

I N D E X

Friday, July 3, 1959 - 2:30 P. M.

	Page
<u>Select Standing Committee</u> , Municipal Affairs (Mr. Ridley)	517
<u>Statement</u> , re Portage Fair (Mr. Christianson)	517
<u>Question</u> , Mr. Guttormson (Mr. Evans)	517
<u>Statements</u> , re Natural Gas, Power Connections (Mr. Carroll).....	518
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re Pensioners (Mr. Gray): Mr. Cowan.....	518
Re Motor Vehicles (Mr. Paulley), amendment (Mr. McKellar): Mr. Orlikow ..	519
Mr. Hillhouse.....	521
Mr. Carroll, Mr. Hillhouse	522
<u>Proposed Resolution</u> , re Minimum Wage (Mr. Harris) amendment (Mr. Groves):	
Mr. Wright	523
Amendment to Amendment (Mr. Wright): Mr. Hillhouse	524
Mr. Lyon, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roblin	525
Re Deficiency Payments, Mr. Schreyer	525
<u>Bill No. 65</u> , re Ste. Agathe Bridge (Mr. Roberts) Second Reading: Mr. Roberts	528

Committee of Whole House, Supply

<u>Education</u> , Statement, Mr. McLean	529
Student Instruction, Directorate of Instruction	529
Alcohol Education	534
<u>Agriculture and Conservation</u> , Statement, Mr. Willis	536

Friday, July 3, 1959 - 8:00 P. M.

<u>Agriculture and Conservation</u> , Administration.....	543
---	-----

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Friday, July 3rd, 1959.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister concluded the statement I -- Mr. Chairman, there are some questions that I would like to ask and later on I'd like to make a few remarks on this item, but I think of all the timely subjects that we could be discussing now this question of crop insurance is perhaps uppermost in the minds of a good many of us now that the Federal Government has introduced the legislation. And so I would like to start off, Mr. Chairman, by asking the Minister who gave, I thought, a very brief explanation of the federal program some further questions, unless he had anything more than he would wish to add to the statement that he gave. I understood the Minister to say that he has a copy of the Bill.

MR. WILLIS: this afternoon, there it is.

MR. CAMPBELL: The copy of the Bill.

MR. WILLIS: That's right.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I'm sure that my honourable friend won't have had much time to answer all the questions in detail but I suppose it is correct that he discussed the matter with the Federal Minister on more than one occasion.

MR. WILLIS: He never permitted me to see a copy of the Act or to get the information in regard to it until it came in the mail.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sure that would be right, but I mean in the limited time that I have had since the reports appeared in the paper about the legislation being introduced, or at least the committee stage having been concluded, I have been reading what I could find in the press of the day and my honourable friend just got a copy of the Bill this afternoon. It was only this afternoon that I got a copy of the Hansard that carries the discussion that took place in Committee. So, I haven't had the time that I would like to have to make the detailed study of it that I would wish to make and that I intend to make. But I don't -- likely the Minister was in the position that he had talked to the Federal Minister on more than one occasion before this came up.

MR. WILLIS: I did, but I didn't get the information. I said "I'd gotten into trouble before by giving people information. I'm not giving you any".

MR. CAMPBELL: In other words, he acts a bit like the Ministers do here. I mean since the ...

MR. WILLIS: The way they used -- the way they used to do anyway.

MR. CAMPBELL: since the change of government. Well, what I would like to ask the Minister, did he either when he was making representations at that time or since the press reports have come out, has he pressed the Federal Minister for a better deal from Ottawa? Because I'll express my opinion here and now that I don't think that this proposal that has come from Ottawa is as good as the most of the people of Manitoba were expecting in the light of what has been said. I'm sure the Honourable the Minister made some representations on that behalf himself, did he?

MR. WILLIS: I made certain representations to them seeking the ultimate in generosity, but I'm afraid as far as the Minister is concerned, I didn't get too far with him. He said "I can only do that when we have drafted the Bill" and I was hoping to get the grants information in regard to it which I didn't get. I have it before me and if it is of any use, I could read the contributions and loans if that would help you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I think at some stage it would because, Mr. Chairman, I know it's not easy to run through these Bills and have all the details. Yet I think all of us are particularly interested in this one. I can sympathize with my honourable friend because I know that we didn't always find it easy to get everything we wanted out of Ottawa either, but I

MR. WILLIS: They're a little sticky.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, but I had thought that with a change of government here and with a change of government at Ottawa one might say almost simultaneously, and certainly more or less uniform change, that greater co-operation between the provinces would have started to be in evidence. But I understand my honourable friend to say that he wasn't very successful in getting information. Well, would the Minister be prepared, Mr. Chairman, to give us what

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . information he can from his quick provision of the Bill because there's some questions that I think are very important to us here.

MR. WILLIS: I'd be glad to read a section of the Bill. I am of the opinion that it won't help greatly but I'll be glad to, and I think the important part of the contributions which are outlined in the Bill, if it's agreeable to the Committee, I would read section 4 of the Bill I have not even seen the Hansard, so the Leader of the Opposition is ahead of me there. But clause 4 of the Bill which is headed "Contributions" reads this way: "4. (1) Contribution payable to a Province under an agreement shall be paid in respect of each year, shall be a total of (a) 50% of the expenses incurred by the province in that year in the administration of the insurance scheme and (b) if a province has, by the agreement undertaken to pay a share of the premiums, the lesser of (i) the amount required to reimburse the province with the share of the premiums paid by it in that year or (ii) 20% of the premiums paid in respect of the policies of insurance in that year. (2) - that's 4. (2) The loans that may be made to a province under agreement shall not exceed in any year 75% of the amount by which the indemnities are required to be paid under policies of insurance, exceed the aggregate of (a) the premium receipts of that year, (b) the reserve for the payment of indemnities, and (c) \$200,000.00." That's the operative section of the Bill. I think it will appear a little clearer when you see it on our own Hansard probably.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I think that is pretty clear -- those matters are pretty clearly brought out by the Minister's statement and subsequent questioning when the Bill was in Committee stage, or the discussion was held in Committee stage. What I would like to ask the Minister, and I don't want to be unfair to him so I'll tell him my conclusion before I ask him a question. My point is this, that inasmuch as we are in session now, whether the Legislature of Manitoba would have a great deal of influence with the Minister and the government or not, but inasmuch as we are in session, inasmuch as this Bill is just before the House at Ottawa, doesn't my honourable friend think that this would be an opportune time, if we are of the opinion, that those contributions should be more generous? That this would be a good time for us to make representation to them in that regard? And even if the Minister has been unsuccessful up-to-date in getting it made any more generous, shouldn't we seize this opportunity, because we're in session and the Parliament is still in session, and it just happens that the First Minister of this province is leaving, I suppose almost immediately, for Ottawa, mightn't we make some representations now while the Bill is before the Committee. Because I don't want to put words in the mouth of my honourable friend, but I would say that certainly I do not think that a half of the administration cost and 20% of the premium is a sufficient contribution by the Federal Government. Surely, surely we would have a right to expect that in this matter that is admittedly going to be expensive, that if we're going to do it at all, it should be put on as sound a basis as possible. And goodness knows, the farmers are going to find it difficult enough to pay their share. Shouldn't we at least ask the two governments to share the administration cost? Therefore I have no objection to the 50% on that. But shouldn't we then ask, wouldn't it be reasonable to say "Let's share the premium three ways" and then the only place that the farmers would not be sharing completely equally with the two governments, would be the administration charge. I think it would be abundantly fair -- that the two governments could carry that. And then let's start off with a thirdage on the premium. Now, wouldn't it be worthwhile trying right now while the Bill is before the Committee?

MR. WILLIS: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition in regard to it. I think if I read this correctly, and I'm not entirely sure in regard to it, that when the losses exceed \$200,000.00 that they pay 75% of them, if I read the Bill correctly. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition and will contact the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa.

MR. CAMPBELL: Fine, I think, Mr. Chairman, though that, and I tried to read this very carefully in the Hansard, and as I read it, and I admit it's difficult to be sure at first glance over these things. Probably more difficult reading the Bill than it is reading Hansard; but I'd be pretty sure that what that section is intended to mean is that the payment of the amount in excess of \$200,000.00 will apply only during the early years. In fact, the discussion seemed to indicate just during the first two years and that from then on, everything that is in the reserve fund, if there is anything, must also go into it before the payment beyond the \$200,000.00 becomes effective. In other words that that's a contribution only in the early years, I believe the first two; and the other part is, that's not a gift, that's just a loan. Well, now, there isn't

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . much of a contribution to making a loan to a province where the credit has always been kept as good as Manitoba's -- that is until just recently. That really isn't much of a gift, just to loan the money beyond \$200,000.00 after the fund has been exhausted. So, - my honourable friend is willing to make some representations in that regard. I would like to ask if he could find the clause there in the Bill that deals with the causes -- of losses caused by certain disasters. I understood from the Hansard that the wording was something like "caused by weather". Caused by weather. Now, I would like to have asked the Honourable the Minister how he would interpret that if it says "caused by weather" because I can think of a good many hazards that can cause serious crop losses that, though they may be indirectly related to the weather, maybe wouldn't come within the strict reading of that Act. I wonder if the Minister can find that? Well, if . . .

MR. WILLIS: I don't see it immediately, I'll continue looking.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking for a minute or two to the Minister's salary. First of all I can assure you that I'm not the agricultural expert of our group. My own experience in farming is several years of harvesting. But I remember during the depression years, at that time I was a member of the Unemployed Committee of the Provincial Government and also of the city. During depression years many farmers abandoned their farms and came to the city. First of all they cannot maintain themselves, and secondly, as bad as the city relief was at that time -- they came to the city, it was worse than the rural districts. So they came to the city, stayed a year probably under starvation difficulties and when they got a year here, they applied for relief. But nevertheless, hundreds and hundreds of farms have been abandoned. There was a movement on foot at that time -- well, that's my information that I get at that time dealing with the Back to the Land Assistance Association. If not hundreds, maybe less, but I say hundreds, I stay by my figure. Later on, of course, some of them went back to the farm, and started out again. Now, my worry at the present time is whether -- what encouragement can be given to the individual farmers, when I speak of individual farmer I mean a man occupying a half-section or a quarter-section, even a section of land; he has his home down there, he has his cattle; he has his poultry; he has his vegetables, he has sufficient subsistence for himself, for the family and could sell his products to the city or the urban districts. There is a tendency in the province now, and probably the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition knows best - I stand corrected, that have become grain manufacturers. What I mean by it is this, they buy up two, or three or four or five thousand acres of land from farmers.

MR. CAMPBELL: What with? What do we use for money?

MR. GRAY: I said certain individuals, not the farmers, -- who don't know anything about farming. They come down there in the spring. They build a shack, they have to buy their butter and milk and everything else for the help in the city or from the storekeeper. They have nothing down there; they come with big machinery, put their seed in, take a month's rest, and then come back with the binders - combines - harvest it, deliver it to the elevator and we don't see them on the farm anymore. They are just speculators in farming. I can't call them farmers. I don't call them -- I call them grain manufacturers. And this may be or may not be the fault of the economic conditions of the farmer not being able to maintain themselves on the farm, seeing how the city leads the highest standard of living -- probably sell out, come back to the city, retire or go back to Honolulu and there is not the same spirit of individual farm, the same glory as it used to be in the last 50 years. After all this province prides themselves the world over as having the main industry - agriculture. First of all, it gives them a very secured life, and secondly, they probably realize that this industry if it's being neglected may cause an economic depression, not only in Canada, not only in this province, but perhaps the world over who needs their products.

Now the question that I would like to put to the Minister is this; what plans has this government - I've probably asked the same question before - to see that the farmer, the younger generation, because I don't expect, the old people likely want to live the rest of their lives in a more comfortable place, like in urban districts -- but nevertheless they could still stay on the farm, -- but particularly I'm interested in what is being done to encourage the farmer to stay on the farm. One thing has been done - a wonderful job - and this is the electrification, which came a little late. Late in years - late in years. There are some of the members here in this House 25 years ago who advocated rural electrification 25 years ago. No action was taken until only

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . four or five or six years ago --

A MEMBER: Oh you're away out!

MR. GRAY: -- to complete the job. I don't mind if I'm away out. That's why I'm out - I always break rules because I wanted to know the rules.

