

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 2, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might take a moment at this stage of the proceedings to introduce our distinguished guests. On my right in the loges we have Senator Grant Trenbeath of the State of North Dakota. Accompanying the Senator are State Representatives Oscar Solberg and Don Halerow, representing the North Dakota Assembly. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you all here today.

We also have with us today some rather special guests. I am told that there are divers from many parts of the world including Canada congregating in Winnipeg for the International Invitational Meet at the Pan Am Pool, Winnipeg, Friday and Saturday of this week. We are pleased to recognize representatives of the diving world here today and pay recognition not only to the youth but the outstanding athletes, and a special welcome is extended to Miss Melina Duchkova 1968 Olympic Gold Medallist in the ten metre tower. Miss Duchkova hails from Prague, Czechoslovakia.

We also have with us Mr. Arne Walde of Dusseldorf, Germany, who is a member of the German olympic diving team.

Also with us is Miss Beverley Boys from Pickering, Ontario, champion diver of Canada in 1, 2 and 3 metre competitions, and placed fourth in the 1968 olympics in the tenth metre tower. She received the highest individual diving score of any woman and executed the hardest dive ever made by a woman in the olympics - a triple twisting forward. Representing the Canadian Amateur Diving Association accompanying this group we have President Vaughan Baird, Q. C. of Manitoba. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

And we have some very young guests: 50 students of Grade 11 standing of the Murdoch McKay School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Schroeder and Mr. Grant. This school is located in the constituency of the Leader of the New Democratic Party. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you also here today.

In view of the general agreement yesterday I might take a moment to say thanks to the Clerk and his staff that overnight you have been provided with an up to the minute Orders of the Day in order that the proceedings may proceed unhampered.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services, that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 50, The Fisheries Act, and that the same be now received and read a first time. Mr. Speaker, I can advise you that His Honour recommends this proposed bill to the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House the Report of the Commission on the Targets for Economic Development 1980, sometimes referred to as the TED Commission. I understand that the Clerk has the copies and copies will be delivered to all members of the House.

And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might have the indulgence of the House to make a very brief statement concerning this report. The members of the TED Commission called on the Premier and myself this morning and formally presented this report which has been in the course of preparation for 18 months. It's a very large report and undoubtedly members will require time to study it. The government at this time is not in a position to indicate what courses of action may be proposed on the basis of this report. Even the most cursory examination indicates the report obviously presents challenges and targets that are most significant and

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd.).... exciting in our province's history. Certainly no sector of the community can afford not to study the report with great care.

I believe the objectives and the real values of the Commission can best be summarized by two brief statements from the report itself, and I quote: "The targets set out by the Commission are meant to be challenging but realistic. They are related to projections for the economy of Manitoba and of Canada. These projections are extrapolations or reasonable modification of recent trends. They suggest what might be expected given the continuation of current conditions and policies. The targets for the economic performance of the province are set substantially above the projection but at levels towards which the province may realistically strive. A key policy of the Commission has been to set targets not as mere extrapolations or present trends, rather the targets represent ambitious goals for provincial development. They call for Manitoba reaching or surpassing its sister provinces and vastly improving its relative economic position in Canada." The most outstanding value, I believe of this report, is the contribution made by Manitobans. In this regard the work of this Commission is unique. It might be described as planning by confrontation. Almost 400 leading citizens participated as members of the Commission itself, the advisory committees or as advisors and consultants. Business firms, citizen associations, government agencies at the municipal, provincial and federal levels also co-operated.

As you study the report you will find it is not only a study of Manitoba but a study of all Canada from a Manitoba perspective. In defining the challenges of the '70's the report looks closely and critically at the world outside Manitoba as well. The report also builds upon the COMEF report, the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future report, offering recommendations to sustain the momentum gained from the earlier study. However, the real reason for asking permission at this time to make my few comments is to pay tribute to the almost 400 Manitobans that I've referred to - the business, labour, agricultural and professional and academic people who served on the committees or acted as advisors to the Commission. This has been I suggest, a remarkable co-operative effort by Manitobans and I think it would be only right at this time for me to pay tribute to first, the amount of time and sacrifice that has been put into this report and second, to note the spirit of co-operation that existed between all sectors of the community in the preparation of this report. I believe that this should be a matter of great satisfaction to all the members of the Legislature, because as long as Manitobans are prepared to work together for the good of the province, I have nothing but confidence in the future of Manitoba. And if I may at this time, I would like to refer specifically to the people who served as commission members and to those who served as the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. I think thanks are due to the energetic and capable Chairman of the Targets of Economic Development Commission, Mr. Rex Grose who is Chairman and General Manager of the Manitoba Development Fund.

The Commission members consisted of Mr. Julius Berkowitz, President of Monarch Wear of Canada Limited; Mr. A. T. Chapman, President of the West Man Regional Development Corporation of Brandon; Mr. George Chapman, who was at that time President of the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce of Winnipeg; Mr. Art Coulter, Executive Secretary of the Manitoba Federation of Labour; Mr. Roland Couture, Manager of Radio Station CKSB of the City of St. Boniface; Professor H. E. Duckworth, Vice-President of the University of Manitoba; Mr. W. A. Farnell, Vice-President Anthes Western Limited; Mr. A. A. Franklin, President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, Winnipeg; Mr. Donovan N. Knight, an Investment Counsel of Winnipeg; Mr. John R. Knight of Thompson, Manitoba; Mayor A. C. Montgomery of the Town of Selkirk; Professor John D. Mundie, Director of the School of Commerce at the University of Manitoba; Mr. Morris Neaman, President of Neaman Fur of Winnipeg; Mr. W. C. Vick, Manager of Canadian Canners Limited of Morden and the Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Lorne Dyke, who is the Deputy Minister, Department of Industry and Commerce.

On the Advisory Committees the following served in the position as Chairman: For policies for development Mr. I. H. Asper of Asper and Company; Agriculture, Mr. Ralph Hedlin, President of Hedlin Menzies & Associates; Construction, Mr. G. A. Libling, Partner, Libling Michener & Associates; Rural Development, Mr. H. A. Luckhurst, Principal, Western Business Services, Winnipeg; Primary Industries, Mr. Winston Mair, Deputy Minister of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources; Manpower, Mr. Barry D. McDougall, Partner, P. S. Ross and Partners of Winnipeg; Tourist Development, Mr. Fred McGuinness, Vice-President the Brandon Sun of Brandon; Commercial Development, Mr. J. S. Merrett, Executive

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd.).... Vice-President, Hedlin Menzies & Associates; Urban Development, Mr. M. P. Michener, Partner, Libling Michener & Associates; Trade Development, Mr. Paul Moore, President The Paul Moore Company Limited, Winnipeg; Taxation, Mr. W. C. Newman, Q.C., Newman, MacLean & Associates; Secondary Industries, Mr. C. S. Riley, President Dominion Tanners Limited, Winnipeg; and Capital, Mr. D. M. Rogers, Assistant General Manager of the Manitoba Development Fund.

On April 16th, Mr. Speaker, a testimonial dinner will be given to all those who participated, including the members of the Commission, the Advisory Committee and those who made their presentations. The guest speaker on that occasion will be Mr. Michael Barkway, publisher and editor of the Financial Times of Canada. An invitation has been extended to all members of the Legislature to attend. May I again thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the courtesy in allowing me to say these few words of tribute to those who have contributed so significantly to the progress of Manitoba.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Minister for his statement and for the copies of the report which we are now receiving. I want to join with him, and I'm sure that in this regard there's no disagreement anywhere in Manitoba in our thanks to those he mentioned particularly who were the leaders in the TED Commission, as well as all of those who worked with these people in preparing this report. I don't think there's any question that the future of Manitoba is not going to be solved by government alone. It has to be done by a combination of government and the people in our province. I think that the way in which this was done, the approach to the Commission and its study is the proper approach insofar as Manitoba is concerned. There may be disagreements as to how we proceed to develop the province, but there is no disagreement as to the need for development in Manitoba.

Now, I would hope, Mr. Speaker - and obviously I have not had a chance to study what the report contains, I will do so with great interest - I would hope that the government will be prepared to take action soon in the areas recommended by the Commission. I think in the past we've too frequently had the case of government reports being received and gathering dust on shelves, and if it's going to be useful we must now proceed, from a government standpoint, to do the things that the citizens' committee is recommending to us. It would be a great loss to Manitoba if after all the effort they have put into it, government did then not proceed and fulfill its part which is now the action which issues from this report.

So, I will reserve further comments, Mr. Speaker, until I have had an opportunity to study the actual recommendations but I want to share with the Minister in the congratulations and thanks to all the people who worked on preparing this report.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to ask some specific question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister. Is it correct that copies of this report were given to the two daily newspapers in Winnipeg approximately, more or less a week ago and issued to them at that time?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm informed by the Chairman of the Commission that this is correct. They were given copies with the understanding that it was not to be released until it was tabled in the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Was the report made available as well to the radio and television media, as well as the newspapers?

MR. SPIVAK: I understand from the Commission that this was not made available to them.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I then rise to object to the obvious discrimination there, in that two areas of media are not treated fairly; but much more, Mr. Speaker, to object to the fact that this report was given outside of this House before being tabled in this House. If this report was ready a week ago to be given to the newspapers, then surely it was ready a week ago to be given to the members of this House. And I see no reason whatever, Mr. Speaker, for this course of action by the government. I see no reason whatever why a report of this importance to the people of Manitoba should be given to people outside of this House before it's tabled in this House. That type of action by this government is contrary to the spirit of our democratic process, and entirely contrary to the methods of operating this House, Mr. Speaker. This government is responsible here, not to the publicity media.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I also participate in the recognition of the amount of work that has been put into this report by so many people in Manitoba, of whom I trust there were sufficient knowledgeable people to be able to make a meaningful contribution. We have dealt with a very extensive report that was previously filed by the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future. I'm not sure to what extent members of this House and people interested studied that report to a great extent, but I would hope that this report will be carefully studied and evaluated - not only from the standpoint of targets for economic development but also from the standpoint of how these targets will bring about social development, which is of course the real purpose for which we are charged to work. The economic development must be a tool used by society in order to bring about social development. I think that we should understand that we must all study this carefully and deal with it and not say we have another report to put on another shelf beside other reports which may or may not be referred to from time to time. I would think that it would be necessary for all of us to review it.

I share the criticism already expressed of the fact that the report was given for pre-digestion to some other media. It seems to me that a proper way to evaluate a report is to do it by people in the House to whom report has been made, and not by the press to have that opportunity, which was apparently given to them for a week to study it, in order, I presume, to have a voluminous newspaper account today or tomorrow on the contents of this. I think that it is important that the House should have had it and as I say, I share the criticism. But regardless of that we should recognize that there must be a considerable amount of great value in this volume that we have before us and we must look at it in the terms of the objectives in the report, related of course to the COMEF Report and bearing in mind our concern that the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future having been wound up and having become an arm of government rather than the independent objective committee that it was, we must now look at this report from the standpoint of its objectivity, its value and certainly to carry out its intent in the best way possible again in the interests of the social development of the people along with economic progress, which is as I say, incidental thereto.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to congratulate the people that worked on this committee and bringing in this report. I hope that the report will be beneficial and fruitful and that we will have results coming from this report.

