

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, October 7, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if on a matter of privilege or goodwill I may take this opportunity before routine proceedings of extending a sincere welcome back to the Chamber to the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

May I say to the honourable member that while some of us haven't been able or weren't able to get up to see him during his sojourn in Misericordia Hospital, we did follow, Sir, his progress with deep interest, and as I indicated earlier we're so happy to have the honourable gentleman back with us. We trust and hope that his progress toward full health will be speedy and that before too long he will be able to fulfill with the vigour that he previously had, his responsibilities as a Member of this Assembly, and as one who has taken an active part in political fields, municipal fields, of the Province of Manitoba, and of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I want to say how happy I am to be back and to thank the Honourable the House Leader for his kind words. I want to thank all members of the House for the wonderful cards that I received. The only thing I can tell you is it's a helluva way to collect autographs - you have to get sick in order to get them. But I've got them - all 56 of them.

I want to say a particular word of thanks to the Honourable Member for Point Douglas for the beautiful card that he sent me; it's one of the most beautiful cards that I've ever seen. Of course he's a long standing friend.

It will be five weeks tomorrow that I had my attack. I can tell you that in the last seven days I have arrived at the state that I am in now. Seven days ago I was completely paralyzed in my left arm and left leg and the good sisters and the nurses of Misericordia Hospital have brought me to this situation, that they were able to discharge me from the hospital yesterday. I'm making a tremendous recovery. I'm grateful to you all. Wolseley may be down, but we're not out.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance, I think who's in charge of the public utilities. I'm sorry that I didn't give him any notice. This is a query that I had during the dinner hour. Are there any public utilities, are they free to go in the wholesale business? Now the question I promised is apparently some of the people living in trailer courts are charged by the owners of the trailer courts, not directly from Hydro, and they're not getting any information from Hydro what their cost is. Is that regular practice?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): I'm not, Mr. Speaker, really familiar with the practice. I am aware of the fact that not only is power sold in that way, but also water is sold in that way by municipalities by special arrangement. It's not the wholesale business; it is the provision of water to - or power in this case, of one metre. I'll try to get more detailed information for the honourable member, but I suppose it will take a little while. Hopefully, I'll have to write him a letter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege affecting the peace of mind of members of the House. There is an article in the paper tonight that says that Bud Boyce, NCP, Winnipeg Centre, adjourned debate. I just want to let everyone know that there's no split in the NDP caucus, and while I can -- (Interjection) -- I haven't formed a splinter group. He can play with the letters of NCP, but I want to assure everybody they haven't kicked me out and I haven't left.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the honourable member who just spoke? Does the NCP stand for the "New Conservative Party"?

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, if I may. No, it's nice, calm, progressive, for myself if you're . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I was late this afternoon. Just for a matter of clarification, I understood that the Minister has said that the CN will not be discontinued - the campers' special out east is not going to be discontinued. I wonder if this is correct?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I indicated that according to news reports that I had read, that the management of the CNR had indicated that they intend to run the campers' special next year.

MR. PATRICK: Just a supplementary question. I wonder if the Honourable Minister would get a confirmation from the CN if this is correct, because if this is, I think it's most important news for many of the campers. I think it would be advisable if the Minister can get confirmation from the CN.

MR. PAULLEY: May I assure my honourable friend that as soon as we get out of here it is my intention, in consort with one or two others, to approach the CNR for confirmation.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if there are no further questions on Orders of the Day, I wonder if you'd kindly call Bill No. 46, the bill dealing with the Agricultural Credit Corporation standing in the adjournment in the name of the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Bill No. 46. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill No. 46, I can assure the members of the House that I'll be very brief on this bill, because the bill in itself does not really give us very much to talk about. There is nothing set out clearly of what the government's intention is in regards to this bill any more than I think we on this side of the House can take some satisfaction out of the fact that while the government of the day have nothing new to offer for the farmers of Manitoba, they are now reverting to a policy that was considered to be obsolete and outdated and unnecessary by those of us on this side of the House when we were in government. But it is interesting to note in the absence of a policy for agriculture in the Province of Manitoba that the New Democratic Party - the present government - have reverted to policies that we considered to be obsolete.

I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the House that at present the farmers of Manitoba have at their disposal three different types of government sponsored lines of credit. We have the Federal Agricultural Credit Corporation sponsored by the Federal Government which was up-dated because of legislation brought in by this government in 1958, to the point where he felt that it was no longer necessary to be in the long-term loaning insofar as agriculture was concerned. The Federal Government still offer long-termed credit for the purchase of land, for the development of that land, and for the general upgrading of the agricultural industry in the Province of Manitoba.

The Federal Government also are sponsors of a Farm Improvement loan policy through the banks with interest rates that are fixed on a six month basis, and adjusted on a six month period of time. Through the Federal Agricultural Corporation -- pardon me, the Federal Farm Improvement Loan Corporation, it is possible for farmers to develop their industry along the same lines proposed by the bill that is before us now.

The third government-sponsored and guaranteed line of credit was established by this government to replace long-term loaning as of the 31st of May last year. I suggest to the Minister and to members of the House that the establishment of this line of guaranteed credit was a good bill. We, of course, were not aware at that time of the cash shortage that would occur, the acute cash shortage which now exists in the Province of Manitoba, or were we aware, of course, of the tight money situation that would develop between the time that that bill was passed through the House and regulations set up, and the Corporation provided with the necessary authority to proceed to guarantee it through the banks. I don't think that I need, particularly to the members that were here in the House last spring, to go over the terms of the regulations that were involved at that time insofar as the credit was concerned, a guaranteed credit through the bank. But I should point out that we were talking in terms of \$150 million spread over a three-year period.

It is with regret that I have to admit of course now, because of circumstances that did not exist at that time that this line of credit has not done as much for the farmers in the province as we had anticipated. I believe the last figure that I got some weeks ago was to the

(MR. WATT cont'd.) effect that \$1 million had been loaned - or \$1 million had been guaranteed through the chartered banks and other recognized loaning agencies.

However, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the three lines of credit, through government guaranteed or sponsored programs available now to the farmers of the province of Manitoba, is all that is necessary at this time. Considering the acute cash shortage that has taken place and has become extremely acute in recent months, I would expect that the government of the day would have considered an area of subsidy insofar as interest rates were concerned.

We are not sure on this side of the House exactly what is involved in this bill any more than the government are reverting back to the long-term loaning program that did exist prior to May 31st. But there is no evidence here on which we can go by that there will be any subsidy insofar as interest rates are concerned; nor are we aware what amount of money will be available through this lending program, other than what I've read in the press. And I gather from what I've read in the press that this money will be to the extent of some \$6 million, over what period of time I am not sure, nor exactly what the source of the \$6 million is. -- (Interjection) -- I still am not clear exactly where the \$6 million is actually coming from, or where it will come from beyond the time that the \$6 million is loaned out, when that time comes.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, what I really want to say tonight in respect of this bill is that it provides no immediate relief for the cash position of the farmers in the Province of Manitoba today. It is true that we are interested as farmers in long-term loans. Insofar as diversifying is concerned I think it is necessary in the province, and I see nothing wrong with the projected intent of the bill; but the problem lies not today with the farmers that are diversified but with those who are directly engaged in grain growing. And there is no relief in this bill, no intent that there will be any relief insofar as interest rates are concerned, and no direct relief for the immediate position the farmer finds himself in. And I'm referring now particularly to those farmers who were involved particularly in cereal grains.

There is one section of the bill, Mr. Speaker, that I am particularly interested in, that I would like an explanation from the Minister on, and that is Section 33. There has been some discussion in the House today with the Minister of Health and Social Services in regard to state farms, and I'm wondering when I look at Section 33 if this is not, Mr. Speaker, the mechanics on which the government may set up state farms. I'm referring to the section which gives authority to the corporation to buy, to accumulate, to possess, to develop, to put buildings on land within the Province of Manitoba; and as I read that section of the bill, I believe it suggests that they may operate. So, I ask the Minister if he can explain to us if the intent behind this section of the bill is to set up state farms in the Province of Manitoba? The Minister of Health and Social Services shakes his head and laughs, but I ask him, what is the section there for? I want a clear explanation, if it is the intent of the government to set up state farms within the Province of Manitoba?

Now, I've just referred briefly to this section and I will have something more to say about it when it comes to the committee stage - if it gets there. But I want to ask the Minister to be prepared to give us a clear-cut answer on why Section 33 is set out in this bill? I particularly want to know from him what his intentions are. Apparently this is the only legislation that we will have before the House at this session, if I am to accept the promise of the House Leader that the last bills have now come into the House, so I look forward, I look forward, Mr. Speaker, for exactly nothing for the farmers of the Province of Manitoba in this session. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that it's as much as I expected; but it is not as much as I should have expected or any of us on this side of the House or the farmers of the Province of Manitoba considering what we have listened to from my honourable friends opposite when they were on this side of the House in regard to farm policies over the past -- how long would it be, I ask the honourable House Leader, ten years, 15 years, 20 years? -- when we have been berated on this side of the House for lack of agricultural policies. And here, Mr. Speaker, we have sat for two months at this session which was supposed to be a mini-session, which was supposed to be just simply cleaning up Tory leftovers from the last session, and here we have been for two months now without the slightest indication from the Minister of Agriculture that they have any farm policy to bring forward that will in any way alleviate the problems that we have at the moment.

So I ask my honourable friend if he will explain this bill and tell us what it will do for the farmers of Manitoba in the immediate future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the speaker that just sat down. Perhaps something like the story that my honourable friend told the other day, the farmer that kinda forgot to do his bookkeeping was a little bit more optimistic than the one that kept too many books, and perhaps the former Minister of Agriculture -- I realize he knows much more about agriculture than I do, but I do wish that he would join me in saying at least I think we should be optimistic about this bill. While I don't understand some of the parts in it and perhaps there will be explanations later, I for one am happy to see this bill before us. I'm also glad that the former Minister admitted, or said that perhaps conditions have changed since they were in office last spring. I don't really care what the reason is as long as we are trying to take a forward step along the line of agriculture.

I think we have perhaps not spent enough time in this House or any place else and really sometime sit down and think of the wonderful opportunities that Manitobans have as far as agriculture is concerned. I'm sure that the former Minister is aware and many members in this House are aware of this. We don't have to look very far to see, perhaps our packing house facilities - oh, so many things one could mention as far as our agriculture facilities, as far as marketing is concerned. I believe when you hear figures of 60 or 65 percent of our beef being sent east from the prairie provinces, I'm sure some of these animals should be perhaps - when we take the price differential of 26, 27¢ roughly, in Calgary I believe it was yesterday, and take prices perhaps 8 to 10¢ higher in the east, I think we have a wonderful opportunity with the kind of facilities we have in Manitoba to try and take a forward look. I believe while this money may not sound much -- I understand it's supposed to be raised from six million to \$15 million and perhaps it'll need more -- I think it'll give a lot of farmers a shot in the arm if this is distributed in the right direction and I believe we can -- and not the kind of shot in the arm my friend from Churchill's thinking of right now -- I believe we can perhaps see the beginning of a new belief. I don't want to blame the former government. I believe like the former member of Lakeside used to say that certainly a lot of our problems are with the federal government and they cannot resolve a loan in Manitoba; but I also don't believe that we can't do anything about it here in Manitoba. I think we can and I think this is one part where we have to begin with.