MR. CAMPBELL: Why not find out the facts first?

MR. GRAY: Well, I have the facts. I have them here and you know it yourself.

MR. CAMPBELL: 1945.

MR. GRAY: But the main job has been finished closer to '50 - 1950.

MR. CAMPBELL: You mean 1945.

MR. GRAY: started 1945. But I'm not going to argue with you. If you say '45 - O.K. I'm satisfied. And even '45 is late. How old is this province?

Now, I want to assure the honourable members here that I'm not responsible for the good that Saskatchewan does and I'm not responsible for the failures, if they make any failures. I'm a member of this House and I'm nowhere else, and I'm not defending any province at any time if they make mistakes. So the question what about Saskatchewan? Two wrongs does not make one thing right, at any time, so I feel that electrification has done a tremendous amount of good. And while I'm on this subject of electrification, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that if not for the Manitoba Power Commission selling appliances on payments at the time that the average retail man or the average merchant who handles electrical appliances refused to give it to them, the Manitoba Power Commission, if not for them, most of the farmers would not have the equipment - the electrical equipment, like washing machines, stoves, to make their life a little bit easier, if not for the Manitoba Power Commission. And after we have the good of this, the government gives them the O.K. to close it -- however that's by the way. So I would like to know what is the program five years from now, ten years from now. Are we going from day to day, and then when there is a flood, whenever there is a drought, at any time anything happens, then we start worrying about it, and at times it is too late. In other words is anything being done concrete, is anything being done in a tangible way to try and keep the young people on the farm, -- and I'll still make this statement, that many are leaving the farms, even now. (Interjection) Well fine, I stand corrected if I make a mistake, but I don't think I make very many mistakes because if I don't have anything to say I keep quiet.

MR. CAMPBELL: You're doing all right. If a lot of people would only follow your example, eh?

MR. PAULLEY: You're doing all right, Maurice.

MR. GRAY: Now, this is a serious matter because those people when they come back to the city, the young element, they are not qualified to occupy positions in industry where it would pay them a good wage, and directly or indirectly they are bound to undermine the standard of wages that the wage-earners get here in the city. I remember during the depression years when the relief of the City of Winnipeg, and it was worse than the province, was handing out orders for groceries, twelve loaves of bread, half a pound of potatoes, quarter of a pound of onions, and so on. And they didn't have a dime to their life to do anything else. And I know where caretakers worked for \$10.00 a month because they were allowed to earn only \$10.00 a month, and the \$10.00 a month became the maximum wage. And the others -- so when we objected to, and it took Mr. McNamara, who was the head of the Unemployment Relief Commission for the province at that time, it took him a long time to pass a minimum wage for the unemployed of .25 cents an hour. And this .25 cents an hour became the maximum to many, because they couldn't prosecute them. They had a law here that the minimum wage was .25 cents an hour. And this is also a fact -- it is not a dream. And I know the facts -- I remember it very well. Now if these people come back to the city now where life is a little bit easier they are bound to undermine the standard of wages in the city. So come back to the main question is; is there any planning being done for now and for the years to come, to see that our farms will not be abandoned, and particularly to see that they don't go into the hands of the so-called grain manufacturers, because this is not, for this province, this is not the agricultural principle of this province. This is not why immigrants have come here in the hundreds, settled here on homesteads - worked hard, slept in dug-outs in order to have a little farm, a little land of their own. And I'm afraid if you don't take care of it now and plan ahead of time, they may lose it.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, if I might go over quickly the question asked by the

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.) . . . honourable member, what has been done to keep the farm boys down on the farm. I think there have been many things done in the last few years that have had a tendency to keep them on the farm. I think the roads are much better than they used to be. We now have electricity where formerly we had to go to the bush and get the wood. We now have telephones where previously we were isolated. We now have tractors instead of thirty horses to feed as we used to feed. We now have trucks instead of slow horses which took you half the day to go to town with a load of grain and come back again. We have self-propelled combines that do the job of a threshing outfit, we didn't have before. We now have silos out of which we feed our livestock. We now have bales which have made it so much easier to handle straw and hay and alfalfa and feed for the cattle. We now have in our barns self-feeders which have made so much great labor saving, whereby you don't need to do anything about it except to keep the bin filled, and you don't have to do that too often. Also now we've developed cattle that will stay outside during the entire year, and just go into a shed. If you would like to know the proper type to get, see me after the meeting. We now have television on practically all our farms, which brings everything modern right into the home. We now have radio, of course, which we didn't have in those days. All these things have indicated progress - a better life on the farm than it was in those days. I recognize and realize that there are other things that bring them to the city, particularly increased education, but we are always hopeful that that may be improved; but there are many things that have been done by the people in general to make it better on the farm. And while many people complain about agriculture, I think there are many people sitting in this legislature who would not be here at all, and who would not have received an education if it were not for successful agriculture on the farm, -- and I am one of those.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a comment on the size of the farms that the Honourable Member from Inkster is worried about. I have been doing a little bit of arithmetic and a little bit of research here, and in 1958 in Manitoba there was two million, three hundred and fifty-eight acres sown in wheat; one million, five hundred and eighty four acres to oats; one million, seven hundred and eleven to barley; and five hundred and ninety-two thousand to flax; seventy-one thousand to rye, and I left out some of the odd ones that are down at the the twenty -- two or three items -- that are down in the twenty thousand mark; I left them out for the sake of arithmetic. That comes to a total of crop acreage in Manitoba in 1958 to six million, three hundred and sixteen thousand acres; and also in the same report there are estimated very, very close that there are forty-nine thousand farmers in Manitoba. That works out to 129 acres of crop per farmer. Now I would like to know how many farmers the Honourable Member from Inkster thinks there are in this province that have four and five thousand acres of crop and are going down to Honolulu in the winter time.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a comment to what the Member for Roblin has just said, because if that is the case then certainly the Federal Government case for not paying deficiency payments on the grounds that it would benefit only the large farmers certainly has no foundation in fact, has it?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say one or two words on the question of the Minister's salary, but I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, in view of the very interesting points that were raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in respect of crop insurance, whether or not the Minister has had the opportunity of looking up the section of the Act which my honourable friend referred to, and it may be advisable before we go into the question of the Minister's salary just to continue pursuing the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition in respect of crop insurance.

MR. WILLIS: I have looked at it with what time I had, and some care, I don't find that in the Act as I read it, but let's face the facts I couldn't be entirely sure in regards to it. But in reading the Act, it is fairly short, I have looked at it but I don't find it there. -- Yes, maybe in the regulations, but I don't see it in the Act. Of course let's face the fact that as far as we are concerned in this legislature, this is July and we face the possibility of a new Act to be worked out with the Dominion Government. In that we may fail, let's face that, that we may not have enough time. Let's be honest about it. We can't guarantee that you will have crop insurance this year. All we can assure you is that we will do our best to get it -- that we have the desire to do so. But we may not be able to and if perchance we don't get it, I hope the members will not come back and say "You told us that we would have it". I don't tell you that, I tell you

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.) . . . that we have the hope to get it; that we'll do our best to get it but frankly we have doubts in regard to the possibility from the element of time, and investigation and changes which might have to be made and we are not certain - we'll give it the best try we know how but we're not certain - let's face the fact.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Honourable the Minister is very wise to put in that disclaimer because I think I could say that at least if it followed the pattern of the Farm Loans that it wouldn't be of very much use this fall. But what I understood the Minister to say, and I don't want to quote anything that he didn't say was that he was hopeful that he would be able to get the Legislation in this year. And I was careful to look it up in Hansard - and in Hansard the report was I think, that he said that he thought that the action that had been taken by the Federal Government would enable us to bring legislation in this year.

MR. WILLIS: I'm still hopeful.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, well we can continue to be hopeful anyway and after all, if the legislation is going to come in then I'm sure that these are some things that we can talk about at that time. But because the Honourable Minister is only hopeful and not certain, and because this is such an extremely important subject and so timely --

MR. WILLIS: And difficult.

MR. CAMPBELL: I intend to spend a little bit of time on it yet, because I'm sure that it was the Minister himself who said - that is the Federal Minister - who said that "this insurance would be applicable to losses caused - due to weather". And yet in another place he referred to "all risk crop insurance." Certainly the indication I got was that he was meaning that this was all risk, and I couldn't quite see how those two statements could be paralleled, because it seems to me, that if the legislation or the regulations carry a clause saying that the insurance will be payable for "losses due to weather" then we'd certainly get the big one of drought, which I suppose during the years has caused more damage in the three prairie provinces taking them as a whole, than anything else. I doubt that it would have caused more in Manitoba than rust has. But certainly drought would be covered as due to weather, I would think; hail would undoubtedly; frost certainly would; flood I guess would; drowning of crops; I suppose wind damage and sometimes there is considerable wind damage and I suppose it would. But if that is the language, would rust be covered? Is it due to weather? I know that prevailing winds right at this time of the year, if they are long continued from the straight south, have a great influence on rust, but still whether it would be held under the terms of the legislation. My Honourable Friend the Minister himself has suffered from aphids in his time I know. Would aphids be? Would army worms? Would grasshoppers? Weather has something to do with them, no question about that, because their hatchability depends a great deal on the kind of weather that you get in the spring and to some extent the kind that you get in the fall too. But still if that qualification is in there of "losses due to weather" I would think there would be some fruitful lawsuits or arguments for my friends from the Honourable Member from River Heights and Selkirk and other experts in the law. I would think it would be a pretty difficult interpretation.

So if the Honourable the Minister is going to -- he has undertaken to get in touch with his federal counterpart -- if he is prepared to do that, I would suggest that he check up carefully in the meantime and see if this is a case of the losses being only those attendant on weather - to be very sure that we have the definition of how wide that coverage will be. And then -- the legislation, as I understand it, pre-supposes that there will be an agreement between the individual province and the Federal Government. I don't know whether my honourable friend has seen a copy of the agreement yet or whether he has discussed that. Incidentally I should tell him that the Minister said in reporting to Parliament, the Minister said that he "had talked to four of the provincial ministers about this," and I assumed that the Minister from Manitoba was one of them. He said that the three prairie province representatives -- whether he said Ministers or not, I'm not sure -- were much more interested than those from other provinces. And I think that's all to the good. But has the agreement itself been discussed and is there still time to make representations on that?

I remember that it was the honourable gentleman who now occupies the honourable position of Speaker of this House, who, speaking from over here someplace, was the gentleman who really stayed with this question for a long time. And I give him part of the credit at least for converting me from my previous belief that I used to think that we would get nothing in the way

of a crop insurance program in Manitoba, except what the other prairie provinces got. I did not think that any Federal Government would introduce a crop insurance scheme that they would be willing to apply on the basis of one province only. Certainly the honourable member for Killarney, as he was then, argued with some force that inasmuch as our record of production in Manitoba was better than the other provinces--the other two prairie provinces--that it would be to our advantage if we could get a scheme that was tailored to meet the needs of the Province of Manitoba rather than us throwing in our lot with the other two prairie provinces.

I must say that I was pleased when it became evident that the Federal Government was prepared to entertain a proposal of that kind and as soon as it became evident that there was some hope of that being done, I certainly joined with my honourable friend in thinking that that's the best scheme. And I still think it's the best scheme. I think we're on the right road, if the Federal Government and ourselves share this program, because the figures that can be substantiated from the records of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act indicate that we are a better crop insurance risk than the other two province. Particularly with regard to drought, it's true, but on the general average. The same as the honourable member for Roblin who just near the conclusion of the last session put on the records of the house here the experience of the P. F. A. A. up to the end of 1957, and those records showed that the Province of Manitoba had something like 2 1/4 million dollar reserve in that fund, if you could use that term. Because the farmers of this province have paid 2 1/4 million dollars more into that fund than they've got out. I always took the position that I thought if we had a scheme of our own, jointly with the Federal Government - that we would have a perfect right in equity on moral grounds to ask the Federal Government to put up that 2 1/4 million dollars or whatever our surplus was at that time, to put it into a reserve fund for the crop insurance scheme, because that is money that the Manitoba farmers have paid in. The farmers of Manitoba have paid their share of the greatly, of the much larger payments that have gone to Saskatchewan and Alberta. And I would think that we should still ask the Federal Government to make a cut-off at least where the areas that join in the crop insurance scheme, and pay us back, pay the farmers of this province back, the amount that they have contributed beyond what they have received from that scheme--because certainly the reverse is true in the other two provinces. Well, anyway whatever the Honourable the Minister can do in that regard would be appreciated. And I would suggest that in addition to getting in touch with the Federal Minister himself that he should call on the good offices of the First Minister of the province while he is down there to see that he takes it up as well.

