

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, February 27, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Auguste Dansereau and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate L'Association d'Education Canadiens-Francais du Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 42, an Act respecting the United Dominions Investments Limited.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 64, an Act for the Relief of Cyril Alvin Henry, Service Station Operator, Joseph Allen Bryant, Merchant, and Frances Adelaide Bryant, his wife, all of the City of St. James, in Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: In the gallery there are some 45 Grade 11 students from Garden City School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Mel Solar. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. There are also some 55 Grades 7 and 8 students from La Broquerie School, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Oscar Gagnon and Miss Carmelle St. Hiliare. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

Nous vous souhaitons la bienvenue ici cette après-midi. Nous espérons que tout ce que vous avez vu et entendu à l'assemblée législative vous sera utile dans vos études. Puisse cette visite vous inspirer et stimuler votre intérêt dans les affaires de la province. Revenez encore nous visiter.

We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I beg leave to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation for the year ending March 31st, 1963, and I would like to extend my abject apologies to the members of the Legislature for having to wait beyond the accepted time for this report.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table a Return to an Order of the House, No. 11, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table a Return to an Order of the House, No. 12, in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the NDP.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I would like to table a Return to the Order of the House, No. 20, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Logan, and I'd also like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Health for the year 1963.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I went into the library today asking for Sessional Paper No. 52, which is the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Fund. They haven't received it in the library yet. It was tabled in the House on February 20th, and I don't recall getting it myself if it was mailed. Perhaps it could be because Metro saw fit to change the name of my street from Melrose to Kimberley, so maybe it is waylaid in Transcona someplace. But I would like to get a copy of that report and I wonder if the Minister could tell me why it is not in the library.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I am not aware as to why it is not in the library. I'll see that my honourable friend gets one.

MR. PETERS: I would like to thank the Honourable Minister.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson) Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I asked a question the other day of the Honourable the Minister of Public Works in respect of salt on Metro streets. I note that there has been a carpet laid in the entrance of the Legislative Building. On inquiry, I have been told that it's so that we can scrape the salt off of our feet before we come into this Chamber. I again ask my honourable friend: does he intend to conduct an investigation into the adverse effects of salt on household effects?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, the answer to the question is that we are still keeping a watching brief on the situation.

A MEMBER: For how long?

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the carpet that the Honourable the Leader of the NDP has mentioned there for the purpose of an experimentation to see just how great the ill effects of salt is on clothing and other materials that he was speaking about?

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, this will certainly help us prove one point.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to inform the members that we had a most pleasant meeting this morning, the first of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and we agreed to meet again next Thursday, a week from today. My reason for speaking at this time, however, is to say that we would be glad to have anyone, either members of the Legislature or members of the public, come to our meeting in Room 254, at 10:00 o'clock next Thursday to make such representations as they would like to make in respect of The Elections Act, and if our colleagues in the press could assist us in this matter we would appreciate it very much.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities. Inasmuch as the Motor Vehicle Branch will not issue a licence for a power toboggan, of which there are thousands now in the province, does this mean that you cannot use them on highways or municipal roads or public roads?

MR. STEINKOPF: That is right; you are not supposed to use them on highways or public roads.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question. You are not supposed to. Well, is there a fine if you do? And where can you use them, because they have actually replaced the dog team, I am told, and will become very numerous in the future.

MR. STEINKOPF: There is quite an argument in The Pas whether they have replaced the dog team or not. This is a relatively new vehicle or contraption that they have developed and the matter of safety is a very important one. We are looking into it now and making a study of the whole problem. It's been brought to our attention very forcibly the last few weeks and we are looking into the matter and hope to be able to come up with a report in the next few weeks on it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I take it then, in the meantime, that there will be no fines levied until the committee reports and makes recommendations.

MR. STEINKOPF: I haven't heard of any fines yet, but I'll look into that too for you.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT: (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose) Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, the House has been very kind to allow me to stand the resolution on Ways and Means, and if it is the wish of the government I would be prepared to go today, but I am not asking for any change in the Order Paper. I appreciate what has been done so far and I am prepared to agree to whatever it is that the House wishes.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I thank my honourable friend. I think it would be desirable to proceed today because this has now been stood for a week and we could proceed today and thus allow this debate to make some progress. I would just mention, however, that before I ask the Speaker to call that motion on Ways and Means, I would ask that the Motion on Concurrence in respect of the Report of the Committee that is studying the livestock situation be called so that we may get that debate initiated as well. So we will proceed with the ordinary course of business, Madam Speaker, until we come to the resolution of the Committee of Supply. At that stage we would then call the report of the Livestock

(Mr. Roblin cont'd) . . . . Committee and, after that, the motion on Ways and Means and resume the budget debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The amounts the Manitoba Government is committed to future Capital Grants on outstanding Capital liabilities by School Divisions, School Districts, Hospital Areas, etc., not appearing in Public Accounts of the Province of Manitoba: (a) For the Department of Education; (b) The Department of Health; (c) The Department of Agriculture; (d) Others. 2. The amounts to be paid annually, in the categories named above, from 1963 onward until paid for. 3. The amounts paid annually, in the above named categories, in the years 1958 to 1962 inclusive.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may I ask a question of the honourable member who just moved the motion. I had some conversations with him pointing out certain problems in answering the motion as listed on the Order Paper, and asking him if he would be satisfied with the information in a different form. I wonder if that does now meet with his approval.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I'll be satisfied with whatever information I can get and which is within the bounds of the government to give me.

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Madam Speaker, whether the rest of us can be let in on the secret as to what information will be forthcoming that has been agreed to by the Social Credit Member for Rhineland and the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: I anticipated that question and I was scouting for my honourable friend before we came in, but I didn't get him in time. He has my little piece of paper with the details of the kind of information that can be provided. If he still has it in his pocket, if he might read it then the House would know just -- he hasn't got it -- (interjection) -- Oh, I have it. Here we are. It's not possible to determine the Capital Grants beyond the level of existing Capital Liabilities as the amount is directly related thereto. In these circumstances it would be only possible to give the actual grants payable with respect to a previously determined period. That's the first point. The second point is: The amounts in total for each type of grant could be produced on an estimated basis for 1963-64 and 1964-65. And three: The amounts in total of each type of grant could be produced on an actual basis for 1958-9 to 1962-3. So this is the information we will undertake to produce under the terms of this order.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable . . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: I observe that the question has not yet been put on this motion.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. The Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. L. A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, it may be anti-climax on my part to deal with this matter after the excellent presentation made here the other day by the Honourable Member for St. George in respect of Bill No. 37, but at the same time I feel that the matter is of sufficient importance to deserve repetition and emphasis. In my opinion, the sole purpose of this amendment is to remove ministerial responsibility for the actions of the Hydro Board and to make that Board responsible and answerable to a standing committee of this Legislature. If there is any doubt in anyone's mind as to the accuracy of the statement which I have just made, I would refer you to Pages 277 and 288 of the February 20, 1964 issue of Hansard.

I believe that this legislation is bad. I believe that this legislation is a negation of responsible government. I believe too that it will interfere with the efficiency and affect the morale

(Mr. Hillhouse cont'd) . . . . of a board of a crown corporation, in that it will place that board into direct contact with and answerable to a committee of this Legislature. The other evening I asked the Honourable Minister the Provincial Secretary a question regarding the policy of the purchasing bureau. Now I could, Madam, have asked that question of the purchasing agent direct, but at the same time I felt that it would not be fair for me, as a member of this Legislature, to place a civil servant in the position where he may have to answer a question to me, or deny me an answer to a question which might affect a practice or a policy of the government.

This amendment in my opinion will force the members of the Hydro Electric Board to appear before a committee of this Legislature and to answer personally, and perhaps try to justify matters which could be a policy of this government and directed to be followed by that board by this government. I believe that our present legislation is quite satisfactory in that it gives to Parliament an indirect control over a Crown Corporation, indirect in the sense that it is exercised by a Minister but nevertheless parliamentary in that the Minister is acting as a parliamentary agent and is responsible to Parliament for everything done by the corporation over which he is responsible.

In conclusion, this legislation would deprive the members of this House of one of their most cherished democratic rights; namely, that of asking of a Minister the questions relating to the operation of a board or a commission under his jurisdiction. I feel, Madam, that this legislation is bad. I think the government has made a mistake in introducing it and I would ask the government to withdraw it.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Selkirk and I have both spoken on the other sister Bill and he found it necessary to make some further statement with regard to this Bill and so do I, because I interpret the intention of the government here in a way that is quite different from my honourable friends to the right.

I get the impression that this government is trying to change the relationship as between the two crown corporations and the Minister insofar as matters of detail are concerned. It is a fact that a crown corporation works and labours under a distinct disadvantage, and that is the people, members of the general public tend to demand from it service to such an extent that it at times undermines the efficiency of the operation of crown corporations; and when crown corporations tend to run up a deficit, then of course there is usually a holler when they have to be subsidized. But in any event, I don't think that we here should do anything that would put the efficient operation of a crown corporation in our jurisdiction under any kind of jeopardy. I don't think that it is proper, constitutionally, for members to pester a Minister with questions of detail relating to a crown corporation and therefore I would welcome the establishment of a committee -- or rather I would welcome the change in procedure whereby the annual report would be referred to a special committee, the standing committee that would have the report permanently referred to it.

Now then, there is nothing in the remarks made by the Honourable Minister that I could see -- and I did do my homework, I did read the statement that he made -- there is nothing in there that I can construe or interpret as meaning that they will refuse henceforth to answer to questions of overall policy, and this is the nub of the matter. I hope that the Minister will set my honourable friends' minds at ease and tell them that, insofar as matters of overall policy are concerned, the Cabinet will still hold itself responsible.

There can be no other way, Madam Speaker, because the practice, and it's a well established practice by now, is that -- at least under the British parliamentary system -- is that matters of detail pertaining to crown corporations are kept out of the House. Questions and statements on broad and general and overall policy are threshed out in the House and I don't see any change in this legislation or anything in this legislation that would change this. It's just the cleaning-up operation because of some misunderstanding that has taken place in the past few years.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed Resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Morris.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that this House doth concur in the final report of the special committee of the House appointed to enquire into all phases of the Livestock Marketing System in Manitoba received by the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba on Monday the 10th day of February, 1964.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SHEWMAN: Madam Speaker, it might appear that I might be reading my notes, which I will be in part. The Committee, in accordance with its terms of reference, undertook a comprehensive review of the livestock marketing system in Manitoba, what machinery is involved; how it functions; which of its functions are not performed to the satisfaction of the industry; what the specific problems are; what are the thinking of those involved in the industry. The Committee has also studied general principles of marketing systems and has gathered information and comments from those competent in the field in Manitoba and elsewhere. It has considered various methods and procedures in general for experimental use in other areas. Submissions were received by the committee that covered many aspects of the system and presented a variety of issues: public markets versus direct to plant deliveries; live and rail grading; health standards; community auction sales; transportation services; marketing margins. These are a few of the issues and problems presented for the committee's consideration.

In the early stages of its investigations the committee solicited submissions from all organizations known to be interested in the marketing of livestock and twenty briefs were submitted.

