

DAILY INDEX

Tuesday, February 16, 1960, 2:30 P.M.

Law Amendments Committee Report	599
<u>Motion</u> re School Room Grants (Mr. Dow): Mr. Strickland	601
Mr. Gray, Mr. Molgat, Mr. Stanes, Mr. Lisaman	604
Mr. Scarth, Mr. Shoemaker	606
Mr. Wright	607
Mr. Hryhorczuk	608
<u>Motion</u> re Pulpwood (Mr. Roberts): Mr. Alexander, amendment	608
Mr. Hryhorczuk	609
<u>Motion</u> re Teacher Grants (Mr. Tanchak)	610
Mr. Prefontaine	612
Mr. Alexander	615
<u>Motion</u> re Physical Fitness (Mr. Schreyer)	616
<u>Motion</u> re Minimum Wage (Mr. Peters)	618
<u>Motion</u> re Cancer (Mr. Wright)	619
<u>Motion</u> re Fair Wage Act (Mr. Harris)	621
Mr. Schreyer	622
<u>Bill 56</u> (Mr. Scarth) 2nd Reading	623

8:00 P.M.

<u>Committee of Supply: Agriculture</u>	625
---	-----

The Progressive Index of Votes and Proceedings will be published on Tuesdays on the last page.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, February 16th, 1960.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to let the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) passed. (b) passed.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, last night I directed two questions to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Last night of course was a stormy night and I was the least important, but perhaps he could answer me tonight.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I believe, if I remember correctly, the one question that he asked was if people were moving from the urban area to the rural area and settling on farms. I think the reverse is true. I'd like to----

MR. GRAY: Pardon me, that's not the question I asked. I just want to find out, say during the last calendar year or fiscal year, was there an increase or a decrease of individual farmers? In other words, the individual farmer I call the one that lives on the farm, gets a subsidy from the farm, and looks after the farm, raising crops, raising cattle and so on. That's question No. 1. The second one is, I asked whether the Minister could answer or not -- it may be more or less of a political or a diplomatic question -- in the opinion of the Minister, will the dairy industry be affected by having coloured margarine?

MR. HUTTON: Well this is a very controversial question. Many people hold many varied opinions upon it. If you're asking for my own personal opinion ----

MR. GRAY: I am asking whether in your opinion, as the Minister of Agriculture, will the dairy industry suffer?

MR. HUTTON: Well I can't see the difference between my opinion as the Minister of Agriculture and my personal opinion, and I would suggest that you consider the information in the report and draw your own conclusions.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, may I direct two questions to the Honourable Minister? First of all, in the Speech from the Throne there is mention made of a program for the supply of sewer and water to farm homes. I am wondering if there is an item in the estimates in your department for the expenditure of money so that we might discuss it under that particular item? That's the first question and the second question is --(interjection)-- no, no, no. The servicing of farm homes with sewer and water, whether there is an item in your estimates where this can be discussed. And the second question, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask is, whether the work which was begun under this department in the survey of the needs of Indians and Metis, whether that is being continued in your department or in another department so we can discuss the work which could be done at the right time?

MR. HUTTON: The answer to the first question is that this will be carried out, this service for sewer and water -- plumbing will be carried out under the Extension Department. I might point out that the government is able to share the cost of such educational programs with the Federal Government through the Department of Education because it comes under the qualifications of technical training. I've forgotten your second question. Would you just prompt me?

MR. ORLIKOW: My second question had to do with the work which was proposed to be done amongst the Indians and Metis. Is that now being done through your department or through another department?

MR. HUTTON: No. The appropriation for the study that was made was covered in the agricultural estimates, but at the present time any policy in that regard is not under the

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)....Department of Agriculture. However, I might point out that we had an opportunity during 1959, through the Co-Op Services Branch, to give assistance to the Indians and Metis at Norway House with the co-operation of the Federated Co-ops. The Federated Co-ops advanced supplies to a Consumers Co-op that was formed at Norway House by the Indians and Metis, and because supplies had to go in before freeze-up, the Federated Co-op, underwritten to some extent by the Co-operative Promotion Board, undertook to put in stores for the winter. I might say that so far the undertaking appears to be successful and the people in that area are taking part and participating enthusiastically in the program.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister a question, or the government, whether anything has been done to include the old northern part of the Interlake area under the PFRA. So far to my understanding the whole northern part of the Interlake area, I believe up to Stony Mountain, is not included under PFRA, and just the other day I received a request from a farmer that he would like to have a dugout and he enquired whether I know anything whether the PFRA would assist him. I enquired from the Honourable Minister at luncheon and he directed me to the authority which I got. Now to my surprise the department informed me, of the PFRA, that we are not included, which I believe the farmers out there in that particular area are discriminated, if I can use that word, on the dugout. I received some figures which the PFRA assist up to \$250 on dugouts, and stock and watering up to 25 cents per cubic yard, and so on and so forth, even as high as to \$1,000 if it's a neighbour project. Well possibly the farmers in that area would be able to take advantage of this. Whether the Minister gave a thought to ask the Federal Government to include the farmers of Interlake area under this PFRA.

MR. HUTTON: My understanding of the situation is this, that over the years there has been some encouragement given by the Manitoba Government to have the PFRA consider more of the province, but as I understand it at the present time, aside from the designated area in which PFRA has worked, they only assume responsibility in the Interlake area and some other areas as well on the basis of particular projects. They will undertake particular projects and have in the past, and they have undertaken and do a lot of investigational work, and carry out studies on particular projects for us. But I think that you can be assured that the Government of Manitoba is only too happy to receive more assistance through PFRA.

MR. WAGNER: Would it be possible for the Minister to say whether they would assist for a dugout, offhand, or would you have to look for the information?

MR. HUTTON: As I understand it, they would not at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Administration ----

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a small contribution to this debate. I am prompted to do so by an article that appeared, or appears in the latest issue of the Canadian Commentator, the February issue. I looked at my copy here yesterday and was surprised to find that I have been wrong all the time in thinking that Canadians were pretty well informed as to the seriousness of the plight of the western farmer. I didn't think that there were too many that didn't know about it, but when I read this article I was somewhat inclined to change my opinion. The journal itself is pretty highly thought of and it certainly isn't any comfort to us to see an article such as this appear in that particular journal. And I will just quote part of it, Mr. Chairman, and the whole article was written in the same vein, and I quote: "Farmers complain, among a multitude of other things, that the prices that they have to pay for commodities and machinery have gone up and are continuing to rise. But haven't we all suffered from the creeping paralysis of inflation since the end of World War II? Haven't we all been subject to the same harsh economic pressure? Why then should the farmer ask for special economic dispensation and complain bitterly when he doesn't get it? The long-suffering taxpayer might be forgiven for asking these questions once in a while; after all, he has been subsidizing farmers for years and getting little in return but abuse and further demands on his purse."

Now that led me to think, Mr. Chairman, that prior to the last two federal elections our western M.P.'s seemed to be very well informed as to the plight of the farmer here in the west, but after their election they have been, should I say, disinformed, or have done nothing at all about what they promised they'd do prior to that election. And I might go a step further. During a debate on this item, Mr. Chairman, the backbenchers of our government have been

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd) . . . very silent. Is it possible that they too are beginning to think along the lines of the article which appears under the name of -- I want to get this name straight, I've never seen it before -- R. Varela. There does seem to be something very wrong -- (Interjection)-- Varela -- V-A-R-E-L-A --(Interjection) -- No, I don't think you'd admit it even if you had.

Now we hear a lot about the squeeze and it probably wouldn't hurt at all, Mr. Chairman, if we just spent a moment or two and tried to find out the reasons for this squeeze. Are the farmers the only section of the Canadian community that are being subsidized one way or another? Or are other subsidies to some degree responsible for the adversities that the western farmer is facing today? I believe, Mr. Chairman, that you'll agree with me that there are more than the farmers asking for subsidies. The difference is that the farmers are not as successful in obtaining them as some other sections of our society, and we had some of the examples of what I mean right here on the floor of this House this afternoon. The CCF Party in asking for amendment to the Fair Wage Act, asking for an increase in minimum wages in the Province of Manitoba, what are they but subsidies? Any increase in wages eventually has to be paid by the consumer and the farmer is a consumer. And whether he pays it by way of taxes or higher prices it is still costing him more. It may not be a subsidy in the full sense of the word but he is certainly subsidizing labour. What about all this labour legislation that we have in this country today? What about unemployment insurance? Isn't that a subsidy by the Canadian consumer and isn't the farmer paying part of the cost of it? What about workmen's compensation benefits? What about all these free fringe benefits, hours of work, increased wages, holidays with pay both while working and while not working? Today we heard that the cost of living has gone up since 1949 to the tune of approximately 28%. This is added to the cost of what the farmer has to buy. We have heard this afternoon from one of the honourable members of the CCF Party that wages have gone up since 1949 but they haven't gone up high enough. They should be higher. Every time wages go up the cost of what labour produces goes up, and the farmer -- the squeeze on the farmer is that much more harsh. What about our manufacturers? What about these tariff protections that we've been speaking about during this debate? And the Honourable Minister of Agriculture in answer to those criticisms had to go back over half a century to quote some Liberal statesman of that time. He couldn't find anything within reasonable distance of 1960, of even within reasonable distance of the twentieth century. He had to go back to the 19th century for some of his quotes.

MR. HUTTON: Do you want me to do a little research?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: It's quite all right if you want to go into the historical background of the parties in this province. We've got no objection to that. But every time the tariff is raised on clothing or on anything else, the farmer's cost of living goes up. And those are the reasons for it. And when you find an article such as this, an opinion such as this expressed, you begin to wonder whether this lady or gentleman or whoever he may be or she may be, really has given the matter any study. Do those Canadians who do not appreciate the position of the western farmer really understand the situation? We are not asking for any handout for the western farmer. We are only asking for equal treatment. I think that the prices of farm commodities should in some manner be attached to or come into focus to the cost of living index. Everybody else says the cost of living index is going up, therefore I want a little higher pay in order that I may be able to live properly. The only way I can see that happen, Mr. Chairman, is a two price system on grain. And I think that this government would be doing a wonderful thing for the western farmer if they got behind a scheme of that nature and pushed it for all they were worth. I think if we had a two price system for grain then we could have our prices of western products set according to the cost of living index, and as the cost of living increased so would the price of the western products increase. There is no reason why the farmer should be subsidizing the rest of Canada in the cost of food, and I think that is one way that you would get away from that subsidization. That would be one way in which we could get some equality. I don't see why our breweries should be able to get their barley at the prices they are getting it. I think they should be made to pay an equalized price, equalized on the cost of living bonus, and I do hope that the honourable backbenchers of the government will get up before this debate is over and express opinions so that we can feel that we have a united front in here insofar as the western Canadian farmer is concerned.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, the last speaker brought me to my feet -- I and some of the others in the Opposition. It's a terrible thing, Mr. Chairman, to have a broken-down chassis, a hot rod engine, and no gas to go any place. I've listened to the debate in this House, and I think this is the tenth session, and while I was sitting over here where the honourable members on the right are sitting, we presented the story and the plight that the farmers were facing in Manitoba for the last ten years, and every year we brought in resolution after resolution asking for these things which the present government is doing. And now they are trying to get off the hook. And their gas, if they have any gas left, is not getting them off the hook. There are three kinds of people in this world, Mr. Chairman. The first will learn from their own experience and these are wise, very wise people; the second learn from the experience of others and we are quite happy on this side of the House that we have learned from the experience of others; then there is a third class of people that neither learn from their own experience nor the experience of others. And these honourable members over here have asked the previous speaker, why don't we do something about a two price system? I am sure my memory serves me right when session after session our Leader and the rest of the boys who sat in the opposition over here were asking for help for the farmers, and what did they do? -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Your leader?