Well now, the Honourable the Federal Minister says that one of the qualifications in this program is that it must be "actuarially sound." I think that we would all agree with that, we would want it to be actuarially sound. But I do wonder if the Provincial Minister knows just how that will work out in practice, how are they going to establish it's actuarially soundness? Is there a proposal already made as to what will likely be the cost and how it will be assessed? Because these figures of 20% of the premium paid by Ottawa and the rest to be divided between the Provincial Government and the farmer don't mean as much until we know how much the premium is likely to be. And I suppose what that premium will be, is what will determine in later years whether the program is actuarially sound or not. Has the Minister any information on how that will be established and what the program is for setting up the premium assessment?

MR. WILLIS: I do have a bit of information from the Act itself or from the Bill 366. I didn't have any additional information regard to it in advance although I had two conversations with the Federal Minister of Agriculture. This says there must be an agreement, and this is what the Act says: @Clause 5 (1) An Agreement shall (a) specify the terms and conditions of the insurance scheme including (i) the crops and the area or areas in the province to which the insurance scheme extends (ii) the nature of the losses insured against, and the manner of ascertaining and determining those losses." Therefore I take it that that would be in the regulations if it were at all, because it doesn't appear in the Act. This says the "nature of the losses" which would cover the question of whether it was by hail or drought or so on, and then @ (iii) the producers who are eligible for crop insurance and (4) the amount of the insurance to be effected on any crop in any area which shall not exceed 60% of the long-term average yield of the crop in that area"; and then in the same one "subsection 2-" Subject to the provisions of this Act and the regulations an agreement may be amended at any time by mutual consent of the parties thereto." I pause to say that I assume from that, that you could have an amendment as between the Federal

Government and the Province alone, because they're the only parties to that agreement. Then (a) with respect to any matters specified in Paragraph (a) Sub-Section 1, with the consent of the Minister and (b) with respect to any other matter with the consent of the Governor-in-Council, so there is quite wide latitude as far as that agreement is concerned apparently, as long as it has the consent of the two Governments.

MR. CAMPBELL: read that section when it mentions 60% of the long term average yield, does he read that as being both a maximum and a minimum? Must it be exactly 60% or can it be any amount up to 60%?

MR. WILLIS: I think the--if I remember correctly the Bureau of Statistics do establish that in their statistics in regard to the long term average and I think that's the figure.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh yes, oh yes, the long term average. That one is pretty well known I think. But I mean the act or the agreement states that the insurance shall not be for more than 60% of the long term average. I don't know that it says -- whether it says, "shall not be for more". I don't know, maybe it says, "it shall be for 60%". Is it a -- is it a maximum only, or is it both a maximum and a minimum? Is it a set figure?

MR. WILLIS: Which shall not exceed 60%.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would take it then that it can be for a lesser amount if they want to. But I was going to ask the Minister if he in getting ready to introduce a bill here, because I'm sure that he couldn't make the statement that he is still hopeful of introducing at this session, unless there's been a good bit of preliminary work done on it. I was wondering, what does the work that's been done to date indicate as the cost would be likely to be on, let us say, on one of the--on a good land best land section in one of the good long term yield areas and then on an average land, an average section, and then in so called sub-marginal land? Has he some figures as to what that 60% would be likely to cost in the way of a premium?

MR. WILLIS: I don't have those details.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, will it be necessary to have them, in order to have any reasonable idea of how this scheme is going to work out?

MR. WILLIS: I think before the bill is brought in we should do our best to make an estimate in regard to what that would be. I think that's necessary. That we expect to do, but this has arrived just this afternoon.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I know, but I know it's arrived just this afternoon but, and again I see my honourable friend shaking his head. Does he wish to make some statement in this regard?

MR. WILLIS: Who is this?

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend the Attorney-General was shaking his head that I thought he had some correction to make.

A MEMBER: I think he was just about to sneeze.

MR. CAMPBELL: He looked as though he was just about to do something, and I was wondering if he had a contribution to make in regard to this crop insurance because it seems to me that a person, I won't speak about the Minister of Agriculture, but it seems to me that a person like the honourable, the Attorney-General or the honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources who the first being a lawyer of great repute and the second a statistician in his own right. It seems to me that they wouldn't go around the Province of Manitoba saying that they're going to introduce a crop insurance scheme without knowing something about what it's going to cost. They wouldn't do that Mr. , I'm sure that's why my honourable friend was shaking his head, and if they know, perhaps they would tell us because surely Mr. Chairman, surely the Government hasn't proceeded to this extent of where it says that it's hopeful of bringing in a bill at this session and doesn't have some idea of what the cost will be to the people who pay the premium and to the Government who shares the premium. They wouldn't do that.

MR. WILLIS: We decided it was no opportunity at all until the Federal Act arrived which it did this afternoon, and of course I have not been able to make a calculation since that time and I think it will take some time to do it. I did have conversations with the Federal Minister in regard to it, but then the Minister said "I think that we're going to, we'll permit you to bring in an Act," and as we were anxious, ready, willing and anxious to do so, we were hopeful. We are still hopeful in regard to it and we will get those figures before it's brought in.

MR. CAMPBELL: One other thing that I think in addition to that, that the Government

MR. CAMPBELL (Cont'd): would have its mind made up some considerable time in advance, would be whether this is going to be a compulsory or voluntary scheme. Is there--is there a decision on that matter?

MR. WILLIS: There is no definite decision in regard to that. We would have to discuss it with the Federal Government. I realize the difficulty there as far as voluntary is concerned, that it's sometimes hard to enforce and when it's compulsory it's clad-iron and bad policy in that regard, and I realize the difficulties in whichever way you go, as the Leader of the Opposition does, but we don't think that that's insuperable, and we would prefer the voluntary system if it can be worked and we're hopeful that it may.

MR. CAMPBELL: I notice that one of the things that the Honourable the Minister said in Ottawa. I think this is almost a direct quote, "You cannot put in an insurance scheme in which you take in only the very poor risks." Now, if a voluntary scheme would be contemplated, wouldn't it be highly probable that the best land areas, particularly if they had the record of high crop production, would be the ones who would be very likely to not take part and if they didn't and the less productive areas, probably the ones that had the poorest record, not only of production, but of the worst record of crop failure, wouldn't they be the ones that would be likely to come in, and wouldn't that get exactly back to what Mr. Harkness is saying you can't do, you can't put in an insurance scheme in which you take in only the very poor risks, and would it be a fair question to ask my honourable friend if he recalls the provision in the Conservative Farm Program of last year, as to what they said about crop insurance? Don't anybody else answer, I'm not asking everybody this time. Does the honourable member remember what.... ah, it's not fair I guess to ask what.....

MR. WILLIS: What's this, Provincial or Federal?

MR. CAMPBELL: Provincial. His own party. His own wing of it. What did they say?

MR. WILLIS: You certainly leaned in that direction, and we're still doing it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Leaned in the direction of..

MR. WILLIS: Crop insurance.

MR. CAMPBELL: Of crop insurance, yes, that's right, that's number one, and which one.

MR. WILLIS: There's no change.

MR. CAMPBELL: Which one, voluntary or compulsory?

MR. WILLIS: Well, as I said before.....

MR. CAMPBELL: Which one?

MR. WILLIS: This we have to discuss with the Federal Government for which.....

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh no, no, no, no, --no, you don't have to discuss it, I'm asking what the program.....

MR. WILLIS:.....we prefer it to be voluntary.

MR. CAMPBELL: Ah, you're right. That's what it said.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Would the Leader of the Opposition permit a question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. SHEWMAN: In the dying moments of the 1958 Legislature there was a statement came from the Minister of Agriculture, then the Minister of Agriculture, that you were going to implement a Crop Insurance scheme. Now what would you have paid for it?

MR. CAMPBELL: If that was -- that was exactly the point that I made a little while ago-- and for my honourable friend's benefit I'll have to go all over it again because I just related that. I told how I had been an advocate of believing that that was all we get from the Federal Government, of a scheme in which the whole three Prairie Provinces would take part. (Interjection).. compulsory, compulsory... in which the whole three Prairie Provinces would take part along with the Federal Government, and I mention that my honourable friend who used to pretend he was interested in this subject before he became a member of the Government and has thereafter remained silent and held his peace, if he had been listening to what I had said on that subject, that he used to find so interesting, he would have noticed that I gave credit to the honourable gentleman who is now the Speaker of the House, for having done a good job in him or arguing the fact that on the basis of our--of our P.F.A.A. record and other statistical information, that we had a good claim for asking Ottawa to -- to set up a program with this province alone, and as soon as I saw that there seemed to be some indication of the Federal people thinking that way, I certainly was glad to adopt that scheme, and that's exactly what we did in '58, and my honour-

MR. CAMPBELL (Cont'd): able friend is referring to. That's what we asked this House to give us the authority to negotiate with such a scheme with the Federal Government with the farm groups sitting in with us as advisors and preparing such a program.

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me right, I think it does, and the Minister of Agriculture at that time said that we were going to have a Crop Insurance scheme. Now, of course the Leader of the Opposition...

MR. CAMPBELL: No, no, your memory does not serve you right because..

MR. SHEWMAN: I think it does, I think it does

MR. CAMPBELL: It does not...my honourable friend....

MR. SHEWMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.... I think we'll have our day and as long as I've been in the House I'm always listening to his good council and more times than once he's often said in this House that silence is golden and I've never forgotten.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well sir, I'm awfully glad that my honourable friend has taken my advice in one regard. If my honourable friend can--can establish to this House that the Minister said that we were going to have a Crop Insurance scheme then I'll withdraw everything I've said because we said no such thing.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, on the subject of Crop Insurance, because that does seem to be the one we're presently discussing, I have had some experience in not only selling crop insurance, selling hail insurance, for some twenty years, but have been adjusting losses both in Manitoba and Saskatchewan for fifteen years, and because of my experience in that field I can certainly foresee many problems in this Crop Insurance venture. The -- I take it that the Province of Manitoba and any other province that wishes to join the plan will have to do their rating in the Province and that alone does present a problem because in the Hail Insurance field that the Province is rated on a township basis, every six square miles has a rate of its own. Now, that will certainly take a lot of figuring, if we are to establish a rate based on the crop reporting areas that is to take in a large scope and base it on the crop reporting areas, I'd suggest that that will be no good at all because in the Neepawa crop reporting area for instance, there is land that will produce probably three or four bushels to the acre, certainly no more, and ten miles from that there's good land that will produce forty to fifty bushels of wheat per acre. So that one rate in that area would be absolutely not sound actuarially. The -- as regards the amount of insurance that a farmer will be able to buy, because I do think the Honourable Minister suggested that the producers eligible, that's the term he used I think, and that certainly would have to be considered, because we -- my experience in the Hail Insurance business, and incidently in the Hail Insurance field a farmer can go in and purchase say twenty dollars per acre of Hail Insurance and probably, probably, if he's never had any hail, he would only have ten dollars worth of crop on the land. Well that certainly will not be sold I hope with this legislation. The maximum amount that you will be able to buy I understand will be 60% of the long term average. Now the question -- the number one question I would like to ask is, will the premium be based on a dollar basis, so much per dollar and can be purchase as much -- as many dollars as he wants up to 60% of the long term average, or will the premium be based on a bushel basis, up to 60% of the long term average, and will he be required to pay a premium based on 60% of the long term average, or can he buy any quantity of insurance that he wishes, either on a dollar basis or on the bushel basis up to 60% of the long term average. Those are things that would have to be considered. When it comes to adjusting are they going to pay him on the basis of the 60% of the long term average, and if so, do they suggest then that it will not be necessary to do the adjusting until after he has harvested the crop? Well, I'll admit that that is the simply way to do the adjusting because you could easily establish -- or you would attempt to establish the long term average in specific areas and it could be as in the Hail Insurance business that you get right down to a township basis and establish the 60% of the long term average in every township, but let's suppose that you leave the adjusting until after harvest, and you go out and you find that, we'll say this year for instance has been an unusually good year, and the farmer has paid a premium for 60% of the long term average which could be say twenty four bushels to the acre whereas this year he had a potential crop of forty bushels to the acre. So he gets a hail storm or some other hazard that reduces his yeild down to twenty-four bushels to the acre, so you don't pay him anything. Those are things that I suggest will have to be considered. I -- in talking to some of the Hail Insurance Companies that I represent, most

