

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, February 28, 1966.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 7.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (GLADSTONE): Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if my honourable friend the Minister intended to make some comment on the speeches made up to this point.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND CONSERVATION) (ROCK-WOOD-IBERVILLE): Mr. Chairman, I thought I'd save the time of the committee.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well in that case, Mr. Chairman, I feel that I should make two or three comments on the Minister's salary, and I don't hardly know where to begin -- that's a problem isn't it.

Mr. Chairman, if I lived in the City of Winnipeg the year round, particularly in the spring of the years, I think I would be inclined to question the reliability of the Flood Forecasting Committee. I listened with some interest to the first forecast of the season on Friday - was it, or Thursday - and it was, as the Minister suggested, slightly pessimistic. Then I started looking through my files to see what happened last year - because I do recall the helicopters all out on the front lawn here just about the time we rose last year - and I find that the first forecast that was given to us last year was on February 26 - just about a year to the day to the first one that we got this year - and it is headed: "Expect No River Flood This Year," and reports the Honourable Minister as having made that statement to the House.

Then on March 23 last year, a further statement was made - the second one, I would think -- (Interjection)-- The Free Press, I think. The Free Press on both of them for the information of my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and incidentally I am glad to welcome him back into the House after his week or two at home because the House is not the same without him. This second report, March 23, 1965, headed, "Flooding Not Seen Likely. Reporting on the second meeting of the Flood Forecasting Committee, Mr. Hutton said river stages in Winnipeg will be well below." And April 8th, Free Press again, "No Effects Here From South Dakota Floods, George Hutton advises the House." April 13, a week later, "Red Not A Threat So Far This Year." Mr. Chairman, that was April 13, in the afternoon, because I don't think we were sitting in the morning at that time - we certainly were not. Two days later, April 15, "May Evacuate Two Towns - Manitoba Pushes The Emergency Button." Forty-eight hours after he had made the statement in the House that there was no threat at all. And in the same paper - I believe it's the Tribune - yes, Tribune - Tribune this time - big headlines, "Danger Parallels That of 1958 - Fight Against the Flood Begins. Evacuation and diking begins." Forty-eight hours, or less than 48 hours after we were told in the House that there was no threat at all.

Now likely, as I said when I entered this - it's not a debate - when I entered the Estimates, that you might be surprised that I, coming from a rural area, would even raise this point at all, but I think it is rather interesting to those people who live in the Greater Winnipeg area and I think they would question the reliability of some of these sources if we can't get a little closer to it than this. I think I would want to be assured too, if I lived here, that there was adequate measures to take care of the flood this year if we had one.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, who is not in his seat at the moment but getting some instructions on the way that we ombudsmen are to perform - and I am looking forward with a great deal of interest to receiving certain information in this regard tomorrow morning - but the Honourable Member for Lakeside referred quite extensively to the cost-price squeeze and pointed up that he thought it was just as great in this year, and in 1965, as it was indeed in 1958.

Now of all the clippings that I have, Mr. Chairman, I think the three most prized ones that I have - and I think I will put them in my safety deposit box because they will likely be collectors' items sooner or later - are the three documents and lists of promises that were made by the party opposite in 1958, 1959 and 1965. The one in 1958, I believe that that is the year my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture - no, he didn't enter the House that year, it was the year following that - well anyway, the year before that, in the (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: The year before what? We've lost you.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I am quoting from the 9-point Program for Greater Manitoba that

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . was promised the electorate in 1958. My honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture says that even with all of those promises it didn't get him into the House that year, but he made it the second time around. Well anyway, what they said - and no doubt my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture has this memorized long ago - Education was first and then Agriculture. I'm quoting from that famous document and it says, "The Campbell government has abandoned the Manitoba farmers to the pressure of the cost-price squeeze and the Liberal Leader has says there is little or nothing that the Provincial Government can do in this regard" - and so on. And just as the Ottawa Liberals were turned out of office, the Provincial Liberals were turned out in the same fashion. They promised to do things to eliminate this cost-price squeeze that the Campbell government had abandoned for so many many years.

Now of course what my colleague the Member for Lakeside was pointing out, was they have not done it. They haven't eliminated the squeeze, the cost-price squeeze, and the Farmers' Union that met with us just - well one day last week, I believe it was - not more than ten days ago -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? It was this month anyway. They have a whole page in their brief that is devoted to cost-price squeeze in agriculture and they say: "Whereas due to the cost-price squeeze that agriculture is suffering from today, the small farmer is being liquidated at an alarming rate and indications are that three out of five more will be liquidated in the next ten years."

Now I know how my honourable friend the First Minister does not like us to use Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures because he prefers to use tables that he has gathered up himself, but nevertheless I think that we have to place a certain amount of confidence in the DBS and they - that is the Dominion Bureau of Statistics - recently made a release available to the public. That release is reported in the Free Press of August 6, headed: "Rising Costs, Falling Returns Widen for the Western Farmers." I'm not going to read all this, but I'm just going to read about two paragraphs to point up what the Farmers' Union fellows have said and what we have continued to say, that there is in fact a cost-price squeeze that the farmer feels himself caught in today.

I am quoting, Mr. Chairman. "At the start of the current growing season" - so this would be 1965 - August 6 - this is a report that was released from the DBS in Ottawa, and like most governments, their wheels grind pretty nearly to a stop sometimes -- (Interjection) -- That's right. "At the start of the current growing season, farm prices for agricultural products were 4.2 percent lower than prices received by farmers a year ago, but the cost of commodities and services used by the farmers was two percent higher" -- it just points up that there is in fact a cost-price squeeze and it is worse today than it was last year and it's worse today than it was in 1958 -- and it continues with this, " plus the huge cost of setting yourself up in the farming industry today, makes it a real problem.

Now my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, and indeed my honourable friend the First Minister, in speaking to the farm people in Brandon in January - the last week in January at that famous Farm Outlook Conference -- urged that we endeavour, as the Member for Lakeside has said, to strive for a \$5,000 farm gross income. Well, to me, gross income means absolutely nothing if you don't relate it to the cost of producing that crop, whatever it may be, and surely to goodness my friends opposite can comprehend that. That point is given plenty of publicity in the most recent farm business summary that is obtainable over at the Norquay Building, I think - the latest one I could get - and it is for the year 1964. Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend has the one for 1965, I'd be glad to have it, but this is the last one that I could get and they told me that this was the last one that was available - last week.

As my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture has suggested on so many occasions, this summary is compiled from the results of something in the neighbourhood of a thousand elite farmers - I think that's the term he uses, selected elite farmers in the area - and I understood him to say on February 14 that he had graduated a number of farmers this year and given them a diploma. I don't know what that diploma entitles them to do, but they have graduated and now they're asking for more assistance. Well anyway, on Page 20 and 21 of this report, summary of their activities, it's interesting to know that in 1963, and this is a report of 72 farms in the medium to high productivity soils - that is the better ones, I would take it - that the total operating receipts for the farms in this 72 farm group was \$12,634; their operating expenses, \$6,994; their net farm income, \$3,634; their operator's labour earnings, \$1,414; an average farm debt of \$9,739; an average capital investment of \$56,301; the actual number of work days, 368; the total operators equity, \$40,730; the gross expense ratio, 65.8; the daily

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . labour earnings, \$3.84; and the total acres, 676.