MR. SHEWMAN: Pardon?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Was it your Leader at that time or the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. SHEWMAN: The Leader of the Opposition, I'm sorry. I bear correction from the Honourable Member for Carillon, because if I know anything about political expediency or parliamentary procedure I learned it from him because he was my tutor when I first came into this House, and I do respect him in every way, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBLIN: Let's have a little more of that.

MR. SHEWMAN: And when we were asking for loans on grains or assistance for farmers such as the crop insurance scheme, or anything that we brought up that was to further and help the farmers of Manitoba - no. And as I said before in a previous speech, the younger members go back and read the journals and you'll see how the opposition performed in those days as far as helping the farmers was concerned. And these things that they are bringing up today, Mr. Chairman, are things that we've been asking for: more research in livestock, more research for grain and things that the farmers need today. Everything that has been mentioned that they are asking this government to do, Mr. Speaker, they had the opportunity for 10 years in my recollection in this House.

I can remember right well, Mr. Speaker, when I was at home that I was given Betsy to take down the road, but I can never remember my dad ever giving me a wheelbarrow to bring the calf home in. Now these people are expecting things overnight, Mr. Chairman. They have had the opportunity to just do those things and if there is any blame to be put and blamed on anyone, it's the Liberal party that sits to the right, Sir, because they had the opportunity to help the farmers which they didn't do.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, the honourable member said that he rose to his feet because of the speaker just preceding him. I think I could use the same phrase beginning my few remarks because I was prompted to call the honourable member's attention to a resolution that appears on the Order Paper today. The honourable member said that when they, from the opposition side in the days that he sat here, proposed resolutions that were for the benefit of the farmers of this province that the government of the day set a horrible example by amending them and referring them to Ottawa, so I wanted to read the amendment that has been proposed by the government side of the House of today to the resolution presented by the Honourable Member for Fisher. The honourable members will all be acquainted with the resolution by the Honourable Member for Fisher, and what does the government of today do with that resolution? After the Honourable Member for Fisher has been trying to do something for the farmers, to use the words of the Honourable Member from Morris, by asking that this government use its influence or press upon the Government of Canada the need for cash payments to western farmers to make up for the deficiency between costs paid and prices received, etc., what does this government do? I'll remind the Honourable Member for Morris what he just said because this amendment says,

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd).....after striking out all the operative part, that putting in some different whereases, says, "therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this House the Government of Manitoba as spokesman for the people of the province should impress upon the Government of Canada the urgent need for action to improve this situation either by an immediate payment of cash assistance or other effective measures consistent with the general public interest." I wonder what my honourable friend the member from Morris thinks of that amendment if the practice is so reprehensible?

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Chairman, . . . (interjection)-- Well, it's not very good because I'm not the debater that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is, but I would think that this ---

MR. CAMPBELL: You're plenty good enough.

MR. SHEWMAN: But I would think that this resolution, this amendment is quite fair and quite justified. It is quite justified. It goes on, and I would give.....if I could remember such an amendment as far as the farm problem was concerned that ever came from the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 26 passed. No. 3

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry; I believe that we're still back on number (a).

MR. CHAIRMAN:.....either the items are going to be passed or not passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: We certainly should have some order and we've not passed an item yet tonight, not one. There have been no's from this side every time they have been mentioned. And I'll give notice now that there are going to be quite a few more speeches yet too.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, as I recall it, it was the normal practice in the House here that new members were always entitled to special courtesies from the House and weren't attacked too violently on their maiden efforts, and Ministers usually benefited from the same courtesies when they came up to deliver their first estimates before the House, that is of course provided that the Ministers were willing not to become provocative or belligerent in their presentation. Mind you, once they had opened the way by provocative statements, well of course they could expect a return engagement by members on the other side. It appeared to me that the Minister of Agriculture yesterday in his first comments during the course of the afternoon was certainly not belligerent; in fact it sounded to me as if he was reciting a funeral oration at that time insofar as agriculture was concerned. But between the afternoon and evening sessions he gathered some extra enthusiasm and then when we came back later he became -- well, much more positive in his views. And in particular there is one which struck me which I think is of utmost importance to the Province of Manitoba and to Western Canada as a whole, and that was his statement that we on this side were bringing up red herrings by bringing up the matter of trade. Mr. Chairman, I view this with a great deal of alarm from someone in the position of the Minister of Agriculture of any western province and of the Province of Manitoba in particular. Now he started off by trying to show that we Liberals were really not free traders and he went back, way far back into the textbooks back in 1893 and so on, to prove the point in this regard, and I certainly don't want to engage in a contest over ancient history with him, but I must say that I couldn't resist the temptation but to go back to one of my old textbooks. I found there a quotation which I thought he might find interesting himself to add to the collection that he read to us last night.

MR. McLEAN: Was that an authorized textbook?

MR. MOLGAT: Well I'm not quite sure whether the Minister of Education authorizes this one or not. It was a text at the university some few years ago. It's called The History of Canada, by Carl Whitky; this is the third edition. I don't know who Carl Whitky is, quite frankly, right now I've forgotten. (interjection).. However this was the third edition in May, 1941, and here's what he has to say on page 216. He said -- he is speaking of the era approximately 1878 -- he said, "The great issue by which MacDonald and the discredited conservatives hoped to return to power was the national policy -- the N.P.-- which was fundamentally and principally the policy of high protective tariffs, although other features were shrewdly coupled with this proposal in order to build a nationalist program which would appeal to all Canadians who believe in the great possibilities of their country." And Mr. Speaker, when I read that I thought to myself now that almost fits 1957 -- one need only change here from

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) the national policy to the visionary policy. One can imagine this whole program being developed all over again around that great vision. Well, I don't intend to cover all the old history as I said, and enter into a contest with my friend. I needn't cover Mr. Bennett -- his activities are well known. His statement that he would -- what was it? "blast his way into the markets of the world," which ended as far as I know only by his blasting his way right out of the House of Commons.

But I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture where has he been these past two and a half years, without going back to 1893? Where has he been since 1957? (Interjection). And I would suggest, I would suggest the Honourable Member for Swan River that if he keeps on making speeches like ones he made last night he'll be back there pretty quick because the agricultural people of Manitoba aren't going to take that kind of talk from the Minister of Agriculture. And this government across here had better start worrying if that is the basis of their agricultural policy and if they're going to come and tell the people that talking about trade is bringing up a red herring. Well, coming back to the situation in the past two years. I ask the Minister has he not followed what's gone on in world affairs in the past two years? Has he not found out that the government that took over Ottawa two and a half years ago has been steadily protectionists in its activities? One of the first things they told us before the election -- they talked about a 15% trade diversion from the United States to Great Britain. After the election nothing more was heard of it. The British came to Canada offered us free trade. This caused the greatest alarm in Ottawa. The two Ministers mainly concerned almost never recovered, and they certainly never talked about it again. The reply to the free trade offer was an increase on tariffs on British woollens; and from then on, Mr. Chairman, it's been step by step the same performance. There was first of all the method of valuation of all imports, and the Minister of Agriculture should know what that has meant to a lot of the farm people in Manitoba. His colleague who was then the Member for Manitou and is now the Minister of Municipal Affairs, introduced a resolution in this House last year because of this method of valuation. I will confess that he ended up by voting against his own resolution but that was not really his fault, the amendments did confuse him a little. Then the same thing carried on, Mr. Chairman, all the way down the line. The next thing was cotton goods for example. Here is a large heading from the Free Press, November 17th -- "Canada will seek higher cotton tariffs" -- it goes on to say, "negotiations will affect clothing and goods purchased by all Canadians, not only in the cotton field but in the synthetic fields such as nylons, orlons, and other fibres and lately we've had the same performance on Japanese goods." And this, Mr. Chairman, has been a steady constant progress -- I shouldn't say progress -- I should say retrograde step by the government in Ottawa, and this has been counter to every movement in the world today insofar as markets are concerned. We see developing on the continent the six nation group and in the British Isles the seven nation group. And what is their attitude? Again I refer to the newspapers, here's November 25th, Free Press: "Free trade trend wins in Europe. Common market will offer low tariffs to all. Outer seven group signs trade pact." And this, Mr. Chairman, is the present development in world markets. But where does Canada stand? Exactly at the reverse, and still the Minister says that we're bringing up a red herring. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is the most important factor to agriculture. In spite of the statements of the Minister, the question of markets is the basic item that concerns agriculture. Markets at decent prices, and that the actions of the government at Ottawa have been counter to the very interests of this province and of the agricultural interests of all of Western Canada. (Interjection). Which?

MR. EVANS: What about turkeys? Ask your friend from Emerson about turkeys.

MR. MOLGAT: Ah, my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce would like me to discuss turkeys. Well, it's true. I'll admit it. It was the Liberal Government that was in power when there was an increase made in the price of turkeys. That's true. (Interjection). All right, in the tariff on turkeys. Fine. I haven't stood here and pretended that the Liberal government that was previously in office always reduced every tariff. I can think of two cases where I criticized, one of them was on turkeys, one was prior to that when they made the change on the dumping regulations, and I think they are wrong in both cases and I'm not afraid to say it. But you look at their record -- and I can think of no one who's better placed than the Minister of Industry and Commerce -- and you go over the record from

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) 1935 until 1957 and you will see the most consistent decrease in tariffs in the history of Canada. (Interjection). Ah yes.

A MEMBER: Oh no.

MR. MOLGAT: You check it. I ask you, you check it, and bring us back the figures if you find differently. You'll find the government that operated in Ottawa, who was the most constant advocate of the general agreement on Trades and Tariffs --

A MEMBER: The same way Sir Wilfred Laurier was.

MR. MOLGAT: My honourable friend would rather talk than check the figures -- go back and check the figures. Go back and check with the tariffs in 1935 when your colleagues left the government in Ottawa, and find out what they were in 1957, and you will find that my statement is correct. It was a constant and steady development of freer trade, reciprocal trade with other countries.

Now I would like to say to my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture that before speaking about red herrings in the matter of trade that maybe he should check on what's going on right here in the Province of Manitoba. Is he not aware that in the early part of January Mr. W. J. Parker the President of the Manitoba Pool Elevators wrote to the Prime Minister of Canada not just on his personal behalf or that of the Pool Elevators, but as well on behalf of the United Grain Growers of the Alberta Wheat Pool and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I submit Mr. Chairman, there are four organizations, the three wheat pools and U.G.G. who certainly are well versed in agricultural matters, who know the agricultural problems, who've a long long experience in the problems of agriculture. What did they say? Their whole problem was this matter of Japanese trade and the actions that were being taken by the government in Ottawa affecting this potentially tremendous market for Canadian agriculture. Letters have followed, one after the other. I see from the paper last night that they're now at their third letter, and still without satisfaction from the Ottawa government.

Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture may not feel that the statements by Mr. Parker and the three wheat pools and the U.G.G. are sufficient basis for him to consider that trade is important. Then I'll refer him to an authority that he probably considers better -- to the Prime Minister of this country -- and I see from the paper tonight, I'm quoting now from the Tribune, that at long last none other than the Prime Minister says "that there should be a trade offensive sought by Canada, that the free world must rise to the Russian threat of an economic war and prove that free enterprise is better than communism". He proceeds to warn Canada about the dangers of Russian trade. So I think we've come the full circle, Mr. Chairman. If my honourable friend thinks it's a red herring, then he'd better consult some of the other authorities.

One other comment, Mr. Chairman, that I feel bears discussion, a statement of the Minister last night, is his reference to prices. He suggested that this was not the most important factor. Well I come back to my original statement. I think it's a question of prices and markets; those are the two basic factors concerning agriculture. My honourable friend again I think should check on some of the things that are going on. Here I'm quoting from a publication by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, published in Regina, January 1959, and this is what they're having to say. My honourable friend was telling us that it wouldn't matter too much if prices went up by 20% - it wouldn't make that much difference. That the real problem was, as I recall he stated, that there wasn't enough grain being delivered, there was less being delivered, or there had been more delivered since his party had taken over in Ottawa than previously. We lost our markets. (Interjection) Well here's what the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool had to say: "Moreover in the last five years while the agricultural problem has been building up, western farmers have delivered more wheat to country elevators than they have on the average for the last 35 years." And I'm skipping a little to carry on to the next paragraph: "In short, western farmers have been selling better than average crops during these years of surplus, and they have found nevertheless that the cost-price squeeze is forcing them into bankruptcy. The disparity between farm costs and farm prices is the major problem." And I repeat that one Mr. Chairman -- "the disparity between farm costs and farm prices is the major problem."

Now Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belittle the efforts of the Minister or his Department in regards to the improvement of production of quality, of assistance to agriculture.

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)..... We had a policy in that regard as well, the research that was conducted at the University, something that was started I think six or seven years ago now. The Department of Agriculture itself conducted a great deal, and that's good. No one will question that that is good. But Mr. Chairman, I still submit that in spite of the statements of the Minister of Agriculture last night it is prices and markets that are the main consideration, and I submit that this government, in my opinion, has not been sufficiently aggressive in presenting the case of Manitoba farmers to the government at Ottawa; that it has not been sufficiently aggressive on this matter of trade and the statements of the Minister of Agriculture last night in my opinion show exactly the opinions of this government on that subject. In his opinion trade is a red herring, and I say Mr. Chairman, that that is entirely wrong.

.....Continued on next page

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I can't let the statements of my Honourable Friend from Ste. Rose stand. I think he has carried on in the tradition that has lately been established by his party that is of a deliberate distortion of the facts and a deliberate distortion of what I had to say last evening. I at no time in my address stated or even intimated that trade was a red herring.

MR. GUTTORMSON: You said it last night.

MR. HUTTON: I objected most violently to the old trick, the old standby trick of the Liberal party of putting themselves up as the champions of free trade and besmirching the Conservative party as the champion of the tariffs, and I said that was the red herring. And I think it might be a very good idea Mr. Chairman, if the Liberal Opposition were to hold a caucus once in a while to establish some consistency in their policies and in their statements, because the Leader of the Opposition last evening definitely and very vehemently stated that the loss of markets to the Canadian farmer were not a factor in his present crisis, and I think Mr. Chairman.....

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I want to correct that statement. I said that my honourable friend was wrong in saying that the markets had been lost.

MR. HUTTON: And I proved to you from the statement of the Canadian Wheat Board that the market for oats dropped from almost 70 million to three million.

MR. CAMPBELL: On one commodity.

MR. HUTTON: I think I also pointed out that from 1952 to '53 and in 1953 to '54, that we lost approximately 120 million bushels of our share in the world trade, for wheat.

MR. CAMPBELL: One year.

MR. HUTTON: One year, and it didn't come back.

MR. CAMPBELL: What about these figures

MR. HUTTON: And it didn't come back. I am using the Canadian Wheat Board statistics and I believe they are fairly accurate.

Canadian exports of wheat. In the year 1952-53 were 329 million bushels; in 1953-54 they were 208 million bushels. I was not the one, Mr. Chairman, who said that trade was not important. I say again that I objected only to the insinuation that the conservatives in Canada should be the only ones associated with a high tariff policy. If the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose would like me to read that excerpt again, I think more than anything I have ever run into in history, those two quotations, prove the point that I was trying to make. That the Liberal Party in Canada down through history has passed themselves off as the champions of free trade while all the time they hug very closely to those things which they condemned to the public.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't like to interrupt my honourable friend but would he like to bring us more up to date. He quoted us 1893 to 1905 last evening. Would he like to bring up the record of our party in the matter of free trade up to more current times, and right up to 1957, then we'll be delighted to have him read anything he wants onto the record.

MR. HUTTON: I say again, Mr. Chairman, that I think that there is nothing more important to the farmers of western Canada than trade and markets; and I believe that they are more important than price because without markets the western Canada will shrivel up. And I would like to say also in reply to the statements of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains that when he talks about prices and that something should be done, I would suggest to him that if we are to increase the prices for farm products we must definitely think in terms of controls on productions, and I am wondering if he is ready to stand up and be counted amongst those who want to see the western farm economy shackled with controls. And until the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains and his colleagues are ready to take such a stand, I think they should consider the implication of pressing for subsidies upon the products that we the farmers of western Canada have to sell. Certainly we want higher prices, and certainly it is much easier to operate under economic conditions which give to us a fair return, but I believe we must be very careful that we in trying to achieve a fair return do not find that we have jumped from the frying pan into the fire.

And on the question of learning from experience, I think we don't have to look very far afield to see what has happened in other countries. And if we just turn our eyes south, and certainly no one in this Assembly can plead ignorance, of the terrible situation that has developed in the United States. And down there the farmers, a great number of the farmers would love

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) to shake off the shackles of government control and they find themselves in the anomalous position that they have created vested interests down there who find it to their advantage to keep these controls. The storage people who are drawing off a billion dollars a year; they have every reason to want to keep these controls. And even if the majority of the farmers decided that they wanted to go back to a free farm economy they would have to fight the vested interests that they have created by this system.

We're in trouble, but let us be very careful that we don't get in to more trouble. In western Canada we are not producing nearly what we could produce. And I say again that we don't want to shrivel up in the west, we want to grow and we want markets. And we won't get them if we ask for government policies that are going to offend the very markets that we wish to gain.

On the insinuation that I don't accept Mr. Parker of the Manitoba Pool Elevators as an authority on trade, I would like to say this. I never have at any time in this House or anywhere else ever intimated that free trade wasn't in the best interests of western Canada; and I am as anxious as anyone that our trade with a customer as good as Japan should thrive and flourish. My honourable friend from Ste. Rose has done a very good job of something that he has probably had a good deal more experience in than I have — and that's of twisting the words of his Opposition to suit his own needs.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on a matter of principle I must object to that statement. On a question of privilege I must object to that statement.

MR. HUTTON: The honourable member deliberately -- Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose associated my reference to a "red herring" to trade and I never mentioned the word. I mentioned "tariff".

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I regret the understanding that I had with the honourable member's statement last night -- and I haven't got Hansard I regret -- was that he said that we were bringing in a red herring into this discussion when we were discussing trade and tariff.

MR. HUTTON: When the point is proven that you have made, I will be glad to apologize. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose suggested that the record of trade, the record of Canadian policy in trade from 1935 to 1957 proved that the Liberal Party in Canada was a party of free trade. Well Sir, in all fairness I think the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose should also tell this Assembly, or remind them because we should all know it, that during the thirties not only were Canadian restrictions on trade very stringent, they were stringent in all the countries of the world. And the Bennett administration only did what it was compelled to do in self defence. And I would also say, Mr. Chairman, that the Liberal tariff policy was as lenient as circumstances in world trade permitted it to be. And I object again as I did last evening to the suggestion that high tariffs are traditionally associated with the Conservative Party and that low tariffs are traditionally associated with the Party that they represent. I want to state so that it is clearly understood that the Minister of Agriculture of Manitoba considers trade and markets as the most important factor in the development of agriculture not only in Manitoba but in the entire West.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, like many other speakers I will start off by saying I had not intended to speak tonight, but when the Honourable the Minister claims that the Liberal Party is not associated with lower tariffs than the Conservative Party is, I feel that he is absolutely off the track. He has not proven his case at all except by quoting Wilfred Laurier before the century started. Does he not remember the election of 1911, the reciprocity election? Doesn't he remember that there was in 1921 a Progressive Party which swept the western provinces. They went to Ottawa as Progressives. They watched the two parties in action and they finally fused with the Liberal Party because they thought the Liberal Party was the party of lower tariffs.

MR. HUTTON: They though. Yes, that's where they made the mistake.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Yes absolutely, they did. They had seen the two and they joined with the ones -- the party which they were sure and thought -- and they were sure -- they became sure that it was a lower tariff party than the other one. We saw Mr. Bennett -- and in fact this was a major factor why I became a Liberal myself after having farmed for a while, because the Liberal Party was the party that would do most for the farmers of Western Canada and I was one of them myself. It was this factor. I was a Progressive; I wanted lower tariffs;

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)....there was a better change of getting lower tariffs from the Liberal Party than from the Conservatives. And we got lower tariffs. As soon as Mr. Bennett was elected, up went the tariffs. And everybody knows it. It shouldn't have to be proven in this House. The Honourable members on the other side know it very well that it is a fact -- we all know that it is a fact and why should we argue about it indefinitely -- I don't see why. We know that between 1935 and it was well stated by my colleague from Ste. Rose, tariffs had a tendency to go down definitely -- there were a few exceptions -- nothing is perfect. But since 1957 in June, tariffs went up again. Amendments to the Customs' Act, everything's gone up and now we had hoped that we could increase our trade with Japan -- what's developing. I'm sure we all read the papers, we know what's going on. The Japanese would like to sell us stainless steelware, but "no" says Mr. Diefenbaker, that would do harm to the eastern interests. Oh, no, voluntary quotas. And it's a fact that should not have to be proven in this House that tariffs have gone up since the Conservatives are in office in Ottawa. And I know for sure, and you are starting to realize I'm sure on that side of the House, that after a few years the people of Western -- of Canada will have caught on for good. Have we seen a thousand farmers go to Ottawa during the Liberal regime? Have we seen it? Was the trouble as intense, as grave as it is now? The plight of the farmers was not as bad; it's getting from bad to worse. And I say that when the Minister says he didn't say that the tariff he meant the red herring was mentioned with respect to trade, but trade is affected by tariffs -- it's just about one and the same thing. Absolutely, when tariffs are high, trade goes down. So I say that there was a red herring thrown before us in this House last night. And in spite of all the denials, I believe it is a sad day when the Minister of Agriculture for this province throws this red herring when discussing this most important matter as was so well brought forward by the member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to first of all say that I was most pleased to hear the Minister establish himself as a free trader, but I was disappointed when he went a little further and found it necessary to defend R. B. Bennett's policies. I would like to hear him when he has the opportunity of perhaps defending Mr. Diefenbaker's policies on the subject of Anti-Dumping Bills.

MR. HUTTON:I'm not here to defend it,....

MR. ROBERTS: No, but you found it necessary to defend Mr. Diefenbaker quite a few times in the last 48 hours, and you found it necessary to defend Mr. Bennett. Surely..

MR. HUTTON: At what time?

MR. ROBERTS: You just finished telling us why R. B. Bennett raised the tariffs.