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd) . . . of them suggest that, -- that is the company heads, not the general agents or the agents, but most of the company heads -- suggest that the Hail Insurance business has been one of the most unprofitable businesses that they've ever been in. In fact one company that has been writing hail insurance in Manitoba for thirty-one years told me last year that they have just now broken even. One of the companies that we represent writes comprehensive crop insurance in two or three of the states in the United States and they tell me that the premium there is 20% - 20%, that means that one fifty of his crops goes for premium. And even at that high rate of premium, the companies claim that they're losing money and they're going to get out of the comprehensive type of insurance. Now I understand that both the Federal Government and this Government have talked about Crop Insurance in terms of a comprehensive nature, as the Leader of the Opposition said a few moments ago, that they have now reduced it to a weather type of insurance or so his information would indicate. Now there are plenty of other hazards in addition to the weather that can reduce the acreage of a crop. It can reduce it to nil as far as that goes. There is this possibility too of encouraging with the comprehensive type of Crop Insurance, of encouraging men to go out and put in -- put in crop, very semi-marginal land that hasn't produced a crop in many years, to do -- with -- in anticipation of collecting under the plan. Though I may have more to say on it later, but I suggest that there are plenty of problems both in rating and in adjusting that we will have to consider.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, when the bill comes before the House, I'm sure we'll be able to answer the questions which have been proposed. We now have a Committee working on the drafting of the act and they will come forward with a draft which we hope will reach the House before the session concludes, at which time we may have a full discussion.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask one question. Under this scheme all farmers would be treated alike - I mean as far as coverage goes. Is that correct? There will be no option for any farmer by paying a greater premium to increase his coverage?

MR. WILLIS: I see no signs of an option.

MR. MILLER: There would be no prohibition however for the farmer from private sources to add supplementary insurance?

MR. WILLIS: I don't know the answer to that.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to just say a word or two in connection with this subject of crop insurance. As far as I'm concerned and at the present, we are awaiting with interest an opportunity of reading the bill that is before the House at Ottawa. And also we have not as yet received the copy of Hansard that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition referred to, for study, so at the present time we are reserving in general nature our remarks in connection with crop insurance.

But I would like to say a word or two if we're off of crop insurance now, at least temporarily, -- of the general statement that the Minister made this afternoon. I should say at the offset, Mr. Chairman, and I think that is obvious to most of the members of the House that insofar as being a real grassroots' farmer, I cannot qualify at all. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I can't even qualify as a Tuxedo farmer. I do however, think that I can qualify, at least to some degree, as a television farmer. Because I watch with interest the television programs which are conducted on Sunday under the auspices of the Agricultural College and the Department of Agriculture. I did have, I must hasten to add, Mr. Chairman, some experience in the past in the vocation of farming in that I was one of the late Premier Bennett's five-dollar-a-month farmers during the thirties. And I had the opportunity of going farming for about three years into the Treherne Hills, and watch progress taking place there. I listened with great interest to the Minister this afternoon as to the advancement that farming has made in the last number of years. I recall, Sir, the first year that I went out on the farm, I think it was about 1931 or '32, the farmer that I was indentured to, for the want of another word, had an old J.I. Case threshing machine, and we had to not only feed it by hand, we had to buck the straw from the t'other end. But we really progressed on that farm and the second year, came threshing time, in the advancement of the industry of agriculture we were able to take this same tractor and put a self-feeder on it, and no longer did we have to cut the sheaves in order to put them through the machine. Progress was still maintained on this farm, and the third year the same Case threshing machine, with other spare parts from around the neighborhood, became equipped with a blower, so I was out of a job bucking straw. And the machine that was used for power

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... was an old Hider tractor, with its big disc wheels, and I think that it should have been placed, the one that we used on that particular farm, in the Agricultural Museum in Manitoba, because I have spoken to a lot of farmers today, and I mention about this old Hider tractor, and they don't know what I'm talking about - it's the old friction wheels. And if I recall correctly, the farmer that I worked for at that time, said that it was a Dutch word which meant "faster", and I can assure the committee, I think that was the basis on which this farmer operated, because of the fact that no matter how fast I went, he said "Hider".

Now then, the Minister gave us a very interesting discourse this afternoon on the progress that is being made in the farming industry, and the contribution that this Provincial Government has made in the past and intends to make in the future. He indicated to us the plans that the Department has in the use of planning, of research, and new innovations and new crops. He suggested to us that a more thorough investigation is going to be made into the question of land use. I was quite interested to hear him mention that, because I recall about four years ago in this House when we were discussing the question of floods and flooding, I had made the suggestion somewhat along the lines that the Minister announced today, and that is moving from much of our submarginal land those farmers who are on farms which are uneconomical at the present time, and with their co-operation moving them into the areas which are capable of greater productivity. And at that time, if I recall correctly, I suggested that one of the areas to which these people could be moved would be into the Pasquia Development north of here. And I would suggest this to the Minister, that if he has plans along that line, which I think are reasonable plans, that the conditions under which people are moved from one of these areas to the other should be to the advantage of the persons being moved; by that I mean that the Government should undertake to make sure that it's definitely to their gain, and that they are made comfortable in their move.

The Minister also mentioned plans that the Department has in the question of water control. I think, too, that there was another - there is another factor on the question of water control that we should take cognizance of, and I recall quite a number of years ago when I was Mayor of the Town of Transcona, I believe the Deputy Minister of Public Works at that time was a gentleman who knew his job, by the name of Matt Lyon; I believe his position was Deputy Minister. And I recall him telling me, because we had him out in our neighborhood in connection with flooding, and I recall the warning that he gave to us at that time: To be very, very careful of the steps that we take in respect of drainage, because it appeared to him at that time that we were passing through a cycle in which we had an abundance of moisture, and that ere long we may be sorry for taking the steps of making drainage ditches and the likes of this, which may eventually adversely affect us. So I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that the warnings that were given to me at that time by Mr. Lyon may still hold true today. And I think, too, Sir, that the recent disaster that we've had in the Seine River valley, to some degree may bear out what he said. While we are fully cognizance of the fact that recently we had an abundance of rainfall in the general watershed of the Seine, it may have been due to the construction of drainage ditches over the past number of years, that that run-off was of a greater velocity than it would have been, and consequently may have been a contributing factor to the damage that we had in the Seine River valley. So I think the words of caution, Mr. Chairman, uttered by Mr. Lyon at that time are well worthy of consideration when we are considering the question of water control and soil conservation.

Now again referring to the remarks of the Honourable the Minister of Education. He led us down a path of very informative - informative verbiage of what we are doing, or propose to do in order to make the farm unit more economical, in order to show us -- Agriculture. Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I meant Agriculture, - obviously. - Pardon?

A MEMBER: You're getting an education anyway.

MR. PAULLEY: I certainly was, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate it, and I think I am one who can stand a lot of education, and I'm prepared to receive a lot of education even from my friends opposite. But, what I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, was this, that we have heard from the Minister of what their plans are to create more and better hogs, more and better livestock; more and better grains, and so on. I think as an observer of the plight of the agricultural industry, that I can say this, that that is all very fine, but I think that one of the plights in the agricultural industry is that not enough planning has been given to the industry

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... itself as to the disposal of the products of agriculture. I think it is a truism to say that one of the factors that is governing the adverse situation which agriculture finds itself in today is the fact that while we continue to improve our methods of production, we have not improved to any material degree the methods of getting rid of those things which we produce. I think it is a truism to say that a year or two ago, for instance in the matter of turkeys, the price of turkeys was exceptionally high. They were still high last Christmas. I think the situation is today, also true, that as the result of the lack of planning or guidance, that we have a glut on the turkey market in Manitoba today, with a consequent lowering of the price and the return to the farmer. We noted the other day that a large operator is going to open a new plant for the production of turkeys at Lac du Bonnet. I feel sure that his plans were laid at the time the price for turkeys was at a reasonable level. I hazard to say, Sir, that if other plants of that nature enter into the turkey field, coupled with the general price of turkeys today, that the gentleman in his endeavors may lose his shirt.

I think, Sir, the same situation prevails insofar as poultry and eggs are concerned. I think in these fields we're still facing over-production. My colleague from Brokenhead, speaking this afternoon, drew to the attention of the House the question of hogs, and the lowering of the price of hogs. I think, Sir, that one of the reasons that our livestock prices are holding up, and have held up, has been because of the lifting of the embargo to the south of us. I wonder what would have happened to the cash income of the agricultural industry in the Province of Manitoba for last year, had the embargo been placed by the Agricultural Department across the line, for as we know, reading the figures of last year, that while the net cash income of the farmers of Manitoba was up, it was only due to agriculture - or, only due to livestock.

I think, Sir, these are the things that are very vital to the agricultural industry in Manitoba. And I would like to hear from the Minister, after having heard the story of what his Department, of what the University is doing, to lower the costs to production, which are all to the good -- to give us plans or the efforts of the Department and the University in forwarding through research, plans for increased production, for the increase in the quality of production. I suggest these are very, very vital, Mr. Chairman, but I suggest that as interesting as the discourse of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture this afternoon, that what the farmer of Manitoba wants to hear from him in addition to these things is "what are we going to do with our production and the things we are producing in excess today"?

And so I say, before we leave the Minister's salary, Mr. Chairman, we should hear from the Minister the other side of the picture - "what are we going to do with the things that we are producing and hope to produce as the result of our research and planning?" Because I am firmly convinced that while we have to plan in agriculture for the future, and as he mentioned a five-year plan, I think that it's necessary also to plan in connection, in conjunction with other jurisdictions and other nations what we are going to do with the surpluses and the commodities that we do produce, and I would like to hear the Minister comment on that side of the picture in the same degree as he did on the other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)

MR. ROBERTS: (La Verendrye): Minister's salary, I presume that, Mr. Chairman, that the Agricultural Credit Bill comes in under here, does it? Mr. Minister, is this - There is no other item in the estimates which cover Agricultural Credit?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should speak from your own seat not necessary.... (Interjection) Who's right.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the Minister kindly tell us with the Agricultural Credit Plan, how many applications have been processed and how many cheques have actually been issued?

MR. SCHREYER: (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, at this time, I might ask the Honourable Minister when I might fairly expect the Order for Return which I requested some - oh, about a week ago, with respect to the number of applications for farm credit to date, June 15th.

MR. WILLIS: Did the member for La Verendrye desire to discuss Farm Credit at this time, or would he go ahead and make a speech?

MR. ROBERTS: Well I was asking you a question, Sir. Do you intend to answer question?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, yes. I should like to cover in some bit of detail the question of agricultural credit, because I think it is important and it has been mentioned several times. May

(Mr. Willis, cont'd). . I say to the Member for Brokenhead that as he asked the question, and as we are approaching the estimates, I thought it was much better that we should discuss it fully at the time, rather than to merely answer the questions. And this evening I'll be happy to answer the questions which you have in mind and I think there is no undue delay in regard to it.

