

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 27, 1975

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 60 students of Grade 7 standing, of the Nordale School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kazina and Mr. Skabar. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on Thursday, March 27, 1975, to consider the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Corporation. Having received all information requested by any member from Mr. S. J. Parsons, Chairman of the Board and General Manager of the Corporation, the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Corporation for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1974, was accepted by the Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister in charge of Autopac.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation)(St. George): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended October 31, 1974. I believe there will be copies distributed for the honourable members.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other ministerial statements or tabling of reports? The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an Order for Return presented to me by the Honourable Member for Roblin, dated March 17, 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development)(St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Health Services Commission to the end of December, 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this particular report has been tabled as yet, and accordingly I would table now - copies will be . . . the requisite number will be made available this afternoon - the report entitled Financial Statements of Boards, Commissions and Government Agencies of the Province of Manitoba for the last fiscal year.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the Premier but, before that, I would just like to say that the Official Opposition would like to associate itself with the congratulations, I am sure, that the Premier is extending to his colleague, Premier Lougheed of Alberta.

My first question to the Premier relates to an Order-in-Council of yesterday, I believe - dated March 25th - in connection with an authorization of the payment of \$2,500,000 from the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund to the Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited. I wonder if he can indicate what this money was advanced for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the money was advanced for technical reasons, having to do with the fact that some \$12 million plus interest is being held by the Department of Finance as being DREE funds from the Government of Canada. We are not in a position to transfer those funds as yet, although that is where they are intended to go, and until certain technical requirements are met, those funds remain in trust and in the meantime we are offsetting advances from time to time against those \$12 million.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether this is the first such advance made against the moneys held by the government.

MR. SCHREYER: Affirmative.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to indicate whether the moneys, or the accounts of the Receiver of CFI as opposed to ManFor, indicated in its balance sheet the money held by trust, held by the government in trust, as moneys owing or available for disbursement and use by the Receiver.

MR. SCHREYER: That becomes just a little involved, sir. I'll be glad to take the question as notice.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. I wonder if the Minister could advise the House if Mr. Parasiuk has been replaced as the Chairman of the Communities Economic Development Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): I think, to put it in the affirmative, Mr. Loxley, who came to the government to perform some of the services previously performed by Mr. Parasiuk, has been named Chairman of the Communities Economic Development Corporation, and Mr. Parasiuk is doing the work that was previously done by Mr. Eliason, which I think, if one looks at hierarchies, is a promotion. Just so that there is no misunderstanding, Mr. Parasiuk will be available at the Committee of Economic Development when the committee meets to hear that report in case there are any questions which are to be put to him.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is now to the Minister of Co-operatives. I wonder if the Minister would advise the House the status of the timber wolf population in Manitoba at this time and are they causing any serious problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That question can be asked under the Estimates. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. I wonder if he could confirm to the House that the converted half-ton or one-ton vehicles that have been used in transporting school children in the various school divisions throughout the province, will no longer be insurable under the Public Insurance Corporation after June 30th. The small trucks, half-ton or one-ton, some four-wheel drives that have camper units on them, or box units on them, that are used in transporting school children on various school divisions, if they will no longer be insurable after June 30th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice but the vehicle itself will be insurable because the insurance is compulsory. If he's talking about the value of the camper that may have to be insured as an additional coverage through special risks extension policies.

MR. BLAKE: A supplementary question. I'm referring to the occupants and their transporting school children, they operate as school buses and they're transporting children, and we've been given to understand that they'll no longer be insurable after June 30th.

MR. URUSKI: They are being transported . . . I'll take that question as notice and check it out, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable member has any specifics, I would like to have that from him.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary if the Minister might also like to take

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) . . . as notice, it is our understanding that the camper units that are seen so frequently on the highways today, that they are not covered by insurance if they have more than three passengers. I wonder if he would also look into that and confirm that to us.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will take that as notice but if that vehicle is used regularly for other than its intended purpose, the honourable member is probably correct, but I'll take that as notice.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could now . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Take the Order for Return first. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the names of the directors or board members of the following government agencies and the remuneration of the individuals in each case:

- Manitoba Development Corporation
- Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation
- Communities Economic Development Fund
- Manitoba Forestry Resources Ltd.
- Milk Control Board
- Manitoba Hydro
- Manitoba Telephone System
- Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd.
- Human Rights Commission
- Law Reform Commission
- Public Schools Finance Board
- Universities Grants Commission
- Liquor Control Commission
- Manitoba Water Services Board
- Veterinary Services Commission
- Land Value Appraisal Commission
- Manitoba Health Services Commission
- Manitoba Export Corporation
- Manitoba Labour Board
- Workers' Compensation Board
- Civil Service Commission
- Welfare Advisory Committee (Appeal Board)
- Clean Environment Commission
- Manitoba Water Commission
- Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation
- Drivers' License Suspension Appeal Board
- Manitoba Boxing and Wrestling Commission
- Manitoba Feed Grain Marketing Commission
- Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board
- Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation
- Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba
- Manitoba Lotteries Commission
- Moose Lake Loggers Ltd.
- Morden Fine Foods Ltd.

MR. SPEAKER: If it will be dispensed with then it will be entered in the Hansard as a record. Agreed? (Agreed) The Order for Return agreed to.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in looking at the Order for Return I find that each of the boards or commissions referred to here are on record by way of Order-in-Council as to membership of boards and their remuneration. I give the commitment that if the honourable member finds that any one of these boards or agencies is not on record by way of Order-in-Council as to membership of boards and remuneration, we will provide that information by

ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . way of subsequent Order for Return, but as proposed here we are not prepared to accept it because it is a duplication of effort at public expense, and furthermore, caucuses of this Assembly now receiving \$1,000 per caucus member for research, it is a simple research to take it from the already existing public record.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could undertake to provide us with the dates of the Orders for Return or the Orders-in-Council covering these. We'll be quite prepared to put the information together if we know where it is. But under \$1,000 allowance per MLA, we certainly haven't got a staff that can do the sort of work asked for in entirety in this Return.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't want to be difficult about this. The information is certainly a matter of right to obtain, but it already exists, sir, on the public record, and I believe that caucus is financed to have or to hire a research person, and accordingly it is a matter of rather simple research at that to obtain.

SPEAKER'S RULING ON ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We have seemed to arrive at where we were just going to start debating the issue back and forth. I would suggest that since it has been stated, and I would assume just by glancing at some of the names that are on here that this is public information, that the honourable member research and find out which ones aren't on public record.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that it be transferred to the Order Paper. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. My ruling is not that it's debatable or anything else, but that it's not acceptable as an Order for Return because it's public information to some degree. And now if the honourable member will give us information which is not public information then we can have it as an Order for Return.

The Honourable Member for Morris,

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Under our rules, if an Order for Return is refused by the government, which in this instance it has been, the member who proposes it has the right to transfer that Order for Return for debate. That is what the Member for Riel is proposing to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can see where the difficulty arises. We did have such a rule when the government refused information which it was in order to be requested. The rule change that we made did not intend to make what was previously an out of order Order for Return in order on debate. In other words it's still for the Speaker to rule whether the Order for Return is a debatable motion and to make what was previously an order for a . . . an out of order Order for Return, in order on debate. In other words it's still for the Speaker to rule whether the order for return is a debatable motion. My submission was going to be, if the Speaker had not himself intervened, was going to be that this motion is out of order. If it was in order and the government refused, then it would be debatable, and I believe that is our rule, that is the rule under which the House operated previously, and there was no intention when the rule change was made, to make in order and out of order motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Well, Mr. Speaker, referring to the Order for Return, it's quite correct as the First Minister states that we probably can search records and find out who the directors are. But, on many of these occasions I know from looking that you cannot find out what the remuneration is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: One further point. I think that if the record is perused, the journals of past years, they will find that a similar Order for Return was passed year after year and accepted and returned. Now the wording may not be precise but similar orders for return have been passed and it was on the basis of previous Orders for Return that this was formulated in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, there has been a valid point of order raised by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. Certainly there