Madam Speaker, the members will notice in their report that we went far and wide to gain the necessary information to be able to table the report which we tabled. And in the appendix -- we contacted a good many people in our investigations and the contacts with them, but there are a few names that I would like to mention at this time. I would like to thank the members that have worked on this committee with them and worked very well, such as the Honourable Walter Weir, Dan Roberts, George Johnson, D. I. Dow and Mr. Peter Wagner. It was Professor F. Campbell of the Ontario Agricultural University who was of great help in the experience that he had in Ontario in work along these lines, and was well acquainted with the problems of marketing livestock and other products in Ontario.

At this time, I would like to thank Dr. J. C. Gilson and Dr. A. W. Wood of the Department of Agriculture Economics for the University of Manitoba, and also the Manitoba Telephone System. They have put on a display for us of marketing livestock by television; also by teletype. I'd like to thank Professor J. H. Ellis of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources who contributed quite a bit of useful and well thought out information to the committee. Then there was the three farm organizations: Mr. Usick and Mr. Galonsky of the Farmers Union, Mr. Ransom and Mr. Douglas of the MFA, Mr. Kapiluk and Mr. Hamilton of the Pool.

In Ontario, Madam Speaker, there was Mr. G. F. Perkins, Commissioner of marketing; also Mr. W. P. Watson, the Livestock Commissioner. There was a Mr. Fred Campbell, the Stockyards Manager at the stockyards in Toronto and Mr. Charles McGinnis, the Manager of FAME.

In Saskatchewan there was Mr. H. S. Hanna, Director of the Animal Industry Branch, Mr. Glenn Flaten, President of the Saskatchewan Hog Producers Association, and Mr. Ira K. Mumford of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

In Alberta there was Mr. R. M. Putnam, Deputy Minister of Agriculture; Mr. W. H. T. Mead, Livestock Commissioner; also Mr. J. M. Bentley, who is the National President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. At Lethbridge, Mr. E. French; and at Walsh, Alberta, a very interesting interview was held with Mr. Walsh who is a large rancher at Walsh, Alberta.

Then in the United States we had interviews with Professor Lee Kolmer of State Iowa University; Mr. E. V. Stadel of the Farm Bureau Services Incorporated at Des Moines; Mr. Frank Kutish of the U. S. Department of Agriculture at Ames, Iowa; Mr. R. A. Rodeen, President of the Sioux City Stock Yards; Mr. Harry Gamage, Secretary of the Sioux City Livestock Exchange; Mr. W. P. Dolan, Secretary-Treasurer of the South St. Paul Stock Exchange; Dean Arlon G. Hazen of the North Dakota State University at Fargo, Director of the Agricultural Experimental Station.

At this time I would like to thank those ones who helped us with the secretarial and

(Mr. Shewman cont'd) . . . . stenographic work. There was Miss Ruth Loutit, Mrs. Marjorie Badger, Mrs. Molly Bailey, Mrs. Betty Broadfoot, Mrs. Katherine Clancy, Miss Nan Guertin and Mrs. Phyllis Keyworth.

When this committee was established, set up in the House, we had very little to go on, Madam Speaker, and we decided at the first two meetings that we had that we would take it in four phases. We would call for briefs from the producers; next was the processors and the labour in the meat distribution; public markets and transportation; then the fourth was retail and consumers. As we went along we did vary that first setup in some ways. We had on our mailing list the producer groups, which were 21 in total; transportation was two railways and one trucking association, and the individual truckers, which amounted to 203; selling facilities, there were ten; processing phases, labour, two; meat packers councils, that included Swift's, Canada Packers, Burns, and at that time the Brandon Packers, there was nine; slaughter houses 26; processors, such as sausage manufacturers, etc., and wholesalers, 25; locker plants 89. The retail association has a membership of 1,500 but 500 of that association handled meat in one form or another. Then there was two consumers associations that we contacted. Now I mention these figures in passing to say that we notified these people of every meeting that we had right from the start to the finish, to give them a chance to hear the evidence and to sit in and to see what was going on.

Now the committee held 27 meetings and some of them were two-day meetings, and we did have Professor Campbell fly from Toronto to Winnipeg to spend a full day with the committee, which was very valuable.

Now, Madam Speaker, I think the report should be accepted. It speaks well for itself and that's all I'll have to say at the time.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member from Lakeside, that the report of the committee be not concurred in but be referred back to the committee to consider and report on the following resolution: Whereas there has been a great deal of public discussion on the merits of the Hog Producers Marketing Board in Manitoba; and Whereas consideration is being given to the establishment of similar boards in the Province of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and a vote will likely be held in Saskatchewan shortly; and Whereas there is presently a request on behalf of the farm organizations of this province for a vote on the establishment of a Hog Producers Marketing Board under The Natural Products Marketing Act; therefore be it resolved that this House request the government to instruct the Marketing Board under The Natural Products Marketing Act to proceed with a vote on the establishment of a Producers Marketing Board in the Province of Manitoba, and that the recommendation of the committee so establish a state-controlled hog marketing commission be not implemented until the results of such a vote has been determined.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I take it that the mover of the amendment does not propose to speak on it and explain what it's all about.

MR. VIELFAURE: Yes, I would. Should I now? Thank you.

The main reason -- my amendment is fairly self-explanatory -- my main reason for bringing it at this moment is that I cannot see why the government should bring in a state-controlled marketing board when at this very time in all three provinces the farmers are asking the governments concerned to give them the opportunity to vote whether they want a board or not. I would strongly recommend the government to wait or to give these farm organizations the opportunity to express themselves. And I would even go a little further and ask the government to try and establish the vote on the same day as in the neighbouring provinces. This is the main reason for bringing in this amendment at this time.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the debate . . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the honourable member makes this motion, I would like to say that this is referring the motion back to a special committee and, under the rules of the House as we have it so far, this is not allowed. Therefore, I must rule that the motion is out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I certainly would have no objection to your taking the motion under advisement if that was your decision, but I think that we're in an awkward position



(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . . . here in the House. The motion was read to the House and after being read to the House an honourable member has spoken on it, so I think by virtue of that that the motion has been accepted. I really don't believe that the decision can be reversed just in that way at this time.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, it is a difficult question. It was a very long motion and I, myself, was rising to say that we should let the matter stand. I got off the track there and invited my honourable friend to speak. I think that it might be reasonable to ask that Madam Speaker take the question under advisement and have a look at it. It does run square into the proposal on the Order Paper of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and it does put us in a bit of a quandary. Perhaps it would be better if it was taken under advisement and we allow Madam Speaker to rule on it at a later date.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is this agreed? I will take it under advisement then and give my ruling at a later date.

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I repeat again my thanks to the House for allowing this matter to stand. We had not really expected that we'd be in the budget debate quite this early. It is not our normal practice and I would like to comment briefly first of all on the change in procedure introduced by the government this year in the dealing with estimates and with the budget.

I'm not sure that I agree with the First Minister in the change that he is proposing to the House, although I do admit that this appears to be the practice followed in a number of other provinces. In the past in this House, the Throne Speech has been the traditional verification of the confidence of the House in the government before proceeding with any business at the beginning of a session. This was followed on the completion of the Throne Speech by the discussion of estimates and the government plans for the following year. When the estimates, which are the proposed spending program for the coming year, were fully discussed and passed, then we moved on to the budget which was introduced by the First Minister. The budget then proceeded to outline how the government proposed to implement its plans and, once again after a thorough discussion of the plans and estimates, the House was able to decide whether it had confidence or not in the government and its procedures and allowing it to raise the money required to implement its program.

Now under the new system we don't have that, Madam Speaker. We have two confidence motions at the very start of the session before the House had actually had an opportunity to discuss the government's plans in detail. And as we're being asked at this time in the ways and means motion for the raising of the taxes before the approving of the expenditures, we are in fact being asked to give the government a blank cheque, to tell them that they can proceed and raise the funds before they have told the House exactly what the funds are going to be used for. I submit, Madam Speaker, that the previous procedure in this House was more consistent with proper practice.

Now in terms of words spoken, the Budget Speech that was given to us was certainly a great success; but in terms of real accomplishment, I believe that it leaves a great deal of doubt in the minds of the public of this province, doubts that can't be buried in some 65 pages of comments and statistics as given to us by the Provincial Treasurer.

I believe that the people of Manitoba can take a great deal of satisfaction out of the fact that the Canadian economy has been buoyant in the last year and that this province has been able to share some of the benefits of this upsurge. In fact, Madam Speaker, this buoyancy in the economy appears to be the only thing that has saved this government from following what has now become an annual practice of introducing new taxes. But the First Minister has left the door open. He apparently is having an open-door policy in the field of finance as well. He mentioned that there could be increases later on. I think it is well, Madam Speaker, to remind ourselves at this time of the record of this government in the field of taxation, and to remind the government that they will be judged not on how much they spend but on how wisely they administer the tax revenues of this province and how well they run our affairs.

Now let's look at the record of this government in that regard. Starting in 1959 when they took office, Madam Speaker, there was a substantial amount -- some \$13 million or so in the

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . . . Post-War Emergency Fund. That was soon used up. Very shortly after that, I think around about 1960, there were increases in fees and licences of all sorts. I don't know exactly how many million per year but it was a substantial amount, in fact nothing that could be increased at that time was left untouched, including fees for students writing exams, students attending Teachers' College and so on. Not too long after that an increase in beer and liquor prices -- again, I don't know how many million. In 1961 the gasoline tax was up by three cents. I estimate that this will bring in something like \$4 million per year. In 1962 the provincial income tax was introduced, and again I estimate that this will bring in something in the order of \$11 million per year. In 1963 the cigarette tax was introduced. This, according to the estimates presented to us, is going to bring in some \$3.7 million per year. Then there has been driver licences increases, park fees and oh, so many, Madam Speaker, that it is impossible to have a complete list. The one that I have is only partial and I must confess that one has to guess at the figures.

At the same time as that was going on, the municipalities of this province were being forced by actions of this government to substantially increase their taxation. The figures there are clear, Madam Speaker, that since 1958, the municipalities of Manitoba and this is including school taxes, have had to increase their taxes from \$56 million up to \$79 million in 1962 or an increase of \$23 million -- almost 50 percent.

On top of all this, Madam Speaker, the heaviest tax of all, and that is the huge increase in the provincial debt, a figure that stood at over \$570 million at the 31st of March, 1963 compared with some \$225 million in 1958. The figures for 1963, Madam Speaker, are the ones given to us in the Public Accounts Committee on Tuesday of this week. The latter figures for 1958 I have calculated from the Public Accounts on the same basis as we had the calculation for 1963. They show more than a doubling in the past five years.

Now it is clear from these figures, Madam Speaker, that this government has imposed millions and millions of dollars of new and increased taxes on the people of Manitoba, some direct, some hidden; some we see, some we don't; but the taxpayer has been hit on most of his activities -- his driving, his drinking, his smoking, his recreation in provincial parks, to say nothing of the most painful and serious of all, the increase in taxes on his home and his land. This is the record of this government, Madam Speaker, and the warnings from them still persist.

