

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 13, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Guy Simonis and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Manitoba Sports Federation.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions. Presenting reports by Standing and Special Committees.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the Gallery where we have with us 100 students of Grade XI standing of Kelvin High School. These students are under the direction of Messrs. Alward and Dickens. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. On behalf of all members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here this afternoon.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (LaVerendrye): Mr. Speaker, I will try to be brief, but I could not resist saying a few words concerning our Committee on Economic Development.

I think to some extent there has to be some reprimanding done at this time because we all realize that the Department of Industry and Commerce should be and is playing a very important role today, especially with so many of our problems being zoomed in on the Agriculture field. I think this department is perhaps something that we just certainly cannot take this attitude that, for example, I believe this committee should have spent much more time, should have not only thought that well we are perhaps not ready to solve certain questions or to look at certain problems. I think it is hardly forgivable that this committee did not do a better job than it looks like, when you take into consideration the short time that they took to take up the problems of industry and commerce and I believe it was their responsibility that they should have come up with some solutions, and if not solutions, at least with some suggestions. I think at a time like this, when you hear that a committee has spent less than perhaps, I don't know just how many hours, but I think some report was that they spent less than two hours on our deliberations and this I believe is just not good enough. I wonder if the committee at least had taken enough time to realize some of the problems involved and some of the things that are going on in the minds of people that try to help their own communities, that are trying to solve some of their local problems; I think if they had at least taken that much time I think they would have come up with something different than they did at this time.

I don't want to go into a long spiel on what some of the problems are; I think most of the members in this chamber are aware of the many problems that face especially our rural-urban communities, people that are vying for positions as far as industry is concerned, that are looking for guidance and help from a committee such as this. I think I must strongly reprimand these people, and I am not trying to get personal, it's a matter of where committees should have acted; I don't think they did their duty at all. The conditions today - we have in quite a few areas, we have our areas organized whether it be Eastman, Westman - I think there are three or four other organizations, they are helping to a great extent, but with their wisdom and with their knowledge, if they could have got together with a committee like this, I think some of the problems could have been solved or should have been looked at. I know that it's costing some of the municipalities, it's costing the government money to set up these organizations, but somehow we don't seem to utilize or take the help from these people or give them a chance to act in the direction that they would wish to go. I believe a committee like this, much has been said as far as Churchill Forest Industry is concerned or other elements, I do not wish to go into that at this time, but I think it was not fair when a committee was asked to sit and to do something about a matter that still has a little bit of elbow room -- in the field of agriculture it seems that we have come to a spot where it isn't so easy to find solutions -- but I believe in this field and in the field of industry I think we all agree that this is the one place where there still is some elbow room and I think we know that the success of any industrial development, or

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) . . . . an industrial development I should say, is the lifeblood of most of our areas and most of all communities in Manitoba.

I think the present government held this idea, or I believe believes in the fact that this is one of the areas where they can go forward and I think this is one area where people have shown fear that this government is not perhaps acting the way they hoped, or the fears are there, and I think this is one avenue where certainly this committee could have taken a stand. I not only blame this committee, I blame the people in charge, this government; that they should have encouraged this committee to take a different attitude or at least more action than they have. I thought at least, Mr. Speaker, that here was a golden opportunity for all concerned to get together, and I'm speaking of the communities, municipalities and certainly this government; if such fears exist, this is one way that some of these fears perhaps could have been subsided or taken care of and they did not. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to carry on much longer, but with the competition that we have in the world today, and this is across North America or across Canada for that matter, perhaps some of the worse competition is right amongst our own community and these communities are looking forward to some help and some guidance. I believe this committee is one that could have alleviated some of the problems that arise out of competition in so many areas today.

Mr. Speaker, I think much has been said, I wish the committee would have at least spent as much time on their duties as we have in this Chamber. Perhaps too much in this Chamber by now, I don't know, but I think the committee certainly should have taken a different attitude than they did. I am also thinking of the many, I like to call them local rural or perhaps you could call them rural-urban areas that I am specifically concerned about, I think these people as I mentioned awhile ago, they must have more guidance, more information.

I was just thinking of our own little venture at Steinbach a couple of weeks ago. A company called In Graphics Limited decided they were interested to come to Steinbach if conditions were favourable, and as we all know you are confronted with a lot of problems the minute you start planning any project, as was the case here. These people had been around and of course there are many favourable spots in Manitoba and in our case it happened to be a matter of having to act very quickly, having to make up our minds if we could raise \$100,000 in about three hours and having to act perhaps with a lack of certain information that I think certain committees could again, I repeat this but I am very sincere about it, they could give guidance, they could set down perhaps certain rules. I know this can't be a hard and fast rule but I think the guidance that people like this could give would make a lot of difference when you are confronted with an industry wanting to move into an area and some of the problems are just not familiar, or people vary so much or industries vary so much and in this case, it was a matter of, I don't know what credit the present government can receive for this project, I doubt very much, but I wish to think that the Department of Industry and Commerce whatever information we could get through them, shall have the credit due.

We were thankful for our own organized Eastman Corporation and the fact that the Federal Government threw in nearly, or pumped in you might say, nearly \$200,000, a project of approximately half a million dollars, these were all good contributing factors. But the fact I'm trying to stress is this - so many people, especially in smaller communities are confused when confronted with certain issues and I think this is one avenue that this committee could have sat down and while not setting down fast rules, they could have at least planned for the welfare of some of the communities of Manitoba.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Tell them to go to the Mayor.

MR. BARKMAN: This helps sometimes but not always, the Honourable Member of Churchill. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is asking too much. I believe we have learned a lesson here. I think this committee by now should feel that certainly we could have done quite a bit better than we did and I don't think it is asking too much that we take a lesson here. I do not wish to brag with some of the other committees, but I know if we had taken this kind of attitude on the municipal committee, we wouldn't have got very far. A complacent attitude was taken there and I wish that would have applied in this case. So I for one have to charge this committee with, a committee of such importance, I see my colleague is also on it, but I think he should share some of that responsibility. I believe this committee, if really an honest effort had been made then a lot of our problems could have been solved and I hope we don't see any committee in the future take the kind of attitude that I believe existed on this one.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, with a reception like that I'd better not fail. I was interested in the comments of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye, talking about a committee that had done very little. I want to assure him that the committee I'm going to speak about, did a good deal and travelled a lot of miles and gave a good deal of their substance in order to meet the wishes of the government, that was to get on with the job and come in with a report.

I feel that I should take a moment and acknowledge with appreciation, and congratulate those members that made up the executive personnel of this committee. They did a tremendous job, Mr. Speaker; not only the planning in the beginning, but also the accommodation under all sorts of conditions and recording everything that was said at these 40-odd meetings, plus finally, collating and bringing together the reports and activities of this committee in a condensed form for the information of the House.

Prior comments, as you know, Mr. Speaker, over the radio and TV and news media have referred to this report and it is of course, not my purpose to go into it in depth but rather give you my opinion on things as I go along. I must say, however, that this information that was given out prior to this report being tabled in the House is entirely improper and I would hope that in future this would not be allowed to happen. I say that, Mr. Speaker, in deference to all members of this House who are entitled to this information first, and the people at the same time. This, of course, was not the case but I don't fault anybody other than if it is a practice to be followed in the future, I think it ties up and ties the hands of those people other than myself or like myself that may want to speak to the subject at hand.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): I would like to know from the honourable member whether he is suggesting that this was a practice that the government follows - the release of this information?

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I trust I'm not going to be continually interrupted by the Leader of the House. I thought I had made my position perfectly clear that I hoped that this wouldn't be the practice.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, on a question of privilege, I'm asking my honourable friend whether he is suggesting that the practice was that this information was released by the government, because I assure him that that was not so.

MR. BILTON: Of course I accept the Minister's word in all seriousness, but nevertheless it was done, that's the point I'm making.

MR. GREEN: It could have been done by anybody who had the report.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor I believe and I intend to keep the floor until I have finished my remarks, and unless I give the floor to someone I don't want to be interrupted.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, despite what my honourable friend says, on a question of privilege, I think it always takes precedence, and if indeed the member is suggesting that the government indulged in a practice of releasing the report to the press before it was released to the members, then it is a question of privilege. If the member is not suggesting that, I'll withdraw the question of privilege.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie):... wish to speak on the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the Cabinet Minister on the government side released the minimum wage report. I don't think it came from the minimum wage board and was released to the newspapers before it was released in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe, order please - I believe I heard the Honourable Member for Swan River indicate that he accepted the Honourable Minister's explanation. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON:..... blame the Labour Department. Why I don't know, but we do. However, Mr. Speaker, could I remind you that when this committee was originally formed, the government intended that it should be a one-party committee, and of their party and we on this side of the House persuaded them to change their minds, and I hope that those of us on this side of the House have contributed something worthwhile from which the government will derive some information.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I took it from the observations that were made by the

(MR. BILTON cont'd.) . . . . government in the formation of this committee that they wished to have a down to earth report and a fact report and a report that should be brought into this House at this particular time; and it was my impression that it was their intention to grapple with the thing and get on with the job at hand. I believe the committee has accomplished its job. My colleague from Birtle-Russell at the time this matter was being discussed, said last year, in fact he pointed to some half dozen or more reports on northern Manitoba, and I hope that this report, Mr. Speaker, doesn't go the same way. I feel sure that it won't; but I would like to emphasize that it must not go there. Here is the substance of the various meetings throughout the Province of Manitoba in which is incorporated information from the many, many, many briefs that we received, and from there we come to the condensed report with the recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, we travelled and we listened and we have filed here dozens of briefs prepared and spoken to by just the ordinary people, and we as members of this Legislature, representatives of the people of Manitoba, must dare not let these people down. There are 47 recommendations in this report, Mr. Speaker, every one of them with a teeth-in that requires, many of them, urgent attention now; others will follow on. Mr. Speaker, I challenge every member of this House to read these recommendations and from that I would expect that many of them will rise in their places and express their opinion as to how they feel things should be done, and from that debate possibly other things that have not come to the attention of the committee will come forward.

Mr. Speaker, those people are looking for action, and I do mean action, and I feel that right now as I stand here making this short expression of opinion that the ball is in the park over there insofar as this report is concerned. It is for them to accept, in my humble opinion, or reject anyone of the 47 recommendations and get on with the job, the important part of the job now. I looked in vain through the estimates so far that would indicate monies that are being provided to eliminate some of the problems we met with. It will be a sorry day, Mr. Speaker, if this report is used by anyone in this House for political advantage. I thought when I made a note of that that I would get a chuckle here or there. But I mean this very very seriously, Mr. Speaker; the problems in that country are above and beyond political argument, we've got to get on with the job. I notice the Minister is smiling and I think he agrees with me. I'm thinking more or less of the basic things, Mr. Speaker. I'm thinking of health and education, jobs and housing and police protection. The other things will follow on but these are the immediate things and somehow down through the years it has got away from us.

Mr. Speaker, wherever we went there was great poverty, poverty everywhere, but I must say to you that poverty has plagued society from the beginning of time. We don't have to go far from this building to see similar conditions and even worse, or for that matter in every town and community in the Province of Manitoba. This, Mr. Speaker, after generations of established authority in the old world and the new. The difference, however, as we see it today with our people in the north is the lack of medical attention due to remoteness, and dental treatment which is in a terrible state of affairs; separated families brought on by the children going to school which our society pretty well demands that they do. Family planning is so badly needed, women are overburdened with children, creating and adding to the misery and despair of these good people. Jobs are necessary, of course they're necessary, but where these jobs are going to be created we don't know but a way must be found. Welfare, Mr. Speaker, has been a godsend to those people and as you know many hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent every year out of the public purse in order to give those people some sort of a living and in many instances it's only an existence; and it is only filling a gap, we've got to step into it, and step into it boldly there's no question about it.