I would also like to pose a few questions. I certainly agree with the Member for Arthur that I do not know if there will be a subsidy as far as the interest rates are concerned. I'm sure the Minister will let us know on this as soon as he can. I don't believe that our farmers are perhaps looking for such a big subsidy as far as interest is concerned, but at least if they can control it within a limit or perhaps one or two percent lower than the average interest, I'm sure this would be appreciated.

I am concerned also with Section 33 coming from a very free enterprising area of southeastern Manitoba, that I hope some of the things that I smell in this bill are not going to react like I think they might and I believe there is a chance that they could serve a lot of farmers to some extent if this were enacted in the right way. So at this time I have very little more to say. I think that perhaps it will not be so much relief for the grain farmer but perhaps it is a beginning. We can start looking at the situation and I wish that the Minister or this government would follow this with real vim and real vigor because it's not good enough to just present this bill in this House and say well now this is available. I think some type of education or some type of knowledge has to either through our agriculture reps or otherwise, has to be given to the farmer. I know in today's new media news gets about very fast especially good news, but too often -- and I have quite a few areas in my constituency and I'm sure the other members have in their constituency -- too often the ones that really needed this kind of lift for some reason they don't keep their weekly or their daily papers, and there aren't too many left, but I think a little better job can be done here in trying to reach those people that really need this help. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that might be the one place to start, but again I think we should stop blaming the federal government and start working right here in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been some time that I've been directly involved with the Department of Agriculture, but I do want to add a few comments at this time, and I'd like to frame them in a broader context.

It was my privilege to be associated with the Department of Agriculture at the time the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation was in its zenith, if I can describe it that way. I was the

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) proud recipient of being responsible for having some say in the jurisdiction of that organization that led the way in long-term agricultural credit in Canada to the point that in succeeding years the federal government and the federal organization, the FCC, progressively followed the pioneering efforts in providing long-term agricultural credit to Manitoba farmers, to farmers across the country. And it reached a point, Mr. Speaker, where a very serious and very hard decision had to be made by those in responsible positions at that time. I want to assure the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, the present Minister of Agriculture and the farmers of Manitoba that the decision to -- I'll avoid the word "emasculate" because it brings on another debate about other subjects -- but the decision to withdraw from the field of direct loans on the part of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation was not arrived at easily. There was no misunderstanding about the contribution that the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation was making to the farmers of Manitoba. There is no misunderstanding about the appreciation of those that worked in the corporation, the manager, the field workers, the staff of that very capable organization that provided in the very short years under the progressive leadership of the conservative government some 45 millions of dollars of long-term credit to Manitoba farmers that filled a very specific need at that time, which was availability of long-term credit for farmers. That's what this government or the former government recognized, defined the need and they devised the mechanics, namely the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, to fulfill that need. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the current Minister or the members opposite will deny that that has to be one of the more successful programs that any government of any political stripe has put forward to the farmers of any province, and particularly this province. So that I will always consider it as a privilege of having been associated with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and having been part of it.

However, the decision or the changes in the conditions that led to a decision, and a hard decision it was, a hard decision within the department, within the government of the day, to recognize the fact that a federal agency was providing a very identical kind of service, namely, providing long-term agricultural credit to Manitoba farmers, and recognizing that there was a gap developing in terms of intermediate and short-term credit that was not being filled properly -- oh, it was being filled all right -- but it was being filled in a very expensive way, very high expensive interest rates and so forth, that we could best use our resources available to any government in this area to be more directional and this persuaded us at that time in '66 -- and you must remember at that time we were in a period of a reasonably good agricultural situation, grain sales were moving along well, the general inflationary spiral that we are now caught up in had not become part of our day to day scene, and in keeping with our philosophy that we hold on this side of the House that it's for government to lead and to pioneer, to develop those areas that private or existing enterprise don't or aren't in our opinion as government sufficiently active in -- we felt that at this particular stage in the development of agriculture we were better off to divert our efforts into encouraging the private sector, namely the chartered banks, the credit unions, to use their resources in providing short-term and intermediate credit, production credit if you want to call it, to the farmers of Manitoba. And we devised the bill, that Mr. Speaker, is essentially before us today, Bill No. 46.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I really have to take issue with the Minister of Agriculture, because Mr. Speaker, this is bunch of window dressing that he's throwing in front of the Manitoba farmers. Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Agriculture was sincere in his approach to the farm problems of Manitoba, he would have brought in an amendment to the existing legislation containing Clause No. 23 because that's the only new thing in the bill. But no, not this open government, they want to have something to parade in front of the farmers of Manitoba, because after all this government found \$25 million to add to the Manitoba Development Fund -- and they're a little sensitive about this particular question, sensitive to our planning on this particular issue -- so very rapidly and very hurriedly in the dying moments of this session they had to produce a major piece of agricultural legislation. Mr. Speaker, don't let me get carried away and let me calm down.

There's nothing wrong with Section 23 at this time. I want to indicate to the Minister that I certainly will support it. I will be listening keenly to the further explanations that he will have with respect to that. But, Mr. Speaker, I make the most violent criticism of the manner and the way this has been brought in. We're being presented here with a bill some 13 pages in length, which starts from Page 1 which is conservative legislation, Page 2 which

October 7, 1969

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) is conservative legislation, Page 3 which is conservative legislation, Page 7, 6, 5, one clause, one clause in the 13-page bill before us is what the current Minister and the NDP government have added to our credit corporation legislation. When I make the charge "window dressing" Mr. Speaker, I don't make it lightly, because he will lead us to believe that he is introducing a major piece of legislation, something that will alleviate the current crisis on the farms of Manitoba. I say that's cynical, Mr. Speaker; I say that's being politically opportunistic, because he knows that this bill's been presented yesterday before us, we've hardly had time to examine, nor has the Minister given us any indication of how he intends to use Section 23 -- oh, we've heard reports, yes we've heard reports from Quebec, Mr. Speaker, that six millions of dollars are going to be dispersed to the farmers of Manitoba. Well now, Mr. Speaker, which farmers of Manitoba are going to get it? You see one of the reasons why we discontinued the direct loans under the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation was, that unfortunately it was the fatted calves in agriculture that was getting most of it. To a great extent we were only building larger and larger land estates.

The Minister has not explained -- I've tried to read and I regret that I wasn't in the House at second reading -- how first of all the additional monies of the direct lending will be applied. It says (a) to diversify farming operations, to carry on our improved farming operations, to relocate on new . . . so forth. But, Mr. Speaker, just how is this going to be carried out in practice? Does it mean that that farmer that has clear title and no mortgages around is going to be able to go to the credit corporation and get a loan to diversify his farming operations? Mr. Speaker, I have to inform the Minister of Agriculture, and he really should know that, that at this particular time there aren't too many farmers around that haven't mortgaged themselves up to the hilt. I would hope that in some explanation of the bill, that obviously some basic major changes are going to have to be made which will allow the corporation to make loans on a second or perhaps even a third mortgage basis, that they will not demand, because we recognize the conditions have changed. Right now the farmer that is in a difficult position, that is up to his neck, he's got mortgages up to here, now the decision might well be to have him change his enterprise to help him diversify, but unless he suggests to us that the corporation is prepared to accept that liability to diversify without first of all having to resolve his current debt problems, then Mr. Speaker, it's going to be a very effective piece of legislation.

The one criticism, Mr. Speaker, that I have -- and I make it without apology to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation -- if there is one mistake that we made in the administration, and I take responsibility for it for the time that I was there -- in the policy of the credit corporation is that we did not take sufficient risks. Many a time I've been on a public platform and prided myself in being able to say that the farmers of Manitoba are the kind of people that you can loan public money to because they have repaid with singular success, or the amount of negligent loans is hardly you know worthwhile mentioning. It also, Mr. Speaker, underlines perhaps in what I just suggested a failure of the Corporation in not taking sufficient risks with that lower strata of our farm population where risks have to be taken. I'm prepared to support that. If the public money and a public enterprise is to be used in this way to encourage a segment of our population then we should have enough guts -- pardon me, Mr. Minister of Transportation, I realize that your tender ears aren't used to those kind of words but -- enough guts and determination to accept the responsibility for laying out public money in some cases more on the strength of a policy, the strength of hope and faith in rehabilitating certain sectors of our farm population that are underprivileged and that don't always have the kind of collateral that will satisfy the powers to be in granting these kind of loans.

Mr. Speaker, I would have to take this occasion while speaking on the general subject of agriculture and this bill in particular that not only has the Minister not indicated to us how the money is going to be distributed, and indeed where the money is coming from -- (Interjection) -- Well I've tried to read your speech, Mr. Minister. You gave us a reasonable background. I would suggest that primarily you're counting on the fact or you're reaping the benefits of the fact that the past Conservative government saw fit to put five or six or seven million dollars into this Credit Corporation for the last eight or nine years so that we have a revolving fund of some forty million dollars built on, which you now can use in terms of repayment funds for bringing back the agriculture industry. And I commend you for it. I think it should be used that way. I think it should be used that way. Only I have yet to see how Section 23 is going to be used, as to whether or not this is enough or whether or not this will be effective in this current situation.

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)

I'd like to suggest to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that it is probably much more significant that he has expressed such a total disregard for the contribution of the marriage of industry and agriculture, namely "agribusiness." That's a bad word in the current Minister of Agriculture's vocabulary. He doesn't like that word, Mr. Speaker, because it somehow means giving up a degree of dependence on the part of the family farm; it ogres up visions of corporate farm structures. They call them co-operative farm structures here. But you see, Mr. Speaker, co-operative farms that raise more chickens or that raise more wheat or that raise more beef don't do anything in terms of converting that beef into a saleable product and that's what the agribusiness community can do for Manitoba. And that's the only way, that's the only way, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba can -- and we're in a very fortunate position, far more fortunate than our sister province of Saskatchewan which have such burdensome quantities of surplus grain production or that are so heavily weighted in favour of a single resource economy in agriculture, wheat economy. In Manitoba our talk of diversifying our agriculture is not pie in the sky; it can develop. But it cannot be developed, Mr. Speaker, by simply encouraging more farmers to quit raising oats or wheat or barley, or more farmers to grow more hogs.