We have been warned in the budget speech that we should expect an increase in hospitalization premiums. We have been warned of a possible increase in taxation as a result of the Michener Commission Report. The Telephone System is in deficit; I suppose we can expect an increase in its rates. But, Madam Speaker, this is the record, but the most serious weakness at this point in the statement given to us in the budget is the failure of the government to clearly tell the facts of the present situation. The budget is the time when the government should expose in plain, clear terms to the public of Manitoba, the true position of the finances of our province. It should give full and complete details of its stewardship. The government should not try and juggle figures.

Let's look at the budget statements compared to impartial facts. Let's deal first of all with this matter of surplus. This government again persists in claiming a surplus in the coming year. The Budget Speech says on Page 36 that "Information now available from the departments shows prospects for a surplus on current accounts in the 1963-64 fiscal year of about \$10 million. In accordance with the established practice, this amount will be carried forward into the next fiscal year."

Now the established practice referred to here, Madam Speaker, I would point out, was a practice established by this government in 1960. It established the practice. Starting at that time, in an attempt I presume to hide deficits, this government carried forward last year's surplus into next year's income. According to the estimates of revenue, the amounts carried forward from year to year are the following: in 1960 they carried forward \$3.7 million; in 1961, \$5.1 million; in 1962, \$6.5 million; 1963, \$7.5 million. Similarly, the same estimates of revenue which are given to us here in the House would indicate that the estimated surpluses at the end of each year according to the government were: in 1960, \$5.3 million; in 1961, \$3 million; in 1962, \$1.9 million; in 1963, \$265,000; but we are told in the budget that this would be revised.

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . . .

Madam Speaker, that's the government's statement. What are the facts? The following figures that I will give are not my figures, they are not the figures of the Liberal Party; they are the figures of the Canadian Tax Foundation. This Canadian Tax Foundation is an independent body. The best description of it, Madam Speaker, I think is found at the back of this booklet, and this particular one is "Provincial Finances, 1963." At the very back of the book, behind Page 177, there is a heading: "The Canadian Tax Foundation".

I would like to read onto the record, Madam Speaker, exactly what the Foundation is so that there will be no illusions as to the source and the accuracy of the figures that I give. "The Foundation is a non-profit, tax research organization established in 1945 by the joint action of the Canadian Bar Association and the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants. Its policies and affairs are controlled by a board of governors elected annually and drawn equally from the two sponsoring professions and from all provinces. While it is an emanation of these two professional bodies, the Foundation is not expected nor does it presume to represent their interests, but their sponsorship does provide the advantage of direct access to expert knowledge and opinion of the highest calibre. The membership of the Foundation is made up of both individuals and corporations and their contributions are its sole financial support. The Foundation receives no financial assistance from governments. The offices of the Foundation are in Toronto, but it functions as a national organization and its studies are carried on on a Canada-wide basis. The permanent staff now numbers 13. In addition to the permanent staff, outside experts are engaged from time to time to carry out special studies and the Foundation carries on extensive correspondence with tax specialists in several other countries."

Then they go on and give the role of the Foundation, Madam Speaker, which is basically to study and analyze tax structures in Canada. I read this on the record, Madam Speaker, because I think it is important to understand that this is not a group sponsored by government or by any special interest group, that they are simply interested in analysis and presenting the facts. So I think that I've made it clear that this group is in an impartial and knowledgeable position.

So let's see what they say about the surplus position in Manitoba. I quote now from the same book, Madam Speaker - 1963, Page 167. I see the Premier has a copy so he can follow clearly what I have to say. There on Page 167, Madam Speaker, the heading is -- this is referring by the way to Manitoba finances which starts on page 165 -- and the heading is: "Deficit for 1963." "Manitoba's estimated revenue of \$123.9 million in fiscal 1963 fell short of expenditures of \$155.2 million by \$31.3 million. This short-fall represented 25 percent of revenue. In 1953 Manitoba's accounts showed a surplus of \$13.4 million" -- that's in 1953 -- "Over the ten-year period revenue increased by 124 percent and expenditure by 269 percent." Then turning to the previous page, Madam Speaker, Page 166, we have Table No. 50, and here after an analysis of the accounts of the province is, at the bottom of the page, indicated surplus or deficit, and in each column, Madam Speaker, here are the figures: for 1953, a surplus of \$13.4 million; 1960, which is the next figure given here, a deficit of \$27.8 million; 1961, a deficit of \$32.9 million; 1962, a deficit of \$20 million; 1963, a deficit of \$31.5 million. Madam Speaker, could anything be clearer? A very substantial deficit every year according to the Tax Foundation, in spite of the government's claim of surpluses every year.

To go on now, Madam Speaker, to the debt position. The budget in this regard says the following on Page 29: "At the close of the calendar year our outstanding obligations on capital accounts, as represented by the net debt, have actually been reduced from a year ago by about \$1 million. This has been in large measure due to two factors, the transfer of maturing utility obligations to a guaranteed basis and the continued growth of provincial sinking funds."

Government news releases published on the 12th of February repeat the same statement, to be carried in all the news media of the province. Here's what that news release says. The heading, "Net Public Debt Down - Net public debt of Manitoba declined \$1 million from December 31, 1962 to December 31, 1963 to stand at \$168.4 million. Gross debt \$373.4 million is offset by \$189.8 repayable by utilities and by an increase of \$6 million, to reach \$21.5 million in sinking funds and other funds for general debt retirement."

Those, Madam Speaker, are the statements of this government in the budget speech, in

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . . . the news release. Now in fairness to the government I must say that at least in the budget, if not in the news release, mention is made of the guaranteed debt. It is mentioned, but do we find any clear-cut statement, Madam Speaker, of the total debt including the guarantee? No. There are two tables, one on Page 30 and one on Page 32, and if you carefully combine the right figures, as the Comptroller-General did for us in the Public Accounts committee -- and this had to be done with some care and considerable juggling from page to page -- if you do this carefully here and combine the right figures, it is possible to get the total, but if you look at either table separately there is no clear picture, Madam Speaker.

Similarly, if you take the last page of this budget which shows this graph entitled, "Province of Manitoba Public Debt", one could reasonably expect that this would be a true presentation of the total public debt of this province; but, Madam Speaker, it is not. This chart does not include the guaranteed debt of the Province of Manitoba. This, Madam Speaker, has not been made clear in the budget nor in any of the news releases.

Now the Premier cannot claim, Madam Speaker, that all these types of debt should not be included. The First Minister himself was an expert in the field of finances a few years ago when he sat on this side of the House. I have to remind him and the House and the people of Manitoba of the statement that he made in the budget speech debate here on the 25th March, 1952, and of the amendment that he moved at that time -- (interjection) -- 1952, that's correct. It's a very interesting statement, Madam Speaker, and it outlines the philosophy I presume of my honourable friend, and I quote: "But, Mr. Speaker, there is something more important than exchange rates when you come to talk about the Provincial Debt. There is another consideration which we should not overlook, and surely that is the size of the provincial debt. We were told the other night that last year it was 135 million; this year it will be \$158 million; next year it will be \$175 million, which will be the peak that we have ever aspired to in this particular connection, and we heard a lot of definitions. We heard about gross debt; we hear about self-sustaining debt; let us be careful lest we deceive ourselves with words. What is this phrase, "self-sustaining debt"? Well, let's take an example here. The highways right now when they are covered by capital borrowing are considered to be dead weight debt. But, Mr. Speaker, if you had a Highway Commission as they have in some parts of the world, with the right to levy the gasoline tax and that sort of thing, in other words to sell the highways, they would come to this government and borrow funds. We would lend them the funds and they could sell the highways to the public and pay us back the interest on our money and we would call that self-sustaining debt."

The speaker, the present Premier, carries on: "That is precisely the procedure that takes place when you authorize the Telephone System to have a monopoly on phones in this province or the Power Commission to have a monopoly on power in this province. You could call anything self-sustaining debt provided you balance and define your terms nicely. We know what happens in hard times. Whether you call them self-sustaining debts or dead weight or whatever you call it, the people do not use the roads; the people who don't use them take out their telephones, as we have seen them do; they economize on electric light. Some of these self-sustaining debts may require a prop or two before we are through."

The present Premier carries on, Madam Speaker, and says: "There is a funny thing about debt, Mr. Speaker, no matter what you call it, you still have to pay it back, and I say that we should regard this steady increase in the gross total of the debt of this province with some concern." Madam Speaker, that was Mr. Roblin speaking in 1952.

The following is the amendment that he moved at that time, Madam Speaker, as an amendment to the budget speech, and his amendment read as follows: "That this House regrets that the government has failed to propose measures adequate to reverse our adverse population trend and has failed to display that economy in internal administration that they preach to municipalities, while at the same time are increasing the provincial debt of Manitoba to an all-time high of \$175 million as estimated by the Provincial Treasurer as of March 31, 1953." Well that was 1953, Madam Speaker. Yesterday, or rather on Tuesday of this week, Madam Speaker, we were dealing with the figures for the 31st March, 1963. My honourable friend was showing great concern of 175 million in 1953; the figures given to us the other day by the Comptroller-General indicate that we are now at \$570 million.

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . .

Let's have a look then, Madam Speaker, at the facts of the situation as they are now. The Comptroller-General told us on Tuesday of this week that the total guaranteed and direct, less sinking funds was \$570 million; that in addition to this there is another figure of some \$25 million of bonds of the utilities presently held by the government. According to the tables in the budget speech on Pages 30 and 32, if you total the right figures you find, Madam Speaker, that at the 31st December, 1963, the total debt, less sinking funds had risen to approximately \$610 million. In the period of nine months therefore, Madam Speaker, from the 31st March 1963 until the 31st of December we have had an increase of some \$40 million in the debt of this province, and this government claims in its budget speech, and spreads news releases all over the province saying that there has been a decrease in the debt of \$1 million.

Madam Speaker, let's turn again to the impartial opinion of the Canadian Tax Foundation in its 1963 report. I refer the Premier to Page 26, Table 14. I'm sorry I have been unable to supply all members of the House with this most illuminating document. In fact after reading it, Madam Speaker, I can well believe that they needn't put in the back here when they say that the Foundation received no financial assistance from government? I'm sure they'd receive none from this one. So Table 14, Page 26, shows that, today, Manitoba has the dubious distinction of having the biggest per capita debt of any province in Canada. The Premier stated, Madam Speaker, that whether its direct or indirect it's all debt and it must be paid, and I agree with him and when you combine the per capita direct debt and the per capita indirect debt for every province in Canada, Madam Speaker, this table shows clearly the results. Manitoba is at the top with \$530 of debt for every man, woman and child in this province. The next to us is the Province of Ontario with \$526; Saskatchewan, \$486; New Brunswick, \$441; British Columbia, \$400; -- and we hear so much about the tremendous debt of British Columbia; Nova Scotia, \$381; Prince Edward Island, \$347; Newfoundland, \$267; Quebec, \$248; Albert, \$166; but Manitoba, Madam Speaker, at the very top with \$530 per head.