The Agricultural Credit Act was passed in November last, and then we cast about to find a man to run agricultural credit in this province. I discussed the matter with probably 25 different people in order to assure that we would get the proper man for agricultural credit. I was ever conscious that we had farm loans in this province in the past; that those farm loans were a colossal failure; and that care should be taken so that we had the proper administration in regard to agricultural credit in this province. So I sast about with some help for the proper man, and I discussed the matter with the head of the Veteran's Land Act for Canada - Mr. Tom Rutherford - sought his advice because the Veteran's Land Act probably runs the best agricultural credit system in Canada. They have dealt favourably and satisfactorily with the veterans. They have operated without losses, and they have done an excellent job of - the best job, may I say, in regard to farm credit in Canada. Therefore, I sought the advice of Mr. Rutherford, who is head of agricultural credit in Canada, seeking to find the right man, and I wanted to get, if possible, a man from the Veteran's Land Act because they had made such a success of the business of credit. And he said to me, "If you can get Mr. McLennan, who is Superintendent in Winnipeg," he said, "he is probably the best man in Western Canada for you, and he would be able to set up the whole system because he has had many years of experience, and as a matter of fact he had been District Superintendent here for fourteen years." So I took his advice, and after getting some additional advice, I finally suggested to the Civil Service Commission that they should approach Mr. McLennan and see if he was available. Mr. Rutherford, who is head of V. L. A. for Canada had indicated to me that he thought that he would be available, and so I had the Civil Service approach him, and we ultimately agreed to make him head of the system and we took him on. He was not able to come to us due to the fact that he had his contract with the Veteran's Land Act, until the 1st of March. He came to us at the 1st of March. Then having come then he sought about to secure staff to run the Act for us. He was of the opinion that he must necessarily get the best possible men and we advertised and I think we did get excellent men, but unfortunately several of them were not able to come to us until the 1st of May because good men are employed. And they were employed with the Veteran's Land Act. Some were not able to come to us until the 15th of May, due to the fact that they were already employed with the Veteran's Land Act. I want to point out the type of men we got to be appraisers for the Act. It is on evidence, the scheme which we had in Manitoba formerly failed because of improper appraisals; men who were not properly trained to make appraisals. And for that reason they had \$4,000 loans and they ended up with 2,000 farms, which had to be foreclosed.

We have as Assistant Manager, Mr. McLennan. He had three years of engineering training, and he'd been district superintendent at the Veteran's Land Act from 1945 to 1959. We got as assistant Mr. Leggat who was the district superintendent of Brandon. He's a man of 40 years of age. He is a graduate in agriculture, 1949, and from 1947 to '59 he was Veteran's Land Act regional supervisor in the City of Brandon covering that entire area. And we got Mr. White, who is an accountant. We needed an accountant. He is 44, a Bachelor of Arts degree, a chartered accountant as well. We got Mr. McCombe, who is 35, and is a graduate in agriculture and he was with the provincial department from '52 to 59. We got Mr. J. M. Barr, who was two years in Agriculture. He had three years examinations with the Appraisal Institute and he had been with the Veteran's Land Act from 1947 to 1959. We got Mr. Rhines, who is 36 years of age, a graduate of the Agricultural College. From 1955 to 1957 he was livestock fieldman for the Government of Canada. For the last 3 years he has been with the Veteran's Land Act. And we got Mr. Ollenik, 38, graduate of the Agricultural College who from 1947 to 1959 had been with the Veteran's Land Act as an appraiser. We got Mr. Westall, 41, graduate of the Agricultural College, - 1950 to '52 -- with the Veteran's Land Act as well. In addition, to the men who had been working mostly with the Veteran's Land Act and some of whom who had been retired, we got 7 additional appraisers. And so we were careful to get, what we thought, were proper men to carry out the appraisals, but the appraisals -- the men

(Mr. Willis, cont'd)... were not able to come to us until the middle of May in some cases, because they were already employed. We have received 1,302 applications. We have made appraisals on 319 loans. They have approved loans amounting to \$600,618.00 approved today, - \$600,618.00 have been approved.

MR. SHOEMAKER: 71 farmers or the 319 . . . of that amount .

MR. WILLIS: 71 I guess, yes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: 71 farmers received \$600,618.00?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, that's right. I have no statements in regard to rejections, but may I say this to you that as far as rejections are concerned I think there will be considerable rejections. And the reason is obvious. That all of those who have failed to get loans from mortgage companies, from the Canadian Farm Loan Board, from the Veteran's Land Act and the rest, they've all come to us hopefully. And therefore, because of that, there will be quite a large number of rejections. They will continue to come, however, because our Loan Act is better than anything else in sight. The young farmers particularly will be able to get a low rate of interest at 4%. All of those which have been approved are now in the hands of lawyers for the purpose of completing and registering the papers and we should be able to proceed now fairly quickly.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave that - how many of the 71 were young farmers?

MR. WILLIS: I don't know. I don't know. I can get it for you but I don't know the percent. I don't have that here. But certainly we've had a large number of applications from young farmers who seek the lower rate of interest.

That is the picture as far as the operations are concerned to date. We think we have an excellent staff. We think we have men who will make a success of this agricultural credit. We have operated with some care because we knew that in the past in this province the last farm loans we had were a colossal failure. We know that that operation was everything that was wrong and we took great care, if I may say so, to try and make sure that it didn't occur again. Indeed I think that loan operation of the past probably helped to carry down the political party of that day because of the utterly bad job that was done in regard to farm loans. Here we are 40 years later and we still have from that operation between 50 and 60 pieces of land which they're trying to sell. 40 years later and they're still trying to collect on 11 mortgages. I recognize that from a public point of view there were those who thought they should have got their money more quickly, and we would have been much happier to have been able to give it to them more quickly; but I suggest to you that we operated on a proper basis to get the proper persons in charge of agricultural credit in this province. I suggest to you that we will not just operate for 15 years as the former association did after which it went into bankruptcy and the manager of commissioner, went to jail. That is the kind of operation we had at that time. And so we were doubly careful to try and make sure that this time there would be a difference in the operation. And so we secured those men who carried on this business as a profession. Professional appraisers. In addition to that practically all of them are graduates of the agricultural college, and as they will be under the Department of Agriculture, if the loaning business isn't good in the future, and it's too good at the present, but if it's not good in the future, these men can easily be transferred to the Department of Agriculture itself, as field men or agriculture representatives. The man who is in charge, Mr. McLennan, is a man advanced in years. Then we have selected the Assistant Manager, who is ready and willing and able to take over and has the experience to take over this operation dealing we expect with many millions of dollars, and we believe that we'll stay in business for a long time. And because we have selected these men with great care in this way, we think this is an operation to be a credit to the Province of Manitoba. The people will say, "thank goodness, we didn't have an operation like the one we had before under the Manitoba Farm Loan Association." And I venture to suggest, this is supervised credit, and as a result it will not only help farmers with the money that's advanced, but it will help them in the science of agriculture; that they will be able to get instruction and help from those men who are graduates in agriculture of the University, who for 5, 10 or 15 years have been instructing farmers, returned soldiers, in the operations of their farms to be helpful. And that all in all this operation will sustain, and will live, and will be a credit to Manitoba.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, may I direct a question to the Minister? The two main principles of this Farm Loan Establishment, as I understand it, was two. One is to lend money to the farmers if they're in need at a lower interest, and secondly to those who cannot get a loan at a bank. Now you have informed that you have rejected many. Those who were rejected were on account of their inadequate backing credit or other reasons. If it's only because their securities are not as good then the principle of the loan is done away with. (Interjection) ... I'm asking a question.

MR. WILLIS: The reason the loans are rejected are of course for a dozen different reasons depending upon what the operation is. But many of them are certainly for the reason that they've already made a failure of farming, and consequently they can't get a loan any place because they shouldn't be farmers, they should try something else. The question of security is, as you know, much better than any other basis we've had in the past because cattle and cattles, are included in security in a way in which they were not under the other systems. 60% of your security can be land, 40% of your security can be cattle. Or included in the 40% you can have 20% security by way of machinery, which again is unusual. So the system as far as making the loans are concerned, is much more generous than any system we've had in Manitoba in the past.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Chairman, I was very, very much interested in the comments made about this particular Act. Being city-born I had no idea more or less of the farm problems, and the difficulties in setting up a farm. Possibly this Farm Credit Act will have a great deal of merit and help a lot of our younger men out in the country to get on their feet and start farming as it should be done in this day and age.

I'm rather intrigued at the figures that you gave. I know that there's a maximum loan that you allot to a farmer, I think it's \$25,000.00, I believe that it is, and here you say that 71 applicants have been accepted and you have issued \$600,000, which means it comes to an average of about \$8,460.00 per person. Now, I'm a little interested as to - is there a minimum that you give to a person based on his farm, because on this average basis, I just wonder how much headway any man can make with \$8,460.00. I'm just wondering if there's a fluctuation as to the loans that are given to the various applicants.

MR. WILLIS: Yes, there can be loans of course from any amount up to \$25,000 depending upon security, but in a number of cases a farmer doesn't want that. It's just a question of how much he wants. It isn't a question of giving him -- giving him the maximum at all, particularly the young farmer, who's seeking to get money at 4%. He'll get the least possible amount that he himself wants, because he doesn't want a big loan, he doesn't want a big debt, he wants the smallest one that he can get by with, so that his annual charges with not be heavy. That's why there is that variation.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister break down the areas of the province where these loans have been made? I'm specifically interested in the Interlake area because I strongly suspect that the people in that area are going to find great difficulty in obtaining loans because of the regulations -- the land in the Interlake is sub-marginal and as I understand you 60% of the loan has to be assessed value of the land. Is that correct?

MR. WILLIS: That's right.

MR. GUTTORMSON: And the land in that area isn't too rich. Is there no possibility of the government changing the policy some way so that the cattle could be used as security and to a larger extent than it is now?

MR. WILLIS: This is the largest extent to which cattle have ever been used as security as far as a farm loan is concerned, and I haven't got a breakdown in regard to it, because after all this is a separate corporation that's running this operation. It's true that it was appointed under the government but they run their own show with a Board of Directors, with farm representatives on it from the Farmers' Union, from the Federation of Agriculture and civil servants. I myself have never been in their offices -- I have talked to the manager from time to time, but we have not interfered with them, we have not tried to influence them in that regard at all, so I don't have the breakdown, I suppose it might be possible -- the loans are being made all over Manitoba.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, from the figures that you give us, are we to assume that there were 248 applications rejected out of 319 appraisals and 71 loans granted?

MR. WILLIS: No, that's not so.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I ask this question because when I was home last weekend, two farmers approached me, both of whom submitted applications about two months ago. I didn't know incidentally that they had submitted applications but they told me they had, so they asked me if I would kindly check for them when I got back to Winnipeg, and I did. And I was told, they were very courteous over there, I will say that, and very efficient because in no time at all did they whip out the application and quote the number that the application held; and they said one bore number 457 and the other one 650, which means I suppose that it was the 650th application received, and I asked them when the farmer could expect to have an appraisal made and they said it would be two months before they would reach that number. So then I asked them, well, if an application was submitted today, when could he expect an appraisal and they said well certainly not before October, -- certainly not before October -- and in the event that the ground was frozen at that time or covered with snow, that they couldn't do anything about it then until a year from now or sometime next spring, so I thought that that was rather discouraging.

Now another discouraging thing has happened in Neepawa. Now incidentally I don't know of a loan that has been granted in that area but there could be. But I know of a couple that have been, that are on this list where they have not accepted them and the farmers have received letters stating that their application has not been approved; and in this one particular case he owns a half section of land that is presently assessed at \$1,600.00, and his application was for an \$1,800.00 loan, and he stated on his application, so he tells me, that the purpose of the loan was to consolidate his debts and pay off a small existing mortgage, and one thing and another, and he required \$1,800.00. Now, I have always maintained that this relationship between the assessed value and the real value -- and I've been doing quite a little bit of studying on it since the farm lands in Neepawa have been assessed by the Provincial Assessment Branch -- and I have a great deal of confidence in the Provincial Government assessors, and assuming that the assessed value is 50% of the real value, and in most cases I think that you will find that pretty true. Now in this, as regards the farm land owned by this chap that I refer to here, his half-section is assessed at \$1,600.00, so you can see it isn't high priced land -- but using this factor -- 50% factor -- as the relationship between the assessed value and the real value, then his farm would be worth \$3,200.00. Now he's only asking for \$1,800.00 and they have turned him down on the grounds that the purpose for which he applied for his loan doesn't qualify him for a loan under the Act, but I can't see it myself. I haven't discussed this with the farmer incidentally, I haven't discussed this with him at all, because I didn't know the purposes of the Act. I didn't have the Act with me but I have one here now, and on page 5 of the Act, under Item 7, Purposes of the Loan, and in subsection (d) it says "The paying off and discharging of mortgages, encumbrances and other charges or liens on land owned or purchased by the Board" -- so it would seem to me that he would qualify. I wonder if you would mind checking with that one and see if there are other reasons why, that he wouldn't qualify, and if, the corporation have so many applications on hand now, that any more applications received would have to be dealt with next year, I think the farmer should be advised of that fact.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, while we are on the credit. If I recollect when the bill was coming in -- this is to the effect of young farmers. Now I understood from the Minister that it will be in the Board's discretion when the young farmer may borrow the money, that he would have to put up 40% or 60% of that, whatever it may be. In my area there is a case, a very respectable young farmer, a reliable farmer, he's got a bunch of cattle, he's got a full line of machinery. I believe he is in a partnership with his brother and he's renting a half-section of land. Now the owner for some years wouldn't sell that half-section of land and this spring he decided that he's going to sell. So this young farmer wants to buy that land and he approached me one time in town and asked me whether he can come -- qualify under this agricultural credit, and I told him to write a letter to the Agricultural Department, and I understand he did that and I don't know how far the correspondence went, but I was told indirectly by his relation that he was turned down. Now I just want to ask that question, how closely does that Board screen a young farmer? What qualification that young farmer has, since in my case he's a respectable, intelligent farmer, he's farming, got a full line of machinery, quite a number of head of cattle, and yet he was turned down because he couldn't put up the percentage?