So from the capital investment of \$56,000 - from the capital investment of \$56,000, and after having worked for 368 days, they end up with \$3.84 per day for all of their trouble. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I want to ask my honourable friend who is a business man, the member for Brandon, if he had \$56,000 tied up, would he be satisfied to work for \$3.84 a day? My guess is he wouldn't be satisfied to work for \$3.84 an hour.

MR. LISSAMAN: I wouldn't feel badly if I had accumulated that capital in the meantime.

MR. SHOEMAKER: In how many years would my honourable friend -- and the rising costs of farm land, the rising cost of farm land -- but I'm just asking my honourable friend or any member in this House, would they be satisfied to work for \$3.84 a day if they had \$56,000 invested in anything - I don't care what it might be. -- (Interjection) -- Well, you could convert the \$56,000 into something else and that's exactly what the farmers are doing my honourable friend, and the farmers are diminishing in numbers pretty rapidly as everyone agrees - everyone agrees that they're diminishing in numbers. The Farmer Union farmers told us that two-fifths of them; two-fifths more of them would be gone in 10 years hence. They'll be reduced in numbers by another 40 percent.

Now it is always interesting for me to re-read a little statement that my honourable friend made - true, two or three years ago - but I find it still interesting because I'm still trying to figure it out. This was made to the Third National Farm and Business Forum on Friday, March 30, 1962. The Honourable George Hutton, Minister of Agriculture, speaking, and he says that sometimes he is asked what his philosophy is, and I would like to know what his philosophy is in respect to agriculture. He's talking in this particular paragraph about the family farm and I think I should read this, Mr. Chairman, because it is interesting, and I'm just going to read one paragraph. "I sometimes am asked what philosophy the Department of Agriculture has in developing agricultural programs. The main idea to me is the development of programs which provide social and economic good to the farm family within the harsh realities of a market oriented agricultural production. The main objective is to carry forward programs which allow the farmer the opportunity to make an income comparable to that received in secondary and service industries. All of this must be done within the concept of the family farm as the basic unit in agriculture. I am sure that the family farm will persist as a permanent institution due to the important place of the family farm in Canadian life, and to the fact that the family-operated farm has many inherent strengths over 'the field factory concept of farming'."

Now I would go along with that but I can't understand the government, after having made a statement of that kind, loaning three-quarters of a million dollars - sorry to bring this subject up again, we talked about it briefly last year - and turn around after making a statement of this kind and loan three-quarters of a million dollars to a field factory which he is opposed to. So perhaps when my honourable friend gets up he can perhaps tell us if his philosophy has changed in the last four or five years.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know when it would be in order for me to discard this famous document, because I think there comes a time in your files when you have to decide what you're going to throw out and what you're going to save for the future. I think, Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the Minister of Agriculture I'll have this one into the wastepaper basket. This is the famous one that is marked 1961 and headed, "Economic Survey of the South West Manitoba," and as you will recall, this is the one where we were going to have Christmas tree farming all over Manitoba and a Christmas tree marketing board at Erickson. The recommended industries for Neepawa, Minnedosa, Carberry, Erickson, Rapid City, was all Christmas tree farming, and a Christmas tree marketing board was to be established at Carberry.

Well, I haven't heard -- Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- They settled for potatoes which was a lot better idea than growing Christmas trees and setting up a Christmas tree marketing board. I have gone pretty thoroughly through that one and that's about all the recommendations they made, and gee whiz, if that's all they made, I think right now I'll heave it in the wastepaper basket because it like a lot of the other propaganda is of no value -- (Interjection) -- Well, it may have been good for one election but it won't be any good for the next one, that's for sure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend, when he made that statement about preserving the family farm and denouncing the field factory, my guess is that he was following - I was going to say following John, but he was following the Honourable Alvin Hamilton, who I understand was in Winnipeg last week giving my honourable friend a lot of new instructions.

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . In 1961, because the year before, the year before my honourable friend made this famous statement, this policy of preservation of the family farm and denouncing the field factory, I see that in the ARDA release, Edition 1961, and that one is headed, "A Rehabilitation Program in the Making;" and the other one, "The ARDA - What is it?" Well, I'm still wondering what is it? But the Honourable Alvin Hamilton makes statements in both of those - the same statement - and my honourable friend looks amazed and I think he has his ears bent forward because he wants me to read this one.

It says - I'm quoting the Honourable Alvin Hamilton, Minister of Agriculture in that day - "It is not the purpose of ARDA to reduce the number of farms. Those who feel that the small farm problem can be resolved by uprooting people arbitrarily from their farms do not understand the deep attachment of rural people to their home surroundings. ARDA is designed rather to help, by various means, to improve the income and standard of living of the smaller and more marginal farms and in that way help improve the over-all position of agriculture." Well, that was the Honourable Alvin Hamilton that made those statements on numerous occasions, and repeated on numerous occasions by our honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture. In the light of that, I can't understand his philosophy and perhaps -- I can't understand his philosophy on so many things and I can't understand it in particular when he designs legislation that is not intended, but does contribute to putting the family farm out of business.

Well, my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce and I attended a ceremony to mark the Auction Mart birthday at Gladstone here a year or two ago and I rather liked the little story that he told, but I cannot repeat it in the House, Mr. Chairman. At the noon luncheon we had, he told a little story to point up how little that he knew about agriculture. I'll tell my honourable friend some day about it. (Interjection) Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- I don't think it would be parliamentary. But anyway, anyway, after reciting the little story to point up how little that he know about agriculture, I see that the next day - I think it was about the next day, speaking to - he was guest speaker at The Canadian Hatcheries Federation and he says, "Livestock has a bright future," but he says that in spite of all that, 19,000 farm workers will leave the farms by 1975. Well, that doesn't sound like a very bright future for the family farm - for the family farm.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I intend to take part -- just because I've spoken for 30 minutes now doesn't suggest at all that I do not intend to take part on some of the other items later on, because I am disturbed about certain other programs or the lack of them that the government has implemented.

I know it would be too much to ask my honourable friend to supply every member of the House with this reference textbook because I understand they're charging \$3.00 for it, but I suppose there would be nothing wrong with our buying one if we could take up a collection. But I see that this one differs, it says here in an article that I have before me, in that this one is based on what some experts have compiled. The inference is that it differs from all the other publications because experts were called in to compile this one. And so I think even if it does cost me \$3.00, I will invest \$3.00 in it and see how it does differ from all of the other propaganda sheets that are put out. Surely if we pay \$3.00 for it, it should be of some value.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that I will now sit down and hear what my honourable friend - what his philosophy is in this day and age - 1966 - in respect to the family farm and see what measures he has designed to see what measures he . .