MR. HUTTON: I objected to an association, that you weren't to I didn't defend anything.

MR. ROBERTS:you seemed to be rather proud -- that was about the proudest I'd heard you speaking was when you were talking about Mr. Bennett's policies. (Interjection). Personally I would think you would rather divorce yourself from him as far as you could.

I actually rose on an entirely different subject. I noticed in the recent reports of the Manitoba Vegetable Growers' Association Convention that they have passed a motion to request the Provincial Government to hold another plebiscite with regards to marketing board "at the earliest possible date" is how their resolution reads. Would the Minister please tell us if he has been approached and would he tell us what his decision is?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't wish to raise the subject of order in an irritating way but after all we are still on the Minister's salary on which we are expected to make rather general statements. And I think it's true that a number of rather general statements have been made and perhaps we could now consider the possibility of passing this item and going on. Then when my honourable friend who has just spoken wants to raise that question, I'm sure that under soils or crops or some suitable place it could and should be raised.

MR. ROBERTS :a suitable place?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I'm sure we can find a spot to assist you on -- probably under soils and crops. I'm sure there's a place where it can be raised. All I'm trying to say is if we have concluded our general discussion then let's get on and we can deal with these points one at a time.

MR. CAMPBELL: But we probably haven't concluded our general discussion, Mr. Chairman, because of lot of these matters fit into the general discussion. If there's no specific item in the estimates themselves then the custom is, and I think a proper one, to raise them on the Minister's salary or on the first vote of this department, so that I suggest that the question

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.).....is quite in order.

MR. ROBLIN: Let's get on with the business. That's a good idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN:Members in the House, and that is that we should point out as we go through the estimates here, many of these things we are discussing come up under particular items and that when we come to those items we have to stick closely to the item. We've had seven and a quarter hours in a general discussion, and that perhaps, is one reason why we are thinking that it's ready to go on with the separate items.

MR. PAULLEY: As you know Mr. Chairman, when we discussed the Department of Education we had quite a comprehensive discussion on the Minister's salary, and then as a result of that discussion the individual items went through rather rapidly, and the same might hold true -- I only say "might" advisedly -- the same might hold true in respect of the Department of Agriculture. So I would suggest that possibly the discussion should carry on the way it is in the hope that after the matter has been thoroughly discussed on the Minister's salary that the items may slide through. I use the word "may" advisedly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We got through in very good time when we did have a thorough discussion and I have been feeling hopeful as we've gone along in the last while that perhaps it is going to facilitate the details further along. I've been clinging for that hope and I hope that that will...

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I just heard you say that we'll be going item by item and we should stick to our item. Well I don't see where I can discuss culverts and bridges under this item, and I believe (Interjection) I'm sorry but it says under Agriculture and Conservation, the Water Control Department has been fixed from Public Works. And under what item do I discuss culverts?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready then (a)

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe the Minister has given an answer to that, but it seems to me that surely, on the Minister's introduction he covered a lot of ground, and we would have the same right to cover the same ground. Now we didn't start the discussion on -- (Interjection) Oh, my Honourable Friend the First Minister has changed very considerably, hasn't he from the days when he sat over here. He had no worries then of keeping us for hours and hours. Well we're not trying to keep you for hours and hours, we're trying to find out what you're doing -- that's all. And you are not trying to help the issue, you're trying to confuse us. So if you find a lot of questions from us don't complain.

Now referring back to what I said earlier, I want to remind the Minister that he's the one that brought the subject up and let us have no complaints now about our discussion on trade and tariffs on this ... (Interjection) ... That's fine. Now I'd like to ask some questions, Mr. Chairman, on the plumbing course for farmers, because I would like to know whether that which was explained to us yesterday is really what the government was talking about in the Throne Speech. Because the Throne Speech said right on page one, Hansard No. 1--that "recent surveys indicate that only 7% of farm homes in this province are equipped with modern water supply and sewage systems. My government, through the extension service of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation, is introducing a useful program to assist rural people to plan and install their own modern water supply and sewage disposal systems for their farm and home." Well I want to say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that the statement of the Minister yesterday that they are going to have farmers on a plumbing course is undoubtedly very good. I don't criticize that procedure one least little bit. Any assistance that they're prepared to give the farmer on plumbing courses, welding courses, cow milking courses, whatever they like, as long as it's useful, I'm for it. But surely, Mr. Chairman, surely the plumbing course he talked about yesterday isn't the program that they referred to in the Throne Speech. Now we're accustomed that when something comes out in the Throne Speech when it's given a major portion as this, a whole paragraph on page one, that this is going to be their major program. And if that's the plan that my honourable friend was talking about yesterday, I can only qualify it as a farce and a phoney unless.....

MR. HUTTON: You've qualified other programs....

MR. MOLGAT: ... unless there's a lot more to it then he told us yesterday, and I hope there is. I certainly hope that this isn't referring to the same thing, because it's just inconceivable to me that this would be referred to in the Throne Speech as a major item of agricultural policy, and that it should turn out to be the plumbing course that my friend talked about yesterday.

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.).....(Interjection). The two just don't go together, Mr. Chairman. Now if really that's it, then I suggest that the agricultural policies of my honourable friends across the way have really gone down the sewer. They're really down at the lowest ebb if that's what they're presenting to us. Now it appears to me that my honourable friends across there heard that Saskatchewan was going to have a plan of that sort. Now I can't claim to have been a great admirer of the Government of Saskatchewan at all times...(Interjection)... It must be by sitting next to the gentleman here. But it appears that the Government of Saskatchewan has a plan in this regard -- a real live plan, something that will do something. Now, the only conclusion I can draw is if my honourable friends really mean this to be the plan, is that they heard that Saskatchewan was going to do something, and they said "My, we can't be left behind on this course, we've got to get in the plumbing business too. If we can't help the farmers with the plumbing, at least we'll give them a course.

MR. ROBLIN: He wants to talk about the plumbing. I think he's got something to tell those fellows.....(Interjections)

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, this is rather amusing. First of all the Government was criticized for having a great many more civil servants than the previous administration, and they said, what have you got all these civil servants for if you are not going to offer programs -- new programs to the people of Manitoba. Now surely after being in office under one name or another from 1922 that they should have some idea of how the departments in the government work, and especially of how the Department of Agriculture works for the people of Manitoba. There seems to be an assumption on the part of the Opposition that unless you're throwing money around holus bolus that you're not helping the people of Manitoba. They seem to reject the idea that by working with people and giving them the opportunity to use their resources to the fullest extent that you can help them -- they reject this conception. Now this is contrary to the whole concept of extension work. And this is the work of the Department of Agriculture -- is extension work. And yet, they come into this House and advocate that we should do away with this extension work -- it doesn't amount to a row of beans.....

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, could the Honourable Minister tell us who advocated that, and when?

MR. ROBLIN: You. You just told us now.

MR. MOLGAT: Oh no, no. I congratulated you on your plumbing course.

MR. HUTTON: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in his previous statement said that he didn't want to belittle the work of the Department of Agriculture, but...(Interjection) but what? You tell us.

MR. GUTTORMSON: You're the Minister, at least you're supposed to be.

MR. HUTTON: I don't know what you're thinking. I take a guess once in awhile.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I can't even guess.....

MR. ROBLIN: Now don't flatter him George.

MR. HUTTON: This isn't educational. It falls within the work of the Extension Department. It isn't a correspondence course as they try to intimate. (Interjection) It's a personal contact and a real service. Qualified plumbers are going to be engaged to teach the farmer how to do the various jobs. Qualified people will visit the home, make plans. Now what are they doing in Saskatchewan? Now the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose may have a closer association with the CCF party than I have -- no doubt he has -- but to my knowledge the only thing I know about their program out there is that they are going to go out and give engineering assistance on the farm, and I gather to a large extent help the farmer in developing a supply of water. And beyond that, and they say that this service is worth -- I think the figure on the average was \$800, this engineering service. Well, I don't know; I've never put a figure on what it's worth to have qualified people go out and plan a plumbing installation for the farmer; to supervise it to some extent; to teach him how to do the job; to organize the purchase of the materials that he needs so he can get a better price on it; to organize the excavation and so forth that is necessary for the fields -- I don't know just what this is worth except what my experts tell me. And they tell me that this will effect a saving for the farmer of approximately a third of the cost of the installation of water and sewage in the farm home. Now because we aren't giving a cheque to the individual farmers for \$600 they say that it's no good, and I say especially -- and I direct this to the Liberal Opposition -- that when they were in power two

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) short years ago their Leader believed that a penny saved was a penny made. But now that's happened? Has he come awake? And we believe that this again of course is a beginning, but we believe that this can be the beginning of a useful and worthwhile service, and if the farmers continue to show an interest in it, and I have had an indication only today -- I've had an enquiry by an individual farmer who wanted to be sure and get in on it. And I must state once again this evening, I wish I could take credit for originating this idea. It's a good idea and I wish I could take credit, but the credit belongs to the farmers of Manitoba because they thought of it. Now if you still want to suggest that the farmers of Manitoba are fuzzy-wuzzy and that they haven't any conception of what is worthwhile and what isn't worthwhile, then you can make that suggestion. I suggest that it is a very worthwhile program; that it is going to effect the saving of approximately \$650 on a \$2000 job; and that it may be just as effective in the long run and effect just as much of a saving in the long run to the farmers of Manitoba as this much-vaunted program that we hear of from Saskatchewan, because -- I am willing to be corrected --but I personally at the present time am not aware of any of the details of that program.

..... Continued on next page.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister seemed to ask a rhetorical question a moment ago. If I had come awake. Well, I want to suggest to him that I am awake enough to see through that argument that he just advanced about throwing money around anyway. Now what did he say? As I heard him, he said that we folk over here, including me, that we seemed to think that if the Government isn't throwing money around holus bolus -- it's not doing anything. That's what he said. But we're not the ones that suggested throwing the money around holus bolus. It's my honourable friends. And if any people in the history of this province have given the public the impression that they think that the throwing of money around holus bolus is the important thing, then it's these people over here, because all the publicity that we've had -- and goodness knows we've had a lot of it since my honourable friends went into office, and of course plenty before they were in office when they were conducting election campaigns -- the publicity time after time, after time, after time in every place that they speak, Ministers and all the rest -- Honourable the Attorney-General over in his own constituency -- and all the Ministers as they trail around this Province of Manitoba, it's how much money we're spending. How much money we're spending! They're the people that seem to think that throwing money around holus bolus is what the people want. We're not the ones that suggested it. What we're suggesting is simply that the government implement its promises. That's all. And in this case, the promise is the one that was in the Speech From the Throne. So if there is any suggestion about throwing money around my honourable friends were the people who started that procedure. They are the ones that are still selling it to the public, because I notice the speeches that my honourable friends make in all parts of this province -- it's the amount of money we're spending here, there and every place else.