You know a former Minister of Agriculture by the name of George Hutton did that once. In fact I have to suggest that it was he that led me astray and got me into the cattle business. Just about the time that I got my 128 or 150 cows going you know he encouraged so many other people to get into the cattle business the bottom of the market fell out and I had to turn to politics to survive. But this is the kind of diversification that we're hearing from our friend the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. This is the kind of diversification that most practicing farmers don't really believe in in terms of just encouraging one farmer to grow more hogs or quit doing something like that. Diversification in its full sense means that we regard the primary agricultural product as a raw material; that we develop and turn that through a series of manufacturing processes into a finished goods which in itself brings about a higher return, and at the same time providing the needed stimulus, the needed jobs for Manitobans in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has indicated by innuendo that during my reign in the Department of Agriculture that I was really suffering under the heavy hand of the Department of Industry and Commerce, that agriculture played second fiddle to that particular department. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the Minister, as he will find out in his own due time - and as we have found out to some extent just in an unrelated field when we were discussing the matter of fish marketing boards - that you cannot separate the interests of the primary producers, the processors, the industry, and indeed the consumer; that it's an integration of the three that can develop the kind of economy that has some hopes of withstanding the buffets of international trade that can maximize the contribution of either one or either three of the sectors to the province as a whole. It's not just good enough for us to jealously safeguard the interests of an individual department or an individual segment of the population; there has to be a marriage. And if in the course of that marriage it appears that one department is not exercising its will and its domain over the other department as it should, Mr. Speaker, it's been wrongly interpreted as being a fact of domination anyway. It's a question of a serious attempt to maximize the contribution that agriculture can make to the total development of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would have to suggest that the present government's attitude towards the agribusiness sector of our province, will probably have a greater detrimental effect to the farmers of Manitoba than this bill and its one clause addition will have in improving the situation in agriculture in Manitoba. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister introduced this bill this afternoon we were hoping that it would contain something within its provisions that farmers of this province could hopefully look forward to as being of some help. In looking through the bill, I've come to the sad conclusion that I must agree with my colleague from Lakeside when he said this is not much more than "window dressing."

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question?

MR. JORGENSEN: Surely.

MR. PAULLEY: My question is: does not my honourable friend from Morris agree with

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) his colleague from Lakeside that with the exception of one clause in this bill, the whole bill is Conservative legislation?

MR. JORGENSEN: That's exactly what we mean, but apart from that the

MR. PAULLEY: Apart from that.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation went out of existence, or at least ceased its operations in its original form last year. One of the reasons for that is because there are other forms of credit that are available to farmers. It was felt that an additional source of credit was really not going to be of any material assistance. Today it is possible, Mr. Speaker, for farmers to get loans through the Farm Credit Corporation with a subsidized interest rate; it is possible for farmers if they want to consolidate their operations or do some of the things that are suggested by the Minister in consolidation or in grouping together to combine farming operations. The Farm Syndicate Act is available for them to borrow money from. If they are looking for short term-loans to buy machinery or to buy livestock, the Farm Improvement Loans Act is available to them, in addition to the chartered banks who are very actively engaged in this field. The conclusion, of course, that I arrive at is that if there is something the farmer doesn't need today, it's another source of credit. What he could have used, and of course one of the difficulties, one of the real problems that farmers face today, is the cost of money; the fact that farm income has dropped to the extent it has -- and I must take issue with the statement that appeared in the press which seems to indicate that farm income has gone up. I'm quite prepared to admit that insofar as livestock production is concerned, there's no question about it. There's more livestock being produced and in the past year the price of beef in particular was considerably higher. It was only logical that you were going to expect an increase in farm income insofar as livestock was concerned. But that is not the case insofar as the grain producer is concerned. The report that was released last night by the Minister would seem to bear that out to a certain extent, but it would have been preferable, I would have thought, if the report had of been somewhat more conclusive, if we could have had some indications as to the number of farmers who were in difficulty and in what areas they were in difficulty and in what ways they were in difficulty. I have a fairly good idea, but an intensive job of research and a complete report would have given us a far better idea of the magnitude of the problem that faces us in this province, and indeed in all of western Canada. The suggestion is made by the introduction of this legislation that what's going to be possible now is that farmers are going to be able to shift from cereal crops, particularly grain, into other forms of production; and I suggest that the thought that this is practical and is going to help the present situation is nothing but errant nonsense. We've heard this for so many years.

The Minister suggested in his introductory remarks when he introduced this bill that they were coming up with a novel idea, that in addition to the loan that was going to be made to the farmer they were going to supply advisors so that the farmer will be able to use this money wisely. Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had a lot of experience in that area. Tom Rutherford who was the first Director of the Veterans' Land Act right after the war and later went on to become the first Chairman of The Farm Credit Corporation, had written reams and volumes of material on the subject of supervised loans, and if there ever was authority on the subject it was Tom Rutherford. But all the dreams and all the hopes and all the plans of the Farm Credit Corporation in attempting to use advisor and advisory bodies, along with a loan, have obviously not produced the kind of results that we would have hoped it would have produced, otherwise we wouldn't be in the situation we are today.

There's been a tendency on the part of so-called farm advisors -- and this I presume includes, I would suggest that it includes people at the university as well as agribusiness and others, who have continually suggested that the only avenue of farm prosperity that was open to farmers was the complete specialization of the agricultural industry. That advice was followed by a good many farmers, and they incidentally happen to be the farmers that are in trouble today. There's been a lot of tears spilt in past years over the plight of the family farm and the small farmer who was struggling along on a diversified operation. Ironically it is that farmer that's going to survive this crisis, because he used his own good judgment, because he did the thing that was natural to a farmer and that is not to put all his eggs in one basket and to diversify his operation, so that no matter what kind of a year came along or what kind of economic circumstances prevailed, he was going to be able to survive.

So the suggestion that credit advisors along with a loan are going to resolve the problem

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) is as I say again errant nonsense. What is the real problem? Today for those farmers who are unable to market their crops it is purely and simply a matter of acquiring sufficient cash with which to pay their bills and continue their farming operations. And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the addition of a further lending agency, an agency that will carry with it a much higher interest rate than is available under farm credit loans, is going to do little or nothing to assist the farmers in this situation. One cannot help but contemplate if indeed farmers do take advantage of the legislation that is proposed what will be the result. Does it mean then that there is going to be a wholesale shift into other commodities and produce surplus in those areas? I hardly think that that is possible in the livestock industry. The livestock industry is one that will grow of its own accord and it will grow according to the market demand. As a matter of fact, I rather suspect that because of the nature of the industry, the increase in the human population and the increase in the per capita consumption of beef, will for some years to come be in advance of the increase of cattle and beef. And in any case, shifting from a grain operation into a livestock operation involves more than an overnight process. It is a venture that is more likely to take ten years than it is to take one year to set up, become acquainted and become proficient in beef production. There's an inclination on the part of many people to have very simple answers to the agricultural problem, and my experience has been that there are no real simple answers. And if the Minister thinks that the introduction of this legislation is going to get him off the hook and enable him to parade around the country saying: "Look what we have done for agriculture," then he's got another think coming, because in my view it will do absolutely nothing to alleviate the situation that exists today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that if the government had really wanted to do something that would have been of some assistance in the situation today, they would have undertaken -- I understand that there is something like a million and a half, a million and three-quarters dollars that are coming in each year from outstanding loans under the old Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. Those monies that are coming into the government as repayment on those loans could have been well used to subsidize the interest rates on existing loans that are currently available to farmers, and I have mentioned several of them.

My honourable friend from Pembina mentioned earlier today that it's no solution to the agricultural problem to suggest that farmers can borrow their way into prosperity. It cannot be done, and it is nonsense for the Minister to think that this legislation is going to do it or to leave the impression that it's going to do it, as he did this afternoon.

I am curious to know what that particular clause that the Member for Arthur mentioned, clause 33. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm not going to suggest it's that because it's the kind of a suggestion that has been kicked around a good many times. As a matter of fact, a farmer from my constituency wrote the Minister of Agriculture -- the federal Minister of Agriculture, or rather wrote the Prime Minister, and asked him when he was going to buy his farm. And I happen to know the farmer and he's not a fly-by-night operator. This happens to be one of the better farmers in this province, realizing that it is difficult, if not impossible, for him to cope with the present crisis in the industry. And this is a thing that really should be of concern to a good many of us. If farmers of that calibre are losing hope in that way, then there can be little hope for some of the farmers that are not as well established as Mr. Kendall is, many of the farmers who have already borrowed themselves into serious debt, and how this legislation is going to help them is more than I can understand, and perhaps the Minister has some magical explanation that he can give us. Maybe he has hidden a clause in here that we have been unable to find, that will give the farmers of this country some hope that the introduction of this legislation is going to be of any material benefit to the agricultural industry.

I would have preferred, rather than submitting this report -- and there's a lot of information in here, but in my view there is not sufficient information to give us an idea of the magnitude of this problem -- the suggestion that was made here that the Agricultural Committee be allowed to meet and question the representatives that appeared before that committee to elicit the kind of information that we as legislators would be interested in knowing, I think it could have been a much more comprehensive, a much fuller report, and we would have had a lot more accurate information. And I'm not critical at all of the people who compiled this report but it seems to me that there are some very searching questions that can be asked of this report, or of the people who worked on it, to determine just how much money and how great the problem really is, and how much money was required to resolve it.

I say again that the introduction of this legislation will, in my view, do little to help the

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) present situation and the Minister better not try to create the impression that they have now resolved the entire problem because he is far from doing that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear you call my name. I thank you.

I have a small contribution that I hope to make with respect to this bill which we've been waiting for since I made my first speech on agriculture in the early days of this session, begging of this Minister, begging of this government for a policy, or where are we going to go, for the farmers of Manitoba and my constituency, and we finally got it today, in the last days, the dying days of this session. And after all the great speeches -- I wish now that the Minister of Health was the Minister of Agriculture. I think we'd be much better off than we are with this Minister. No doubt about it. I'm sure. I'm agreed now -- the speeches that the Honourable Minister of Health made in this House last year gives me much better direction where we might be in agriculture than the present Minister is giving by delivering this bill in -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that's right.

And we've been crying, crying all through the days of this session, Mr. Speaker, for this Minister to call the Agricultural Committee. And I'm not going to read back into the record the answers we got. Is this the answer? I'm not going to read into the record. Some of the answers we got -- we asked for this committee consistently week after week after week. We're going to get the answer. You're going to get it. We got it now - Bill No. 46. And how am I going to go home to my constituency this weekend, Mr. Speaker, and tell the farmers in my constituency? Half their crops are still out.

A MEMBER: Thanksgiving at that.

MR. McKENZIE: Thanksgiving, and this is the message. The Thanksgiving from the NDP Party, the great philosophers that have an agricultural policy, and then have a message to get across to Roblin constituency. It is indeed shocking that we have to sit around and wait this long for this type of a bill to come through to give us an answer to some of the problems on agriculture in this province.

I appreciated the remarks from the Honourable Member from La Verendrye, and it was indeed an honour and privilege for me to tour part of his constituency about a week ago and see some of the agricultural complexes in that area. And I congratulate the farmers out there who are doing a pretty darn good job in agra business, or the things that . . . Their market-place is close. They haven't got the problems that I've got in Roblin constituency with agriculture and this is why I was hoping that the Minister would call the committee to get the farmers in here, and let the farmers tell you what the problem is.

I fully realize now that he doesn't understand the problems on agriculture in this province. -- (Interjection) -- Hasn't got a clue. Absolutely. He hasn't got a clue. He's told us he's got all the answers. You know, read his speeches. Now he's laid it on the table, the last days in the session, and it says: "Here's my philosophy. I'm going to nationalize the farmers of Manitoba." If he can in fact correct what I read into that section 33, because there was a by-election in Saskatchewan, right across the border from me, not too long ago, and the NDP policy in Saskatchewan at that time was to nationalize the farmers of that province. Much the same. What is the difference in this section 33 than was being advocated in that by-election? -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? I can't say by-election. I haven't got a clue. But nevertheless, the Minister would know that I have . . . time infiltrated in my constituents by NDP organizers coming over to Roblin constituency, as he leaves the odd little bit of literature laying around which I pick up from time to time, and that's how I became involved in -- as I knew it was going on.