However, Mr. Speaker, I feel that in any ventures that are and will be contemplated in the years to come have to deal naturally with finances and I feel that this is one area that is very important and that this government certainly has lagged and has not done its duty to get lower interest rates for the people of this province. I note from the report on Page 325 that in 1980 alone \$2 billion will be required, one billion for inventory, another billion dollars for fixed capital investment, and the rates of interest have gone up. Surely enough if all this capital is going to be required we should do our part in trying to get the interest rate lowered because this I feel is one of the secrets in having this matter being a success and that this one area that definitely we should look into and work on to get the interest rates lowered.

Mention is made too of the interest ceilings being removed on banks and as a result we have these high interest costs. Mr. Chairman, I feel that we have to make representation to the Federal Government to have a reimposition of ceiling on interest rates. Surely we can't go on and proceed from this and having increased interest rates coming along every so often, because this is not going to give us additional industry, this will not give us prosperity; in fact the effect is the reverse and unless we do something about this I think all these reports will come to naught if we do not take an interest and do something about this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to clear up an inadvertent misleading statement that was made to the House by the Member for Churchill and with which I associated myself. The Member for Churchill at committee, in discussing the effect of the amendment to the Medicare Bill that was approved, indicated that to the International Nickel Company alone it would mean roughly \$240,000.00. He was basing his remarks on the fact that a \$200.00 medical premium would be reduced to \$120.00. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Churchill is not here at the moment. He wanted this matter cleared up at the earliest possible time and asked me to speak on his behalf.

(MR. GREEN Cont'd.)

The medical care premiums at Inco are far less than \$200.00 so the effect will not be as he has stated. It doesn't reduce the argument for other companies but would not have the effect stated at that company. I just wanted to clear that up.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, on a point of privilege, I'd now like to just refer to a statement that was made with respect to myself in the Winnipeg Free Press yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: There are other members that have caught my eye, but however the honourable gentleman may proceed if he...

MR. GREEN: A very short point, Mr. Speaker. The Winnipeg Free Press indicated that Mr. J. M. Froese told the House his constituents don't support the principle of Medicare; Sidney Green, NDP Inkster, was the only other member to endorse a motion by Mr. Froese that Bill 33 be scrapped. Mr. Speaker, I think that this must be an error on the part of the newspaper. The Honourable Member for Lakeside joshingly suggested that I had seconded Mr. Froese's amendment and perhaps this is how the misunderstanding arose. There was no recorded vote and therefore in all fairness I would like to advise the Speaker, to clear up any misunderstanding, I voted for the Bill. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, my vanity has been rather pierced. I would think that if I had voted against Medicare that there should have been a headline to that effect.

MR. SPEAKER: isn't debating this matter. Here it comes. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. GREEN: I just want it recorded that I voted in favour of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I do hope next time I ask for a vot that they will support me in having it recorded so that these things wouldn't happen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I thought I'd like to inform the House that I propose to bring down the budget a week from tomorrow night, Thursday the 10th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C.(Selkirk): Would the Honourable Minister of Finance grant a request? I understand that you have just recently delivered a speech to the Faculty of Commerce at the University of Manitoba; I believe it was delivered on Tuesday of this week. Would it be possible to furnish the members of the House with a copy of the speech that you made on that occasion?

MR. EVANS: Well, I accept my honourable friend's compliment with pleasure and will do my best to distribute copies as soon as I can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk's supplementary?

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wish to make an announcement, Mr. Speaker, of great public importance. Neither the Member for St. Boniface or I are candidates for the leadership of the Manitoba Liberal Party.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, a question of privilege. I'm not ready to accept that; I've never named my honourable friend as my agent. I'm still thinking about it very seriously.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER JORGENSON (Morris): I wonder if the Minister of Health and Social Service could bring the House up to date as to how many candidates have opted out of the Liberal leadership race to date.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe we might get on with the business of the House. The Honourable Member for Burrows, please.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour, and the unfortunate accident, or two accidents at Portage la Prairie prompts me to do so. What protective regulations are there governing workmen descending below ground level insofar as insuring the proper supply of oxygen for them? In other words, are there any regulations making it mandatory that they wear oxygen masks and the supply of oxygen and that sort of thing or not?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, in order to get the detail I'll have to take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture would undertake to provide the members of the Legislature copies of all the position papers that were presented at the recent Farm Congress in Ottawa.

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur): I think I'd be prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker. That is the position papers of the Task Force you're referring to? I think I could.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to inform the Members of the House of the most recent publication of the Department of Tourism and Recreation. It's a publication devoted entirely to fishing in the Province of Manitoba and I would hope it might stimulate the imagination of all the red blooded fishermen we have in this House. I would like to advise them our northern lakes will soon be open and ready for fishing. This, I think, is by way of a prestige publication. It shows some of our 115,000 lakes in the Province of Manitoba....

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Honourable the Minister is not making a selling job?

MR. CARROLL: No, no. This is a factual report, Mr. Speaker, on the....

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There are honourable members that have caught my eye that are anxious to take the floor.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, with respect, I believe the Honourable Minister is making a statement to the House about a new government publication.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Attorney-General for his comments but I have my opinion too. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. If the City of Brandon or the Town of Flin Flon requested you to bring in legislation so that they may handle their own transit fares, would you be prepared to do this?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Osborne): Sure, Mr. Speaker, being a hypothetical question, but I could tell my honourable friend that it would be given serious consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct another question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Does he know whether his department has completed the investigation into the fire at the construction site of The Pas bridge over the Saskatchewan River? I believe that some time ago he did announce that his inspectors are investigating it. Does he know whether they've completed and reported to his department thereon?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the inspection was completed, yes. I have not got the final report from them but it was completed.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A further question, Mr. Speaker. From the newspaper reports regarding it, one got the impression that the plastic used for the enclosure was very highly inflammable. Would the Honourable Minister, if that should be so, would he undertake to relay that information to the Department of Consumer Affairs with a view to regulating the sale and the use of that type of material?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the plastic or the material that was used was not a highly inflammable material.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a supplementary question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I understood him to say in response to the question posed by my honourable colleague, the Member for Brokenhead, that he would be willing to make available to the members of this Assembly, position papers as prepared by the Task Force. I was just wondering whether the Honourable Minister would also be willing to favour the members of this Legislature with a position paper taken by the Minister himself at that Canadian Congress.

MR. WATT: We didn't present a position paper at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, referring back to the question I asked some time ago. Is the

(MR. BARKMAN Cont'd.)... Minister now ready to assure the people of southeastern and southern Manitoba that the veterinarian lab facilities will remain in Winnipeg?

MR. WATT: I'm prepared to assure the people of Manitoba that there will be a new vet service lab built.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture would undertake to tell us just what part his department or himself played at the recent Congress?

MR. WATT: I was Chairman of the meeting on Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. In view of the TED Commission Report stating that the wages in Manitoba are rising much below the national average, and the per capita income is the lowest next to the Maritime provinces, will the Minister be requesting a Minimum Wage Board to submit a report this session?

MR. WITNEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to answer a question that was directed to me in my absence some days ago in regard to over deliveries for the purpose of purchasing seed grain. I understand that the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Seed Growers have passed a resolution in which they are asking for rather an over delivery of 600 bushels of wheat, they are asking for over deliveries to the total of \$1,000 in value of grain. Now this resolution has not been submitted to my office. I understand that Saskatchewan seed growers and also Alberta are following similar resolutions but when I receive such resolution I'd be quite prepared to support it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. The House has been in session now almost five weeks. When does the Minister expect to come forward with two pieces of legislation, in particular the Redistribution Bill and the Bill on South Indian Lake? I bring this up because I would not want that we end up in the position as we did on the Medicare Bill where there seems to be pressure because of deadlines.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I don't anticipate any pressure as a result of deadlines on them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I addressed a question to the government yesterday in connection with the Management Committee. The First Minister was not in and I was asked to refer the question to the First Minister. Will we be getting reports from the Management Committee as a House?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, the committees of Cabinet report to Cabinet and Cabinet itself through its various aspects report to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. This might be a good opportunity just to take a moment, and my remarks are directed to all sides of the House. It's my understanding that this particular period is traditionally the question period and preciseness should be the byword. I wonder if I couldn't call upon the honourable members in the future to keep their question precise, possibly the answers precise and the other matters that they wish to apparently debate be debated at the proper time on other occasions where they might fit in. It would make my job a little easier and certainly I think the business of the House would proceed just that much faster.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, THAT an Humble Address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and/or any of the Crown agencies of the corporations and the San Antonio Gold Mines Ltd. in respect to monies owing to any provincial agencies or Crown corporations by San Antonio Gold Mines Ltd.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, I didn't get the seconder.

MR. JOHNSTON: The Member for Hamiota.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if members of the House will recall, I believe it was back in 1963 that San Antonio Mines found themselves in extreme financial difficulties and appealed to the Government of Manitoba for financial aid. If my memory serves me I believe the First Minister, the Honourable Mr. Roblin at that time, had a bill sponsored offering substantial financial aid to this gold mine, and after a great deal of debate and committee hearings I believe the bill was passed through the House with only one member voting against the bill. So I believe, Mr. Speaker, because of that action there is a moral responsibility by the Government of Manitoba to watch closely the financial affairs and the financial standing of San Antonio Mines. When about a year ago it became public information that San Antonio Mines were in financial difficulties and they owed a long list of creditors nearly a million dollars, and when it became evident in the estimates of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that among these creditors were many agencies and Crown corporations of the Province of Manitoba, I thought it would be good business for this House to examine all the documents between the Crown corporations and the government to see where the responsibility truly lies and whether or not the matter should be allowed to have gone on so far that many firms, many individuals and certainly the taxpayers of Manitoba lost a great deal of money in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: We're prepared to accept this Order if my honourable friend could give us some help however in timing. Otherwise we would have to go back to the beginning of San Antonio operations in the 1920's. Does he mean from 1966-67-68?

MR. JOHNSTON: I would think that it would be reasonable to go back to the time that the loan was granted.

MR. LYON: Say from the date that the Bill was assented to granting the loan to San Antonio Gold Mine? I think that would give us sufficient information to go on. Otherwise, subject to any of the usual restrictions that apply, we have no objection to accepting the Order.