Mr. Speaker, the Indian and Metis people in my humble opinion, and I've been associated with them for many years in one way or another, don't want pity or charity, they simply want a place in the sun, a place in our society. You know, Mr. Speaker, it's the young people in the 20's and the 30's that I'm worried about. Somehow or other these young people must be routed from their present feeling of resentment and in many cases idleness which is growing on them. They must be the leaders of tomorrow and somehow or other they've got to be told they're going to be the leaders of tomorrow. The very salvation and very existence of their people depends on the places that those young people attain in their own particular interests. It's no longer the job of the missionary -- and God bless them for the last fifty years, or sixty years or more they've done a tremendous part in the isolated areas for the good of these people. Or even for

(MR. BILTON cont'd.). . . . that matter a few dedicated people who are still spread out through northern Manitoba and are still interested and are still fighting for these people, I say God bless them. Now the government is in there and has been in recent years and as each day goes by it'll have to be in there more to take these people out of this wilderness. For too long we have seen the children of Indian and Metis parentage ill fed, ill clothed and uncared for. And in saying that, Mr. Speaker, I don't excuse the parents; the parents have a responsibility to see to it that those children are not left in this manner. These children did not ask to come into the world and these Indian and Metis parents must, as I've said before in this House, grasp the hand that's being put out to them in their own interests. Some of these parents, Mr. Speaker, as you know and as I know and as almost every member in this House knows that has taken an interest, squander what money they earn in this way or that way, any other way but bringing up their family. They even squander the welfare assistance. Challenge them though and they'll tell you this is not the case. And for too long have these children been brought up in homes such as this, in the environment that could be better by a little help of the parents themselves. Because you know that environment, Mr. Speaker, is taking those children down the lackadaisical trail of laziness, poor living and misery, making it doubly harder as they increase for the province to do its part in order to better their livelihood.

There must be a new approach, Mr. Speaker. I say that approach is within the covers of this blue book. Everything is right in there; this committee has done its job without any fear of contradiction would I take from anyone, it's there in the written word. There are recommendations in there, Mr. Speaker, that are far reaching and are good for these people and what these people have been asking for. And these recommendations, Mr. Speaker, came from their words that we listened to and we can do none other, none other than get on with the job or let them down. Recommendations are in here, Mr. Speaker, to produce and develop leaders amongst these people; to train nurses, to train teachers that these people want of their own tongue, which is a very very important matter to them just now. Craftsmen and the like. In other words, it can be an uplifting continuing program and to show them at long last that someone, somewhere, is interested. Mr. Speaker, to do less will spell problems and disaster; time is important and is running out. These people are asking for guidance, tolerance, understanding and help, and I ask this House in all sincerity, politics aside, for every member of this House to read this report, be good enough to read this report. A good two-thirds of them have never been north of Neepawa and it would be good for them to read about what goes on in the rest of Manitoba.

Manitoba's greatness, Mr. Speaker, its wealth and its strength lies in the natural resources of northern Manitoba, and these people that I've been speaking about and pleading for can very well be the large part of the work force in that northern part of our province in the days to come. Now is the time - and I say it again and I apologize for continually repeating it - that get on with the job, the job is in that book and I personally will want to know something about it the next session. I know in the meantime the Minister in his wisdom has related important material for the various departments and has insisted on replies and many of these replies have come forward, but I sense in there somewhere there's a little bit of - well, I was going to say it, but I don't think I will - no, I wouldn't say hanky panky, but we'll put it off until tomorrow sort of thing. But there are others, there are others that are interested, I get one today, where the chief and councilmen are being called within this month to bring them together in order that they could hear the development toward the setting up of a council so that they can handle their own affairs in their own settlement. This is good and this has got to come and I'm not going to belabour the House with getting back again into the details, but the work is going on and it must be accelerated and I compliment the Minister for the effort that he has made thus far in seeing to it that as this material came forward meeting after meeting, no time was lost in seeing to it that it was flushed out to the department and ask for a reply. But some of the replies I don't like; but nevertheless in good time it'll all be straightened out.

There is a motion here to reconstitute the committee. This suggestion I question, I question it for only one reason. As I have said, the government and the House in its wisdom set up this committee of six men, sent them on their way and we came back, and here's the job, we've done it. Now, in my humble opinion it gets down to interdepartmental or what have you in order to iron out the matters that have to be taken care of. We're bringing, Mr. Speaker, today with this report to the immediate attention of the government the problems, 46 recommendations. Planning will follow. My friend from Churchill laughs. If that's the best he can contribute to anything I've had to say, I appreciate it very much. . . .

MR. BEARD: Would you count the recommendations. . . .

MR. BILTON: I haven't given the floor to anyone yet. It's a little less; being a newspaper man you're given the credit of exaggerating a little, particularly in numbers. However, Mr. Speaker, I've only got one or two things more to say. . . . (Interjection: Hear, hear!) -- I can sense from those remarks that possibly the seeds that I've cast today have fallen on barren ground. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity of getting up in this Assembly and making the remarks that I've endeavoured to make in the interests of the citizens who were in this country long before we were. This is the type of approach I have carried out on every opportunity that has come my way down some 30-odd years or more, and I say to some of these people that say "Hurrah!" that I hope they'll take up the cudgels and they'll continue to do something about the situation; because if they don't, Mr. Speaker, the Indian and Metis people will be coming up those steps in the thousands, hundreds of thousands, if many more years go by and they're left in the present situation. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: If anyone else wishes to speak, Mr. Chairman, I would be agreeable. Otherwise I would move the adjournment.

MR. BEARD: I would just like to ask the honourable member a question - from Swan River. Did he say as the publisher and editor of the paper that it need not always be correct?

MR. BILTON: I don't know what that has to do with what I've been saying, Mr. Speaker, but I didn't say it was the privilege of a newspaperman to be incorrect all the time. But I've gone to NDP meetings when there's only been 50 and for their good I've said there was 200; so that's what I meant by that remark.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion. Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. GREEN introduced Bill No. 32, an Act to amend the Predator Control Act.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet) introduced Bill No. 30, an Act to amend The Veterinary Science Scholarship Fund Act. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Orders for Return. I'm sorry. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day I have three questions. My first one is directed to the First Minister. That in view of the statements made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs last Thursday concerning the alternative types of government for the metropolitan area would he inform the House if it is his intention that the public will have the right to vote on any new form of government or not?

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Minister of Municipal Affairs made any reference to that possibility, but it would seem to me that if, inasmuch as we have a Boundaries Commission, that if it was intended to have some kind of plebiscite then there would have been much less need for a boundaries commission in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. CLAYDON: Mr. Speaker, my next question is for the Minister of Health and Social Services. I understand that there are renovations in the way of emergency in the casualty section for Misericordian Hospital in the process of being approved. Have they been approved; and if not why not? I understand this has been before them for quite some time.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, to be able to give a more comprehensive answer to that question I'll take it as notice.

MR. CLAYDON: My next question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. In view of the statements coming from Ottawa that they have closed their files on the Sir Hugh

(MR. CLAYDON cont'd.). . . . John Macdonald house on Carlton Street and that the wreckers are to move in on Wednesday, is this now the view of the Manitoba Government, they also have closed their file?

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs)(Wellington): Mr. Speaker, what was it about the government? Would you repeat the latter part of the question please.

MR. CLAYDON: I'm asking if the Province of Manitoba, if the Government of Manitoba has also closed its file concerning the Hugh John Macdonald house on Carlton Street.

MR. PETURSSON: It never, Mr. Speaker, had files officially opened on it. It was depending on the Federal Government to take action and was awaiting whatever action the Federal Government should see fit -- the Historical Sites and Monuments Board of the Federal Government.

MR. CLAYDON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. There is no chance then of the present government intervening in this situation before Wednesday?

MR. PETURSSON: There is no chance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, but in his absence I'll direct it if I may to the Honourable the First Minister and ask him whether he can confirm a report that the operations of the Polaris Snowmobile enterprise in Beausejour are not necessarily lost and that the hundred jobs involved there are not necessarily lost.

MR. SCHREYER: That is correct, Mr. Speaker. There are some discussions going on now as to the possibility of re-opening the plant to manufacture either other kinds of what might be generally described as "recreational-type equipment" or possibly re-opening it to manufacture snowmobiles under a different trade name.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the First Minister then if we may assume that the government of the province is meeting with the principals in the factory concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm certain that the honourable member is well aware that the House has no control over what any member wishes to assume.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase the question and eliminate the use of the term assumption. May I ask the First Minister if the government is meeting directly with the principals in the factory involved?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question I suppose to the Minister of Finance who has control over public utilities and I would ask, with the additional studies that the Manitoba Hydro tabled, will the lawyer, Mr. Buckwald and other expertise be made available to the people of Churchill if necessary?

HON. SAUL CHERNLACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the thought that I have control over public utilities. I am responsible to report on behalf of the public utilities and I have no report to make on the question asked by the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. I wonder if he'd be prepared to advise the House if he is re-considering the appointment of J. Kaufman.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is really a supplementary question to the Honourable Member from Churchill and this would be then to the Premier. Is the government not going to direct Hydro to arrange for counsel for the Indian community in the event that any disruption is to occur in connection with their situation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it should be understood that there is no tangible proposal to proceed with any kind of flooding whether it be high level, medium level, low level, and until such a decision is taken, even if only tentative, there is little point in having any counsel involved.

MR. SPIVAK: Then again, Mr. Speaker, my question is a supplementary. In the event

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.). . . . that such a tentative decision is arrived at, will the government instruct Hydro to appoint a solicitor for the Indian community?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is out of order. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister, the Attorney-General. Since there are no appeals to the decision from the Liquor Control Commission, and I'm sure he's aware that the licence in Assiniboia in one of the outlets has been cancelled just recently after an operation for two years, would he undertake to review the whole matter, when the licence was granted first and then it was cancelled for no apparent reason?

HON. AL MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): I'm sure the honourable member realizes that this is the type of situation where the licensee, former licensee, could certainly avail himself of the facilities of the ombudsman. It's my understanding that he is looking into the matter so I don't think I should investigate as well. If the ombudsman is looking at it I think that is fair enough. I'll get his report in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I'd like to direct another question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Was Mr. Kaufman appointed to an established civil service position, and if so what was the salary?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question of salary as notice because I can't answer the question, I don't have the information. It's a term position that was created for the particular job.

MR. GIRARD: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Was that position advertised?

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker. It's a term position.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question before the Orders of the Day is to the Minister of Government Services. At the time of the announcement of the purchase of the Winnipeg Auditorium, the Honourable Minister mentioned in the House that the renovations required by the government were estimated to cost between a million and a million and a half dollars. I wonder if he can confirm whether any architects, consulting engineers or others in fact reviewed the situation before that estimated figure was given to the House?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Government Services)(Transcona): The answer, Mr. Speaker, is "plenty".

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear it.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend may not understand, but my answer was that there were plenty of architects and engineering consultants interviewed or they submitted suggestions to the Minister of Government Services before the estimate of a million and a half was arrived at.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Minister were there any architects within the government service who in fact gave estimates?