In the year 1952, Madam Speaker, when the First Minister was so distressed about the situation, when he was giving the speech I read back to him a few moments ago, when he was moving amendments decrying the debt of \$175 million, do you know what the per capita debt in Manitoba was then? -- \$177.00. It's gone up from \$177 to \$530.00. According to these latest figures, Madam Speaker, this is the province with the highest per capita debt in Canada.

Now I ask you in all fairness, Madam Speaker, does the budget presented by the First Minister in this House last week reveal the true financial position of Manitoba? Does it give to the people of Manitoba the proper facts of the situation? These are the facts, Madam Speaker, from an impartial body -- not my facts -- the facts of an impartial group of specialists in the field of taxation, and this is what the government should be telling the people of Manitoba.

This government is a management. We here are the board of directors, if you will. We represent all the people of Manitoba as the shareholders. I don't know of any board of directors or group of shareholders who would accept this kind of financial statement. The Premier says himself in his budget speech on Page 29 that we must accept the fact that Ontario and Alberta have a very much higher level of economic wealth than we have in Manitoba. I accept that fact. It is true, and that is why the situation as revealed by the true debt picture of this province, by the fact that we have the highest per capita debt of any province is, and must be, of real concern to us, and the government should give us those facts. I believe, Madam Speaker, that Manitobans look forward to constant improvement in government services, but we're not getting value for our money from this government.

During the Throne Speech debate I covered some of the failures of this government in certain departments. I discussed how they had failed to act on reports such as the Willard Hospital Report, with the resulting serious shortage of hospital beds. I showed how they had failed to take advantage of generous Federal Government offers to build and operate sorely needed technical schools; how the curriculum program was behind; and on and on.

Today I would like to deal with two other departments. In the field of agriculture, the

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . . Throne Speech said very little; the budget speech says not much more. Mention is made of capital investment in agriculture. The government pretends, Madam Speaker, that there's a large increase in the spending estimates for the provision of services to agriculture. This is not the case. The largest single increase in the estimates for the Department of Agriculture is the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. Surely the government does not intend that the people of this province be left with the impression that money spent on the floodway can be classified as an expenditure on agriculture. I am sure that the people who live in the Red River Valley south of here will have a hard time justifying this type of expenditure as being just for the good of agriculture.

Mention is made in the Budget Speech about watershed studies. I ask, Madam Speaker, when is this government going to stop studying and start working? There are hundreds of small water-controll and man-management projects in this province on which work could be started at once. Why do we have to submit to this same routine of more studies year after year? Why are they delaying and failing to act? Is it because the government has no policy? Well it's certainly so, Madam Speaker, in the field of extension services in this province and my authority there is none other than the Minister of Agriculture himself.

I quote, Madam Speaker, from one of these new news releases that have been developed in the past year -- the green ones. This is one that was released on the 24th of January, 1964. In other words, barely a month ago. This is the Minister of Agriculture speaking, and he says -- speaking I believe to his own staff -- yes, he's speaking to departmental personnel. He says: "Agricultural extension workers must restore in some of our farm people and nurture in others a real confidence in the industry. Over the past 20 years the province has lost 1 1/2 percent of its share of the national agricultural production. This represents the loss of \$40 million annually, or \$1,000 per farm. In terms of physical farm production, the province has increased its volume output by ten percent while the Canadian average is a 23 percent increase. Only two provinces have shown a lesser increase than Manitoba. In 1963 alone, hog population dropped 17 percent in Manitoba while Ontario farmers increased their hog numbers by the same percentage. This is a loss we are not going to recover." The Minister continues: "Since the Manitoba resources are not poor, relative to other provinces, and the farm people no less resourceful, this failure to expand equally must mean that information is just not getting through to the people. In spite of a highly qualified staff of extension workers promoting good programs and backed by a fine research institution in the University of Manitoba, there still needs to be a continuing improvement in extension techniques." The Minister of Agriculture continues: "We in the department must analyze ourselves to see if we are truly utilizing our energy and efforts to the best advantage." Mr. Hutton said: "Only by doing so can we be assured that Manitoba agriculture becomes second to none in Canada." That's the end of the statement, Madam Speaker, and that's an amazing statement.

Here we have the Minister of Agriculture telling the staff of his department that the government agricultural policy has failed to cut any ice with the farmers. He admits to his staff that the government six years in office have not only failed to produce an upswing in the prosperity of the farmer, but have actually seen a downhill slide set in -- and not way back when, Madam Speaker, -- but even last year, 1963, he admits hog production going down. What a remarkable statement. The Minister then goes on to say that his department must analyze itself to see if it's truly utilizing its energy and efforts to the best advantage. There could be no better way of condemning the government's agriculture record than the words of the Minister himself. I'm happy to see however, Madam Speaker, that he finally admits what we've been trying to say for some time, that this government spends most of its time talking and dreaming -- talk, but very little action.

A look at other departments of this government indicates that large sums of money are being spent. Oh, the promotion program is rolling ahead full steam; but a close scrutiny reveals that because of lack of leadership and a clear definition of what government policy is, we are failing to take advantage of the buoyant economy that the Provincial Treasurer boasts of.

What about the Department of Industry and Commerce, Madam Speaker? Here we have what was heralded as the shining star of the Roblin Government. This was the department that was going to lead this province to new and greater things; develop industry; provide jobs; and

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . . . and make Manitoba the envy of all provinces. Well if spending is the criterion of greatness and the full measure of the onward thrust, then this department has succeeded beyond the most ardent expectations of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. He is this government's great planner. In terms of dollars spent he has been a smashing success. In 1952-53 when this department was originally formed, it had 28 employees and a budget of \$27,000.00. In 1963, ten years later, it had 105 employees and a budget of \$1.5 million. In terms of money spent for industrial activities the rate of increase has been even greater -- from \$129,000 to \$1.1 million -- almost ten times. But what are the sobering facts, Madam Speaker? The report of the department itself shows 260 additional jobs created in this province in industry. It works out to 26 jobs per year. Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures show that the index of industrial employment for Manitoba stood last year at only 12 points above that of 1949, and about half the national average increase.

Now the First Minister has spoken about his government's plans to provide for the 75,000 new jobs that will be needed by 1970. I sincerely hope that he's not depending on the Department of Industry and Commerce to provide the leadership that is needed. The reason, Madam Speaker, that this department is failing in its objectives is due to the fact that there is apparently no direction from the government. The government does not even know what its own policy is in industrial development, and I will give you an example of what I mean.

The Honourable Gurney Evans, Minister of Industry and Commerce, speaking in Washington -- this was on the 31st of January, 1964, Madam Speaker, not a month ago yet -- he was speaking to the Society of Industrial Realtors and he spoke in glowing terms at that time about his government's accomplishments and he outlined this policy, and I quote directly from what he says: "Our industrial development policy is to provide stimulation and incentive to private enterprise. It is our firm conviction that the economic growth of our country depends directly upon individual entrepreneurs with risk capital undertaking the investment required and operating with the objectives of making a profit. Massive expenditures by government are not "underlined", not ". . . . ." the key to our economic growth, nor can they attain the goals required. The responsibility of government is to create the appropriate business climate." The headline in the paper at that time, Madam Speaker, was "Massive Spending Not Answer", and then we had a description of the meeting that my honourable friend attended. Now this, Madam Speaker indicates government policy as announced by the Minister himself on the last day of January of this year.

Now let's take a look at this government -- oh, not in Washington or in New Orleans, but right here in Manitoba where the policy should be carried through. And what do we find? I refer, Madam Speaker, to an article in the Winnipeg Tribune on the 11th of February, 1964, and the headline of that one is: "Government has Key to Growth." Now this is, oh, some 11 or 12 days, Madam Speaker, after the Minister spoke -- but within two weeks.

Now this article covers a statement made by Dr. Baldur Christianson, the Executive Director of the Manitoba Consultative Board, a distinguished civil servant appointed by this government as the permanent head of the Consultative Board and charged with getting COMEF going. Now here is the man, Madam Speaker, charged by this government under this Minister to put into effect the policies of this government presumably. Here's the man who should know what government policy is, and this is what Dr. Christianson says, and I quote: "Massive expenditures by the government are the key to Manitoba's economic growth." Two weeks before the Minister is saying in Washington: "Massive expenditures by government are not the key to economic growth."

Now, Madam Speaker, I can find no more damning indictment of this government for its lack of policy. I ask the government: what is their policy? Is there a policy or is there not? Is it any wonder, Madam Speaker, that the people of this province are becoming weary of high sounding phrases of promotion that are heard in New Orleans and Washington and no policy at home? "Evanisms" by the dozen, but no policy. How can you have any action? The people of Manitoba are saying, Madam Speaker, "Does this government really know what it's doing? Is this government getting full value for all the taxes it collects from us? How can they be when they don't know themselves what their policies are, and they contradict their own statements?" Can we be expected, Madam Speaker, to have confidence in a government which on the one hand continually increases taxation, in which by some of the examples I've cited today --

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . . and these are only some of them -- fails to carry through programs that will allow the people of this province an opportunity to share in the resources that are ours? I therefore move, Madam Speaker, that the motion be amended by striking out the words after "that" in line one and substituting the following -- this is seconded by the member for Lakeside -- "that this House regrets that while greatly increasing provincial expenditures, debt and taxes, this government has failed to produce results in any of its programs and has wasted the taxpayers' money."

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood, that the debate be adjourned.

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

. . . . . continued on next page.



MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee with the Honourable Member from St. Matthews in the Chair.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): . . . . before we move into the curriculum, I would like to take this opportunity to clear up a little confusion which resulted the other evening with respect to some of the questions which were left -- if I may clean them up. The first one is with respect to the number of permit teachers. The Leader of the Opposition asked for a reconciliation of the various figures connected with permit teachers. The figures taken from the departmental records we believe to be correct. Three figures came out and I think they can be explained in this fashion. In January, '63 there were 144 people teaching on permits. During the school year 1962-63 the number of individuals who taught on permit at one time or another was 160. This was the figure showing in the Annual Report on page 74. In January of '64, the number of teachers employed on permit was 229. The difference between the number on permit in January '63 and January '64 is approximately equal to the decrease in enrollment which resulted from the rising of standards at the Teachers' College in the previous year. The figure of 293, which I quoted, is the figure which includes those listed for payment in one of our tables here, includes those teaching on permit and a number of others listed as "others" who were not listed at the time as having valid Manitoba certificates. Included in this group were those who came to Manitoba to teach on exchange from other countries; those who came from outside of Manitoba; and who at the time of the account were negotiating for Manitoba certificates but had not yet received them. I think it is interesting to note that of the permit teachers who are now teaching 41 have university degrees, 32 have third year, 17 second year and 42 have a complete Grade 12. That leaves about 97 with less than Grade 12. However this discrepancy in the figures I think is cleared by this statement.

The Leader of the Opposition also asked the numbers of teachers leaving Manitoba. For obvious reasons we can't tell how many teachers left Manitoba and taught elsewhere but we can give a good indication of the probable transfers from the following figures: 249 Manitoba teachers requested that a transcript of academic and professional standing be sent to Departments of Education and Universities outside Manitoba. Some of these took further professional training or academic standing but did not teach and have since returned to Manitoba. On the other hand, 222 teachers from other jurisdictions transferred their credentials to Manitoba and were issued Manitoba certificates. It would appear there is no significant difference between the number of teachers who transferred to Manitoba to teach and the number who transferred from Manitoba to teach elsewhere.