Now this promise, this particular one was made in the Speech From the Throne. It was to be a program worthy of mention in the Speech From the Throne. Maybe what my honourable friend says is right. It may be a good program, I'm not criticizing it. All I'm asking is what's being done with regard to it? And I would like to know -- I had the plumbing courses, etc., marked down for a later place in the estimates, but since we've entered on the discussion we might as well continue it I suppose -- all I'd like to know is how many people are enrolled up to date in these courses? Are the courses started? Because as I read the article that has appeared in the paper -- and we assume that the Speech From the Throne was mentioning a program for this year's implementation -- as I read the article in the paper these teams of engineers and sanitary inspectors will have to go out and inspect the farms. Well, by the time they do that can you get people, can you get farmers enrolled now, before seeding starts? Can you have these courses completed with the farms inspected? Well if you can, that's fine. And have we any idea how many we're going to have. And may I ask the Honourable Minister the question: is this government going to help with the water supply because the water supply is tremendously important in the majority of cases. There are a few fortunate districts that have almost a ready made water supply, but a great many other districts just don't and the water supply is pretty difficult to come by and absolutely essential to the program. Now is this government going to help with the water supply?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is the most interesting House that I've ever had the honour to be in.

A MEMBER: What others have you been in besides this one?

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I was in one or two other sessions but it is really most interesting. Interesting because it has been revealed in this Chamber this session, as indeed it has been in others, that the people of Manitoba have missed the boat in not electing a CCF government in the Province of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: There's no doubt of that.

MR. PAULLEY: Now then my friends to my right have criticized the government on many occasions because they have only swallowed up our platform. And now tonight we have the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose berating the government because they haven't adopted, in respect of sewer and water extensions, the program of the Province of Saskatchewan which is a shining example for all of the North American continent of a government which is truly a government of the people. Now then my friend and particularly the Leader of the Opposition has berated us on numerous occasions because of our philosophies and our policies -- And it was quite proper. But it was with great interest at their convention here just a matter of a few weeks ago, we noted

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . that insofar as the Liberal progressive, with a small 'p', Party of Manitoba is now undertaking a survey of the possibilities of socialized -- and get that word well -- socialized medicine for the Province of Manitoba. They're also having under consideration compulsory automobile insurance, and now tonight my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose is berating the government because they're not going far enough in sewer and water installation in the Province of Manitoba. And then we have on the other hand, on the other side of the House, the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, sort of apologizing for the introduction of a system of sewer and water scheme for the betterment of the people of Manitoba, apologizing because "well, we're just starting out." And I suggest this that both the members on the far side of the House and the members to my right just join with me and my group in the formation of a new party in the Dominion of Canada, where we thoroughly analyze the factors which are necessary for the well-being of the people of our province and the people of Canada. There would be no hesitation on the part of the Minister of Agriculture at the grass roots basis; we'd inform him of what the farmers desire and what the farmers need in respect of plumbing and water. He could come along with us. It wouldn't be necessary for my friends on my right after 20 or 30 years of consideration to come along with such things as socialized medicine and automobile insurance and the like.

So what I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, while we are dealing with the question of agriculture, a principle has been established here tonight and ever since we started this session that both the Conservatives and the Liberals are missing the boat. Come along with us and the trials and tribulations of the people of Manitoba and Canada will be well taken care of. Because of the three parties who are amply represented here in this Chamber -- and I say amply in deference to my friend from Rhineland -- of the three parties that are amply represented in this Chamber, we alone, of the CCF, know where we're going.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to pursue the subject of plumbing too far but I can hardly resist remarking on the Honourable Minister's exaggeration of the value of this course. I think we're all agreed that the course can be of a great value to men who study it and make use of it. But his figure of \$600 on a plumbing course surely must be very high. I have first hand experience, having installed plumbing in my farm home within the last six years, the total cost of installing the plumbing, and it is a good plumbing system, was only \$200 more than the \$600 he mentions. And the engineering and the blueprints and the equipment and the digging equipment and the wrenches and vices and so forth that were used in the installation of the plumbing were supplied to me free of charge by the company that sells the plumbing equipment. And surely this is available to any farmer who decides to install plumbing, this service by the company who supplies the plumbing equipment. And I think that the Honourable Minister has grossly exaggerated the value of the course. I hope that the Minister will answer my question with regard to Vegetable Marketing Boards before this item is passed.

MR. HUTTON: The marketing boards first. The answer is "no". I have not been approached, and to the second part of that question, I would suggest that I will deal with it when I face the problem, or the situation. On the question of the cost of plumbing installation, I think this is purely a question of opinion. I could say that the Member for La Verendrye had grossly exaggerated, or minimized the cost of the installation of plumbing just as he has said that I have exaggerated it; the figures that I give are those of my department and these men have been trained. I suggest they should know something of the value of supplies, the cost of labour and so forth that are involved. And as a matter of fact, I myself have had experience also within the last six years, of installing plumbing and I didn't get away with \$800.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I won't pursue the matter further. I assure you that my figures are correct as to the cost of installing the plumbing and I assure you the plumbing is still working.

On another subject . . . -- (Interjection) -- the Honourable the Minister in his introductory remarks spoke at some length on the weed control policy of the province and I think all of us in the Committee heard the same speech last year delivered by another Minister of Agriculture. And it was quite interesting to me. A very few days or very shortly after the Honourable Minister of Agriculture of last year, who incidentally was also the Honourable Minister of Public Works, delivered this speech about the stepped-up program in weed control, and he went on to tell about the \$1,000 per farm damage that weeds were doing and assuring us that the weed

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.)... control program was in effect and was working well and was being stepped up and had been already stepped up. It was very interesting for me particularly, and annoying I think somewhat. Right after the very day the session closed, the Member for St. Boniface and I decided to have a short holiday in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare, and to do this, we had to drive through the constituency of the present Minister of Agriculture -- I think it's No. 8 highway that runs straight north there -- and once we left McPhillip's Street and from there right through the Rockwood-Iberville constituency -- the Gimli constituency, on No. 8 highway I believe it is -- on both sides, both highway right-of-ways, on both sides of the highway, both ditches were absolutely full of weeds all in seed, none of which had been mowed or sprayed or cut down or anything else that year. We made a list as we drove along, we saw dandelions, sow thistle, Canada thistle, stinkweed, mustard, wild barley, wild oats, golden rod, giant ragweed and perennial ragweed and many others we didn't recognize, all in seed. We didn't see any leafy spurge. Particularly the thistles and the wild barley were blowing over onto farmers' fields in every direction and the other weeds were being carried by water. Surely the old program has very little meaning if our own Provincial Government highways take no better care of their roadsides than that.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture has explained in detail his plan on the sewage; this is what the Speech from the Throne says: My government through the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation is introducing a useful program to assist rural people to plan and install their own modern water supply and sewage disposal system for their farm and home. Now surely the pledge is being kept on the very program as outlined by the Minister.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to dwell on the subject of drainage or on agriculture. I'm afraid that I might accidentally pull the chain and the whole policy will go down the drain, so I'll leave it alone.

But mention was made before on carrots and you remember last year in this House that I cited an example where a farmer went across the 'Line'; he bought a seeder for something like -- I don't exactly remember the figures, but I think it was around \$100 or close to that. At any rate, it was assessed for over double at the Boundary. He did not take the seeder; he says I'll wait till the Liberal Government comes back in power and I'll get it across free. Well, I'm -- (Interjection) -- Just a minute, he didn't have to wait. I'll finish the story to you; that's the reason I got up. I'm happy to announce that there was a reversal of the Ottawa policy and I do not know whether that resolution that was voted -- brought in and then voted against by the present Minister of Municipal Affairs -- helped or not, but the farmer has been notified that he can come and take possession of his implement now without any charge whatsoever. They may be becoming liberal.

There's another mention made here and that's turkeys. Maybe you remember the former Minister of Agriculture, the present Lieutenant-Governor invited me to make a speech on turkeys. At the present time, with the permission of the Chairman, I am ready to go into the whole history of turkeys. I can take up about -- until about 11 o'clock anyway if I get the permission of the Chairman. (Interjection) -- No. I don't think I'll bore the members with that -- gobble-gobble, tweet-tweet -- It's quite an interesting story. But there's something else that I wanted to bring to the attention of the House and that is, somebody -- I think it's the Honourable the Minister or it might be one of the other members, had mentioned before, the tariff on turkeys. I would like to remind them that it wasn't the former Liberal government who placed that tariff. Immediately after the election of the present government in Ottawa, that's when this policy was implemented.

A MEMBER: Who requested it?

MR. TANCHAK: I'll tell you who requested it. I happened to be one of the Board of Directors on the Turkey Association, and if you want the complete story I'll tell you. In that board there are seven of us, and in the board there were at least five, and I'll say good Conservatives -- we can find a few good ones -- and the story that they told us is that now is our chance; we could not get anywhere with the Liberal government but the Conservative government is in power now. I am sure -- one of our members said -- I am sure now that if we approach the new Minister he will readily accede to it and that's exactly what happened. I myself was not in favour of it but I felt it was my duty and my obligation as one of the members.

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) ... When the majority in the board had voted and asked me to do it, I dropped that request into the Minister, the former Minister, and he was willing to pass the information on. But I say right now that even without that request of the Minister, I think that the Turkey Association would have had it. I myself did not favour it at the time and even the deficiency payments. I did not go in favour of that. I was in favour of the turkey market seeking its own level and I can --

MR. HUTTON: ... a favourable position too, very safe.

MR. TANCHAK: Maybe you're right, but I don't agree with you. So I think that this proves the point that the Conservative government is always sponsoring higher taxes.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition mentioned water supply before. I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture just what is being contemplated this year in the way of water supply, especially for the Pembina Triangle. Could we have a progress report as to what is being done and how the matter is being co-ordinated in the department? It seems to me there's a certain overlapping although I'm new and I would like to have some explanation on it.

MR. HUTTON: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that this comes under capital expenditures and I would be very happy to give a full story on it at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, 1 (a) -- we haven't yet, I think, asked the Minister how many people are represented in these salaries? Could we get that figure?

MR. HUTTON: Ten.

MR. CAMPBELL: No change since last year.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, still on 1 (a), I just want to ask a very brief word on the matter of the plumbing course, and I assure my honourable friend from the CCF Party that I hadn't really been advocating the plan Saskatchewan were putting in. All I was saying is that I commended the Minister for the plan he was putting in here; I thought it was good. But that surely it wasn't the major plank in the agricultural policy of this government, one that would enter in the way that it does in the Throne Speech. If so, I think that it's certainly not a very good indication of the basic agricultural policy of this government. Now there is one of my major complaints on the matter of operation of this government, and this is just one other sample of it, making a great deal of noise about a situation that really doesn't warrant it. A good program -- admitted, but certainly not one that deserves the type of promotion that my honourable friends are giving to it and that's the policy that they're following through in so many other fields. I have one here as an example on the matter of the disaster payments. I'd just like to read to the House -- oh, not all of the reports that have been put out, but these are the reports that went out from the, well let's call it the propaganda section of my honourable friend's government. Subsequent -- (Interjection) -- well, maybe we set it up but let me tell you; you sure improved it.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): We're better at a lot of things.

MR. MOLGAT: We were slouches compared to you in this one, and listen to this one. Now here's the record in the matter of assistance to farmers on this disaster. The first issue is on October 13th and the heading is, "Hutton on Two-Day Tour of Snow-Hit Farm Land" and there's a two page spiel on that one, and just on the side, the Minister's name manages to appear eight times in the page and a quarter. October 13th then. The next one's October 19th and it's "Freight Assistance on Fodder and Bedding". A freight assistance program to help cover the cost of transporting fodder and bedding to Manitoba's livestock farmers was announced Monday by Honourable George Hutton, Agriculture Minister, and his name appears, manages to, seven times in that particular release. Then on October 23rd we have another one, "Provinces ask Farm Aid on an Individual Basis". Now this is a very poor one. He only appears twice but he does manage to get my honourable friend the First Minister in twice too, so that made up for it. November 20th is the next one -- "Hutton Outlines Feed Grain Aid", and he appears seven times in that one. Then we have December 4th, "Manitoba Proposes Farm Aid on Basis of Need". Three appearances for the Honourable Minister on that one. Then this is the prize in my opinion. On December 8th, he says, "Detailed Disaster Plan is expected this week". In other words, we have been talking about it now for five issues but it's

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) ... expected this week, and we have put in an announcement in that regard and that's good for three mentions. Then on December 11th we have, "Hutton Lists Details of Farm Aid Program," finally -- we finally get the program and he manages eight insertions on that one. Now there, Mr. Chairman, is the type of programs that we have been getting from this government. A great deal of propaganda and very little action.