MR. JOHNSTON: That suggestion is agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Welfare.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, in accepting this Order for Return I can accept it on the basis within our ability to get all the information if that's acceptable to the honourable members. For instance the Clean Environment Commission in the past year have spent a great deal of their time on regulations. There's certain permits under 11 here that may not be available at the moment. So within the availability of the information and any explanation I can give of it, I'll be happy to do so. No. 12, of course, will have to be obtained from the Department of Mines and Resources if possible. So within those limitations we'll do our best to comply with this Order.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before you call the question on the Order. I was somewhat concerned the other day by statements which apparently came from the previous Minister of Health and the now Minister of Labour that at The Pas, Churchill Forest Industries were apparently going to be allowed to proceed and dump raw sewage into the river, and coming from a previous Minister of Health I wondered what investigations actually had been made by the government to see to it that there was in fact not going to be any harm done. I saw no indication that this has been checked out by departmental people and that there was in fact a thorough survey to see what the impact of the sewage was going to be. It seems to me that too often in the past we have simply gone on the assumption that we were fortunate in having a lot of land, a lot of wasteland, a lot of water and we didn't really need to conserve it as carefully as we might. This is changing very rapidly. We can't afford practices that in the past were permitted, and I would like to have the assurance from the present Minister of Health that his department has in fact checked very carefully as to what pollution is going to be put into the river at The Pas and that we have an assurance from departmental people that they recommend what is being done and that there will be no detrimental effects to the area there. Now it may have been done. I've seen no indication so far that this has been a departmental recommendation. So I'd like to have that assurance from the Minister, if it has not been done, that before any further steps are taken that the department responsible for the pollution matters have a complete investigation.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I should make a comment or two on the

(MR. WITNEY Cont'd.).... Order at this time. I was the Minister of Health at the time, or just came in as the Minister of Health at the time that this figure of 50,000 b. o. d. 's per day was put into the Churchill Agreement and I was given the assurance from the section of Environmental Sanitation which had on it public health engineers that even at the lower flows of the river and with the speed of the river or the rate of flow of the river that the loading that was permitted in the agreement "not more than 50,000 b. o. d. per day" would not cause any undue harm downstream from the plant. We had in particular in mind the question of the commercial fishing interests which were further downstream. There is some muskrat downstream as well, some fur and some ducks, but I was given that assurance at the time on the basis of engineers who had the qualifications of public health engineers and supported by the Department of Environmental Sanitation.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his statement. I wonder if I might ask him a question. Would he make available to the House the report of the engineers in this regard?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have no report - in answer to the question, I have no report. In discussion with them I have this assurance and I presume -- well they will have measured it because they knew the flows, they knew the rate flow and they knew the amount of water that was going by at the different seasons of the year.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, didn't the Minister say though that they had conducted a study on this and if so could he make copies of the study available, if not to all members of the House, to those who would want a copy.

MR. LYON: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend realizes full well that it may be an inter-departmental matter which is of course not tableable under any circumstances.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, your advisor again is interjecting. Surely if the department....

MR. LYON: Is my honourable friend speaking again Mr. Speaker? I thought he had spoken once on the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: My honourable friend raised a point of order and I'm speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. If he doesn't like points of order then he oughtn't raise them. So on the point of order, surely if the Minister is willing to give the information there is no law that says it's privileged because it happens to be between one civil servant in the department and another civil servant in the same department, or two civil servants....

MR. LYON: There is such a law unfortunately for my honourable friend and he knows it.

MR. MOLGAT: If the Minister wants to make the information available he can. He's just hiding behind this business of privilege, Mr. Speaker. That's all. All he's got to do is to agree to make the information available and it can be made available. So my question to the Minister responsible, not to the gentleman who would like to run the whole operation of the House, but the Minister responsible: Are you willing to make that information available?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, not knowing just what this information is, I'll try and look into the matter. I would say to the Leader of the Opposition I spoke to the Chairman of the Clean Environment Commission concerning permits. He said no permit has been issued in this case at this date, that they're still studying the agreement and their regulations pertaining thereto, and came up in connection with this Order for Return that I asked him this specific question, and no doubt they will be making their recommendation to us on the basis of their present study.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by my colourful deskmate, the Member for St. Boniface....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I inadvertently overlooked a very important matter. Apparently I should have called for the vote on the amendment. Is that what the Honourable Member for Rhineland had in mind?

MR. FROESE: That's right.

MR. SPEAKER: We're going to deal with it now. I'm calling for the question on the amendment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: We are now dealing with the main motion as amended.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Gladstone. I'm sorry he was disturbed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by my colourful friend the Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, you will probably recall, or will know, that this is an exact duplicate, I believe, of an Order for Return that I put in two years ago and the situation in respect to the number of dentists and doctors in Manitoba at that time, that is two years ago, was, to put it mildly, very critical particularly in the rural areas, and what I frankly want to know is has it improved any in the last two years. Mr. Speaker, as bad as it was, with the advent of Medicare we certainly want to do everything that we possibly can to encourage more students to enroll, more students to graduate and more students to remain in Manitoba to practice once they have graduated.

Now the Order for Return, two years ago, showed that for the years 1964, 65 and 66, there were 17 dental students graduated in 1964, 30 in 1965, 25 in 1966 and medical students for the same years, 52, 50 and 62. The next question, the number of the above who remained in Manitoba after graduation: 12, 19 and 15 for the dentists; 31, 31 and 24 for the doctors. So do you know actually what happened? About 50 percent in each case, more in some, more in some cases, upon graduation moved out of Manitoba to practice. Well that's a serious situation.

Now in going through some information in our Legislative Library yesterday I came across what is called "Community Reports" issued by the Department of Industry and Commerce for the year 1968 and it has -- well it's a book that's about an inch and a half thick containing a lot of data on all of the towns and communities in the Province of Manitoba - good information. I thought I would quickly run through it and see what centres didn't have a dentist at all. And here is what I learned: No dentist at Birtle, Carberry, Emerson, Gilbert Plains have one I think on part time now -- (Interjection) -- None at Gilbert Plains he tells me. Well I'm right so far. None at Gillam. Gimli, two on part time; none at Lac du Bonnet; Lynn Lake, one part time; Manitou, none; Neepawa, we've got one. There was a time when we had three, we've only got one. -- (Interjection) -- I've got that down here, I'm not finished. Pilot Mound, none at Pilot Mound; Powerview, Riverton, Roblin, Ste. Anne, St. Pierre, Ste. Rose, Shoal Lake, Snow Lake, Teulon, Winkler, Winnipegosis. No dentist at any one of these places at all. -- (Interjection) -- Any denturists my friend says? Yes, there is a denturist at Dauphin, I believe, one at Portage la Prairie and we don't know the number in Winnipeg yet. -- (Interjection) -- But if the denturists are flourishing to a greater extent than the dentists would like them to flourish, certainly one of the reasons is that there are not enough dentists to go around. That's one reason.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall, I've told this story a couple of times, but just for the benefit of the new members, and we have a few -- (Interjection) -- there are only four? That's on the last several votes that were taken in this House. Back to this, okay. We only needed four votes and we'd have won, that's what I was going to say. Now listen, Mr. Speaker, back about 1964, and that's five years ago now, the Department of Industry and Commerce made a survey

(MR. SHOEMAKER Cont'd.)... of 12 of the towns in Manitoba wondering why they were going downhill instead of uphill, and it was called as my honourable friend and colleague, the Member for Lakeside said, "Twelve Manitoba Towns Under Microscope." That sounds like language from my honourable friend the Minister of Finance and I think it is. But anyway the purpose of this whole survey, the purpose of having these 12 towns under microscope was to find out what could be done to encourage growth in these areas. That's the purpose of it. And they issued 12 surveys or summaries, and I only have the one for Neepawa here, but they all said practically the same thing. They asked the question, they asked the question of - in the case of Neepawa - of some 1,400 people: If you are not doing your shopping in Neepawa now, why not? Why not, and put down the reasons. They give various reasons, about a dozen different reasons, but at the head of the list, 68 percent of the people asked said "because we have not got enough dentists." And the next one in line, 58 percent of them said, "we don't do all our shopping in Neepawa because we have to go elsewhere to see a doctor." That's what they said. So, what they were saying and what the Department of Industry and Commerce was saying to the people in Neepawa, you just get yourselves some dentists and doctors and immediately business will start booming in your area. They said that about Neepawa, they said it about 11 other areas in the province. Well, what have we done? What have we done to encourage dentists and doctors to go out to the rural areas? I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there is not an adequate supply in Metropolitan Winnipeg. I think statistics show that something like 80 percent of the doctors and dentists are in the city now, and there's only 50 percent of the population, so therefore we in the rural areas as you know are the ones that are losing out.

Now, this famous report on TED that we just had laid on our desks, and I just finished reading it. And on page 434 - I've taken one of these fast reading courses you know, Mr. Speaker - but on page 434, I'm going to quote. I suppose my honourable friend the Minister of Health has reread this several times: "There have been frequent complaints about a lack of government machinery to deal with development problems except through the slow process of local lobbying or endless letter writing. Some people believe that all decision making and concern for development have been concentrated in the metropolitan areas. In some cases municipal and town boundaries are seen as a restriction on attracting industry. Concern is expressed regarding housing, education and service industries. There appears to be a pressing need to attract medical doctors and dentists and other professional people to rural communities", and so on. And I hope that my honourable friend will pay more than a passing or more than lip service to the targets that are set out here. I'm saying it, the TED Commission is saying it, and I know, Mr. Speaker, that the other day the Minister of Health in reply to a question that I put to him asking - you will recall yesterday on the Orders of the Day I asked my honourable friend the Minister of Health, what was all this new plan about that he announced in the House the other day to encourage doctors and dentists to go out to the rural areas. I haven't been able to find that in Hansard yet, but I see in today's paper on the front page a heading: "Plan to lure MD's to country okay'd." I guess they mean okay'd by the Legislature. Well, I don't recall that that in particular was okay'd, but I say it is okay if he gets around to doing it, because that's what we need. So it is quite evident that the Minister of Health has at long last recognized the great need to do something to lure them to send doctors to the rural area and is now about to set out on a program to do something about it.

Now that is about all that I want to say on this particular subject matter. I just wanted to inform the House that with the advent of Medicare we better be doing more than we have done in the past to encourage more dentists and doctors, not only to enroll, to graduate, but to stay in the province once they have graduated.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the Honourable Member for Gladstone. I gather that there's certain questions that he would like to get information on and I agree with him that it would be of interest. In reading the questions that he is asking and for which he wants detailed replies, it occurred to me that there's an additional bit of information that will be helpful to us this session, in view of the announced decision of the Honourable Member for St. James to bring the question of the legalization of denturists to the House this session.