SPEAKER'S RULING

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . can be no question but that if the public record, the orders in council in this case, do not show membership or remuneration, then that kind of information ought to be provided . There's no question about that. But with respect to all the others, in which both membership and remuneration is already on the public record, it's merely a case of researching the public record, and it is accessible, and what has changed since the precedent that my Honourable friend from Morris might be looking at, is the fact that now there is \$1,000 per MLA per caucus for research, for precisely this kind of thing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that not only is it based on former Orders for Return, but in years past there was a tradition in this House when the former Member for Lakeside, Mr. Campbell, stood in the House during the first week of the session, and asked for these, and they were provided without order for return. It became a tradition that these things were supplied as a matter of courtesy by the government. It didn't even require an Order for Return. Now we can't get it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must indicate to the honourable members of the House that just glancing at the list, there are a number that I am aware of are public information. The Manitoba Hydro Act indicates the remuneration, and of course the board members, and so on. There are a number of these. Now, if the Honourable Member will have a look at this and reconstruct it and resubmit it, I'm willing to accept it but under the present conditions, I am not.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? All those in favour please say Aye. Against, say Nay. In my opinion the Ayes have it. Declare the motion carried.

MR. CRAIK: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

YEAS

Messrs.	Adam	Johannson
	Barrow	McBryde
	Bostrom	Malinowski
	Boyce	Miller
	Cherniack	Osland
	Derewianchuk	Pawley
	Desjardins	Petursson
	Dillen	Schreyer
	Doern	Shafransky
	Evans	Toupin
	Gottfried	Turnbull
	Green	Uruski
	Hanuschak	Uskiw
	Jenkins	Walding

NAYS

Messrs.	Axworthy	Henderson
	Banman	G. Johnston
	Bilton	Jorgenson
	Blake	McGill
	Brown	McGregor
	Craik	McKellar
	Einarson	McKenzie
	Enns	Minaker
	Ferguson	Patrick
	Graham	Spivak
		Watt

CLERK: Yeas 28; Nays 21.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Ayes have it. I declare the motion carried. The

SPEAKER'S RULING

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . Honourable House Leader, The Honourable First Minister,

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, subject to guidance from you, sir, with respect to the procedure under the rules, it's my impression that the Order for Return . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Has not been allowed. The Honourable House Leader,

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on to the adjourned debates on second reading, followed by the second readings Bill No. 11 . . . 14.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 3, proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell,

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Can I have this matter stand please, Mr. Speaker,

BILL NO. 11 - AGRICULTURE SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. Bill No. 11. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture,

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet) presented Bill No. 11, an act to amend the Agriculture Societies Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister,

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, this is another one of those amendments to an Act which is designed to give greater flexibility in the operations of our grant program to agriculture societies. Members will recall that we've had a series of amendments in the last few years, and these are simply to add to those which would in fact provide for a much more direct and better relationship between the department providing grants and the various societies throughout the province. It is also in response to representations that have been made by the Ag Society Advisory Board and various fair boards, and so on. I would think that it will result if approved, Mr. Speaker, with a much more meaningful contribution from the province to the operations of these groups.

One of the main changes is, of course, in the area of provincial adjustment in grants. It is our feeling that we should upgrade grants to some of these associations. The area of prize money, for example, we think that we can bear a larger percentage of the costs, and we're changing that to something like 65 percent to 75 percent of provincial funding.

We are removing the ceiling from the \$10,000 limit rather on prize money grants to "A" fairs, and that too is in keeping with the desire to have flexibility based on programs, and of course which will always be controlled by the budget review process. Certainly we have been approached by these groups on a number of occasions for a good number of years to be more flexible in that area.

We also want to give greater support to the Austin Museum and therefore we are removing the ceiling on grants to that corporation. We believe it is a very worthwhile venture in Manitoba, the Austin Museum. I personally am very much impressed with what is going on there, and the \$3,000 limit that is now in the existing act is simply not meaningful in terms of the size of the operation that is undertaken at that museum. So, we are not suggesting that we are going to be incredibly generous, but at least, Mr. Speaker, we want to be in a position to respond to the programs that are presented to us each year and of course the normal budgetary constraints will have to govern. Also, we feel that the province should have a more direct involvement in the operation of the museum. You will notice that provisions are being made for direct representation. The part of the board of directors representation which would be appointed by the Province of Manitoba in the order of some three directors, that would be the provincial input of the total board of directors.

An additional provision that we feel is worthwhile in the area of travelling expenses for people who serve on boards of directors of your larger fairs, the "A" fairs. We're hoping that by doing that, Mr. Speaker, that people that are somewhat removed from the location of the activities would want to participate more than they have in the past, and we have to appreciate the fact that many people do give of their time and money, out-of-pocket expenses every time they have to attend a board meeting, and that we would want to make provision to cover those out-of-pocket expenses, and hence to have a greater involvement and a larger area, around Brandon for example, without penalty to those members that have to travel some distance.

So in essence, Mr. Speaker, these are what I would call housekeeping in nature, although their impact perhaps will be perhaps a little more substantial in the years ahead.

BILL 11

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . For the moment, the current year's position, we are locked into the existing provisions. I don't believe we have budgeted in anticipation of the changes of this Act but for future years we will be able to respond more in relationship to programs presentations that we receive from the various groups across the province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Roblin, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 14 - UNSATISFIED JUDGMENT FUND ACT AMENDMENT

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General)(Selkirk) presented Bill No. 14, an Act to amend the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a piece of legislation which is made necessary because of the form of concept in respect to the insuring of motor vehicles that existed in Manitoba prior to Autopac in 1971.

Members will recall that there existed an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund to which a levy was made in respect to each driver's permit, a sum of money which was used as payment towards a fund from which orders could be made against for payment of judgments received against those that were operating vehicles on our highways that had no insurance. The number of uninsured in Manitoba during that period of time were very difficult to estimate precisely, but estimates would range from 5 to 10 percent. Certainly insofar as the proportion of accidents caused by those in that uninsured range, they were much higher than the 5 to 10 percent.

As Autopac came into existence one of the very distinct advantages of the development of public automobile insurance in Manitoba was the absorbing of any uninsured claims which were very very little because of the, well, Mr. Speaker practically non-existent numbers of uninsured motorists in Manitoba into the Autopac concept.

But this of course did not take into consideration those that were still involved in pressing their claims from the period prior to Autopac. So that since Autopac claims continue to be heard in our courts, settlements still being arrived at as a result of claims against the old Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

At the same time as claims are being presented and orders being given by the courts, settlements are arrived at between litigants and the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund personnel, that payments can be made on a monthly basis, sometimes as small as 10, 15, 20 dollars a month, other times much larger, or that it would be straight cash payments in settling the claims under the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

The fact is, however, that it will take many many years in order to collect all those moneys that are owing to the Fund from settlement of claims under the old legislation. In the meantime Mr. Speaker, we find that there are no moneys to pay orders that are still being obtained through the courts dealing with the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. So that the legislation which we have before us is to provide for the payment from the consolidated funds, moneys that would otherwise be payable under the old Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, rather than reinstating a levy which has existed prior to, I believe it was 1972 when that levy was discontinued. So we have to make payment of the claims and this bill is introduced in order to provide a means in order to do that.

I understand that the Department of Finance has also requested that the present Act be changed in order to authorize special payments to be made from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund in respect of costs to the Attorney-General's Department in appearing and doing work in connection with cases and for driver training programs, driver testing programs, highway safety programs, etc., that this section in the old Act be repealed. The Fund, as it will be exhausted in any event, the Department of Finance has recommended that such payments should be made from ordinary appropriations voted for those purposes. So the basic purpose is to provide funds for payment of old judgments and settlements under the old Unsatisfied Judgment Fund that are still accumulating, and two minor technical changes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Minnedosa.