Another question raised the other evening by the Leader of the Opposition was the question of the amounts of grants to the affiliated colleges. I would draw his attention to the Statutes of '63, Chapter 1, Bill 67. In here is set out the formula by which affiliated colleges are paid grants. All these affiliated college grants are paid from interest earnings of school lands funds by authority of this Act of the Legislature. They are not included in the departmental estimates but are in a trust fund.

The Leader of the NDP asked the number of Grade 12 students at affiliated colleges. The information is available. The enrollments at United last year in first year were 308, and they get a \$60 grant which comes to \$18,000.00 I even multiplied these out for the Honourable Leader of the NDP. St. John's College, 75 times \$60 is \$4500; St. Paul's 96 times 60, \$5760.00; Brandon 34 times 60, \$2,400; St. Boniface, 29 times \$60 for \$1740; for a total of \$32,538. Every affiliated college apparently knew it would have no first year in '64 - the scale of grants are worked under known conditions, that is when it was decided to extend Grade 12 as set by the University Senate, when they said Grade 12 was the minimum, they were quite cognizant in the affiliated colleges of this fact.

I think those were the questions which were asked -- I think there were two questions asked by other members which I'm trying to get information on and I will communicate with them directly if I may.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman I'd like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Education

(Mr. Peters, cont'd)... a clipping that I ran across in yesterday's Free Press and deals with the United States: "Two more years of school in U. S. proposed." "U. S. Labour Secretary W. Willard Wirtz has proposed that two more years be added both to free public education in schools and to compulsory education requirements. He offered the plan for the point of departure for getting poverty and unemployment out of the U. S. bloodstream. Mr. Wirtz's proposal would carry free public education through two years of college in most states and would lengthen compulsory school age to 18 years." Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add and draw to the Minister's attention that I would urgently ask him to confer with the other Ministers of Education in the other provinces and confer with the federal authorities of getting a uniform curriculum right through the whole of Canada. I know that under our statutes the age is going to be 16 next year and I would ask him to urgently take this under advisement because apparently they have studied this question a lot further than we have. I think we should have a uniform curriculum right through all of Canada and I would urgently ask the Minister to take this under consideration.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Honourable Member from Lakeside while speaking about the Hutterite schools, mentioned that these were private schools and the Minister then answered and the Premier shook his head, meaning "Yes, they were private schools." I'd like to make sure of this. I'd like the Minister to answer this question. I understand these schools are public schools -- the Hutterite schools are public schools. I'd like to know what kind of grants, if any, they are receiving for their teachers and who built their schools and if they are subject to same Attendance Act as anybody in Manitoba, and who inspects their schools to make sure that they follow the same curriculum as the other students in Manitoba. I think that we should get more than that. Yesterday we didn't get anything on this at all. I'd like to know how many of these children have taken Grade 9. I don't think they go much past Grade 9. I understand that some of them take Grade 9 by correspondence. I'd like to know if the Department has a record of how many have been taking Grade 9, the Correspondence Course of Grade 9, let's say over the last 10 or 20 years. I'd like to know more about this. From my understanding these schools are not private schools and the Premier yesterday was waving his head indicating they were, so I'd like to have an answer from the Minister on this.

MR. JOHNSON: I thought we were past that item but as a courtesy I would say to the Member from St. Boniface the Hutterite schools are operated as public schools under The Public Schools Act. They are built by the school districts; they get regular grants, regular inspectional staff; they are under an official trustee appointed by the province; the numbers are in the Annual Report.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . . Mr. Chairman, that one of these schools they are allowed to have their own division with only 3,000 acres of land and their schools therefore are built by the public the same as the other public schools in Manitoba. What is the requirement; what is the minimum acreage that they have to have before they are allowed to be classified as their own division?

MR. JOHNSON: These are school districts that are formed within the colonies. I don't know of any acreage requirements.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman I have no business to interject here but for the honourable members' information there is such a district and the mill rate is 322 mills.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if I inadvertently gave what could be considered as incorrect information yesterday, I'm sorry. The sense in which I was suggesting that these were private schools was that according to my understanding that even though they set up a school district composed of the land that the Hutterite Colony itself owns and support the school district-- with government grants of course -- but support that district completely by themselves, that they still pay taxes to the municipality in addition to that. It was in that sense that I was comparing them to private schools; and I think that even in the case where the mill rate is more than 300, that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead mentions, I think he will find that they are likely paying the regular municipal taxes on that land -- the school taxes, (Interjection) The regular school tax, yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . . should be clarified. Are they paying school taxes on their land just to their own school division. In other words, they're not paying to any other municipality but to their own school division. I'm not talking about the municipal tax now but the school tax.

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)... There is another question that I asked: Do they come under The School Attendance Act?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, they come under The School Attendance Act. I said under The Public Schools Act which includes The School Attendance Act. My understanding is they pay all regular taxes and have their own school districts.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . this regular tax; is that the municipal tax or the school taxes also? Are they paying double tax -- double school tax or their own money go to their own schools? This is what I would like to know.

MR. JOHNSON: I believe they are paying double taxes on their own schools.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . completed this . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was kind enough to give me an answer to a question or two that I posed to him yesterday in respect to the grant in first year university, Grade 12. He was kind enough -- I didn't jot down the sum total but it seems to me it is somewhere in the neighborhood of about 400 students that will be affected, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$42,000. in grants -- \$32,000 is it . . . \$32,000. in grants that the university won't be receiving for these students come the next succeeding term. He also mentioned I believe Mr. Chairman, that he had discussed this with the Senate of the University, they were made aware of the fact that there would be this reduction of the number of students, or at least the students for first year university would not be attending at the university. Now I would like to know from my honourable friend -- he may not have the answer but I am sure the Attorney-General would or he should, if he hasn't -- were discussions also taken up with the public schools or any other schools as to the necessity of them making additional provisions for the retention in their schools of students in Grade 12 as we know it now, or first year university? If there were about 400 students, I would roughly estimate that this would mean an additional 20 rooms based on 20 pupils in Grade 12, or first year university, as being desirable -- of course naturally this means additional 20 rooms of accommodation -- and I want to know whether or not accompanied with the discussions with the senate were discussions also conducted with the other school districts who have to provide accommodation?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, two years' notice was given by the senate to the department and the department in turn, gave two years' notice to the school districts of the province -- school divisions.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I would like first of all to deal with the question that the Minister has answered to me in part only, which he was supposed to give me the balance of -- and that was regarding the Island Lake School. I had asked him whether it was still open. He replied to me it was but I think he was to get for me the number of students -- which I don't believe I got.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm sorry I would be pleased to give the Honourable Leader of the Opposition a complete statement on that matter which I have in the office. I'm sorry, I believe there are I won't say it -- I'll double check on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 (a) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped really that we wouldn't go into curriculum today because I must confess that I had other things that prevented me from reading the statement made by the Minister or the statement given to us yesterday. However, I am prepared to make some general comments and I don't know if they are covered in the statement that he gave us or not.

During the throne speech debate Mr. Chairman, I said certain things about curriculum. The ex-minister of education said that my accusations that the curriculum was makeshift and handled in bits and pieces were not accurate.

Well I would like to refer first, Mr. Chairman, to some of the statements made by the teachers in this province. They have recommended to the Minister, this is by a resolution of the Teachers Society, that the Minister establish a curriculum commission and sub-commission to study the whole field of curriculum, and on the basis of this, to publish a comprehensive curriculum. They have requested that the personnel of commissions and sub-commissions be highly competent and be relieved of other professional responsibilities and paid equitably. The problem it seems Mr. Chairman, in this matter of curriculum revision, is that it is done on a part-time basis by teachers who are presently teaching and they cannot

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)...devote the time to it that's required.

Now the Minister said, "Well it doesn't matter where you start; if you start at Grade 12 and work down in your curriculum revision or if you start at Grade 1 and work up, there'll be people complaining." Well Mr. Chairman, here's an example of the problems coming out in the way in which the Government has proceeded with curriculum revision, proceeding as it has with the revision of the higher grades first -- and here I'm quoting now from the magazine entitled "The Manitoba Teacher" which is the Society's Journal -- referring to curriculum: "The move leaves one important problem yet to be dealt with and that is the relation of the high school program to the elementary program. Supposing for example, it is found that by the use of such methods as Cuisinaire the work now being done in elementary mathematics for Grade 8 can be completed by Grade 6, this would leave a two year gap between elementary and high school, and the answer might be in part to move some of the present high school mathematics program into the elementary school. This in turn, would mean a revision of the high school curriculum." Now this Mr. Chairman, it seems to me is the whole problem, that if you do it piecemeal you cannot have a curriculum that flows through the complete system. You do your high school first, then you have got to make fit your elementary into this program, rather than taking the whole affair and doing it as a complete job. And this Mr. Chairman, was our objection. This was to be done by the Government many years ago. It received the Royal Commission Education Report back in 1959. This is now 1964 and to date the main revision has been the General Course. The Minister said that he would have the University Entrance Course. Well it will be partly in apparently for the Fall of 1964.

Now insofar as the necessity for revision, I don't think there is any argument about that. I'd like to quote some of the things the teachers are saying Mr. Chairman, about texts and curriculum. Here's a statement for example on the science text: "The Grade 10 science text is out of date to the point of being wrong on the following points as well" -- and then he lists some of the specific errors. "Over and above it being incorrect and outdated, the Grade 10 science text also suffers from a lack of exactness. This is explainable since it was meant for use by students approximately thirteen years rather than sixteen years. Why the authorities have allowed this text to remain in use for so long is a mystery."

Another statement in the field of mathematics: "The present program in our schools is woefully ineffective and mathematically unsound. The main complaint seems to center around both the teaching and the contents of the algebra course. Probably the most damning statement of all Mr. Chairman -- this is made by Professor Jaenen who my honourable friends have appointed on the Commission for Biculturalism, so I presume that they have respect for his ability, I certainly have -- he is an old classmate of mine -- and he says "Our present syllabus in history in Manitoba is abominable. It is a disgrace to our intellectual perception and I am surprised that teachers have accepted it for so long with only murmuring."

