

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 A.M., Thursday, May 6th, 1965.

Opening prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Madam 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.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, if we could have the permission of the committee, I'd like just to discuss the order of business in the House because we're fairly close to finishing our program.

I would like to suggest to the committee that if we can that we finish the agricultural estimates this morning and then, if that's the case, this afternoon we can proceed with concurrence. We have ten bills still standing on the Order Paper, I think all of which should be debated, and we could then proceed to the ten bills and see what progress we make with that. We also have outstanding on the Order Paper 11 resolutions. I propose that when we come to that we should agree that there should be no further adjournments or standing but that we should dispose of them. Following that, we could complete the budget debate and there are three or four budget bills that have to come in after that.

So I wonder if the committee would agree to make an effort to complete agriculture this morning and, hopefully, before the day is out we will have dealt with the ten bills and the 11 resolutions that are before us. That would give us Friday to have the Law Amendments Committee and to deal with the budget and conclude our labours. It seems to me that that might be a reasonable program to work for.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I think that the proposition advanced by the First Minister would probably suit us all right. My concern was that the private members resolutions, and bills in particular, that are before us would proceed. I think if we went on this basis that if this afternoon we disposed of the bills they could appear I presume at Law Amendments tomorrow morning, if that would suit the government. I think it's quite acceptable as far as we are concerned.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, anything that could send us home on Saturday at the latest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 33 -- passed; Resolution No. 34 --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on the Animal Industry Branch, as I said last night I still wanted some details insofar as the poultry business in the Province of Manitoba, because there appears to me to be some conflict in the figures that have been given to us. The Minister of Industry and Commerce the other day when he was speaking indicated that the production in Manitoba was some 9 million pounds and I think that this is correct. My own figures from the Federal Department of Agriculture on the poultry market report would indicate that we produced 9,159,000 pounds, so this is certainly correct.

There appears to be some conflict however in the consumption figures in Manitoba. The figures that I can get insofar as the Federal Government are concerned would indicate that the production then was some 9,100,000 pounds; that we imported just a little less than a million pounds but that we exported about 1 1/2 million pounds in 1964, which would leave us a net export over imports of some half a million pounds. So on that basis, if we produced ourselves about 9 million pounds and we exported a half a million pounds more than we imported, then our consumption must have been something in the order of 8 1/2 to 9 million pounds and not the 13 or 14 million pounds that the Minister of Industry and Commerce indicated.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)

I think that the consumption figures indicated by the Minister of Industry and Commerce must have been based taking a national average of the total Canadian production and dividing the total Canadian population into production and getting an average of the number of pounds. I think we have to point out that most of this type of product is not consumed in rural Manitoba. This is essentially an urban consumption. The rural consumption I think is very very slight, so I think we're off when we take national figures and interpret them on the provincial scene because the production figures, taking in imports and exports, would indicate that in 1964 we were in balance and that in fact when Professor Hobson was quoted as saying in the early part of this year that we had moved from an area of deficiency in the past to one of self-sufficiency in 1964, that Professor Hobson was correct. I would like to know from the Minister of Agriculture which are his figures.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, all I can tell the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is that Mr. Cameron, our poultry specialist who is fairly knowledgeable in respect to the product produced here and the market demand, has worked with Industry and Commerce in evaluating the consumption production and export possibilities in respect to the broiler industry in this province. As you might be aware, since the broiler producers have requested the establishment of a broiler marketing board, both departments have given fairly close consideration to the implications of such a board for the industry in this province. I am satisfied that on the question of statistics in this respect that our department concurs with Industry and Commerce in the assessment of the industry.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister mean then that he thinks that the consumption was between 13 and 14 million pounds?

MR. HUTTON: Well the Minister isn't an expert, and all I can do is accept the findings of the people who are sitting down to study this.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, how then does he relate this to the actual production figures? Does he disagree that the production figure was just a little over 9, 1 million last year?

MR. HUTTON: I'm not disagreeing with anything. I'm just saying that the figures that were given to the committee by the Minister of Industry and Commerce have been checked by the staff of the Department of Agriculture and they are satisfied that this is right.

MR. MOLGAT: So the Minister is saying then that the federal figures indicating the production in Manitoba, the imports and the exports, which would indicate I would think the consumption, because if you take what you produce yourself, what you ship out and what you bring in and you total all this you get a figure of something in the order of between 9 and 10 million, I can't see how this couldn't tie in with the consumptions figures. If we consumed about 13, I don't know where the other 3 million pounds would come from. My point is, Mr. Chairman, that on the basis of the federal figures we were in a balanced position in 1964, production against consumption, and that is not what the Minister of Industry and Commerce is saying. The Minister of Industry and Commerce is saying that we were in a serious deficiency position.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, my remarks are pertinent on any of the -- I guess 3 (a) would be the most appropriate one. Have we reached that one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to check with the Minister on a few matters under livestock. First and foremost, I don't collect my honourable friend's literature as assiduously as my honourable colleague the member for Gladstone does, but I've been interested in one of the information sheets called "Farm and Home News for Manitoba" of November 10, 1964, and what attracted my attention to this news release particularly in the early instance was the fact that I glanced at it to see how far along in the body of the report the Minister's name was mentioned, and lo and behold it wasn't mentioned in either the first or the second paragraph. I could hardly believe that -- so out of keeping with the usual information bulletins of both the Department of Industry and Commerce and Agriculture -- and so I went a little further on it and here I find that this release is talking about the quality of the cattle in Manitoba -- beef cattle.

This release says that "orderly marketing of beef cattle is as important as good quality when it comes to the prices the producers receive at the stockyards. According to the provincial and federal livestock officials and representatives of the livestock trade, Manitoba's beef cattle industry is presently suffering from a lack of both factors." Well now this is why -- I gather this is why the Minister doesn't make this statement, because this is a kind of a critical statement and so we leave it to the officials and the representatives, and later on in the

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) report it's the spokesman who is saying something. "The quality of the beef cattle industry is presently suffering." But surely this is what my honourable friend's department has been working at for years, and this is another thing like the cost price squeeze that they were really going to do something about.

Here's a release of late in 1964 saying that not only is there too heavy a movement to market but the quality is down as well. I'm concerned about that because this was another thing that the previous government was criticized for, that they weren't doing enough for the quality of the cattle. I remember my honourable friend's predecessor who used to expend at great lengths on that subject, and in his very first year in the department he told us of great plans that were afoot to really raise the quality of the cattle. Now how is it, Mr. Chairman, that the department itself now admits that Manitoba's beef cattle industry is presently suffering from both good quality and a lack of orderly market.

Then I wanted to ask the Minister about three or four particular matters. Would he give us a report on the sire indexing policy that is being carried on up near Douglas and would he explain to us how it is that while other prairie provinces have found it advisable for the government itself, or the department or the university to undertake this work, it's being established here under the initiative of a private firm in the province. Now there may be good reasons for that and I'd like to know what the reasons are.

Then I'm not going to take the time, Mr. Chairman, because I'm resolved to try and help to expedite matters in getting along with the work of the committee because I realize it is late in the session, so I'm not going to take the time to read even portions of the brief of the Manitoba Stock Growers Association which was presented to the Cabinet and later on to caucuses of the different groups in the province here, but I would like the Minister to comment on a few of the representations that they make.

For instance, they're quite concerned about the lack of enforcement of herd law in this province, and I know that's not my honourable friend's particular responsibility. It was interesting to me that this exceedingly well-informed livestock group tied this question in with highway safety.

Then my honourable friend will have noted the fact I am sure that they're making some recommendations re The Horned Cattle Act. I believe their primary recommendation is that it should be withdrawn or, lacking that, that the board should be revised. I would like once again to get a report from the Honourable the Minister on what is being done under the fund as it exists now, if there is any change in the board from last year and are any changes contemplated in line with the Manitoba Stock Growers Association representations.

Then the stock growers are very concerned about cattle thefts and they say that in their opinion branch inspection is not the answer. They have some suggestions to make of their own including a check of the roads and the trucks carrying livestock and, in particular, much stiffer sentences on those who are apprehended for cattle stealing. It would seem to me that the latter suggestion particularly is an excellent one and that all these matters should be checked. It seems odd that cattle thieving should be of such a major problem at this time, but I respect the opinion of these people - I believe they are experts in their field.

Then they have a section on animal disease, and in this connection I know that it belongs actually under the veterinary science, the very next item I think in the estimates, but so as to not have to speak on every branch that comes up I thought I would just read this brief paragraph from the Manitoba Stock Growers Association presentation dealing with animal disease. It's on Page 5 of their brief. "This winter many reports have been received by this association of the death of animals on farms because immediate diagnosis of the disease from which they suffered was not possible. While this province has been able to boast of an every-increasing livestock population, no complementary expansion of diagnostic facilities has taken place. Indeed, in some cases, blood samples of the diseased animal must be sent to Ottawa before identification of the ailment can be made. This it will be readily recognized is a very serious matter especially when the disease may be highly contagious and a danger not only to the herd of one owner but to all neighbouring herds. The Manitoba Stock Growers respectfully request the government to make a thorough study of this matter with a view to developing suitable diagnostic facilities and the employment of personnel required to carry out this work."

In that connection, and this is not from the brief of the Manitoba Stock Growers but from other representations that I have had made to me from people whose knowledge in the area I respect, that recently since the change in the veterinary laboratory out there, or I think specifically since Dr. Jack McGowan has been employed there to head up the large animal part of the

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . laboratory work, that reports of findings are no longer made directly to the owner of the animals concerned but must go through local veterinarians. Would the Minister report on that because I have been informed of serious delays in the information coming back to the owner and this is the reason that they ascribe to it.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, would this be the item to discuss the Hog Marketing Board? Would you like to discuss it under this item or later?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I think we can discuss that under the Co-operative and Credit Union Services Branch.

MR. VIELFAURE: Thank you.

MR. HUTTON: If no one else has any questions, I'll start off by saying that the income from the Horned Cattle Purchases -- or income to the Horned Cattle Purchases Trust Fund in 1964 was \$64,673.14. The disbursements were grants of \$5,259; The University of Manitoba Research, \$36,308; salaries and administration, 9,106; Board meeting, 217; dehorning paste, \$856 - this is provided free; two sets of portable scales to carry on the record of production program with farmers upon the farm, \$1,747; advertising re dehorning, \$627; the CBC, \$7,500 toward the cost of producing this "Business of Farming"; miscellaneous, \$129.86; and the bank balance at December 31st, 1964 was \$36,877.05.