BILL 14

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member from Rhineland, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Before the motion is put I'd like to ask the Honourable, the Minister if the Act really, and as I can read it, is going to do away with the Unsatisfied Judgment set-up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think that question can be answered later in committee. --(Interjection)--

QUESTION put and MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

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

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Refer honourable members to their Estimates Book, Page 4, Resolution No. 8, (4) (b) (4)--Pass? The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't quite sure where we left off yesterday. I thought one of the members of the opposition were still intending to complete their remarks. If that is not the case then I'm prepared to respond.

MR. MINAKER: I had completed my remarks at this point, or at least at that point yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I find that it's somewhat awkward, and perhaps to some degree unfortunate that we are using the time of the Estimates debate to deal with a matter that is not properly before the Assembly, but having ruled that that is what we must do I suppose I shall make my contribution.

I should like to point out that in the debate yesterday we were dealing with the question of whether or not there is a need to build a facility in Manitoba which would be responsible for the environmental control of whey. And of course since this is still a hypothetical proposition I find it somewhat difficult that we would be spending so much time in this House debating it, and I simply want to point out that if the decision is to proceed with that facility, that that matter will be brought before the House by way of legislation, and therefore we really should not be discussing it at the present time.

But I should like to respond to some of the comments that were made. The Member for Lakeside wanted to know whether Crocus Foods had indeed applied for a licence, and I should like to advise him that they have not; and he wanted to know whether or not the government was going to by-pass the legislation, namely the Dairy Act, in the implementation of an environmental control program. I should like to point out to him that it is not our intention to by-pass any of the laws of the province and that there is indeed a board that decides those issues, or recommends on those issues. It is not a new procedure, it's one of longstanding in this province, and certainly I think I have to take a leaf out of the comments of my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside when he indicated that the main purpose of the Dairy Act, or one of the purposes, and indeed the consideration of any application for plant expansion or the building of new plants, is the well-being of the industry, the efficiency of it, and that all of these factors had to be taken into account before any new licences would be issued, either to existing plants to expand their operations, or to new plants that would be either competitive or whatever.

Certainly I should like to concur with him on that point because it is obvious from the studies that have been done with respect to whey disposal in Manitoba that it would not be feasible to have two or three or four or five whey plants dealing with whey disposal. The economics are simply not there. The studies that have been carried out indicate that if we are going to move in that direction in an effort to clean up the environment, then the only way it is at all possible or practical is that if all of the whey was put through a single facility, and it's strictly an economic argument. Hence if we are going to proceed in

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . that direction I would suggest that we will have to proceed on the basis of having one plant dealing with the problems of whey disposal for the whole of Manitoba.

Whatever form that plant takes, whether it's private ownership or public ownership, is irrelevant. What is important to remember is that to be at all feasible or - I don't know if it ever would be from the point of view of return on investment - but certainly to cut down the costs or the subsidies, it's most desirable that all the product flow through one plant.

Now, assuming that there was some private interest that would want to undertake this venture, and I don't believe that I have been advised of any interest in that respect, other than perhaps some small effort on the part of one or two plants that may be prepared to try to cope with their own particular problem. But no plant has offered to build a facility that would indeed look after the totality of the whey problem in the province, and that is really the dilemma that we must face up to.

Now the members opposite made a lot of, made mention rather of the fact that the Crocus plant would have the effect of putting existing plants out of business, and I should like to respond to that in this way: In that (a) we don't know that we're going to have the plant but if we do, if we do it is not the intent to put other plants out of business; the intent is to keep the existing plants in business who may otherwise go bankrupt if the Clean Environment Commission imposes very onerous conditions on those plants in the interest of cleaning up the environment in the disposal of whey. So that is really what is before us, Mr. Chairman. We are trying to assist plants like Pilot Mound or Rosburn or Dauphin or Bothwell, or Souris who have had - or Winkler who are having very serious problems with respect to whey disposal - and who have to face up to that problem whether it is faced up to through the agency of the Province of Manitoba, or whether they have to install equipment facilities of their own. My advisers tell me that if we are to ask the small plants to install equipment to look after their own whey disposal problems, then we really are closing their doors, that they would go bankrupt if we impose that kind of capital expenditure on them.

And so an effort is brought forward, or will be brought forward hopefully to try to deal with the problem in such a way that it would not impose a hardship on the existing plants, and at the same time hopefully bring the province to a position where it wouldn't have to unduly subsidize the environmental control. It would be a major operation in any plant that the province would build.

One of the points that has to be considered in that connection is that because of the new technology available to us that the same equipment that processes whole milk can also process whey, or vice versa, and the economics are there in terms of, if you look at from the point of view of having the capacity to do both. And if it is deemed that the totality of whey supply would not be sufficient to make a plant feasible, then it makes economic sense to add a component so that that plant could be brought to a position at least, at least to a break-even position, Mr. Chairman, so that the people of Manitoba would not have to subsidize the whey disposal program. And that's where the whole milk component comes into play.

Now the figures that we have looked at are in the order of some 185 million pounds of whey per year, and some 35 million pounds of whole milk. That is the basis of our studies. And of course we are not there at this point in time in our milk production, but we hope to be there. We know that in order to bring this to a level of production of 185 million pounds of whey that the existing cheese plants will have to produce more cheese than they are now producing, which means that they would have to have more milk than they are now receiving. So contrary to the opinions that have been expressed on the other side, we would really be committed to allocating more production through the existing plants in order to get the volume of whey that would be put through the central plant that would make it feasible.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want members opposite to know that the interests of the province, the interests of the province at the moment are with respect to the viability of existing plants and their continued operation, and the alternatives if the province does nothing, or the alternatives if the province clamps down from an environmental point of view and imposes regulations which would result in plants being put into a very serious financial position. These are the concerns that we have.

Now we know that there may be one plant in Manitoba owned by a very large company that may be in the position to look after its own particular whey disposal problem. But certainly we have not had any offers from anyone to look after that problem for the whole of

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) Manitoba. So it's something that we must deal with because we have the responsibility of environmental control. Members opposite I'm sure would not want to see the communities of Pilot Mound or Souris, or Bothwell or Rossburn suffer hardship because of the inflexibility of government to install some facility in order to bring about the sort of best of all worlds in the area of milk processing, and in the area of environmental control as it relates to whey disposal.

Now I think one ought to keep in mind that in the Interlake area on eastern Manitoba, as some members know only too well, that there is still a lot of room for conversion from cream production to milk production. We still have a fairly substantial number of creameries in that area of the province. And it is a matter of time till those phase out as they have in the rest of Canada and the rest of the province, and that there will be a need to supply them with an opportunity for delivery. I think this is something that that plant could take into account, in the fact that they do and will have to have some additional supply beyond whey supplies in order to bring that plant at least closer to a break-even position. It's not envisaged that this would be a money-making plant; it's envisaged that this plant would be an environmental control facility.

I should also like to point out that we still have about 150 million pounds of market share quota to fulfill pursuant to our agreement with the Canadian Dairy Commission, wherein lies the expectation that we will meet those objectives of through-put to the existing cheese plants and the resulting by-produce availability for the whey plant itself.

Now members opposite alluded to the fact that machinery was already being purchased and so on, and I simply want to advise them that that is not the case, that we have not gone to that stage in the development of this facility where orders have been placed for equipment, that, as I said earlier, the decision has not been made at this point in time; hopefully it will be made soon as to whether we proceed or we don't proceed.

I want to take issue though with the Member for Lakeside, Mr. Chairman, and I want to plead with members opposite to desist from the kind of character assassination that they sometimes indulge in. And here, Mr. Chairman, if you look at Hansard of yesterday, and I haven't seen it, but it will be there, the Member for Lakeside alluded to the fact that the man heading up the Crocus Corporation, Mr. Muirhead, that he didn't quite see the expertise that this man would possess, having had some knowledge of his abilities and the fact that he was good in extension, one didn't quite know how he could perform in this particular field. I just wanted to enlighten the Member for Lakeside that that particular gentleman happens to have a degree in Animal Science. So that you know, I think that it's not in good taste for members opposite to indulge in that kind of criticism or questioning of the expertise that the department employs from time to time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member for Lakeside on a matter of privilege.