It's so interesting, Mr. Speaker. Today we got the resolution for the north - the Committee for the north. It's all set up. It's all cut and dried. But what happens tonight when I stand on agriculture? I see four, six, eight, ten, twelve members on the government benches - 12 members on the government benches tonight when we're dealing with the most grave situation that we have in this province today. And that's all the forces they can muster over there to listen to me speak? I would like to move tonight, Mr. Speaker, that the House adjourn. I would like to move it because I'm concerned. If that's all the bodies they can muster to listen to me speak tonight, I think we should adjourn. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I imagine we've got 12. In fact there's three, six, nine, ten, twelve, fourteen, sixteen, seventeen. Eighteen - I forgot the Honourable Member from Pembina. So we are 18.

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.)

But this is classical of this government. In the many times that we've spoken on agriculture, you just see they go out the side doors because they have nobody over there to talk about agriculture. They have nobody. They actually haven't, and they mean to tell me that they're going to stand up and lead the farmers of this province with the great NDP philosophy that's blowing through Roblin constituency, blowing through Ethelbert Plains. They got the answers to all the problems of Manitoba, and they've only got 12 guys that will sit in that House tonight and listen to what the problems of agriculture are.

I submit to the House Leader, you're talking about the last days of this session. I submit that you'd better -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry. I didn't hear the honourable member -- (Interjection) -- I don't see any members coming back and taking their seats so basically I don't think I'm doing too well, Mr. Speaker.

But anyway, we have the bill, we have the legislation, and I humbly submit that this is not going to -- you know, I really am serious that the days of this session could be lengthened a month if this is all the answers that you've got for me to take back to my constituency. -- (Interjection) -- Right. Or at the -- Conservative legislation. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. With one small amendment. Right. Section 33, so what's your problem? So I'm supposed to go back and tell them, you know, they're going to nationalize you guys. And maybe it would be better if the House Leader would take his Thanksgiving vacation and come out and take some of that damp flax offered, rather than sit here and regiment us from day to day. I would be glad to go with him and show him some of the problems of agriculture, and I hope he would take the Minister of Agriculture with him when we go -- and the invitation is open.

But anyway, in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned and greatly concerned about this bill that we have before us tonight. If this is all the answers that this party and this government has got for the farmers of Manitoba, I submit that we are in deep trouble. I'm wondering, is the risk too great for the Minister to take and offer some alternatives? Or is he trying to, you know, as the Member for Lakeside said, window wash? And if he needs a window wash I'll get him a brush, but it's got to be a bigger one than this because this hasn't fooled me. I don't think it's fooled anybody, at least it hasn't on this side, and I'm sure it hasn't fooled too many farmers. -- (Interjection) --

The TED Report -- nothing about this at all. Well, I've heard various things about TED but I sense that he maybe hasn't read the report either. And I agree there's a lot of things in the TED Report that may be not -- but there was a direction that we could have followed. There was a direction that told us about the problems of the interest rates. They told us about the fact that many farmers today have got loans from last year's crop, they've got loans from this year's crop, and now you're offering them more loans? Is that the answer to the problem? I guess it is.

So the smart way, and I submit very humbly, Mr. Speaker, he's telling me and he's telling Manitoba: "We'll nationalize you, and this is the answer to it." He's nodding his head, so I guess this is where we're going. Once I understand where he's taking us now, I can sit down and rest because I know where we're going, and he's going to nationalize.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): There's many other speakers, I think, that want to speak before the hour of 10:00 o'clock, but I do want to -- this is very serious and I want to emphasize most emphatically the problem of agriculture. And it's more serious than it ever was, in my opinion, than in any time in the thirties. And after looking at this bill, being a farmer myself, I can imagine what most farmers would say if you took this on the main street of any particular town. They'd say: "Well, if this is all you've got to offer, we'll go on our own merry way."

I want to tell the Minister of Agriculture, the average age of the farmers of Manitoba is at least 56 years of age, and if you think they're going to switch overnight to livestock, you've got another think coming. And another thing I want to tell you, those people are nearly all out of debt. The ones that are in real trouble, who have a lot of debt, are the young farmers who started up since the Second World War in the Fifties and early Sixties with loans from both the Manitoba Credit Corporation and the Federal Credit Corporation, and I doubt very much if they could give any more credit. I doubt it very much.

Do you realize that the price, the value of the land has actually been cut in half in the last two years? This is the fact that you must realize, and it boils down that you can only

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) borrow so many dollars for acres of land that you have in your possession. And I would think that each of the appraisers when they go out in this day and age that they would definitely say to these young fellows that "you're loaded up with enough debt and you better just try to pay off what you presently have."

I'd like to read you a paragraph here in this big long report I was reading tonight, and Bob Douglas, Secretary-Manager of the Farm Bureau, I think he pretty well brings a fact of life out here, and I want to read you this paragraph: "It was emphasized to the Farm Bureau that it's not sufficient to merely shift the burden to other sections of production such as live-stock productions, or the production of special crops such as oil seeds, etc. It was suggested that expanded consultation with all aspects of agriculture and markets is essential to become more knowledgeable about the nature and dimensions of the problems and opportunities, especially in the field of markets."

Now there's, I think where you should be stressing, is in marketing, because never in history have we needed better experience in marketing, both in I think we can say, in the grain situation where most of us are involved in, and many of the members here involved in the cattle industry.

If you want experience in the cattle industry let's look back to when we were here in the month of May where we were experiencing 33 cent steers. I think about the first of July they went up to 37 cents. You know where they are today? They're 27 cents. Did you know what happened to the man that bought steers at 36 cents? He lost his shirt and I mean lost his shirt because he has to dispose of them now at a loss of about eight cents a pound. This is the experience which many of the people who thought they were going to have a few dollars in their pocket this fall find now that they are not even breaking even, they're having to pay the interest on the money they borrowed to buy these feeder cattle. Now I have been in the farming business for the last 35 years and I saw a lot of ups and downs in the industry, and I expect I will see a lot more ups and downs; but I must say, as I mentioned in the early part of my speech, that we are experiencing something as serious as what we experienced in the middle 30's, and for you to think that you could propose the cure all by bringing out one little bill here to all our problems in agriculture, I think you would have been best advised to take the resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie here, the House Leader of the Liberal Party, and did what he suggested, and had all the farm organizations come before this Committee, had all the grain trade and everybody else, the implement dealers, the fertilizer dealers and right down the line come and meet with us here. I'd be quite willing to stay in the month of November if you'd do that, at no cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba. I think you could be safe in saying that all members here would be quite willing to do this too. Because when we go home all we have is filled up granaries and on a section of land - I'm the smallest farmer I think in our group, I got a section of land - I got over 30,000 bushels on hand, over 30,000 bushels. And you can see the position. A year ago I spent \$5,000 in granaries; this year I spent a thousand dollars more in granaries. And I've sold exactly \$1,200 of wheat since the first of January and don't expect to sell another bushel during the last three months of the year of 1969. This is the experience of most of the farmers.

There was mention made of the cash advances. This is another good example. The Reeve of the Municipality of Glenwood mentioned to me not very long ago that he owed an amount of \$2,800 on the cash advance which he picked up for the year 1968-69, and he said quite likely in this present crop year, 1969-70, that the amount outstanding would be far greater because the quotas are going to be a lot more. And I think all this emphasizes this. As one member mentioned, you can't buy yourself out of trouble by borrowing money. We have to deal with it another way, I would consider at this time, and try as members of our governments, both provincial and federal, to go out into the far corners of the world and sell our grain. I don't care how many cattle we have in this country we're not going to get rid of the surplus grain, and everybody knows this, we're not going to even touch it. I got a shed full of oats - 40 by 48 by about 9 feet high - about 17,000 bushels of oats in that one granary and I don't know how many cattle it would take to eat that binful of oats dry. But this isn't going to be the answer. Many many farms are not suited for diversified farming. Sure, you can put a feedlot on there but somebody's got to be in the cow-calf operation before you can put calves in the feedlot, and a lot of the farms in Manitoba are just not suited for that type of operation.

In reading this report, I think it emphasized one thing - and I'm sorry that headline in

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) the paper - I don't know who the editor was that put that headline where the farmers have more income this past year because I don't think that's true. I'd like that man to prove this to me, because while it might be that we sold a few more cattle, I'll tell you what's happening in the cattle markets. People are selling off their heifers and they're selling off their cows to get a few dollars, where they would naturally keep them home and build up their breeding herd.

But I think if you read this that you will find out the fuel oil dealers are in trouble with credit; you'll find out the fertilizer dealers are in trouble with credit for the last two years; you'll find out that the implement dealers are in trouble with credit for the last two years and not selling hardly any machinery and credit on financing of the repairs. The municipal officials are gradually finding they're in trouble this year. All credit institutions, or the finance companies who help the farmers out, that's through the implement dealers, they're finding out that there's more reposessions than there ever was before. And right down the line. The insurance agents also are finding it out and I know that personally. The wholesaler, farm supply firms aren't selling anything; the hardware dealers, the grocery store people are only selling the basic necessities, and all down the line. People are buying at home in the small towns rather than go to the cities to buy. I would say that we're going to meet this head-on - and I mean head-on - and it's going to come around the first of July, right in our Centennial year, when the farmers are going to be -- the real squeeze is going to come. And I would say right now, Mr. Minister, that you better get all the power in your department out there working and just don't send the experts out to help the farmers out. I believe something similar to the Member for Pembina. My father always said if the government is always advising you to do something, do the opposite, you'd just be doing the right thing. I say many good farmers go down the drain because they were advised to take a different course of action in the operation of their farming due to the bookkeeping system, as I mentioned too, and they found out in a very short time that they had to readjust themselves so they could carry one.

Now, Mr. Minister, I think that when we get into committee that someone better be there to answer quite a few questions because I know from this side of the House that we will be answering many questions, because as I mentioned before we're in the most serious crisis that I think the farmers of Manitoba have every met, and we, the farmers who have been in business all our lives, are not going to quit farming so at least we'd like some cooperation from the governments of the day, both provincial and federal, to assist us in trying to arrive at some solution. I know it won't be very simple, I know it's going to be most difficult, but I would appreciate this. As I mentioned too, I would suggest that if you can get these people, the grain companies, the implement companies, to come before the Law Amendments Committee dealing with this Bill, I think the people of Manitoba, and the farmers of Manitoba more particularly, will be very happy to get their advice at this time. Thanks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J.R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My address will be very brief also. We have a brand new Minister with a brand new member speaking to him on a brand new piece of legislation, at least one particular section, and this one seems to be the one that's catching the eye of everyone that's speaking.

However, I'm not going to enter into this clause 33 of this argument. What I would like to go into a little bit of is the marketing problems that are affecting us. Now there's no individual selling any commodity that can do so without any salesmen, which is the unfortunate fact that we seem to find ourselves in. We go through a process of producing a crop, trying to market it, going through a series of strikes every time we're coming up to a point where we have got something sold, we have no salesmen pushing our product, and then we go around and bring out legislation that says that we should be borrowing more money.

Now I would like to know why we are borrowing more money. We're producing the thing, we're producing it cheaper than anywhere in the world possibly, and I think that the money that is being taken out of our pockets to handle these strikes and to pay the so-called salesmen, that it's high time that we quit talking about giving us loans and got busy and sold our product and got a little cooperation from the rest of this nation.

