooded. If it is not economically feasible to provide drainage or flood control, the lands are acquired and converted for wildlife..." and so forth. I don't quarrel with the idea of land acquisition. We have numerous instances in this report dealing with land acquisition: The Delta Marsh area, the Birds Hill area, as I said the Parks Development area. The government has gone into a million and a half dollars in land acquisition in these areas.

I don't see why they can't go into this type of program in the lake area. This is the proposition before them. The farmers in the area want to be bought out and they say, "We don't care what happens but we want to get out of there." But we can't seem to find the dollars to do anything for them. I suggest to the Minister that he should use his good office to impress upon his colleagues the need for swift action, because action has not been forthcoming in this area for a good number of years; and I might add, Mr. Chairman, that I am very much acquainted with these problems, I have become acquainted over the years in that the problem area begins only three miles from where I live. I have lived with it with these people for a long time. I have assisted these people in sandbagging their homes and what not, but this isn't the answer. We've spent thousands of dollars repairing their buildings every time they get flooded, and we keep repeating this program year after year without coming up with a permanent solution to the problem. We're wasting people's money and we're not arriving at a solution.

(MR. USKIW cont. d.) . . . .

The ARDA program has spent somewhere near a million dollars just in research in the year 1965-1966 fiscal. A million dollars in research. I've taken the trouble to add the figures. I don't think it's too much to ask. We spent a few million dollars in dealing with the problem of the water levels of Lake Winnipeg for the rehabilitation of the people in the area. Forty-four thousand dollars was mentioned the other day by my honourable friend from Gladstone for blueberry research. Well I don't quarrel with it; maybe this is good. But priorities is what I'm talking about. Blueberries may come 10 years from now but we had this problem 10 years ago, and this is what we must deal with today. When are we going to get down to earth and deal with serious problems such as the water levels of Lake Winnipeg and so forth, the people affected by it?

Last fall we had -- and I headed a delegation, people in the area, in approaching the Minister for his consideration of payment or assistance for crop losses as a result of the Labour Day flood situation, the back-up of Lake Winnipeg which had destroyed many crops in the area which caused tremendous hardship to farmers in the area; and the government of that day, or the Minister at that time, told us that they were going to take this under advisement and that "within a matter of weeks," they said, "we should have a statement of policy." I haven't heard a statement of policy. There hasn't been an answer to these people. They want to know where they stand. They've lost a number of crops; they haven't paid their bank; they haven't paid their implement company; they seeded their crops last year but they didn't harvest them; they can't seed this year because the land is simply not worth seeding on, there's so much debris and water and ice, even at this present time, that has been trapped. They don't hope to put in a crop this year and I don't think they can hope to put in a crop next year or the year after. This is the situation. And my friends keep telling us that "we're going to keep this under consideration."

I don't know what they're waiting for. Maybe we'll have some action some time around 1970 at election time, I don't know; and the reason I say this is because during the last provincial election we had a meeting in Libau and we had a number of governmental officials at this meeting - in fact we had the full slate: the engineering department, water control and so forth - telling the people how they realized that the problem was serious and that action was just around the corner. But the election came and went, and a year has almost gone by and the problem is still under consideration. In my opinion this is terrible. This is mismanagement of ARDA's money, in my opinion, because ARDA money should be used in areas where it's needed first.

We can have our parks but let's have our bread and butter for people who are affected by natural disasters. In 1959 we had a natural disaster in the three prairie provinces, the early winter, the snowfall in September where the three prairie provinces lost the bulk of their crop. The province in 1959, when it was more imaginative - of course it was a young government at that time, a year old - decided that something had to be done and they provided financial assistance for all those people who suffered crop loss in the Province of Manitoba, and I was one of those recipients myself in the loss of 27 acres of potatoes. I would say that the government acted promptly that time, and rightly so; they realized how critical the situation was. But because we have a small area with not too many people in the same type of strait jacket, they don't want to deal with it because it's not a general situation. And I say this is irresponsible. A few people are as worthy of as much consideration as the whole province in my opinion. We shouldn't have to start counting heads, how many people does it involve, before we decide to do something.