MR. PAULLEY: Of course, Mr. Speaker. We're a very efficient department of government.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. And they confirmed the million and a half dollars that was stated by you in the House?

MR. PAULLEY: I did not speak of a million and a half dollars in this House without some basis for using that figure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that we will be dealing with the Education estimates shortly, could he tell us when the Public Schools Finance Board's report will be tabled.

MR. MILLER: I'll try and find out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Orders for Return.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The number of deputy ministers (or equivalent) whose annual increments fall due by



(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.), . . . . the end of the fiscal year 1969-1970.

2. The number of assistant deputy ministers (or equivalent) whose annual increments fall due by the end of the fiscal year 1969.

3. The number of those whose increments have fallen due that have been denied.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I understand it's not possible to debate the matter at this time. There are reasons which I would like to put forward, so I ask this matter be transferred to Private Members' Day, transferred for debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Transferred to tomorrow? (Agreed.)

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The date that Alex Filuk was hired by the Department of Transportation.

2. His position within the Department; terms of employment; salary.

3. If employed as a civil servant - How his position was advertised.

4. Whether or not his application for employment was processed by the Civil Service Commission.

5. Is he still employed with the Department?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. A copy of the Department of Industry and Commerce cost study undertaken to compare the merits of various possible locations for the proposed fresh fish processing plant.

2. Has this study been given to any persons outside the provincial government and not connected with a Fish Marketing Board or the federal government?

3. Has the Chairman or Manager of the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Board indicated a preference for any particular plant site?

4. Does the Manitoba Government favour any particular plant site? If so, which one?

5. Has the Manitoba Director of the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Board been instructed to vote in favour of a particular site? If so, which one?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have this matter transferred for debate to Private Members' Day. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings.

#### GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS - BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 15, an Act to amend The Companies Act. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. GREEN: May we have leave of the House to have this matter stand? (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, on Bill 27 we would concur with the change in terminology. We believe and agree with the Minister that the word "advances" is a more appropriate one than "grants". And also, of course, the provision of terms which would provide liens on any developments that might occur and would facilitate the recovery of advances by the department; and also to the inclusion in the bill the description of the areas within which you would be prepared to grant advances for exploration. So we have no reason at this time to delay passage of the bill. We would of course reserve the right to question any of the terms in the committee stage if it should seem desirable at that time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): May I ask a question of the Minister? Is it the intention to proceed with Agriculture or are we going on with another department?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that you would read the motion and then we can vote on it.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . . finish the Department of Agriculture. Resolution 7(f)(4)-- passed, (5)-- The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, at the time that the clock ran out on me on Friday at noon I was attempting to make a case insofar as I could in the time available at that stage of the debate for those potato producers in the province whom I feel have been the object of disenfranchisement and discrimination. I was talking about the potato producers who have crops in areas under four acres in production and who as a consequence of their position as small producers rather than large, were deprived of an opportunity to vote the last time a referendum was held on the desirability of compulsory marketing in the potato industry and I had raised the question with the Minister as to whether this was not unfair and discriminatory for potato producers and for the industry in general in the province and whether, in fact, the kind of situation that the small potato producers have found themselves in, is really consistent with all the noble principles that the party to which the Minister belongs espouses, particularly with respect to the rights of individuals and equality of opportunity for small producers alongside large.

I realize that I am in a particularly disadvantageous and difficult position resuming my remarks on this subject at this point because my friend the Minister has now had all weekend, if he needed it, he's had all weekend to prepare himself for the criticisms that I have of the potato marketing procedures in the province and to a certain extent I recognize the fact that I may be sticking my head in a buzz saw by resuming the debate at this point, having had my arguments broken in mid-stream at noon on Friday. I also feel that I'm in a rather disadvantageous position in that I'm really taking the side of the bad guys in this debate - I use that term rhetorically - those producers who have not registered with the Vegetable Marketing Commission and who prefer to, or many of whom have not registered with the Vegetable Marketing Commission, and who prefer to operate privately and independently and would like to be free of all the encumbrances that compulsory marketing means for them and for the industry.

-- (Interjection) -- yes Mr. Speaker, certainly.

MR. SCHREYER: Has the Member for Fort Garry spoken to his colleague, the Member for Lakeside, in recent days or hours about this very question; and when the Member for Lakeside was the Minister of Agriculture, where stood he?

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): We are not on speaking terms. . . .

MR. SHERMAN: I have spoken to my colleague the Member for Lakeside in recent days. As a matter of fact, I spent some time with the Member for Lakeside on Saturday, with his sister-in-law, who probably needs no identification at this stage, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SCHREYER: Where does she stand on the question of vegetables?

MR. ENNS: She likes them well cooked.

MR. SHERMAN: But we didn't discuss the plight of the small potato producer. However, in answer to the First Minister, Mr. Chairman, I did discuss this problem with the Member from Lakeside during the winter and as I conceded at the beginning of my remarks on Friday, I'm sure the Minister feels that I'm on very thin ice and vulnerable ground because after all, the whole concept of compulsory marketing was introduced by Progressive-Conservative administration and responsibility for administration of same rested with my colleague the Member from Lakeside when he was Minister of Agriculture; but I absolve myself from culpability there, Mr. Chairman, because I was not a member of that administration and I don't feel that I subscribe to the philosophy contained in the compulsory marketing machinery. I think that it was certainly justifiable to attempt it, to test it, to experiment with it, but if it has proved to be detrimental to producers and consumers, and I believe that it has, then I suggest like any other legislation that doesn't prove out, and that doesn't stand up, it should be

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.). . . . changed, it should be repealed, should be eliminated.

The third thing I want to say though about the difficult position I'm in in this debate at the moment, Mr. Chairman, has to do with the extent to which our deliberations on the estimates in this department have now gone on. I think we all would agree that debate on these estimates has ranged far longer than we had hoped and we would like to move on to other business at hand and I'm one of those who subscribes to that ambition. I had a great many things that I wanted to say about the potato marketing situation but I would like to expedite business and try to get finished with these agricultural estimates and move on to other departments so I intend to keep my remarks at this stage very brief, Mr. Chairman. I make them simply because I feel it incumbent upon me to. I had agreed to do so to advance the case in this particular forum for small potato producers and I feel that in all conscience I have to follow through on that pledge. But I will not take the time that I originally had intended to.

Let me just begin in this final phase of what I want to say about compulsory potato marketing, Mr. Chairman, by asking the Minister whether he would not consider that perhaps the time has come to do away with, to abandon a bureaucratic apparatus that really was undemocratically arrived at, if one looks at those potato producers who were permitted to cast opinions and cast votes on the question, and which as I have said, in my experience this past winter, talking to producers and consumers I think has proved out to be detrimental to the industry and to excellence.

One thing that bothers me, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that one of the more influential members of the Vegetable Marketing Commission who sits in judgment really over the industry and helps enforce the rules, is himself one of the biggest and most successful potato producers in the province, and I find it difficult to square this kind of permissive situation with New Democratic Party philosophy - if the truth were to be spelled out, Mr. Chairman - New Democratic Party philosophy about the so-called little man and his right to fair treatment. Here we have a New Democratic Government sanctioning a piece of legislative machinery that puts small producers who are not on the commission really at the mercy of a very large producer who is on the commission and who helps impose the commission's strictures and regulations upon those small producers. He sits in judgment over them and at the same time he's competing with them in their industry. Even the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Mr. Chairman, gave up that kind of undiluted hypocrisy many many years ago when it replaced the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's Board of Governors with the Board of Broadcast Governors and now the modern result of that transition is the Canadian Radio and Television Commission of course; but originally as you will recall the CBC through its Board of Governors really sat in judgment over public and private broadcasting, really sat in judgment over its competitors. That situation as I have said was changed in the CBC many years ago, yet it persists today, that kind of unfair - that kind of inequitable situation that persists today in the potato industry in Manitoba.

There was a pretty substantial debate last fall in the First Session of this Legislature over the policies and the effectiveness of the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Board and I find analogies in that debate to the one which I'm concerned with at the moment in the field of potato marketing, Mr. Chairman. At least there, when we were talking about and considering the values of the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Board, at least we had the rationale of the board that it was of value and benefit to the producer, that is to the fisherman. I feel that there is no such justification in the case of the potato marketing board. It's the producers that I've spoken to in fact who are the most unhappy with the system. It's the producers, particularly the small producers, who feel most severely that their potential and their freedom and their opportunity and their success is inhibited by the compulsory machinery imposed upon their every day undertakings in the market. Surely Mr. Chairman, part of the justification for any machinery, any legislative machinery such as that contained in a marketing board is necessarily that it be of value and benefit to the producer and my experience in discussion of the problem with the potato producers is that it is of no value and benefit to them and on the contrary is a substantial detriment to their enterprise.

In this case, Mr. Chairman, our producers, certainly the small ones and certainly a majority, are unhappy with it and they feel that they are the subjects of discrimination by this compulsory marketing process. They place their position on the record and to that end, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take a moment to quote from a 1969 submission to the province by the United Vegetable Producers of Manitoba Incorporated. And here among other things, Sir, is

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.). . . . what they have to say: "We, the United Vegetable Producers of Manitoba urge the government of Manitoba to eliminate immediately all compulsory aspects of the potato marketing plan and return to the producers their democratic right to grow and sell their product in the open market if they so desire or to use the service provided by the proposed marketing plan voluntarily on a service at cost basis. We want you to know that much is wrong with the system when one wholesaler sits on the commission and competes with other wholesalers not on the commission. We want you to know that the big producer is growing bigger while the young and new producers are having great difficulties in getting a satisfactory quota. We want you to know that selling on the open market we have secured better prices than by selling through the commission. Our position is as follows: A large number of producers would be better off financially selling their produce on an orderly voluntary basis. The consumer stands to benefit in the quality of the product and in the price paid in a competitive market." That is from their submission of April 1969 to the government, the authors of which as I said, Mr. Chairman, are the officers of the United Vegetable Producers of Manitoba Incorporated.

Surely one of the key considerations, Mr. Chairman, in any function such as compulsory marketing is the benefit to be obtained, if any, for the consumer. We have talked about the position of the producer; what about the consumer? Well here I think is where the compulsory marketing concept breaks down most severely in the field of potato marketing in our province, for not only has freedom suffered, not only has the producer suffered, but the consumer I submit, Mr. Chairman, has suffered. With competition you get a producer extending himself to offer the best product he can possibly produce on the market, in this case potatoes. With compulsory marketing you get everybody gearing down to the lowest common denominator, getting rid of his mediocre produce just as though it were top grade, so the person who gets hurt in the end, Mr. Chairman, is the consumer.