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Sure

MR. HUTTON: You said near the end of your talk that you couldn't understand why the government could be interested in the small farmer and at the same time introduce certain legislation. You never enlarged on that.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Oh yes, I'd be very pleased to give my honourable friend what I was referring to. I suggested earlier that at the last session of the Legislature the government had loaned three-quarters of a million dollars to the FFF farms. And was this not in fact, a field factory? If it is not the definition of a field factory, then I would like my honourable friend to probably start off his little talk by defining the family farm, defining a field factory, so that we can see the difference in the two, because it is a fact that the government loaned the FFF farms three-quarters of a million dollars. We established that, and I'm not going to elaborate on that again this year, because we established that last year for sure. (Interjection) The Friendly Family Farms. I wonder if my honourable friend has not heard of that. Where was he last year for two weeks when we debated the FFF farms? Where was he when we searched titles

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . and we did find out? The government would not give us the information that we asked for. We knew we could get it anyway. You know, Mr. Chairman, you being one of these lawyers, you know that in respect to mortgages and titles that if the government fail to give us the information we want, all we got to do is pay \$3.00 for a search at the Land Titles Office. We can get the information anyway. It costs us \$3.00, sure; but we can get it. And this is frankly the way we got it last year. Let's not kid ourselves. So I hope that I have satisfied my honourable friend; and if he wants more evidence in this regard, why we'll try and supply it to him at a little later date. You know, Mr. Chairman, I've answered his question, I think (Interjection) - Why did he ask for it? I think he's wondering that now too, why he asked for it.

But on page 203, of this year's Hansard, my honourable friend made rather an interesting statement, in the last paragraph that he made, Page 203, Mr. Hutton speaking in the Throne Speech debate you know. And he says, like myself he says this "And I'll just say this before I sit down. The record of production in terms of constant physical volume shows that prior to this government taking over in 1958 Manitoba had lost ground from 1944 to 1945, and then he skipped 13 years. (Interjection) That's what you said now. Mr. Chairman, here is another front bencher denying that he ever made statements. I have my trouble with the Attorney-General in the statements that he makes. I'm referring to page 203 of Hansard, and if he did not make this statement then surely the Hansard can be corrected tomorrow morning, not tonight. (Interjection) He made this two weeks ago, this statement, and that's not so far back that most of us, even if we are in our dotage can remember two weeks.

I'll read it again, Mr. Chairman, because they seem to question the statement that my honourable friend made. I didn't make it. Last paragraph on page 203, "And I'll just say this before I sit down"- this is the Honourable Minister of Agriculture speaking "The record of production in terms of constant physical volume shows that prior to this government taking over in 1958 Manitoba had lost ground from 1944 to 1945 and that since 1958 we've gained ground.

MR. HUTTON: Well use your head.

MR. SHOEMAKER: There's 13 years missing. What happened in those thirteen years? And he says "it's just as simple as that."

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, mine is a slip of the tongue, not of the head.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well then my honourable friend should make the correction in Hansard, that's all I say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 7 --

MR. HRYHORCZUK: No, Mr. Chairman, no I'm afraid that from the response that my colleague received in this House for the past half hour or so insofar as the family farm is concerned, I don't think that we should pass it up that lightly. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks mentioned prior to the supper hour that he realizes the plight of the farmers, but it took him some time to find out just what it was. It would appear to me that there are still some members in this House who don't quite appreciate what the family farm means and the danger it's in and what it will mean to the economy of our country.

I may feel a lot stronger than most members, Mr. Chairman, because I happen to come from a country that is based on the family farm and I would only like to remind the members that it was the family farm that built up the economy of Canada. Without the family farm we wouldn't have the Canada of today. It would have been impossible. It was the family farm that provided the raw material for building up this country, for building up a lot of our factories, our cereal factories, our elevators throughout the country, the terminals, even the railroads to a large degree, the abattoirs, the packers, the leather manufacturers, and you could go on indefinitely as to what the family farm meant to this country; and I repeat that without the family farm, Mr. Chairman, we wouldn't have the Canada of today. I don't think that we should take lightly the contribution that these people have made and the hazards and the hardships that they worked under to achieve an economy in this country that we have today; and when we say that it is no longer the basic industry but that manufacturing is taking over, I would disagree with that entirely, Mr. Chairman, because take away the farming industry from Canada, and how much of an industry will you have left insofar as manufacturing is concerned?

I think that our family farms gave the people of this country quality, quantity of food unsurpassed anywhere else, at the lowest prices that the consumer could purchase it anywhere else; and I feel that once the family farm has disappeared, if it does -- and with the

(MR. HRYHORCZUK, cont'd) . . . policies that both our Federal Government and our Provincial Governments are following, it would not surprise me to see it disappear. During the term of this Minister's office more farmers have been forced off the land than under any other Minister in the history of this country. Now that doesn't mean to say that he is to blame for this. I'm not blaming him for it. Circumstances which are beyond the control of the farmer are forcing him off - and I want to put myself on record as saying that neither of our governments are doing what they should do to keep them on the farm. That is the point. Now where does the family farmer stand? What is it we talk about him? What is this cost price squeeze that we hear so often that we're really getting tired of listening to it? I'm quite sure that a lot of the members of the House do not like to hear this repeated over and over and over again. But it has to be repeated, Mr. Chairman, because the farmers have not been receiving the publicity that they should have been receiving. No matter where you turn, anything you hear, it makes it appear to the people of Canada that the farmer is having it rosy, that all is well. We hear it from the Minister. In his address today, I don't think he intended to leave that impression but he certainly did - that all is well on the farm.

Here is a report that was placed on my desk today, and it's the monthly review of the Bank of Nova Scotia, January 1966. And how's it headed? "Buoyant Markets for Farm Products." It leaves the people at large under the impression that the farmers are very well off. They are doing exceptionally well and all they do is gripe. Well that's far from the true situation, Mr. Chairman. During the past - well any number of years, you can name them yourself - the price of the manufacturers' articles have been climbing continuously. - Labor earnings have been climbing continuously. Hooked onto what? - onto the price index, and productivity. The farmer has none of these benefits. The price of farm products are not based on the price index. He is not paid for being more efficient, more productive. His per unit price remains about the same as it was in 1949, in some instances, even less.

And again today I picked up a brochure here which is issued by the Meat Packers Council of Canada, and just let's see what the farmer is receiving or has been receiving for his livestock which is a very important part of the industry in this province. Now if we look at the average annual prices Toronto per hundredweight, there may be a slight difference between that price and the Winnipeg price, but this gives you an indication of what is happening. In 1958, feeder steers sold at 23.50; now in '59, they sold at 25.10; in '60 they were below the figure of '58, 22.90; '61, 22.70; '62, 24.90; '63, 25.30; '64, 22.80. So you see the price is just about constant and at times it drops considerably.

Now what about production? Have we improved our production in the last few years, always remembering that we have less farmers every year producing; because they are being forced off the farms there is less of them left. In 1958 the number of cattle was 11 million cattle on the farms in Canada. Today it is 13 million. So the farmer is doing his bit. There is no doubt about that. But he can't carry on when other segments of the society receive the protection of the government and are subsidized in one way or another and the farmer is not. I think it is correct to say, Mr. Chairman, that the support in the way of prices that the farmer in Canada receives is probably one of the lowest in the western world. I don't think that any other country gives as low a price support as we farmers receive in Canada. I think that is a correct statement; there may be an exception or two but I doubt it.