Now this is a perfect example, Mr. Minister. You assured us from the 14th of August on that when this strike was threatening that everything was going to be done by We were assured by the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa that everything was going to be fine - Mr. Mackasey. So what happens? The strike comes on, everything comes to a standstill and still

October 7, 1969

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd.) nothing is being done about it. As far as I'm concerned, I'm getting sick and tired of this sort of legislation. I mean the big thing seems to be always sure, the poor farmers, we'll go out and lend them some more money. As was suggested here a while ago, many of these cash advances that have gone out, they were never paid back because they couldn't possibly. The grain was there so you add on to onto. So what's going to happen? Talk about serfdom back in the olden days, you're facing it right now and you're facing it good.

A MEMBER: That's socialistic policy.

MR. FERGUSON: Is that what it is? Thank you, Sir. And the business of diversification in cattle and hogs, certainly people diversify. They're doing it, but this will just be another one of the same kind of deals. The minute you get into cattle, you get into hogs - hogs is quite a lot faster operation than cattle are - you'll just find yourself out of business there again and you'll be transferring into something else. This is just a stopgap measure again to try and bail the thing out, to try and get it moving for another couple of years. And it won't work.

And with these few words, Mr. Speaker, I pass the ball to the Minister.

..... Continued on next page .

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I wasn't quite finished examining the bill but honourable members are prodding that we get this bill into Law Amendments Committee so I will try and accommodate them and make my remarks at this particular time.

The bill before us is a new Act, Agricultural Credit Corporation Act, and it proposes to repeal the former Agricultural Credit Act so that I'm rather interested in certain aspects or certain parts of it. Under the "Objects" we read: "The objects of the Corporation are to provide credit facilities for farmers to assist farmers in obtaining credit and to assist in development of farms in the province." I have on repeated occasions mentioned that I felt that there was room for a second organization as far as extending credit to the matter of purchasing farms. We have the National Farm Loan Board - I think it has a different name or title - and we had formerly the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, and speaking from practical experience that we had through our credit unions where we generally finance these people over the short-term period which allowed them time to make arrangements with either one of the two sources, namely the federal or the provincial agricultural credit corporations, and which worked out very well in my opinion.

Then the Manitoba Act was repealed and ceased functioning and we were thus limited to one source of credit for this purpose, and I always had the feeling that we should have kept on that particular provision so that we would provide credit to those people that wanted to sell and where other people wanted to buy, so that they could make these purchases in the proper way. Many a farmer has sold his farm to his son in this way, or many young farmers have been able to get into farming as a result. So I think the legislation over the years has been to the benefit of the farmers.

There is, however, the other aspect that has been voiced by the members of the official opposition party here that probably some of the younger farmers went into debt too deep and that they might find it very difficult at the present time. With the interest rates presently going up and up, I think some of them are very fortunate to have been able to make the loans at that time at those lower rates, and where these people are subsidized very extensively compared to what the interest rates are today, so that they are deriving a lot of benefit as a result.

I have certain items here marked up which I will question when we get to the Law Amendments Committee, so that I will not necessarily deal with all the various matters that I feel that I would like clarification on. But the section dealing with direct lending mentions here, as far as security or collateral, that much of this is left to regulations. I feel that more of these provisions should be spelled out in the Act and not left to the regulations. And then coming to the last, or second last page of the bill, the whole page deals with regulations, and I might just remind members of some of the items mentioned that will come under regulations: the maximum and minimum amounts of a loan, this is coming under regulation; the securities will be left to regulation; interest rates are left to regulation; the terms that will be prescribed under regulations; measures to be taken in case of default also under regulations; the determining of losses, the collection procedures, the reports to the banks, the matter of inspection, all this is left up to the regulations; and we as members of this House do not know at this time just what those regulations will be and how drastic they might be. So I am really not satisfied on that score by leaving so much of the legislation to be taken care of by regulation. I think this should be spelled out in the Act as such.

I notice also under the matter of direct lending, or direct loan section, as far as security is concerned there's mention of floating mortgages. No doubt this applies to the matter of financing feedlots and cattle and so on where you will have a floating charge. And also, the matter of continuous revolving lines of credit is mentioned, that you will be able to get production credit under this section and that the Act certainly is not limited in any way to just real estate loans.

I think one of the new items, or the main new item of the bill is Section 33, as was pointed out by the Honourable Member for Arthur, and I think we're dealing with a dangerous matter here when we refer to Section (b), and I would like to read: "Acquire by lease or purchase real property for the purpose of assisting and the relocation of farming operations, or for the purpose of assembling land to assist in the development of economic units." I would like to hear much more from the Minister as to just how this is supposed to function. Will they be acquiring large tracts of land? Is it the intent to buy up, almost any parcel any farmer that wants to sell, to buy up the land? Is that the intent of this particular provision here? I think we should have

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... a little more clarification as to just what is meant by this and what they intend to do, because it is wide open in my opinion. Are they going to move the people from the Interlake to the southern part of the province? I think somewhere in the bill I noticed that those people from the poorer land will be able to locate in better land areas, so that certainly this provision will raise many eyebrows I think among the farmers in Manitoba was to hear about it.

What I would have liked to see in here is that we should have taken into account and probably brought into being here a measure whereby we could supply inland storage for grain in Manitoba so the farmers could deliver the grain and sell it. I think this would be doing the farmers much more good, that they would be able to sell their grain and to market their grain, because this is what we're up against right now and the serious problem that has been mentioned by the members on the opposition. This is what we're facing at the present time, and certainly this bill does not give any relief in that direction.

Just another point - I made some additional points as I went through the bill - the matter of this corporation, as I understand it, that we will get an annual report. But how much direction will this Legislature have over this corporation once it's set up. This is where I feel we'll be at arm's length again and we will have very little to say because of the many things that are left to regulations. I remember too well on one occasion trying to assist a young farmer who wanted to buy a piece of property under the former Act. This was some distance away from his other property and the board would not agree to grant him a loan because he figured he was too far removed from the property that he was buying. Yet this is what is happening today, that many of the farmers are moving into town and that their properties, their farming properties are farther removed. So I don't think we should create these barriers. If we bring in legislation to provide credit, we should not leave these matters to regulations and then find out later on that we're actually not assisting these people that need the help or want it.

It might also have an effect on improving the net worth of the farmer in Manitoba just because another source of credit is being made available, because I find that in this last while that land prices have gone down and this means that the net worth of the farmer is going down, and if we can arrest it in some way through legislation of this type, I think in that respect it is good.

I'm not too sure, I thought I'd read somewhere in the bill that they were hoping, or that they were making provision that at some future date the federal loan board might channel funds into this corporation so that the federal program would be discontinued more or less and that the provincial one would be the only one that would be functioning. If this is so, I would like to hear from the Minister, probably in greater detail, just what he has in mind; how he features such a program; how it would operate.

I've already mentioned the matter of having an alternative source of credit, and I also approve of that in this connection.

I mentioned the interest rate. Here again I feel that this is also left to regulations. I would like to have an indication from the Minister what the interest rates are going to be; how much above the rate that they have to pay from the banks or lending institutions; how much margin will the corporation keep unto itself for their operations; how much will they require as a differential of rate charges.

The matter of a revolving fund has already been mentioned, that over the years a fairly large sum of money has been lent to farmers over the years and as these loans are being repaid these monies become available for re-lending. I think it would be appreciated by members of this House if we could have some table that would indicate the amount that is repayable in a given year and project this over a number of years so that we'd have some idea as to how much of that money is coming back in. This would also apply to the Development Fund. I think we should have information of this type as to what we can expect of monies coming in for relending because this definitely has a bearing on the amount of new money that we will have to find, and certainly the monies that are already in there were borrowed at a lower rate of interest, so that the cost would as a result be lower and would definitely have an effect on the lending rates.

Mr. Speaker, these are a few of the comments and ideas that I thought I would like to make at this particular time. Surely, as has been pointed out by some of the other honourable members, this is not an answer to the dilemma that the farmers are in today in Manitoba. In that respect we need something more different. It requires a completely different answer and I don't think this bill is designed to give that in my opinion.

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

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, when I introduced the bill I did not indicate to the House that that was the master plan for agriculture as far as Manitoba is concerned, and that indeed that piece of legislation was going to solve all the current agricultural problems that we have before us. It is not the intention that this would be the image of that kind of legislation because it certainly is not the case. I want to point that out, that I have made no claim to the effect that this legislation is this government's answer to the current agricultural financial crisis in the Province of Manitoba.

You can appreciate the financial crisis is not limited to the Province of Manitoba but indeed it's a prairie province problem, or prairie provinces' problem, and that indeed it is largely a matter of responsibility of the Federal Government. Honourable friends may have a bit of fun with me today in trying to indicate that answers ought to be forthcoming from this side of the House with respect to those kind of problems, but I can appreciate that it is only a matter of fun and that members opposite don't really believe themselves that I have the authority and the capacity in the provincial government to indeed solve all of the problems, whether they be provincial or federal jurisdiction. I want to indicate in that connection, however, that we are doing....

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I want to make it abundantly clear that the problems of the farmers of Manitoba is not a matter of fun for anybody in this House, particularly on this side of the House.

MR. USKIW: There's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the problems are serious, and if some of my honourable friends would remove some of the smirks off their face I might believe that indeed they are more serious than they appear to be. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I implore the Minister of Agriculture that if we are to proceed with the debate, to desist from these kind of remarks. If he is making an accusation that we're smirking about the plight of the farmers of Manitoba, then he'd better back that situation up.

MR. USKIW: I want to correct my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker. My remarks were directed to the obvious smirks opposite, dealing with the fact that there was some implication that I was totally responsible for all the problems and that they were sort of suspecting that I was going to come out with all the answers in some sort of grand design this afternoon. My honourable friends opposite indicated to me at this time that I had all the answers when I was on that side of the House, and I want to say in all fairness to my friends opposite that I think I was one of the most vociferous characters on that side with respect to agriculture, I have to admit that, but I don't think that I implied at any time that the government of Manitoba at that time was responsible for all the problems. --(Interjection) -- I welcome you to do so, Mr. Speaker. I want to point out that on many occasions, wherein I took issue with the then government of this province, that they were indeed not at all involved sufficiently in the development of national farm policy, and that it wasn't my position at that time that they were the only group responsible in terms of the problems related to agriculture in the Province of Manitoba. I want to make that point quite clear so that we understand our respective positions.

My honourable friend the former Minister of Agriculture has indicated that the program which we are adopting today is an obsolete one which was discarded by the previous administration, and he went on to say that....

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a question?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. ENNS: Would he clarify which former Minister of Agriculture he's referring to at this particular time?

MR. USKIW: I can realize the sensitivity of the issue, Mr. Speaker. It was the Honourable Member for Arthur that made the point, and that of course clears my honourable friend from Lakeside.

A MEMBER: He lost his job before that.