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the members don't produce the 1,300 applications here, but there are at least a dozen reasons why in some cases they turn down a loan. They, I'm sure, are ready, willing and happy to loan where they think it is a reasonable risk and they're not -- they'd get no kudos or increased salary by turning a person down. I'm sure they're much happier to agree and to make the loan, because they make the person happy under those circumstances. They are not limited as far as money is concerned; that they are to expend, and they are to go forward and make proper application.

I come back to the same question again, namely, that I think we have an excellent staff, it's well trained. Most of them have spent many, many years in the business, most of them are trained in agriculture in addition to that, and we can't guess what they had on their application. We can't guess the report of the appraiser when he went to talk to them. He may have talked to their neighbors as well and we can't guess what those reasons are because they'll vary in each case. Suffice to say that they have approved these loans; suffice to say too, that they can inspect about 30 farms a day with the present staff that they have, and that is considerable; and ordinarily it takes them half a day at a farm, and they have some fifteen appraisers there, with part-time, so that they're doing it as quickly as they can, but it's quite impossible to say the reasons why your particular friend was turned down or the friend of the man from Gladstone on those features. I have many come in to see me and I usually phone the manager and to date his reasons for turning them down to me seemed to be quite adequate and fair, and as I say there are a dozen reasons why they are turned down, but there are no specific barring of anybody. They are happy to do it and they want to do it, but they want to do it on the proper basis.

.....(Continued on next page.)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, doesn't the Minister think it might be a good idea if the reason for the rejection was given to the applicants. I think in some financial houses they do that and then the person knows, and I think maybe it's a suggestion that the Minister might take under consideration. And if the reasons were known to the applicant, maybe they could improve the reasons for the rejection and make a re-application.

MR. WILLIS: I think it would help the members considerably if they would ask these persons who are applying for loans as to whether they had applied for a loan elsewhere before and were they turned down before in their application. One can imagine many, many things why. I had one man who phoned me up and said it was completely unfair. He fairly well burned my ear off and so then I phoned to the manager. I don't know whether you can have a telephone taken out, I suppose likely he was at a pay station maybe, and so I phoned the manager and he said, we made an enquiry and he's got at least twelve bum cheque's floating around that part of the country and he never pays his debts, and he's not a farmer. He said "It's just as simple as that". And so this man that was so very angry, I didn't see that he had any basis, but I can understand that these men who are unable to get credit any place would be most energetic in their protests, if they were turned down. It is probably the last possible place they could go for farm credit.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I can understand that, Mr. Chairman, I can understand that.

MR. WILLIS: I was going to point out that you can't write a man and say "We can't loan you the money because everyone says you are a crook."

MR. RIDLEY: Mr. Chairman, in a case of a man being rejected, I had one case in my constituency, and this man came to me, so I went up to the Board and the first thing I asked Mr. McLennan was it permissible for me to come in if a man was rejected on a loan. I said if I was doing anything wrong, I wanted him to tell me right there and I wouldn't ask any further questions. He informed me that if one of your constituents was rejected that there was no harm at all in any member of the Legislature coming in to see why he was rejected. He got out the file and showed me the reason why he was rejected and I could see the point quite clearly why he was rejected. In any case it was, I went back to the gentleman and told him and we talked it over and there were some changes made that he didn't need quite as much money as he was asking for what they had down on the application. So I think that anyone is permissible to find out why a man was rejected and I would think that I wouldn't take it from his relations that he was rejected, I would see the man himself and get the story true and then I think you are quite in order to go to the Board and find out why they rejected him.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, could that not lead to political patronage if the local MLA is undertaking these sort of things where he might be able to talk the Board into it. I thought that the legislation was so drafted to prohibit all that. I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that the answer that the Loans Board might give instead of saying "You're a crook", they might say "Well, we think you're likely to become a politician" or something of that nature as the reason for the rejection.

MR. WILLIS: Do you think he'd understand?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on this one that I referred to a little earlier that was rejected, I will read you the letter because — and there's nothing wrong with the letter except it didn't please the applicant because it was rejected. It says: "Your application for a loan on the above land has been reviewed by our Loans Committee. Due to the small amount of your mortgage we do not believe it would be in your best interests to transfer this over to our corporation. Further, our Board of Directors has ruled that loans should only be made when incurred for productive agricultural purposes which would expand the enterprise and enable it to be operated on a more economical basis. We feel that your request for a loan cannot be justified in this regard. We regret to advise you therefore that your application has been declined." Now in the Act on page 5 in clause 7 there are eight purposes listed under the heading "Purposes of the Loan" -- there are eight purposes there and I say that it does qualify under the Act, because it not only mentions the clause that I read before but under (e) it says "the consolidating of outstanding liabilities incurred for productive agricultural purposes" -- and that's another one, and there are eight of them in the total. But I will go over and check with the Agricultural Credit Corporation just for my own satisfaction. And thank you very much, the honourable member for (Interjection) Well, Mr. Chairman, this man doesn't owe me any money so I'm not trying to obtain money to pay me off.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Chairman, just for further clarification, if I recall the bill, a person could get \$25,000.00 and have 30 years to pay. Now if the loan is less -- say it's around eight, five, six, seven thousand -- does it mean that he still has 30 years to pay or -- he still has the same time.

MR. WILLIS: Still has 30.

MR. HAWRYLUK: I see. Now the second question. Is there such a thing as an open loan or like an open mortgage where a farmer can pay his loan back in a shorter space of time than allotted by the Credit Act.

MR. WILLIS: Yes, there is. The ordinary loans which they make he can pay off any amount at any time without notice or bonus.

MR. TANCHAK: I presume you are still on the Ministers' salaries and I have nothing against . . .

MR. WILLIS: I'm still unpaid.

MR. TANCHAK: I have nothing against you receiving a higher salary, even double because I can see -- listening to what the Honourable Minister had to tell us this afternoon -- I can see that he worked very hard and I must admit that I listened with great interest to the explanations. It kind of rings almost the same as my first session here when I took an awful lot of interest in this session being newly elected, and it seems to me that most of it was more or less a repetition of what had formerly been said by the then Minister of Agriculture. True, there was some new items listed and I'm very happy that they are. I do not say that any of these items listed were not worthwhile. I agree with the Minister they are but I cannot see too many new projects in here. I'll go through some of them. Of course I think they are all necessary and I can see that the Minister is really trying very hard. So I will vote for to double his salary if that comes up.

There is one point I would like to bring out -- I think it has been brought out -- I spoke to the Minister once before on this, and this is the agricultural representatives, not only in my area -- Ag. Reps. as we call them -- but I think throughout the whole Province of Manitoba. I understand that the Minister gave us indication that there will be new Ag. Reps. appointed, and some assistants, but I do not think that even with a number of newly appointed Ag. Reps. that we have enough to do the work properly. I would suggest that the Minister look into that and I think that we can make use of twice as many, not because I am in opposition now. I said the same thing when I was sitting with the government.

A MEMBER: It didn't help much.

MR. TANCHAK: Yes, it did help. They tried very hard.

MR. WILLIS: We've already sent you a new man you know.

MR. TANCHAK: Yes, I know -- an assistant. Probably in the last few days they made one appointed permanently, but I knew that there was an assistant in there.

Another point I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister is the Vets. I had numerous complaints from the eastern part of my constituency that there is no Vet within a hundred miles. I wonder if the government can do something. I understand this is more or less private. The government appoints certain veterinarians in different parts, but I think there should be one appointed further east. The closest one I think is in Emerson.

Now there are a few other points raised. Weed control -- I am looking forward to that because the municipalities have been complaining that the controlling of weeds is too much of a burden on local authorities. I notice that there is appointed a director, regional director for the southeastern part of the province. I welcome that because I believe there is a lot of work to be done in that area. True, quite a bit has been started but an awful lot of work is to be done. Some of the six changes that were mentioned by the Minister -- the first one was credit. I do not know whether I understood the Minister right but the way I understood him that to date no cheques have been issued. Am I correct in that?

There's something that I think I should mention right now. I'm not going to say the Honourable Minister did, or any other Ministers of the government, but during the last election campaign they made a lot of ado about this, and it's immediate help to the farmer, and mentioned one of those as "farm credit", and some of the speakers boasted in my area that numerous farmers had already received credit and were issued with cheques. I do not think that that was being honest. Of course it didn't hurt me any in my constituency but probably

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) in other constituencies it might have hurt some other people. I do not think that was quite right.

Now the Honourable Member from Roblin tried to convince us that the farms are not any larger now than they were some years back. In fact he tried to prove there was something like 100 and so many acres per farmer. I do not think. . . .

MR. RIDLEY: Excuse me, could I ask the member a question? Who is the speaker that said cheques had been issued? Who is the speaker that said that cheques had been issued on the

MR. TANCHAK: I am not at liberty at the present time to mention the names, I could mention to you privately about half a dozen, that said that cheques had been issued, and that was during the election campaign. I can tell you privately if you wish.

MR. RIDLEY: I don't think it should be told privately. If you say our speakers said cheques were issued, I think you should tell us their names, if you know them.

MR. TANCHAK: They were the speakers that were supporting the candidate. I did say that it wasn't the Minister who said that, and I don't see why that concerns you. I didn't mention your constituency.

MR. RIDLEY: I concerns me, Mr. Chairman, in this manner. That if some of our government men were out and said that, I want to know who said it because I'm one of the government. That's why

MR. TANCHAK: I'm sorry, I didn't say any of the government men did. I would suggest that the honourable member listen more carefully. I said some of the speakers who spoke for the candidates. I didn't mention the government. In fact, I made sure that I stated that none of the government did it.

Now as far as the larger farm areas, I think the Honourable Minister himself, in starting his explanations did mention that the trend is towards larger farms and I agree with him, and I do not think the Honourable Member from Roblin was quite right when he tried to point out that the farms aren't much larger.

Another -- Water control and conservation. I agree with that. The crop insurance has been discussed and I presume it will be discussed later on again. Increase in agricultural education. I welcome that very much and I think it is a step in the right direction. Research and experimentation -- I notice that there was winter wheat mentioned. I don't know if the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is familiar with the area at the eastern end of Emerson constituency, but I would like to draw his attention to a beautiful field of winter wheat down around Sprague. It's fully headed and it is just a wonderful sight at the present time. It was done on the farmers' and I think that the possibilities of winter wheat are very great.

There is one more item that I would like to confirm and that was the Honourable Member -- I don't remember who -- from Fisher, I think, did mention, or was it the Leader, about marketing. He mentioned hogs, cattle and poultry. I am not going to talk too much about poultry because I would probably be pleading my own case. I am engaged in poultry raising, but I think that the government here, although they cannot do too much about markets, but should use as great an influence as possible to see that there are markets for our products, farm products. I thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: On the subject of agricultural credit. Has the Minister agreed to get for us the breakdown of the ages of those?

MR. CHAIRMAN: before when the member spoke from not his own seat, the question was disputed as to whether he should in Committee, but I would like to read from the rules and orders, forms and proceeding, for this Legislature, the following. Under the heading of Committee of the Whole, Committee of Supply, Committee of Ways and Means. 66 (1) The rules of the House shall be observed in the Committee of the Whole House so far as it may be applicable, except the rules as to the seconding of motions and limiting the number of times of speaking".