Now, what is going to happen if the family farm is displaced? In the first place, as I have mentioned before in this House, a lot of little villages and towns are going to fold up - and they are beginning to fold up right now. You can go down any of our highways through the towns and you will see anywhere from 25% to 50% of the business establishments closed.

Now there are other reasons than the fact that the farmers have gone off the land, but the primary reason is because the customers are there no longer. What the farmers have contributed to the economy of this country is going to be lost because your corporation or commercial farm, whatever you want to call it, is not going to equal the demand for the manufactured products that the family farm - the market that the family farm provided. There is no question about that. And we have no assurance, Mr. Chairman, that they will give us the services that the family farm has given us, nor have we the assurance that we'll be able to buy the food as cheap as we have until this time. In fact, I can predict that if the family farm disappears and we have corporation farmers, they're going to be in that business for a profit and the consumer will pay what the corporation farmer wants for his product, not the way it is today. And I think because of that, we should do everything in our power to keep that family farm in existence.

(MR. HRYHORCZUK, cont'd)

I quite agree that the size of the family farm of the past can't possibly exist on the farm, even with reasonable assistance from both governments. I agree with that. But they are expanding to the size now where they should be able to operate and to make a fair living on the farm, providing that they receive the same type of treatment that other segments of society are receiving from the two levels of government, and I say again that the farmers are not receiving the same assistance and the same consideration.

Now what can this government do to help the family farm who at the moment is large enough, or there is hope of him being large enough, to exist on the farm. I have said this before and I repeat it, Mr. Chairman, that there are things that this government can do and I can name some of the things that can be done.

For example, I have suggested that the government not only offer to make soil tests; if it has to go out of its way to make the soil test for the farmer - and surely this isn't going to be too expensive - why not go out and make them, analyze the type of soil that the farmer is on, and suggest to him what type of crop to grow or what kind of livestock to go in - surely that's not asking for too much - tell him what type of fertilizer to use, and the quantity of fertilizer to use. All these things will improve his efficiency and probably in the end give him a larger margin of profit than he has today, because most of our farmers today, from my personal knowledge, are operating at cost or below cost in a lot of places.

There was this question of some farmer that the Honourable Member from Selkirk mentioned, had \$56,000 capital - and some members wondered where this came from. Well down in my country it didn't come from the farm - it didn't come from the farm. The farmers there, for as long back as I can remember, supplemented their revenues from the farm with work outside. They probably spent half the time working out to get enough money to buy the type of equipment they needed. I'd also like to know how big a debt is outstanding against this \$56,000. There could be considerable.

I say that we should take the matter to heart because we are not appreciative - and I'm not saying this in the manner to criticize or hurt anybody - we must show our appreciation for the contribution of the family farm to the general economy of Canada and we must admit that without the family farm Canada would have never, never made the progress that it has, and if we have to go out of our way and spend a little bit of money, even less than we spend on the other segments of society, I don't think we'll be making a mistake.

. continued on next page

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, you know, you'll forgive me if I quote a saying that is attributed to Abraham Lincoln. At a time like this, one gets a little comfort out of it. The saying is: "That as long as people are kicking you in the backside, they can't get ahead of you." There have been some reliance on statistics within the House to prove our point. We got involved in this in the Throne Speech, and then again today in consideration of the Estimates and in consideration of the problem that's facing the agricultural industry and the people who are involved in it. I think one always wants to remember that little story about the use of statistics, that statistics are to a politician like the lamp post is to a drunk, they are there more for support than enlightenment. Sometimes the way they are used, they can be quite confusing. I have in my hand a clipping here from today's paper which shows that, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, that the cash receipts of the farmers of Manitoba in the year 1965 were 10 percent higher than the previous year. So if we didn't sustain the 10 percent increase in the cost of production, this is one year - or the year '65 is one year in which the farmer probably gained a bit, although I must agree that in the over-all we have to run awfully fast to stay in the same place in respect to the cost price squeeze; and of course this is the reason why the Premier of Manitoba has called for a national conference. Because on the one hand, as has been stated before, we face tremendous opportunities to produce food in the future, but we can only capitalize on those foods if we remain very competitive with the other important food producing areas of the world.

The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains stated that there were more farmers forced off the land under my ministry as Minister of Agriculture than anyone else. Well I don't have the figures going back too far, but between the years 1951 and 1965, the number of farms dropped from 52,383 to 41,000. I was responsible for a drop from 45,600 to 41,000. In the previous eight years it dropped about 6,000, so I've got nothing to brag about; but on the other hand, I don't think I'm any worse than the fellows who came before. If I remember correctly, I think I probably held this office longer than a few of my predecessors did and in that respect probably I'm setting some records. It's the reverse of hockey where if you're fortunate enough to stay active you can score a lot of goals. It wouldn't have really mattered what my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains said to me at this Session of the Legislature; I couldn't have said very much back because last summer we were holidaying up in the Duck Mountains and if any of you folk have ever had a flat tire on a 4x8 wheel, you will understand the difficulties that a fellow can get in when he hasn't got any tools, etcetera to change tires. My honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains just happened along and boy did he help me out, so you don't take a tire wrench when a fellow is helping you out and beat him around the ears with it.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: If I may interject, will the Honourable Minister just forget about that instance and go ahead with his job.

MR. HUTTON: No, I have a very warm feeling toward my friend. I'd like to say at this time that I'm very sorry that the remarks that I made with respect to the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, offended him. Certainly I hold that gentleman in respect and I didn't intend that he should take them in the way that he did and maybe we can start over again.

On this question of free soil testing. On the face of it, there's some merit in what the honourable member suggests, but if he has ever gone out and taken samples on his place - I think he probably has - he'll know that it's no little job. I would hate to see us saddled with the cost of going over all the farms of Manitoba every year and taking the soil samples, because under the new system it's no use taking a test from a previous year and using them in subsequent years. You have to have your soil tested every year because the available nutrients in the soil change depending upon the cropping pattern that you've had and certainly depending upon the weather conditions. For instance, I recall here a year or two ago we had a very sunny fall, a long dry sunny fall, and the nitrogen content in the soil built up to the point where even on stubble, on analysis, the experts who did the analysis recommended heavy applications of phosphate fertilizer rather than nitrogen fertilizer and some people who had bought their fertilizer on the strength of previous experience found themselves with a stock of the wrong kind of fertilizer, and I know some that had to change it. So I think that we should endeavour to encourage our farmers through education etcetera and keeping them informed of the advantages, the monetary advantages of using fertilizer and using this soil testing service. And I think they'll use it. As a matter of fact, I think they're probably more likely to go by the tests if they have to pay for them than if you give them to them for nothing. It's been the experience of the department sometimes, when they give a very valuable service, that this service tends to lay on the shelf just because it didn't cost the farmer anything. Now the cost

(MR. HUTTON cont'd).....of soil testing, relative to the cost of applying the fertilizer, is very small, and in most cases he can save himself substantial amounts of money by getting the specific recommendations that he can through a soil test rather than using the general recommendations that are available through the department.

