

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
9: 30 o'clock, Monday, April 25, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills
Orders of the Day

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw to your attention and to that of the members of the House that there is another parliament starting its sessions today, namely the Parliament of Labour, in that the Canadian Labour Congress opens its Convention this morning. I understand that the Honourable First Minister will be speaking to the gathering this morning. I think that it is only fitting, however, that the rest of the members of this House join in welcoming to Winnipeg the members of the Canadian Labour Congress and wish them every success in their deliberations.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BILLS Nos. 110, 122, 58, 105, 111 and 16 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell):

Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bills standing on the Order Paper.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Minister of the Municipal Affairs.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I thought that I had the floor when we adjourned the other evening, and I think we were asking questions . . .

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement about the matter which was under discussion on Friday afternoon.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, it just happens that I had the floor, and the . . . that is true, except that he had sort of appropriated the situation from me.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement about this matter before it is further considered.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, will you make a ruling on the matter please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs was the first on the floor.

MR. CAMPBELL: What about the last on the floor the other day, Mr. Chairman? Okay, let my honourable friend make his speech.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rose on Friday afternoon, we were discussing a request for an amendment to the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, which would allow the Metropolitan Corporation to guarantee a loan of the YWCA in the amount of some \$365,000. At that time I had expressed on behalf of the government our reservations as to the advisability of allowing this extension of the Metropolitan Corporation's authority. I have not changed my mind on that matter. I recognize, however, that the project which it was wished to finance by this means is not only one which is desirable, but is one which is necessary in this community, and therefore government would wish to explore other avenues of making this possible.

I am not in a position at this moment to divulge to the House or to the public what our proposals may be, because I have had no opportunity to discuss them either with members of the YWCA or with other bodies who may be interested. I would, however, suggest to the House that we should proceed with the consideration of Bill No. 109 without this amendment,

(MR. SMELLIE, cont'd) . . . and I would ask that if the President of the YWCA is within sound of my voice that she would come to my office at 1:30 this afternoon to explore with me further possibilities for the financing of this project. If that is satisfactory to the members of the House, then I believe that we should proceed now with the consideration of Bill No. 109.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement of the Honourable the Minister and I think it's useful in our consideration of the matter that is before us now. My understanding of the matter differed slightly from what the Honourable the Minister has just suggested, because I didn't understand it as being a guarantee that was to be given by the Metropolitan Council. I understood that it was a grant payable over a certain number of years on terms that were satisfactory to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. However, whichever it is, so long as it accomplishes the purpose, that is satisfactory as far as I am concerned, and provided that it's satisfactory to the representatives of the YWCA;

But, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this whole situation is fraught with so many unusual factors that I simply want to run over them briefly once again.

Apparently at least two meetings were held - high level conferences, in that a senior civil servant of the Province of Manitoba was present, along with representatives of Metro, and as I understand it the City of Winnipeg as well, and of course of the YWCA, and after a preliminary discussion, another meeting was held at which agreement was reached. This is my understanding, that the Metro Council would either guarantee or grant an amount not exceeding \$375,000, the arrangement being apparently that they could count upon the Province of Manitoba for approximately \$262,000.

Now when this matter first was heard of, so far as I was concerned, it was in the Committee of Law Amendments and the solicitor for the YWCA came before the Committee and said that he was quite concerned over the fact that no amendment was proposed in the Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, and that he suggested that an amendment should be put in. Some discussion developed and continued for some time, and I'm not certain whether it was at that particular meeting or whether it was at the later one when Councillor Willis attended on behalf of Metro and again reviewed the situation, but at one of these meetings of the Law Amendments Committee, the Premier of the Province, to use his own term, intervened and made the statement that the amendment would be supported by the government when introduced at the Committee of the Whole stage, and I am simply -- I was simply astonished to find that we got the explanation on Saturday that further consideration had been given to this matter and the government had changed its mind about introducing or supporting this amendment.

Now one of the main reasons, as I understood the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, one of the main reasons that he gave was that Metro did not have responsibility in the welfare field. Well now, it certainly doesn't seem to me that the YWCA depends only on its welfare operations for the community support that it receives and is entitled to. I suppose if you take welfare in its widest meaning, of meaning the welfare of the community as a whole, then all of the organizations that we have exist to provide welfare. I suppose that we're primarily in the welfare sphere in the Legislative Assembly here, if you take welfare in that wide sense. And in that sense I certainly agree that the YWCA is in the welfare field, but if you restrict it to what's the more usual interpretation so far as the Welfare Department is concerned, then surely the YWCA has important and over-riding functions in addition to those.