In the recommendations, well in the report itself of the special committee appointed to study the provision of dental services, and which made its report in January 1966, there were

(MR. CHERNIACK Cont'd.).... a number of recommendations, the first one of which extensively dealt with certain programs that could be introduced into the Faculty of Dentistry to assist in dealing with the problem of the conflict between dental technicians and denturists and the fact that, as referred to by the previous speaker, there has been an illegal practising of dentistry going on for some time in this province. In amongst the recommendations was the proposal that took into account the offer of the Faculty of Dentistry to begin training of further dental auxiliaries, and the establishment of a new and expanded curriculum in dental hygiene which would include instruction in various additional areas, and to cover all duties currently assigned to the dental hygienist in Manitoba, which involves cleaning and polishing of teeth and instruction on all hygiene, x-rays, taking of impressions and determining and recording relationship of one jaw to another, and repairing minor cracks in artificial dentures. In addition to that it was proposed that studies would be made of all duties in the area of complete denture processes, excluding diagnosis, treatment planning and mouth preparation and overall responsibility to the patient for the service. And there would be certain additional duties taught relating to the placing of filling material in teeth, and that there should be an adequate training program for dental technicians which would be developed, and the Committee was recommending that this be done by the Faculty of Dentistry in consultation with the Society of Dental Technicians.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me once we're getting the information about the graduates of the Medical and Dental School, it would be well to have a report on what has transpired in the field of the Faculty of Dentistry relating to the recommendations that were made by the Committee, but which of course were never discussed in this House because the report was never moved in the House for consideration. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, in order to bring that about I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that the resolution be amended by adding thereto the following: "(8) what changes in curriculum or program of the Faculty of Dentistry has taken place since 1964 that would reflect the purport of recommendation 1 of the final report of the special committee on provision of dental services dated January 1966."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: I apologize for my handwriting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: This is an amendment, so I guess this does entitle me to say a couple of words more, doesn't it?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman has the privilege of speaking to the amendment, but having spoken this will be the last time.

MR. SHOEMAKER: That's the one I want to speak on. Now, the dental services committee report that my honourable friend refers to is the one that both he and I, I think, were members of. --(Interjection)-- We wrote it he says. But we never got it. --(Interjection)-- We got it? It did not receive - it was not implemented nor was it concurred in, that's the word I'm looking for, Mr. Speaker. The motion that the House do now concur in the dental services committee report was never moved in this House, as I recall it. --(Interjection)-- Well, then not having moved it, has it any value at all? Or could I move that it now be tabled and concurred in? And another question. I don't know whether I should direct this question to - the House Leader I guess. Did all members of the House get a copy of the report or just the members of the Committee? --(Interjection)-- All members of the House got one, did they?

MR. LYON: The report was tabled in the House and so it becomes the property of the House. I don't know who got copies of it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, my honourable friend the House Leader says that it was tabled but the motion that the House concur in the report was never voted on. Never moved or voted on. --(Interjection)-- Yes, well then what is the value of it? What's the value of it other than to collect dust like so many other reports do? It's a lot easier cleaning shelves off that haven't got books on than ones that have, because somebody has to take them all out once in a while and dust them off. But this is my concern. I don't object to my honourable friend moving the amendment; I would like to see what the answer is. If they refuse to give an answer on that one why get up now and say so.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly endorse the Order for Return and the questions that are asked, because I think this information would definitely be valuable. We have, as pointed out by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, many communities in Manitoba that do

(MR. FROESE Cont'd.)... not have dental services because of the shortage of dentists and any encouragement that can be given I'm sure would be very welcome. And, too, whether our facilities are ample, and whether we are giving the necessary encouragement along this line of getting the number of people to go in for this type of training, I'm not sure. As mentioned by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, I too am one who never received a copy of that report. Maybe it was tabled and that the staff took it off the desk, that I wasn't in the House that particular day, I couldn't say, but I have to date never received the report and if there are reports available that the department could supply us with one, I would certainly appreciate it.

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

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I never realized the Member for Gladstone thought his member on his left was not colourful. But I may say that this whole matter is one which I will have to accept with reservations as to the availability of information. As members know this amendment especially deals with the program of the university not under the control of this department, it's an academic atmosphere there of training of dentists, but within the availability of this information we'll do our best to answer the questions.

One question for example here: how many have graduated in the last three years still remain in Manitoba? That may be very difficult to put a tracer on all these people but we'll do our best. Within these limitations we'll - those qualifications rather - we'll do our best to answer these questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The main motion as amended. Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information regarding the Manitoba Centennial Corporation:

1. The names of all persons employed at April 1, 1967.
2. The names of all persons employed at March 31, 1968.
3. The names of all persons now employed.
4. The amount paid out in (a) salary (b) expenses to each person in the above three questions in each of the fiscal years 1966-67 and 1967-68.
5. Which of the above persons are supplied with a car at Manitoba Government or Centennial Corporation expense.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Wellington, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) The name of the firm awarded the Contract on Tender 5-1640.
- (2) The tendered price submitted by this firm.
- (3) The tendered prices submitted by all other firms.
- (4) Was the equipment purchased as originally specified in the Invitation to Tender or was equivalent equipment substituted.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in speaking to this Order for Return is to bring to the attention of the House the policy which this government has been pursuing for I believe the last 30 years in regard to its tendering and purchasing practices followed by the Purchasing Bureau. Other jurisdictions, the Federal Government, other provinces, have updated their practices in the light of business practices today but apparently Manitoba is content to go along with a policy or a system which is archaic and which I feel does not give the best return for the dollars spent in Manitoba.

It is accepted practice today that where a firm is asked to tender on materials or equipment, they be invited to tender on certain specifications, they then tender by a given date, and in other jurisdictions if they fail to receive the contract they have the privilege of phoning or writing to the government and finding out what the price of the winning tender was. In other words, they have an idea of how close they were, whether they're in line at all, whether they were within five cents or \$500.00 of the firm that was awarded the contract. I can get this

(MR. MILLER Cont'd.).... information through a simple Order for Return. The government will make it public in this House through Hansard by issuing this information. But I don't think that's sufficient. I think that if business is to be encouraged to tender on government contracts then I think business should be in a position to know where it stands in relation to the tenders it sends in. It isn't enough to simply be told, "You were not the highest" or "You were not given the contract."

I'm not suggesting that the government isn't picking or isn't choosing the lowest tenderer, they probably do; and where they don't, they probably have good reason not to accept the lowest tender. But I am suggesting that it discourages people and firms from tendering if they have no idea after they send in their tender how close they were, as I say, or whether there was any chance at all of them ever getting close to winning a tender. It's also very common where equipment is specified that the government's tendering system accepts the equivalent. Now this is a common practice, the federal government does it all the time, but there's a great difference between an equivalent and the piece of equipment as is sometimes specified in the tender itself. A firm could be winning the contract by submitting quotations on equivalents which the competing companies are not even aware of, and they can only become aware when they recognize or when they're told that the price of the winning contractor was "X-plus" dollars. Then and only then can they relate that price to the product which they were quoting on.

And I can tell you from personal experience, having done business with the federal government, through its tendering practices that I never had any problem in this regard at all. I would tender for various products; I could phone within two weeks; I would get the information and I could know from the award made whether it was an equivalent or whether it was a product as specified. I could judge my future tenders accordingly and my future quotations accordingly, and I did, and the net result was that the government benefits because the government then gets many more people tendering. It encourages firms to enter into the field; it encourages competition and it avoids the possibility of the same firm going through the motions year after year getting the contract almost automatically.

Now I think it's the government's desire, I'm sure it's the government's desire, that they encourage as many firms as possible to tender and to get the best possible price. I know that the government position has been that there is a Comptroller-General and surely he looks after accounts and he would make sure that things were proper. But the Comptroller-General does not really enter into that aspect of it at all; the Comptroller-General simply sees to it that the amount set out in the contract is the amount that the government shall pay, that they should not overpay more than that stated, and that the money that they do pay out is not in excess of any given bill. The Comptroller-General does not concern himself with the specifications; he does not concern himself with an analysis of equivalent materials, whether it's valid or not. In other words, it's nothing like the work done by the Auditor-General in Ottawa. And I'm not critical of the Comptroller-General, he has his function; he has to limit himself to those areas and he therefore really is not the man who we can look to to study these matters and to see that we get the kind of tendering practices that I think Manitoba needs. I would suggest that Manitoba open up its tendering system, open it up so that justice is not only done, it's seen to be done, that those firms who tendered are told, if they request the information, who won the tender, to whom the contract was awarded and the price at which the contract was awarded. I'm convinced that this would encourage more people to tender; I'm convinced it would encourage competition; and I'm convinced that it would save this government and the public treasury considerable money. Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Portage.

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

1. The amount of expenses incurred by Ministers of the Manitoba Government in the fiscal years 1966-67 and 1967-68 for which they were reimbursed or which were paid for them out of public funds.
2. The amount of all such expenses paid to or on behalf of each Minister in each month of the fiscal years 1966-67 and 1967-68.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I put an Order for Return in last year and it was delivered to us in between sessions, and it concerns cabinet ministers' trips for the year 1967, and while I haven't read it as closely as I might there were several items that struck me as rather odd. And I refer to one, trips taken by the Honourable Mr. Roblin in that year, and I find that for a trip of one day to Vancouver the travelling expenses were \$145.00 and living expenses were \$52.50. Now it could be argued whether or not these expenses are reasonable or not. But what made me wonder about the worth of the trip was it was to address the Men's Chamber of Commerce. So I'm wondering how far the Province of Manitoba's taxpayers should go in financing trips of Ministers of the Crown.

The same person made a trip on July 12, 1967, of one day; the travelling expenses were \$140.00 and the purpose of the trip was to address the London Chamber of Commerce. Again I wonder what this has to do with doing any -- giving any benefit, either direct or indirect, for the taxpayers in Manitoba. There are other trips. Perhaps they were official functions or official visits, but I wonder how far we in Manitoba should go in financing trips that are not directly connected with the business of the people of Manitoba.

Also, I wonder whether or not there should be upward limits on such trips. I'm looking at another one now. This is one of the Honourable the First Minister. When he was Minister he made a trip to Ottawa on December 10, 11 and 12 -- it was a three-day affair. He took with him two assistants and between the three gentlemen for three days their travel and living expenses were approximately \$800.00. And I wonder if there should not be some sort of an upward limit on Ministers' expenses in this regard.