So I say to the government that these people are waiting for a statement of policy. They want to know should they plan on farming these areas in the future or should they make up their mind to pack up their bags and let the financial institutions chase them for the debts which they owe. It's that serious. You can't lose crops year after year and stay on top financially, and they're to the point now where the banks won't loan them any money because they say the government has built a dike in there - and it has, the 25 mile-dike; but the people that are affected are on the inside of the dike which is on the water side of the dike, and certainly that dike isn't going to help these people unless the government decides to do something with them. So if the government decides that they're not going to do anything for these people, then they are only aggravating the situation by building a dike in the first place. While it protects the areas further back it aggravates the situation for people inside the dike. So having taken recognition of the problem, and having expended some I don't know how many thousands of dollars in the

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . building of a dike, surely the government can go one step further and make a statement of policy to the people that are on the inside of this dike as to what their position is. They have a right to know whether they're going to be in business next year or the year after or whether they're not. The decency that is required is to know what is your policy. You can be decent enough to let them know just where you stand. If you're anticipating action tell them so, but if you don't anticipate any action at least be kind enough to let them know.

So I say to the government, let's take a look at these priorities that we're talking about. Parks can come any time but bread and butter has to come now. I think that we're misusing ARDA money if we're not going to deal with the most critical problem of the day in Manitoba. Thank you.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on this matter of the flooding on Lake Winnipeg, I would appreciate a statement from the Minister because I was unable to be at his meeting in Petersfield when he spoke there, but I gathered from that meeting that he did intend to buy the lands that were between the lake and the dike. I think that this is really the request that these people have been making, that if in fact, as he has been doing, proceeding with the dike -- I met with a group the other day from the Libau area in particular and they outlined for me on the map the location of the dike which is some four or five miles from the lake at points, and these people who are between that dike and the lake are obviously going to be in the future in a very vulnerable position, and there's no doubt about it that we are constantly draining more land. Then there is the added problem of the proposed control structure at the north end of the lake for the Nelson River project. Now because of the wind effect on Lake Winnipeg similar to that on Lake Manitoba, the leveling of the lake at any particular point by government action obviously can have a detrimental effect on these people.

Now if the Minister could outline what the policy is for those of use who weren't at his Petersfield meeting, if he could tell us if the government does in fact intend to purchase this land between the dike and the lake, I think it would solve the majority of the problems for these people.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, very briefly I should point out to the member from Brokenhead that with respect to the general remarks that he makes with the expenditure and the manner and the way in which this province has spent ARDA funds, I would have to say very clearly that -- I think most members are aware of the fact -- that these funds are available to us under certain prescribed conditions, some of the conditions being that for instance a certain set amount, 10 percent of the funds, be spent on research; another pre-condition being that not more than 50 percent of the funds available be spent on water control or water projects; other specific areas are singled out for expenditures of these funds with respect to rural development programs and so forth, which I feel the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is aware of. Certainly the problem that we have in the Libau area around Lake Winnipeg is a serious one, and with particular reference to my meeting not only at the meeting at Petersfield but on other occasions, as the Member for Brokenhead has outlined, in my office and indeed in the office of the Minister of Highways, first of all to say that we don't recognize the situation is wrong. We certainly recognize the situation. We have also expressed our sympathy and we've been very quick to answer that we know that they can't eat sympathy, but to anticipate expenditures of moneys that are not ours yet -- the situation being that a negotiation is presently under way, and Mr. Chairman, that is the next item on the estimates, the enabling fund that we hope will spring loose funds which we will draw out of this 9.1 million total ARDA fund that is in this agreement, under which perhaps we can, in our order of priorities, find relief for this particular situation. We might well be able to do so but it's very difficult, and for that reason impossible for the government at this time to anticipate a firm approach to this problem. We, first of all, don't know how successful our negotiations will be that are presently under way, and then secondly, as I pointed out and I'm sure that all the members that were present at that particular meeting that the Leader of the Opposition refers to -- I perhaps made an excusable error, or unexcusable error, whatever way you want to look at it, the newness of the office being such that I in expressing sympathy and indeed in expressing an intent on my part to press with my colleagues for solutions of some of their problems, but that being distinctly different from expressing government policy.