MR. USKIW: The Honourable Member for Arthur did admit, however, that the new legislation that was adopted by their government a year ago with respect to agricultural credit did not pan out. He expressed some regret that out of a projected \$150 million program in a three-year period that the record shows only some one million dollars of loan capital provided since the inception of that -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it's a good question. It was just drawn to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that there aren't too many in the House when we're dealing with such a most important matter, not even the former Minister of Agriculture.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I think we should have it on record that Social Credit was here 100 percent.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with my honourable friend the Member for Arthur that it is a fact that the new Agricultural Credit Act, as it were since a year ago, was not effective. It was not filling the need and therefore we had to come to a decision at this point to fill the vacuum. I have had on a number of occasions, as I mentioned earlier this afternoon and which members opposite would have known had they been here this afternoon, that there were many people wanting credit, working capital, short-term, medium-term credit, and were refused by the commercial lending institutions, and that the FCC, the Federal Farm Corporation was not in a position to provide them with that kind of capital and there was a real problem developing.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister permit a question? Are you saying now, or implying that all those farmers who asked for loans from the Farm Credit Corporation and other lending agencies are now going to get loans from the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation? Can you give the farmers that assurance tonight?

MR. USKIW: Of course not, Mr. Speaker. Every application for a loan has to be looked at very carefully, and in light of the information, the cash flows that appear with respect to those applications, a decision will be made by our most competent people in the department. But nevertheless it has been brought to my attention that there is a crying need and this government has taken the appropriate action.

Insofar as Section 33 is concerned, I want to point out to my honourable friend the Member for Arthur that some time ago he had raised the question whether or not socialism or the socialist principles of this government were going to launch into some sort of agricultural state farm program, and he wondered whether his constituency might become a state farm as I recall it. You know, it gave me an idea - and I was quite happy to receive the benefit of his views - and that's wherein Section 33 comes into the picture. In all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, it is not intended. -- (Interjection) -- That particular aspect of it was not.

The provision in Section 33 has to deal with the problem we have in Manitoba with respect to uneconomic farm units which hopefully, through a formula, we will develop projects to deal with and that we will be in a position to buy out certain uneconomic units for the purpose of consolidation and to re-sell these larger units back to private entrepreneurs. This is the intent in Section 33. I might point out for honourable members opposite that have such a very short memory, that part of Section 33 was in the previous act, and that has to do, my honourable friends, with the question of providing the facilities and property now designated for the University of Manitoba, and that is the Veterinary Services Laboratory which is going to be financed through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. So not all of Section 33 is something of an innovation on this part; it's something that was partly adopted from the previous bill.

Members opposite have mentioned that they thought that we would have some sort of a grand design approach. I want to point out, as I have on one or two other occasions, that we are doing things other than what is before you this afternoon or this evening. We did have representation at the Prairie Economic Council. We did submit certain proposals to the P.E.C. which hopefully will be carried through to the Federal Government for increased cash inputs into the prairies, hopefully that the Federal Government will have a sympathetic ear to these proposals. It is my hope that as soon as this Session is over that I would be involved in making representation at the federal level with members in the various sectors of the Manitoba economy, perhaps even members opposite - I haven't made up my mind about that. But my honourable friend the Minister of St. Boniface tells me there is a limit. That will be determined in due course, Mr. Speaker. But we do have at heart the total picture. This is only one part of the so-called program, and some time in the next session, some time during the next session further programs will be revealed for your consideration and for your endorsement, Mr. Speaker.

There is a problem with respect to encouraging the farmers to do certain things, and in that connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that many politicians have been guilty of advising badly because of a given opportune moment, opportune in the political sense. And I want to go back to a comment made by Alvin Hamilton when he was Minister of Agriculture, wherein he stated that as long as we can maximize production grain, of wheat, that as long as the farmers can increase their efficiency, put more land into production, maximize their production in the wheat industry, that he was sure he could find enough sales to...

-- (Interjection) -- My honourable friends opposite tell me he could have. Well I don't know

(MR. USKIW cont'd.)... that he could. You know, about two or three weeks ago I had occasion to fly over part of this province and I found out that there were many empty barns wherein at one time they were full prior to the years of the former Conservative administration at the federal level. And I'm wondering whether it was that kind of advice that emptied those barns and whether that is the reason that we now have those barns full of wheat instead of full of cattle, Mr. Speaker, at a time when we have a shortage of beef in this province, a shortage of pork in this province and a shortage of poultry products in this province. So I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether or not politicians always have a kind of credibility when they advise our people in the agricultural industry. And I want to point out that it is my intention to improve on that credibility; that when we go into credit programs we would look at the application form very carefully and have the kind of expertise that will properly advise as to whether or not the proposition is sound or not. And this is the kind of approach, Mr. Speaker, that we should have adopted some years ago.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside has indicated that the private sector was able to supply the credit need, and I again take issue with him because if that was the case, Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't have this bill before us today. And I know that members opposite know fully well that there is a shortage of capital, the money situation is tight, and the interest rates are very substantial at the present time.

Mention was made of the fact that this government has lost sight of agra business. I don't think that that is true but I think we want to be more introspective. I think we must recognize that we don't adopt a policy wherein we sacrifice all for the good of a few. I think we have to rationalize in such a way that benefits will accrue to all members in society and that we co-ordinate the efforts of all for the benefits of all.

The question of integration of producer, processor and consumer, there is no doubt in my mind, there is no doubt in my mind that this is a must, but I want to point out to you that in the absence of sufficient quantity of slaughter cattle and hogs in this province, that our packing facilities are operating at only two-thirds of capacity. This is an inefficiency, Mr. Speaker. The reason why we have this credit legislation is to try and deal with that situation, hoping that we would be directional with the kind of credit facility that we are setting up. My honourable friend the Minister of Finance tells me that was a very good point so perhaps I might make that. I want to point out that it is the intention of this government to use the capital in such a way that will direct the production of commodities in this province in a most meaningful way, most beneficial to the producers in question, and we will attempt to develop the kind of market research well in advance of the investment and hopefully not fall into the traps of previous administrations, previous governments. A development of structure within the Department of Agriculture will be unveiled, as I said earlier, at the next session which will substantiate largely what I'm trying to point out with respect to this particular bill.

My honourable friend the Member for Souris-Killarney is it, has indicated that he is a section farmer and that he has some 30,000 bushels of grain, and that he doesn't know that he wants to diversify. Well I can appreciate the fact that some people don't have the expertise to get into other fields. I can appreciate the fact that some people may be too old to get into other fields. I don't know if my honourable friend feels he's too old....

MR. PAULLEY: I hate to interrupt my honourable friend but in accordance with a resolution that was passed, the House would normally adjourn at 10:00 o'clock. I do understand, however, that there has been a consensus reached by the members of the House, as a result of consultation, that we could go on 'til 11:00 o'clock and, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether you would establish that that consensus has been arrived at, otherwise the House would adjourn at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed that the House sit until 11:00 o'clock?

MR. JORGENSEN: If we could have assurance from the Minister.....

MR. PAULLEY: I can't guarantee or give any assurance but I do think my honourable colleague is just about at the end of his remarks in connection with this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker,.... that we are agreeable in this corner and possibly we could put the matter to a vote now and see what happens.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It is not my intention to delay the passage of important legislation. I simply want to point out to my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Killarney that it is in his interest and in the interests of many other grain producers, that we have made

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . and will continue to make strong representation to the Federal Government for additional cash advances through a supplementary system. -- (Interjection) -- Markets is important, I agree, but I don't think anyone underscores the importance of markets. I think you're right. The point is well taken. I think members in the federal department, members here, recognize the importance of markets. The irony of our problem, Mr. Speaker, has to do with, in short, too much grain, not enough cattle, not enough hogs, not enough poultry. My honourable friend tells me we even have a problem with cow-calf operations in this province - and he's right. But at the same time he's trying to suggest to me that diversification is not the answer, at the same time the packing plants don't have sufficient quantity to be efficient in production. So I just want to point out the contradictory statements that are being made from that side of the House. But the finale of the whole thing, Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. MCKELLAR: May I ask the Honourable Minister a question? Is he not aware that the experts told many many farmers in the past year, go out. . . cow-calf operations. . . .

MR. USKIW: I'm fully aware of it, but perhaps we should devise a program wherein they can make some money. -- (Interjection) -- We have to change the system then. The most important point, Mr. Speaker, is that while all the criticisms that we have had from that side of the House today deal with what we are attempting to do, that is to diversify agriculture to some degree, or to be directional in this connection, this is contained within the TED Commission Report. And only a few weeks ago they said to us. . . .

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the criticism was coming from this side of the House. We were asking the Honourable Minister to implement some of the things that he's said from this side of the House when he was over here. That's all we're asking. We're not criticizing.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, if we analyze the records at some point in a day or two after we receive Hansard, we will find out that the very things that they wanted us to do because TED said it was good, tonight they've said we oughtn't to be doing this kind of thing because we may produce surpluses in other commodities. I just wanted to make that point quite clear, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland had made mention of the fact that we should be getting involved with, or we should have the authority to handle FCC loans. This is a point I made this afternoon. I'm certainly in accord with him; we will endeavour to negotiate with federal authority to accomplish this at some point.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FERGUSON: In relation to the quotation that the Minister used several times that packing plants are only operating at two-thirds capacity, I would like to ask him what is the percentage in beef, or what are the pounds of beef in store this year as compared to last year.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the statistics before me, but I do know that we have had representation - perhaps my honourable friend doesn't know it because he wasn't here last year - but the packing industry did indicate to us a year ago that they were heading for trouble. As a matter of fact, they made it quite clear that unless we get their plants into greater capacity of production that we may lose some of the very packing plants that we're talking about. As a matter of fact, there's a danger that we might lose Swift's and Canada Packers in Winnipeg if they don't maximize production through their plants.

MR. FERGUSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I believe possibly the Minister missed the point there. They claim that the reason the price of meat has gone down is that they're full. My first one wasn't answered, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . in Law Amendments and there will be every opportunity to discuss.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, . . . on the question. If the Minister will accept the question, and I think that it's a sensible question and that it is worthy of an answer. The Minister has mentioned the possibility of packing plants moving out of the province because of the fact that there is not enough production to keep their plants going, and I think we're all aware that there is a problem here. My question is: Is the fact that the plants were operating will less than capacity because of reduction in the production of cattle and hogs in the province or is it because of, you know, mechanization within the plants, technological change.

MR. USKIW: It has been brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, on more than one occasion that there isn't the sufficient quantity of product moving through the facility.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister if he's in agreement with the Prairie Economic Council about establishing markets in other countries.

MR. USKIW: Well that's like saying you believe in motherhood, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker -- thanks for that applause gentlemen. I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, whether you would kindly call the resolution standing in my name and the amendment and the amendment to the amendment thereon.

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Labour and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the discussion on this resolution and perused it in detail. I am content with the matter and prepared to let it go forward.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the sub-amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I just want to inform the House that as far as the main motion as amended is concerned, as indicated by the vote we accept both the amendment to the amendment and the amendment, and it will be my intention, because it requires a message from His Honour, to add the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill to the committee by resolution and by a message of His Honour.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the main motion as amended and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, whether we would call the Committee of the Whole House to consider the bills standing in the name of -- Bills Nos. 36, 38 and 39. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bills 36, 38 and 39.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. When I was consulted about giving leave it was mentioned that we were only going to consider the two bills, not go into third readings or the Whole House.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I guess it must be my failure to communicate properly with the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I indicated to him our great desire to -- and I think I express the desire of all members of the House -- that we proceed as quickly as possible, and I indicated to him also that I had received consensus from all members of the House at the time I spoke to him that we would continue until 11:00 o'clock, in the hope that we would succeed in clearing quite a bit of the business before us. I'm sorry that he misunderstood.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Kildonan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health and Social Services.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I was trying to indicate earlier this morning that this particular section, Section 28 (1)(a), is a model of status quoism. It's an attempt to make things exactly as they were before the passing of the legislation, and as near as I have been able to ascertain, and despite what has been said by some of the members opposite, there will be nobody financially affected by this legislation.