I am aware of the fact that there is some agitation on the part of the Stock Growers Association and on the part of the Manitoba Farmers Union to have The Horned Cattle Purchases Act rescinded. There may be some justification in this approach, but on the other hand, certain programs have been built up on the revenue that has been derived from this Act over the years and I have told these people frankly that they must recognize that if they do away with this program, that they must consider the curtailment of certain programs which are definitely contributing to the welfare of the livestock industry. In addition to this, we don't know what would happen if we rescinded the act and there was no penalty. It could be that the situation would deteriorate.

Now I've got to admit that there isn't any great improvement from year to year, but the Bible says, "before ye have always and sometimes the careless ye have always too", and maybe we'd have more careless ones if it wasn't there. It's like saying that, well you've got police forces, etc. and you don't have any reduction in crime. What would happen if you took the police force away, I don't know. I think that it's not an easy question to answer. I think there's two sides to the story.

In respect to the sire indexing centre, the station has a capacity of 160 bulls. It's owned and operated by the McCabe Grain Company Limited and I think one should pay tribute to this company for the interest they have shown here and this very real support they've given to this program. Any breeder can enter a minimum of three or a maximum of ten animals for tests. My information is that there are 114 animals on test of 28 breeders - 28 Angus, 72 Herefords, 9 Shorthorn and 5 Charolais. The costs were estimated when this information was compiled at between 150 and \$175 per animal, but I think that they are finding that the costs are in the upper range rather than in the lower range.

They recently had their opening. I was unable to attend, but I understand that there was a tremendous interest displayed. I heard a report that there was something like a thousand people attended the opening and we expect that this program will make a real contribution in the selection of the high producing strains of animals.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . actually the closing of that first test rather than the opening that was held recently.

MR. HUTTON: Well I think it was a combination. I think it was the official opening but it came at the end of the first run if you like.

MR. CAMPBELL: At the end of the first test.

MR. HUTTON: Yes. I think in the case of herd law, that this is a question of local government determining whether they shall enforce herd law or not. Under existing legislation the provincial authority has no right to interfere. I think probably it may be more of a problem in the unorganized areas than it is amongst the organized municipalities. I can't really comment on that.

I think that the criticism voiced by the Stock Growers about veterinary facilities is a little bit unfair. Obviously they are not aware of the tremendous expansion in the service that's been offered during the past year. Now I mentioned yesterday that the autopsies on large animals had increased from 15 percent of the total to over 60 percent of the total, or it had quadrupled in the past year, and this is due to the very active contribution that Dr. McGown is making in

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) . . . providing a better service to the producers of Manitoba. I think it has really paid off because we have diagnosed quite a few diseases for the first time and determined that they existed in Manitoba for the first time.

Maybe I should give the committee some of this information if I can find it now. I think the discoveries have had real economic significance for the industry, the cattle industry in Manitoba. Sixteen diseased conditions were diagnosed at the lab in 1964-65 that were not previously diagnosed in the province. Eight of these were in cattle, seven in swine and one in sheep. Black disease - what is commonly known as Black's disease - there's been a good deal of attention in western Canada concerning the disease of feeder and feed lot cattle characterized by sudden deaths. We have observed this symptom in eight herds in the province and have been successful in consistently isolating an organism and believe it to be *Clostridium novyii* - my Latin I took a long time ago. Cultures of this organism have been shipped to Britain for positive identification. You see we can't even identify them in Canada, so we have to resort to Britain to confirm our diagnosis. A vaccine is available for prevention of this disease. If we are correct in assuming that Black disease is a major cause of sudden death in feed lot cattle, this will be a major breakthrough with regard to this disease.

Then there's another disease commonly known as "over-eating" disease. This disease has been incriminated by other workers in western Canada as the cause of the first mentioned syndrome, and this without confirmation. This disease has been observed here only in quite young milk-fed calves and we are of the opinion that this disease does not exist in feed lot cattle contrary to the opinions of other western provinces.

While I've spent quite a bit of time going over all of these diseases that have been isolated and diagnosed for the first time in the Province of Manitoba, I think what it indicates is that it was very worthwhile to establish a Veterinary Services Branch and to pay some attention to the development of a program of veterinary service that would grow and serve the animal industry in Manitoba, and I think that we have had very good returns for the initial investment and the initial attention that has been given.

I know that there is some concern on the part of the poultry industry in this province and also on the part of the animal industry that we need better facilities, and we are very conscious of this. This matter is under consideration by the staff and I would hope that sometime in the not too distant future that the provision for more adequate facilities can reach top priority and that they can be provided, but I think the groundwork of building staff and developing a program is well under way and that facilities to complement this program will come in due course.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise me at what point I might raise the matter of brands - cattle brands?

MR. HUTTON: Right here.

MR. GUTTORMSON: During the past year the Minister will recall I contacted the department in regard to requests in the area of the Interlake from farmers who are anxious to have the government permit rib branding, and when I initially contacted the department I was told that the only brand that would be acceptable by the department would be the shoulder and the hip. I believe that the government has changed their attitude with this respect and now will accept rib branding. Is this correct?

MR. HUTTON: I think that you are right. I would want to get confirmation of this from the Livestock Branch, but I believe this is correct.

MR. GUTTORMSON: . . . I remember I contacted the department and I think I spoke to the Minister as well and got this information earlier that rib brands would not be accepted, and I advised the farmers concerned about the answer I had received. Then they came to me later on and said, "Did you know that we can use rib brands now?" I said, "Oh, I was told differently". And he said, "We've been told now that we can use the rib brands". And this was contradicting what I had been told initially by the Minister.

MR. VIELFAURE: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us whether he can force demands for new standards for milk shippers, I mean the small milk shippers, the ones that are shipped to the powder plant and the cheese factories and also the cream shippers. I think these standards are under the food and drug people, right? Is it expected that these standards will be changed in the near future?

MR. HUTTON: No, the standards have just recently been revised and they are regulations under The Manitoba Dairy Act. They've been revised and somewhat stiffened. There was a period, an initial period in which we gave the operators a time to adjust their operation so that they come into line with the regulations. The food and drug people are only interested in the existence

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) of residual matter which can have a deliterious affect on health.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, has the government given any consideration to the appointment of a brand inspector for the Yards? This is of some concern to the farmers, particularly Interlake, where they are experiencing cattle rustling to the degree where the cattle are vanishing and there's no way of knowing where they are going and there's no way of checking on it either when they get to the Yards because there's no one checking the brands at that point. The farmers feel that if there was a brand inspector that it might curtail the activities of these people who are rustling cattle.

They feel also that in view of the fact that the government charges for a brand, that they're not getting anything for it, and that if the government charges for registration of a brand then there should be some service provided for that fee.

MR. HUTTON: Well if we implemented brand inspection, then there would be a further charge. You also run into the problem that somebody buys cattle that already have a brand on them and then these cattle would have to be held until it could be proven that -- you know, they'd have to have a bill or sale or something to cover it. We feel that the desire for this brand inspection is not supported by the majority of the cattle men in Manitoba at this time, but things can change. We feel that it doesn't have the support of the majority of the cattle industry; it would cost money and so far we just haven't implemented it.

MR. GUTTORMSON: of clarification, did the Minister say that the policy of a brand inspector was not supported by the majority of farmers in the province?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3 (a) --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. There are some matters I would like to take up, still on the Livestock Branch. It seems to me that the Minister has been less than enthusiastic about the Record of Performance testing program. Back in 1962 in the estimates of my honourable friend, I brought up some figures indicating that Manitoba was lagging far behind the Province of Alberta and the Province of Saskatchewan in performance testing. At that time for example, the 1961-62 year, only 16 Manitoba breeders were making any use of the performance testing program as against 89 in Saskatchewan and 131 in Alberta. Similarly, the number of calves under test was very much lower in Manitoba, less than half what it was in Saskatchewan and less than a third the Alberta number.

Since that time the other provinces have moved along as well and Saskatchewan initiated their sire performance program with an actual station. Now Manitoba has not done so. My colleague the Member for Lakeside indicated that the Manitoba plan was set up by a private company, and I agree with the Minister that they should be congratulated for taking this action, but my question of the Minister is: why wasn't he taking some action in the field. Is it that he doesn't agree with the record performance program? It seems that he's not moving along nearly as quickly as other provinces.

My understanding is that in Saskatchewan the beef cattle test station at Saskatoon was established with funds provided from the Horned Cattle Trust Account. This is where they took their money to do it and this is a government program. This was done as a result of recommendations of their advisory board on the Horned Cattle Fund and the government has proceeded. Their estimated cost is some \$50,000 and they have in their program I think about 200 young bulls under test. It's full up; they couldn't take any more. The Minister has indicated that here in Manitoba I think it was 114 head.

MR. HUTTON: 160.

MR. MOLGAT: 160 - pardon me - that were under test, but we had to wait here for a private company to come forward and take hold of the program. Now is the Minister really convinced that ROP is the proper thing, and if so, what action is he taking to see to it that Manitoba moves ahead. I think there has been a lot of criticism in the past, in fact I recall when other people were sitting on this side of the House and vice versa, that we had some lengthy speeches about the quality of cattle in Manitoba and how it was much inferior to that in other provinces.

Well here is a program that's designed to improve the quality of cattle and the Minister just doesn't seem to be catching hold of it and forging ahead. I wonder if he could express his views on ROP. Is he definitely for it? Is he going to promote it further? Is the government going to consider a testing station of its own or will it continue to rely on private organizations?

MR. HUTTON: We're not contemplating a station of our own at the present time. We are contributing to the cost of maintaining the bulls in the sire indexing centre here in order to keep the cost to the farmer or cattlemen down to a reasonable level. We are contemplating taking money from the Horned Cattle Fund for this purpose to keep the cost attractive to the producer.

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) In addition to this sire indexing station we have a federal-provincial ROP beef program and in the past year there were 33 herds enrolled and approximately 1,285 calves were on test. This is where we send the specialists out to the farm or ranch with scales and enable the operator to determine which are his best producing cows.

MR. MOLGAT: 33 herds?

MR. HUTTON: There are 33 herds and 1,285 calves on test in the past year. I think that we endorse ROP. As a matter of fact, Manitoba in swine led the way and set a pattern that the Canadian Swine Breeders have now adopted, or a version of it, for the establishment of elite breeding stock in swine. I don't think that we should have the government going into areas where private enterprise is willing to make a contribution. I think that we should say that we are particularly fortunate in Manitoba that this company - the McCabe Grain Company - took this interest and made this investment.