And if you turn to Rule 28, having kept in mind, it says - "The rules of the House should be observed in the Committee of the Whole. Every member desiring to speak shall rise in his place uncovered and address himself to the Mr. Speaker".

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I want to disagree with your interpretation of that particular clause, because I think you'll find that the rules that are referred to there are the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . Rules of Debate. The Rules of Debate - that's why they exempt the seconding of motions and the speaking more than once. It's the Rules of Debate. It has been the custom in all the years that I have been here. There is no question about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course it's under the heading of the Rules of the House and doesn't refer to Rules of Debate.

MR. CAMPBELL: You will find that is the Rules of Debate. And incidentally my honourable friends are always quite willing to go to the Federal Parliament for their authorities and the same thing obtains in the Federal Parliament.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well my honourable friend has taken his place.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, discussion in view of the transposition of the honourable member at the present time. I would merely point out that I was making enquiries during the interval from the Clerk as to what the practice has been. I realize the practice of the House of course is one of the guiding rules of what takes place, and not having had the honour or the privilege of being in the House prior to the last two sessions, I wasn't aware of the practice, but I do suggest, Sir, that the rules that you have quoted - 28 and 66(1) - would seem to indicate that your ruling in this connection is at least prima facie correct. Now I haven't had the opportunity to look at the federal authorities myself yet, but in view of the fact that it is an academic discussion at this stage, perhaps we might look into it further and resolve the matter to our satisfaction at a later date.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think, Mr. Chairman, that if you will look at the heading under Chapter 3, just before 28, you will notice that it is clearly headed "Rules of Debate and members speaking".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The Member for La Verendrye has gone into his place. Apart from what might be the details of the academic ruling, I think everyone will agree that it is much better for a member to be speaking from his seat, and from any point of view that rather the man would be anywhere in the House, get up and take part in discussion - we don't call this a debate, it's a discussion - but I agree with the Attorney-General that this is an academic question that needs going into further.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is not just an academic question. This is a question of some importance, because this is something where the practice has been most clearly understood for many years; and the reason that this practice obtains in parliament and here is that a lot of rules are relaxed in Committee of the Whole, and Committee of Supply, because the fact is that when this kind of discussion is going on the Minister himself or the Opposition Leader or the Leader of any group may want to have for that time, different desk-mates to what he has at other times. And in Ottawa it's quite common, as it is here, for the membership to change around according to what estimates are before the House. And in my own case, there are ones of the members that I might want to have conferring with me during the time that estimates are on, and the rules are certainly relaxed to the extent that that can be done and to us it's not an academic question at all.

MR. MILLER: I might add, Mr. Chairman, that not only has it been the experience during my stay in this House, that the member in committee can sit where he wants to, and partake in the debate, but when Mr. Chairman calls a vote he doesn't have to be in his seat.

MR. ROBERTS: I'm almost frightened to speak. Did we have the assurance of the Minister that we would receive an age and area breakdown as to the applicants to the Agricultural Credit Bill?

MR. WILLIS: Would you repeat your question?

MR. ROBERTS: Will we receive from you a breakdown as to the age of the applicants and the area in which they come from - general area?

MR. WILLIS: I'll try to get that information for you.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you Sir. And also at the same time, could you give us the number of applicants who have been rejected, because obviously it isn't correct that all of the other 248 or something of the 319 appraisals have been rejected; therefore we would like the correct number of rejections. And on the same subject, would the Minister tell us, does the Board pass judgment on each appraisal that is on each applicant?

MR. WILLIS: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Even after their appraisals have been okayed by the appraisal board or the appraisal committee?

MR. WILLIS: They may do so, and they may review them, or ask for any particular application, but on the ordinary course I understand they do not because they are in various places, one is in Dauphin and so on, they are not called in to check every application. There would be too much delay.

MR. TANCHAK: Could the Honourable Minister tell me whether the farmers in unorganized areas qualify, or not?

MR. WILLIS: They do.

MR. TANCHAK: Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the Minister tell us the interest rate at which these loans are being made?

MR. WILLIS: 4% and 5 1/2.

MR. ROBERTS: Will this be continued throughout the year?

MR. WILLIS: Beg your pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: Will this rate continue for the year?

MR. WILLIS: To the best of my knowledge, yes.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, to clarify a point of procedure. I realize that the Minister has given us at least half the information which I asked for in my request for an Order for Return, but I would just like to know what the fate of my request for an Order for Return will be now? I mean, will he honour it or not?

MR. WILLIS: It is now ready and you can get it anytime.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if that is the case might I ask why it has not been forwarded into the House instead of a member going to get it?

MR. WILLIS: I got the information today but I could have handed it to the Honourable Member for Brokenhead when I came in tonight, but I thought it was more advisable that I should make this explanation at the same time. With which he is satisfied.

MR. PAULLEY: That is not quite the point I was raising, Mr. Chairman. Is it not the obligation of a Minister on an Order for Return to table it in the House.

MR. WILLIS: Yes, and that I will do.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the Horned Cattle Fund. Could you tell us how much money is in the -- obviously it doesn't appear in the estimates or anywhere else either -- how much money is in the Horned Cattle Fund, and what purpose is it being put to?

MR. WILLIS: Maybe the honourable member would wait until we reach that item.

MR. ROBERTS: I'm sorry, I couldn't find it. If you would give us some idea as to where it is.

MR. WILLIS: Yes, I have it here. It's under Item No. 3 in the Livestock Branch.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, there is a topic of very vital importance to the farmers at the present time. It is a federal topic but this House, I am certain, and our present Minister of Agriculture should be vitally interested in it, and probably making recommendations to Ottawa on it. It is the subject of the proposed changes in the payments to farmers for their eggs and hogs. These are the suggested places where the Federal Minister of Agriculture is planning on changing the policy. In other words, the Agricultural Stabilization Board as reported from Ottawa, will be changed on the price of eggs and on the price of hogs, and that a different type of payment will be made to the farmers. In other words, the floor price will be taken off these products -- they will be thrown on the open market presumably, and that a deficiency payment will be made to the farmers directly from the Federal Treasury up to a certain production.

Can the Minister give us any reports as to the development of this program?

MR. WILLIS: I have no special information in regard to it.

MR. ROBERTS: Have you made any recommendations to Ottawa as to your desires, Sir?

MR. WILLIS: Officials of the department have.

MR. ROBERTS: And could you give us some idea as to what your thinking is on these things?

MR. WILLIS: I can get it for you. I don't have it here though.

MR. ROBERTS: I suggest this is a vitally important thing. Our whole approach to the problem of where these deficiency payments on these products are going to be paid; at what levels; sort of establish our whole thinking as to what type of farm we are trying to protect in

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) Canada. And I think it is of vital importance to the Minister, to all of us, that we be making recommendations to Ottawa as to where we want our levels to be established on these things.

MR. WILLIS: I'd be glad to listen to the honourable member on this question.

MR. SCHREYER: The words just uttered by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye are much the same as what I was saying this afternoon and would seem quite obvious now that here is a very striking example of the need for impressing on the Federal Government the need for deficiency payments on grain because the Federal Government, as the honourable member has said, is embarking on a new interpretation of The Agricultural Stabilization Act to the detriment of the hog producers.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if before we leave this if the Minister might explain -- or say a few words to the House in respect to the question I raised as to what the department intends to do as to the disposal of the products of agriculture?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, I would be glad to. As far as the disposal program is concerned, I suggest to the honourable member that what we are doing is to try and get agriculturists into other avenues, and to get them, if possible, away from surpluses. And particularly a large part of our program is to try and get them away from the production of wheat of which there is a surplus at the present time. And because of that we are introducing various types of crops into Manitoba to get them away from wheat. We are trying to get them more into other crops. One of the interesting crops in which we are investigating now is tobacco. That's been going on for about two years now but it shows interesting possibilities and this year, for the first time, we've brought a man here from the Ontario tobacco field to advise us, and to watch the crops, see whether we couldn't grow tobacco in this province.

There is another important experiment going on now among many -- that is in regard to growing beans. I speak of beans, I mean the kind of beans that you get in pork and beans, underneath that little wee piece of prok, if you can find it. And there is a great opportunity for the production of that type of beans for canning within the province. And we have one man who is doing nothing else but that -- Mr. Dave Doerksen -- who is an excellent man in regard to specialized crops. And of course we have done well in regard to sunflower seeds within the province. The Altona area and Winkler down there, they have, in the constituency of the man second on your right, that they are doing great things in regard to new crops and have for some time in the past. But that is the object, rather, to get them away from the growing of wheat and get them into even other types of wheat. At the moment I don't grow any hard wheat; I grow Durum wheat. The idea too that there is an immediate sale for that wheat. It is drought-resisting to a remarkable degree, and that we don't add to the surplus in the meantime. We are encouraging, too, as you know, in regard to growing cattle -- raising cattle, and we have more promotion people in regard to that. But rather we think the question of disposing of the surpluses such as wheat is the -- within the ambit of the Federal Government. They deal with foreign trade, they deal largely with those surpluses, and we consider that to be their problem. But in the meantime we are helping to the best of our ability to get people away from those productions. I had hoped that the Honourable Member for Emerson would have given us some longer dissertation in regard to turkeys, because I have had to help him at times when other members of his party wanted to open up all the markets from the south and let the turkeys pour in here. He's a protectionist in a mild way, and he wants his turkeys protected, and I was carrying on some correspondence with Ottawa trying to give him, a good Liberal, some degree of protection as far as his turkeys are concerned.

MR. TANCHAK: I wish to thank the Honourable Minister.

MR. WILLIS: Yes, so we were working together in that regard on that particular occasion. So that the answer to your question is that in my opinion almost entirely, the question of surpluses is a federal matter, and they are set up for that purpose. But we, as I see it, have to change agriculture, and place the emphasis on those things for which there is a ready sale, rather than increasing those where there is that difficulty.

I realize in regard to poultry, that a great deal has been done within the last year. In my own town of 1,100 people, three plants have been built in the one year, where they take the poultry right from the commencement right through to -- till it lands on the table. The three different plants handle it there within that town. They were all built this year, including a feed

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.) . . . mill, all in the one year, because the emphasis is now on poultry, and the special processing of poultry. But most of those things, in most of those things you can go too far, as they have done in wheat; as they have done in butter, of which there is a surplus. But our object, as far as we are concerned, is to try and get them to work in other avenues where there is not a surplus; and there are many of those still available for successful agriculture.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, that's the reason that I raised this point; I think it's very, very vital and I agree with the Minister that in many of these produces of the land that it is within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government as to their disposal. I recall a debate in this House some three or four years ago, when this question was before the House at that time. At that time, we had, if memory serves me correctly, a greater surplus of wheat even than we have today. And if I recall correctly, the Minister of Agriculture at that time was Mr. Ronnie Robertson. And a number of members asked him what would he suggest -- would he suggest that we should go into greater production of livestock. And his answer, I thought, was a very sane one at that time, and it was something similar to this -- "Well, I can appreciate, as the Minister of Agriculture, the difficulty we are having with wheat at the present time; but also I can foresee if we all abandon wheat fields and go into the produce of livestock, that we are going to create a surplus of livestock." Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister has just informed us of the chicken plants, poultry producing plants that he has in his own home town, and I think it is an admirable venture. But what would happen insofar as that particular industry, if that was reflected right across the Province of Manitoba, which is within the realm of possibility?

Now the main purpose of my question to the Minister was what guidance is the department giving to the farmers and the livestock raisers? Are they giving them any guidance as to the degree to which they should or should not go into these various other producing agencies? I think that is very vital, and that was the reason I raised the question. Is the Department of Agriculture giving guidance along this line, recalling the sage words, as I thought they were at that time, of the former Minister of Agriculture in the person of Ronnie Robertson. Now the Minister has mentioned the question of tobacco and beans, sunflowers and poultry. And I would suggest that the efforts in order to have greater diversification in agriculture is admirable, but I do think that there should be general guidance, or I shouldn't use the word "control", because that's a naughty word, and only we usually use it -- but I do think, I do think that the department might give greater emphasis to this, because as I mentioned in my earlier remarks, that we have seen that where, first of all we create the surplus of eggs and then we leave them alone and then egg prices go down or go up because there is a shortage, and then immediately we have another influx of egg-raising in the province, and then the price goes down. There seems to me that there hasn't been any planning. Now, I can use that word, because my friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, often uses it. Is there every any overall planning for the production of agricultural commodities; and what guidance is being given by the department? That was the purpose of my remarks.