But the area I want to return to just for a moment is that while the Member for Brokenhead is quite right that we should not be counting heads when concerning ourselves with the problems in the area, that the rights of a small group by and large have the same as the rights of a large, I would have to point out that since that meeting at Petersfield this little Minister

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . . has been getting letters from every corner of this province from every farmer that ever had 80 acres flooded out in his lifetime, asking for the government to buy it, and that may be treating the matter facetiously but I know that the Member for Emerson can point out probably farmers in his area who haven't had crops in five, six years in succession; who are having troubles with the banks. Now I may be exposing part of the problems that we face in this province. I don't think so. I don't think the Minister of Highways or Water Control thinks that he has all the water under control in this province or else he wouldn't be proposing new estimates to you. We have our problems. I'm just pointing out that the scope of the program that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead is asking us to enter into is large. It involves an immediate area there but a policy set there carried through would have to carry through throughout the province. My colleague here at Gimli has similar situations up there. It's not restricted to that small little area that we're talking about, and within this scope of things I think it's not a mark of lack of responsibility or dereliction of responsibility on the part of the government. Indeed it involves large expenditures of public money and we would be foolhardy if we went into this without taking into consideration reports that are presently underway by experts in the water control department telling us just what amount of land is involved, setting a framework for which the province could entertain such ideas, and having to take, in other words, a real hard look at it.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Hasn't the government a moral responsibility towards these people in the Libau area in view of the fact that, as I understand it, they are building a dike leaving these people between the dike and the water and actually making the condition worse than it would be without the dike? Surely if the government is building a dike and leaving these people in the Libau area behind it, they're worsening the situation and they have a moral responsibility towards these people.

MR. ENNS: I suppose we have a moral obligation in many instances. There are instances of dikes being built in the Winnipeg or the Metropolitan area where houses have been left on the leese of the dikes. I do agree with the Member for Ste. Rose - or St. George rather - that in this area where the land that we are talking about is, by virtue of the dike that he referred to, clearly defined, and we can in this instance place particular study in this confined area. In other words we feel that we can look at this particular area perhaps separated from the rest. We would like to; we're entertaining these kind of . . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might get an answer, probably not from our Minister, but from the government, whether or not negotiations with Ottawa - in the ARDA negotiations that is - have ever been approached with respect to this particular problem in that the ARDA program begins in 1962. This is 1967 and the problem was with us before 1962 and the delegations were here before then. So therefore my point is that the action should have been, not that it should be now, right now. I'm not saying you have to dig up \$10 million. Where were you up till now? This is my point.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question, if I may. We have heard that with the development of a control dam at Warren's Landing at the northern end of the lake, when the Kettle Rapids development is either completed or well under way that it is proposed to keep the lake level; the lake is to be a storage place and the lake level is to be kept at 712 to 715 feet above sea level. These figures have been quoted a number of times. Now there's a great volume of water in the northern end of the lake. If the control dam keeps it at a level of 715 feet, say, in a storm such as we had last Labour Day week-end the water level rises 6 feet. That brings it up to 721 feet and it floods out a great number of farms, summer homes and buildings. Is it being proposed, can the Minister tell me, to keep the level at 712 to 715 feet? How would they control it if a similar storm blows up again and flood conditions develop as a result?

MR. ENNS: The answer to that is that this House has just very recently been asked to establish a commission by my colleague the Honourable Minister of Highways, to establish a Water Commission whose -- one of the first functions will be to deal with this particular problem. No level has been established on the lake. This will be one of the prime functions of this commission's job to take in all the interests, the cottage owners' interest, the farm interest and indeed Hydro's interest, and then come up with an acceptable level to all. While I agree with the Member for Wellington that figures have been talked about - 712, 715 - but to the best of my knowledge - and I stand corrected by my Minister of Highways - that no level has been put or licenced. This is one of the precise functions of the proposed Water Commission.

MR. PETURSSON: . . . . supplementary to the one I was asking. The dikes are being built or have been built now which leave a number of farmers between the dike and the lake, but it's for the protection of those who are on the land side of the dike. Is there anything being done there to prevent run-off in the spring during the melting of the snows or heavy rains from building up to flood the farms that are on the outside of the dike?

MR. ENNS: It is my understanding that these dikes are all being built with the type of engineering devices in them that will allow for the suitable run-off of these land-locked waters you would call . . . .

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, lest I be accused of not looking after the interest of my own constituents because there's a large portion of my constituency affected by high waters in Lake Winnipeg, the reason why I have not taken part in this discussion and debate is because I am an owner of land in that area and I consider that it would be highly improper for me to urge anything on behalf of the government which in effect would be asking the government to do something for myself. So for that reason, my honourable leader, and the Member for St. George have spoken on my behalf.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was not at the Petersfield meeting. Now could the Minister inform us as to what promise he did make to the people in that area at that meeting? Is it an item of government policy that they will definitely be compensated and that the land inside the dike, that is the land that is between the dike and the lake, will this land be purchased by the government?