If there were another referendum held now on the value of the Vegetable Marketing Commission and whether that Commission should exist or not, and the small producers in true democratic fashion were given back their voting rights, Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my view that the Vegetable Marketing Commission would be thrown out by the potato producer of this province. Mr. Chairman, what about the question of fair and democratic treatment; what about compensation for loss, for example? It seems to me, Sir, that there's a squeeze play operating here against the United Vegetable Producers. The government and the big growers appear to be working in alliance to squeeze the small producer, that is the man under four acres, out of existence. There's evidence of such a campaign clearly recognizable in the government's policy on assistance being made available to growers who suffered losses on their 1968 potato crops. The government has indicated that no assistance would be forthcoming to those growers who are not registered with the Vegetable Marketing Commission. Originally I think in communication with the United Vegetable Producers, the First Minister indicated that in considering applications for assistance on 1968 crop loss, there would be no discrimination as between those registered with the Vegetable Marketing Commission and those not registered with the commission. My impression from communication which certainly was not in any way intended to be private, Mr. Chairman, was that the First Minister felt he didn't see that there was any way in which the government could justifiably respond to the plight of those growers who were registered with the commission and turn a blind eye to those who were not registered with the commission. But that position has undergone a diametric about-face. That may have been the position, in fact, it was the position according to my information in September of 1969 in the early months of the present administration's lifetime, but that position now has been replaced by one diametrically opposite, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister shakes his head and I'll be glad to listen to his comments and hopefully his rebuttal of the case that I'm stating, but at the present time, if one consults the small potato producers of this province who suffered crop losses on their 1968 crops, they will insist most emphatically and unconditionally that they have been removed from the realm of those growers in this province who are being considered for assistance, they've been denied consideration of their problem and denied assistance or recompense on their crop loss. One wonders, Mr. Chairman, what pressures were imposed, indeed perhaps by the big growers, what pressures were imposed on the government and on the Minister to bring this situation about-face in the manner in which I have outlined.

There are many questions, Mr. Chairman, where the potato producers, and particularly the small potato producers of Manitoba are concerned, which cry out for an answer and I would

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.). . . . ask the Minister of Agriculture to take them under advisement. One is the question I've raised about compensation for 1968 crop loss and the degree to which a grower is rendered illegitimate and not entitled to aid if he is not registered with the commission. Another is the question as to whether small growers in Manitoba are not indeed subsidizing those big growers in the province who ship their potatoes outside the Province of Manitoba. Another is this one, I would ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman: why are two growers, Manitoba and American, for example, unloading potatoes at the same time at the same platform, not treated on equal terms? The American goes free in effect; the Manitoba grower is burdened with commission charges. Another point is this, Mr. Chairman, that it costs 35 to 40 cents to market a bag of potatoes through the Vegetable Marketing Commission, the Potato Marketing Commission. A sum of 35 to 40 cents appears pretty exorbitant, Mr. Chairman, when one considers that it costs only a fraction of that amount to market a hog, and the question arises as to whether this is not an unnecessary inflation of prices where the consumer is concerned. The man in the end who carries the burden for this kind of bureaucratic cost is the consumer. Another question I'd ask of the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is this: if Manitoba has the best and the only answer to marketing potatoes why is it rejected elsewhere? It's my understanding that this is one of the few states or provinces on the continent that employs compulsory marketing machinery of the type in existence here, so I would ask the Minister whether he's of the opinion that marketing in other provinces or states is disorderly compared to marketing in Manitoba.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, on philosophical grounds it would appear to me that this compulsory marketing machinery really inhibits the freedom to enterprise on his own of the individual potato producer. With the machinery as it's set up with the alliance as I've suggested that exists between the government and the large growers, the small grower is forced to capitulate to a compulsory marketing program. In effect the government is saying to the small grower, "you're not getting any say in the matter, we're not giving you the vote, you're under four acres, we're simply telling you either do it our way or go to the devil."

I'd ask the Minister, finally, Mr. Chairman, to provide this House with the following information growing out of the severe 1968 losses suffered by potato producers. I'd like to have him supply this House, or at least supply me with a list giving the names, location and acreage of those growers who have received assistance from the government for losses on their 1968 potato crops and the amounts received and a list of growers who were refused assistance and an explanation as to why assistance was refused. In the same vein and the same area that we're really talking about, Mr. Chairman, is how many applications for assistance has the Minister received arising out of 1968 crop losses; what has been done with those applications; what were the criteria brought to bear in terms of judging the response on the government's part; and in those cases where assistance was offered, where assistance has been granted, what are the areas, what are the areas, I mean geographical area, where the producers have been helped. In the interests of fairness, Mr. Chairman, in the interests of open government, good government, in the interests of good agriculture in the Province of Manitoba and in defense of the small potato producer's right to compete for a living with as few strictures and as few regulations imposed on him as is humanly possible to impose, I would ask the Minister to address himself to these questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister gets up to speak, I would like to make a few remarks myself. Before I forget, on Page 81 of the Annual Report there is mention made here of a cost of production survey in connection with potatoes. If this survey is available by now I would certainly appreciate getting a copy of it to see just what the cost of production is in the way of potatoes in Manitoba.

Coming back to what the last speaker has mentioned and said. I feel he has covered the subject quite fully. It certainly is a relief on my part after being alone and taking the stand that he is now taking in this House for several years to find that we have new people come into this House and take a similar stand. I certainly appreciate hearing from him and some of the remarks he made certainly were the reasons why I did get up to speak, because I know too well when the marketing bill and the matter of the regulations was discussed in this House how the New Democratic Party used to be the supporter of the little man. This is the one that they championed. But when it came to this particular marketing bill and this particular legislation they were the ones that supported the larger growers; they were the ones that supported the

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . capitalists, so to speak, and it seemed to me that when it came to the matter of achieving or accomplishing their philosophical ends this would take precedent or would override any matter such as giving assistance to the small man; the philosophical ends were the ones that were the determining factor and also the allegiance lies with their philosophical beliefs and this appears to be much stronger than that of helping or coming to the help of the smaller man. This leads me to believe that even in the present government that the socialist element is stronger than the democracy end of it, that they're subscribing to socialism is the overriding cause.

The Member for Fort Garry mentioned that there were certain members on the commission board that probably should not be there and who are more or less sitting in judgment of their own doings, acting both as judge and jury. This I too have questioned and I think the government should take a second look at this whole matter, because under the legislation some of these people, the larger growers, have privileges that are not offered to the other growers because they are also in the processing end of it and because they are in the processing end there are certain privileges extended to them that are not extended to other growers. I feel this is also unjust. Then, too, I have never subscribed to the principle of marketing boards because they consist or comprise of a monopoly and that they cannot operate or cannot compete and therefore they require these monopolistic features and I do not subscribe to that. If they are not being able to compete, and I have said this so many times in the House, then they should not be in existence. I am looking forward to hear the Minister give us a report on the various questions that were put to him and on the matter of the potato production in general in this province. Is there an increased market and if there are increases what is the basis as to the increases. Who gets the increased acreage? Are new growers being accepted? I think some information along this line would certainly be of help to us in the committee. I will wait with any further remarks until we have heard from the Minister on this. I do hope that he will give us the information because no doubt the information is in his hands.

Then too, the item that we have under consideration or have discussed is the Manitoba Development Fund re Winnipeg Gardeners' Co-op. Here we're making an annual contribution to them. How long has this yet to go? I forget when it first came on the estimates and I think it involved an amount probably around 150,000, if I'm correct. Is there still quite a number of years to go as far as this grant is concerned?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, this particular subject matter is one which is proper before the House, obviously. And the fact that it is doesn't mean that I would have expected my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry to raise in particular because all of the things which he makes reference to pretty well outside of the assistance program, the information he could have got from his fellow colleagues who were the Government of Manitoba when these things were brought about. So that it's really an exercise I suppose on his part, I suppose for the record. But essentially I'm sure that he has most of the answers which he has asked this government for, that is if he at all caucused with either the Member for Lakeside or the Member for Arthur with respect to policies in the establishment of the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission.

The Member for Fort Garry made a strong point about the fact that the four acre or less producer lost his right to vote or his franchise in other words and this was a most undemocratic procedure from his point of view. I think that one has to -- and I'm not trying to defend what has been done by the previous government -- but as I understand it it was decided in the development of that particular plan that that particular plan would not control producers that are below that acreage, that is below four acres; and that since they would not fall under control of the program then it was fair game to expect that they should not influence whether indeed the program is launched. So in essence I would agree that if that is the case then they are rightly not allowed to vote on a matter which isn't for their purpose, wasn't intended for them and to which they weren't expected to participate. So that I don't see anything wrong with that particular aspect of it. As my honourable friends ought to know, producers of four acres or less are able to sell outside the marketing commission, they are not compelled to sell through the marketing commission. The only thing that they are obligated to do is to register that they are indeed less than four acres for the purpose of identification and they are given consumer tags with which to identify their product in the market. But it's merely an exercise of identification to know which product is or which product is not controlled so that when the inspection staff is

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . . out in the field they can fully understand why there might be some product in the marketplace that does not bear a commission -- a controlled tag in other words or a commission tag but rather simply a consumer tag which is provided for this particular purpose. So essentially they are not controlled and for that reason it's my understanding that they were not given a vote.

Now with respect to the fact that there was a referendum on the question of establishing a marketing board, the fact that that referendum didn't carry by -- well I think it was short something like less than one percent to achieve a two-thirds majority - notwithstanding that it is recognized that the government of that time assumed that the vote being so close that the growers really wanted some form of compulsory marketing and as I understand it that is why it continued and I'm sure my friends opposite are in a better position to know why they decided to at that time continue the operation or to allow it to continue after that particular referendum.

I think for the benefit of the Member for Fort Garry I should remind him that the then Minister of Agriculture, the present Member for Lakeside, he undertook to, as I understood it at that time, take steps to abolish the marketing commission. But having done so or announced some intents of policy in that direction he found himself subjected to a great deal of pressure. As a matter of fact there was a demonstration on the Legislative grounds asking him to reconsider his position, and that indeed subsequently he did reconsider his position and maintained the operation on 1200 King Edward. This is a decision that was made by my friends opposite. And I endorsed it, of course, at that time, I was not at odds. -- (Interjection) -- We trimmed it down a bit he says. All right. But I'm sure members opposite accept the responsibility which was theirs and hopefully accept the answer that I am giving to my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry. I don't at all intend here to defend certain methodology by which members opposite happen to achieve their ends when they were in office; and why some of the things were done the way they were done I have no knowledge. I may have some suspicions but I can't accept my criticism for what has been done during those years. I can only accept criticism of programs that are launched by this government, or developed by this government.

Now it is true that from time to time we review, we review different activities in our department, areas for which we are responsible, and my friend from Fort Garry may be right that it's fair game to say let's review it. And I want to say that I don't reject that particular position. As a matter of fact, I stated on a number of occasions that we are reviewing all programs that come under this department and will continue to do so. In fact some real analysis of program is going to take place between now and -- or has been taking place and will continue, and there may be further changes made within the Department of Agriculture by the time we roll around to the next session - based on the kind of deep analysis that I'm talking about. There may be major changes made. But certainly in the area of a few months my honourable friend surely doesn't expect that a thorough and complete review has been achieved in every area of this particular department's activities.

Now I think that it is true to say that the people that should have the right to decide the future of their industry is the industry itself. It's not up to the Government of Manitoba to decide for the producers just how they ought to operate. But again in that context, I remind my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, that the referendum that was held produced a 64 point some 3 or 4 percent in favour of continuing this program. So when my honourable friend is arguing that we should be abandoning it then he ought to appreciate the fact that he's arguing on behalf of the 35 percent that voted against it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, can the Honourable Minister explain who was able to vote and who voted in that referendum?

MR. USKIW: I did cover that point earlier but I'll repeat it. Anyone with less than four acres did not vote, was not given the privilege. And as I explained a few moments ago the reason for that was that those under four acres would not be controlled as well and would not be obligated to sell their products through the commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: . . . . . just by correction, that the last final statement by the Minister is not quite correct in the sense that the four-acre and under grower is controlled to the extent that he is prohibited from selling where he wants to sell his potatoes. In other words, he cannot bring them into the commercial market through the regular channels without going through the commission.