MR. ENNS: On a matter of privilege, insofar as that suggestion is made that I may have been party to some character assassination, I believe was the words of the Minister, I take this earliest opportunity to deny that, and to suggest to the Honourable Minister that, you know, we can both read Hansard tomorrow, or when the Hansard comes out, I think I was more than prepared, and certainly prepared to acknowledge the contribution and the confidence of the individual person involved.

The question of what degrees he holds, or what his past immediate performance has been, it simply doesn't suggest to me that he necessarily has the competence to head up a 5 or 6 million dollar dairy processing industry. And I would have hoped that perhaps if he was attempting to set out a calendar or a - what do you call that? - a brochure on the new manager of the Crocus Foods Limited, that he would indicate to me some of his years of past experience within the dairy processing industry, perhaps in the private sector, or his own direct involvement in the dairy processing industry as a manufacturer, as a plant superintendent, as a multi-million dollar business administrator.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I only raised these points in the context that my honourable friend cannot stand up in this House and tell me that he believes that someone doesn't have the competence without being able to tell us why that individual doesn't have that competence, whatever the responsibilities that are assigned to him. And I think that one has to assess that after the fact rather than in advance. --(Interjection)-- And the Member for

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . Lakeside should know that when I make reference to character assassination whatever, that I alluded to many comments that have been made on the other side about people that are employed by the government, and certainly the Member for Morris is well aware of what I am talking about. Total disrespect for the staff of the administration is something that I think should not go unnoticed and without challenge.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is any point in belabouring this subject. As I said a moment ago, it is going to be a subject matter that will be debated if and when a decision is made to proceed with this project, and if that is so then that matter will be before the House in the form of a bill, at which time members opposite will have their opportunity to discuss the merits of it one way or the other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for his comments in regard to the subject matter. In his closing remarks he felt that the debate was really unnecessary until such times as we saw a bill before us in this House.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that this is one subject to the Estimates that we have before us, but I want to indicate to the Minister that it is probably as important as any that we're going to discuss.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I was interested in hearing the comments from the Minister in regard to, as he put it to us, he couldn't understand why we would discuss this matter because he thought it was out of order. And I fail to see anywhere in the estimates where we can discuss this matter other than under the heading that we are now discussing it, under the Milk Control Board.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated yesterday the price that the farmers are getting for their milk and their cream. I agreed with him. It's probably a price that is justified, and they're probably being paid for the hours that that particular group of farmers have to work to provide that commodity. Also he indicated that the consumers benefitted by this in that they are getting milk cheaper than many other parts of Canada.

But the area that my colleagues and I are concerned about, Mr. Chairman, is the industry that is operating in between those two groups that he discussed. And that, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the Minister, if the truth were known, he would rather nothing was said about it, because this is the area where the crucial problem lies, not for today, Mr. Chairman, but as I see it, two years, three years, four, five years hence, and what the results may be then, I hope we won't have to go back in history to prove my point. I hope that won't happen, Mr. Chairman, but if I see the course that this Minister's following now, I fear very much that not only will the dairy industries that are operating in this province are going to go under, but the farmers are going to feel the pinch on it, which will be a detriment to them in the way of prices that they will receive for their milk and their cream, and in essence the consumer will have to pay more.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister talked about the various plants that are operating throughout the province, and he was concerned about the environmental situation, and that is so true. About three years ago - and I'll speak for the dairy plant in Pilot Mound that I represent, and he will hear from my colleagues from other colleagues who have plants in their respective constituencies, but I will speak of the plant in Pilot Mound. It's true, we had an environmental problem insofar as the lagoon was concerned. To date, Mr. Chairman, I want to report that that has now been taken care of, and the plant is there now trucking their whey out from the plant and putting it on the farmers' fields for fertilizer. You know, sir, that is costing them approximately \$11,000 a year. The Minister mentioned the fact that it would not be advisable for each one of these plants to look after their environmental problems on an individual basis, and it seemed to me if I understand him correctly that that is one of the reasons he wanted to build this Crocus Food Plant, was to have everything funnelled to that one plant insofar as reprocessing our whey product was concerned.

I would like to indicate to the Minister, and you know I've said this so often before, but we have a Department of Agriculture in this province that doesn't seem to want to consult with anybody. The board and the management of Pilot Mount Dairies requested to see the Minister, or any of the officials of his department, last August. I spoke to them last November and they informed me at that time they still were not able to get to see the Minister,

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. EINARSON cont'd). . . or anyone in this department, to discuss the very matter that we are dealing with right now. And to this day, Mr. Chairman, they have not been able to get to the Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of privilege.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I want to advise my honourable friend that I have met with them more than once, and that they had asked that the province take over their plant, which I refused to do. So let not him stand here and say that I refused to meet with that board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pose a question to the Minister then, was that since last August or prior?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I couldn't give him a precise date but we've had discussions on a number of occasions with the people from Pilot Mound, and the department has put in their staff to help Pilot Mound clean up their plant which was condemned for awhile. So let not my honourable friend say that the department was unresponsive.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to the Minister he has no point of personal privilege because I indicated to him from last August, last August the plant was in business. And maybe he wants to give me a little bit - I should give him a little bit of history because I was involved with that plant back as far as 1966 when it first started. It was an American concern that ran that plant, and it did go broke. But I want to say to the Minister that local people took it over, raised money --(Interjection)-- That's right. They raised money themselves and there's not one cent of provincial money in that.

MR. USKIW: But they want the province to take it over.

MR. EINARSON: No, not at the - they did prior to them doing that, that's quite correct, sir. But I'm talking about from last August, and I'm talking about the present state of affairs: That the local people saw the initiative on themselves to form a new company, to form a new management and put the thing back in business, and it's now operating, and it's operating well. That, Mr. Chairman, I want to say is a credit to the people of Pilot Mound and this entire community because, Mr. Chairman, this, like many other plants that organized in this province, had to go out and solicit customers, namely farmers, to get into the business of producing milk. And they did this, and it took them a number of years, and it was a costly business. Now this plant is operating as a viable industry and it's an asset to the town and this community.

You know, Mr. Chairman, I would like to at this point, and it's I think appropriate, and I don't understand, and I want to say it is from last August that this group, and they're a new group and they're operating a business, that this government would not see fit to meet with them; because they're not interested in what they're doing out there. Because the Minister indicated to us this afternoon about the concern and the cost that it was going to be to those plants to look after their own environmental problem. And I am informed that it is now costing them \$11,000 to dispose of their whey. But they were prepared to put in a device where they could dry that whey at a cost of about \$20,000. But you know, Mr. Chairman, they have to get permission from the department before they can do that.

So for the Minister to stand up and say that these dairy industries are not able to, or they are not performing their duties, because you know, Mr. Chairman, this Minister has taken complete control of the dairy industry. He pays the producer for his milk, and also he pays the dairy processing plant for processing into cheese and other products. And you know, as I'm given to understand, they're paid so much money and they're not concerned as to what the situation is as to what the market situation is, you know. If the cheese price goes down they still get so much money. And right now they are concerned about what's going to happen - Mr. Chairman, I believe it is on the 1st of April where there's going to be an increase of 14 cents a pound for milk.

Now before they made that decision I think that the Minister would have been well advised to bring all the boards and managements together, Pilot Mound, Souris, the Co-op Plant in Winnipeg, Silverwoods, and all the plants in the province, Dauphin, Grunthal, Winkler. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister would have been well advised to bring them all together and discuss this whole matter with them. But, Mr. Chairman, he has chosen not to do so. Rather he knows he's got full control of this whole industry, and what amazes me, Mr. Chairman, is

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) that the Minister of Industry and Commerce spends thousands and thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money advertising throughout all our papers in this province how he's prepared to help small businesses in rural areas of Manitoba, while the Minister of Agriculture is doing just the reverse. He's doing just the reverse, and I venture to say, and history will prove me, if he gets his way you'll see these dairy plants fold up. Because when he says you know we shouldn't be concerned about a processing plant in Selkirk until we see a bill in the House.