MR. ENNS: I think the meeting was impressed upon me, as being one of my first public meetings, and I think I can recall verbatim what I said. I said that certainly I would like to see and will press for the government as a means of finding a suitable eventual, a long-term solution to this problem - and I'm referring specifically to the land on the water side of the dike - that this land should be acquired by the Crown so that we don't face this problem repeatedly. But in my very humble estimation this wasn't announcing government policy.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm not trying to pursue the Minister personally on this, Mr. Chairman. I realize his circumstances. He is new as a Minister and this isn't by any means an attempt to get him cornered. But has the government made any decision as to the policy in this regard? Because there is an obvious problem; the Minister himself admits the problem; but obviously the people in the area who are directly affected are the ones who feel this problem all the more, and I'm told that there are a goodly number of them who not only haven't had any crop at all but can't even foresee getting any crop next year either, because the level of the lake was such at the fall that they will not be able to get on their land in the spring. They were unable to do any work on the land last year and they're simply in a position of at least two years without income. Now we don't know at this stage what the long-range plans of the government are with regard to the lake level. I have some questions on the Order Paper to the government regarding the proposed Nelson River Dam, and if we could have that information fairly soon then we would know. So I think the question here is: when can the government announce policies so these people will at least be able to make their own plans? The way they sit now they're completely in an impossible position. They don't know whether they should move or not move or what they can do with their land.

MR. ENNS: For reasons that I have already mentioned earlier in this debate, the government has not announced any policy with this respect. It is not in a position to do so. I suppose the first occasion for us to do so would be the successful signing of the FRED agreement at Ottawa which would enable us to reconsider in the light of the funds then available to us. But at the moment we have none. Now I would go one step further and say that certainly as a farmer in the interlake myself I most certainly want to identify myself with the problems that the farmers face in that area and will do my very best within my own colleagues here to see that we get to a satisfactory conclusion.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned my constituency and I agree with the Minister that I have quite a few people, quite a few farmers who would be quite willing to sell their properties to get out of the drowned-out area, and the problem is very serious. Now the Minister tells us that he is awaiting successful negotiations with the federal people. It is necessary to await them but I am sure that the provincial government, Manitoba Provincial Government, is lagging in this respect because, as we know, other provinces have taken advantage of this and they have successfully negotiated already, and they are in the process of buying. You would like one mentioned? I have a clipping here. It's a



(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).... Canadian Press release and it says, "Governments to buy uneconomic Ontario farms." The Province of Ontario is doing it. I'll read just one paragraph: "The Federal and Ontario governments have already signed an agreement, agreed on a program to buy up uneconomic farms in the province and turning them over to other farmers to produce economic units. The far-reaching program under the Agricultural Rehabilitation Development Act was announced by Forestry Minister Favri and federal and Ontario officials today."

That happened in Ontario. They took action, took advantage of this generous ARDA grant and they went ahead with it. And that's not all. Here is another one. It says - it's also Canadian Press: "Alberta will also buy farms. The Alberta Government is ready to begin a program of buying uneconomic farms and making them into economic units, Agricultural Minister Harry Strome said today." So if other provinces were able to negotiate a deal with Ottawa I cannot see why the Province of Manitoba was so slow in taking advantage of this, and last year -- the present Minister will not remember, but the former Minister does remember that I made a similar complaint, the complaint expressed today by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that some of this money, ARDA money, was misused in that respect - Birds Hill and so on. Maybe it wasn't misused. I shouldn't say that exactly, but still it's a matter of priorities and I would say that the government has had plenty of time to come up with a policy and try to save these people.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, when we met with the group of farmers from Libau the other day, one of the farmers made a comment that seemed to me difficult to understand and comprehend. I said, "Well are you not covered?" because he was speaking of the fact that in the area concerned between the lake and the dikes they had not harvested a crop for two or three years nor did they expect they might harvest one in the next two or three years. I said, "Are you not covered under the Manitoba Crop Insurance Program?" And they said, "We signed up for it but by virtue of the fact that you didn't put a crop in you naturally couldn't expect to harvest a crop; therefore you could not expect to receive any benefits from the program." And that sounds reasonable because you must have something to have a loss on otherwise you're not covered. However, the alarming thing was that they said because of the fact that they had signed up for the Manitoba Crop Insurance Program they were completely ruled out of any benefits under PFAA. Now is this a fact or isn't it a fact? Because if that is a fact then it certainly is working a hardship against farmers of this kind. Can I get an answer to that? Is it a fact or not? If you sign up under the Manitoba Crop Insurance Plan then you're completely ruled out of any benefits under PFAA. And if that is so, then these farmers should be an exception.