Flood forecasting reliability. Well that's why we're building the Red River diversion because flood forecasting is not a reliable science at the present time. As a matter of fact I recall we had a flood here in Manitoba in '60 - I think Gladstone was caught in that when the White Mud River overflowed, and I got a letter from a very irate constituent of the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa in which they said that our forecasting wasn't worth very much - I can't tell you exactly what they said in the letter but I'll let you use your imagination. I think the short answer here is that this is why we have to build permanent works, that at best a flood forecast is only an alarm to do what you can to fight it and to be ready to fight with what you have; and every one of us knows that there is a limit to the ability that we have to fight a flood, depending upon the level or the peak flow.

The philosophy of the family farm? Well, I don't think that we have changed. I haven't changed in my philosophy about the family farm. I believe it has been the backbone of this nation; I believe that it will continue to be the backbone of this nation. I believe that the kind of development, the field factory type of operation is going to be in the minority. It has a particular application in certain areas of production - poultry. I think we could well see it in hog production in the future where there are tremendous responses to control environment, etcetera; in the case of multiple birth, as in poultry and in swine production. I think it's not likely to take over the general kind of farming that we have known. I think that the impact of technology and science has gone so far along the road in some aspects of farm production, such as poultry, that to try to stem the tide would be like trying to turn back the flow over Niagara Falls. It's inevitable. There's one way to fight it and that's to be as big as the other fellow. And when you have some knowledge of the proportions, the dimensions, of the poultry industry in other parts of Canada and in the United States, when you consider that the broiler producers for instance down in Tennessee are producing on a scale where they are competing in the United Kingdom for the market there, then I think one can see the futility, the utter futility, of saying that we will stand in the way of such production techniques in Manitoba because we believe that they are detrimental to our concept of what the family farm should be. And even in the case of the Friendly Family Farms, I think one must remember that ~~here were~~ a group of people, farmers, actual farmers, who saw in this kind of organization of their resource and their finances, a way of surviving in a very competitive field of production. I don't think really that the government's policy in respect to this particular enterprise could be interpreted as a move detrimental to the family farms in this province.

There's another thing, when we're talking about statistics and we talk about farms, in the Premier's statement about wanting to raise the minimum level of production to \$5,000 a year, this is in one sense compared with the incomes of non-farm families, a \$5,000 total gross output is a pretty modest kind of income for the farmer who would realize a pretty modest kind of income. But you know that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, when they classify farms, call any estate that is an acre of land or more, and where more than \$50.00 worth of produce is sold in a year, they call that a farm -- an acre of land and an annual production of \$50.00 is called a farm. Well, how many of these farms do we have? Under three acres, we have 209; three to nine acres, 553 (this is 1961); 10 to 69 acres, 1,909; 70 to 239 acres or what we would call 240, 10,460; 240 to 399, 12,562 farms -- there were about 25,000 farms which were pretty small in Manitoba in terms of production. And it's this group where the production is small -- oh, here I have it, this is the one I wanted to use for you. Gross Sales: 25,818 of 43,000 farms in 1961 sold products worth less than \$3,750.00. Now some people if you talk to them about a farm would say well, this isn't a farm at all today because that kind of production just simply can't support a modern, standard of living on the farm today. It was fine when the mode of transportation was a horse and buggy or even the model T Ford or even the Model A Ford; it was fine when the kind of lighting you had was kerosene; it'll support a privy, but it won't support modern conveniences in the home. This level of production - aside from price factor altogether, we have to raise this level of production if we want people in this category to be able to share in the good things that we're all striving to achieve for ourselves and the people that we represent. And it's a prodigious job.

There's been a great deal said by the Honourable Member for Lakeside about the cost price squeeze, how this has continued to trouble the agricultural industry and the individuals

(MR. HUTTON cont'd). in the agricultural industry. Certainly the cost price squeeze is a big problem and this is what we have been trying to alleviate. As I say I don't think we have made a lot of progress; I think it's still with us. But we have tried. We have tried by putting new tools in the people's hands, new tools that they can use to increase the productivity on their farms. As I say I don't think we've made a great deal of progress but I think we've been able to hang on in a very competitive field today. And such programs as Farm Credit, we have tried to make that -- last year you were part of making that Act more flexible, more generous. It did help. I gave you the facts this afternoon. It did help a great deal.

Crop insurance. The Honourable Member for Lakeside spent quite a time today demonstrating the variability of yields and the vulnerability of the farmer to all kinds of natural hazards. This was a big fact and one over which he had little control. This is why we introduced crop insurance. This is why we feel good this year because 90 percent of the farmers of Manitoba are going to be able to protect themselves if they want to. This is why we have started the farm business groups so that we could work intensively with individual farmers -- and we have got 900. I'd like to see double that number, at least. This is why we have started to offer this farm management consultative services so that when the fellows are finished the four year course if they want to continue this close association, if they want to continue to get intensive consideration of their problems, we can give them that service. And I think to be able to offer this service to farmers for \$200.00 a year is a pretty good deal. It would be better if we could do it for \$100.00. But there's some question I think as to whether philosophically we should offer this kind of a service which is tailored to the farmer's needs, to his specific needs, that we should offer it at a cost to the taxpayers. The farmers have indicated to us that they are willing to pay to have this service if we will make it available and underwrite it.

We have tried in the provision for, in improving marketing -- and we're babes in the woods in this I must admit -- but again I think that we have put money in the hog producers in Manitoba through the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission; I think we have put money in the pockets of the potato producers in 1965 through providing the Potato Marketing Commission, and I feel reasonably sure that we'll put money in the pockets of the producers of other root crops in this year thru the function of The Vegetable Marketing Commission. We have stepped up our program in education through the use of modern media, and as I pointed out today we believe that it is being effective.

Then I think another thing we have done for the farmers of this province -- and there's a lot of them left that haven't been looked after, as the Honourable Member for La Verendrye said, they need better drains, but over the last seven or eight years, we have had an unprecedented drainage program in our good agricultural lands in this province -- an unprecedented program -- and we have given protection to people, a level of protection that they never hoped to have in the past. The job isn't finished -- don't let anybody get that idea -- it's going to take a while yet, but I think under the new program of provincial waterways, we're going to be able to provide a level of protection for a lot of people who never hoped to ever have that kind of protection, at least from one kind of natural hazard, and that of flooding.

I think that certainly we can't protect prices except in our association with the Federal Government and in urging them and encouraging them to take all reasonable steps to give stability of price, but in all these other areas which affect a man's pocketbook, because always remember that the total income to the farmer per acre is the price per bushel times the number of bushels; and if we can help him have more bushels, or more pigs or more poultry, or more cattle through the use of the programs that we have, then I think that we can help him to cope with what is a very -- well let's call it a rat race. That's what it is in agriculture. It's a bit of a rat race, because as I've often said, farmers in Manitoba are not only competing with themselves, but they are competing with farmers all across the nation, all over this continent and all over the world; and all we can attempt to do is within our jurisdiction to carry out programs to introduce policies which will help him remain competitive. I believe that many of our programs in spite of what has been said, and allowing that they aren't foolproof at all, I think our programs have helped farmers in Manitoba to maintain their competitive position and in fact to gain a little bit on the others that are in this race.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I want to return to the matter of soil tests and type of production and the use of fertilizer. Insofar as the soil tests are concerned the Minister says that he feels that the services given now are better than they would be if the department went out and sent men out to the individual farms. Well one thing he said today, out of a few

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd). . . . that really surprised me, is that the same soil can require different types of fertilizer from year to year, instead of the same type.