That's my very point, Mr. Chairman, that it is of very importance that we discuss it now, and we bring to the attention of the Minister the concerns of the people that we represent in this province. And it's not only going to affect the dairy plants, but I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, it's going to affect the farmers who are producing our dairy products in this province. And it's also going to have an effect on the consumers later on whereby the price will be increased to them as well. Because we know how governments in this province have demonstrated how they can run a business, that has been proven, Mr. Chairman, and we don't have to tell the consuming public, and I'm as concerned about them as I am about the producers.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly in this matter and while the Minister is trying to divert our attention by the comments that he's made, I feel that we have a problem that is of a very serious nature and a very important one. I would like to ask him, did he send a delegation to Europe to look into the possibilities of purchasing equipment for this plant that he proposes? There's been enough discussion on it, Mr. Chairman; he doesn't have to kid us; I think we know that that's the future thinking of this Department of Agriculture.

You know, Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that approximately 80 percent of the food bill comes from the south part of the City of Winnipeg around Grunthal, Winkler, and away out that way. Why would he want to put a processing plant in Selkirk? Probably it's obvious because the Minister of the A-C's department, is he in such difficulties that this is a future potential that will assist him in the next election? Mr. Chairman, I don't want to sound facetious but this is the way this government thinks, and this is the way they act, and by their actions in the past have proven this, and I just use this as another example.

Mr. Chairman, there's another aspect of this thing, when the Minister of Agriculture talks about economics, you know, and we have the plants that are producing cheese and producing other commodities, and they have the whey, the by-product, and it has to be trucked in from all these plants from all over the province and funnelled to the one factory at Selkirk, but how do we know, and what assurance have we got, if there's going to be 7 million, 8 million, 9 million dollars of the taxpayers money that may be spent, and those, sir, are people who are represented by honourable gentlemen opposite. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture has consulted with his city colleagues as to whether they approve of it or not. --(Interjection)-- Well I think possibly that if they were to go into their respective constituencies . . .

A MEMBER: They approve of a decision that hasn't been made.

MR. EINARSON: If they were to go into their respective constituencies I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that if they couldn't be guaranteed that that money spent wasn't going to be assured that they weren't going to have a return on it, or a guarantee that milk wouldn't go up, I don't think they'd go along with it.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to stress again that if the Minister is going to proceed on the course that he's taking, and emphasize to him that if he insists on refusing to meet with the parties concerned, who are running and are responsible for the various dairy plants throughout this province, then it's going to be a disaster insofar as Manitoba is concerned for those who are in the dairy industry.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister, it just seems to me that every course that he takes it's one of confrontation, and I don't know why but it just seems that that's the way he wants to operate his department. I feel, sir, that unless he changes his attitude, unless those in his department who are working with him are prepared to go out - when they do go out to meet with people, they say you know, he says, "I'm not satisfied with the way these dairy plants are operating." Well if he's not satisfied with the way they're operating, why then doesn't he say what is wrong, and assist them in saying well what can we do to correct it. But the method he chooses to use I suggest, Mr. Chairman, is not in the best interests of the dairymen in this province, or of the consuming public in this province. I think the future will tell if the Minister is going to pursue this course.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to speak on the same subject and perhaps the Minister's answers can accommodate the points I would like to make.

Mr. Chairman, knowing the Minister as seemingly a very reasonable person, he has a very good approach to appear to be reasonable, and if he really feels sincere he should take the advice of the last speaker and do some consulting in the industry, because I have reason to believe that the Minister has a few minutes ago made statements that I can't believe. I believe the Minister - there's one of two things happening on that side. Either he's pulling the wool over our eyes deliberately, or somebody in his department's going behind his back, because the statements he has made don't stand up. Don't stand up at all. All right I'll give you an example. You said in previous statements that the only reason the government's going into the whey plant operation is because of the environmental problem. So we'll take that at face value.

Then the next stage is that in order to make it viable you have to do some other processing, so you're going to dry milk, make milk powder in order to make the plant self-supporting. I understand this is your position. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister as far as I know has not talked to anybody in the industry to see if this problem can be solved in another manner. If he has done any consulting, he hasn't told us. Now I have a letter here and I haven't got the permission of the person who wrote it, but he's the type of person that stands by what he says, and if the government or the House wants the letter I'll say the name that was on it, I've taken the name off, but on reconsideration, on reconsideration I'm sure the gentleman won't mind if I identify him. It's Mr. Don Speirs of Modern Dairies, and here's what he says, here's what he says. . . --(Interjection)-- Oh yes there's the socialist stream from the background there, because someone is in business and trying to make a dollar they are somehow very ruthless pirates preying on the poor people. I understand your outlook.

A MEMBER: Except that they also provide the cheapest milk in this country.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes, they just by the way happen to supply the cheapest milk of any of the provinces also.

And I'll read the whole paragraph so that when I come to the sentence in context, I'll probably emphasize that. "I indicated to you during our conversation that we have equipment on hand at Grunthal now that was delivered to us last March or April," And this letter was written in January of 1975. "that is specifically designed for the drying of liquid whey and is of a capacity that would certainly look after all of our own requirements, plus that of the Winkler Co-op Creamery and the New Bothwell Co-operative Cheese plant. Dairy regulations in Manitoba require any manufacturing plant to make application to the Dairy Board for permission to either install equipment, or to manufacture a product that has not up till that time been manufactured in that plant. You may wonder why we have not made a formal application to the Dairy Board for permission to install this equipment, and the reason is that we were informed by a senior official in the Department of Agriculture that we would be wasting our time and effort as we would be turned down out of hand."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister had the consummate gall to stand here a few minutes ago and say that they haven't made up their mind at whether or not they're going to go ahead with the Crocus Plant operation. We look in the Annual Report of the Milk Control Board and there's been over \$9,000 spent on a whey plant proposal. I'd ask the Minister if he would table this proposal in the House for the members to have a look at. We look in the MDC Annual Report and Crocus Foods Products Limited have a loan at 9 percent of \$140,000.

A MEMBER: That's a pretty good start.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Now who's he kidding when he tells us that they haven't made up their mind as to whether or not they're going to go ahead? Is he saying that if they change their mind they've thrown \$149,000 down the drain?

A MEMBER: Well then we ought to really get on their backs.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I don't believe that, I just don't believe it. And the explanation the Minister has given on this so far doesn't stand up. It doesn't stand up. I'm sure that if required the gentleman who's letter I just quoted will come and take oath that this statement was made to him by a senior official in the Department of Agriculture, and let the Minister answer that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member table that letter please?

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Having a cheese factory in my own constituency this is of course of concern to us, and I would like to just further elaborate on some of the remarks made by previous speakers, and possibly update some of the things that the Member from Portage la Prairie has just spoken about.

New Bothwell has in fact installed a whey drying facility and are presently now looking after their environmental problem. I think he is very correct when he says that Grunthal did have the equipment but were told by the department that chances for getting a license for installation of that equipment was very very slim, so as a result I understand that some of that equipment has been sold. But the people had the intention, and they had the willingness to go ahead and install this type of equipment.

The Minister a little while ago said that things are still very very vague when it comes to Crocus Foods, and I think the Member from Portage la Prairie pointed out the loan that the MDC has already advanced to that particular company. And I would just read, it must be a fairly substantial drive by this government, and it must be a fairly important venture that they are embarking on because the Chairman and General Manager of the Manitoba Development Corporation saw fit to devote a whole paragraph in his Annual Report, in the Manitoba Development Corporation's Annual Report. And you know this Minister has a very very fine knack, a great knack of saying, "Well listen you know, we have this environmental problem so we've got to build these whey plants. We've got to build a whey plant to take care of this problem." But you know he says a little while later, he says, "You know to make that viable we're going to have to also go into the powdered milk business." The only thing he doesn't say is what happens when you make powdered milk? First of all you have to skim the milk. What do you do with the cream? You make butter, you make cottage cheese. I mean, the wheel has made the complete revolution and now all of a sudden . . .