MR. ENNS: I think the Member for Gladstone is aware of the fact, probably more so than I am, the workings of the PFAA Program in that certain block - it works on a block plan - and that the percentage of loss has to be such that it applies in that area. I am not conversant - and maybe the Member for Brokenhead can help me on this - conversant whether or not this is applicable in their area or whether it is not. I am told that in the crop insurance, the people that are in crop insurance do not affect the consideration for PFAA. Now I stand to be corrected on that.

MR. SHOEMAKER: You've missed the question completely, I believe. The question I put is this: if you enroll and sign up for Manitoba Crop Insurance, this automatically rules you out from benefits under PFAA, and if it does then it's working a hardship against these farmers. I thoroughly understand how the benefits work under PFAA and I suggest that likely there was plenty of acres in that area to qualify, but they couldn't obtain any benefits under the Manitoba Crop Insurance Plan because they didn't seed anything. They signed up for the Manitoba Crop Insurance Plan. They could not collect by virtue of the fact that they didn't put a crop in. Because of the fact that they had signed up for crop insurance it eliminated them from collecting any benefits under PFAA. That's the question.

MR. ENNS: I'll take that question under advisement. Certainly it would appear that the mere signing and not successfully entering into an actual contract with the crop insurance should in my humble opinion not preclude from the PFAA rights, but it's a question that I'm not aware of. I'll take that question as notice and be happy to make some inquiries with the Manitoba Crop Insurance people about this.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could help out on that one particular point. I think the statement made by the Honourable Member from Gladstone is correct, because when an individual farmer signs up for crop insurance he has a choice between his premium and crop

(MR. WEIR cont'd). . . . insurance and paying a percentage of his deliveries as PFAA payments. He is relieved from the payment of any grains that he delivers towards PFAA and therefore I would believe would be excluded from any PFAA benefits.

As far as the over-all situation is concerned, I think it can best be summed up by saying it's a matter that is under active consideration at the present time and a statement will be made as soon as it's possible.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering whether or not it's possible that this government will give us a statement before the farmers have to consider whether or not they should invest any further money into this coming year's operation, if at all they are able to get on the field. I think this is a very important point. They have to start planning very soon, they can't wait till next July to find out whether the government is going to make up their mind. I would hope that the government will commit themselves even today and say that we will have a statement early enough for them to know their position before they must make up their minds as to whether or not they're going to invest any further sums of money in their farming operations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)--passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I had a few remarks that I wanted to make on the general question of ARDA, but I prefer to wait until the discussion is finished with in regard to the Libau area because they do not deal with that. If that has finished, and when it's finished, I would like to say something on the general question of ARDA.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, one of the questions I'd like to ask the Minister is with respect to the money. Last year there was \$297,000 spent on this item, and this year it's only \$36,000. Why the difference?

MR. ENNS: The difference comes into the fact that the item right below, the Manitoba FRED Agreement, for some \$194,000 last year is taken out of that estimate figure.

MR. GUTTORMSON: It's still a substantial decrease.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, was it not possible to initiate the program at Birds Hill under the FRED agreement as against the ARDA agreement? I'm wondering why we didn't use the FRED instead of ARDA.

MR ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we have no FRED agreement.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister attributes my first question to the fact that the FRED agreement was \$194,000, but even with the two figures it's only \$230,000 and the last year's sum was \$297,000. Now there must be some reason for this nearly \$70,000 drop.