Well I don't know what is involved in the actual processing of a soil sample, but if it doesn't involve too much equipment, would he consider the suggestion of establishing soil testing stations in our major centers such as Brandon, Portage, Dauphin, Swan River, Neepawa where the farmer could come in with his soil sample when he's in town and come in for the results when the test is finished. If that could be done it would be a great help. I still feel it would make a world of a difference to the farmer if he was advised as to what he should be producing on the particular farm that he is on. I think that is something that we have not been able to get home to the individual farmer. In spite of our TV programs and everything else, it still doesn't seem to get home. I think the Minister mentioned that they had one program in which 450 people showed an interest. Well that's not a big percentage, out of what - around 14, 000 farmers or something that we have in the Province of Manitoba?

Now as to the flooding of lands, I really don't know where the Minister has been doing all this work he's telling us about, but I do know that I live in a place that's at the base of the escarpment of the Duck Mountains and our flooding damages there are serious; and I think the same thing applies to the people living in and around the Riding and the Turtle and so forth, because the head waters of, oh hundreds of creeks come out of these mountains and although the river or creek may be small in itself, it may only affect a half a dozen or ten farmers; but when you multiply that by 100 creeks it means a lot of farmers.

Now there's one thing I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister and that is that they should have a little more control of the manner in which they clean out these creeks and rivers as winter projects. In my area I know of two winter projects that were cleaning out the beds and banks of creeks. Instead of starting at the bottom of the creek they started at the top, and they worked down from the top for a short distance and that would be it and then the flooding would be much worse the following spring than it was the year before. I think that the engineers who are in charge of these works, if there are engineers in charge of them, should see to it that if there is any cleaning out of river beds and creek beds, that they start at the proper place, and that is at the bottom of the creek and work up against the stream, instead of starting at the top and working down.

MR. VIELFAURE: On the matter of soil testing, I agree with the Minister when he says that some charge should be made so that it should be appreciated. I think this is very true, because if we just went out testing and giving out information, much of it wouldn't be used. I would like to know what is the relation as to the cost by the department of doing the test compared to the \$9.00 that is being charged? What I have in mind is many of the land in my own district where you have a great deal of variety within a quarter section, where actually you would need more than one test, and establish the real need for the fertilizer use. Of course it is very hard for the layman to figure out what the cost is to the department and I wonder if the Minister could tell us.

MR. HUTTON: The charge is \$9.00 for a wheat sample; that's \$3.00 for each type of soil. They take three different types. They test the first 6 inches, the next 6 inches and the last foot; and you send in a composite sample.

The \$9.00 covers the cost - well it doesn't quite yet - but when we get built up to a volume we believe it will pretty well carry the cost of the program. We have adopted a bit of a policy we stole from the Pool - "service at cost" you know, and we try to offer these services to the farmers at exactly what it costs the government to provide them.

The question of soil samples, I think that the honourable member has maybe a pretty good idea here that we do more to encourage farmers to turn in their samples by more decentralization. I can't see the lab being decentralized. I can see the receiving and dispensing of the recommendations being decentralized. As a matter of fact, an awful lot of our farmers go into our ag reps right at the present time to get advice on how to take samples and for all I know they may forward them to the soil testing lab through the ag rep office. I'm not too clear on this, but maybe we could do more to encourage this sort of thing. We feel within the department that there has been a pretty good response to soil tests. I don't think we anticipated at the start that the program would latch on the way it did, as quickly. I think it's a good thing to have the program discussed as we are here tonight to give it more publicity because probably there are few programs within the department which can put more money into the farmers' pockets than soil tests, because we know that the proper use of fertilizer will assist the crop to withstand a good deal of rough treatment on the part of weather.

(MR. HUTTON cont'd).....

For instance in a drought period and I'd just like to say this - I think the Honourable Member for Lakeside this afternoon mentioned that if we ever had a drought of the proportions of the thirties, we'd really be hurt again. Well, this may come as a surprise, but the precipitation during the period 1956 to 1961 in western Canada was less than it was during the worst period in the thirties; and in spite of that, we maintained some pretty substantial yields, except for the year 1961. The largest reason for maintaining yields during this droughty period was the new technology of farming, the new methods of cultivation, the tremendous power and the ability to time your operations, the ability to take advantage of all the moisture that is available. Most certainly the wide use of fertilizer enables the field crop, whatever it is, to withstand the unfavourable weather conditions, no matter whether it's too dry or too wet, whatever the case may be. But certainly I think your suggestion about getting closer to the farmer with this kind of program is a very worthwhile one and although I believe we are doing that at the present time, maybe we can increase our efforts in this respect.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman that's come to my mind after hearing the Minister reply, and that is in the case of re-testing would it be necessary every year to go through the three stratas for a re-test? The chemical change takes place through the 18 inches of the soil does it?

MR. HUTTON: The roots of a wheat plant go down four feet.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: That isn't my question, how deep the roots of the.....but what change - the chemical content of the soil change from year to year to a depth of 18 inches and more, or is it only the surface soil that

MR. HUTTON: It changes to that depth. That is the depth from which the plant is drawing its nutrients and that is the depth to which the available nutrients in the soil can be used up or accumulated.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, because the Honourable Minister hasn't commented on some of the things I said before the dinner hour, I feel that I should probably enlarge on it. I said this afternoon that many farmers feel that the Extension Service is not reaching the very people who need the services most. I thought he would have mentioned something about that, because many farmers feel that extension workers are bypassing them and many people are applying directly now to the university for information rather than the Extension Service.

Now in view of the good work that has been done by the Extension Service over the years, I feel that this is worth looking into. Many people feel that the extension services now given by the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture should be placed under the University of Manitoba where they have more access to research materials and the like. We have heard so much about the propaganda pamphlets that have been issued by the Department of Agriculture over the years, and while I don't hold too closely to that idea, I look upon them as a means of communication between the people who work in agricultural science and the farmer.

I think it's a good thing, but I did say some few years ago, upon the advent of the sewer and water program in the Province of Saskatchewan, that I thought that all that would happen in Manitoba in regard to this type of development would be simply a few more pamphlets by the Extension Department of Agriculture. I would like the Minister to say something about this because I think a lot of farmers think this way. We are taught in industry if a man has a grievance, whether it's real or imaginary it certainly deserves not to be ignored, and I'd like to hear the Honourable Minister talk about the Extension Service.