Mr. Speaker, in the annual report, Mr. Parsons mentions that "it is proposed that this company will process whey and other milk products." Mr. Speaker, the Minister in the last year together with his department have made several substantial changes in the milk marketing and milk producing field, and I'm concerned about the future of those dairies, because as I mentioned it's a very very prominent industry in my constituency. I wonder what explanation the Minister would give for the drop in milk production in Manitoba over the last few months. We've dropped below the 1973 production level, even though we've gone ahead and done away with the industrial fluid milk shippers. We've done away with that. I'm sure the Minister's hope was that more people would be able to get into the fluid milk business and reap the higher returns paid to the fluid producers, but this doesn't seem to have had the desirable effect that we wanted. In January of '73, we produced 36.4 million pounds, January '74, 37.1 million pounds, and in 1975 we're dropped down to 36.3 million pounds. So you can see that we're even below the 1973 average, and I didn't go back any further than that to get a comparison what was happening.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the members opposite realize --(Interjection)-- this was for the month of January. The month of February is very similar, the month of December is very similar. The dairy industry is a tough industry in that it requires a lot of work, it's seven days a week, and in the day and age that we're living right now, we're talking about 32-hour work weeks and that type of thing, I'm sure that many of the people that are in dairy are wondering what they're doing up at seven o'clock in the morning and making sure that they look after their animals, and of course they have to be around in the evening again, and this is of course seven days a week. I think they're a special breed of people that are willing to put this time and energy into the production of milk, because it is a real real tough job.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not only concerned about the Crocus situation the way it is right now and the possible effect it will have on the local industry such as New Bothwell and Grunthal, but also about the production of milk in Manitoba in the future. I think that when we see a decline instead of an increase, even when the Minister has gone ahead and tried to implement some other policies, I think this is a matter for concern and a matter that the Minister and his department should definitely look into.

The other aspect I would like to say though, I wouldn't like to see the same thing happen to the dairy people that happened to the cattlemen and that governments undertook a very very

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) active role in trying to help out the grain farmers and by helping out the grain farmers they shifted the problems of the grain farmer on to the livestock people and the hog people, and we wouldn't want to see this happen in the dairy industry.

Mr. Speaker, mentioning a few more things about the Crocus Food Plant. The size of the plant, if we understand correctly will be about big enough to handle all the milk production in Manitoba, and I can understand the Minister's feelings when he would like to see all the trucks in Manitoba driving around picking up milk in rural Manitoba and then all converging on one plant. You know, I think it's a dream the Minister has, and I would urge him that he goes home and dreams about it a little more and forgets about it before it turns into a nightmare. As mentioned before too, the government's track record in industry has not been that good, and I can't see them performing any better with a perishable product such as milk.

Mr. Speaker, with those few words, I would just like to ask the Minister to confirm that his department has not been issuing whey licenses, whether his department or the Manitoba Milk Producers Milk Marketing Board or the Manitoba Milk Control Board. And I would also ask the Minister if it's not a fact that some of the processing plants such as the new plant up in Dauphin is operating at less than 15 percent capacity because of a milk shortage. And I would also like to ask him if his department has any substitution for the programs that were under way when the private companies or the co-ops were encouraging certain farmers, giving them certain kinds of assistance to make sure that they had a sure milk supply. I realize the Minister knows now that they are subject to whatever the marketing board deems advisable for that certain area, that that's what they get. They are not assured of a certain supply at all such as they had before and of course have let their field men go and the development I think on certain areas I think is lagging right now, so that they are not receiving the quantity of milk possibly that they should be getting. But I understand that plants are suffering from a shortage of milk and especially the one like Dauphin which is a new plant and I understand has capabilities of expanding to three times its present capacity, and even at the present capacity they're only operating at less than 15 percent. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): I notice the Honourable Minister is anxious to rise, but again, paraphrasing my honourable friend, the colleague from Portage la Prairie, I would like to make a little further contribution at this time, for no other reason than to say that the Minister has done very little else but to further add to the confusion that reigns on this side of the House with respect to the plans of this Crocus Foods Limited, and, Mr. Chairman, our right to discuss it. You will recall that yesterday the Minister suggested to us that we were out of order in discussing this matter under the item, "The Milk Control Board". Well again for the edification of the Minister and his staff, I remind him that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The item has already been decided yesterday. The Chair made a ruling.

MR. ENNS: Oh no, but that's fine, Mr. Chairman. I just want to say how the Minister goes about in confusing us, because this is a board, the board that we're discussing that has the right to grant or renew licenses or may suspend or revoke licenses already granted after due notice, and then does virtually everything. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a sneaking hunch that the Minister has other plans for a major revision of the Milk Control Board, transferring of authority now vested in the Milk Control Board, perhaps to the newly formed Producers Marketing Board responsible for milk. That may well be, but this is the law as it stands today, and I would like to make the assumption that the honourable government and this Minister would . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: . . . whether the Honourable Member for Lakeside would now rationalize his last statement with what he read to us in the House yesterday, wherein he suggested another authority had the powers of licensing.

MR. ENNS: Well, I really don't know who has the power of licensing, because the Honourable Minister has again today suggested to us - well no, he didn't really mean that we shouldn't discuss this question of Crocus Foods under the Milk Control Board part of his estimates, we should wait for a bill to be introduced in this House and then we can discuss the Crocus Foods Limited. Well, you know, I'm beginning to ask, why does the Minister not want

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) to discuss Crocus Foods Limited? Why does the Minister want to have us wait for a bill to come into the House now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. A point of privilege has been raised by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have not stated that that subject cannot be discussed. Yesterday I pointed out the proper place at which time it could be discussed.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm merely indicating to you, and to members of the Committee, that the Minister seems to be devoting more time as to thinking out ways where and when it can be discussed rather than discussing it. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, what he has also told us today is that when the decision is arrived at, when he can concur with the \$100 thousand already advanced in study form, or \$140,000; when he can concur with the hoped for enthusiasm that the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation has for this project, then he is prepared to go back and begin to abide by the law, begin to hold discussions within the industry as to the desirability of what? The desirability of concurring with a decision that you already arrived at? Well, the Minister shakes his head, and that only of course reaffirms the suspicion that we had and that we now rightly hold, namely that the Minister is not prepared to listen and take guidance from the Act as it stands, he is not prepared to consider whether any enlargement, any new entry of plant has any detrimental effect of existing plants. The decision will be his. He is then prepared to go back through the antics of issuing permits I suppose, perhaps even setting up advisory boards to confirm to the sections of the Act and to support and confirm his decision already arrived at.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister should begin to appreciate that, you know, certainly I have to acknowledge that many of the difficulties that this government has found itself in with respect to their business ventures have not entirely been of their own making, and subsequently it is not fair, even though we in the Opposition from time to time do so, put all the responsibility on this government. And I'm referring specifically to some of the other business ventures that this government is engaged in, namely the Gimli aircraft manufacturing plant, to some extent the Flyer bus plant here in Winnipeg. Certainly the taking over of the ship, the Lord Selkirk, you know, can't be squarely put on this government as a venture that they sailed off into the wild blue yonder on a pipe dream to hope to add to their fleet. No, these were things that this government to some extent inherited and has had to, has had to attempt to come out as best they can. They have chosen to ignore the suggestions coming from us from time to time that perhaps in many instances the first loss is the best loss and that that policy may well be a policy that they should pursue from time to time.