I have some information here now that Alberta for instance - who have many times more cattle than we have - have only a privately owned testing station. I think that the 160 cattle on test in Manitoba compares very favourably with the record in Saskatchewan of 200, because I believe that Saskatchewan has about 1,700,000 cattle as compared to 1,100,000 in Manitoba. No, we support and encourage the ROP program and the sire indexing station and will continue to do so.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that statement of policy because I was getting a little concerned as to what the department really felt about this. The Minister says that we're fortunate, that we should rely on private enterprise, and in many ways I agree with him. We are fortunate that this private company was prepared to do this because it seems to me that had they not come forward and done this, then my honourable friend apparently was not going to do it himself, because I know I've heard of no plans that he announced that Manitoba was going to do this. Certainly Saskatchewan did it sometime previously because the clipping I have here indicates in this past year they operated at capacity, which I gather meant that the year before that, when it was in operation, they didn't. So I agree with him it's fortunate that McCabe Grain decided to go ahead because it would seem to me that we would not have been along with a program of our own had it not been for them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to return for a moment to the poultry business again because I think that some information has been given--(Interjection)--no, we're still under the same topic, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on Animal Industry Branch.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, that's correct. Don't poultry come in under there? You'll find item 5 specifies poultry, Mr. Chairman.

I think that there has been some information that has gone out that is not correct and may in fact be harmful. Some of the statements made in the House, for example, there was a clipping or a newspaper headline as a result of some of the discussions that went on here last Saturday and the headline says, "Evans says Poultrymen Must Modernize or Fail." Does the Minister of Agriculture agree with that statement, because my understanding was that most of the major production now of poultry - and I'm referring specifically of course to broilers and turkeys, I'm not referring to the production on small farms - but most of it has now been highly modernized. I think that most of our plants are new plants and are actually set up on the basis of the experience in the United States, and surely when the Minister says modernize he's not suggesting that further vertical integration is the modernization that we want.

I think if we look at some of the statements made, for example when he said that -- 80 growers in large operations averaging 60,000 birds a year was the statement made by the Minister of Industry and Commerce -- and he says that that indicates that these are very large concerns. Well actually on the basis I think of their net returns, 60,000 birds a year -- I think if they are fortunate they may get a net of 10 cents a bird, I think really what they probably get is closer to 8 or 7 -- and on the basis of say 8 cents per bird, 60,000 birds represents a net return of \$4,800.

Now this I don't think would really qualify as being a very large enterprise. This surely is still in the category of a family farm operation, because if a family farm cannot produce \$4,800 then it is certainly in serious trouble and our industry is in a very serious way. This is why these people are concerned, because if a producer is presently producing 60,000 birds and averaging 8 cents per bird or 7 cents per bird, he is obviously highly concerned when he sees a very large enterprise coming in. This I think is where the Minister of Agriculture has a real problem and he requires much closer co-operation with his colleague the Minister of

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). Industry and Commerce who seems to have a different view of the subject.

I don't want to labour the point, Mr. Chairman, but I really feel that in this particular area the Minister of Industry and Commerce has failed to have proper co-ordination with his colleague the Minister of Agriculture, because I can't believe that the Minister of Agriculture subscribes to the statements that the Minister of Industry and Commerce makes. If he does subscribe to them -- well if he doesn't subscribe to them, I think he should definitely say so. It seems to me that we have modernized in this particular field and that the action of setting up some very large producers is in fact going to hurt a number of what we can term family operations.

Now the Minister has before him a request from the poultrymen - the broiler producers - for a marketing board. I think he indicated last night that such boards had been established in other provinces. I think one of the problems in most of these provinces has been one of production. The marketing boards I think have been established to have a regular production. I think most of them have operated on a quota basis - most of them have in fact controlled production. Now this certainly doesn't back up the statements made by the Minister of Industry and Commerce who said that we needed more production, because if we needed more production then why is it that everywhere along the line the producers are asking for a board that will in fact control production.

So I would like to hear from the Minister what is likely to happen here with the request of the poultrymen for a marketing board. Has he made a decision as yet and when is he likely to make a decision on this? Is he going to proceed with the marketing board or not?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to deal with the question of the efficiency of the broiler producers. I think what the Minister of Industry and Commerce said was essentially true, but it wasn't said in a way to reflect adversely upon the operators of the existing plants in Manitoba. One of the terrible problems about this kind of production is that science is banging along at such a tremendous rate that the techniques of just a year or two ago; the knowledge of environment as it affects the production of broiler birds for instance changes, is increased; and somebody who made an investment ten years ago or even five years ago did so on the basis of the best available scientific information existing at that time, but the trouble is that we have scientists who are working on this all the time and they are finding new things. So one of the very real problems in this industry is the rate of obsolescence that occurs, and of course the man who is in last and who has the benefit of all the mistakes and all the new information that has been brought to light makes a sounder investment than the earlier investor, and especially a family type operator has a terrible time to find the capital to re-tool his factory and to implement the newer ideas.

Now just take for instance this FFF farm. They grind up the feathers even and feed them back to the poultry to grow more poultry. The operator who isn't operating on this scale and isn't integrated doesn't have this source of feed available, and certainly those who have been in longer will not have as ideal a plant in terms of providing a perfect environment for production as those who have just gone in in the past year.

Now this is one of the terrible things about agriculture in general and it's emphasized more in industries like the poultry industry, that the technology is changing every year on the basis of new knowledge and that it becomes a race that's pretty hard to win for any length of time. Maybe somebody else is going to go into the broiler industry a year or two from now and they'll be able to produce birds with 1.9 or 1.8 pounds of grain per pound of bird. They're going to have an advantage over the latest in facilities that have been built in Manitoba.

All the Minister of Industry and Commerce is saying is that it's very difficult for anybody who requires 2-1/2 pounds of grain to produce a pound of broiler meat to compete with somebody who can do it for 2 pounds, and this is a fact. It's not a criticism, it's a fact; and if you stop to think of it you can extend a great deal of sympathy to those people we have made their investment in the past on less comprehensive knowledge than those who are investing today.

This is why so much of the farmer's income today is going into the re-tooling of his plant. He has little left for himself and his family. It's a terrible problem and I don't know what the answer is. If we could say, well science should stop here and wait for everybody to catch up, maybe that would be the answer, but science doesn't stop. We have no way to stop it. Do we want to stop it? We sort of have to live with it. The fact is down in Tennessee they can produce broilers and market them in Great Britain. Now if they can market those broilers, hens, anyway you want, in Great Britain, they can market them here in Manitoba if we don't produce

(MR. HUTTON cont'd).....broilers, and it's a fact of life. We don't like it but we have to live with it.

Now with respect to marketing boards. I can't tell you what the decision of the government is going to be with respect to this request. I do know there's no sense in trying to control production here unless there's some arrangement made with the Province of Ontario, because right now we're paying for freight on feed grain to be sent down to Ontario so they can produce broilers more competitively with Manitoba, and unless there was an arrangement between the board that has been established in Ontario and the proposed board for Manitoba, then any of the benefits from controlled production would accrue not to Manitoba's producers but they would accrue to the producers in Ontario who would be free to come in and undermine and erode the market.

Now I think that the hope in the broiler industry is in orderly marketing, but it's going to have to encompass not just the producers in Manitoba but there has to be orderly marketing worked out in co-operation between all the broiler producers in Canada who are competitive in one another's market. I can't say any more I think about that.

I have some further information with respect to our contribution to the McCabe Sire Indexing Station. We are contributing \$4,500 a year to the maintenance of the animals while they are in the station, hoping to keep the costs down to the producers so they will make use of it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his statement. I think he describes the plight of the poultry producers fairly accurately and that is the very reason that the poultry producers are concerned, when the government steps in, and using public money assists other producers, because the very producers that are in the business now are highly concerned about their competitive position. They know that they have to keep up to the modern developments and so on and when they are suddenly faced with all their problems, with government money being injected into competitive enterprises against them, then they are very very concerned.

Now the Minister says that we have to worry about Ontario. Obviously we always have to be on guard to keep up our industry, whatever field we are in, and be competitive. I think it is correct however that at this time we are really a major exporter. If you take the whole field of poultry, including turkeys - we are a very major exporter of turkey meat - and even insofar as the broilers themselves which we are discussing specifically, I think it's correct to say that we export more than we import in broiler meats. The Minister of Industry and Commerce says "no". My information is that in 1964 we exported approximately a million and a half pounds and that we imported less than a million pounds. These figures, as far as I know, come from the Dominion Government--(Interjection)--Does the Minister of Industry and Commerce say those are not the correct figures?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): I say that, yes.

MR. MOLGAT: He says that the figures on broilers are not correct, that in 1964 we imported more broilers in Manitoba than we exported.

MR. EVANS: By a good deal.

MR. MOLGAT: The Minister says that is so.

MR. EVANS: We imported four or five million pounds net.

MR. MOLGAT: The Minister of Industry and Commerce says we imported four or five million pounds net of broilers in 1964.

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Well those are certainly not the figures that I obtained from my check, and I will go back and verify this further because I think that is very important insofar as the over-all position the government has taken in this regard. My information is that last year there was a difference in exports over imports of about a half a million. Very good, I'll check this further.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as the livestock industry, I think my colleague the Honourable Member from Lakeside brought up one subject which I don't think the Minister touched on, and that's the question of cattle stealing or rustling, and this is of concern in certain parts of the province in particular. I know that part of Saskatchewan operates under a brand inspection program whereas another part of the province doesn't. The problem here of course is to set up a brand inspection program costs money, which in the final analysis the producer must pay for; and if it does not control the rustling, then it's an expenditure for no purpose. For it to

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).be effective -- it can only be effective if the cattle really end up in the market. If they are butchered locally and used up locally, then no amount of brand inspection at the market place is going to control it. In order to decide whether or not we should go into brand inspection, then we have to know what really is happening, if we can, to the cattle that are being stolen.

Has the Minister initiated any program at all, either to his ag reps or to other means of trying to ascertain the importance of the problem and exactly what is happening to the cattle that are stolen? It is of concern in many parts of the province, certainly on the Westlake area it was of major concern last summer, and any producer who loses four or five head, it's a big blow to him. So I'd like to know from the Minister if there are any investigations going on and if he has any proposals to correct the situation.