The worker who had his premium paid will be entitled to the same savings as every other worker because the money will be passed on by the Corporation to him, and will pay the taxes that every other worker does. I would ask you to consider what would occur if we didn't pass the legislation. His premium would not be paid as it was before and he would be required to finance the reduction, which is a situation which would be entirely intolerable, that not only would his premium not be paid but that he would finance the reduction, whereas other people who paid their own medicare premiums, they would get the reduction for the purpose of

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... assisting them to pay the increased taxes.

The employer, it will not cost any employer one cent more than he has already paid. He will continue to pay exactly the amount and will show the exact amount in continued payments on his balance sheet, under the expenditure ledger of his balance sheet, as he showed the day before the legislation was passed.

The government, it will not cost them anything. And the Member for Riel, who indicated that there would be an administrative problem, is right, there would be some administrative problem. But it wouldn't be on the basis that we would be sending out cheques once a month, we would try and do it a little bit more intelligently than that. There would be periodic remissions to the employees on the basis of some sensible scheme.

The employee who was not having his medicare premiums paid by the employer prior to the Act will be in exactly the same position.

The employer that both the Leader of the Opposition referred to and the Member for Riel referred to, the employer who is presently voluntarily or under a contract of sufferance making a payment for the employee in terms of his medicare premiums, could have stopped doing that a week ago and will be able to stop doing that a week from now. But only because he has permitted himself that flexibility and the Act will not in any way change that. If there is a contract of employment between an employer and an employee for a year, even if it's not a collective agreement, that employer will be required to continue making the medicare premiums.

And so, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen and lady, all that is being done here is an attempt - and I realize that sometimes attempts don't succeed entirely - but as near as I can see it, this attempt will succeed in leaving everybody in the same position as they were before.

Now the employer who talks about double taxation - and that's the last problem that I'm going to deal with - is just not telling the truth, Mr. Speaker. Because all that he will have to do is pay the same corporation tax that every other employer will pay, and he will continue to pay the medicare premiums for his employees, which is what he paid before. His taxes won't go up more than any other employers taxes will go up, and as a matter of fact, to do the contrary would be to give that employer a competitive advantage over his competitor.

Let us assume, Mr. Chairman, that we have two employers. Let us assume that the Member for Riel was one employer and the Member for Rhineland was another. The Member for Riel had been making the medicare premiums to his employees. The Member for Rhineland had been paying them an additional \$100.00 a year which would take care of that. Both the same situation, both selling the same merchandise, both competing on the same basis.

The Medicare Act comes in and the Member for Riel doesn't turn the money over to his employee, he keeps it, and he's got, let us say, 100 employees. He immediately has a hundred times a hundred which is a \$10,000 competitive advantage over the Member for Rhineland, for no reason at all other than that the people who were entitled to benefit by the reduction in medicare premiums did not get it and he got it.

Both would be paying the same taxes, and, Mr. Chairman, I hate to admit it but the extent of status quoism in this legislation makes me feel like an economic Conservative, because that is all that is being done with regard to this particular section. All we are doing is trying to maintain the status quo, and as near as that as possible I suggest we are doing it. Any other system, any other system such as has been mentioned by any of the members who have spoken thus far, would upset that status quo, would create an unfair advantage either to one person or to another person. We feel that all of the people of Manitoba who are receiving a reduction in premiums should receive that premium equally, as near as is possible for us to accomplish this. We hope we can do so by the section which is now before you and I would commend the section to the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready to proceed? The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, at the committee hearings, as I recall, there was a question asked as to whether or not verbal agreements as well as written agreements would be considered an agreement in the wording of the legislation, and I don't recall exactly the answer that was given at that time from the government.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, my view as a lawyer, a contract of employment is a contract of employment whether it's verbal or whether it's written. If the employee could prove that the contract was for a period of a year, then I would think he would be entitled to the reduction in premium. But that's really not the difficult situation. The difficult situation is where an employee is employed as sufferance, or on a month's notice or on a week's notice, and in such

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... a contract there is nothing anybody can do for that employee because the employer could say that next month maybe I will pay your medicare premium but I'll reduce your wages by \$100.00. And there is really nothing that the legislation can do vis-a-vis that particular employee. We're not attempting to freeze employment relationships in accordance with a governmental standard. All we are trying to do is maintain the employment relationships that existed before as far as it's possible to do so.

You asked me whether a verbal agreement is an agreement within the meaning of this Act. I would say yes, but a verbal agreement is always something that is difficult to prove. And furthermore, an agreement to employ from month to month would not entitle to an employee, unless he could make that arrangement with his employer, to have a continued payment of his medicare premiums. And he couldn't do it before the Act was passed so there's no change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 2 - 28(a), subsection (a)...

MR. GREEN: There was a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I moved the motion before that 28 (a)(1) be deleted.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, before we go on to it, I find myself in the difficult position here that I'm not in disagreement with the action that was initiated last spring, but I do find that there's a serious inadequacy of information on the number of employees in the province that we are affecting by this decision. I don't know whether the Minister can give us this information. I don't know how long it will take him to get it, but if he could conceivably do it in a matter of a day or two I think it would be a much sounder basis on making this decision.

Certainly if it covered all the employees in the province that carry a medical scheme, which it doesn't, there would be no problem in it. But I still see, despite his argument, that we are to a certain extent not benefitting the employees who were under a program before, that will not get these payments in lieu, and I can't see any reason whereby they will. We are benefitting those where the agreement was formalized, and I realize that they would have a loss. There appears to be no alternate way, which it could be done by letting the contract run out, as I asked the Minister personally on this. But we are in serious lack of information here in making this decision and I'm greatly concerned about supporting it at this moment, particularly in light of the taxation legislation.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm able to provide the honourable member with the same information which he had available to him last year.

There are numerous forms of collective agreements in the Province of Manitoba. Some of them provide for full payment of medicare premiums; some of them provide for three-quarter payment; some of them provide for half payment; some of them provide for no payment.

There are many employment relationships in the Province of Manitoba which are not formalized by collective or any other kind of agreement. In these instances where the employer has, as part of his standard payment to his employees, paid the medicare premium so to speak, as the Leader of the Opposition said it out of the goodness of his heart, then all I can say is that if his heart does not continue to remain good he could do many things to that employee. He could fire him next week; he could reduce his wages next week if the employee wanted to continue to work for reduced wages; he could take off his medicare premium next week, with or without legislation; and he could continue to pay. I happen to think that if an employer is now incurring that cost that he'd be very unwise not to continue to incur it and not to pass that on to his employees.

But I am not prepared to bring in legislation to force him to do so. The only legislation this government is prepared to bring in - and we don't think that we should throw out the baby with the bath water, because we can't legislate for everybody we should legislate for nobody. We intend to legislate in such a way that those people who are bound by a contractual relationship will continue that relationship and we will not upset it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CRAIK: Could the Minister of Labour, by chance, give us any information on how many people would come under the term "agreement"?

MR. PAULLEY: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that as far as Manitobans are concerned, of course they're all under it. I would hazard a guess - and it's only a guess, and I'm sure my honourable friend would appreciate this - that in the railway industry there may be approximately 10,000, and outside of that, outside of the trucking industry that is -- (Interjection) -- Well I can't really hazard a guess at the present time, but I believe - is it not true that as far as the provincial is concerned they are covered under -- (Interjection) -- Well, there is a collective agreement.

MR. GREEN: For instance, I'd like to advise the honourable member of what he learned last year. The province does not pay the medicare premiums for the employees so there will be no change; they'll continue to not pay. Anybody that is paying up to now, will pay.

Mr. Chairman, I can only repeat the phrase, that as far as it's possible to maintain the status quo, this piece of legislation does that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I still feel that the representation that was made in committee in connection with this section was valid. I don't feel that the employers will be drastic in any way, that even if this is deleted that they will be hard. All we are doing by deleting this section is saying that there can be further negotiations, which the protection is retained. There will be no further negotiations. -- (Interjection) -- Well once the contract expires, well then it's self-understood that they will then be discussing these on the basis of the new premiums, of the lower premiums. The matter of bureaucracy that will enter into this has already been indicated and mentioned by the Member for Riel, and I think it's quite well that this should be dropped.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion before the House is that Section 28 (1)(a) be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 36 was read section by section and passed.)
Bill No. 38. Section 1--

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on Section 1, I would move the amendment that the last word in that section be changed from 18 to 19. This is changing the voting age from 18 and substituting therefor the word 19. I have given my reasons for this on previous occasions and I think members are probably not in the mood to debate this at any length at this hour. I think it's rather unfortunate that we had to extend the time tonight to pass this important bill and not allowing the necessary time to deal with it.

But I definitely feel that as far as the voting age is concerned that 18 in my opinion is just a little too young, and that I feel that 19 is a better age. I've indicated that these young people are then out of high school, many have started out on their own, earning money on their own and paying taxes, and I'm sure that once they pay taxes they get a different idea about many things and that this is probably a better time to give them the right or the franchise to vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The question is to change 18 to 19.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sections 1--passed; 2 as amended--

A MEMBER: I wonder what the amendment was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 2-(a) of Section 35 of The Election Act as enacted by Chapter 19 of the Statutes of Manitoba 1968 is amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the word "eighteen".

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move an amendment that the word "eighteen" be struck out and that the figure "twenty-one" be reinserted. I feel that we should draw a distinction between the voting age and the right to be a candidate or be a member of this Assembly. Certainly we know that from practical experience in any business....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must interrupt the honourable gentleman. I can't accept a motion which is contrary to the amendment. The amendment says: "From twenty-one to eighteen." The gentleman is putting it back to twenty-one which is contrary to what the amendment is.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, this was done in committee. Certainly we have a right to amend again in Committee of the Whole.

MR. PAULLEY: that way, because the only way you could do it is vote against it and then reinsert it, because the age 21 is in there now and it's just reverting it back.

MR. FROESE: Twenty-one is not in there now. Age 18 is in there now.

MR. PAULLEY: It is in the amending section. Mr. Chairman, if I may say to my honourable friend, the figure 21 is in legislation at the present time. The amendment changes 21 to 18.

MR. FROESE: In Law Amendments.

MR. PAULLEY: In the legislation, and the way to achieve what my honourable friend desires is to have sufficient support or vote against the change of the age from 21 to 18.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, may I suggest, in deference to the Member for Rhineland, is it possible to have a vote on this one section of the Act?