MR. ENNS: I'll take that question as notice and be very happy to supply the answer. To the best of my knowledge this is a matter of it being in the estimates somewhere and not being able to put my finger on it at this time.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the new agreement is to be signed either in March or April of this year, the new ARDA agreement, and the Honourable Member for Emerson has suggested that in Alberta apparently they have already developed a program of trying to improve the uneconomic farms there by buying up some of the land and developing a program that would rehabilitate the owners, the previous owners of this land, and thereabout improve "Canada's invisible poor," I think is the term that ARDA uses in respect to poverty in Canada, and the study in depth that they made of this whole problem of poverty in Canada last year. Now I wonder if my honourable friend the Minister is familiar with the booklet that was put out by the Manitoba Pool Elevators last year entitled "Poverty in Canada; its nature, significance and implications for public policies," published by M.W. Menzies, Hedlin, Menzies and Associates Limited, because they have a very comprehensive and debatable program for dealing with this whole subject matter of the poor on the farms, and this was one of the reasons that gave rise to me asking the former Minister last year if his philosophy was the same as Menzies' and Hedlin's in this regard, because, let's face it, if it is then we should be developing a program, an ARDA program, similar in nature to that that apparently Alberta is doing at the same time.

I'm not saying that I think that it is the cure to end all of Canada's invisible poor, but if the new agreement is going to be signed in March or April as is suggested in an article that I have before me, surely the Minister has made recommendations to the federal government as to what he thinks should be done in regard to eliminating -- well, Menzies says about 44 percent of the farmers in Manitoba; he says about 44.2 percent are uneconomic. Now, I don't think they're that bad, but in the budget speech that we heard on Monday night, the Provincial Treasurer said that, what"? 6,000 out of 40,000 earned over \$4,000 and the remainder or

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).... about 85 percent earned less than that, and that's a pretty sizeable figure. When you consider that 85 percent of the farmers are earning less than \$4,000, it more or less supports a lot of the statements that Menzies made in this book. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, we could talk about this subject matter till the cows come home, to use a farmer's term, but what is my honourable friend's philosophy in respect, and does he endorse the suggestions that are made by Menzies in respect to this whole problem of poverty on the farms?

MR. MOLGAT: I was hoping that the Minister would answer my colleague, the member from Gladstone, Mr. Chairman, because I think this is important. The member from Emerson pointed out to the Minister because the Minister finally came out and said that what was holding up the buying of the land along Lake Winnipeg presumably was because they hadn't claims and agreements with Ottawa. The question is, why? Why hasn't the government signed an agreement with Ottawa? If Ontario, as announced in June of last year - over six months ago - had signed an agreement whereby they could proceed to buy up uneconomic farms, the same thing applies to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, where they could proceed under an ARDA program to buy uneconomic farms, if Alberta, which isn't considered to be a "have not" province in Canada, was able to announce on the 4th of June of 1966 that they could proceed and buy uneconomic farms, why is it this province of Manitoba has been unable to arrive at an agreement? I can't understand the statement that Ottawa is at fault if in other areas Ottawa has appeared to be prepared to go along with the provinces. And so my question is the same as the member for Emerson; why hasn't Manitoba been able to proceed?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose, although I would rather not take up any unnecessary time, but in view of the number of new members in the House and others it's perhaps wise to try very sketchily to relate our over-all situation with respect to ARDA, and if it kind of flows over into the next item, the Manitoba FRED Agreement, the two are inter-related as you will see. The question of who's to blame, there's no question of blame being attached here to Ottawa or to anybody else. We are in the process of negotiations and they take their time. Certainly it wasn't my implication to attach any inference as to blame; I just was merely stating where the situation now stood. There is, however, a difference between our province's particular ARDA or FRED arrangement that we are now hopefully entering into, a difference between that of Ontario's or Alberta's or some of the areas that were mentioned. We are following hard and fast on the heels of New Brunswick with the first total comprehensive program for a designated area, and it is for this reason, because it's a very comprehensive program that we hopefully will be getting into; it's a program that was announced or initiated, as you members know, three years ago. It was a program that calls for the development of the broad outline of something that we would like to begin to call a total approach program. This booklet here, that I'm sure you members are familiar with, was developed; it was taken through the Interlake; meetings were held. Last May the Minister of Forestry or the Rural Development, the Honourable Minister Sauv e, was down at a meeting at Teulon at which different members from this government were present. The plan was laid out to the people at that time; a negotiating team from Manitoba consisting of Messrs. Bateman, Newall and Mr. Ted Poyser along with Ottawa ARDA officials was appointed. This committee began to work, then actual discussions began to take place.