MR. HUTTON: We have considered the matter and on balance we don't think it's worthwhile implementing a brand inspection program.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister either confirm or deny the suggestion that I presented from some of my friends - and this was not from the Stock Growers Association - on the fact that the reports on large animals go out to local veterinarians rather than directly to the owners of the animals involved?

MR. HUTTON: Yes, this is the practice and the reason for this is that these reports are not the easiest thing to interpret to a layman and it is felt that a more useful way to handle it is to have the local veterinarian interpret the report and make the recommendations in respect to the problem that exists. There is another thing that we are trying to establish and that is a close liaison between the local veterinarian and the veterinary staff of the Department of Agriculture and this is one way of doing it. We are not in business to displace the local veterinarian; we are there to assist him to be able to do a better job for the people that he serves.

MR. CAMPBELL: I agree completely with that point of view, Mr. Chairman, that the local veterinarian is a very important person in the community; but on the other hand, the possibility of delay - because these veterinarians are very busy people these times - are so great that I think the other side can be argued with a great deal of merit too.

However, I don't intend to take a lot of time on it at the moment. It would be my feeling though, that just as the farmer has to be a pretty all-round guy these times, that the stock growers generally speaking are pretty well able to interpret anything that they get from the department. I'm sure my honourable friend in his own operation would understand pretty well the report that would be sent back directly. But the occasions that I have had mentioned to me have been because of the veterinarian being away, or busy with other matters, that the report didn't reach the actual livestock owner for a matter of two or three days, which can be quite important in some cases. I would simply urge that the Minister take another look at the policy.

MR. P. J. McDONALD (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word or so on this particular subject. I can appreciate the Honourable Member for Lakeside's remarks, but very few farmers when there's some special problem that comes up knows what the problem is and he usually, and he should, call his local veterinarian and a small part of the body of this animal is probably sent in to Winnipeg. A farmer would probably have to load the whole thing to know which part was to be examined.

And also, as the Minister has suggested, it is very important that they know the problem in their community so that it is not spreading to the neighbours. Many farmers may find out if they've got a disease and it's quite contagious, could probably say, "Well, forget about it then." Well if the local veterinarian knows about it, he is well aware of the subject and I think this is the proper procedure.

I would just like to mention something about the sire index station out at Douglas at this time too with your permission, Mr. Chairman. The cattle men are quite qualified to organize and approach the government for this type of help and I think that it is a real effort of the government working with the cattle men and the McCabe Grain Company as they are interested in the different types of feed. Now the government has made a real contribution. Their staff has organized and has spent the time -- the entire organization has been done by the president of this group and the staff of the Department of Agriculture, and I think this is a real good way for people to work together like this.

There's one other subject I would like to mention while I am on my feet. There has been a lot of talk about the price of cattle, that it's been too bad that the cattle have been flooded on the market and all this type of thing. In my opinion it is real foolishness talking like this,

(MR. McDONALD cont'd). because if we had twice as many cattle in Manitoba, you can be darned sure that it wouldn't make hardly any difference to the price of cattle. The reason that cattle were low that fall - the market was low last fall - we did not have the buyers here from the USA and other places because they had probably lots of cattle of their own; they could buy them other places.

Therefore, the feed lot operators, by choice, they took the better cattle and they paid for the better cattle - they paid 22 cents for steers. Thousands of them were sold at a good price in Manitoba if they were real good breedy-looking animals. This left a poorer grade of cattle which made it look as if there were a poor market.

Now right in the very middle of the depression - the lowest depression we had last fall in the cattle market - I shipped steers and got \$250 a piece, that were just a little over a year old. I showed the results to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland and he was quite impressed about this. There has been a good market for any cattle that have been fat and well finished, and I think that if we had twice as many cattle, we would have pretty near twice as many dollars to spend in Manitoba.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with my honourable friend from Turtle Mountain completely so far as the advisability of the stock owner having the veterinary services available to him when he can, but the fact is that there are a great many farmers in Manitoba who are a long way from a veterinary surgeon. Then the other fact is that some of them become pretty expert in these matters themselves, and whatever the arguments that we may raise, the fact is that a great many specimens reach the laboratory directly from the farmers.

Now I'd be all in favour of my honourable friend's suggestion too that he take the report to the veterinarian. The more he sees of the veterinarian the better. That's all to the good. But if he decides to do this on his own, as a great many of them do, then my point is that in my opinion he's entitled to a direct report. Certainly he'd be wise to take that and discuss it with the veterinarian, but if he wants to take this action on his own then I think he should have the opportunity not only to do that but to get the report back directly to him. We'd leave it to him whether he discusses it with the veterinarian or not, and I agree that it would be good practice to do it.

My honourable friend tells us about the excellent steers that he shipped and that he got confirmation of that fact even from the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. Does he not realize as a member of the government group that the proper person to have taken that up with was the Honourable Member for Morris?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3) -- passed; (4) -- passed; (5) -- passed; (6) -- passed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister give me any indication at this time what the prospects are for the people of the interlake - particularly that area that I represent - of getting a veterinarian? This is a prime concern to the people up there. We haven't got a veterinarian anywhere in the area. If I'm not mistaken, the closest one is Stonewall, and as the Minister well knows, this is a big country left unserved. For instance, any animal taking sick in the northern part of the constituency, it is maybe a hundred or up to nearly two hundred miles for a veterinarian to come to give the animal attention. I know many of them are very concerned about trying to get a veterinarian established in the area so that they'd be closer to one when one is required. Is there any policy whereby the government pays a veterinarian or assists a locality to pay a veterinarian's salary so he will establish in an area?

MR. HUTTON: The Veterinary Services District Act provides for the government to make a grant - a matching grant - to a maximum of \$1,800, that is on the government's part, with municipalities and local government districts who wish to provide an incentive for a veterinarian. These districts - we have only one in the province - at Roblin - and they're established to try and equate or equalize to some extent the costs of veterinary services in areas where the veterinarian in order to service the people has to drive long distances. The money is used to try and reduce the costs to those people who are residents long distances from the veterinary centre.

In the case of your people in St. George, there has been some activity on the part of your local area development committee to provide an incentive for a veterinarian there and they have made enquiries with the department as to some variation on the conventional method of just offering a retainer to a veterinarian. They are interested in the establishment of a veterinarian centre which they feel would be attractive to a veterinarian to move in and take over, because he would have facilities there ready for him. This matter is under consideration by the local area development group at Ashern and we have received no final request on their part,

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) but there is a movement there and it may culminate in the establishment of some incentive to attract a veterinarian to that northern area.

MR. GUTTORMSON: For the purposes of clarification, supposing a municipality - we'll say Eriksdale or Coldwell or Siglunes - decided they want to provide funds themselves for incentive for a veterinarian to come in. Supposing they put up \$1,800, for the sake of argument, would the government match that \$1,800? Therefore, it would be \$3,600 they could pay - just for the municipality itself - it wouldn't have to be in association with other municipalities? One municipality could do it on its own or they could go in a group of perhaps three if they wanted to?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (3) -- passed.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, you're on (b) (1), (2), (3) or (4) or (5) or in there somewhere. I thought perhaps my honourable friend would have something to say in regard to the wonderful progress that apparently is being made in the Bang's Disease Program. --(Interjection)--It's illegal to talk about it? I see, well okay. I think that's what they refer to. What is the proper term then, Mr. Chairman? --(interjection)--Brucellosis, brucellosis - I thought they used both words.

However, on Page 66 of the annual report, it looks to me as if last year for the first time in some years there has been real progress made - real progress according to this. For instance 1960-61, under the heading of Questionable Animals, there were 5,000 some odd; 1964, zero - none at all. We have been asking every year since I entered this House, "How are we getting along with this program?" Surely after so many years of vaccination, year after year after year, eventually you should eradicate it completely, and yet in spite of that wonderful record as reported on Page 66 of the annual report, I see that under the estimates there is \$70,000 to be voted, the same as it was last year. Now perhaps there's justification for this. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I see in the estimates it's called Bang's Disease - right in the estimates.

MR. ROBLIN: It's not the name, Mr. Chairman, it's the subject.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Oh, okay, thank you. Now, Mr. Chairman, in light of the record on Page 66, how do you account for \$70,000 now being required in this field?

MR. HUTTON: vaccination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4) -- passed; (5) --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under (5), I notice there's a decrease here in the grant. I presume that this is because our students will now be going to the Saskatchewan College rather than the Guelph? Is that correct?

MR. HUTTON: I think it's because there was a carry-over. Oh yes, there was \$8,700 in the trust fund.

MR. MOLGAT: How many students -- well, No. 1. Are we still using Guelph? Are we sending students to Guelph still or using exclusively Saskatchewan? Secondly, how many students are presently out on the scholarship program?

MR. HUTTON: There are 11 students currently enrolled on scholarship. I can't tell you how many have -- I think that these are all at Guelph at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: What are our arrangements insofar as the Saskatchewan College? As I recall, this was to be the prairie provinces' college, to be attached in Saskatchewan but that the other provinces were to be involved as well, and were certainly to have access to the facilities. Now have we absolutely free access to those facilities? I don't mean no fees, but I mean that there's no discrimination against students from outside of Saskatchewan. So far as space - they have room for 50 students - will they give preference to Saskatchewan or is it clearly understood that the other two provinces, Alberta and Manitoba, can get a quota in the college.

MR. HUTTON: The arrangements between the Province of Saskatchewan and the other provinces have not been finalized. The question of whether we would contribute to operating expenses, the basis for contribution, the allocation of available space, these things have not been resolved as yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (5) -- passed; (c) (1) --

MR. SHOEMAKER: Is this the item under which we might discuss the ag reps?

MR. HUTTON: They come under Agricultural Development.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It doesn't come under Extension Services? Well okay, I'll talk on another subject then, Mr. Chairman. I was interested last night to hear my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture refer to this farm business group and he said that the 700 or more

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). farmers that made up this group were now coming back to him and saying in effect - well where do we go now? He said that it would appear that some of them would like him to implement "post-graduate work" along the same lines.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is understandable in light of the report that has been tabled from this group. Mr. Chairman, I think -- I think that the report that my honourable friend referred to was the one that I obtained yesterday called "Farm Business Analysis 1963." This is a compilation of the 700 or so farmers that volunteered to go into a program of study. Well according to this report, Mr. Chairman, it points up far beyond anything what we have said in this House as to the plight that agriculture is in. How would you like, Mr. Chairman, to put in a 10-hour day -- put in a 10-hour day and have \$50,000 invested plus 44 head of cattle, and end up with 66 cents an hour for your labour.