I note some of the Ministers were rather frugal in their expenses when they were away. The Honourable Stewart McLean made a trip -- well, he made several trips -- attending a highway conference, a safety conference and a transport conference, and his expenses for three days were \$124.00 in one case, \$110.00 in another case for three days, and \$169.00 for four days. But we expect our representatives to live appropriately to be able to represent Manitoba in an adequate way but, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how far the honourable gentlemen should go in this regard. Hence my request for further information in this regard.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The names of individuals or firms bidding on the excavation for the Portage Diversion;
2. The tendered prices submitted by all firms;
3. The name of the successful bidder;
4. Was the tender fee returned to all unsuccessful bidders.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

With respect of the land acquired for the Portage Diversion in the vicinity of the Assiniboine River supply the following information:

1. Names and addresses of owners;
2. Names and addresses of previous owners;
3. The date when the land last changed hands;
4. The amount paid per acres in each case;
5. The number of acres in each case;
6. The amount paid for buildings and/or damages in each case, giving details;

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)

7. To whom the money was paid;
8. Whether the land was acquired by expropriation or negotiation;
9. The names and addresses of individuals where expropriation or negotiations have not been completed and the amounts offered in each case.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I was prompted to put in this Order for Return. Two farmers in the vicinity of the Assiniboine River Diversion are still in the midst of negotiations for the land that will be taken for the Diversion, and in previous years I had put in similar Orders for Return and I have a case that I really feel needs looking into by the responsible Minister. By the way, the Minister and the gentlemen concerned will be meeting shortly. I thank her for giving this co-operation. But I feel that a few points should be made here and I do not wish this to be construed as an attack on the Land Appraisal Commission, but I have found some of their judgments to be rather inconsistent. I would like to quote to members the prices paid for river bottom land which is some of the finest land in Manitoba -- Assiniboine silt I believe it's termed as -- and the land I'm going to quote to you consisted of approximately 69 acres. This is a settlement that had already been made, I believe about two years ago. The land is known as the Kroeker Farm. It was cleared from the forest some years ago and has been used for one or two crop years by the Kroeker group to grow root vegetables, so naturally this would be considered very high cost land, it was very productive land, and the Kroeker group received in settlement \$650.00 an acre for 29 acres, \$500.00 an acre for 30 acres, and \$250.00 an acre for an additional ten acres, making 69 acres in all. The average price I believe is around \$500.00 an acre. Besides the price of the land, the firm or the Kroeker group received \$113,650 in additional damages. I have no way of knowing what those were but I would expect it would be the cost of breaking land and the presumption of receiving additional crops in the future. I just don't know, I'm assuming that. But the two gentlemen who called on me three weeks ago to ask for some help in presenting their case, have land across the river from the Kroeker property. It is the same type of soil; in one case it is put to identical use - the farmer, Mr. Chuckree, was one of the pioneer growers of seed potatoes in that area, and he produces consistently \$500.00 an acre net profit off this land. Now for a grain farmer, or for someone not used to this specialized type of agriculture, these figures undoubtedly would seem very high, but the gentleman has records to back up his assertion that this land has been producing this sort of revenue and in his dealings with the Land Appraisal Commission, unbelievable as it sounds, he was offered as low as \$20.00 an acre to a high of \$250.00 an acre, so I believe that this should have a second look. It's my understanding that when the Land Appraisal Commission makes an appraisal it's usual for the courts to uphold this. As a matter of fact, I believe the government propaganda service about two years ago saw fit to issue press releases across the province pointing out cases where people who had taken objection and had gone to court to try and have their awards raised from the Land Appraisal Commission's recommendation, had had their awards reduced in court, so I feel that the Land Appraisal Commission has made a grievous blunder in this case and they should be taking a second look at it before this gentleman is forced to go to court.

Another farm in the same location belonging to Mr. McLary, a similar type of soil although it is used for grain and feed crops, was offered similar low prices with very little regard for damages, and this farm, a small farm, in the past year has, through specialized farming, turned over \$250,000 -- that is not to say net, but it has turned over. Through the feeding of grain to cattle and so on, this is a very profitable operation and I think that the people on the Land Appraisal Commission should be experienced in all phases of land use and not just have the experience of grain growing or one of the more traditional uses, so that they would be more sympathetic and more reasonable in some of their appraisals and some of their decisions.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, may I ask the Honourable Member if he would be a little more specific when he says "in the vicinity of the Assiniboine River." Do you mean the parcels of land around the river or are you asking for all of it down to the Trans Canada Highway?

MR. JOHNSTON: In previous Orders for Return I had received much of this information but it's my understanding that the land at the river was not purchased until it was needed, which would be the last year or two, so I don't wish to make it difficult for the department but I'm concerned with the land where the inlet structure is being built and also where the water is

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) being backed up by the low level dam, and perhaps downstream, if the department has purchased any land there mainly around the inlet structure on the Assiniboine River.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could -- would a question be permitted? Could he tell us what the 113,000 was for, the 113,000 he mentioned. What is it for?

MR. JOHNSTON: In the Order for Return I neglected to ask for details and I just asked the amount paid for damages. It only comes as the figure of \$113,650 and no explanation, but of course that was my fault. It could be for some buildings although I'm given to understand there are no buildings there. The only building is a warehouse which is on high land and the firm still retains that.

I might say, while I'm on my feet, the farm across the river, where the low of \$20.00 an acre was offered, is offered for land that is called accretion land. This is land that is built up by silt over the years and was not originally on the survey but is still land that was worked and used and very productive land.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Burrows. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on this resolution I must . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Rhineland have a . . .

MR. FROESE: May I be permitted to make a few remarks on this resolution - I know he's closing debate.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Certainly. If it's permissible with the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did have an extra telephone call in connection with this particular resolution and this prompted me to take part in the debate here this afternoon. I feel not only that the resolution is proper as calling for just what we need because I feel that we should investigate the prices of hearing aids. The particular person that called me mentioned that there were hearing aids on the market all the way from \$60.00 to over \$600.00, and that he in particular had been using several of them. The one he was using presently cost him \$275.00. I feel that with such a variation of prices that the matter of prices of hearing aids should be looked into, because certainly if these hearing aids are of a similar quality, the variation in price should not exist, and therefore the people who are on low income and require hearing aids that they should then be afforded the opportunity to get the hearing aids at a much lower price. I understand hearing aids are imported from Europe and different countries so that this could account for some of the variation in prices but it needn't be that, it not necessarily had to be that. And therefore when this resolution asked for the advisability of regulating hearing aid sales, that to me is not quite answering the needs of the people of Manitoba and it should go a little further and that we set up a committee to investigate the matter of pricing of hearing aids. As I already pointed out, people are paying different prices, and that we have people who are on meagre income, those who are on welfare or on old age pensions, that they have difficulty to get the necessary means with which to buy these aids. Then, too, the matter of repairs. This can also be very costly in that some of these sets will not last too long, that they will have to get new sets. So therefore I feel that this matter is a very worthy matter for the honourable member to bring up in the form of a resolution, but I would hope that even when this resolution is accepted that they go a little further and investigate the matter of prices.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there was one departure from the rule, if anyone from the government wishes to speak on this resolution I would be most happy to hear him.

It rather disturbed me, Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services took the position that he did on this resolution, as was indicated previously by the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Minister says that in view of the fact that the Federal Government is concerned about this matter and may possibly deal with it, let's wait for the legislation handed down or that may originate from the Department of

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) Consumer Affairs and then we will do what else need be done to tighten the controls or implement controls on the sale and dispensing of hearing aids, although he did admit that this matter is of concern and one calling for some form of action.

Now perhaps, Mr. Speaker, at that time I did not sufficiently impress upon the Honourable Minister the gravity of the situation, the importance of it and the need for immediate action, the need for immediate action by this House regardless of what may or may not be done by other government bodies. Now, we are dealing with a health appliance. We are not talking about the sale of shoelaces; we are not talking about fraudulent practices in the advertising of shoelaces; we are talking about a health appliance, and at a very time, Mr. Speaker, on the day of the birth of the Manitoba Medicare Plan, at a time when we should be perhaps a bit more concerned than at any other time about matters of this type, and perhaps if appropriate action were taken now we would avoid a type of situation which has developed recently between the doctors and chiropractors. We should take a look at this matter at this time and determine just what position does this hold in the field of offering health services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the matter of provision of hearing aids, the use of a hearing aid appliance; it's something which is more frequently used by people in their declining years than in their youth, as opposed to other appliances and instruments which are used for the improvement of one's health or the function of one's body, such as teeth, eyes and that sort of thing that go with those organs, and unfortunately, many of the people who are forced to buy hearing aids are people of limited means. Being people in declining years, they are retired people living on old age pension, on the few meagre dollars that they obtain from that, and they are forced to buy hearing aids, and those are the very people who are forced into a position to buy a type of health appliance which evidence does seem to indicate, not in Manitoba because I don't know if we have done that through a survey, that through a study, but some of the research that has been done locally and elsewhere does indicate that excessive prices are being charged for those requiring this type of service. Not only are excessive prices being charged but they are dispensed by people who are not really qualified to diagnose the hearing deficiency in order to determine whether an appliance would correct it or, if an appliance would correct it, what is the best type of appliance to correct that particular hearing deficiency.

Now, the Honourable Minister did mention, did make reference to a study of this matter in the State of Oregon and, in fact, of legislation presently on the Oregon books. Well, studies have also been made elsewhere. A study was made in British Columbia a couple of years ago; a study and a report was made by a committee of the United States Senate in 1962; and some of their findings are, Mr. Speaker, that well over half of those who wear hearing aids are 65 years of age or over, and more than twice as many people suffer from a hearing loss than from visual defects, and that loss of hearing is by far the single most common impairment in our country today.

Now it may be well worth reminding this House, Mr. Speaker, that hearing aids are provided in Great Britain under the National Health Plan. In other words, it's recognized there as an appliance which contributes toward the enjoyment of one's health and which is a necessity and hence being provided under that plan. Now this resolution does not call for the inclusion of hearing aids under our Medicare plan. Although I'm not opposed to it, I'm not speaking for it at this present time. But hence the reason for our resolution to study this matter at this point and take what future action ought to be taken. And it's been found in England - I just wish to add this comment - that by including hearing aids in the British National Health Plan, they are able to buy them in quantity at a much lower cost and thus pass on the saving to the consumer.

In Bevin's book, in reporting on the matter of the provision of hearing aids under their National Health Service Plan he had the following to say: "The way that seemed to offer the best chance of success was to bring the hearing specialists and the oral technicians into conference with each other to see if a satisfactory aid could be devised which would then be put into mass production and distributed through the hospitals. The effort met with outstanding success." This is what happened in England and, according to the reports that we received, to the satisfaction of the people there.

As I've indicated earlier and as the Honourable Member for Rhineland indicated, there is evidence to indicate that excessive profits are being made in the sale of hearing aids and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether it is fair to allow this type of practice to continue, to allow people to make exorbitant profits on the needs of individuals for their health, comfort and well-being.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)

Now, the British Columbia survey that was on this matter indicates that there's a rather startling mark-up between the wholesaler and the retailer, and the mark-up ranges, according to their study, from a low of 49 percent to a high of 306 percent - from 49 percent to 306 percent. For the most expensive hearing aid the five firms that were investigated showed mark-ups from 97 percent to 278 percent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the retailer selling a hearing aid for up to, in fact slightly in excess of three times the amount that he pays for it and that's the price that he charges the consumer. Now the British Columbia survey gave examples of numerous types of hearing aids with suggested retail prices for these five different firms, and most of the examples indicated a mark-up of between 200 to 300 percent, and that report also uncovered the fact that hearing aids which cost \$35.00 in Japan were being sold at upwards of \$400.00 in Vancouver. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if this is going on in the City of Vancouver, it may well be also in the City of Winnipeg and in the province of Manitoba. And they found that hearing aids from manufacturers in that same country in Japan, which were bought for \$77.00, or cost \$77.00 to manufacture them, were being sold for \$700.00. And this is the type of thing that's going on, Mr. Speaker. This is the unfortunate position that the people, the hard of hearing people, are forced into today.