Now since that time there have been a whole series of meetings scheduled starting from December 12th. Meetings are being held every two weeks, and at the present time the actual program is in front of a committee of deputy ministers in Ottawa. Now, to say that we have gone cautiously on this, yes, we have, because as the member from Gladstone revealed in his remarks, this means or could mean the moving or the adjustment of people, of human people, stock farms, maybe off from their fishing habitats or what have you, and we have to go slow and we have to go careful in this, and I for one would urge extreme caution in this area. I point this out only because this is a slight difference. We are trying to negotiate a total program involving a designated area and in this sense we differentiate between Alberta or the programs that are being carried out in Saskatchewan or in Ontario. It's just recently that the first program of this nature was successfully concluded in Ottawa, that of the New Brunswick agreement, and we are hard on their heels with our program at the federal level.

Now, the member from Gladstone is waiting for a reply with respect to my position or the department's position vis-a-vis the displacement of people from rural areas, it's a very difficult question to come very flat out and make any kind of a statement. My interest, the interest of my department is to develop that Interlake region. I feel we have, I know we have a half a million acres that can come into production; another half a million acres that can come

(MR. ENNS cont'd).... into forest production or improved wild pasture production. It is the area where we're going to have our cattle expansion, and certainly from a very personal point of view our primary interest, or my primary interest is to develop all the lake potentialities of the farmers in that area, and I speak rather personally there because I know that in many instances the case of a couple of hundred acres under cultivation can mean all the difference to bring a now marginal farmer into a much different and better position.

Now along with this, my honourable colleagues the Minister of Education and the Minister of Highways will require that roads, schools, vocational facilities be built to handle - if you want to use the phrase, and I don't like to use it - the redundant portions of the population that find themselves displaced in this program. I question the actual figures of any booklet that comes out, and I won't try to defend any particular point in any kind of program. These are hoped for programs. We have no idea of the participation level. We're not a proletarian state. We're not going to force people off the farms. We are hopefully going to present before them programs that are attractive enough to have them participate in these programs. We hope to bring forward to them educational possibilities that will make it available on their own to seek out different avenues of employment. This takes time and we can't with any accuracy predict the level of participation, and indeed for that matter predict the actual amount of money to be spent. We have a very broad program here. It's been well advertised throughout the Interlake at different meetings, different area development boards. The main priority coming out of these meetings was education, and my colleague the Minister of Education has outlined that in his Education estimates.

If you ask me what my personal position is with respect to any reports from the honourable gentlemen mentioned, my primary objective would be to have that region support the number of successful commercial farmers that I know it can support, and I have the feeling, although not substantiated by fact, that that in itself will solve many of the economic and social problems that we are faced with in that region. Not all of them, and for the residue, for the problems that can't be solved in that manner, if you want to speak specifically about the extra number of fishermen that are on the lake, other programs have to be devised for them and those we hopefully will do so.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I wonder if my honourable friend would advise the House whether or not the booklet, the green booklet that he was waving around, has it been distributed to members in the House? Is it a new one this year?

MR. ENNS: Last year.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I don't recall seeing it in my filing system. What one is it? What's the name....

MR. ENNS: I would have no objection to making that available to any members of the House. It's called "The Guidelines for Development of the Interlake Region of Manitoba."

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thank you. I would appreciate it if you would supply me with one.

Now Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friend, what he has said is that, and being an astute politician like myself, he says he has friends that are for this program and he has friends that are against it and he's for his friends. But, it would seem to me that inasmuch as there are a number of farmers in a number of areas in the province that are pleading with the government to "please come and buy our land," that we should take a look at these areas, because here's an area that you can't go wrong politically or any other way by saying to these areas, "We have developed a program and we believe you're right, and we believe that we should start here and do something about it." Now you can't go wrong, you just can't go wrong on a program of that kind because you've got all of the farmers right solidly behind you and you're doing the kind of a program that ARDA is recommending, so you've got everybody on your side and nobody "agin" you, when you develop a program of that kind.

MR. ENNS: .... in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Gladstone, is that if it was a simple matter of buying land, fine, a more rapid approach may be taken. But it isn't always that simple. We're talking about people. We're talking about people who have made their livelihood on that little plot of land up to now, and unless we have suitable alternatives available for them, and it's becoming very difficult to make these available to them at a rapid enough rate, then we're in trouble and I just suggest to him it isn't just a case of going out buying land.