That's what it says here unless there is something wrong with my honourable friend's figures, because what I have before me is a propaganda sheet emanating from his department dated the 23rd October, 1964, and it says the farms under consideration - that's the 700 or so I suppose that made up this report - the farms under consideration in this summary averaged 692 acres, some of which was rented land; the average number of livestock was 44 head; the average value of the operator's assets including the land, building and machinery was \$51,000; the average debt was \$10,500. Allowing five percent for the farmers investments in these assets - and it looks to me as if it doesn't include the cattle because it's talked about in a different sentence - now allowing five percent for the farmers investment in these assets, his average labour earnings were \$1,800 or \$6.60 a day for a 10-hour working day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on Extension Services.

MR. SHOEMAKER: That's right. That's exactly what my honourable friend said last night. He said that these groups under the extension program - this is exactly what he said last night - were now coming back to him, a number of them, and asking for a further extension and he called it post-graduate work. Now if after three or four years of study they have found that they were only able to make 66 cents per hour, then I would think that they would need some further post-graduate studies. I wonder what my honourable friend has in mind for them so that he can at least have the farmers in the area earn the minimum wage.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, you are now at the top of the page under (d) - Agricultural Development. This is where we discuss ag reps, right?--(Interjection)--Under (c)? Well I don't care where it is, Mr. Chairman, I've got a few words to say on ag reps anyway.

I was rather alarmed and a little discouraged two weeks ago, or a week ago last Sunday I think to be exact, when I got a telephone call from the ag rep in our area - who has been with us quite a number of years and been a very faithful ag rep - I got a call from him to say that he thought he should advise me before the rumours started flying around that he was leaving Neepawa - and I was certainly very sorry to hear that - and that he was taking up work, I think he said, with the Federal Government. He wasn't exactly certain, but one thing he was certain about and that was that he was leaving Neepawa.

Now I hope that we will not be left without an ag rep. I hope that we will have an immediate replacement. The ag rep in our area, Mr. Wallace Lee, has really in effect filled a double role, if I'm allowed to use that term. He has served in the capacity of the regular duties of an ag rep and he has gone beyond that and did an immense amount of work on watershed and conservation, much more so I think than you might expect from the regular duties of an ag rep. So I hope that my honourable friend can assure the committee and assure me and assure the people of Neepawa that we are going to have a replacement and soon.

About one year ago now the Honourable Minister waited on a delegation from Gladstone, and I think one since that time too, in regard to the possibility of the people in the Gladstone area receiving further assistance from an ag rep. They either wanted a full-time ag rep, preferably a full-time ag rep station in the Gladstone area, or some assurance that they would receive better service than they presently are, and even the Minister referred to this particular area, according to the news article I have here, as "no man's land" - if the article is correct - "no man's land."

Well this points up what I have said time and time again, that it seems to me that it is time that the entire province was set out in new ag rep districts, that is new boundaries established for the various ag rep areas. I believe we have something like 36 ag reps at the moment - in that neighborhood - and probably we should have 50 percent more and smaller

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . districts so that greater service could be rendered to the farmers in the area by the ag reps.

Now according to the article that I have before me, the Minister assured the delegation from Gladstone that he would do something about their problem as soon as possible. In fact it says "in the very near future", and this was February 20, 1964. So, Mr. Chairman, I do hope that my honourable friend can assure the people in the area that we will not be left without the services of an ag rep and that the farmers in the Gladstone area will receive probably more help in this particular field than they have in the past, in accordance with the assurance that he gave them a year ago.

MR. HUTTON: I'd like to reply to this. You know I think there's a way to solve the situation up there, and that would be to move the Ag Rep office to the centre of the area. At the present time the Ag Rep's office is situated to one side of the area. However, I gave this very serious consideration together with the staff last year, and I felt that due to the statements that were made by the Honourable Member for Gladstone that this was what he was conveying, that the office at Neepawa was not well situated to serve the general area that had been allocated as the responsibility for the ag rep. But then I thought about it again and I thought my goodness, if I move the ag rep from Neepawa to Gladstone, the Honourable Member for Gladstone is going to be a very unpopular fellow in Neepawa, so I decided that on balance it was better to leave the ag rep office in Neepawa.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend knows -- I should thank him for his consideration in this regard -- but he understands that this is an awkward kind of an area to serve properly. You have got a jut of land running away up there by the lake and the Big Grass Marsh that separates it all, and all of this business, and I think really - and I believe that he will agree with me - I think that the ag reps today have too much to do in every area. It's just impossible. I have gone out with the ag rep until one o'clock in the morning at meetings. Well they can only do so much work and I think that they are over-worked. I think that it's time that new areas were defined and more ag reps put in. I think this is money well spent.

The Minister said last evening that he was of the opinion that the Extension Service would undergo considerable change in the next few years. He was of the opinion it would have to become much more intensive, and so intensive that it might necessitate the farmers having to pay partly for this service. It is rather interesting because I get the impression that it is already becoming much more intensive, which leads me to put this question to the Minister. In an area which an ag rep is supposed to serve, the more intensive the consultation with them, obviously the fewer farmers he is able to deal with.

I haven't had any formal complaints but I've overheard a good deal of -- you might say dissatisfaction with the fact that in an area an ag rep finds himself after one or two years, finds himself working pretty intensively with about 50 or 60 farmers and then the other farmers in the area complain that the ag rep doesn't seem to have time for them, etc. I think in many cases those who complain, it's really in some way their own fault because they never engaged the ag rep into anything that is really interesting and of any consequence.

But the question that I want to ask of the Minister is: is he aware that this transition is taking place, that the ag rep is tending to work more and more with fewer and fewer farmers simply because these farmers are the ones that are trying new things, undergoing expansion, and in fact soliciting the ag rep's services and attention.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I just say a word here. I think what the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has pointed up is the reason why we don't need more ag reps in Manitoba because the kind of service that an ag rep can give is not what the farmer needs today. When he gets down to specific details, personalized services, he needs the services of a specialist who knows the very latest in that field. It's purely inhuman to ask an ag rep to be able to comprehend and grasp the total spectrum of agricultural knowledge today. So it points up the fact that we are going to have to take a different approach than we have in the past and that's why I talk about - I think the ag rep should fulfil the role of leadership, work with groups in the community, be a source of dissemination of general information, but to ask him to fulfil the kind of a role that the farmer needs today is unfair to him and he isn't able to do the kind of job that needs to be done. This is why we are moving towards the provision of the personalized service that these farmers that you're talking about, are seeking, and this will leave the ag rep free to pursue the kind of leadership role, community leadership role, that is his and always has been his prime function.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) 1 -- passed; (2) -- passed; (4) -- passed; (e) (1) -- passed; (2) --

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) -- passed; (f) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (3) -- passed

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman under (f) (1) I was looking through the report and I find on Page 79 a paragraph which reads; "Individual farm calls." (this is in reference to the soil specialist) - "Individual farm calls" and it reads: "Individual farm calls are an important part of a soil specialist program. Requests for these come through the ag rep to the specialist. At least one farm call is included as part of a Soils Club and Farm Business groups program. In many cases the ag rep accompanies the soil specialist on the call, thus acquiring further knowledge of the soil in this area, etc. Four hundred and thirty-five farm calls were made by the soil specialist during the year."

Now I realize that the services of the soil specialist are available upon request and for certain purposes to an individual farmer. My point in rising is to ask the Minister why it is that his department has a policy; and I think it's a new policy, it's a departure - has a policy that an individual farmer's request for a soil specialist call is turned down if it is found out that there is some sort of litigation behind the request. I think that we should stick with precedent, and the precedent is that in the past if an individual farmer requested the service of a soil specialist or a vegetable specialist or whatever, and there was reason for it, this call by the specialist would be made. However, in the past couple of years, if the department thinks that there's even the slightest inkling of possible litigation between a farmer and a municipality because of improper drainage, or soil erosion due to improper drainage, the department will turn down that request no matter how legitimate the request may be. Some farmers suffer soil erosion due to improper drainage; they want a soil specialist to come out and tell them the approximate extent of the soil erosion and the kind of soil that has to be replaced, especially the kind that's been eroded -- this requires a specialist. And it's not easy to hire a private soil specialist, and so if the department turns him down where is he to turn? Very often the farmer can't even get his day in court simply because he hasn't got the evidence, and he can't get the evidence unless he gets a specialist. I would ask the Minister to comment on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f) (1) -- passed

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, please . . .

MR. HUTTON: I think there are - you see I'm not a lawyer and I'm not a legal expert but I think there are procedures by which claimants can require someone to be called as an expert witness in court procedure, but I think you can understand that our specialists are not here to get involved in litigation and that naturally we cannot take sides in disputes. If we know that there is a dispute we just stay away from it, and I think it's pretty good policy. If we're going to be of any use to the people in the community I think we have to be independent and no strings on us and not take sides.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, quite so, the department and its staff shouldn't take sides, but I think that soil sampling, or appraisal should be carried out and then let the expert be subpoenaed or summoned to court. One then simply gives his testimony. The giving of testimony does not involve taking sides.

In any case, I know for a fact that a few years back a vegetable specialist was called by an individual farmer who had suffered some damage due to spraying carried out by Manitoba Hydro. The vegetable specialist did go out and make an analysis and subsequently he was summoned as a witness and he didn't take sides; he merely gave his expert opinion. Having done that it seems to me it sets a precedent insofar as departmental policy is concerned. I'm asking the Minister how it is possible for a vegetable specialist to be summoned to give evidence at a court hearing and why, three or four years later, the department refuses to allow a soil specialist to go out to make a soil analysis of erosion, etc.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (3) -- passed; (4) -- passed; (5) -- passed; (6) -- passed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, under (5) - (f) (5) or (6) - Distribution of Weed Control Chemicals - according to a news release here I understand that it is impossible for a dealer to obtain a licence now to sell pesticides or insecticides unless he does attend a short course, that is you will not let him write. I understand there is a \$10.00 examination fee that he pays but they won't let him write unless he actually attends a short course? -- (Interjection) -- That's right. Well, that seems rather odd, Mr. Chairman, if he could qualify, why not let him write?