MR. HUTTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry that I overlooked the remarks that the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks made because they were very pertinent; I think he touched on one of the very real problems in extension work. I would say at the outset though that I wouldn't be worried about the kind of person who fails to get what they want from us and goes directly to the university. This is not the person who needs us most. You know an educated man is not one that knows everything; he is just one who knows where to get information, and this case applies to farmers.

Many of our farmers utilize the university; they utilize the feed mill - most of the feed mills now have nutritionists on staff - graduate agriculturists; seed companies, chemical companies have agricultural graduates who are specialists in their particular field. So there is nothing to worry about when a farmer consults these people, but there are a lot of people who have been on the tail end of agriculture for a long long time and I think they develop an outlook - almost a dependency, some of them I suppose - a feeling that somehow or other all this new-fangled stuff has nothing to do with them. Well we have tried to orient our extension work to reach these people.

(MR. HUTTON cont'd).....

As I stated earlier in this Session, the TV program that was originally developed in Manitoba was a joint project between the CBC, the University of Manitoba and the Department of Agriculture. It was the first kind of this kind of program to be developed in Canada. It was a Manitoba program for the first two years and then subsequently Alberta and Saskatchewan joined with it and it became a regional show. It's a five day program; it's called "This Business of Farming"; and it is an attempt to reach a lot of people who ordinarily are not in touch with the Department of Agriculture. For your information - I think you'll find this interesting - the first year there was a very careful and detailed survey made by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and they found that 50 percent of the operators of farms in Manitoba watched that show and that half of them had never had any contact with the Department of Agriculture in the previous years. I think this was a very interesting bit of information to find out.

Now we have continued with that program and we have a weekly series through - - there is a 15-minute weekly program called "Ag Review" on the Brandon television station, three 5-minute programs per week on the Yorkton station, five to ten minutes of agricultural content on a weekly CJAY-TV Winnipeg program, and a similar amount of home-making content in the same program. In addition, as I said, this year we tried to teach farm accounting over television and it was, we felt, reasonably successful. We had a very good response to it. Now the people who took this course will be of course in addition to those that we are dealing with directly.

Now I'd like to underline this thing because the honourable member and others here have put their finger on this thing. A lot of our small farms are going to go down the drain and we only kid ourselves if we think they're not going to go, but there are a lot of them on the other hand that need not go down the drain. We can't save them all but we can save some, and in the experience of the Department of Agriculture since I have been Minister, the answer seems to lie in a very much closer and personal association between the farmers of the province and the members of the extension staff. It there's one program that we have that we know is doing the job, it's the farm business group, and here, over a four-year period, these men have a once a month contact with people from the department, and the results of analysis of their business over a four-year period show that on the average they have moved ahead of the average progress being made in Manitoba.

Now it may seem like a laborious task, but I believe that the answer in extension service in the future is to increase this close contact work of the department with individual farmers in the province. I am not talking necessarily about the elite farmers here; I'm talking about farmers who really want to farm and they want to find the answers, because I think not only are we able to give them techniques and knowledge to help them, but I think that they, over the four-year period, learn appreciation of agriculture and of their opportunities in agriculture.

You know one of the most inhibiting things with a fellow who is down at the bottom of the ladder is his fear, his fear of taking a chance. He is scared to move because he may lose the one rung that he has on the ladder, and I think that one of the things, one of the very real gains or advantages that comes out of this close contact is that these men end up at the end of the four-year period, not with a certificate to hang on the wall - they get that - but they get a sense of their own worth and their own position in the nature of society and a determination that they're not going to be stumped. I have always been impressed at every one of these graduations that I attend, at the morale of the individuals who have taken part in these courses.

So I say, "You're exactly right when you talk about the need of getting to the people who need it," and we have done, I believe, a great deal in this respect. Mind you, there's still thousands of farmers that we haven't had contact with but we'll keep on trying; we'll keep on intensifying our efforts; and I believe that over the years that such a policy will pay off.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture has touched on a matter that is very close to we of the New Democratic Party, and that is how to reach the greatest number of people possible insofar as methodology in agriculture is concerned. I appreciate very much his remarks, but I think, Mr. Chairman, he is missing the boat completely. I think we here in Manitoba in the past, insofar as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, have missed the boat.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, a year ago my colleague from Brokenhead, who is now the MP for Springfield, laid before this Assembly a proposition in the field of education which called for a closer liaison between agriculture and education in the province. Historically, our ag reps have been connected with the Department of Agriculture. The Minister has just

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) stated that there are untold numbers of people who are interested in agriculture who have not been contacted. Our proposition of a year ago was to set up in the field of agriculture, and in the field of education, a closer relationship. Our proposal at that time was that the agricultural representative should be associated with the Department of Education rather than that of the Department of Agriculture in order that the young farmer - and by the young farmer in this instance, Mr. Chairman, I mean the boy and girl attending high school in the Province of Manitoba - would become closer associated with the problems of agriculture.

As I survey the curriculum in the Department of Education, there isn't any emphasis on problems of agriculture, and surely, Mr. Chairman, if we're going to give to the boy and girl in our rural areas an incentive and provide them with the knowledge in the operation of a family farm or indeed a large scale farm, where better a place is there than in the educational system in the province. The Minister has said that we have been missing the boat by not having a close contact with the grass roots on the farm. I agree with you, sir, that we have been missing the boat, and I think you are continuing to miss the boat when you and your department set aside the Agricultural Representative from the educational authorities in the rural areas in particular.

We pride ourselves on the job that our 4-H Clubs are doing throughout the province, and I join with others in paying a tribute to the work that is going on as far as the 4-H Clubs are concerned, but I would like to hear from my friend the Minister of Agriculture as to whether or not there has been any consultations between himself as Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Education insofar as the proposition that was suggested by my former colleague, Ed Schreyer of Brokenhead, just a year ago, because if we are going to make agriculture a paying proposition in Manitoba, then we need the full participation of our young people.

I heard the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains a few moments ago talking about the question of the contribution that has been made in the past and is indeed still being made by the family farms, the contribution they made to the history of our province and the history of our Dominion, and it's true. Where we're missing the boat in my opinion, so far as agriculture is concerned, we're forgetting the farmer. We're not considering the farmer as being a person but rather a producer of wheat, oats and flax.

I think if one takes the trouble to take a look at the problems in agriculture today, we find that notwithstanding the advances that have been made in the field of agriculture so far as production and productivity is concerned, we're still not producing, we're still not exporting sufficient cereals and grains to feed a hungry world. Indeed, as far as the economics are concerned in the Manitoba farming, we heard the announcement from the Honourable Mitchell Sharp the other day that in this progressive society of ours, the farmer for the last crop year is going to receive 10 cents a bushel less than he did the year before. If this is the agricultural policy of the Liberal authority at Ottawa, then I suggest that it's time for a change once again down at Ottawa. It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that we oftentimes forget the farmer as an individual, a person who requires sufficient income in order to be a real vital part of the community.