A MEMBER: A lot of hay.

MR. MOLGAT: A lot of hay!

A MEMBER: A lot of hay.

MR. MOLGAT: Aha, that's the trouble. -- (Interjection) -- Not too good. Now what I would like to know from the Minister is exactly where do we stand on this assistance program now. Have any payments been paid out? I understand that in certain areas that the PFAA payments have been held up pending this survey. I understand that certain farmers in the province are receiving at the moment no PFAA payments pending this. I think that's bad. I want to repeat statements that have been made by members on our side that I cannot agree at all with the decision of this government to exclude those who receive PFAA payments from this aid. I think that the two are entirely distinct programs. The PFAA is an insurance plan of a type to which the farmers pay whether they like it or not. So far in Manitoba the money that they have received is strictly their own money. There has been no government money involved in payments to Manitobans, it's been strictly the money the farmers have paid in; and I can see no reason whatever that they are excluded from the program that my honourable friends have set up after eight publicity releases over a period of two months on that basis. Now I would like the comments of the Minister in that regard.

MR. HUTTON: I believe, Mr. Chairman, when I told the House yesterday that somewhere between 1600, at least 1600 cars -- the equivalent of 1600 cars, rail cars of hay and straw had been moved in the Province of Manitoba, 800 by rail and I believe, Mr. Chairman, if I'm not incorrect, that the government was attacked in this House because of the amount of hay that was moving on the highways in the Province of Manitoba. I think I'm correct in saying that. And now, Mr. Chairman, they turn around and say that our assistance doesn't amount to anything. Now I wish, Mr. Chairman, to avoid confusion, and I ask it once again, that the Liberal Opposition get together on these matters. Now there has been a total of \$77,491.41 paid out in assistance to date. The payments are going out at a good clip and I think that before this House is finished sitting that we will have a very, very justifiable position in regard to the money that has been spent to help the farmers in this province.

And I just take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to revert back to something that was said last evening by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition when he was comparing Manitoba's program to that of our province to the west, and he picked out those portions of it that served his purpose, but he neglected to tell the House that in the Province of Saskatchewan they have a scaled down method of payment. If you threshed up to 110 acres of crop you qualified for the top payment of either \$3 or \$2 per acre. But for every ten acres that you have harvested over 110 acres the grant is discounted by 10%, and so if you have harvested between 191 and 200 acres, regardless of what you have received in the way of return, you would get a cheque for 30¢ an acre or 20¢ an acre -- 30¢ or 20¢ an acre, regardless of how much you had realized from your crop. Now I think this puts a little different complexion upon the situation. If we want to compare our policy in Manitoba with the policy of Saskatchewan, let's compare the whole policy, let's not leave out some significant detail.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I was called to the phone when the Minister started to speak. Was he giving figures out on the aid for unharvested crops, money paid out to farmers for unharvested crops? May I get the figure again please?

MR. HUTTON: The total assistance is \$77,000. On unharvested crop acreage payments, \$42,929; on freight assistance on hay and straw, \$30,000; on feed grain, \$3,747.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give us the number of applications? I understand the applications closed something over three weeks ago for this farm aid assistance. Would you tell us the number of applications you have received? How many have been dealt with?

MR. HUTTON: I can't promise to be accurate. I believe that we received somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,000 applications or it could have been more than that. I would prefer to

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . bring that information to the House tomorrow in order that I could be accurate.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Did you receive any applications after the deadline of January 23rd?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I believe that on a previous occasion that I told the House that we were endeavouring to assist the farmers in their plight, and I think that I pointed out to this House that if any applications were received from farmers who were in difficulty and who qualified under the program, who had not for logical reasons made application, we would give them consideration.

MR. GUTTORMSON: My question, Mr. Chairman, was had you received any?

MR. HUTTON: To my knowledge we have received one or two or three, maybe more, but these to my knowledge we have received. -- (Interjection) -- We are accepting them.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister told us about a visit that he had made down the Dufrost and Arnaud area and announced that he had established a new policy for that area. A policy, if I understood well, whereby the department would assist the farmers in the purchase of grass seed in order to put into grass some of this heavy gumbo of farmland in the flat land around Dufrost and Arnaud. Was that the announcement that he made yesterday that he would assist the farmers to seed up to 30 acres by selling the seed at half price? And if so, I would like to ask him if he could tell us the area that would be covered by the policy and whether the farmers have been thoroughly advised and if the plan is going ahead.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, the policy is more than just a question of supplying seed. A committee was set up of members of the Extension staff, an Agricultural Engineer, and members of the Soils Branch and the ag rep in that area, Mr. LaFrance. They attempted and did work out a program that they thought would be of material assistance to the farmers in the area where the land is of a very flat topography and where drainage is a major problem, and they are going to assist the farmers in perfecting the surface drainage from the fields to the lateral and trunk drains that are in existence in that area. I know the Honourable Member for Carillon will agree with me when I say that there is a very complicated and extensive drainage system in that area, and the job is, I would say first of all, to relate the surface drainage from the fields to the ditches which are existing to get the best use from them; secondly, to promote the use of deep-rotted legumes, preferably alfalfa, to promote the establishment of livestock in the area; and also at the present time investigations are being made as to the possibility for a community pasture in southeast Manitoba which can also serve this area because we all know that on the very heavy lands in the Arnaud-Dufrost area it is impossible to pasture -- graze cattle on this land and maintain any kind of forage production during the summer months, because when you pasture cattle on the heavy soils in the Red River Valley the cattle destroy more graze than they can use. And so there is an investigation on at the present time into the possibilities of establishing a community pasture not only for this area but to assist the farmers also in the southeast -- in the general area. I would like to say this, that at the initial meeting that was held there was a great deal of enthusiasm. Thirty-two farmers enrolled in the club. It is a soil conservation club and we are hoping that over the next few years that a program can be developed that will be of real significance, of real value to the farmers in that area.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Minister to think that I'm critical of the program at all but I will carry on and ask him what is meant when he says that the department will assist the farmers in their drainage problems. Will it be by giving advice or some financial assistance somehow to drains? Suppose the farmer has a section of land and he has to try and drain it by small surface drains to lead it to the big trunk drain, and does the Minister mean that he will give some financial assistance or just some advice to these farmers? And I would like to know what area is covered by the plan or the program.

MR. HUTTON: Well at the present time the area is covered to the extent that 32 farmers own property -- farming land in the area. It is the intention, the hope, and I trust that the result will be that many more farmers will take part in the program. As far as the financial contribution, here again we're coming back to this point of how much value you place on highly trained personnel in the Extension Department. Now I think that it's about time that this Assembly got off the horse of discrediting the people in the Extension Department. Now I want to point out to the gentleman across the way that in the United States, I don't know whether they've heard of the D. . . . people who carry out much the same type of work, and they charge handsomely,

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . handsomely for their services; and at the present time in Ontario some of the former ag reps and soil specialists and so on have found it very much more to their advantage to set up private offices and engage personnel, soils experts, agricultural engineers to go out and give the farmers this advice, only they charge them for it. They charge them handsomely. Now because this service is given by the government of Manitoba is no reason to discount.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, did I ever insinuate that the department was not giving good service? Did I discount the services being mentioned by the Minister? Not at all. I never hinted anything along those lines in any way, shape or form. I don't think the Minister can say that I said anything that would lead anyone to believe that I was discrediting the Department of Extension Service. I was just asking the Minister whether the assistance would be in the shape of some financial assistance or advice by the Department, that's all. I made no insinuation to justify the remarks that have been made now.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, he said is it going to be financial assistance or is it going to be advice from the Department. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I don't know how he interprets it. I can only interpret it that there is quite a difference. Well there may be a difference. I would say that the assistance that they get from the department is of more help than any financial assistance that we could give them and the assistance they will get is under the policies that I outlined yesterday. They can get assistance in the purchase of seed, up to 30 acres under one program; up to ten acres under the other. Beyond that they must provide their own seed, but over a period of four years their farms will be inspected at least once a year. Every field is inspected; the individual problems that that farmer has are inspected; there is a detailed soil analysis made, not of just one field but of every field and parts of the field that are particularly troublesome; and in the fourth year a detailed soils map of that farm is made, the different soils are delineated on the map. This service alone, if offered by a commercial concern, would be much in excess of \$100 -- just the mapping alone. And the experience during the four years and the knowledge that the soils experts and the ag rep and the other specialists who are called in, the knowledge that they gather over the four-year period is brought to bear upon the problems of the individual farmer in an attempt to solve it. Now how much value you put on that I don't know. I know how much I put on it because I have been a member of a soil conservation club; I know the assistance that I have received from it. I think over a 20-year period it can be counted in thousands of dollars.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I'm very happy that I received the answer that I was trying to get, whether it was financial assistance to provide this drainage or advice, and I got it from the Minister. I wasn't in any way, shape or form criticizing anyone, or critical -- and I'm glad that I've got the information that I wanted.

MR. GUTTORMSON: How much money does the Department of Agriculture spend on community pastures in the province?

MR. HUTTON: Well if you wait for that answer, I'll get it for you.

MR. GUTTORMSON: A supplementary question. Does the Provincial Government share in the cost of the operation of the Sleeve Lake community pasture?

MR. HUTTON: Yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Are they planning to extend it next year or in the future?

MR. HUTTON: There is some development of the pasture going on at the present time. I don't know of any plan to expand the pasture.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What do you mean by development?

MR. HUTTON: Improvements such as roads, fencing, water, brushing, brush control and so forth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) passed; (d) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on 1 (a) before we leave the Minister's salary, I wonder if he could give us some details on the pork disposal program that the Federal Government instituted some time ago. I understand that they approached the province, or provincial institutions to see if they would take up some of the surplus pork at special prices. Could he tell us what progress has been accomplished in that regard? How many -- how much of this has been taken up and what is the status of the program at the moment?

MR. HUTTON: As I understand it, this is a Federal program.

MR. MOLGAT: That's correct. I agree, but aren't the provincial institutions, the ones that are concerned in the offer, and wouldn't this be handled through the Provincial Department of Agriculture? Are they not concerned in the program?

MR. ROBLIN: This is being handled as a food problem with the Department of Health and Welfare. I'm sure that the Minister can answer in due course.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister told us that he had plans for a community pasture in the southeast. Are the plans progressed enough so that he can tell us something about it? Where it's going to be? The progress being made on this plan?