MR. USKIW: He has an option. He has an option; he can use either the commission or he can bypass the commission whichever he chooses to do. The question of whether a wholesaler is going to buy them, I'm not quite sure, I'll have to check. My honourable friend may be right; I would have to check that.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . one question at this point, why the small potato producers are so unhappy with the situation, why are 200 small potato producers so unhappy with the situation. I'd really like to have a definitive answer.

MR. USKIW: Of course I'd have to explain that by stating that I don't know if there are 200 unhappy small producers, and if there are I haven't met them. My honourable friend seems to have access to information that I don't have.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . producers in Manitoba, whatever their membership is, it's around 200.

MR. USKIW: Well, let me say this, Mr. Chairman, that since I became Minister I have never received one communiqué from such a group and I don't know whether they exist or they don't exist, and I don't know who they represent and I don't recall receiving one letter in my department either in support of or against anything, so if there is a problem then I would expect that if it has to do with my department then I should have received some kind of a communiqué outlining what the grievance is and outlining what their position is and organization, if there is such an organization. I know who the honourable friend is talking about but I just simply make this point, that they have never seen fit to approach the department with their particular views. Now strange as that may seem, that is the fact, and I have never told them that they shouldn't, I've never told them that they -- I've never been in communication with them quite frankly, so I don't understand that kind of procedure. To reach the Department of Agriculture through my honourable friend opposite is hardly the appropriate procedure for any organization that wants something from the Department of Agriculture.

Now the Member for Fort Garry made a strong point about the fact that the Marketing Commission is dominated by one very large producer, and again I don't know whether he has all his facts here. The Marketing Commission is composed of members which were appointed by the former government. I think there is one observation that you might make, Mr. Chairman, and that is that all those appointments expired sometime last August. The second observation is that I haven't reappointed them or appointed new people; they are continuing but subject to change.

Now, why have I neither reappointed them or appointed new people, because I think one has to be very cautious, one has to feel one's way through, one has to know where the pressures are in order to fully comprehend what is involved in the industry, and until I have all this I don't intend messing about making changes which may not be the proper ones without full information, and I have to say to my honourable friend opposite that I am taking a very cautious approach here to make sure, to make sure that all matters are fully considered. But there will be changes made with respect to the appointments and those changes will be announced in due course.

And I don't have to defend my friends opposite, I can stand on this side here and be very pleased that my friend opposite has raised this question because it's only an embarrassment on the former administration, if that's the light in which he puts it, but I do want to say that he is wrong when he says that one major producer controls the commission. Well if that is true, it means the other six members are falling asleep at this particular meeting. But my honourable friend ought to know that it's a seven-man commission of which there are two people at least, well three, that are small producers, so that it isn't dominated by large producers by and large. There's one large producer on a seven-man commission.

Now it probably can be appreciated that that particular person may be very persuasive and has a capacity to persuade people to move in certain directions, I don't know, but I do have to say that - and I think I have to say that I was involved in this particular area at one time, that is on the question of getting small producers represented on that commission. It took a bit of doing with my friends opposite in power, but I want to tell my honourable friends opposite that I had a lot to do with trying to get the membership of that commission more representative of the growing areas of this province, producing areas, and that quite frankly there was some confrontation on one point over the question of representation and we were successful in getting two members that represent the smaller producers added to that particular commission about two years ago, in spite of the fact that members in government were not quite prepared to carry



(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . . out this particular proposal.

So I have to say that my honourable friend from Fort Garry is wrong when he tries to impute the fact that this government is not cognizant of the needs of the small producer and that they are not concerned about representation on the commission so far as that group of producers is concerned. And as I said a moment ago, there will be further changes on that commission that will be more representative of the total production areas and it is my intent to proceed in that direction. So if change is going to come about it will come about not because of what was presented to me or passed on to me in July but because we are taking a very deep analysis of what is going on and are making changes that we feel are necessary. So I would simply suggest to my honourable friend that he ought to be patient and that changes will come about in the operations at 1200 King Edward.

One also has to remember that there is a Grower Advisory Board that were with the Marketing Commission that tried to influence the decisions of the Marketing Commission. This is relatively a new thing that developed some 12 or 15 months ago and they are making some progress, but it is not simply a body that is in my opinion ruled from the top down, there is liaison and perhaps we have to increase the amount of activity at that particular level to make it more meaningful.

One of the things that the Member for Fort Garry may not appreciate is the fact that we are probably on the threshold of the development of national marketing boards that we are going to be involved with. There is a new act passed in Ottawa, or in the process of, I'm not sure if it's passed yet, which is going to provide for enabling legislation that will allow the establishment of national boards. And I want to ask my honourable friend where Manitoba's position would be if we indeed entered into a national board concept with respect to potatoes for example, if we weren't ourselves organized into some board or commission or what have you. I think that we might have some advantage, having been organized for some time, having had some semblance of producer marketing organization or control, in deliberations with the rest of Canada when a national plan might be proposed. It wouldn't surprise me, Mr. Chairman, if this is going to happen before too long and I would hope that we are in the strongest position at that time so that we could use the expertise that we have and the background that we have in the field of marketing to our advantage when that time comes around.

The question of whether or not the consumer interest was properly considered when this commission was set up, and indeed in the operation of the commission, I take issue with the Member for Fort Garry when he claims that the consumer has suffered as a result of the lack of good quality products in the market. The fact of the matter is that the Consumers Association endorsed this concept of marketing. Now I don't know where the Member for Fort Garry gets his information but it's certainly contrary to that of the consumer organization. So I take issue with it; I think that he is accepting too readily what is presented to him by one group of people without doing proper research to ascertain whether it's true or otherwise, whether it has a good basis for argument. The fact that we have an inspection service that is not provincially controlled should be the protection, the only protection necessary from the consumer point of view.

As you know, under the present system of marketing every load of potatoes has to be inspected by the Federal Government inspectors, the grade inspectors, and they have to initial the invoice of every load, having approved or otherwise of that particular grade of product, so that there is definite control of the kind of product that is moving into the market. There was never that kind of control before, Mr. Chairman. There were a few spot checks, but I can perhaps outline a few stories from some years ago when the image that Manitoba potatoes had outside of this province left a lot to be desired. It was true at one time that people were packing everything into their bag of potatoes and shipping them outside of the province. The net result of that was that we were not an exporter of this product for a period of years because we did not have the confidence of consumers outside of Manitoba. So it is desirable to have on-the-spot inspection of every shipment and that is being done through this system of marketing. The idea that poorer product is entering the market place rather astounds me when one has to appreciate the fact that every load is inspected. I would rather think that it would be the opposite, that where you don't have a system that you could run into all kinds of difficulties.

The argument about payment to small growers - the statement made by the Member for Fort Garry that between the large producers and the government the small grower is squeezed out. I don't quite understand his point because assistance is not denied to small growers, it is

April 13, 1970

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . . provided for all the growers. As a matter of fact, if my memory serves me correctly, I think one of the cheques that were sent out was in the amount of some \$21.00 which represented a part of an acre. I was surprised that a grower took the time and bother to apply for such a small amount, but nevertheless it occurred, so I don't know where my honourable friend gets his information.

Perhaps I ought to read to him the statement of policy as announced in this House last fall with respect to how this program is going to operate - the terms of reference in other words. I quote, Mr. Chairman: "All potato growers registered with the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission in the 1968-69 crop year who experienced greater than 30 percent crop loss in that year will be eligible for assistance. All potato growers under contract with processors in 1968 who experienced greater than 30 percent loss in that year will be eligible for assistance. The assistance will be paid at the rate of \$40.00 per acre on loss exceeding 30 percent of the cost, with a maximum available to any one applicant being the amount of \$1,400.00.

"Procedure for applying for assistance. The attached application form must be completed and forwarded to the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission, 1200 King Edward Street, Winnipeg 21, prior to December 15th, 1969. Preliminary assessment of applications will be based on records available at the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission. The assessment will be based on the report of storage holdings as of November 1968, plus sales made through the commission at that date. Loss will be determined by a comparison of marketing through the commission in the crop year 1968-69 with similar marketing for the average of crop years 1966-67 and 1967-68. Adjustments will be made to account for changes in acreage between these years. In the case of contract growers, preliminary assessment will be based on records available from processors. A preliminary assessment of application will be reviewed by the Growers Advisory Committee to the Vegetable Marketing Commission and this committee will make final recommendations to the Minister of Agriculture regarding assistance payments. Upon approval of recommendations, payments will be made directly to the growers." Now I think that fully explains the terms of reference.

Now my friend the Member for Fort Garry then questioned the policy with respect to registered and non-registered growers, and again I want to go back to what has been done in the past by the former government, and that is the requirement that all growers must be registered - and this was legislation that was approved by your administration some years ago - the law demands that all growers are registered. Now when one adopts a policy of this kind one has to talk about what is in fact the case. Now if some producers chose not to identify themselves so that they indeed could circumvent the marketing system, then I have no knowledge (a) who those producers are or how many there are because I just don't know they exist. That is their own choosing.

So when one enunciates policy one cannot foresee that there are going to be people that we don't know about that are in the industry that should be considered, and that in the event that they should be considered, as my honourable friend points out, I would want to know by what mechanism he could judge whether they indeed had a valid application. How could he go back one year to determine their loss without any records of their sales? The whole program is based on the records of sales, average production - two years, comparison with the year in question. My honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Resources says he has a garden in which he grows some potatoes; maybe he could have qualified under the terms of reference that the Member for Fort Garry is suggesting. I am sure that if we adopted that policy the same Member for Fort Garry would rise in his seat and ask us why we were so irresponsible, because what it would amount to would be that all one has to do is apply and then one would get a check because we would have to assume that they are telling the truth, that they indeed were producers. We would have no way of checking this out, no way of comparing production statistics because they are not recorded in the industry - by their own choosing. So it's not because we don't wish to help them out, but if they didn't identify themselves in the industry how could you respond to a number of people that decided not to identify themselves.

MR. SHERMAN: The Minister is saying, Mr. Chairman, that the only way of keeping a record and checking on the legitimacy of a potato producer is by registration through the commission? Surely there are other methods of . . .

MR. USKIW: Well if there are, would you suggest which way you would do it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SHERMAN: Well I think if a man can demonstrate through his contracts with

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . . wholesalers over the past five years that he has been a regular supplier, a regular marketer and producer of potatoes, surely that's sufficient authorization to establish his legitimate claim.

MR. USKIW: Well, do you pay him for an acre, Mr. Chairman, or for 35, because that's what you have to answer.

MR. SHERMAN: Isn't this the point of the four-acre -- the point of the four-acre ruling was to permit the man under four acres some -- I think the Minister implied, Mr. Chairman, in his remarks that the point of the four-acre ruling was to permit the man some flexibility, some freedom, so it's not going to be a case of 35 acres because a man who has got 35 acres has got to be registered with the commission. You know it's a maximum of four acres.

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. USKIW: The argument is that the producer chose to operate outside of the commission, and because he chose to do so there was no basis on which we could identify his total production on which to base an assessment of payment. We would simply have to accept the fact that he would produce a document at his leisure, if you like, or his will, but that we would have no way of checking it against the people that are registered with the commission and are selling through it. So in essence what you would be doing is giving an advantage to a group working outside of the commission which you are not prepared to do with those that are working under the commission and subject to the records of that particular marketing agency.