Mr. Chairman, about a year ago there was a court case or two or three or four in the province on dieldrin in cream. One or two days were spent at Gladstone on this. I attended two different days there where three or four or five farmers in the area were brought into court because cream that they had shipped to the Gladstone Creamery contained traces of dieldrin.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) Now I notice that a publication emanating from the Minister of Agriculture called "Grasshopper Control in Manitoba" prepared by the Manitoba Grasshopper Control Committee 1963 and there may be a more recent one, still lists dieldrin here and how to use it. I rather thought the use of dieldrin was now completely outlawed and yet it is on the recommended insecticides here. So I wonder if my honourable friend would tell the committee to what extent that dieldrin has been found in cream samples in the last 12 months, because there was a real story in the paper a year or 18 months ago.

And then too, Mr. Chairman, I noticed - I haven't got it here but I did notice - that there was postgraduate or advanced courses for insecticide and pesticide dealers - advanced ones. I wonder how do they differ from the regular \$10.00 course. Is there a \$20.00 course now or what does the postgraduate studies do that the other one doesn't do?

MR. CHAIRMAN; (5) -- passed.

MR. HUTTON; . . . grasshopper control program doesn't come under Soils and Crops.

MR. CHAIRMAN; (5) -- passed; (6) -- passed; (7) -- passed; (8) -- passed. (g) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (3) -- passed; Resolution No. 34 -- passed; Resolution No. 35 . . .

MR. CAMPBELL; Mr. Chairman, I purposely left my request until this item. I'm not sure which one it belongs in. I've a very brief question for the Honourable the Minister. I think he can answer it equally briefly. What's the support that's going to be given to Austin Agricultural Museum during the present year? Is it the same as formerly, and what does it amount to in the way of annual grant or building program or any other assistance?

MR. HUTTON; Insofar as my department is concerned, it amounts to \$500.00 grant.

MR. CHAIRMAN; Resolution No. 35 -- passed; Resolution 36, (5) (a) -- passed; (b) . . .

MR. VIELFAURE; Mr. Chairman, on this one I have a few questions I'd like to bring up on the Hog Marketing Commission. Could the Minister tell us what percentage or how many hogs are brought by the, well I would call the smaller buyers that use the Commission office and also what is the amount of the bond required by these buyers? Is it 20,000? It seems to me it was 20,000. If it is 20,000, some arguments have been brought to me concerning these smaller buyers - and certainly my point in bringing it up is not to criticize them as such because I think they have helped in promoting competition in the buying of hogs - but some producers are concerned and even a \$20,000 bond - if it is \$20,000 -- might not be sufficient because of the fact that if they do buy heavily it is common practice that these cheques are not always cashed right away and some of these buyers could have as much as \$100,000 or more outstanding and some producers might be caught short if ever one of them did go broke. I don't know how serious that could be but I thought I'd bring that to the attention of the Minister.

Also the matter of truck washing at the yards is another point that has been brought up to me. I know when we visited we were told then that some improvements were being planned by the people at the stockyards. I think this is very important because we all know that this is one of the main reasons why a lot of the hogs were not being marketed through the public markets in the past, because as much as they have done a good job it must be remembered that they have not kept pace with modern marketing as much as hogs coming in by truck and when the trucker had the choice of either going to the packinghouses where he had good service instead of washing with cold water, well if he was going to get the same price he did go there.

Also another point on - it is the commissioner that told us that we had reached a point where our price differential with these was practically the freight difference, approximately two cents. I wonder if there would be any merit in establishing a teletype office in the east so as to encourage buyers there to, whenever they run into shorter supply down there to bid on our hogs here in Manitoba.

I think these are the points that I wanted to make on the Hog Commission. And also while I'm on my feed on the Credit Union - this is under the Credit Union Services. As we know, Mr. Frossais is retiring and I would ask the Minister if he would consider in replacing him, and I don't mean as chief inspector, but replacing him as an inspector on the board to consider having somebody who could speak French or make reports in French, because as the Minister knows there are a great many Caisse Populaires in the province that have benefitted very much from the services of both the inspectors from attending their meetings and giving them talks in French and also making the report in French. So I wonder if the Minister would take this into consideration.

MR. HUTTON; I don't know what percentage of the hogs are bought by the small processor. I do know that on a particular day one small processor bought 25 percent of the hogs that were offered. We do know that under this system the small processor has an equal chance at any lot

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) . . . of hogs with any of the big processors, to this extent: his participation in the market place becomes many more times effective than it was under the old system of either direct delivery or private sale by private treaty. The percentage of hogs that are being sold through the commission is running roughly between 60 and 70 percent. I think it has averaged about 67 percent; last week it averaged 63 percent.

As to the extent of the bond required, I don't have that information just at hand, but financial responsibility is required. I expect some of my backstops will give me more detailed information. I'll give it to you when it comes along. I don't know whether Mr. Chevalier is a French-speaking - he's French but I didn't know whether he spoke French or not. I expect that we will utilize those who have the ability to have, what I consider to be quite an asset, bilingual capacity. We will utilize them in accommodating the French Credit Unions.

You will notice that there is an increase in the salaries and this is to provide for extra personnel to carry out our work with the Indian and Metis community to give greater guidance to these co-operatives that are being established amongst these people. It takes a greater amount of supervision naturally where these people are becoming familiar with co-operative principles and are becoming involved in the business world. They require more supervision than other areas but we are trying to provide that supervision that will, insofar as we can insure it, insure the success of their financial ventures.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, the cost of providing supervision insofar as the co-ops are concerned with the Indian and Metis, I wonder if he could indicate to us how much active participation in the operation of the Indian and Metis Co-ops is being done by the Indian and Metis themselves; because at one time, at one time it was indicated to me that by and large the supervision was done almost entirely, if not entirely, more or less from above without participation of the citizens themselves.

I wonder if the Minister could indicate to what degree, if any, there's been a change in that method of operation. I think he will recall that some two or three years ago I raised this particular problem that all the decisions or the major portion of decisions was made by the departmental supervisors and the likes of this, more than there would be say in an ordinary, or any credit union in other parts of the area.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, naturally as I say these young Co-ops require a greater extent of supervision than a Co-operative in southern Manitoba. Now you don't impose the will of the department any more than you have to. You try to guide rather than to force these people. We have some 92,000 out in guarantees on bank loans to help finance these operations, whether they're pulpwood operations or fish producers organizations. As a matter of fact, some of the, one at least, of these co-ops at Fort Alexander, the Indian and Metis people were quite adamant about running their own show. They have been quite successful there in their operation, and we try to just stand by and keep an eye on them so that we catch them before they get into any trouble. We don't interfere with their operations as long as we feel that they are following good business practices, but if we do see that they are about to make a mistake - we don't think that a failure is going to have very much benefit for them and we think that success on the other hand can do a great deal to giving them confidence in themselves and prompting them to go on and try other ventures.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a comment on the Potato Marketing Commission if I may. I'd also like to say -- (Interjection) -- Are we not on -- (Interjection) -- Will this come under the next one then, Mr. Chairman? -- (Interjection) -- Where will this come? I understood it would be in section 5. Could the Minister indicate.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, it's under this heading.

MR. JOHNSTON: I would like to say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that I think any board or organization that tries to get better prices for producers is a good thing and I certainly think that the commission is a big step in the right direction to raise incomes for the potato growers, but I'm sure that as the Minister is aware, there are some problems that have not yet been worked out.

I would like to draw to his attention one that occurs in the rural areas away from Winnipeg. I'm sure he's aware that of the 450-odd growers, a large majority are all in favour of the commission, but there are a small minority - and I'm thinking now at Carman and Portage - for instance, at Portage there are I believe 12 growers and most of them have built up their business out of supplying the local chain stores, the local hospital, the air field and they are doing a very good job in supplying a graded product and an acceptable product. Now under the

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . new system they now have to ship their potatoes into Winnipeg where they are graded and they're bought by a wholesaler and the same potatoes probably are shipped back out again to Portage or Brandon or wherever the case might be.

Mr. Chairman. I don't think the consumers in these areas are coming out too well under this deal and something should be done about it. For example, the fourth class freight rate which potatoes can be shipped by, from Winnipeg to Portage is 40 cents a hundredweight. The potatoes have to be shipped both ways - this is 80 cents a hundredweight; in the case of Brandon it's 62 cents a hundredweight each way, which is \$1.12 for the round trip for these potatoes. So someone has to pay this cost, so it's the consumer - it's added on. Now this year when potatoes presently are wholesaling at 6 cents a pound, an extra cent a pound raises the price by 15 percent to the consumer - this is before the wholesale and retail market. Now in a normal year when potatoes are probably two to three dollars a hundred pounds, the price increase is in the neighbourhood of 25 percent because of the freight. I would like to suggest to him that perhaps one of the growers in the Portage area, or the Carman area, may be appointed a wholesaler and take the responsibility of acting as a wholesaler for that area, instead of having this needless expense. If one wishes to build a case out of figures, the average family of five, I would suggest uses about ten pounds of potatoes a week; in a year this would be over 500 pounds, and if it's a cent a pound freight added on, that's five dollars a year added to the cost of living of the average family that must buy their potatoes in a store. So if we project this over a hundred thousand families in rural Manitoba, we're speaking now of a half a million dollars or even more, and while the trucking firms and the wholesalers may be laughing all the way to the bank, so to speak, it certainly is a raise in the cost of living for those people in rural Manitoba where they have to buy potatoes that have had this needless freight rate added on that wasn't there before, and I would like to see some solution to this problem. Perhaps the Minister could tell us what he's thinking of for the future.

MR. HUTTON: Well, the case isn't quite just the way the Honourable Member for Portage put it. The fact is that there are trucks taking potatoes out to the centres on a regular basis. He is saying trucks are going to go whether a grower is allowed to operate as a wholesaler or not. They have been going for many years. It hasn't added anything to the cost of the potatoes in the past, that the truck went out from Winnipeg and serviced certain grocery stores or chain stores, or whatever you have, in Portage or Brandon or Carman.

The thing is, as I said earlier, that in order to maintain order in marketing you'll have to define the role that certain people are going to play. I frankly can't seem too sympathetic to the consumer and I'll tell you why. Never in the history of a world, has so little time on the part of the consumer been spent in earning his bread and butter, as today. Never in the history of the world, has the consumer spent as little time earning his food, as he does today. I think your sympathy is ill placed, especially when we have been talking about the plight of the primary producer. And does it hurt if the consumer has to pay a little bit more in order that the primary producer gets a square deal, gets a fair price for a change? I think it's much better that the consumer pay a fair price, than that we let our primary industry of agriculture get into a spot where only the taxpayer can come to its rescue by price supports. I see nothing wrong in the fact that you can't buy potatoes for less than they are worth. My dad used to say during the "dirty thirties" that potatoes were the cheapest food he could give us, no matter what the price was. I can't in all honesty waste too much sympathy on the consumer in what he has to pay for potatoes. He's bought them pretty cheap at times; he's bought them below the cost of production. This year was a unique year and the potato producers aren't going to get the kind of prices they have received during this year - they likely won't see them or realize them for some time to come.