So Mr. Chairman, I read these things to point out to the Minister that we didn't dream up the complaints about his curriculum. This is what the teachers, the people who are primarily concerned with the curriculum, this is what they are saying about it here in the Province of Manitoba. And we are saying to the Government get on with the job. Don't do it on a piecemeal basis; get a permanent committee if necessary and let's get the curriculum brought up-to-date and from then on we'll have plenty of work to do in keeping it revised. We know this, because the changes in the world today mean that we will have to be working on constant revision; but the urgent thing is to get the revision done and this is what the teachers of Manitoba are saying.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be dragging the detail of this curriculum thing through the heat of political debate time after time, but I think there is a little bit of small talk going on here in this Legislature re curriculum, because -- and I say this with all respect to the Leader of the Opposition Party -- the reason I held up this curriculum thing, and I know he is terribly busy and we all are, and I don't want to delay or extend the issue beyond saying this: that I have made it my business to try and understand the tremendous amount of activity that has been going on in the department since 1960 with respect to curriculum revision, and frankly in the time that I have had to try and absorb what has been going on, I can hardly imagine the extent of activity since 1960. It has been tremendous and I think probably I am partly to blame under Ministers Salaries for not getting across clearly to the committee the extent to which the government, the department rather, the government, have involved the

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd)... teaching fraternity of Manitoba, the university people and everyone acknowledgeable in curriculum content over this period of time. And to give the honourable members of the committee just some idea of the scope and the amount of work that goes into each subject that is considered, I passed around this book. Now as I said when I passed it around, it is more or less to give you in the Legislature an idea, a bird's eye view, of what is seen through the Minister's eye when one approaches the subject of curriculum. This is a field for the professional. I think the Leader of the Opposition can take tremendous heart to realize that only \$12,620 was spent on this in 1957, in curriculum development. In these estimates \$173,000 is being spent, Mr. Chairman, in the coming year on curriculum development. From a staff of two we are coming to a director, full-time consultant, assistant director, research assistant and general staff. It provides for time to pay for substitute teachers, to pay the school divisions for those teachers they take into seminars for two to three weeks in the year for these courses, to look at them. It pays for travelling expenses and so on; and it pays fees and wages for consultants who are brought in to be consulted in specific subjects.

A great deal, a massive amount of activity has been going on. I further determined -- and I would like to explain this to the committee because I think it will help you in grasping an idea of just what we're up against. In addition to this one should realize there's a beginning and an end to everything. One has to start somewhere when one is revising something, and my understanding, and I think it is just as logical an argument, and I'm sure that if you had started at Grade 1 and worked up towards Grade 12, it would have been, in my humble opinion, not as effective as the course of action that has been followed.

The whole reason for not setting up some sort of commission was because the department, the government felt they had to involve as many teachers as possible in curriculum development. At present there are over 170 teachers on various committees, and they expect this figure will be almost double in a year. Arrangements have been made for teachers, as we said, to be released for full-time day meetings with substitutes paid out of this appropriation. To release teachers full-time for curriculum development I think would mean the involvement of fewer teachers. To take 170 teachers out of the classroom for one year I am sure would be most disturbing to the schools -- these are top people in their fields. The pattern in other provinces is the same as here. They haven't done this anywhere else -- that is, they haven't formed commissions or central committees and brought about centralization in the hands of a few. I think it has been proper to attack it the way they have, by means of seminars, curriculum committees involving so many teachers, Manitoba people and consultants in these courses.

They have to carry on continuing research at some seminars and to keep the thread going and the activity at a high level, this three time consultant attached to the Director of Curricula have carried this forward -- a continuing sort of out-going secretariat.

There's a big danger of full-time people I would say in curriculum development, and I'm sure if we did this the Leader of the Opposition I think would properly say this is centralization, or the critics may say that -- and I think they would have a point. I say to myself, "Surely there's enough centralization now; let's not have more of this." I think the whole basis is we must involve as many teachers as possible.

I think, too, the other reason I distributed this curriculum development material here was to say to the members of the House, that this more or less indicates the procedure that went through beginning in the summer of '60 in the development of the general course where a seminar was held for two or three weeks; where the curricula committee was set up and the general outline of their activities decided upon; where following that courses were put in on a pilot basis; consultation was held with other provinces across Canada; in individual subjects consultants were brought in; the process continued involving all these committee meetings; all these individuals; all these people with a contribution to make. And they have completed the content of the general course. The Grade 10 and 11 syllabus is in a program of studies; it has been published and this report more or less says this year the content of the Grade 12 general course outline has been completed.

The work on curriculum development was completed first with respect to the general course -- and why? Why did they start with the general course? Because the first concern when they sat down to discuss curriculum was what to do with the non-matricula? This was their first concern at that time -- the emphasis on non-matriculats at that time --

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd)... apparently no adequate provision was being made. They felt that the general course area was the most immediate need of the many immediate needs at that time because there was no provision for this kind of pupil. They felt to meet the interest and ability of this kind of student that this was the reason they should approach this.

In the meantime as this report indicates, certain studies did go ahead, such as a music syllabus for elementary grades was completed some time back. Physical education was proceeded with and a syllabus outlined on the committee method.

Then they had the big seminar last summer at the beginning of the university entrance course, where pilot projects are going in this fall in '64 -- but where already over the past year certain scientific subjects have been entered on a trial basis into our school system. The very fact that everything went so smoothly and went ahead so well with such major changes in the revision of the general course, determined the course of action with respect to the university entrance. And again the same seminars will be held this summer with respect to the elementary course. Recommendations re subjects such as Francais, conversational French, arithmetic, health, music, physical education -- these elementary committees exist; they have made certain recommendations and done a certain amount of work. A Curriculum committee is studying the possibility of providing a conversational French course commencing Grade 1 and I am advised at the last meeting they recommended a program of such covering Grade 2 and 3 and are in the process of developing an outline for Grade 1.

So activity is going forward now. Not only has the general course pretty well been completed; and not only are we going ahead full steam on the university entrance course, but work has been going on and will continue to go forward on elementary; and in addition to this a terminal course is going ahead with a seminar again this summer. For years, as I understand it, there has been provision for the old high school leaving course in our schools -- as I understand it the nature of the content of that course was left up to the principal of the school. The department were aware of these courses and the patterns of such courses were well known and approved by the department -- apparently teachers can spot these students sometimes early in their careers -- Grades 7 or 8 -- and a number of divisions on that basis were making provisions for terminal courses, some starting in the junior high grades and before that. And as the strengthening and revision of the high school content through the general university entrance courses has been going on, the department have been aware that there would still be a body of students for whom the standard courses do not make adequate provision, and last summer a committee of inspectors were named to study the present terminal courses here and elsewhere in other provinces and their report and recommendations were sent to the Advisory Board. In addition, provision is made in the estimates here for a seminar to be held to begin the planning of the new terminal course.

So here we have in general terms -- what I'm trying to say to the committee, Mr. Chairman, is that not only has this activity been going forward not only on one front but really on all fronts. I think we can be very pleased that we are getting a tremendous involvement of our local people and educators.

I don't think that I as the Minister or members of the committee can . . . . debate except in very general terms the professional opinions as to why certain texts are picked and so on, but I again say that in tabling this I just wanted to let you see how decentralized an operation this was, and how it was a sincere attempt, as I understand it, to try and involve as many people as possible and to obviate the very very question which the Leader of the Opposition has brought up. For example, saying that certain teachers object to the science text, the mathematics text. In this bulletin on page 27 for example, it outlines the committee's work on the science general course, and the second half the problems facing the university entrance curriculum committee in development of science subjects for Grade 11 and 12.

I think that if we only had a commission or a central committee doing this sort of thing we would have less confidence than we do when it's a broadly based group of experts in our own province who can in addition to this rely upon outside consultation. I personally and quite honestly feel that this is a first-class effort in this province over the past few years. I'm also pleased when I hear the consultants who have been brought in from the United States to sit down with our people and curriculum committees, and staff members, are most envious of the very happy relationship which exists between the university people and the Department of Education

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd) . . . and the teaching fraternity in this province. And I think this very kind of activity will only shore up that feeling and enhance the confidence of the people of Manitoba in this House in our curriculum development.

I'm also told, for example, that in the development of the high school courses they have interjected in the last year, from the beginning certain junior high teachers so that as the senior courses are developed the advice and knowledge and background of these people can be considered in the finalization of the more senior courses; and these people in turn will form the core of the committees for seminar and curriculum development when it comes to the specific subjects in those grades. For example, already within the sciences, as mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, I understand that certain of the teachers in the junior high category have been involved in the development of the mathematics course for the more senior grades in university entrance, and they in turn are pointing out that the content of the course at the Grade 7 and 8 level will have to be changed somewhat to fit in with a course later on.

I think the very fear which the Leader of the Opposition has brought out here this afternoon as to what can happen in curriculum development is certainly more likely and prone to happen with a centralized committee not involving the several skills that are required in such a complex procedure.

Now, I'm talking as though I'm a professional -- I'm not. I'm merely relating that there is in these estimates money, Mr. Chairman, to carry forward an active curriculum development program in the coming year and a continuing program, a program that will have to keep going on and on with continuing research. I have tried to indicate to the committee through tabling some of the minutes of some of these curricula committees, how extensive this really is, and while I'm sure nothing's perfect, and I'm sure that the work of curriculum development in this province will never be completed, nonetheless, I feel that we can take much satisfaction from the area. I think criticism is welcome but I think we shouldn't prejudice too strongly the work of the committee without further elaboration and it certainly should be my duty, Mr. Chairman, to try and enlighten the committee in that vein.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be good enough to answer a question for me -- and I won't expect any lengthy speech on this one. But I'm often concerned, Mr. Chairman, about examination fees. We have people today who have two and three children in education and who are trying to give them benefits of higher education, and when examination time rolls around I understand there is a fee after Grade 11 and with two or three boys and girls going to university it could amount to say \$50.00. Now with families in the low income group this could present a problem. I just wonder how you take care of that, Mr. Chairman, we have provided Unsatisfied Judgment Funds for people who refuse to take out insurance, and I just wonder how we do help these people, because it would be a problem.

MR. JOHNSON: It's a difficult problem and I'd certainly like to look at it in the coming year, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman I don't think that's good enough -- that the Minister of Education this year will say exactly what the Minister of Education said last year. I think the Minister of Education the year before said the same thing: "I'll take a look at it." I think that it's time in this regard to stop looking at it and start doing something about it. As my honourable colleague from Seven Oaks has pointed out, there is a hardship in many cases because of the fact of the set fee for taking examinations in our schools. I have had a number of parents draw the matter to my attention. Now, I want to know, and I'm sure my colleague does, and the members of this committee, what happens in the case where they simply haven't got the fee? Are the children deprived of taking the examination? Have they got to make an appeal to the local school board to make an appeal to the Minister of Education or possibly the Provincial Treasurer who receives the dollars and cents for this?