Now, as far as all of Canada is concerned, that even though the hearing aids are imported from the country of Japan, but the majority of hearing aids, that's true, are imported from Europe and the United States, but it should be borne in mind that even though they are imported from a foreign country that they're not subject to the same duty as other merchandise is because there is an exemption provided for an appliance of this type. Now, Mr. Speaker, surely if there's evidence in some part of this country of ours that indicates such exorbitant mark-ups in the sale of a necessary, a vitally necessary health appliance, then surely this ought to alert our government to take immediate action and investigate into the matter at our level, and proceed, as the resolution asks, by referring the matter to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders for study. And I'm at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to know, to really appreciate what the real position of the government is, what is the real attitude of the government towards this matter. Because there was nothing to prevent the government from adopting this resolution and proceeding as requested within it.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. GREEN: . . . with the respect you didn't declare the vote.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg your pardon?

MR. GREEN: You hadn't declared the result of the vote before the ayes and nays were called.

MR. SPEAKER: I said the nays have it.

MR. SPEAKER: For the benefit of the honourable members who were absent from the Chamber during the recent discussion, we're dealing with the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Burrows, at the top of page 4.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Borowski, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Doern, Dow, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Mesdames Forbes and Morrison. Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Claydon, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Evans, Graham, Hamilton, Johnson, Jorgenson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir and Witney.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 25. Nays 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. And the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Fisher.

MR. PETER MASNIUK: I want to thank the honourable members for the applause, but I do beg the indulgence of this House to have this matter stand.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . the impression that the member loses his opportunity to debate if he doesn't debate today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would mind if I would

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . say a few things on this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief because it's the same resolution we had on the Order Paper last year and at that time our party did support it and I think, I believe I spoke at some considerable length on minimum wages at that time and I have also taken considerable time of the House speaking on the minimum wage on the Labour estimates, so I just wish to advise the House that we will be supporting this resolution. I think it's good, and since the tabling of the report Targets for Economic Development, Mr. Speaker, I think we have sufficient evidence now that maybe there should be a review and study of the criteria that's set for use for minimum wages. Because if you look on page 345 of the report, the TED Report, I would just like to quote 345. "The provincial wages in commercial services and industrial sectors in 1967 ranked higher than in the Maritime provinces, slightly below Saskatchewan and Alberta and considerably below the key industrial provinces." A study of over-all wage and salary trends in Canada revealed that average earnings in Manitoba are rising at a lower rate than the national average, Mr. Speaker.

Also, last spring we had the report from the Manitoba Conference on Technological Change and the same statement was mentioned, or the same thing was referred to, on page 14, and I would like to quote. I'm quoting from page 14: "It seems clear that in the early part of the Twentieth Century Manitoba stood second among the provinces in per capita income, but since 1945 Manitoba has also been behind Alberta and has fallen behind Saskatchewan. In the 1960s they ranked fifth and last among the provinces west of the Ottawa River." So, Mr. Speaker, there is sufficient proof that perhaps maybe we should review our minimum wages in Manitoba at the present time, and review the criteria that is used for the minimum wage. I understand that the province of Ontario at the present time is considering increasing the minimum wage to \$1.50 per hour, so I see no reason why this resolution should not be supported.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Revenue statistical study, the survey indicated that Winnipeg is in 48th place in line in per capita income in the cities of Canada. This alone is a good indication that perhaps what's happening in Manitoba is, in many of the service industries, all we're doing is paying the rock bottom and minimum wage. So I think it's time the government did something and do everything possible to remove the people from the poverty wage structure in this province. I know that arguments may be used and to some extent quite convincing, that there are very important problems to consider before implementing higher minimum wages, because minimum wage legislation when it means higher wages, it means probably displacement of employees in certain industries. This is not my feeling but I'm just trying to demonstrate the other side of the picture, but I think if we had the study and the report tabled in the House, probably there'd be no misunderstanding, and really, Mr. Speaker, when we have as many people from industry in the province of Manitoba on this TED Commission and their great concern was the low wage structure in this province and the people that are living on such low wages and the poverty in this area, I see no reason that the government would not accept this resolution and give consideration to probably reviewing the criteria and perhaps giving consideration to increasing the minimum wage.

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

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, may I say that I waited somewhat impatiently to debate this particular resolution with respect to remarks that were made by the Honourable Member for Morris, remarks that I take a great deal of exception to. You can understand why I was somewhat impatient. The Honourable Member for Morris probably thought that because of his past experience with questions dealing with agricultural problems, because of that experience, that possibly he would somehow convey the message that he is indeed the authority and that he is indeed the person that no one could challenge. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm quite prepared to challenge that kind of authoritative thinking. My honourable friend from Morris would like to have the House believe that he was totally innocent in the changes of the Wheat Board regulations, changes that were made in 1960 or '61, Mr. Speaker. I want to go back to remind my honourable friend, although he tried to absolve himself of any responsibility because he finds himself in somewhat of a dilemma, I want to remind my honourable friend that the cloak he is hiding behind, Mr. Speaker, is not a cloak at all. In my opinion it's a very thin negligee, and

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . I, for one, will not be fooled by that kind of emasculation, Mr. Speaker. If we recall . . .

MR. JORGENSON: If he would tell me where, in anything that I've said when I spoke on this matter, that I was hiding behind anything, that I was attempting to absolve myself . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend will be patient, he will get an earful. My honourable friend from Morris suggested that he had not any direct responsibility in the changing of regulations of the Wheat Board, that the Wheat Board had the powers on to itself to do as they wish with the regulations. I want to ask my honourable friend why there was a committee on agriculture set up by the House of Commons, and why he participated in the deliberations and made subsequent recommendations to the Wheat Board to have regulations changed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . that my honourable friend has asked me a question. I answered it in my remarks. I said that the matter was brought before the committee, and after the deliberations of the committee we recommended that the change be made. And the Wheat Board acted on those recommendations. There's nothing wrong with that.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think we have to recognize that the Wheat Board is responsible to the Department of Agriculture - or was at that time - and surely he didn't expect that his employees are going to challenge the recommendations of the department.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . again, the Department of Trade and Commerce.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend wants to make a speech he can speak some other time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. This looks to be developing into an argument between the two honourable gentlemen. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead has the floor and, unless he releases it, the Honourable Member from Morris must not take advantage of it.

MR. USKIW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSON: I just want to keep . . . accurate, that's all.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from Morris did agree that prior to the changes in regulations, that something like in the neighbourhood of ten million bushels were sold outside of the Wheat Board, and that he has also agreed, Mr. Speaker, that since the regulations were changed that that figure has increased to something like 36 or 37 million bushels. Now my honourable friend to suggest to this House that the changes in regulations did not in fact have anything to do with the increase of off-board sales, my friend I want to say to him that this is the negligee which I'm referring to, that it is in fact true that the changes did occur, and that the changes that were proposed by my honourable friend from Morris had a detrimental effect and that he cannot hide behind the fact that it was a Wheat Board responsibility and that he really didn't have a great deal to do with those changes.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that only two weeks ago I had an interesting experience while visiting one of our elevator associations whereby a man brought in a load of grain -- it was a load of No. 3 Oats -- for the purpose of weighing the load, and that he was selling this load for 20 cents a bushel, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend wants to suggest that the changes in regulations didn't hurt the grain producers of Manitoba. I want to tell him that he has a lot of researching to do, Mr. Speaker, because Manitoba farmers have lost millions of dollars as a result of the provisions which were endorsed by the government of that day, which was the Conservative Government under the Prime Ministership of John Diefenbaker.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that there were loopholes under the old system but we recognize that the loopholes that were there provided for only a small amount of grain to be bypassed, and that the Board in fact did have adequate control to ensure that the best price was derived for most of the producers in Manitoba and for as great a volume as could be expected, for as great a volume of production, Mr. Speaker, as could be expected. And it worked relatively well. I don't know that I want to quarrel with the idea of farmers selling to farmers. I know that feed mills wanted to have the regulations relaxed because they were caught in short situations, that is short of grain from time to time, if they wanted to buy on the quota system and if they did not wish to buy from the Canadian Wheat Board. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that there was nothing wrong in those feed mills buying their grain from the Canadian Wheat Board if they were indeed short of grain, and that if my honourable friend is going to suggest that there were no benefits to the producers or consumers if the feed mills were to buy this grain from the Wheat Board, I want to tell him that he hasn't researched it very thoroughly because I know that every bushel of grain that the Wheat Board doesn't handle, that there are

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . increased costs on the balance of the total that they do handle, and I would want to see as much product going through the Canadian Wheat Board as is possible.

Now, if my honourable friend would have read the resolution thoroughly and would have understood it properly, he would see that we have a provision in there that suggests that the freight charges, that regulations should be changed so that freight charges would not be charged to the feed mills buying their grain from the local elevators in Manitoba through the Wheat Board and using that grain in the Province of Manitoba, that this is one area where probably the problem really existed and that this one area could be altered without at all undermining the position of the Canadian Wheat Board and without undermining the price structure, the prices that the farmers should receive for the grains which they are selling, Mr. Speaker, whether it be off-board or through the Board. I know that there have been many sales made off-board; I have made some myself, Mr. Speaker; but I also know that my guideline in pricing was the Wheat Board price until the regulations were changed, and when the regulations were changed, Mr. Speaker, there was another guideline established. The Wheat Board had one price and the feed mills had another price, and for farmers to be able to sell their product because of a credit squeeze they quite often tended to compromise their position and accept prices which were not truly realistic, that did not relate at all to the prices which were maintained by the Canadian Wheat Board. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this isn't the right approach to solving the farm income problem, that my honourable friend from Morris was in an ideal position to introduce probably measures which would strengthen the position of the grain producers rather than weaken them, and that that was his responsibility, and that he has no right, Mr. Speaker, to come into this Chamber and suggest that he was not at all responsible and that he can hide behind the Canadian Wheat Board because they are the ones that administer the regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the government of that day did a great disservice to the farm community of Manitoba, that there are other ways in which we could have solved the problem. One of them would have been to relax or to remove from the price of the grains that were bought from the Wheat Board the cost of freight to the Lakehead. That is an area that could have been approached and I'm sure that regulations could have been changed to accommodate that kind of a situation. And the only other handling charge that would have been involved in the grains that were going to be sold to feed mills through the Board would have been the elevator handling charges.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . question at this time. I wonder if he realizes the implications of that suggestion. It would mean the changing of the Crows Nest Pass agreement and would he be in favour of tampering with that agreement at this time?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that my honourable friend is right. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the record shows to all of us that the producer has had a net loss in terms of return per bushel of grain sold in Manitoba since the regulations were changed, and that if they were indeed changed with the view of helping the farmers of Manitoba, then we should have done it on an experimental basis and had a subsequent review to decide whether or not this was a good change or whether we should revert back to the old regulations or whether we should implement new regulations. But as I see it, Mr. Speaker, the loss is there. It's plain to see. I know of many people that are selling grain far below Wheat Board prices today, which to me is a shame because the farmers cannot afford to do this, but they are only doing this because of the fact that they are pressed for funds, for money; that they cannot sell their grain. And I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that the feed mills would have to buy their grain through the elevators and through the Wheat Board does not suggest at all that they are going to buy less grain. We have the cattle industry, the poultry industry, the hog industry, that requires a certain amount of feed grain, and they will continue to require that amount whether they have to buy it through the Canadian Wheat Board or whether they bypass the Canadian Wheat Board. If our cattle industry grows, if our hog industry grows, if our poultry industry grows, Mr. Speaker, then I say that there will be need for more production of that grain and that grain will be sold through the Canadian Wheat Board or otherwise, Mr. Speaker, depending on the regulations of the day. All I'm suggesting is that if we funnel them through the Board we bring to the producers reasonable prices in light of Wheat Board pricing policy and that we don't have to compromise one group of producers versus the other, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a good resolution. It does take into account that there were built-in charges under the old system, built-in charges of freight costs to the Lakehead which