MR. WILLIS: The answer is that we have 36 Ag. Reps. who completely cover the province, and shall we say, the smart farmer consults with them, and we advise them; we get all the latest statistics in regard to surpluses, possibilities and new ideas, and through them we go out to have those ideas come to the farmer on the land. In addition, of course, we have several people in the department working on publications only, and they can get advice in regard to any of those problems by merely writing the department, and seeking, asking the questions. If they desire guidance in regard to what they should grow, they will be given the vital facts in regard to it. We don't say, we may not say "This is what definitely you should do", but when they have the statistics which they are furnished with, it becomes rather obvious that they should do such and so if their land can produce that type. Not all people can grow certain types of crops. Down around Morden they have special soils there where they grow crops which you can't grow in many other parts of the province. Perhaps they should go into cattle, but perhaps their land is too valuable in the area in which they are to raise cattle. Therefore, it isn't economical and they are unwise to do so, because if their land is worth a hundred and fifty dollars an acre, they are not the people to raise range cattle; but rather in the cheaper lands where they have a good measure of grass. So that they have to take those into

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.) consideration. Those, at the present time for some, I think I am one of those, that it is advisable to raise Durum Wheat. Many parts of the province won't raise Durum Wheat; for it will go down on them; it's too heavy a crop. They can't even harvest it where you have heavy land. Therefore, that is not feasible for them to do that. So that you cannot, in effect, direct them precisely as to what they should do. But if they will consult their Ag. Reps. or write to the Department of Agriculture, they can get a great deal of useful information which will be a guidance to them.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested to hear the Minister mention the banner agricultural constituency in Manitoba -

MR. WILLIS: That's not what I said.

MR. MILLER: I was referring, of course, to Rhineland. The salvation for the people in that area were special crops, as the Minister knows. Starting in the early thirties with corn, they progressed to sugar beets, to sunflowers, to various other crops, experimenting all the time. And as the -- in general -- the farm holdings of the individual are small, they are practically forced into that position. The -- what I wanted to ask, in the last few years they have also been experimenting with the growing on a large scale of onions. Kroeker Bothers, who have pioneered in potato growing and in other special crops, have undertaken that. I might also say that in the constituency they grow excellent barley. I think the Barley King comes from there - from my constituency. There is also an experiment being carried on on a fairly large scale of growing tomatoes, and I wonder if the Minister has any further information on that.

As regards sunflowers, not only do they grow them there, but they process them in a co-operative venture of which I have spoken many times. The Co-op Vegetable Oil plant processes various edible oils, rape seed, soya beans, sunflowers and has built up a tremendous industry down there, through the co-operative efforts of the people. I wonder though if the Minister has any reports from his agricultural experts as to how these new ventures came out; that is the growing particularly of onions, and the growing of tomatoes on a commercial scale.

MR. WILLIS: I will be glad to give the honourable member a report, especially in regard to the special crops; and they have been very successful. Last year we had 45,000 acres of sunflowers worth slightly more than a million dollars. Sugar beets --

MR. MILLER: Has the Minister any -- they're not, that's not all confined to my constituency; they grow them elsewhere. I mean - how successful have they been grown in other parts of Manitoba?

MR. WILLIS: Well, not all the virtues are in Rhineland. But not all. You have many of them as you know.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

MR. WILLIS: But we - we just, we still consider Rhineland as being a part of Manitoba. So this covers Manitoba. (Laughter)

MR. MILLER: Why even Boissevain, even Boissevain is part of Manitoba. (Laughter)

MR. WILLIS: Exactly. Exactly. So, if I might continue, I will give you additional information besides. Sunflowers - last year we had 45,000 acres planted worth \$1,006,000.00. Sugar beets - we had 22,400 to be worth \$2,700,000.00. Field peas - we had 50,000 acres worth \$1,300,000.00. Rape seed - we had 29,000, worth \$450,000.00. Buckwheat - there were 35,000 acres worth \$432,000.00. Corn for grain - worth 11,500. And there were \$317,000.00. Soya beans - there were 7,000 acres and they were worth \$126,000.00. Field beans - 400 worth \$16,800.00. Mustard - 325 acres worth \$14,600.00. And canary seed - I didn't know there were so many canaries but - 500 acres worth \$12,000.00.

I wanted to bring to your attention particularly the tobacco crop because I thought it was of special interest to those of you who smoke, and I don't.

MR. MILLER: But did.

MR. WILLIS: A tobacco specialist has been engaged to establish the feasibility of producing good quality tobacco in Manitoba; two acres at Prawda and two acres at Marchand -- now I don't think those are in Rhineland -- should provide enough tobacco for factory scale testing. In addition, smaller plots are being grown at South Junction, at Piney and at Portage la Prairie. A tobacco transplanting machine was purchased in 1959, and two kilns will be ready for curing of tobacco this fall.

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.) For those who like pork and beans, may I say, the crops in 1957-58 have shown that navy beans of good quality can be produced in Manitoba. Electronic-eye equipment for cleaning is required to make the beans marketable. Through encouragement of department officials, a ten-unit electronic-eye cleaning plant is being established in Winkler. That's closer home.

MR. MILLER: Pretty close. Pretty close.

MR. WILLIS: The way is now clear for an expanded acreage of field beans within Manitoba. Here in general is our policy: Farmers are encouraged to grow special crops. They receive advice as to best cultural practices in growing special crops. A close watch is maintained as to special problems which arise when these crops are grown, that is to say, insects, disease, harvesting, etc. Provincial and federal research institutions are contacted for solutions to these problems, and farmers are given the best advice obtainable. The possibility of growing new crops is continually being investigated, and if proven feasible, such crops are then promoted. New and better varieties of crops developed by Provincial and Federal research institutions are widely publicized, and assistance is provided in the distribution of new seed to them.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give me an answer to yet another question. How is the Lower Red River Valley Water Authority coming along, and when can we expect to be in business, and what is the policy of the government with respect to that - the supply of potable water in the lower Red River Valley, particularly the supply of water to the villages -- the village of Gretna and the Town of Altona?

MR. WILLIS: I don't think I have that here, Mr. Chairman, but in regard to that particular problem; it will arise because we have a special bill in regard to potable water, and I think it better be discussed at that time.

MR. ROBERTS: To get back to the subject of special crops, and as a pleasant diversion, I would like to inform the House that the Leader of the Opposition has become a grandfather for the eleventh time; a grandson (clapping), and I'm sure the House will join with me in offering congratulations and good health to daughter Dawn, son-in-law Jack McKeag, and of course, the boss and Mrs. Campbell. (Clapping)

MR. CAMPBELL: Five girls and six boys.

MR. WILLIS: Nice going Doug! (Laughter)

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister a question. Now from babies to the Ag. Reps. I would like to go. I realize that the Honourable Minister states that they increased the number of Ag. Reps., but for some unknown reason, our Ag. Rep. has been moved from our area, and instead of we having one in our area, we have to go to see him 30 miles away or he has to make arrangements due to his vast, large area he has to cover. Could there be any explanation why that was done?

MR. WILLIS: I don't know the individual reason in that particular case, but I'll be very glad to investigate it and get you the information.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, there has been quite a bit of information given here tonight with respect to the growing of special crops. Now that is, of course, rather commendable policy, being pursued on the part of the government. However, I think that brings up a rather important matter, and that is, if people are being encouraged to grow special crops, just what are the chances that these special crops will be insurable under the new proposed Crop Insurance scheme. Any provision for that?

MR. WILLIS: As the bill has not yet been drafted, it will be a little difficult, as you understand, for me to answer that question.

MR. SCHREYER: I realize that, but I was wondering if the Minister was disposed to giving some tangible information in that respect -- whether it was likely or unlikely that -- that the insurance of special crops was -- was feasible, and would be done.

MR. WILLIS: It depends upon the terms, and I don't know how restricted the Federal Act will be. We will have to come under it and discuss it with them. But if they are grown to any extent, I should definitely think they would be included.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the report the Minister has given us on the efforts in the production of special crops is very interesting, but it leads up to another difficulty, of course, and that is the marketing of these special crops.

Now in the matter of tobacco, and I certainly can't vouch for this information, but I've

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) been told that at present there is a surplus of tobacco in the eastern provinces where it is grown. And that last year, particularly, there was some difficulty in the marketing of the product. I would like to know what action is being undertaken by the department or if not through the Department of Agriculture, by any other department, in the matter of marketing of the special crops. Secondly, in the field of production of special crops, what attention is given to the cost of production of the crops here in Manitoba as compared to the cost of production in other areas. In other words, I am quite prepared to believe that from a climatic standpoint we possibly can grow tobacco, but can we grow tobacco here as cheaply as it can be grown, say, in the Province of Ontario? Will our tobacco match up to theirs once it goes on the market, from a saleable standpoint? In other words, if we are encouraging people to go into it, can they make a go at it?

MR. WILLIS: These are all questions which as yet are not answered, but certainly we realize, and I was discussing it with Mr. Derksen also, that at the moment certain types of tobacco, there is a surplus in regard to them. But if we grew them here, we would have to a large degree the local market, which is not a big market, but they -- our experts are of the opinion that a large quantity of tobacco would not likely be grown here. But we want to get as much diversity there as possible. It is true that as far as Ontario is concerned, we are in competition with Ontario in many, many things, whether it's poultry or hogs or cattle or whatever else it may be. But normally if we have a local sale for that particular product, why we can control the local market, with some, with some variations, so that the hope as far as tobacco is concerned, even the ultimate, would be to be able to produce enough here for the local market here, and if they can produce of quality, then there'll be good returns to the growers. It is another thing in which you experiment. It is highly possible, it is at least a possibility, that we may grow better quality than elsewhere. Perhaps we may grow a different quality than other places which might be acceptable to a certain market. And so those things are found out by trial and error and experiment. But in the meantime, we enlarge the number of crops that we are growing and we give a greater chance to agriculture to make a living than it ever had before.

MR. MOLGAT: But coming back to the field of tobacco, at the moment there is no market for raw tobacco here in the province, is there? I know of no cigarette or tobacco factory here. In other words, I presume that at present our products would have to be shipped to the eastern market. Or has action been taken with the tobacco companies with a view to establishing a plant here?

MR. WILLIS: Those tobacco companies who are interested in production, are watching these experiments with great care. Indeed, there are some of them trying to beat the gun in purchasing land which they think is suitable for the production of tobacco in the Province of Manitoba. So that that is up to them. That's private enterprise, and they desire to be in as quickly as possible on a possible scoop in the market, so that they can handle the local market. If we can produce tobacco satisfactory to the people of Manitoba, there will be, as you know, a considerable market.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I've listened very interested to the words -- the last words of the Minister, but if the tobacco companies are the ones that are going to come in and buy up the land and produce the tobacco, how is that going to help the farmers in their diversification?

MR. WILLIS: They would presumably still be growing the tobacco and selling it to the tobacco companies, and therefore, there would be, to a degree which can't be measured, there would be returns to them.

MR. ROBERTS: On the -- the Minister, I believe in his opening remarks never indicated, although he mentioned the crop losses in the southeast of Manitoba, never indicated whether there would be provincial help forthcoming to the areas that lost their crops. There have been many floods in Manitoba over the years, but this is the first case in my recollection, at least that, where crops had already been sown, and many crops were lost through floods. Would the Minister care to comment on that?

MR. WILLIS: As I told the very large delegation which we had, it's a matter of facts. What are the facts? We are trying to get them as quickly as possible. Is this a major disaster, or is it a minor one? Is there actual suffering in regard to it? Did the water lie a long time on

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.) the land? Was it a benefit, or was it a disaster? These things our team will bring back the necessary evidence. And on the basis of that evidence of facts we will determine the policy, but not in advance.

MR. ROBERTS: You haven't a report from your team in the field yet then.

MR. WILLIS: There has been no report from the team yet. They are in the field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We shall see if we can pass one item here if we could.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, these are some remarks I want to make on this general discussion because we've been spending a good bit of time on questions and I probably am as much to blame for that as anyone else, but I did want to make some remarks with regard to the general statement that the --

MR. CHAIRMAN: On this A?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, on the general.

MR. WILLIS: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered a certain resolution and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker read the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.