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is simply not good enough for the Minister of Education to say "I think this is an important matter, I'll take it into consideration." He stood before us all through his estimates on a dozen and one different occasions and extolled the virtues of the educational system here in the Province of Manitoba, told of "How proud we are that this is a "first." We in Manitoba are pleased to be able to tell the boys that come up here from the U.S.A. of our association with this group and that group and the other group." I would like to

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . . hear from the Minister of a "first" in looking after the children of those less fortunate in the Province of Manitoba in order that their education may be enhanced and them not deprived -- as I'm sure some of them are -- of the opportunity of taking examinations as the result of the imposition of the examination fee imposed by your government.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman I want to tell my honourable friend that I was Minister of Welfare in this province (interjection) Just a minute you are talking as though I'm a hard-headed old means tester or something, Mr. Chairman. I'm just trying to say to my honourable friend that in the Department of Welfare at any time in cases where it was under the provincial jurisdiction where it was shown that the person was on social allowance, for example, and there was any hardship at all in meeting the examination costs of the children of these people, this was attended to. Within the department, as far as I can determine, the cost of examinations is high; the fees have gone up due to the increase over the years. There is no provision here except that. I'm certain that in any particular case where an individual could not pay the fees required to write the examination, if it was referred to the Minister's office I'm certain every measure would be taken to, as far as I'm concerned, to see to it that was met. Other than that there is no change in policy, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the examination fees for the high school examinations are concerned at this particular time. However, in cases of individual hardship, in reviewing the material at estimate time it was my understanding that on very few occasions have instances been brought to the Department of Education's attention -- that is, cases of individual hardship. But with a family of my own I realize that these \$15.00 to write a complete set of Grade 12 examination papers with some people can be a hardship. I don't know anything more than that at this time. I'd be glad to find out what the experience has been in the past. I quite agree with the Leader of the NDP that it would be my hope that no child was deprived of writing examinations because of the lack of the necessary finances. I know that insofar as the province's direct responsibilities were concerned this need was met. That is really all I can say at this time. When I say that I'm taking it under advisement I'm not treating it lightly. I realize the very point the honourable member makes. I will take it under advisement and I will have a look at it in the coming year.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman I believe the Minister when he says he is interested. I'm just wondering though whether any instructions have gone out to the principals of the schools setting out any steps that could be taken should a situation like this arise.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . the very point, Mr. Chairman. Now my honourable friend when he first darted up there with his -- it's a good job that it was just his finger and not something clutched in the palm of his hand or the Leader of the New Democratic Party may be hors de combat. When my honourable friend started out he reverted back a few years to the days when he was the Minister of Welfare and come up with the question of means test and needs tests -- and he was right, I think, when he was talking about The Social Allowances Act and Welfare, of people who are under the needs test -- still a mean test -- whose children may be provided for, but I want to say to the Minister that the people that I have in mind aren't people who are on social allowances and social welfare. People, as my colleague from Seven Oaks has said, that are finding it difficult. Now here we have a great educational system in the Province of Manitoba and we share to a considerable degree in pride that we supply free textbooks to our students up to Grade 12. We supply them with free accommodation, outside of course of the fact that we pay taxes, but generally it is conceded that it is free education up to the level of Grade 12, free textbooks. And having done this, supplied the children with these facilities, in effect at the present time we are depriving many of them or placing an unjust burden on them for their educational fees.

Now I'd like to make a suggestion to my Honourable Friend the Minister of Education. This matter has been discussed in the past; I just want to make a suggestion to him as to a solution. I don't know if he'll be able to get the Provincial Treasurer to go along with this or not, but I make this suggestion that he write to all of those concerned with accepting the fees for writing examinations and say to them that if a student comes to you to take the examination -- I'm thinking particularly of principals of schools and school teachers -- that if any student indicates to you or you are aware that it will be an imposition or a financial burden on the family to take the examination, you are given the authority to allow them to write the examinations without



(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)...the payment of a fee. It is just as simple as that. So my honourable friend says he is going to look into the matter. I suggest to him that he doesn't have to look into the matter any further, he's got some sage advice from this side of the House as to how at least this problem can be overcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . . passed.

MR. FROESE: I haven't had a chance to look through the booklet we were given the other day, the initial report on the work done by the various committees, but I am interested in the one found on page 54 and 55 dealing with the German university entrance course and the committee set up to deal with this particular matter. I wonder whether the Minister could tell us whether these committees that are set up to do the various jobs, whether they will have representation made to them by people who have something of particular interest to them on these various subjects. I also find that for instance on page 55 dealing with the matter of language instruction and dealing with the instruction of German the question when to begin this instruction in school. Personally I feel that this should start at a very early age because at that time the pupil can learn a language without any difficulty. I feel that German should be started at the Grade 1 level like French and any other language. Also I think the desirability of having oral language taught and used in the school at that particular time would be of great advantage.

On the following page they refer to "curriculum must be planned for Grade 7 to 12, inclusive." Does this mean that we exclude a course for Grades 1 to 6 inclusive? I feel that a full course should be planned from Grade 1 and on including Grade 7 to 12. I note that they are co-operating with the committee in B. C. set up for a similar purpose and I expect much good will come out of this. I wonder if the Minister could give me advice on this?

MR. JOHNSON: I will take it under advisement, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman with respect to the last speaker, it says here there are no plans at the present time for the introduction of this subject in Grade 1 but I will take this matter under advisement.

MR. CAMPBELL: I have to confess that I am one of the members of the House who is willing to admit that he hasn't too much to do and I have had some time to read the material that the Honourable the Minister gave us yesterday to take as homework. I took him seriously and took it home with me and have thumbed through it a couple of times. I can't pretend that I have read it completely but I have glanced at most of it. I can certainly see that there is a tremendous number of teachers taking a lot of interest in this work. I would agree with the Minister that would seem to be the logical way to tackle it, but up to date the most of them seem to be saying that the courses will not be ready until such and such a time. I presume that's what the Minister has been telling us, that most of these are going to come in in '64, or even as late as '65.

Now one in particular I was looking at -- I was most interested in the university entrance course -- but one that I paid considerable attention to was the physical education, because later on there will be in one of the departments coming up this question of the annual vote that we now have before the House of the physical fitness program.

There has been a great deal of attention paid to this in recent years and so I was interested to see what the schools were doing about it, and I found that there were two different committees. I know very few of the people that are mentioned here but there is a senior -- I shouldn't call it a senior committee, but there is a committee dealing with the senior grades -- it's mentioned on page 72 -- the grades 8 to 7 and 9, and then a little later apparently the same committee dealt with the drafting of a program for 9 to 12. Each committee member was assigned a specific activity area to develop the content and they divided the work as would seem to be reasonable. But on page 74 we find that they reached the stage in May '62 of where the committee had been divided into two sub-committees -- one to act as an editorial staff and the other as a technical staff -- and the course was then published in its tentative form to be instituted in the fall term of '63. I read on though and find that they are going to make that as an experimental one -- provisional outline will be issued in its final form by '64. A somewhat similar report is given regarding the physical education in Grades 1 to 6. There again they mention "There did appear," -- this is on page 117 -- "There did appear to be general agreement that regulations regarding the time allotment and program enforcement be strengthened to ensure that the daily twenty minutes of physical education be required." Is this a usual requirement? What I am interested in is, how do we tie the school work into this whole overall general

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)...question of physical fitness?

Much attention is being paid to this question these times and I know that it is customary to quote statistics about how the call-ups for both Canadian Military Training and United States Military Training have shown that the physical standard is nothing like what it should be -- it's tremendously low. Is the reason partly because of something that is lacking in the schools? I don't want to appear to be always harping back to the old times, but in my day I think that most of us seemed to get enough physical activity in the natural course of events -- I might almost say, "enforced course" of events to be at least physically active a lot of the time. What's gone wrong that we need all of this attention paid to physical fitness? Is the school doing a good job? I don't know. I'm interested in the subject and I'm not asking these questions to embarrass the Minister -- he can at any time later make his reply -- but I would suggest that a good careful look be taken at this matter. I notice that according to this report that a lady is the physical instructor in Seven Oaks School Division. I notice that in quite a few areas a lady is the physical instructor. A great many districts seem to have someone working in this capacity. Are they really accomplishing the results?

I pass by the high school grounds and I see the -- speaking of junior high and senior high -- I see different classes of youngsters out playing games of one kind and another, practising for track and field events. I think all of these things are good, real good, and I would gladly have escaped from the arduous duties of my mathematics, and history, and spelling and some of those things when I was a boy in school to have snuck out and played some games, or got ready for track and field work. But surely if that's the main thing that we're doing in these times, it doesn't take very high-priced help to do that kind of thing. Is there something new that the experts know about, or is it just the fact that the good old days are gone when we got a lot of activity as a natural course of events? Now if there is any progress really being made in this I would be glad to hear it, but I am quite willing to leave the further discussion of this item until the physical fitness program comes up. I gather it's in the Department of Welfare, is it? I'm giving notice that maybe the Minister of Education could contribute to the discussion at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 27 passed. Department VI.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave education I, with consent of the whips, I have arranged with your permission, and I hope you will be able to come, for all of the members of the House to come out to the Manitoba Institute of Technology for supper immediately following the House rising at 5:30 on Monday next, that's the 2nd. As soon as the House rises, we'll have a bus at the front door, take all of the members out, have them down to supper by six. It's a huge building to see and it was thought best for the members to be able to walk around when it isn't crowded during the day with students, and have a look at just the physical layout of the plant. The rest of the week will be set aside as an open house and during that week if there are any members who would like conducted tours of any particular aspect of the work, or to go into anything in greater detail, the department would be pleased to take on an instructor or someone to take you around. Now I'm hoping that this will be confirmed either Monday or Tuesday, either day -- Interjection -- oh! Well the whip cleared Monday earlier. I'll have to announce this again tomorrow but I would hope that we will have it either Monday or Tuesday then.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say on behalf of our group that we appreciate the invitation of the Minister because I think this is a perfectly proper activity for the members of the House to engage in. We have been showing a good deal of interest in the vocational training and this is -- I have not had the opportunity yet of visiting it, but I'm sure it is an up-to-date and modern building and I think it's well worthwhile that we should go and see it, so I appreciate the invitation of the Honourable Minister. I think the most of us are planning to go. Just with my usual caution I want to check once again -- there is no charge for the meal?

MR. JOHNSON: If there was -- no, there will not be -- I would take you as a guest sir.

MR. CAMPBELL: I made my acceptance conditional.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We spent a long time the other night on this one item and sometimes I thought we were going all over the universe but perhaps the safety valve or the fence some might think was the Minister's salary because someone said, "Isn't so and so out of order?" Well the Minister's salary hides a multitude of sins but that may have been the thing that saved

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd)... some of us from going headlong into perdition. I would like to suggest now that as we take up the estimates for Agriculture and Conservation that if anything that we are going to say is going to be covered by an item further on, that we reserve our contribution to the discussion until we come to that item. I'm just saying that because I think it will facilitate time, because I feel sure in my own mind and I may be wrong, but I feel sure in my own mind, or I hope so, that when the Minister answers these questions he will answer them when he comes to that item in the estimates. I hope so. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I think I can only discuss this under the Minister's salary. I have to confess that I should have done it before. What I am referring to is to this Bill No. 24 and I want to discuss it as it relates to agriculture. That's why I want to bring it up at this time. I realize I should have raised objection to this bill on second reading but at that time I didn't realize how seriously it would affect the farming industry as a whole, particularly the livestock industry and the poultry industry. I'm sure that most of the members here will agree with me. --(Interjection) -- No, I'm just discussing the objections, how it relates to the farming industry, not the bill itself.