But we can't work out a method of orderly marketing if we let everybody just do as they like and do as they please, because it affects the price structure. We have to control these people. We have been very fortunate in Manitoba in that we have gotten the co-operation of the potato growers, the wholesalers, and the retailers. The government acted when a public meeting, 129 out of 130 growers voted for the establishment of a commission and then they went to the wholesalers and 26 out of 29 of the wholesalers in Manitoba endorsed the growers' request for orderly marketing. And it was on the basis of this kind of support that we implemented it. Now it's true that there has been adjustments and some people's toes have been stepped on, but this is necessary. If the situation had been kosher, nobody's toes would have been stepped on and we wouldn't have needed to implement a marketing commission. But the situation was chaotic. Even the wholesalers knew that it was chaotic; the retailers knew that it was chaotic

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) and they gave their support to this scheme. I am not going to say that there aren't weak spots in it; I am not going to say there aren't going to be changes in it; I wouldn't pretend because we are kind of pioneering here. But I think that the majority of both the growers and the wholesalers and the retailers are happy with it and we're going to have to live with some of these kinks until we can iron them out.

I think that we have been most fortunate in the calibre of men that were willing to serve on this commission. I think they bring to it a wealth of knowledge from all fields of production, distribution and retailing. Maybe we will be able to effect economies but we shouldn't effect these economies at the expense of the grower or in a way which would undermine the operations of that commission. The wholesalers are very frank when they say today, "If we're going to underwrite the grower and guarantee him a price; if we're going to promote the Manitoba product, then the grower has to be satisfied not to get into the wholesaling field. Because if he is going to do that, then we'll buy our potatoes regardless of where they come from and we'll put them into the pipeline to the best of our advantage."

There is a spirit of co-operation today and understanding between the groups. I think it should be maintained, because we can't sell Manitoba potatoes unless we have access to the wholesale outlets. Oh yes, we can sell a few at Portage, we can sell a few at Carman and we can sell a few at Brandon, but this is a drop in the bucket to the potential that we have if we can maintain this spirit of co-operation and goodwill that we have today amongst the various segments of the marketing industry. I would just ask the members here to be a little patient. This thing has just operated since the 4th of January. Let's give it a year or two and then see what the results are and see how the principles that are involved in this program, how they feel about it then.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, co-operation, may I just ask the committee if they'd be willing to deal with these estimates expeditiously. I would like to bring in the capital supply estimates right away, or as soon as humanly possible, if we could finish these estimates off in the next few minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one word on the matter of the Potato Marketing Board. I'm sure the Minister has received a number of complaints, as I have. The main complaint that I have received is that there was not a vote as such, on the implementation of the board; secondly the board is in the minds of many producers, not a producers' board but a wholesalers' board. They feel that the producers are under-represented and there's too much representation by wholesalers.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I just have one statement on the Potato Marketing Board. I have quite a bit to say, but not at this time. I would simply say this, that the regulations that have been promulgated under the Act are to some extent a little bit bothersome, or worrisome rather. For example, there is one regulation which states that the board may decide what producer or which producers need or need not be controlled. It's Regulation "D" that comes in under Regulation 79, I believe. I don't believe in regulations that are completely open-ended as that one is. It is the ultimate in giving discretionary, complete discretionary power, to a board. I realize that regulations are necessary but - power given to a board should be by category and not completely open-ended. That's the one point. The second point is if the Minister can now, or at some subsequent time, I would like him to explain just how the quota allocation works. It is my understanding that there is really no graduation between small and large growers of potatoes and it seems to me that there should be some graduation in order to give the smaller potato grower - not a break, but in order to equalize the opportunity for him to continue in operation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; Resolution 36 -- passed. 6 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; Resolution 37 -- passed, 7 -- passed; Resolution 38 -- passed. Resolution 39 --

MR. HUTTON: in respect to Resolution 37, I would just like to tell the Assembly here, the committee, that the Rosner Chair at the University of Manitoba has been recognized by the Rockefeller Foundation. The Rockefeller Foundation has contributed \$52, 000 to the work being done under the Rosner Chair, in respect to the species building program that has been headed by the head of the Plant Science, Professor Shebeski. I think that it is a great tribute to the - and a real tribute and one we should be very proud of, that our Faculty of Agriculture here in Manitoba should have gained this international recognition for its work in plant science.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 37 -- passed. Resolution 38 -- passed. Resolution 39 --

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) -- passed. Resolution 40 -- passed. Resolution 41 - 15(a)(1) --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under the Water Control and Conservation, there's a growing concern not only in the United States but in Canada as well, regarding our over-all water resources and the Minister, I am sure, is well aware of this. I'm not going to cover the ground except to ask him how we are getting along with the joint board covering the Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and I think the Federal Government participates in this as well. This is the one that is set up to co-ordinate the water resources of the three prairie provinces and there was some indications last summer that the Province of Alberta was reluctant to co-operate with Manitoba in particular insofar as water flows and the whole use of the Saskatchewan River system in particular which is vital to us from the standpoint of power and in the long distance vital to us from the standpoint of irrigation. Has that situation been resolved; is Alberta now prepared to co-operate; and where do we stand on this extremely important subject, for the future of the province?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies to the last question I would ask the Minister if his department or if Manitoba has received any formal invitation, whether it has taken any direct part in any conferences that have been held under the auspices of NAWAPA, North American Water and Power Alliance which is that fairly new association with grand ideas about diverting water supply into the arid west and southwest -- as a matter of curiosity, if the Minister has been actively involved in any capacity with that association. And my second question is with regard to the re-arrangement of water control between the province and the municipalities. Now this hasn't taken effect yet but I understand that the province is taking over all third order drains, etc. That it's also taking over the natural stream and river beds but it's not taking over the bridges - it'll take over the bridges over third order drains but not over fifth order drains - over rivers. These are the more expensive bridges and I would like the Minister to reply if this is a firm policy or whether it is subject to adjustment and negotiation in the future.

MR. HUTTON: The case of our relationship with the Province of Alberta. The Prairie Provinces Water Board is a board which determines the allocation, if you like, is involved in the allocation of water rights as between the provinces, and when the possibility of carrying out a comprehensive study on the Saskatchewan and Nelson River basin was first . . . , there was a reluctance on the part of Alberta to have this done by the Prairie Provinces Water Board. Alberta had been reluctant to have any consideration given to the uses that water may be put to in the years ahead or to any allocation of water. It appears that our consideration in the Saskatchewan Nelson River basin will be limited to studying the alternative methods of developing that resource. I suppose one can understand Alberta's reluctance. They feel that a great percentage of the water that flows in the Saskatchewan-Nelson basin rises in Alberta; they have quite a potential out there for irrigation and they are very jealous of any moves which might prejudice or influence the future allocation of water resources. I don't think that their fears have been assuaged as yet, but we have co-operated with Saskatchewan and Alberta and the Federal Government in laying down a term the study that would be acceptable to all of us. I can't add anything because these considerations have not come to any decision as yet.

I have not been involved with this organization which is considering the international use of Canadian water.

In the case of the bridges over the natural channels, there is a difference of opinion between some of the municipalities that my honourable friend from Brokenhead represents and the government. I want to explain it this way. In the case of all artificial channels or natural channels which have been modified, we take over the bridges. We never were responsible for the bridges say over the Brokenhead River. They never were the responsibility of Drainage. There were grants available from the Department of Public Works yes, but I can only say this that arrangements have been made for the Minister of Public Works and myself to meet with some of the municipal officials on this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 41, 15 (a) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (b) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (c)(1) -- passed; (c)(1)(a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c)(1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (3) -- passed; Resolution No. 41 -- passed; Resolution No. 42 -- passed, Resolution No. 43

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, on 42, on ARDA, people up in my area where ARDA is being directed to quite an extent by what we hear from the government, are quite concerned over this program. They say they hear a lot of talk but they don't see anything concrete yet and perhaps the Minister already knows it but some of the committees that have been

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) . . . formed, some of the people that are on these committees are threatening to resign because they don't feel that anything concrete is being done. Some of them feel, rightly or wrongly, the Minister can tell me this, politics has been entering into this because they said last year the government members made a safari into the Interlake, the First Minister, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Fisher and they went into my area, held a meeting there, but I wasn't notified and the Member for Selkirk wasn't notified and I was asked why I hadn't attended and I had to tell them that I wasn't invited and didn't know anything about it. I feel that if this government's anxious to promote ARDA and discuss the problem, that both of us should have been invited as a courtesy, particularly when they were going into our area to discuss this matter with the people that we represent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 42 -- passed --

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman. how many rural development areas have been declared now? I know the first one to be declared was the Interlake and then there is the area called the Central Plains that included Neepawa, Carberry, Portage. Has it actually been declared an area? -- (Interjection) -- It hasn't been declared an area yet?

MR. HUTTON: The Federal Government has not accepted it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: The province has made an application to have it, but the Federal Government has not accepted it? I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 42 -- passed; Resolution No. 43 -- passed --

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I don't think I could let this item, Red River Valley, Assiniboine River and so on, pass without some comment and whatever I say today, I am saying as a representative of Emerson constituency. It's my own feeling and it isn't the feeling of the party that I represent. I'm saying it on my own behalf and whatever the consequences I'm willing to accept.

I'm very much disturbed what happened in the last few weeks, especially during the flood scare that we have had here in Manitoba, that Manitoba was subjected to. I know there are other members here who represent the City of Winnipeg and they can express their feelings as far as the City of Winnipeg is concerned. I represent the upper reaches of the Red River Valley and I want to express their feelings as well as my feelings with respect to the flood scare that we had to undergo. We know that when the first report was issued by the Government of Manitoba, I forget the exact date, but it was in April, the Premier in his television statement predicted that the 1965 flood would reach the proportions of the 1948 level. He also made the statement that it would - or the flood is expected to reach these proportions providing the weather was with us - that it did not rain anymore. Fine and good.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, that's incorrect.

MR. TANCHAK: I didn't hear what. . . .

MR. HUTTON: Providing the weather was normal.