MR. HUTTON: No, I'm afraid I can't because at the present time they are searching for a suitable location. There are certain problems involved. As you know, they try to avoid an area where there's too much pastured land, and at the same time you must get the type of land which is going to maintain an adequate number of cattle.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, nowhere in the remarks of the Minister did I see any mention of the sheep industry in Manitoba. People far more qualified than I have told me that this is one industry where the farmers in Manitoba can make money, but due to the wolf problem, the coyotes, they lose such a terrific percentage of their flock that they're forced to get out of them. My understanding is that at the present time Canada is importing mutton from Australia. Perhaps the Minister could correct me on this if my figures are incorrect. Has the Department of Agriculture got any program whereby they can help the sheep rancher increase his flock without terrific dangers of the losses he must suffer from the coyote problem, particularly in the Interlake area and other northern parts of the province?

MR. HUTTON: There is a program as you know of ten-eighty, but I think this program of predator-control can better be dealt with by my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources, but I was just trying to find the comment that I had here on the incidence of coyotes in -- Ken and George were up north hunting around Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg. They got about 30 coyotes but partly due to the poison scheme in operation in that area there seems to be more moose than coyotes, and so this would indicate that the poison program is having some effect. But I would like to say something on the sheep industry, Mr. Chairman. It is true that the sheep industry is one in which there is room for expansion. I am told by my advisors that we could have three times as many sheep in Manitoba, but there is a real problem of competition from Australian sheep. If I am not incorrect, if my memory serves me well, I believe that Australian lamb is marketed in Toronto for around 27¢ a pound while our Canadian lamb is worth about 48, and so there is a real problem here. The competition for the Canadian producer is pretty stiff. But I agree with the Honourable Member for St. George that there is some possibility for sheep, and that from time to time lambs are a profitable part of a farmer's income, and we in the department are constantly looking for diversification for the farmer and this is a field where there is some room for expansion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I've talked to sheep ranchers about this problem and they tell me that price isn't a problem, it's to be able to keep their flocks. They say that they could make money in the sheep ranching business if they could keep their flocks but they suffer tremendous losses through coyotes. The Minister said that there's a coyote program. That's quite true, but the coyote program is only in certain localities. I don't think there's any coyote program in unorganized territories, and if I'm wrong I'd appreciate it if he'd correct me, and this is an area where they are trying to -- where they have a tremendous problem with coyotes is in unorganized territory. I would certainly appreciate if the Minister would provide some program whereby he could assist the farmers living in unorganized territory with the coyote problem because it's certainly a severe one.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, those coyotes and wolves bring me up to the feet and I hope the Press does not record me again on those "bombs", but I understood the Minister to state that the coyotes and foxes are in the Natural Resources Department. Last year when I directed a question to the Agricultural Minister on timber wolves he directed me to the Natural Resources, and when I questioned the Natural Resources Minister about coyotes and foxes he directed me to the Agricultural Minister. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe it's in the Agriculture Department as far as the coyotes are concerned and the foxes are in the small predator control. My question is whether there is a bounty on coyotes and foxes in the local government districts.

MR. HUTTON: I'm afraid I have to say I don't know.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'll answer that question because I've had dealings with the Minister — with the Games Branch, and I understand there is a bounty on coyotes in unorganized territories. As a matter of fact, it was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who provided me with the information, although coyotes come under the Department of Agriculture.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, earlier this year the Minister was reported speaking in Brandon at the Agricultural Institute of Canada speaking on the matter of marketing boards. Now earlier tonight the question was asked with regard to the Vegetable Growers who had been reported at their meeting as favouring a marketing board. Now I think at that time the Minister was speaking in a general way about marketing boards in various lines. He indicated at that time as I read the news report that he felt that there would be more demands for the establishment of marketing boards on the part of the farmers of Manitoba. Now I want to quote him fairly, I don't think he committed himself as to being either in favour or against, I think that's a fair comment. I would appreciate however, if he could tell us if the Department of Agriculture is taking any steps at this time to review the matter of marketing boards in Manitoba and I'd be particularly interested there in the fields where marketing boards do exist in other provinces. I understand that that's the case in hogs in Ontario; I believe in poultry and eggs in British Columbia and there may be others of which he would be aware. Now this is a very important subject; it's been on our statute books for many years. About five years ago, the Farmers' Union was actively recommending a livestock marketing board. I do not believe the matter ever came to a vote but there was a great deal of consideration throughout the province and I would like to know whether any work is contemplated by the department as I say, and what is the situation in these various other fields where they do exist in other provinces.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Ste. Rose has reported what occurred at that conference very accurately. I have taken no stand, for or against, but I have taken a definite stand that in the case of something as important as marketing boards there needs to be an awful lot of study and some research done. And I believe that before the people of Manitoba make any decision in regard to this question, that this study should be carried out and that any decision that is reached should be in the full light of the facts that are revealed and not on the basis of a motion or on the basis of "by guess or by gosh". I am very interested in this particular subject from that standpoint, and I'm going to make every endeavour to see that we can get the kind of information that we need.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister conducting any surveys at this time in the matter of marketing boards? Is there any survey being made at the operations of the marketing boards in the other provinces?

MR. HUTTON: No, there is not.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of the Natural Products Marketing Act, the benefit of the doubt, shall I say, is given to the "Nay" sayers. By that I mean that those who are eligible to cast a ballot insofar as marketing boards are concerned, and who do not cast their ballot are in a sense included as those who vote "no". Now I know that some people and some organizations concerned are opposed to this particular provision and I would ask the Minister if he has it in mind to bring about or recommend certain changes along these lines?

MR. HUTTON: I would just say this that in the instance of those people who don't care enough one way or another to exercise their prerogative and their birthright in this country, I think some consideration should be given to that point.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Could the Minister give me any indication whether he plans to expand the coyote program to unorganized territories?

MR. ROBLIN: I think perhaps that question might well be asked under Predator Control and I think the time has come when the committee should now start to pass some of these items. We've had a good discussion; practically everybody's had something to say about it and I think that the Honourable Member for St. George might agree with me if we should leave these questions until we reach the item in the estimates and get on with our business.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the stand that the First Minister has taken with regard to the propriety of discussing individual items under the headings where they occur and inasmuch as Predator Control is one that shows up there, I think it is better that we do so. As a matter of fact, I have lost some of the questions, had them asked already, that I

(Mr. Campbell, continued)... had planned to ask on the individual items. I don't suppose that will prevent me from asking them again. But just to complete the discussion on marketing boards, because I believe there is no item specifically on marketing boards in the program here, and I'd suggest also Mr. Chairman, that if there are any questions of a general nature, they should still be asked or statements made. Outside of that I'd be prepared to agree with the Honourable the First Minister. But the one question that I'd like to ask the Honourable the Minister with regard to the marketing boards is: Is he planning an actual study or survey of the question of marketing boards in the terms that he has discussed it, tonight?

MR. HUTTON: I believe that the whole question -- I think marketing boards fall under the general heading of policy, not only of governments but of the farm community and of agriculture in general. And I think that this whole question of agricultural policy deserves a great deal more consideration than it has had in the past. And we are giving very serious consideration to this matter and I would hope that we can achieve something along this line.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, when the Honourable the Minister says that it comes under the heading of "policy", I take it that he's suggesting that we're not allowed to ask questions with regard to policy.

MR. ROBLIN: No.

MR. CAMPBELL: No? Well, I misinterpreted his remarks then. I withdraw that, but I agree with the Minister, I agree completely that these matters are important and studies of them might well be put in hand. All I'm asking is, is the government planning on doing that particular thing and if there's not a decision made, I'm not pressing for an answer.

MR. HUTTON: No decision has been made but we're giving very serious consideration to it.

MR. DOW: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister. In regards to the clearance of cattle, feeder cattle particularly at the customs, there has been delays.....

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, could we not deal with that under the livestock branch. We're trying to close the general discussion and I ask my honourable friend if he could not equally ask his question under the item in the estimates.

MR. DOW: The only thing I was thinking Mr. Chairman, was that it is a Federal matter and the question I was going to ask the Minister, has any representation been made to him to try and develop that as a clear port at Boissevain? On many occasions it's just been open temporarily for feeder cattle sales, winter fair sales and so on and there has been a very decided effort on the part of the livestock men to have it a clear port. And I was wondering if any direction had been made through his department to do so or help do so?

MR. HUTTON: No official representation has been made to me as yet on this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: a - passed, b- passed, Resolution 26 - Administration, \$69,550 - passed; No. 3 - Agriculture (a) 1

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'll have to ask the usual question on Item 1. What number of people are concerned here?

MR. HUTTON: Under salaries?

MR. CAMPBELL: Under salaries.

MR. HUTTON: Eleven.

MR. CAMPBELL: Eleven. Does that mean that it's down from a year ago?

MR. HUTTON: Yes it is.

MR. CAMPBELL: Could we get from the Minister the reason for the reduction in the livestock branch?

MR. HUTTON: Due to the decentralization of the Extension Service at Brandon and Dauphin and the establishment of a fieldman at those two points, we discovered that we could do the job adequately at the present time with three men rather than four. That accounts for one. I'm not just clear on the.....

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if that's a point where the Minister would rather bring in the information at a later time, I have no objection.

MR. HUTTON: All right, I'll do that.

MR. CAMPBELL: The point I was going to make however was and the Minister could take note of it now so that he could have the reply when he mentions the numbers, was that last

(Mr. Campbell, continued)... year the then Minister of Agriculture spoke in very glowing terms of the position that the beef cattle industry held in Manitoba. It was the bright spot in agriculture. I think that was correct. And he gave us some figures that he was intending to add considerably to the numbers in that branch. Now I hesitate to quote the figures that he gave at that time but certainly he indicated to this House that there would be a substantial addition of beef men and that was to still further promote the beef cattle industry. Now I see that instead of that that we are down a couple of people. I am quite willing to leave the Minister to bring in the information in that regard later on but it would be understood, I think, that he might just check on what was said last year with regard to an increase there instead of a decrease.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain that the establishments.. there were no more establishments contemplated in July than are shown as the establishments for 1959-60, that the four beef fieldmen were included in the estimates last year, and we merely, because we were unable to acquire the services of a beef fieldman, the fourth man, in the intervening time we discovered that we could do a very good job with three. If the situation changes and I expect it will as there are more farmers going into livestock, we will add the fieldman as he is required.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite willing for the Minister to check on these figures, but if he will go back two years ago to the estimates for the year ending '59, he will find that at that time we showed the Deputy Minister separately, that's in the earlier item, of course and then Other Salaries, 8. That would be nine people there. They are now up to ten according to figures that the Minister gave me tonight. Then in this next one we showed 10 people - the one that we're now discussing -- and last year the estimates showed 13 -- I mean the 1960 estimates, and this year the Honourable the Minister says it's 11. I'm just trying to reconcile those figures in view of what the Minister told us. I hesitated to quote the number because I haven't looked it up but the Minister has said 4 and I believe that was the number that was mentioned last year. Four additional beef men.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, on Item 3, I believe we are. Under the Veterinary Service, I don't need to rehash what I had to say last year...

MR. ROBLIN: I think the honourable member better wait until we arrive at that item, which is 3 (d). We want to get on with this.

MR. WAGNER: Well, isn't it 3 (a)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3 (a) (3).

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, on that one I notice that it is considerably down from a year ago. Could the Minister explain the reduction please?

MR. HUTTON: It's simply this that we weren't using the appropriation that had been voted, and if you're not going to use the money in carrying out your program, there's no use asking for it.

MR. CAMPBELL: I can't think of a better reason than that. I'm all in favour of that one, but it would raise the question, Mr. Chairman, of why it was jacked up a year ago? I can't hold the Honourable the Minister responsible for that. I commend him for the step he's taking now. (interjection).