We didn't realize how seriously it affected our industry. Most of the members will agree with me that the words, the chemical descriptions are meaningless to us -- probably our doctor friends are the only ones who could understand these words. -- (Interjection) -- Bill No. 24. The Pharmaceutical Bill. Take for instance the word on page 1 -- it's an 18-letter word -- I don't know if I can pronounce it it's Bishydroxycoumarin or something. Here's another one -- I think I can pronounce this one -- Dihydrostreptomycin -- a 19-letter word. And there's one here, that I don't think -- Disodiumdibromoxymercury -- a 24-letter word. Now these words are meaningless to most of us; we probably know them by their more common trade names. However, I took the trouble to investigate and I also discussed this with some more scientifically minded people than myself and I have come to the conclusion that this Bill is very undesirable from the standpoint of the above mentioned farming industry. There are numerous remedies that are presently used in the livestock and poultry industry which are procurable through various feed companies, hatcheries, and even some local stores, and these we can get, all of us, the farmers can get them at a very very low cost. Now if this bill is passed the way it is written, it will prohibit most of these remedies to be distributed through these outlets as they were in the past. I didn't say all of them, but most of them, and there are quite a few of them -- there are some aureomycins and penicillins and then some remedies for Blackleg also I understand even a remedy for erysipelas, hog vaccine, even that is included. It would place the distribution of these preparations in the hands of the pharmaceutical trade. Now I have the highest regard for this trade, this segment of our population, but I don't think we should compel our farmer friends to pay -- what shall I say -- "prescription" prices for these remedies. And then again we'll be burdening them with that extra inconvenience -- in some areas -- of finding outlets where they could procure these remedies. I know in my own constituency there are only two -- it's about 108 miles long -- there are only two drugstores. They'd have to go in and procure those from them.

Now I took the trouble, I wasn't too sure, I was suspicious -- not suspicious of the government. Probably the Honourable Minister himself didn't exactly know what it implied -- I presume the Agricultural Minister might have if he had the time to study it -- but I took this to the people who I thought would be interested in it and I was surprised to find that most of them didn't even know anything about the bill, but once they read it, studied it, they right now are interested and so much so interested that they are going to raise strong objection to this bill. . . .

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could raise a point of order with my honourable friend.

MR. TANCHAK: I'm just about through. Another minute. . . . .

MR. EVANS: I think perhaps I'd like to make the point of order in any event. Surely this is most clearly another debate that is set down on the Order Paper for our consideration. That bill is still open for discussion. I don't know whether second reading has been held. If not, certainly the committee stage is open and my honourable friend has every opportunity to propose changes in that bill. When he was speaking I thought perhaps he had in mind to refer merely to the subject matter of the bill; that it was a matter that he might wish to discuss with the

(Mr. Evans, cont'd)... Minister of Agriculture. But he is discussing the details of a bill which is set down for consideration at another time and I think it would help us if we stuck to the rules of debate.

MR. TANCHAK: Well, I'll try to stick to the rules of the House. All I have now here is a suggestion, if the Minister wishes to take it or not, I have this suggestion and I will speak more when the bill comes here. My suggestion here would be that probably the Minister and the people concerned -- I understand they're meeting -- some of these trades are meeting -- would consider in committee to either amend this bill -- (Interjection) -- or withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) passed, (b) passed.....

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, before we leave (a) I think we have missed something here this year. We have been used to hearing our honourable friend give us quite a discourse of the trend in agriculture, where agriculture is going and what he has in mind for agriculture. Now, I realize the difficulty that my honourable friend is in saying where agriculture is going and be specific in this House, because I've heard my friend speak on a number of occasions and I sometimes find it rather difficult to know where agriculture is going -- at least in the eyes of the Minister of Agriculture.

I certainly am not an expert in agriculture. I am concerned, however, with agriculture and I've seen statements emanating from various Ministers of Agriculture at the federal and provincial levels of different provinces, including our own. Now I think that it is a responsibility of the Minister of Agriculture here in the Province of Manitoba to give or offer some direction to the industry in the province. Now we know that Manitoba wasn't in the same fortunate position as Alberta and Saskatchewan insofar as the disposal of wheat is concerned, and as a net result while the net income of agriculture in Manitoba retained at a relatively high level this year, it wasn't anywhere close to that of the other provinces west of us due to the fact of the availability of wheat and field crops that they had in the other two provinces. We did have in Manitoba some areas where we didn't have the yield that we had hoped to, due to climatic conditions. Now we've been told by the Federal Minister of Agriculture -- and there has been a change in what they're telling us as between one government and the other -- insofar as what the farmer should do, whether he should go into producing more wheat or in view of the contemplated continued sales, particularly to Russia and those countries behind the Iron Curtain. Now it seems to me that we should hear from the Minister of Agriculture as to whether the farmer of Manitoba should go back to a greater degree into grain crops in order that they may take advantage of what appears to be an increased market for grain. I wonder if the Minister can indicate what in his opinion he feels the future prospects are for continued sales to say, Red China and the Soviet Union.

Now, if I recall correctly, insofar as the present federal authorities are concerned, at least early in their regime, the Minister of Trade and Commerce at the federal level was speaking one way and the Minister of Agriculture was talking another way. One was saying, "Well this is just going to be a one-shot deal" and if I remember right it was the Minister of Agriculture started out saying, "Oh, yes, don't start throwing all your crops into wheat because it's just for the one time", or it was the other way around -- it doesn't matter which -- one was talking one way and the other the other way. Now I know that the Minister has on occasion stood up -- a few years back -- and suggested to the farmers that they should not get too deeply into the livestock field of one particular nature or the other because it would create a surplus of a certain commodity.

I think, notwithstanding the fact it was decided by the members opposite that there wouldn't be a full statement on agriculture, I think this is of such vital importance to the agricultural industry in the Province of Manitoba, that the Minister of Agriculture should make a statement as wither the farmer should go in Manitoba in this very important field. It's his responsibility I suggest, Mr. Chairman, and his duty to do this.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, when we come to the agricultural estimates I find that there are so many things to say that I just don't know where to begin. However, not having received the report earlier than this afternoon, I've been unable to check on some of the things that I would have liked to check on, so we might have to get into further debate later on on certain items.

First of all it seems to me that our provincial government is missing the boat on one very

(Mr. Froese, cont'd). . . important point in connection with agriculture, and I think it's the most important factor. This has to do with price. Now the other day I read an article in the paper where our Federal Minister of Agriculture again harps on, "The farmer has to be more efficient." Personally, I think it's as far away from where we should be when he says that, because it's not a matter of being more efficient, it's a matter of price. We have to have a margin in order to make some profit and make a living on the farm. And that's where I feel that our provincial government -- I never hear of them making representation to any of the federal bodies that sets price -- when our commodity agreements are being drawn up, I've yet to hear the provincial government stepping in and speaking on behalf of the farmers and asking them more for their wheat and grain. I think the long-term agreements that we have, while they take care of a large amount of our sales, nevertheless they put the farmer into a straightjacket where he'll have to take the price that is being offered for these grains for a number of years to come, yet the commodities that he has to buy they go up from year to year. Likewise, the cost of labour goes up from year to year, and so on. The costs are continually rising, whereas the commodity that he sells is fixed and pegged and therefore we can have no increases.

This also brings up the point that we as farmers cannot pay farm help what we would like to pay. The margin is too small to pay the farm labour a rate comparable to what people get in industry. I think this is a shame because we need experienced help on the farm more than anything else, and particularly at this time when we have more and more machinery; our farms are mechanized more and more, so that we need these experienced people to help us out, and these experienced people are not getting the proper return. They are also not provided with unemployment insurance like the industrial worker is. If he is laid off he draws unemployment insurance.

When the farm worker is laid off, he has to live off what he has earned during the summer months and come next spring he is at the same spot he was the year before, nothing ahead. I think the provincial government should definitely make representation in this regard to the federal government to have unemployment insurance extended to the farm worker. I have been told by members of the government side that when they were in the opposition this was their yearly beef. But now that they are in the government they are not doing anything about it. Certainly here is an area that the government could do something for the farmer and the farm worker.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one other very important factor to me as a farmer is plant breeding and I feel that this is the area where we are sadly lacking. This year again, or last year's crop again brings out that fact. We had rust in flax, and as a result many of our major varieties of flax are taken off the recommended list for this year. That means that we will have no early varieties left in flax for seeding this year. The only varieties left are the late varieties. We are very fortunate in one respect, and that is that the American government have licensed a variety named Boley and that this variety is now being licensed in Canada and we will be able to import this variety, which is an earlier variety than the ones that are on the recommended list for Manitoba. So that at least we have one variety to replace the number of varieties that are pulled out. I might also at the same time point out as a crop flax is being grown quite extensively in the southern portion and in a survey that was made by the flax committee which reported at a meeting about two weeks ago here in Winnipeg, that the farmers in Manitoba, 79 percent of them grow flax mainly because of flax not being under the quota system. At least that was the case for the years until this last fall, when quotas were deliberately kept down, I think unnecessarily. This is a cash crop that farmers like to raise and that has proved beneficial to them, and I feel that we should spend more money on research in producing new varieties and having them available before the other varieties in existence are ruled out. I think we should be ahead, not always behind. It seems to me that we are behind all the time.

The same holds true for our Selkirk wheat which today is not nearly the wheat that it was several years ago. The rust hit it badly last year and what are the farmers going to seed? The same holds true for barley. There is hardly a variety of barley left which will do good in Manitoba, and as a result we have very little production of barley in Manitoba. There is more barley being produced now in Saskatchewan, much more than in our province and at one time Manitoba was considered a barley province. The varieties that we have are hit by smut, root rot, mildew, rust and what have you, and our varieties are too susceptible to these diseases.

(Mr. Froese, cont'd)...

I notice in the estimates is an item for I think agricultural research under The University of Manitoba, but it doesn't indicate just how much of this is actually going for plant breeding. I would like to know from the Minister how much of this is actually going into plant breeding and trying to secure varieties so that we will be ahead of the times and not always lagging. The special crops in our province were excellent last fall, we had excellent yields in corn, sunflowers and sugar beets, so that here we have an area which has promise and looks bright; but as far as sunflowers are concerned the bottom fell out on prices and we can no longer sell our sunflowers at the good price to the United States as in the past. The farmers out there are producing sunflowers in larger quantity and are supplying the markets themselves, so that we will have to accept much lower prices for this product here in Manitoba. We are happy though that there is some support being given from Ottawa so that there is a floor I think which amounts to some 4.22 cents a pound here in Manitoba.

One other point I would like to mention, that has to do with our farmers importing corn at the present time. We have a number of farmers that have feed lots and are feeding cattle. They would like to feed Manitoba barley but it seems that there is not enough barley in existence, at least not in the southern portion of the province, and as a result corn has to be imported. They are paying \$1.32, \$1.33 for corn laid down at their particular places. These very farmers have tried to buy barley in Saskatchewan but they were refused permits to take delivery of it and haul it themselves so that they would save a little money on it. And if they can't do it that way then they are better off purchasing this corn from the U.S. Now it seems rather ridiculous when we have surplus quantities of grain in Canada and in Manitoba, and not being able to feed them to our own livestock here, and have to import corn and send our money to the U.S. when we could very well do by spending it here at home.

I have a few other matters that I wish to discuss but I think I'd like to check the report in that connection so that I will bring the matters up at a later point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.