But here we have a situation, Mr. Chairman, where the government is thinking of - and I say more than thinking - is planning to enter into a business venture, planning and plotting, to get into a business venture. And, Mr. Chairman, look how neatly they set themselves up for it. On the one hand, you have one Minister of this government, namely the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who I think is responsible for the Clean Environment Act, he goes around the countryside saying within 12 months we're going to close you fellows up. That enables the Minister of Agriculture to come in to the Chamber and say, and I'm going to save you, you know. You know, let's get together on this, you know, let's get together on this. You know, you're working pretty well on both sides of the fence on that one. And of course what they're closing their eyes to, Mr. Chairman, while this is happening, this devious plot is being hatched between two Ministers of this government, the private sector is prepared to accept their responsibility, is prepared to solve the problem, has in fact the machinery in place to solve the problem, and where once a problem was there is none any more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm sort of enjoying the good humour of the honourable member, but just so that the record is clear, I have no influence over the judgments that are exercised by the Clean Environment Commission. Members asked last year when the member of the commission appeared, as to whether he in any way is involved. So if there is a plot, it is between the members of the Clean Environment Commission and the Minister of Agriculture.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. ENNS: I know the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the House Leader is probably correct in stating the situation in those terms. However, I also know that he has a very firm and fond belief that he is at all times responsible for everything that is done under his aegis as a responsible Minister, so would not really argue the point too sharply that he can by saying what he has just said, absolve himself from the dastardly plot that he is engaged in with the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, to make it perfectly clear. If there is such a plot, then I have to accept responsibility for it even though I am not engaged in it.

MR. ENNS: Agreed. I will accept the fact that there is a distinct possibility that the Honourable Minister is being used. Mr. Chairman, what I was trying to say is that the rationalization for the government's moving into this area - and I said this yesterday - seemed pretty sound, when you had a situation that needed solving and when you had at least, you know, some reluctance on the part of the private sector to help solve that problem.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has introduced a letter, tabled a letter, read into the record, from one of the major processors of this province, who is more than prepared, more than prepared to tackle the problem of whey disposal and whey recycling in this province. Other members, the Member from Rock Lake, has indicated that a different way a smaller operation out in rural Manitoba has solved this particular problem and is prepared to continue solving this problem, in a manner that's quite acceptable from an environmental point of view. So when you strip all these original problems away, what is left - what is left? Not even skim milk or skim powder. What is left is this naked desire on the part of this government to enter into a business venture because they want to control a portion of that industry and because they see it as an ideal kind of a business venture that this government can get into where they already have most of the reins in their hands, and where the chances are considerably better that they may come out on the black.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that's fair game if that's the government's avowed intention of doing that. But I wish, Mr. Chairman, that they would have the fortitude to tell us that, that's precisely what they're doing.

A dairy industry in the Province of Manitoba that has managed to supply the consumer consistently with high quality, reasonably priced milk, using the Minister's own statements that he read into the record as he introduced his estimates, "This same dairy industry that is operating under capacity in most instances between 55, 65 percent capacity, whether it's the smaller plants referred to in rural Manitoba or indeed the larger plants here in the City of Winnipeg. An industry that is working under capacity - is this really the priority, the area that this government wants to put hard found tax dollars into? You know, the Honourable Member from Rock Lake suggested that perhaps some of the other members other than the Minister should take a harder look at this priority rating of their government. You know, there are some members there that speak eloquently and highly of the need for public housing; there's some members there that I am sure have specific problems, projects that they have attempted to, or want to have their government enter into. I'm sure the Honourable Minister of Corrections wants some funds in a bad way to carry out some of the programs that he is vitally interested in.

But you're prepared, you're prepared to close your eyes to an industry that is functioning very satisfactorily, and that's not the Member from Lakeside saying it, that's your Minister saying that. Your Minister stood up in this Chamber just a few days ago and with some degree of pride read off the figures how well the milk industry was doing in the Province of Manitoba, both from the consumers' point of view and from the primary producers' point of view. And I happen to agree with him. I happen to agree with him. Now what is the rationalization for disturbing this? What is the rationalization for using public dollars at this time in this particular area?

Mr. Chairman, there are other concerns that I have with respect to this Minister's direction in the dairy industry. You know it wasn't all that long ago that we indicated to him that his great desire to get everybody into the beef industry would eventually produce the very results that the cow-calf operators and other members of the beef industry now are telling us has happened, that has in fact brought them to that rather unique situation or uncomfortable situation, if I might say on their part, of having to ask government for assistance and for help. Now this Minister seems to be embarking on the same kind of eventual course for the

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) dairy industry. He wants to see a massive shift from beef to dairy production. Just how well the combination, or a cross of a Hereford and a Shorthorn will produce with respect to dairy products, I don't know. But I know this thing, that two, three, four years hence instead of the cow-calf producers here, the beef people here, you may well have the dairy producers here complaining about their surplus situation, complaining about the path the government, through programs, through government subsidized programs, has led them into.

Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, I really believe the Honourable Minister needs to be considerably more candid with us with respect to the Crocus Foods Limited. I believe that the Honourable Minister owes that to us in this House, and to the industry outside. I believe that he has to indicate that he is either prepared to ignore the Act so all and sundry will be aware of that, but he gives us absolutely no satisfaction by simply saying that, wait, don't discuss it, we'll wait for the bill to be presented, and then we'll have an opportunity to discuss it.

Well I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that if the Honourable Minister believes that the mere presentation of a bill will resolve this matter for him then he's very badly mistaken because I suspect that the introduction of a bill will only tend to focus a great deal more attention on the subject matter and a great deal more debate.

Now I suggest, you know I suggest that that --(Interjection)-- . . . that's for, but in the meantime, in the meantime the decisions are being made. The decisions are being made, and he'll let us know when the decision is finalized. People are expected to continue investing in the dairy industry under this climate; they're being prevented from doing the kind of things that they are prepared to do while this decision is being held in abeyance. A general smokescreen is being pulled over the whole dairy industry by this Minister in what precisely their plans are with respect to Crocus Foods Limited.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, it's with a degree of interest that I listened to my friends opposite, and in particular the Member for Portage, who I have to assume didn't quite pay attention to my remarks when I addressed the Chamber about an hour ago on the same subject, in that he pursued the observation that there is a willingness on the part of one major company to deal with the whey problem. And then he said, he went on to say, but that they're prepared to look after one or two plants, or something along that line. And that is precisely what I said in my remarks, that some people are prepared to do a wee bit but that the feasibility of cleaning up this problem rests on the fact that you have to have total through-put, and is he suggesting that we allow one company to do a portion, which may be not too cumbersome for them to handle, and that the Province of Manitoba then undertake to look after the balance at great subsidies in doing so, Mr. Chairman. And that is the essential dilemma that we are facing. If it were possible for a private company to indeed look after the problem in its totality, you know, I think that is fair game for consideration, but we have not had that kind of offer to date, Mr. Chairman.

Now I again want to emphasize that we are spending an awful lot of time on the subject not yet knowing whether we're proceeding with the project. You know, we may have the opportunity of dealing with it more fully at the time that it is presented to the Legislature.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister explain to the Committee by what right a senior official in the Department of Agriculture had to tell this company that they were wasting their time if they tried to get an okay to install whey processing equipment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well there again I want to enlighten the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that if we are involved in a study of the total problem, then obviously it would be wrong to issue a license to anyone wanting to deal with a small portion of that problem until we know the results of the study. Therefore the Dairy Board, who will recommend on what should be done, and here the Member for Lakeside bemoaned the fact that the procedure is that we have an advisory board, and so on, that would advise the Minister. Those procedures have to be undertaken, Mr. Chairman. We are not trying to by-pass those procedures. But surely my honourable friend from Portage isn't suggesting that if the Dairy Board advises,

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) advises that we should not piecemeal the question of whey disposal into two or three components, and that the only way in which to handle it would be through a central facility, then I'm sure the Member for Portage would appreciate my position being advised that that is the way in which it should proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I don't want to interrupt the Honourable Minister's reply but one question only. Does the Minister now honestly want me to believe that he's prepared to battle through his caucus, fight with his cabinet, to gain concurrence to bring a bill before the House which represents government policy and then subject that to the advice of an advisory board as to whether it's the government's intention to pursue that. I don't think his House Leader would put up with that kind of approach to running the affairs of the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I want to respond to the Member for Lakeside that that is not at all the way in which I would expect that we would proceed. I should also like to tell him that the Dairy Board has been considering this question for some time. It is not yet to go before them. I hope that I will have a final position of the Dairy Board before a final decision is made. All of these things have to be synchronized, there's no question about that. But in any event we are not yet there, and when we are there we will have - if we decide to proceed - we will have a measure introduced to this Chamber, after which we will have the authority, hopefully to launch the project. It will require your endorsement, capital supply, and the incorporation of the company. It's all part of the natural process that we must undertake when the decision is made.