The Member for Fort Garry also pointed out that there must have been a change of policy, and for the record, Mr. Chairman, he has it now - I read the policy. That has not been changed; we have carried out the program in accord with the terms of reference which I have just outlined for his benefit.

Another question which the Member for Fort Garry raises is the question of why are there American trucks unloading products at the marketing commission alongside of our own Manitoba producers, and that they are not subjected to commission charges. Again it's a demonstration of my honourable friend's ignorance of the industry. The fact of the matter is that the commission is more than likely importing potatoes because of a shortage of supply in this province, and there is no way in which you can tag a commission charge to a producer in another land when you wish to buy his product from him. He isn't imposing on your market, you are soliciting the product from him. So I don't see where my honourable friend could imply that this should be considered or at least should be the case. There is no way in which this could be done.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on that point, I wonder if I could just ask the Minister is it not so though that if this same person shipping potatoes, whether it be United States or else wherever it comes from, that if this party unloads that load, let's say at Safeway, Dominion or anywhere else, he still doesn't really pay the - what is it? - 35 cents or so handling charges, does he?

MR. USKIW: Is my honourable friend referring to the import product? Well no import product is subject to handling charges imposed by the marketing commission - no, that's correct - and in no way should they be or could they be. You could not impose that kind of a penalty on any product that you are importing. Let's face it, we are in the outside market buying the product because we are in short supply; it is not another producer invading our market, and that's the inference that I get from the Member from Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . that the situation and conditions here are so attractive to the American producers that they are able to exploit a situation that reacts in their favour and against the favour of our producers.

MR. USKIW: They would only be able to react to such a situation, Mr. Chairman, if there was a short supply here. And there are many reasons why you may enter into a short supply situation; either you have over-exported beyond what you should have to maintain enough product for domestic needs, or you have had a crop failure such as in '68 or some areas of the province in '69, which made it necessary to bring the supplies in from another area. But this all is within the framework of the marketing commission and its system of marketing.

MR. FROESE: Before we leave that subject, are these imported potatoes subject to the same grading and inspection as our own potato growers?

MR. USKIW: The question is whether imported product is subject to the same grade and regulations as ours? Again I have to point out to my honourable friends opposite that grade is determined by the Federal Department of Agriculture and has nothing to do with the marketing commission. It is they, the federal inspectors that determine whether a product can or cannot be marketed in this province or in this country, so that the grade question doesn't at all enter into the marketing system.

The Member for Fort Garry also made a point of what he considered to be a fact - which is indeed not, it's a complete falsehood - and that is that this is the only province that has a compulsory marketing system with respect to potatoes. I simply want to point out that in the Province of British Columbia for years they have maintained a compulsory marketing system for a number of commodities, not only in potatoes but potatoes is one of them. In the Province of Ontario there are some 30 or 40 compulsory marketing agencies. Manitoba is really at the beginning of the marketing system or marketing board idea; it is only entering the field. I think we have about four or five compulsory marketing agencies so far in the Province of Manitoba

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . and one voluntary one. You have the Turkey Producers Marketing Board; you have the Broiler Producers Marketing Board; you have the Potato Producers Marketing Board - or Potato Commission actually. Those are the three compulsory ones. The Honey Board is a fourth one. And then you have the Hog Marketing Commission, which is a voluntary thing, but which deducts a fee for services whether you use the service or not. So we have five or six in total, but really this is a mere beginning in the Province of Manitoba if you compare it with other provinces to the east and the west of us.

As to the question of how many people were involved in the assistance program, a total of 126 producers in a relatively small area received assistance. Forty-six were not eligible for one reason or the other, and not because of not being registered but because of either not qualifying under the terms of reference or reasons of production statistics. I would suggest that if the Member for Fort Garry wants complete data on it that he could file an Order for Return.

What are the geographic areas of the assistance program? I think again that if you recall what happened in 1968, the area that was flooded was the area along the Red River Valley mainly north of Winnipeg. There are probably a half a dozen producers that were eligible outside of this particular area, but the bulk of the payments were made to the area just in and around Winnipeg to the north. That is the area that was severely affected by the heavy rainfalls in 1968.

The Member for Rhineland wants to know the cost of production. I think we can get that information for him. I don't have it with me, but I will undertake to supply it for his benefit.

The question of whether or not acreage is being increased. There is some discussion under way, as I understand it, between the Grower Advisory Committee to the commission and the commission about whether or not we ought to increase the amount of production in the fresh potato market this year and who should receive the benefit of that increase, whether it should be existing growers or new producers. This is being worked out between the Grower Advisory Committee and the commission and I haven't had any definitive report from them to date. I think that pretty well sums up, Mr. Chairman, the remarks that I have on the subject.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister certainly has provided some answers to a number of questions that I raised; however, I must say that there are substantial discrepancies between his information and some of my information. For example, he said with respect to the policy on assistance to those potato growers suffering 1968 crop loss that there has been no about-face. I accused the government of an about-face, and I asked what pressures were brought to bear that affected that about-face and the Minister has stated, I think pretty unequivocally, that there has been no about-face. Well my information is that in September of 1969 the First Minister stated that "in considering applications for assistance there will be no discrimination as between registered and non-registered growers who experienced losses on their 1968 crop." That was September 1969.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. SHERMAN: On January 14th . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I don't recall the Minister having made that remark.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I just finish making the point. On January 14, 1970, which would have been what? - four months later, the Minister stated: "I do not see any way in which we can respond to the case of growers not registered with the commission and whose products were not marketed through that facility." Now those two statements are diametrically opposite. Now the Minister says that he doesn't recall the First Minister having made that first statement and this may be the case - maybe he didn't make that statement, I'm not 101 percent certain that he did - but my information, Sir, is that he did and it's on that discrepancy that I base my case in which I say that an about-face has been carried out, because those are two diametrically opposite statements.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, surely it's unfair for the Member from Fort Garry to impute statements made by myself or the Premier to be opposite when they were not public statements. I don't know where my honourable friend gets his information.

MR. SHERMAN: I get it from the United Vegetable Producers and this is in a letter addressed to the Premier - from the United Vegetable Producers addressed to the Honourable Edward Schreyer, dated February 5, 1970, recapping some of the communications, some of the argument between the two sides on this question.

MR. USKIW: I would presume then, Mr. Chairman, and my honourable friend could correct me, that he must be making reference to an informal discussion.

MR. SHERMAN: Well I'll have to check that, Mr. Chairman. I don't know whether it came out of an informal discussion or not but it is contained in a communication between the United Vegetable Producers and the Premier, and the communication was addressed to the Premier by the corresponding secretary of that organization.

MR. USKIW: May I ask the origin of the other communication, Mr. Chairman, the one that I allegedly had made.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The other one was a communication from the President and the Secretary of the United Vegetable Producers of Manitoba headed "Submission to the Government and Members of the Cabinet of the Province of Manitoba by the United Vegetable Producers of Manitoba Incorporated, April 1969." I'll make these communications available to the Minister, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: But, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member stated that I had made some statement to the United Vegetable Producers and I have never discussed the matter with them and I am wondering what the basis of information is.

MR. SHERMAN: No, I think there is a misunderstanding on that. I said the First Minister, not the Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member quoted something apparently that the First Minister had stated and then something that I apparently had stated and that they were opposite statements.

MR. SHERMAN: No . . .

MR. USKIW: And I would like to know the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . clear up the point. He made a statement something about two diametrically opposed statements. Were they two statements alleged to have been made by the Premier or one by the Premier and one by the Minister?

MR. SHERMAN: Both statements are alleged by the United Vegetable Producers to have been made by the First Minister. The Minister is not involved in this at all. The First Minister is alleged to have made those two statements.

MR. USKIW: And these were not formal meetings, they were -- were they informal or was this in reply to a letter or is there some documentation to either substantiate or otherwise the Premier's statement?

MR. SHERMAN: Well I can't say whether they were formal or not, but in the letter, what is happening here is that the corresponding secretary for the United Vegetable Producers is confronting the First Minister with statements that he says the First Minister has made and is quoting those statements. Now the Minister may repudiate that challenge, that charge - I don't know, I have seen no evidence that he has done so. I don't know where the controversy went after that, but it's on this kind of discrepancy that the United Vegetable Producers have held many of their talks with me.

MR. USKIW: Would my honourable friend not feel that if that was the case that I would have had a communication from them to me?

MR. SHERMAN: Well it seems strange that the Minister hasn't, Mr. Chairman, it seems strange that he hasn't. I wonder whether one is suspicious of the kind of mutual distrust that may exist between the United Vegetable Producers and the Minister when this kind of situation can arise. I don't know why he would not have received any communication. My assumption would be that a submission such as this which is addressed to the government and members of the Cabinet of the Province of Manitoba would find its way to the desk of the Minister of Agriculture, but apparently this isn't always the case.

MR. USKIW: When was that?

MR. SHERMAN: Well this of course is dated April 1969.

MR. USKIW: . . . the previous government . . .

MR. SHERMAN: It would be in the records, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 7- (f) (4) to (f) (6) were read and passed.) I might point out to honourable members for their own information that we are now at 12 hours and 15 minutes and still counting. (Resolution 8 was read and passed.) Resolution 9 --

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to hold up the committee longer than is necessary, but since we are going to have the Veterinary Clinics coming up this year, I wonder if the Minister could elaborate to some extent. I have heard there will only be - within an hour or two if possible - the fact that perhaps only nine will be set up this year and the fact that there may only be about \$135,000 available I understand. I wish he could elaborate though as far as

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) . . . . . the provincial part is concerned regarding maintenance and perhaps even the municipalities' part, and so as to give him a little bit more time I'd better make my question short. I think he knows what I am trying to get at.

MR. FROESE: Before the Minister gets up to speak, am I given to understand that once these Vet Clinics will be set up, farmers or producers will have to take their animals to these clinics to get relief for them? Does this mean that the vets will no longer have to come out, because this in my opinion will lead to increased costs on behalf of the producers. So I am not quite at this point sold on this program if that is the case, because this will mean increased costs to the producer if that is the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Ask the Minister on the same point, I understand that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you the member for Rock Lake?

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Chairman, just when the Minister gets up to explain this, a number of municipalities are wondering -- and if you will explain the financial arrangement between the municipality and the provincial government. Once this is established, the municipalities are hoping if there is any escalation in costs thereafter that it won't be borne by the municipality, rather that the government will be taking care of this. They are thinking of such as what's happened in education and they don't want to see the same thing happen in this. And I want to also add to what the comments of the Member for Rhineland made. I am very concerned about how the service is going to be offered, that is to the farmer if an animal takes sick, and there are some cases that are very difficult for the farmer to take into the clinic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: The point, Mr. Chairman, that was drawn to my attention was that after five o'clock the veterinary in charge, that his fee would be time and a half and then on the weekends double time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: The question is what is the program going to do. I think I did outline at some length during debate just what the intent is and the reasons for it. First of all, I want to say that we have lost a number of veterinarians in the Province of Manitoba over the last few years. We are down to some, I think it's 26 from some 64 or 65 veterinarians that we used to have. One of the main reasons for that decline in service is the fact that a good number of veterinarians were not able to sustain a decent operation under their fee system, that many of them were forced into a position of having to drive a great number of miles per year in order to carry out their work. I am told that many veterinarians pile up a mileage of some 50 or 60 thousand miles a year on their car, and more than that I'm told -- yes, that may be true, and that essentially it was a situation where the veterinarian pretty well had to live in his car or in his truck, whatever it was he was using, and that this became a very serious problem to the veterinarian and consequently the veterinarian looked at greener pastures and decided to move either into other areas of Canada which offered a better deal for him or into private industry, but that the services that were required in the countryside were not the area that were attracting him. There was a lot to be desired, and it seemed that we ran into quite a crisis in the last number of years. In fact I would say that action should have been taken four or five years ago. -- (Interjection) -- Well I didn't say a thing about that, but if my honourable friend wants to assume the responsibility I don't mind passing it on to him. We could have prevented this decline had we moved a little sooner.