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . probably should have been removed for the benefit of the feeding industry, the feeder industry in Manitoba, and that that was the proper course to explore and that we should have not relaxed the regulations that we have. I don't see, Mr. Speaker, where there has been any benefit to producers of grain if you take it on the average over the last several years. I can only see a smaller return per acre of production to those that have sold outside of the Canadian Wheat Board, and I don't think that any orderly marketing system can be set up and made to work if we are going to undermine the very thing that we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker. And I suggest, if anything, that probably regulations should have been strengthened to ensure that farmers in Manitoba were not the losers in this kind of a change in Board policy.

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

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell) I wonder if the Member from Brokenhead would permit a question? I believe the member said that the freight charges should not be charged to the feed mills. I wonder if he would suggest they be charged to the growers of wheat or other than feed grains, or whether it should be charged to the Federal Treasury, or whether it should be absorbed by the railways.

MR. USKIW: I don't know what freight charges my friend is talking about.

MR. GRAHAM: The very freight charges that you mentioned in your address.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my friend from Birtle-Russell that there are no freight charges on grain that is delivered to a local elevator and sold locally; that there shouldn't be any.

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

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. D. MORRIS McGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, since I adjourned debate on the resolution regarding the two-price system which was moved by my honourable friend from Brokenhead, I would at this time like to make some comments in regard to this proposal. The question of the two-price system for wheat is one that has been debated in this House on other occasions. A similar resolution, Mr. Speaker, was not supported at the last session of this Legislature. I suppose there are two different ways a two-price system on wheat might be introduced, although it is not clear from the resolution which is before us how this could be done. The idea that a higher price, in this case \$3.00 a bushel, would be paid on the first 2,000 bushels of wheat with similar increases for oats and barley, would suggest that the higher price would apply to wheat which was sold for use in Canada while the world market price would apply to wheat which was exported. I am not too clear from my honourable friend's resolution whether he is proposing the \$3.00 on the first 2,000 bushels worth of wheat is supposed to cover what is used in Canada or whether he is also proposing that it would apply to part of the wheat which is exported. One way in which this could be done is to charge our Canadian buyers of the wheat an additional price for this wheat. This could be paid from the federal Treasury, from the Government of Canada. I would hope that this might be clarified by the person introducing this resolution. However, I don't think that this is an important fact at this moment. At least, it doesn't deeply concern me in any case.

If anyone is going to support this proposed two-price system for wheat, I think they have to show that it is the best way to help out the income situation of our farmers, and I believe this year it's more drastic than I have, in my years of farming, seen it and I think you only have to go to some of the rural dealerships, the people who either sell machinery, fertilizer and the things that farmers have to buy, to realize that this depression is real - and I do mean real. How much increased income, for example, would this mean to farmers in Manitoba? First of all, I must remind you that there are approximately 10,000 farmers in Manitoba who do not produce one bushel of wheat, and I think that whether you're raising livestock, raising

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) . . . sunflower seeds, well this is a point but it is not the whole -- grain is certainly not the whole influence on agriculture. I myself, as a straight grain farmer, can appreciate the points brought forward by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, but I think we don't come here to think selfishly from any one -- or anyone's personal approach.

There are also a number of farmers who only grow very small amounts of wheat because they do grow other cereal grains, and again, I would have to question how much benefit this proposal would be to these farmers. If we are going to try to provide a system to farmers -- and I think it is most urgent -- then as far as Manitoba is concerned, there are probably better ways in which federal assistance could be received than through the two-price system. When we are looking at ways of increasing incomes, I can think of how many federal elections have we heard our particular leaders, our Prime Minister, our hoped-to-be prime minister -- I can think of the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker; he thought and believed for Western Canada as well as for all the rest of Canada, but in going into this he realized how complicated this was, and really the net gain was greatly over-exaggerated and he backed off it. Mr. Pearson equally went to the people with this thought for reasons I wouldn't know, but also didn't take this step.

Another question which I would like to raise, Mr. Speaker, is that we have just heard the reports of the federal Task Force on Agriculture, which says that by 1980 we may have to take out approximately 10 million acres of land out of wheat. Now I'm not saying at all that I agree with this, but I think it is an indication that while we have a congestion of wheat and other grains in Western Canada, that I don't think that we should be making this move to encourage the production of wheat, especially wheat, and other grains, at least not as long as we appear to have a surplus on hand. I would rather see something being done to encourage more protection of livestock and encourage more production of special crops. This would make more sense as far as Manitoba and the Manitoba farmers and agriculture in general.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that my honourable friends would have to give a lot more evidence than they have so far that this proposal will be of sufficient benefit to Manitoba farmers to warrant its support. I would hate to see this program introduced if there are other and better ways of helping the income position of Manitoba farmers. For these reasons I am not in a position to support this resolution and I might say, in the amendment I will introduce shortly, I think the acreage payment is so much more beneficial if the farmer knew that he was getting a particular cheque tomorrow or next month of a certain amount. Some of us here are on a half a bushel, some are on three bushels, and I ask you, how can a farmer step into next summer's operation on this kind of economics?

So I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the resolution be amended by adding after the fourth "Whereas" the following: "And Whereas there is an urgent need for financial assistance to agricultural producers in Canada"; and by striking out all the words after the word "institute" in the ninth line and substituting therefor the following: "a system of acreage payments to bona fide farmers". I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: If I might be permitted to ask the Honourable Member for Virden a question? (a) Does he suggest that these be annual payments, or just during election time?

MR. MCGREGOR: Positively annually.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on this resolution, mainly for the purpose which is causing some honourable members to smile, because I don't consider it to be particularly a resolution which would be of interest only to people who are engaged in agriculture. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it always surprises me to hear honourable members talk about a two-price system for any commodity as being something unusual, being some sort of aberration that one must avoid. If one looks carefully, Mr. Speaker, at the situation, I would think that we would find that agriculture is probably one of the few areas in which we don't have a natural two-price system and that this possibly causes some of the difficulties in which the agricultural community finds itself.

So when I hear that there is such great difficulty about establishing a two-price system for wheat on the basis that somehow it forms some type of special consideration, I, Mr. Speaker, am rather surprised, because I don't find it a special feature at all. I find, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that almost every other segment of our economy tries to make

(MR. GREEN cont'd) sure that the domestic price is maintained at a level which will sustain the industry, which will not only sustain the industry -- and I also find it difficult for industries merely wishing to be merely sustained. I don't see why an industry shouldn't be more than sustained; I don't see why it shouldn't produce a fair return for the people who are working in the industry; and I think that every industry accepts this. Somehow, either the non-farming community or in the laternative, Mr. Speaker, ill advisers in the farm community to the community itself have been suggesting that somehow this would create a special position for agriculture, it would mean that the rest of the community was somehow subsidizing the agricultural community.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't accept that at all. I accept for every productive person in our community the concept that his productive capacity, if we are willing to accept his continuance in doing it, should return to him a fair return for the labours which he exerts. I've argued that, Mr. Speaker, for the labouring community. I say that we have to provide a basic minimum wage and that that basic minimum wage is something that we say the man is entitled to as of right. We fight hard fights for the minimum wage and we have gradually raised it to some extent, and I think probably we will raise it to a considerable extent more. And this is a fight that is looked upon by some people as a fight for labour. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not a fight for labour because the same fight is made with far more telling effect by the manufacturing community. They say that our manufactured goods have to make sure that there is a fair return on the investment of our capital and they also have to make sure that there is enough to provide a living wage for the workers who are employed. Therefore, what do they do, Mr. Speaker? They set up, in effect, a two-price system.

We have received today, or the other day in the House, a fair inkling of just what that two-price system produces, because there was a question asked by the Honourable Member for Portage, or at least an emergency resolution put, which dealt with an unusual situation - and I venture to say that it's a true situation. We didn't hear enough from the Member for Portage to grasp entirely what he was saying, but we heard enough to know what he was going to say. He said that fertilizer is produced in Manitoba, by chemical plants situated in Manitoba, it's being sold in Manitoba at one rate; it's being shipped to another country, it undergoes the transportation costs, and it's being sold in that other country at a reduced rate. A two-price system for fertilizer. And every single manufacturer, Mr. Speaker, is in exactly the same position. An attempt is made, and it's often successfully made - often successfully made - and if my honourable friends wish to read the tariff areas which are listed in the federal statutes they will find that manufacturers are maintained by a tariff wall to have a domestic price for their manufactured articles. Absolutely! Do you think that tariff wall has no effect on the domestic price? If it didn't have they wouldn't be asking for it, but they've asked for it consistently and they've got it consistently because they have an effective lobby and they are not so sensitive as the agricultural community for asking for a fair return for their produce. So they have a domestic price for manufactured goods. But, Mr. Speaker, they're not in any way limited from selling their manufactures goods on the world market for whatever price they can get. And they do, and that's a two-pricesystem. That's a two-price system.

And what I take it the people in the agricultural community are saying - and this is why I disagree strenuously with the resolution put forward by the Honourable Member for Virden - what I take it they are saying to us is this, that people producing agricultural products require a basic living wage - call it a wage, call it a return on their labours, call it what have you. We are told by the Member for Virden and by almost everybody in this House, ever since I've been in this House I've heard from people representing agricultural constituencies that they are not getting that fair return. The Member for Virden doesn't deny that; he says the situation is urgent. But how does he solve the situation? By suggesting that there be a handout to the agricultural community, by suggesting exactly the opposite of what he says he is suggesting, because the acreage payments are, Mr. Speaker, surely a handout based on the number of acres. The acreage payments that were provided by the Conservative government were, I believe, a dollar an acre for the first 200 acres, and I had farmers come into my office, Mr. Speaker, who subdivided their farms amongst their sons and their husbands and their wives in order to get the maximum amount of acreage payments. And I didn't blame them; they were trying to get a fair return for the work that they are doing. If the Member for Virden agrees that the present price level doesn't provide that return, then can't he trust us city folk to agree to the fact that we too believe that the farmer is entitled to a fair return for his labour, that

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . that's our return.