In the field of production and productivity, as I say, we have made advances. I recall as a young fellow at school - and this is a few years ago now - we used to consider ourselves as the breadbasket of the world. I think I am correct in saying, Mr. Chairman, that our carry-over this year of wheat is greater than it has been for a number of years, at the same time when we're having a rapidly expanding population count throughout the world. We worry about the farmer and the net farm income at the same time as our federal Minister informs us that the final payment so far as wheat is concerned will be 10 cents a bushel less than it was a year ago. How can the farmer get ahead in circumstances like this.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should give serious consideration to a real two-price system for wheat here in Canada. I say, Mr. Chairman, that if it's okay for us using the taxpayers' money for industrial development in the so-called depressed areas of Canada by way of tax remission and added incentives, then it should be okay for us to, even in this House, agree with the \$3.00 per bushel payment of wheat to the agriculturalists here in the Province of Manitoba. To me, there's nothing wrong with it. We agree that we must have our producers in agriculture and it does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that after giving lip-service to the needs of the producer in agriculture, we're not prepared to keep him down on the farm. The Member for Ethelbert Plains is quite correct when he was saying that we are losing producers of our soil, and this cannot continue, but until such time as we are prepared to keep them down on the farm by paying them sufficient income for the fruits of their labour, the situation that we're

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . faced with at the present time will continue.

But I do want again, Mr. Chairman, to get back to my original point. I was greatly interested in the concern of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture of missing the boat, how he explained to us how through T. V. shows, radio productions, we were meeting a considerable number of the agricultural producers in the province, but I do want to know from him what consideration, if any, was given to the proposition laid before this House a session ago by my former colleague whereby the ag rep would be in closer contact with the expanding educational system here in the Province of Manitoba, particularly in the rural areas.

MR. VIELFAURE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words here on the farm business groups. I was indeed very happy to hear the Minister tell us the amount of progress that has been made by the existing farm business groups and it has been my point right along that this is very true, but if you check the members that are now in the farm business groups you will find that in many cases they are farmers that, through their ability to produce, their effectiveness has reached a fairly high efficiency in their production and like to join groups to further improve their operation and also compare it with other farmers in the community.

However, I always press on this point, that I think we should make more effort to reach the ones, as the Minister was saying a while ago, the ones that are down the rope and are afraid - and really I know they're hard to contact, they're hard to organize - but certainly if we could apply the same principles to many of those who are completely inefficient, for example in the milk industry, you will have some of these farmers which have production of 2, 500 where we note that in our organized groups now we're around the 10,000 pounds. Now I know this can't be done overnight, but certainly there is a pressing need there in these localities, especially on sub-marginal land where a little bit of education and organization could double their production in a very short time, and in my opinion this is where the department should make some real effort to try and get to them.

Again I'm not saying that this is easy, that it can be done overnight, but certainly this would make a whale of a difference on the living conditions of these people. I know many of them will not be able to stay, but on the other hand, many of those will reach the standard in not too many years that the existing farm business groups average now. This again is my point, that I'm convinced that we have to make special efforts to help these people organize and this is the only way that we will bring them to the standards that the people in these groups have now reached. I would have some comments to make on the marketing boards. Does this come under another item or should this be done on

MR. HUTTON: It can be dealt with under the Co-operative Services Branch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 7 --

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on the subject of ag reps and extension services, I wonder when the Honourable Minister gets up could he tell us whether we have more ag reps within the province now; have we more areas. I think when the government took office in 1958 there were 36 ag rep areas and the same number of ag reps. I know that my honourable friend is not satisfied that this is the sufficient number that we should have. In speaking at Gladstone one day, he referred to the Langruth area as "No Man's Land," and certainly the people in that area feel that that statement that he made described the area very well indeed because the people in that narrow neck of land between the Big Grass Marsh and Lake Manitoba did not know apparently who their ag rep was. I know too that the people in the Gladstone area, probably by virtue of the fact that the ag rep office for many years has been in Neepawa, feel that they had been let down. Now there may be some justification for their concern in this regard, but my experience with ag reps generally is that they do an excellent job, and on many occasions I've gone to a meeting with them at 8:00 o'clock after they had worked all day and come back at 12:00 o'clock at night, so certainly they put in a long day and put in a long week and a long year.

I am not exactly quite clear on their newly acquired responsibilities or whether in fact they should assume some of the responsibilities that I believe they are charged with, and I refer at the moment to drainage in the area, to applications for Manitoba agricultural credit. Some years ago we were told in the House by the Minister of Agriculture of that day, that all farmers coming to we members seeking advice in respect to Manitoba Agricultural Credit, we should ask them and advise them to contact the ag rep in the area. Are they still doing this kind of work? Should we, as our duties as an ombudsman and serving our areas, should we refer people who come to us and say, "Look at our land, it is all being flooded," should we

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . send them to the ag rep? If they're expected to do a lot of these things, and it's very nice and handy for us to be able to do this, but if they're going to continue to assume a lot of new responsibilities, then they certainly can not do justice to the job that they were appointed to do originally.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to tell us whether the number of ag reps has been increased in the province; whether the areas have been increased in the province; whether their duties have been enlarged and so on in this regard.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, just a brief word about this question of relationship between agriculture and education. If you keep in mind that nine out of ten young people that are growing up on the farms of Manitoba are going to find themselves employed in off-farm occupations, you can see that the provision of an adequate kind of agricultural technical vocational training would be very difficult to provide. As a matter of fact, it would interest you to know - I was down in Crookston this weekend attending the Red River Valley Winter Shows and the Red River Valley Horse Show, and the University of Minnesota has a district research station there where they have been teaching technical vocational education in agriculture at the high school level, and they have been forced to close down their operation because of the lack of students to draw, to recruit from, and they are in fact going to be operating as a junior college this coming year, offering a two year course in agriculture in the post high school area.

We have a very close contact between the Department of Education and the Department of Agriculture, and certainly the ARDA, the introduction of the ARDA program in Canada and in Manitoba has tended to strengthen this contact between the two departments. As you know, some of the instruction that is offered in the Department of Agriculture in the way of short courses, technical training, welding courses and so on, we work with education because through the Department of Education we are able to get cost-sharing on these programs from Ottawa. This has been a thing that was going on before I was a Minister. In the consideration of the facilities and provisions to be made in the technical vocational schools that are being built - I'm thinking here primarily of Brandon - there has been the closest consultation between the Department of Education and the Department of Agriculture so that they could offer those courses in vocational training in agriculture that were needed from time to time.

I can't agree that the ag rep should be under the aegis of the Department of Education. I would object to that. It isn't a question of defending an empire either. The agricultural representative in Manitoba enjoys a very special role in his community. I can tell you of ag reps in Manitoba who have been in their communities for quite a number of years and they enjoy a respect and a confidence on the part of the people that is just amazing. Some of them are father confessor to the farmers in their area, and this doesn't apply just to agricultural problems.

I would like to underline that I think that although we can't be satisfied with our success to date in reaching people, I think that we in the last few years, and especially since ARDA came in and with the community development program, that we have achieved a contact with the people that we have never had in the past, and this is particularly true in the Interlake area. I happened to have Harold Ross, the ag rep from the Stonewall area, with me on this trip down to Crookston and we were talking about this very problem we've been discussing here this evening.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, we may have to continue this discussion tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I move the committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee would like me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, that the House do now adjourn.

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