MR. ROBLIN: That's one answer.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, but....

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, it certainly was.

MR. ROBLIN: \$1500.00 if you can call that a jack.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, it's an increase. (interjection)

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, but why was it increased? The Honourable the First Minister is anxious to get into this discussion, he could likely tell us, Mr. Chairman, if he wants to tell us. Why was it? My honourable friend says \$1500. isn't enough to pay any attention to I suppose.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, it was a program that was contemplated but wasn't carried through.

MR. MOLGAT: What program was contemplated?

MR. HUTTON: Well the program was carried through, but it was carried through under funds from the Horned Cattle Fund rather than from here and it was a fill-up - it was a \$5,000 item. I was building better beef.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I rose on two occasions to ask a question and I was by-passed. Could the Minister tell me why the reduction of \$4,400 on that particular item?

MR. HUTTON: In the previous year's estimates provision was made for the travelling expenses for this additional fieldmen and I would like to correct that. There was a total of four beef fieldmen, an addition of two, and we only used one. The expenses, the travelling expenses and so forth of the fourth fieldman will not be incurred, and in addition, Mr. Jarvis, of the Livestock Branch is taking out-service training and he will be away until September and therefore there's a further reduction. Also the fact that we have decentralized the services has effected an economy in travelling expenses and so forth, because the men are closer to their work and we are able to get away with that sum this year.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, under this item, if I read the public accounts properly, there was an expenditure of \$12 thousand odd for Veterinary fees and supplies. I suppose it was largely supplies rather than fees, but I was just wondering if the Minister knew - would be able to tell us what the expenditure was in that regard. 3 (a) (3).

MR. HUTTON: It could be warble fly control.

MR. CAMPBELL: Probably.

MR. HUTTON: ... the purchase of warble fly powder which is distributed to Agricultural societies, municipal offices and so forth.

MR. CAMPBELL: It would amount to pretty nearly the full figure? \$12,000?

MR. HUTTON: I'll have to take that as notice and give you....

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under the Horned Cattle Trust Fund there are certain monies expended for dairy and beef breeds and also a certain amount for these artificial breeding associations. Is it the intention of the government to maintain these amounts that were expended last year at the same rates or are the artificial breeding associations going to receive less at the expense of promoting these club grants?

MR. HUTTON: There is no connection whatsoever between the two programs. The advisory board of the artificial insemination program requested that a change be made in the policy so that the assistance was given to new A.I. units and that the assistance be gradually withdrawn as the A.I. units become established. And there's no thought of withdrawing this assistance immediately from any of the existing A.I. units; they'll all be treated on the same basis, but this assistance will be withdrawn over the next three years - gradually. But if it is to grow we can't continue to subsidize old and well established A.I. units.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, is it a typographical error or a particular reason why this item is listed in No. 3 - Administration is 1, Agriculture is 3. Is there a reason for that or is it an error?

MR. CAMPBELL: I think Mr. Chairman, that the explanation of that is that at some past time an item would appear in there as 2, and when that particular service has been discontinued or dropped, then rather than keep the number with a different service that they usually drop the number as well, and I think where you see these spaces that is usually indicates a former program that isn't now in operation. I'm not sure that that's always the case.

Mr. Chairman, I was wanting to ask the Minister where in the items, he would suggest that we discuss the Horned Cattle Fund and the policies thereunder? Would it be on this one or on....

MR. HUTTON: I think this is as good a place as any other.

MR. CAMPBELL: Would the Minister prefer that we stay strictly to the item here and then discuss horned cattle just at the end after we have finished with these?

MR. HUTTON: You may if you wish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3 passed, 4 passed; 5...

MR. CAMPBELL: on 4 Mr. Chairman, I had some questions. I think the Honourable Member for Rhineland has already asked about the artificial insemination units but I was going to ask about how many Herd Improvement Associations have we now and where are they located? And then I was going to ask about the Veterinary Service Districts - they're both included in this item. Could the Minister give us the breakdown of the Herd Improvement Association, the number, the locations and then the Veterinary districts?

MR. HUTTON: Eleven at the present time...

MR. CAMPBELL: Eleven?

MR. HUTTON: Eleven. Well I had the breakdown here but I have so much material I can't seem to — they are concentrated for the most part in the Winnipeg milk shed. I'm afraid I haven't the breakdown with me.

MR. CAMPBELL: Perhaps you could bring them in later Mr. . . . Is it right that there is just one veterinary district, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HUTTON: Pardon?

MR. CAMPBELL: Is there just one veterinary district?

MR. ALEXANDER: Yes.

MR. HUTTON: I would like to say that there is an amendment contemplated and will be introduced in the House dealing with the Veterinary Services of District Act which will extend the opportunity for participation to the local government districts.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that that district is in the good constituency of Roblin, the first one formed in Manitoba and was formed since the Conservative Government took office.

MR. CAMPBELL: Since they took office I'm delighted to hear that there's one thing that they have done since they took office. I'm not too familiar with it — is it a case where the municipality or a combination of municipalities pay part of the salary?

MR. HUTTON: Pardon?

MR. CAMPBELL: Is the district — the veterinary service district is that a policy under which the municipality or group of municipalities pay part of the salary or all of the salary?

MR. HUTTON: Well no, as I understand it the Provincial Government makes a grant of \$1,000 and the municipalities involved make a grant in order that a uniform fee can be charged so that the man who needs the services of a veterinarian and who is in a remote area can have those services say at 40 miles distance for approximately the same cost as the man who is within four miles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 passed.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can inform me whether he received a request from a small council committee headed by an agricultural representative which is located in Arborg — and he also looks after the Fisher Constituency and apparently part of the St. George constituency — whether there was a request for such a district and if so, does the Minister have intentions of having that district formed in the near future that it can be looked after in 1960 summer. And I hear the Minister said \$1,000 grant of the provincial government. Well Mr. Chairman I believe \$1,000 grant is a very small grant. I would suggest at least \$2,000 for such a district as I have in mind, and I believe the Honourable Minister has a large area in mind in that particular country in interlake area, and \$1,000 I believe would be way too low. The farmers would have to pull their pockets pretty tight to carry that service, to come in to that minimum fee. I understand that in different parts of the provinces they give as low as \$2,000 and as high as \$2800. I wouldn't go up to the maximum but I would sure like to have a little bit higher, at least to a minimum of \$2,000.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, there has been no request in the immediate past for this appropriation and we expected that even offering this opportunity to the local government districts that at this time we have no assurance that there will be a great run to take advantage of it. And on the first question that the Honourable Member for Fisher put I must say that I can't recall that a request has come to me; it may have, I can't recall.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I'll pursue it a little further. I was informed that there is such a committee going on, but possibly the Minister is not aware of it. But just to refresh the mind of the Minister, last year I brought it up to the House and we had a lengthy discussion here in this assembly and then the former Minister gave me reassurance that he's going to take it under consideration and then he asked me to come and discuss the matter with him privately, and I had such an appointment, and he agreed with me that we have such a short-coming and he was going to surely take it under consideration and that's all I heard. And then I asked the Honourable Minister, — this Honourable Minister already whether he was informed of our appointment and the Honourable Minister said that he was, so I asked at that time whether he's taken it under consideration and so far it seems to me nothing has materialized.

MR. GUTTORMSON: At the present it is my understanding that the government pays

(Mr. Guttormson, continued)... \$1.00 toward every calf vaccinated. Is that correct? (interjection). Could the Minister....

MR. ROBLIN: Is this on Bang's Disease?

MR. GUTTORMSON: No, this is veterinary services. I just wanted to know, maybe I should ask the question on the next item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed, (5) passed.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, where may one discuss the matter of scholarships for students taking courses in veterinary science?

MR. HUTTON: If it's all right here you could discuss it here or you could discuss it under the.....

MR. ROBLIN: Agricultural Development, 6 (c) Graduate and Post Graduate training - Provincial Bursaries.

MR. HUTTON: Animal Pathology and veterinary laboratory, I think it would.....

MR. CAMPBELL: Are you on 5 now, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We just passed it.

MR. CAMPBELL: I beg your pardon, I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what we just passed. (5) (a).

MR. CAMPBELL: 3 (a) 5.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes we've just passed it.

MR. CAMPBELL: We haven't discussed it at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're now on (b) (1).

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, we haven't discussed Bang's Disease and Sire Purchase Policy at all. We haven't discussed Bang's Disease. No but Mr. Chairman you're not going to rule that you pass it just because somebody over there yelled pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At least the people on this side said pass.

MR. CAMPBELL: No but, of course, they'll....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it passed or isn't it?

MR. CAMPBELL: Of course they'll say pass, but Mr. Chairman do we have to give you notice in advance that we're going to be speaking on these items, because if we do I'll mention to you now that I am going to be speaking on the dairy items all the way through, and I don't care if everybody over there shouts pass as loud as he can shout it, we'll still be speaking on it. The Honourable the Minister knows that we're going to discuss Bang's Disease and Sire Purchase Policy. Even the Honourable the First Minister knows that we're going to discuss that.

MR. ROBLIN: You may be going to discuss it, but at this rate I doubt if we'll ever get to it.

MR. CAMPBELL: We'll get to it sooner in my honourable friend doesn't try to educate his pals over there to holler pass in order to encourage the Chairman to say that items are passed before we've even discussed them.

MR. ROBLIN: You can't complain, you've had a full say and I'm sure you're going to continue to have your full say.

MR. CAMPBELL: Of course we are.

MR. ROBLIN: Go right ahead.

MR. CAMPBELL: Of course we are, don't.....

MR. ROBLIN: Go right ahead.

MR. CAMPBELL: Don't lead the Chairman astray... that's the whole point. (interjection)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will allow a slight interruption.....

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think he will.

MR. CAMPBELL: I won't allow it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: I was just going to try to help you out.

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't need any help.

MR. PAULLEY: What I was going to say, Mr. Chairman....

MR. CAMPBELL: I won't allow the interruption, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: No I was just going to say Mr. Chairman, with the permission of my honourable friend, that the hour is now three minutes of eleven o'clock, and I suggest, because

(Mr. Paulley, continued)... I know that when we get into the question of Bang's disease that it is an involved question...

MR. CAMPBELL: Bang, bang, bang.

MR. PAULLEY: And it's likely to take a considerable period of time. I was going to suggest to the House and to the First Minister that it might be a very appropriate time to cease the deliberations of the House for today, because when we start on an item like this and judging from past experience it's likely to go a considerable period of time.

MR. ROBLIN: I could save my honourable friend a lot of trouble.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you kindly my friend.

MR. ROBLIN: You know when he get's up to make these little appeal of his that we should go home he's.....

MR. CAMPBELL: He's irresistible.

MR. ROBLIN: He's not only irresistible he's almost as lengthy as my honourable friend and that's going some. With a combination of talkers like those two over there I know I'm licked when we come to three minutes to eleven. They'll talk their way around the clock with the greatest of ease, they've been doing it well today. (interjection) Yes, well I'm not going to admit very much that my honourable friend wishes me to, as little as the circumstance demand, and that isn't very much. So we've got no objection to adjourning at the present time so I'm prepared to move that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: Only I defy the Chairman to report progress. (interjection) They were rougher when they were over here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Cypress that the report of the committee be received.

Mr. Speaker put the question and declared the motion carried.

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

Mr. Speaker put the question and declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.