Nevertheless, it is true that between this particular program and the increase in the scholarship for vet students that we hope to bring back to Manitoba the numbers of veterinarians that is necessary to provide us with the kind of service that we want. The grants to the students are moving up from \$500.00 to \$750.00 a year so that that in itself is the major step, Mr. Chairman. The maximum grant to any student is somewhere in the area of \$3,000.00, so that this should help us along in the area of training professional people, and tying that with the clinic system I think we will have an attractive program for vet students and I think within a few years we will be back on our way up with the kind of service that is necessary, and more so because of Manitoba's current push to diversify agriculture more so than it is.

We feel that this year we will have about nine units set up. There are conditions, there's no doubt about that. The old grant was \$1,800 to a district; the new one is \$5,000, or up to

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . \$5, 000 providing the district matches the five. It's a dollar per dollar program; we'll put up a dollar for every dollar that the district can raise. The district may involve a number of municipalities, towns and villages, who will also be allowed to enter into an arrangement. -- (Interjection) -- Who will organize them? The Provincial Veterinarian is involved to quite an extent promoting this idea, discussing it with towns and municipalities and people throughout Manitoba.

As a matter of fact, my understanding is that since the program was announced that the demand for the service is catching up with us rather quickly and that we're not going to be able to respond fast enough to the number of requests that are being made for this kind of setup. So it seems that the people of Manitoba, the rural people are responding very quickly and we may end up having to choose the most desperate areas first in this first year because of the need to maintain a veterinarian in that particular area. There are two or three areas that I'm told are on the verge of collapsing now unless we do have something, and it is only on the strength of a promise of a clinic that the veterinarians are prepared to carry on, so we're fighting brush fires right now in this business, Mr. Chairman. We are hoping to convince people to stay on even though they have made intentions to leave, and it will be these particular areas that are going to get their clinics first I'm afraid. We will be selecting the districts on the basis of need, the basis of our situation in an area. So I anticipate that our budget will be fully utilized in this particular year, that there will be no problem in convincing communities that they ought to participate.

Whether or not people should or should not bring their animals to the clinic is something that they themselves will decide. They will have the option. There will be a fee in the clinic and a fee outside the clinic, and the user of the service is going to decide whether or not he wants to pay the clinic fee or whether he wants the veterinarian to drive out to the farm. I don't have the figures before me but perhaps I could provide the members with more information as far as the fees are concerned.

There is the question of what happens with the evening work, the weekend work or overtime work if you like, and it is my understanding that the veterinarian will add to his income during the off hours, that during the working hours he will be on contract and if he goes out after working hours whatever additional revenue he receives will be his own.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): That's moonlighting.

MR. USKIW: My honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface says that's moonlighting. Well maybe right now we need a bit of that since we're in such short supply of veterinarians. But that's basically the way it's going to operate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just one point. In cases of some animals getting sick like a dairy cow with milk fever, well she can't get up, it would then have to be moved and transported and it would be very difficult. In cases of that type, I take it that the veterinarian will come out and still perform the service.

MR. USKIW: Yes, this is true, Mr. Chairman. Where there's a problem, in fact whether there is a serious problem or not, if the user of the service wants the vet out on his farm the vet is prepared to go out, but the fee will be a little larger. So it's as simple as that. -- (Interjection) -- Well I don't know. I'm afraid he may not want to take advantage of the veterinarian service.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the Minister for a moment. Do I understand him properly here that he says we can get the service of the veterinarian outside the clinic. In other words, what he is saying then that we are charged double. In other words, we are going to have to pay on our own for the services of the veterinarian if he comes out to the farm as well as being taxed for the clinic itself and his services.

MR. USKIW: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that there will be a fee within the clinic and a different fee outside the clinic and the user will determine whether he wants to bring his animal in or whether he wants to call the veterinarian out to the farm. But there will be a double -- or two schedules. There will be two schedules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to direct a question to the Minister before we pass this item. I gather from his remarks that these clinics are being set up that will involve only areas where there are salaried veterinarians. Is this correct? And if so, will this service not be offered -- will the clinic centres not be set up in areas where there are



(MR. WATT cont'd) . . . . . veterinarians that are operating outside of salaried -- well I don't know how to put it, but just in a veterinary district actually. Shall I put it this way? Is it necessary that a salaried veterinary be operating in those areas?

MR. USKIW: I'm not sure that I get the question. As far as the districts are concerned, it's my understanding that they can be formed even before the clinic is there and that they would be entitled to the same program. Right, that will continue.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, does this mean . . .

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I want to follow up this question now. I want to get this clear. Where the clinics are being established, will they be provided only for veterinarians who are salaried veterinarians under a district operation? Is this correct?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. FROESE: Just enlarge on that question. Will it be allowable for private vets to operate even though you have a district where you have a clinic, that you could have private vets come in and service as well.

MR. USKIW: I don't believe there is anything in the legislation that is going to prohibit that although I would consider it highly unlikely. I haven't anticipated that particular problem, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure that I got the question of the Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: I'll try again then, Mr. Chairman. In areas where a vet does not wish to work within the scope of the clinic concept but wishes access to a clinic - and I think I'm asking the same question as the Member for Rhineland - will they have access to that clinic or will a clinic be set up where a vet refuses to come in within the scope of a salaried area.

MR. USKIW: If he is not working within the clinic then I would feel that he wouldn't be entitled to the services of the clinic, Mr. Chairman. It would have to be a contract between the district and the veterinarian.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution No. 9 - (a) to (c) were read and passed.) (d) -- The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on this experimental fur farm - and I'm not going to hold it up long - I think the amount is not large enough here, especially considering the conditions that the fur farmers have been going through the last two years and considering the price of furs. I don't think this amount is enough and I just wonder has the Minister an explanation why, with the kind of trouble that they're in, that the amounts are not larger than they are.

MR. USKIW: Well first of all, Mr. Chairman, I think it's the first time that the estimates in this department show anything for the fur industry simply because it's probably the first year within which we have taken the fur farmers under our jurisdiction. Previously they were shown under the estimates of the Department of Mines and Resources. This is just a carry-over from one department to another, and quite frankly I have to admit that I'm not at all highly familiar with what is happening here. I gather it's merely experimentation insofar as feeds are concerned, medicines and so forth. I'm not sure that at this point I can give you the specific information without referring to my notes, Mr. Chairman. Do you want further explanation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to have an explanation, because if we have fur farmers going out of business and last fall, or was it December when we had a big splash in the papers that a number of the bigger fur farmers were going to quit and were going out of business. What is the reason for it? Has this to do with the auction sales and the way they are being handled and that the people in the business are being gypped in any way?

MR. USKIW: What is the problem in the industry? I suppose one can talk about that for an hour, Mr. Chairman. It is true that the industry is entering into some difficult times. The price of pelts are not what we would consider reasonable but -- (Interjection) -- Do they need a compulsory marketing board? It's something that might be researched, Mr. Chairman, but they haven't indicated to me that that would be of some advantage to them. I want to say that it is a world-wide situation. The price of mink furs has been depressed for some time throughout the world, throughout the markets of the world, and there's nothing that one can do at a local level to try and get around that particular problem. It's a fluctuating thing and I suppose it's a cycle that we're in and I would hope that it wouldn't last very long.

MR. ENNS: What this province needs is more compulsory minking.

MR. USKIW: Now the Member for Lakeside says what we need is compulsory minking. I don't know what he means by that.

MR. DESJARDINS: He means we should let them breed.

MR. USKIW: It is true that the industry is having extreme difficulties and some of their traditional creditors have withdrawn support. Because of that particular fact I have asked the Department of Agriculture, or the Credit Corporation under my department, to provide credit to the industry providing it can be secured, and we are hoping that that will alleviate their immediate cash needs, at least tide them over into next year. We are also looking into the question of cutting down on the cost of feed. There is some research being done in that area to see if we can provide some cheaper feed for the mink so that we can reduce their costs some more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution No. 9 - (d) and Resolution 10 - (a) to (c)(2) were read and passed.) The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under (3) how many additional people will we be employing under this Agro-Manitoba Development?

MR. USKIW: I'm not sure that I can answer that question, Mr. Chairman. We haven't broken it down into - at least I haven't broken it down into staff years, but it might be an opportunity for me to outline for the House what is intended in the program. The Member for Rhineland says "please do so." I will try not to prolong the debate on the matter although it is a substantial amount.

It has to deal with the new concept that is being approached in the Department of Agriculture, the idea that we are more than just a Department of Agriculture having responsibility for the commercial sector, that we indeed should become more involved in the social development of people in rural Manitoba, and this is a start in that particular direction. There is an amount of some \$250,000 to provide us with a little bit of machinery or organization to get into the community affairs programming and social development type of program.

I might say that it's reasonable to expect that we ought to take this approach in particular because of the changes that are taking place in rural Manitoba, the many adjustments that have to take place and will continue, the adjustments within agriculture and the adjustments without. I have made a number of speeches on this particular matter, Mr. Chairman, over the last number of months outside of the Legislature, and one of them dealt at some length with the question of rural development, as to how we ought to develop rural Manitoba rather than allowing the migration of people from rural areas into one big melting pot such as the City of Winnipeg.

It is my opinion that it is to the advantage of the Province of Manitoba to try and maintain a broader rural base, to try and encourage as much as possible more people to stay in rural Manitoba, but indeed to do that one has to be prepared to make some major adjustments. We have to be prepared to try and develop as much as possible the regions of this province, that is development in industry if you like, and in particular industry where it relates to agricultural production. If there's going to be a shift in the rural areas of Manitoba from agriculture, from farming to other occupations, then I think we ought to try as much as possible to make that shift painless if possible, to try to accommodate the unemployed people or the people that are displaced, if you like, in the industry, to try to accommodate them through some rural development programs in rural industry. The area of processing of agricultural products is one example that I think we may have to look at to make sure that as much as possible we develop these industries in the geographic area where the production is, and hopefully to apply social development programs that would get rural people that want to adjust out of agriculture into some of these industries.

Specifically I want to point out a few things that are going to be considered or going to be done this year. I have them listed, Mr. Chairman, and to save time I think I will just read them to you. We want to set up a co-ordinator within the government services to provide a sort of a delivery system towards this program in Agro-Manitoba. We want to, for example, through this program stimulate dialogue as between citizens and the Government of Manitoba, to try and help assess the situation, any given situation whether it be problems in agriculture or problems in adjustment; we want to have more capability on the part of the citizens to communicate with government to try and make this adjustment possible. We are providing \$250,000 in this area, and these are some of the things that are going to be done. We hope to establish a regional library service to demonstrate the contribution that a public library can make to the educational, recreational and cultural growth of a number of communities. We want to establish a regional recreation service, for example, in a district on a pilot basis. In other words, a recreational director within a school division is the idea here to sort of bring to the public attention or co-ordinate the facilities that are available for recreational services to get people involved and so

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . forth. We want to establish a divisional continuing education program to help in provision of continuing education services through life. This would combine normal activities in employment training as well as the use of leisure time. A program of adult learning designed specifically for the needs of the disadvantaged who because of past experience dropped out of formal education and for various reasons are reluctant to re-enter the conventional programs. Provision of incentive grants to innovative teachers in a given school division in rural Manitoba to encourage them to develop and disseminate ideas applicable to their teaching conditions. These are the pilot projects that are going to be undertaken by this particular program.