MR. PAULLEY:

MR. FROESE: No, Mr. Chairman, I must take exception to the Honourable the House Leader, that just by voting against it that you're

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . ruling has been made and I think the ruling is a correct one. I think it is clear that if the honourable member wishes the minimum age to remain at 21 then he votes against this amendment and he succeeds therefore in having the age for running for election at 21. If this section is voted down, then the Act stays as it is in respect to the candidate, and that's very clear, and he has every right and can succeed in bringing forth his proposal by appealing to members of the committee to vote against this section in this amending bill.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, just to make sure that we're all talking about the same thing here, if the honourable member wishes to move something different, for example age 20, then it will be in order for him to move the amendment to read age 20 or age 22. As long as we are clear in that regard.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, he's perfectly correct, but to achieve what my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland wants to achieve, retained at 21, the only way that should be accomplished at this time is to vote against the amendment at 18.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I still feel that I was correct, but nevertheless let it go as it is. If that is the case, then I would urge honourable members to support me in voting the amendment down, because I definitely feel that the age 18 is too young in my opinion to be a candidate and to be a member of this House. I feel that 21 is still rather young in my opinion, because we know in practical life if you engage a person to do a certain job and you want to give him considerable responsibility, that you look for maturity and that you do not just give such a responsible job to just any person. Therefore, I feel that in this case where we're dealing with millions of dollars, where so many other things come into consideration, I feel the age of 18 is too young and that we should restore it to 21.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause (2)--passed?

MR. FROESE: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: There again, you just called for a pass vote. How can you object?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . to my honourable friend if he called for a vote, we'll have a vote against the motion. If my honourable friend got support, well then let's have a vote. I have no objection to the vote and I'm not trying to, to use a term, railroad this. My honourable friend has the right and I'm not trying to circumvent that right, and that is the right to vote against the amendment as proposed.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think this just goes to indicate that the procedure we're taking here is not the proper one or the correct one, because you're just calling for a pass vote and you're not calling for a vote as to the members which way they want to vote.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, in order to facilitate matters, you go back and call for the vote on the amendment, those in favour; those against.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause (2) is passed in that case. Clause (3)--

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, could we have a standing vote on that section?

MR. PAULLEY: Provided my honourable friend has support.

MR. FROESE: Well, I'll see whether I can get it. If I can't get it, it's . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, in order to satisfy my honourable friend that he is in fact able to get a vote in this House if he wants one, I'm prepared to support his motion for a vote.

-- (Interjections)--

MR. PAULLEY: All right, let's have a vote. My honourable friend, I'm very co-operative tonight. Call in the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

For the members who were absent, the vote has been requested by the member for Rhineland on the amendment to change 21 to 18 in Clause 2.

A COUNTED STANDING VOTE was taken, the results being as follows: Yeas, 39; Nays, 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried.

MR. FROESE: Before we proceed to the next section, I have another amendment. I move that Section 37 of the Act be amended:

(a) by adding thereto at the end of Clause (b) of Section 2 thereof the word "and";

(b) by striking out the word "and" in the third line of Clause (c) of Section 2 thereof;

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

(c) by striking out Clause (d) of Section 2 thereof; and

(d) by striking out the word "one" in the second line of Subsection (3) thereof and substituting therefor the figure "2".

Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the matter of deposits. This is the same motion that was made by the Honourable the present House Leader in '68 when this matter was discussed, so you can rest assured that this was researched and that it is the proper amendment in that respect. If you want to, I can read it out again from the Hansard of May 24, 1968, as it was proposed by the....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must interrupt the member. I can find no reference to Section 37 in this Bill 38.

MR. FROESE: You don't require it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must rule the amendment out of order.

MR. FROESE: Why? Mr. Chairman.....

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, if the government is proposing an amendment to an Act, surely it is in order for further amendments to be proposed to the same Act. That's part of the bill is it not? -- (Interjection) -- Not to that particular section, but to the Act as such. Now once it's opened up the Act, can not amendments be proposed?

MR. FROESE: just passed an amendment that was not part and parcel of the Act or the bill before you; now you want to rule this one out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But it was part of the section that was opened.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't rise to dispute the rights of my honourable friend in proposing his resolution, but I do say to my honourable friend that - and I agree with him that I did propose a similar resolution at one stage and I think that I was right then - but I do want to appeal to my honourable friend that we have passed a resolution, outside of the voting age, to establish a committee to go into all aspects of the Election Act which will include the proposition of my honourable friend and a number of others. I say that I'm not trying to deprive my honourable friend of the right of the introduction, but coming at this stage in a Committee of the Whole House, I'm sure that honourable members generally would not realize the full significance of the amendment as proposed by my honourable friend. And I appeal to him, and I don't want to circumvent his rights and I won't, but I do respectfully suggest to my honourable friend that the contents of his amendment may be such that it could be considered when the Committee on Elections and Privileges meet, and I ask him whether or not that he would be prepared to propose that at that time. Again, I want it clearly emphasized that I am not trying to curtail the rights of my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the amendment that we just passed was introduced at the time of Law Amendments. The atmosphere in the Law Amendments Committee that night certainly wasn't conducive to bringing in any further amendments at that time and this is why I am bringing in the amendment at this particular time. If honourable members are willing to hear from Hansard of May 24, 1968, as to the exact amendment that was proposed, I can read it off again. This was made by the now present House Leader and it says: "Section 37 of the Act as amended: (a) by adding thereto at the end of Clause (b) of Section 2 thereof the word "and"; (b) by striking out the word "and" in the third line of Clause (c) of Section 2 thereof; (c) by striking out Clause (d) of Section 2 thereof; and (d) by striking out the word "one" in the second line of Section 3 thereof and substituting therefor the figure '2'." And then he says: "Is that clear?"

So, Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that was proposed at that time. This eliminates the \$200.00 deposit that is required under the present Election Act to be deposited by a candidate if he wants to run for election. I supported the New Democratic Party in their contention at that time, I was with them on this because I feel that this is more or less a licence on democracy and that we should do away with this. I don't feel that this is essential, that we should be required to put up a \$200.00 deposit when you want to run in an election for office of this country or of this province, and therefore I appeal to honourable members to support me in this effort to have it removed.

I see no reason, when other matters have been brought forward in this bill before us such as the voting age, that we cannot consider this matter as well at this particular time, and therefore I would appeal to honourable members to support me in this motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing with my honourable friend. If I proposed

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... that resolution it must have been a good one, when I was on that side of the House, and at that time regrettably apparently it must have been voted down. But may I make this suggestion to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that we do not proceed further with this particular bill in order to give us an opportunity to consult with the Legislative Counsel as to whether I was right then in all the descriptions of the Act, The Election Act. There may have been changes that I'm not aware of at the present time. I'm not arguing with my honourable friend as to the context because if I proposed it it must have been a good proposition. And if I proposed it then I'm prepared, the government is prepared to accept it now, but I would like, in order to be sure that everything is in order, to check it with the Legislative Counsel and this is all I request of my honourable friend.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, might I ask a question of the last speaker? Did I hear him correctly to say that any proposals he made in the past, that the government is prepared to accept now?

MR. PAULLEY: Aw, come on now, Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. No, I did not. As a matter of fact, previously, Mr. Chairman, I made many a proposal to try and cajole or to activate the government of the day into action and it doesn't necessarily follow. But I do ask this, and again I'm not opposing the proposition of my honourable friend, I do not oppose the principle, but I do want an opportunity to check it out with the Legislative Counsel. That's all I'm asking, Mr. Chairman, that the committee consider at this point.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, this amendment was also dealt with on a previous occasion in Law Amendments when we had legal counsel with us at that time.

MR. PAULLEY: At that time, but it might have been changed since.

MR. FROESE: No, because I've got the original copy here of the statutes with me right here and I can read the section dealing with this if you want to hear it.

MR. PAULLEY: All right.

MR. FROESE: The proposed amendment is quite in order and Section 37 (d), the only part that is eliminated says - it is in connection with the deposit - "(d) It is accompanied by a deposit of \$200.00." That's what section (d) says and that's what you're eliminating. So the amendment is perfectly in order, it's the same amendment that has been proposed not only once by the New Democratic Party but more than once on different occasions, and I feel that it is quite in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say immediately that I agree with the Member from Ste. Rose. I think that any members certainly are in order in bringing in an amendment, any amendment when an Act has been brought forward. So therefore I want the honourable member to know that I realize that and I agree that he can make this resolution or this amendment. But I for one will certainly not support it, not support it because I don't think that it is quite right at this time. This is why we have second reading. I think quite right, he's in order, but it wouldn't be right for me -- I think it's irresponsible if we tonight decide to pass on a thing like this when we already have a committee that will study this.

It's something new, and if the other members, or some other members anyway, would have thought that we were going to review the whole -- if that meant that we were going to review the Act I'm sure that we would have had certain suggestions and I certainly have certain suggestions. I don't think this Act is perfect, far from it, and I think that at this time -- I'm not suggesting that the mover of this resolution is not responsible because he did his homework and he's convinced that he's right in doing that. But I don't think that the others have had sufficient notification to study this and if we do that we would re-open the whole thing. I'm not even ready to look at this at this time when there is going to be a committee that will look into that. So I will certainly not support this even if you call him in order, and I think he is in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee prepared to proceed?

MR. PAULLEY: We're in a bit of a dilemma in some respects. I do really and seriously suggest to my honourable friend that we'd like to take a look at this before we deal with the matter. Now there's two ways in which it can be done. Either the honourable member agrees that we hold this particular Act at this time in the Committee for consideration of his proposition and go on to another Act - and we can do that with the consent of my honourable friend. I think that this would be a reasonable approach. The other alternative would be - and I don't feel inclined to do so - would be to move that the Committee rise, which would be possible. We had agreed to go until 11:00 o'clock and it might be that we can proceed with some other bill that's

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.).... in the Committee of the Whole House, or it could be, it could be my honourable friend would allow us an opportunity to -- (Interjection) -- All right, then I'll talk until -- (Interjection) -- If my honourable friend will do that then possibly we could proceed. But I want to guarantee to my honourable friend that if he would be agreeable we would not further proceed with the Election Act in committee at this time.

MR. FROESE: That's fine.

MR. PAULLEY: Then, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could go on to the next bill in Committee of the Whole House on the understanding and undertaking to my honourable friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 39. Clause 1....

MR. BILTON:copies of the amendment....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Member for Rhineland provide a copy to all members.

MR. FROESE: I'll write out some more motions and give them to the honourable members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 1--passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, maybe the member has copies of Hansard....

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 39 was read section by section and passed.)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the Committee rise.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee has considered Bill 36 with amendments and Bill 39 without amendments and wish to report the same.

IN SESSION

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

BILL NO. 36, by leave, and Bill No. 37, were each read a third time and passed.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 39, an Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba) 1962, for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we have now reached near the hour of adjournment. I want to first, before proposing the formal motion if I may, Mr. Speaker, remind members of the Municipal Affairs Committee that there will be a meeting tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock, a procedural meeting; and also, may I remind the members of the Law Amendments Committee. It will be the intention to meet tomorrow at 2:30, and after routine procedures that we would go into Law Amendments at approximately 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon. I draw this to the attention of honourable members, knowing that they are anxious to fulfill their obligations and duties as members of this Assembly.

I now, Mr. Speaker, beg to move, seconded by the Honourable....

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, could the House Leader indicate that we plan to sit tomorrow night? I think for some of the new members who have become accustomed to Wednesday evenings off, this might be information.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is the intention, in accordance with the resolution passed unanimously by this House, we will be meeting tomorrow night.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that the House do now adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Wednesday morning.