MR. TANCHAK: Providing the weather was normal. Well I presume that the weather was normal. There wasn't rain and so on. He also made the statement at that time that about 70 percent of the residents of Emerson would have to be evacuated. This was his assessment of the flood scare. And what worries me - it wasn't the preparedness that the government wanted the people to go into. That was fine and dandy and I would like to say that in that area, especially in Emerson, the people are always prepared. I'm not saying that the different departments did not help in this case but what I don't like was the amount of exaggeration that went on with this. In this instance I'm not blaming the adverse publicity that these areas got - not blaming it on the press - because I know that the press got their reports that were sent by the government. But this, I can't reconcile this, how the predictions or the people responsible for it could be almost 10 feet out, because some statements were made that the flood, even in the City of Winnipeg would reach almost - we'd have to protect ourselves against a 29 foot level -- that it may be possible.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, now that's absolutely incorrect. 24 feet, not 29.

MR. TANCHAK: But the existing dikes with sandbagging would have protected the City of Winnipeg up to the 26 foot level. That's the way I understood it at the time. And then it may have been necessary to raise the dikes because it could have gone up as high as 29 feet -- that's what the reports were at the time. Now the peak, which according to my understanding was lost somewhere, but the peak through Winnipeg was up to about the 19 foot level. At one time it was higher than that but that was our runoff prior to the peak - the peak hadn't reached us - but when the peak did reach it was somewhere in the vicinity of 19 feet. I cannot see how

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) the people who did predict, the government, could be almost ten feet out. But that's gone and passed. I don't know what the purpose of that was, but a lot of it was exaggerated, quite a bit exaggerated, and that's what concerns me and worries me. I do not think that this kind of propaganda is even good for the City of Winnipeg because adverse publicity like this is liable to do much more harm sometimes than it does any good. It's nice to be prepared, I agree with that, but this adverse publicity could do a lot of harm; especially so it did a lot of harm further up in the Red River Valley, especially the Town of Emerson. And I know the feeling there - they resent that - and I agree with them. They say that this does not promote the future growth or expansion of these little towns up and down the river.

I did say at first that I'm concerned about the people in the upper reaches of the Red River Valley and I also make the statement that these people are used to these kinds of "high waters" because that's what it actually was - high water. They are used to it; and they are always prepared -- maybe some people, once, the people of Morris were caught without being prepared I don't know whose fault it was, I presume that a lot of it was the fault of the people of Morris at the time -- but the people of Emerson were always prepared, as prepared as they possibly could be and they were prepared for this flood, this high water. The people of Emerson are the first ones to be hit by any high water coming from across our boundary. They've had this high water in 1948, that was a flood. They had a flood in 1950 and I do not think that anybody could have been prepared to fight a flood of 1950 in Emerson, because I was there at the time and people had to enter some of the buildings through the second floor windows -- you couldn't. Then again these people were subjected to high waters in 1952; they were subjected to high waters in 1956; they were subject to high waters in 1962, and once again in 1965 there were high waters.

If the government is so concerned about the people of Emerson, if it wasn't mostly publicity, why when these people have continually asked the government to do something for them to protect them, not against a flood by a ring dike which would be dangerous, but against high waters, such as we experienced in 1965 and to a lesser extent '62, '56, '52, and '50 - why doesn't the government listen to their plea; and why doesn't the government in the name of common sense, in the name of humanity, doesn't do something for them - not only pay lip service and fly down with helicopters and so on, but show some concrete action for protection. Fine - the government at this time gave all the possible help, and I gave them thanks for that during the time, but I would say that just taking a small fraction, a very small fraction of the cost of the Winnipeg Floodway and giving those people of Emerson some protection by smaller dikes, say a 5 or 6 foot dike along the river, they wouldn't have to be subjected to these high waters ever year and I think it would be a very, very simple matter. So I challenge the government follow up - if the government is so concerned about the people as they showed this year that they were - follow up and do something for those people. Build this small dike along the river which would protect them against waters of 50, 52, 56, 62 and 65, which in the opinion of the people of Emerson this was not a flood, it was a flood scare. But it was high water and they sure resent this publicity. I've heard many people who have gone, thousands of people on some Sundays have gone in to see Emerson flooded. A lot of them came back and said it wasn't worth the gasoline that I wasted to go and see the flooding, because actually there was flooding on Main Street, on two main streets, high water as we call it, and we don't like that. That shouldn't happen if the government would have shown some action before. But at the same time they resented this bad publicity for the town. I know for example one small industry that was going to locate at Emerson - I saw these people two weeks back and they said, well if Emerson is subjected to this nuisance of high waters and floods, and it may be flooded at anytime, I think we should look elsewhere for locating our business. I certainly disagree with this kind of publicity and again I stress that as far as trying to be ready in case the flood does come, we have to be ready; but certainly it could be done with a little less publicity.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I can hardly be expected to avoid commenting on what my honourable friend has said. My what another tune he would have been singing if we had not been blessed by providence with respect to this flood. What another tune he would have been singing then! How wise he is after the event, to be able to stand up here and accuse us of a publicity scare in connection with this flood, with respect to his own town, forgetting entirely about the consequences, about the rest of the Red River Valley as well. How easy it is to do that! And how absolutely futile!

We were relying upon the best information that we could get with respect to the prospects of flooding in the Red River Valley. Mr. Chairman, we would have been derelict in our

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) duty if we had not taken the steps that we had taken. There was no effort to scare anybody; the effort was to give the facts as best we knew them; that was our plain and simple duty to do and to take what measures were required in the light of those facts.

Below the 49th parallel the flooding in the Red River Valley as my honourable friend knows was greater than the '48 flood. Now that's a fact. It was greater below the 49th parallel - and he nods his head, because he knows it's true. Now when you get a situation like that, do you sit still north of the 49th parallel hoping for the best, or do you take reasonable steps? The fact is that we had two great pluses working for us: First, ponding in United States south of the 49th parallel that saved us from the consequences that they had to endure. Secondly, was a rainfall that was less than 25 percent of normal during that period when the forecasts that were given to us were rainfall in excess of normal, much in excess of normal for that period. Now with those facts before a government what responsible body of men would do otherwise than what we did. If by the grace of God we had no flood let's be thankful - and I for one am - but I do not think that it is just to accuse us of a publicity scare when we do what normal and prudent persons would do, faced with a situation that they were faced with.

I want to tell my friend that while some people down at Emerson may hold his point of view, others do not, because I received letters from some of the oldest inhabitants of that community telling us that they think that under the circumstances we did what prudent men ought to do and I'm satisfied to rest my case on the facts as they are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): I would like to say that I lived in Emerson from the year 1916 more or less until 1943. Never in any of those years was the water anything like as high as it was this year and I think this government is to be highly commended for the precautions it took to save those people from greater trouble.

MR. TANCHAK: . . . that the government did take and I made the statement that I agree that preparedness should be made. But I disagree with that bad publicity and that hurts those towns and one of that bad publicity - especially the remarks that was made about 70 percent has to be evacuated. Seventy percent was not even evacuated in the high flood of 1950 - never did happen - about 25 percent. That was a statement - when the people all over Canada hear that 70 percent of Emerson will have to be evacuated, that's the kind of exaggerated propaganda that I dislike.

As far as being prepared, I gave credit to the government for being prepared and I'm not going to take it away from the government. But what I am pointing out is this exaggerated propaganda that went out. I do not agree with that because it was over-exaggerated. At that time we know that the Mayor of Emerson even himself said - he didn't say that it was the bunk that the people are getting prepared; he liked that and he went along and he worked and helped. But he referred to it that it was the bunk that about 70 percent of the people had to be evacuated from that area in there - and that's what I'm driving at. And again, two points I've tried to make, that if the government is so concerned about this area, why not do something for them. Something has been done for other people of the Province of Manitoba with direct cost to those people, therefore I would imagine that it was just fair and right that these people upstream in the river should be treated alike - there should be no discrimination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 43.

MR. PAULLEY: I just want to raise one point that has nothing to do with the present flooding, but during the estimates of the Department of Public Works I raised the question with which I am sure the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is quite familiar, representations which have been made to him respecting the south end of St. Annes Road which will be cut off on the building of the floodway.

Now I don't intend to pursue the point to any considerable degree at this particular stage of the sitting of the House. The Honourable Minister was kind enough to receive representations from members of the City Council of St. Vital, the Honourable Member for Springfield, the Member for St. Vital and myself respecting this matter and as I recall it at that particular time, the Minister had indicated that he would give another look into the situation and when dealing with the Department of Public Works Estimates I made the request that the Minister of Public Works join with the Minister of Agriculture in re-assessing this problem that will arise on the building of the floodway. It's my understanding that this particular section of the floodway will not be built in this current year but possibly next year. My purpose in rising at this particular time, Mr. Chairman, is to ask the Minister of Agriculture to substantiate, if

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . indeed it's necessary and it may not be necessary, to substantiate in this House that the matter will be given further consideration so far as this request has been made.

And also I would like the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture in conjunction with the Minister of Public Works, to consider an assessment of the problem of the crossing there in relation to the announced \$30 million I believe, new housing development in the area of the old Speers farm, which might adversely affect projective traffic counts and travel in the general area. And in the light of that, will my honourable friend undertake further consideration or study jointly with the Department of Public Works regarding this matter.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, just one - I'd like to answer the question the Member for Seven Oaks asked me the other day about the floodway. All but three miles will be under contract, including the Birds Hill area, in 1965. There's 29 million yards to be let this year, 65 million yards have been let in the past, and there will be about - I think about seven million left to excavate in the coming year. And I will consult with my colleague with respect to the matters raised by the Leader of the NDP.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 43 -- passed. We have still got to pass Resolution No. 7. Resolution No. 7 -- passed.

MR. ROBLIN: That's the Pan-Am Games, Mr. Chairman. If there are any other points to be made on that.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on that matter I think that the Honourable Leader of the NDP asked for a copy of the agreement. Will we be getting that?

MR. ROBLIN: Subject to the concurrence of the Federal Government the Order has been accepted.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . one other point in this, is another controversy rampant at the present time, regarding the Pan Am Games and that is the location of the swimming pool. I ask the Honourable the First Minister whether the Government of Manitoba has anything to do with the allocation of the area in which this particular project is to be located.

MR. ROBLIN: Nothing at all, Mr. Chairman. This comes within the ambit of the Pan American Games Society.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 7 -- passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Move the committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the committee has adopted certain resolutions and asks leave to sit again.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam, I don't think it would be useful to try and begin the Capital Supply estimates in the time left to us so I will move the adjournment and we will begin them directly after lunch.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

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