We are prepared, and I as a city constituent - and if my constituents are displeased with what I do in this connection, I can't do anything about it - I as a city constituent say that the people of Canada should be prepared to pay to that producer a fair price for his labours and he is not now getting that fair price, so we are talking about a basic minimum wage for the farm producer, and the Member for Brokenhead has given a formula, Mr. Speaker, that isn't really quite that radical. I read in the paper that at a farm conference - perhaps the same conference that the Minister of Agriculture attended - that almost the entire substance of this resolution was adopted by the Ministers of Agriculture of the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Am I not correct? A two-price system for wheat based on the first 2,000 bushels of production, and that beyond that, beyond that you are producing for whatever the price of your product will obtain. But up to that you're guaranteed an annual income. It's going to be a familiar expression, Mr. Speaker, to have a guaranteed annual income. I prefer to have a guaranteed return to a farmer for the price of his labour because I don't think that's a subsidy. I think that everybody who works and produces for society is entitled to have the rest of society pay that. I believe that for the worker, I believe it for the farmer, I even believe it for the lawyer and the doctor, believe it or not. I'm even willing to go that far, Mr. Speaker, but they don't have a great deal to worry about. They don't -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Member for St. Boniface says I opposed Medicare. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, his suggestion that I opposed it is that to me it looked a great deal like "doctorcare". On the basis of the figures we received, every doctor in Manitoba would have a gross income of \$50,000 - a gross income - and I suppose that's care for the doctor as well as care for the patient.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . discuss Medicare today.

MR. GREEN: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I'll accept that. I was put off track by my honourable friend over there from St. Boniface.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are certainly prepared to recognize that the problem as far as the agricultural community is concerned is one of price. It's everybody's problem, by the way. The problem of the worker is one of price, the problem of the medical practitioner, despite their protestations to the contrary, is one of price, and they all have taken steps to protect their price. We lawyers have formed a very good union, one that protects my price very well. Nobody else can get in - nobody else can get in except by the terms and conditions which we set and we maintain the price, and the medical profession does the same thing and the labouring community does the same thing, and I say to their credit. So why should the farmer be the sacrifice to the free enterprise system? If everybody else is working for methods to control the fact that their labours will not be expended without a fair return, why should the agricultural community be any different. I say that they have been so advised, and I can understand this advice coming from manufacturers, I can understand this advice coming from interests other than agriculture, but I never could understand it coming from farm leaders. Let your problems, if they are ones of not wishing to ask for more than you're entitled to, be told that by others. They'll tell you that you're asking for too much, but I don't think that under present circumstances it can be denied that the problem of farm income is one of urgency. I accept the principle that if this community says that there's going to be a certain number of producers on the farm producing goods and services that I and other people are making use of, that they are going to have to be paid for their labours by the community, that the consumer will be involved in this payment the same way as the farm consumer is involved in the payment that is made to labour and to the other manufacturing industries.

So accepting those two things, isn't the principle that we establish a price, a basic price - and that's why it's only on the first 2,000 bushels, because production beyond that will be on the basis of the market - but that we establish a basic price under which the farmer would not go. And I am not dealing with other things than wheat at this point. The Honourable Member for Virden says it won't help every farmer. Will it help some farmers? Because if this won't help every farmer, then I trust my honourable friend from Brokenhead and the Member for Ethelbert Plains to bring up some other suggestions to deal with the price of other farm commodities.

As long, Mr. Speaker, as we do not have a society where everybody's product is sold competitively, and that's such a myth - boy, we don't sell our products competitively - the manufacturer tries to eliminate all competition, and besides that he tries to set up a tariff

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . wall which will boost the price in the domestic market; the worker does not wish to be left to the exigencies of a free competitive market, and even we in this House recognize that for the unorganized worker, we won't toss him into the lion's mouth of a free competitive market, we establish a minimum wage. And so far the most sensible suggestion - and I'm open to suggestions, Mr. Speaker - this might not be the best solution but it's certainly better than the solution that has been advocated in this amendment on acreage payments, a dole of a dollar an acre. It certainly is a better suggestion.

The Member for Morris will know that his honourable former leader, Mr. Diefenbaker, ran up and down the country in 1957 and said, "Parity - not charity," and he proceeded to get in and gave charity instead of parity. That's exactly what happened. He talked about parity prices and then he devised the acreage payment scheme which was a dollar an acre and - for what it was, Mr. Speaker, it was something and I won't knock it - it was a subsidy to the farmer who was not getting a fair price. But was it the best form? I'm suggesting it wasn't, Mr. Speaker, because it doesn't take into account what I think this resolution takes into account, that it's a communal responsibility, a legislative responsibility, with all the available assistance that we get from whatever administration we have, to say that we are prepared to figure out what is a fair price to the farmer for his work and we're prepared to pay him that price. We did it for the medical profession. We just finished doing it yesterday. The legal profession looks after itself. The workers, though they struggle, they manage if they're organized to provide themselves with a price. Everybody has the right to make a two-price system, even the worker, because he'll work under his labour agreement at a certain price and then he'll use his extra hours sometime to get an additional price, and he won't be bound by the one price that he sold his labour at. The manufacturer does the same thing. I'm willing to do the same thing for the agricultural community.

MR. WATT: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. WATT: Does the Honourable Member for Inkster support an assistance policy that exempts one-third, approximately, of the farmers of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this program doesn't exempt anybody; it merely -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, this program -- with greatest respect, if they can ask the questions they must permit me to make the answers. If they want their answer, if you want the answer from the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, then get up and give the answer. If you want my answer, then let -- (Interjection) -- Well, my answer is, Mr. Speaker, this resolution deals with one problem; it doesn't exempt the other problem. If my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne has a suggestion to deal with the other problem, let's hear it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, there's only 10 minutes left and I'm sure I won't be able to finish in 10 minutes, but maybe I can bring in a few thoughts anyway.

Members will know that the Social Credit Party has supported a two-price system for the last 20 to 25 years, I think ever since it came -- (Interjection) -- Well, as I said, long before the NDP ever came up with a two-price system, the Social Credit had endorsed that policy long before that. One of the reasons why we did endorse this is that we feel that what is the practise today, that if the western farmer has to subsidize the Canadian consumers, it is an injustice; it is not fair. The Canadian farmer should not be required to support and to subsidize the consumer in Canada with cheap wheat and cheap food products. The consumer should pay his just share, and this is one way in which we feel this can be brought about through the two-price system, that that portion of the wheat that is consumed in Canada, the price of the wheat should have a relation to the cost production and also to the cost of living in Canada.

Sometimes I've even thought that maybe Manitoba should go it alone in this matter, that if the Canadian government does not exercise these powers and implement such a program, that maybe we in Manitoba should consider doing it on our own. Why couldn't we do something in this respect? After all, we know that the industry in eastern Canada is being protected through tariffs, through millions and millions of dollars - it even runs into the billions. Why cannot some of these monies that the people of Canada are paying as a result of the tariffs that are being imposed be used for that very purpose to subsidize the Canadian wheat farmer, because the wheat farmer is in such a situation where he has to sell his product on the open market and the prices arrived at are world prices and depend on the resources of these other importing countries as to how much they can afford to pay, and in my opinion have no relation to what the

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . cost factor is or what the producer in Manitoba or in Western Canada should get for his wheat. We know that the European Common Market countries are subsidizing their wheat by more than a dollar a bushel. I had the figures last year that I presented to the Committee at that time in detail, and I don't intend to go into that matter again, but I'm sure that it was more than a dollar by which the countries in the European market area were subsidized in connection with wheat.

We have heard the matter of acreage payments, and we also know that Diefenbaker won the west on the acreage payments. He gave the farmers \$200.00 apiece. This certainly was an election bait, and he still has the confidence of the western farmer as a result. This is still there, otherwise why would the western people still support him the way they do? But, in my opinion, it doesn't nearly compare to what is asked in the resolution here today, because we now have a resolution before us that asks a \$3.00 bushel price for 2,000 bushels. This amounts to \$6,000, and \$3.00, we know that this is a dollar above the actual price today, so that when we are speaking of 2,000 bushels that we are probably speaking in the figure of \$2,500 of subsidy that the farmer will get on his first 2,000 bushels of wheat that he would deliver. Mind you, these are arbitrary figures that the member who sponsors the resolution is bringing forth. I am not prepared to debate whether this is the right amount, both in bushels and in dollars - maybe the honourable member can give us the information how he arrived at these particular figures - but regardless, I feel that a farmer in western Canada needs a better price, and if it only can be brought about through a subsidy, then let's have that subsidy.

The Member for Inkster just mentioned that the matter of two prices is an established fact. He mentioned fertilizer. We also know the matter of machinery, that the industries are selling machinery to other countries at a figure much below that that the western farmer has to pay, and surely enough if one industry can afford to do this, why cannot we have the same thing apply to wheat?

The Member for Virden mentions that not every farmer would be helped through a per bushel subsidy. Mr. Speaker, I think by vast the farm majority would be benefited, and even those that feed the wheat to their cattle, they could sell the first 2,000 and buy their wheat from the Wheat Board. This is what the farmers and feeders in eastern Canada do. We are shipping the grain out there, paying for the freight so that the eastern feeder can buy cheap feed for his cattle. So why couldn't the same thing apply to western farmer feeders? Mind you, it would not apply though to those people who would have crop losses as a result of crop failures. Here I agree that this would be the case. However, why couldn't we have the dual system, both the acreage payment plus a subsidy as we're speaking of here today. That would certainly -- (Interjection) -- Sure, there's nothing wrong with having both of these programs at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, what are the prospects for the farmer in this coming year? They are very dismal indeed. We know that all over the province they're now asking about buckwheat, can we grow buckwheat in northern Manitoba. Where this was confined more to the southern area, now we will find farmers all across Manitoba going into buckwheat because this is a cash crop. I am sure that if all the farmers go into this that we will have an over-production of buckwheat in Manitoba, and as a result the prices will slump too. The same holds true for the oilseed crops, that you will have an over-production of oilseed crops this year if you have a normal crop, because of the matter of not being able to sell your wheat. So that here is another area where we will be over-producing very likely in this coming year.

On the matter of a 10 percent acreage being taken out of wheat, as the Member for Virden stated that the conference in Ottawa had suggested, Mr. Speaker, I do not subscribe to an acreage reduction as long as there is hungry people in the world.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think the honourable gentleman should be hurried, probably he could continue his speech the next time it appears on the Order Paper, it now being 5:30.

MR. LYON: Members will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the sitting times tomorrow will be 10:00 o'clock in the morning and the Friday schedule will be followed tomorrow by agreement. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 10:00 o'clock Thursday morning.