I want to say with that, Mr. Chairman, that it is my belief that too often in the rural areas of Manitoba we misuse our resources or misapply them, or we don't fully utilize our resources, physical and human, and that this is geared in such a direction as we would bring these more closely together. For example, I would hope that we would start towards the consolidation of government services in rural Manitoba sort of out of one given centre. Rather than having your system of education in one building and your ag services in another building and your home ec in a third building, we would hope to as we go along and develop new facilities, to tie in your educational system with your recreational system, with your service sector, providing services to the agricultural communities, all in one package sort of thing, so that we provide for the young students, we provide for adult education and adult recreation out of public facilities or within public facilities that really are left to a large extent unused today outside of the hours of nine in the morning to four in the afternoon.

So it's really a start in the direction of trying to maximize the utilization of public building that we now have for the benefit of our people in these communities and also so that it may be possible for us when we are building new buildings to take all these things into account so that when we design new government services buildings throughout the province that we take into account all the needs that the community requires and that in that way try to develop our building program to accommodate those needs. This is the principle, Mr. Chairman. If there are any questions I'll attempt to answer them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): I just thought I'd share this with the House. The House of Commons Hansard for 1968 on Page 761 for March 13th. Mr. McEachen in reporting for the Committee on Procedures commented the committee had visited Westminster and said that two of the observations that became quite prevalent in the discussions were No. 1, "We have decided that there are only 365 days in the year and, we have decided that in debate there comes a time when enough is enough." I just thought I'd share this with this House, I thought it should be on the record of this establishment.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, in reply to that I would like to tell the honourable member what half of our constituencies are in rural Manitoba and that they depend on the agricultural program of this province and this is what we are discussing at this time. It's not just that this matter applies to one or two constituencies, it applies to the larger share of Manitoba constituents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Resolution No. 10 was read and passed.) Resolution 11 - (a)(1) -- The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I should mention something on this one. This is something that members opposite to date have not learnt about. There is a bit of a new program in this particular item and it is the establishment of a provincial seed farm for what is called the Elite Three Potato Program. The reason for it, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that we are running some pretty strong competition from the Provinces of New Brunswick, P. E. I., Quebec and Alberta for the expansion of the potato processing industry. Manitoba takes the position that this is an industry that we would want to expand in this province, and indeed the industry has been before us asking that we try to assist them in the development of proven disease free seed which is a real problem in the industry; as a matter of fact two years ago we almost had a disaster in the prairies here when most of the seed was condemned because of a ring-rot problem. This is a very exotic type of thing, it isn't something that can be easily accomplished by the private sector, profitably that is, and it is the intent of the government to establish a seed farm somewhere in the province. It has to be isolated from any growing area; it's a very intensive type of operation and will take three years of development before we can provide the industry with any product from it. It's an area where you start with one acre this year and it will take you three

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . . years to reach 35 acres of production on this type of Elite product. So that it is a bit of an expensive project for the amount of product that we're going to get from it but it will provide a very sound basis for disease control in the Province of Manitoba, and it's my hope that because we do have a substantial processing industry in Manitoba and there's a great deal of indication that they want to expand as rapidly as possible, that there is a role here for the government to play and that this will augur well for the development of this industry if we indeed establish this particular seed farm.

I mentioned earlier that three other provinces have already moved in this direction and I'm not about, Mr. Chairman, to lose the opportunity of expansion of that industry in this province. I have consulted with the Minister for Industry and Commerce, who is in complete agreement that we should push this as fast as we can and at the same time encourage the rapid development of more production in Manitoba.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that Manitoba has a tremendous potential in the special crop area, the Pembina area, the Portage area, the Carberry area, these are vast areas that can be better exploited through more specialized cropping which would produce a better return to the farmers of the area than they are getting from grain and which will serve in the long haul of further diversifying Manitoba's agricultural economy and I would hope that members opposite take a very positive viewpoint on this particular approach.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution No. 12 was read and passed.) Resolution No. 13 (a) -- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the committee that I don't intend to speak on this matter at this time. I'll wait till the new Credit Union Act comes in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution No. 13 was read and passed.) Resolution No. 14 -- The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: You don't want to know it? Obviously members opposite don't want to know what I'm going to say with respect to Agricultural Societies. I just want - the Member for Rhineland says he wants to hear. I just want to indicate very briefly, very briefly, Mr. Chairman, that we are evaluating current policy in this area and - friends opposite say it's about time - I would like to see a substantial upgrading of our agricultural societies program. There is a question of grants involved. It is our intention to negotiate with the Ag Societies Board to try and improve the quality of our rural fairs and so forth and our grants indeed for the following year. This is almost like saying we're giving you a year's notice. The grants may be geared somewhat differently than they presently are to encourage the development of larger and better fairs throughout Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution No. 14 was read and passed.) Resolution No. 15 -- The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Under 15, we note there is a very considerable increase in the net interest cost under the Credit Corporation, I take it. Does this mean that the interest costs are that much higher or that there will be that much more money outstanding? What relation has the interest cost factor, the increase in it here?

MR. USKIW: This is entirely an interest charge, Mr. Chairman. As you know the present rate of interest at which the province is borrowing is much higher than the rate of interest that was with us some years ago when these loans were made and it involves a greater subsidy because of that particular fact. If you notice on Item 3, there's \$240,000, that's the incentive program under the cow-calf program for the breeding stock program, that is the grant of 20 percent of the maximum loan of \$15,000, that's what it's going to cost us this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolutions Nos. 15 and 16 were read and passed.) Resolution No. 17 -- Sorry. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under the ARDA allocation I thought we would have a report in our hands by this time. Could the Minister not give us an outline as to the program as such, what is intended for the coming year and where the monies will go?

MR. USKIW: I can outline very extensively although I don't know that members opposite want me to. The ARDA Annual Report will be completed in about four weeks, Mr. Chairman. Now you'll have the ARDA report in about four weeks, the FRED report in about three weeks, so -- you want to discuss it? Well I'm quite willing, Mr. Chairman, if members opposite are.

The ARDA program as you know is largely completed and we are now in the process of using up the residual funds of that program which will carry us into, I believe it's '72 or '73 I'm not sure, but that there are no new programs entered into that weren't entered into by the

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . previous administration essentially, that everything that is there now was sort of inherited, if you like, by this administration. We really were not involved in the development of new programs under ARDA. If you want the specifics I'll read them to you, Mr. Chairman.

The ARDA projects that we're undertaking this year, Mr. Chairman is \$90,000 in co-operative improvement training - this is the Indian and Metis program, Mr. Chairman, the Community Affairs program and so forth. Rural development co-ordination is discontinued. This project has gone on for several years; this was the Turtle Mountain Resource Council, or - yes, in resource planning. I think we've had some discussion on that particular point. There's \$130,000 here in community affairs, encouraging involvement of people and increase of knowledge of social and economic trends affecting their communities. Of this \$59,000 is to the Metis Federation. There's \$73,000 allocated for forage and erosion control. This is the forage program where the farmer pays the first \$2.00 for his forage seed and the government picks up the balance. Hay and pasture development, Westlake \$85,000 -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Member for Lakeside likes that. Brandon Extension Centre, it's completed; a special input of \$262,000 ARDA funds were used to improve the Extension Centre which was completed last year, Mr. Chairman, so there's no new monies there. Land Utilization Studies and Pilot Research, \$55,000 - these are pilot projects on land adjustment and conservation. I don't have the area here, Mr. Chairman. ARDA co-ordination is \$30,000. This is staff expenses and administration. That's pretty well it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to pursue this a little further. I note there's a reduction in the amount under the Manitoba-Canada ARDA Agreement - there's a reduction from \$781,000 to \$501,000 this year. Now I'm at a loss to understand why the Turtle Mountain project has been knocked out of this program, apparently because of the Manitoba-Canada ARDA Agreement, and as I have mentioned before in the House, Mr. Chairman, in the light of the Conservation legislation that is coming in, I would like some further explanation from the Minister why this project pilot at Turtle Mountain is being, well in the Minister's own words I think is "terminated". Well I would have to go back to Hansard and check this, Mr. Chairman, but I am quite satisfied in my own mind that his statement was that the project had "come to an end". Now I said terminated and the Minister shakes his head and then I said "coming to an end," and he shakes his head the other way - I'm not sure exactly what he means. But I would like some explanation why this particular project now is terminated. In other words of the Minister as far as I am concerned it is terminated in the light of the legislation that is coming in.

MR. USKIW: First all, this is a cost-sharing program between Manitoba and Canada under ARDA and that particular part of it has come to an end. However, we have indicated to the Turtle Mountain group, some time ago, that we are prepared as a government to continue to provide them with the technical advice or information, or personnel, if you like, that we have at our disposal within the Department of Agriculture. What isn't provided for, Mr. Chairman, is the director of the program which they have had on their staff for the last few years, that particular item is not provided for by the Government of Manitoba, but that we are prepared to continue with any technical help that they may require and hope they continue on.

Now when the new Act is passed it will apply to all of Manitoba, so therefore there is no way in which you can separate a certain community and offer them a different program than you are prepared to offer the rest of the province, and that essentially what has been undertaken at Turtle Mountain was a pilot project and that that program has essentially for that purpose come to an end and once the new Act is in force they will then fall within the scope of the new legislation and whatever funds are available for any given area will be available for them.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to hold up these estimates, we might hopefully get through by 5:30, but I'm not quite satisfied with the Minister's answer and I intend to bring it up when the bill comes before the House. What I would like to get out of him now is if the bill then will provide for financial assistance as it has applied in the Turtle Mountain area thus far?

MR. USKIW: The bill that will be introduced will provide for technical and financial support but within the scope of these estimates. Now in other words what we will be doing is redeploying resources from one area to another area that is going to be defined under that particular piece of legislation, but that for the first year it will be a phasing in type of thing and that next year there will be an amount that will be shown under the conservation program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 17 (a) --

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just before we pass the item, I do hope we have a chance

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . .to discuss some of these matters of the ARDA agreement under Mines and Natural Resources when that department comes up, because I note that they have under Resource Projects and Water Control that there is an increase of over \$2 million. I'm sure that this must take up part of this slack here.

MR. USKIW: Again on that point Mr. Chairman, I should have mentioned it, but both FRED and ARDA are now under the jurisdiction of the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet and the departments show the respective estimates for each department as opposed to the old principle under FRED where everything was lumped into the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture answered for all the departments. ARDA remains the same but the FRED program is now under the same set-up as ARDA. You will have an opportunity to debate either of these with the respective ministers that are responsible, so that you will have your opportunity to debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolutions 17 and 18 were read and passed.) That completes the Department.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I take it the disposition of the House is that we call it 5:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could call it a lot of other things, but it is now 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return again at 8 p. m. this evening.