I should like to make the observation to the Member for Portage, and I think the records should be set straight here, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Portage bemoaned the fact that there is a very large corporation that is prepared to take a bigger slice of the action in Manitoba. And I agree that they are, I mean they are a very large company, B . . . Foods is I suppose about the largest dairy industry or dairy company in the United States. They are prepared to take all of the dairy industry over in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. And I want to say that I respect the ability of the Speirs family and their involvement in the dairy industry, but they are now agents for a very large multi-national company. Now in the United States the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission has barred B . . . Foods from acquiring any additional dairy plants in the whole of the United States because it is deemed that they have too much of a monopolistic power over the dairy sector now. And my honourable friend from Portage surely isn't suggesting that we shouldn't guard our position in Manitoba; that surely we shouldn't surrender to one large conglomerate from the U.S., or anywhere, and that we should have our options open to the extent that it is possible and feasible.

So I know that this company would like to offer to take over the whole package, but I don't believe that that would be in the best interests of the people of Manitoba. And I don't mind saying that; I don't think it'll be good public policy to surrender the dairy industry to one large multi-national corporation. I think that the fact that the producers of milk in Manitoba have an interest in the processing side of their industry, I think the government should allow itself to facilitate, or to be used towards facilitating a greater involvement of producers of milk in the dairy industry of Manitoba. It is envisaged that if we proceed with the plant that should some day in the future that that plant turn a profit, that the profits would accrue to the producers of milk in this province and not to the Crown, the Province of Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- Now the Member for Portage says I don't think we'll be alive to see that happen. And you know I'm not sure that it will or it won't. I am assuming that we may never realize a profit, because the thought of going into that venture is not on the basis of making money, but on the basis of --(Interjection)-- but on the basis of dealing with the environmental problem. It is not a commercial venture that we're looking at, it is an environmental control program that we are looking at. And should some day in the future we can expand its operation to the point where it can at least break even, or make a profit, then any profits that would accrue would be passed on to the shippers of milk in Manitoba. So that the Crown would not be the beneficiary of any profit position that we might enjoy from that particular facility.

That is sort of the approach in the studies that we have undertaken with respect to that plant. Now that remains to be seen, Mr. Chairman, because we don't know just when we will make that decision and which way that decision will go.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd)

Now the Member for Lakeside bemoaned the fact that the processing industry is under capacity, operating in a condition of under capacity. But you know my honourable friend should know, he was Minister of Agriculture for awhile in his government, he should know the cyclical nature of milk production, he should appreciate that point. And I should like to remind him that only last summer milk was dumped because the plants in Manitoba were unable, or refused to absorb the total production. He should know that.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Morris, who is totally unfamiliar with the dairy industry as far as I'm concerned, indicates that the reason that milk is cyclical is because we have interfered with the dairy industry. Mr. Chairman, you can go back all the way for 100 years in this province's history and you will see the cyclical pattern of milk production in Manitoba. Right up till now, and including, and will continue to be so. The only hope is that we may change the pattern of production somewhat through good husbandry and farm management, and to that end we have to provide some encouragement so that we don't have the great fluctuations which cause a degree of disturbance to the industry as a whole.

I should like to also make another observation. The Member for Lakeside, the Member for Rock Lake alluded to the possibilities of the milk industry becoming an industry of poverty, that they would be in the position of the cow-calf people. I should like to point out, and they know full well, but, Mr. Chairman, they like to mislead the people of Manitoba intentionally, they know full well that that is not possible because the milk industry is a controlled industry it is functioned on a utility basis in its pricing. The Milk Producers Marketing Board has the power to decide the value of its producers' production, it sets the price that they deem is necessary to get a return on investment. It is not like the cattle producers who allow someone else to set the price for their production. They have that authority under legislation which is provided for them by this Assembly. So I do not look forward at all to that possibility.

I should like to tell my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside that the Canadian Dairy Commission, with whom we have entered into agreement, will honour I'm sure its obligation, and will, if there isn't a market in Manitoba, purchase all of our milk powder up to another 150 million pounds of milk production, Mr. Chairman. That is a commitment, and they have fulfilled their commitment, Mr. Chairman, there's no question about that. They are prepared to buy butter and milk powder to the extent of our market share agreement. So we have a firm market already entered into by agreement, some two or three years ago. It's not a question of not having a market for increased productivity. It is all there. And we will need additional plant capacity to meet those targets that we have already approached, Mr. Chairman, that we have already signed agreements for. We will need added capacity. The question is, where should that added capacity be? Should we build on the top of the largest conglomerate in North America, or should we provide for some additional opportunities for the producers of this province? Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rock Lake tries to pretend . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time is 4:30, Private Members' Hour is next. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions and has directed me to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The first item, Private Members' Hour is Public Bills on Thursday. Bill No. 4 (Stands).

Bill No. 9. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

BILL NO. 9 - BRANDON CHARTER ACT AMENDMENT

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West) presented Bill No. 9, an Act to amend the Brandon Charter, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the principle of this bill is to permit the City of Brandon to acquire property for the purposes of a municipal golf course. They have asked that their charter be amended in order that they could deal with an opportunity to purchase a particular property, and while the charter in its present form provides for the operation of a municipal golf course, the amounts that were specified at the time some 15 or 20 years ago were not adequate to cover the amounts that would be involved if the City did continue and effect a purchase of a property that's now available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is enabling legislation. The particulars of the bill may be of interest, and when it comes to Municipal Affairs if there is any necessary change to the wording of the bill, I think that can be done, but in principle, it simply is a bill which would enable the City to make a decision as to whether or not to buy a property for the purposes of the City, that is, a golf course which has some additional recreational facilities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that debate be adjourned.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 12 (Stands).

Bill No. 10. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

BILL NO. 10 - CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY AMENDMENT

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. Johns) presented Bill No. 10, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Co-operative Society of Manitoba Limited, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the explanation is very simple and very brief. The proposal is to permit the change of the authorized capital of a company from some \$10 million, from \$10 million, to \$30 million. I've a letter from the Co-operative Credit Society which indicated that over the last four or five years there's been substantial growth in the assets of the CCSM from something over 20 million in 1970, to 92 million in 1974, and they find that their subscribed capital of \$10 million has been reached and they wish to be able to put the CCSM on a better financial standing by providing necessary liquidity requirements and loans for credit unions. They therefore, having a record as they do of having paid 11 percent on share capital up to 1974, know that there is an inclination, a desire on the part of their member credit unions to subscribe for more common shares in the CCSM, and for that reason they're asking for an authority to expand their capital to \$30 million.

Of course, if this matter passes second reading and is referred to Private Members' Committee, Private Bills Committee, then I would expect that the Co-operative Credit Society will be represented to answer any questions that members will have.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a general disposition on the part of members for reasons of storm warnings and other reasons, to not proceed further tonight so that the holiday weekend would be extended. I wish to wish to all members a good holiday.

BILL NO. 10

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

As far as the proceedings of the House next week, we are intending to call the Minister of Colleges and Universities to deal with all of the matters which are under his personal jurisdiction, that is Education as well, after the Minister of Agriculture.

And also we will be trying to deal with bills, second reading of bills prior to estimates' revue.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The hour of adjournment having been agreed upon, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.