MR. MOLGAT: Well Mr. Chairman, in the case of the flooded lands or the lands within the dike system around Lake Winnipeg, surely there there's no argument. These people want to sell - at least the ones who've spoken to me. There's no question about relocation;

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... they're not asking for relocation in the province; they're not asking for other jobs; they're simply unable to continue where they are. And this, I think, is the urgent area insofar as this particular group of people because the next season is coming along and they can't proceed. Now this is where I think the Minister agrees in principle. Now it's a question of convincing his Treasury colleagues. I presume from what he said this action must be taken.

MR. ROBLIN: ..... we'll have the money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition appreciates that we have perhaps exhausted this subject for the afternoon.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, just to emphasize or to recap a bit. My honourable friend the Minister tells us we have developed some approach to economic development in a designated area, and of course he's referring to the Interlake area, and of course I have one of these pamphlets. "The Guidelines for Development of the Interlake Region in Manitoba" and the reason I think it's appropriate that we had discussed the problems of the lake is because the lake area, the problems of lake flooding, are within the boundaries of the designated area, and these problems have been in this designated area for a good number of years. The reason the area is designated is because it is economically depressed, and then of course it follows that if people get continually flooded out it creates economic depression. So I wonder why, in the programs that we had outlined to us so far in the ARDA arrangements between Manitoba and Ottawa, that they have not recognized the serious problem of the water levels of Lake Winnipeg, and have not included specific answers or recommendations in this particular pamphlet.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would appreciate getting one of those books that have been waved around here, The Guidelines on ARDA or whatever is its name because I never got one last year and I thought only certain members of the House were getting one. Certainly I would appreciate getting one so that I could discuss this matter intelligently.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside. Did you want to speak now?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to improve my performance in recent years but I still don't consider that I have arrived at the position where I can deliver a major speech in three minutes. It would give me time to comment on the fact, though, that I think that the amount of the questioning that the Minister of Agriculture has been subjected to, that some of his colleagues on the front bench should have risen to his defence, because they are the people who have been dealing with the ARDA program, not him, and they're the ones who should have .....

MR. ROBLIN: He's doing fine; he's got the answers.

MR. CAMPBELL: If my honourable friend the First Minister wants to take this three minutes instead of me he can have it, but if he isn't going to....

MR. ROBLIN: I'd be glad to. I'd like to take my opportunity in this debate to say that I'm rather pleased with the job that our freshman Minister of Agriculture is doing. It's true that I haven't listened to everything that he's said. If I felt that there was a need to listen to everything he said I'd be here to listen, but I've watched his performance outside the House. I've watched his performance at public gatherings. I've heard him even tell us in the Cabinet what he thinks we should be doing; and I must say that I am pleased with his performance and I wouldn't be surprised when the estimates are passed that the House isn't pleased with him too. But I say to all the gentlemen opposite, particularly the Leader of the Opposition and those other folk who are urging us to spend money, that I hope they give us the same kind of support when it comes to raise the taxes to pay for the things that are being done than they do when they urge us to spend money as they have been doing in these last few minutes. So I just urge members, between now and the time we resume the budget debate, to reconcile in their own minds the position that they are in when they are asking for so many new services which may in themselves be well worth considering with the fiscal and tax situation in which we find ourselves.

So, having had this opportunity to say to the House that I'm pleased with my colleague's performance, I resume my seat unless somebody else takes the next 60 seconds to put me right.

MR. CAMPBELL: The honourable gentleman has just left me time enough to say that any time that he presumes to give his opinion on what has been happening, he should be in the House listening to it. He wasn't even here. My honourable friend, the Attorney-General, who has victimized the Federal Government a couple of times in connection with some of his land deals, he didn't arise to defend us at all. The Honourable Minister of Highways, who will be in charge of water programs I gather, for the next while, did make one contribution. But not

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)..... my honourable friend the Minister of Education who's been going to do great things up in the Interlake, to cure anything through education. --(Interjection)-- Yes but why didn't my honourable friend get in this afternoon? Where was my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer who has been -- even the Honourable Minister of Health was Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when they were going to do great things up in the Interlake. --(Interjections)-- But my honourable friends have been here for eight years now and they've been saying for the whole eight years what they're going to do up there, and what we'd like them to do is point out a few of the things that are done. Not the studies that have been made; not the programs that are going to be initiated; but a few things that are done, and this is the trouble with the ARDA program up to date. And my honourable friends can't continue for much longer to push it off, blaming the people that were here before they were here. They've been now in office for eight years. Isn't it time they were showing some performance instead of just talk?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I know what I'm going to do. I'm going to move the committee rise.

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

#### IN SESSION

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.