I simply cannot see, Mr. Chairman, why the arrangements should be changed at this late date. While I heartily approve the suggestion of the Honourable the Minister that he would be glad to discuss the matter still further, I think the best arrangement is to continue with the one that has already been arranged. I am therefore prepared to move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, that a further section be added to Bill No. 109 as follows: Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any provision of The Municipal Act or any other Act of the Legislature, Council has the power to authorize by resolution a grant to the Young Women's Christian Association Central Building Fund an amount not exceeding \$375,000 payable over a period not exceeding 50 years.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK Q. C. (St. John's) Mr. Chairman, it would not be fair to this House to give a lecture on the history of voluntary giving and welfare needs throughout the years. I think it would be sufficient to say that where once welfare needs were considered to be the responsibility of the kings and the lords, and then the responsibility of the community on a voluntary basis, it has gradually been recognized by our society that this is a responsibility of all the people and that government must support welfare needs. The reliance on the voluntary dollar is disappearing, and I think that this is a proper development in our society since reliance

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . on people's goodwill has proven to be one which is best carried out through a proper distribution of the burden of responsibility, which I feel can be best done out of the tax dollar, where people are not relied on so much as to do it on the basis of their ability to pay throughout the community. The government has in the past accepted responsibilities in part, and I think that this is an interesting development and one which is timely, to have the government accept this responsibility and say, "This is a proper role for government to play." As the Honourable Member for Lakeside said, we are all in the welfare business.

I am happy to hear him say that, that an organized government does assume that responsibility.

Now Mr. Chairman, I do agree with what the Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs said on Saturday as to the acceptance of the responsibility by government as compared with Metro. It's true that Metro was created for purposes which did not envision welfare or recreation. I think it's also true that the concept of municipal governments is such that they are not authorized to enter into long-range commitments over many years which would tie future councils. And yet, in spite of the manner in which negotiations were carried on for this particular project, apparently the acceptance of responsibility by this government was inadequate, and it was found necessary to go to other levels of government to obtain assistance, and I presume the logical thing was to go to the City of Winnipeg because the City of Winnipeg is charged with both welfare and recreation. I have said it often that I feel that even that is wrong, that a municipal corporation should not have to be burdened with taking care of welfare needs. The City of Winnipeg took the attitude, as I understand it, and I agree with it, that welfare needs do not recognize municipal boundaries and that there was no reason that the City of Winnipeg should come to any support when there were many other municipalities in the area of Greater Winnipeg, and indeed in this particular case, of the YWCA, that the services provided by the organization are not at all limited even to Greater Winnipeg but really encompass all of Manitoba. As I understand it, the vast majority of the girls that are housed in the hostel come from outside of Greater Winnipeg and their needs are the ones which require this support.

I am happy that the Honourable Minister made this statement today. Necessarily it's a general one; it is only a commitment to meet and to discuss and to consider. That's all the commitment is. There is no undertaking involved. As a matter of fact, I'm not even clear today as to just whether or not or what type of undertaking has been given by the government for its share. It was mentioned that its share is related to the provisions which complement the federal legislation and it may well be that most of the money involved -- well, the Minister of Welfare is shaking his head and I am therefore assuming that it's all Manitoba moneys that are involved in the government's commitment. Well I'm glad to learn that from him.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that although this is not a responsibility given to Metro, the problem itself is an indication that Metro itself has not been given sufficient scope and responsibility and that too much is left on the burden of the municipal governments, and I speak of the cities and municipalities which make up Metro. And this to me is just a further indication that it would be better if we had much greater responsibilities placed on Metro, to the extent of giving it all the responsibilities and having one city so that there wouldn't be the constant tug and pulls and war going on between municipalities as to how the burden would be accepted.

Now, if the Province of Manitoba is prepared to accept this responsibility - and I think it is its responsibility - well and good - if it isn't, then I honour the Metropolitan Corporation for having accepted responsibility which is not its responsibility but is yet recognition of a need. And this corporation, which is elected by all the people of Metropolitan Winnipeg, is prepared to accept that responsibility apparently. I am basing this on the resolution of Metro which was read to us.

Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside made a motion, including a section in the Act. I am not too sure whether the wording is quite as good because he speaks of making a grant over a 50-year period. I think what is needed is a commitment from Metro to CMHC entering into an agreement that it will provide that grant, and I have before me the resolution which was proposed to have been introduced by way of amendment. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that I had moved this section in Law Amendments Committee, and it was the wording of the section which had been prepared, I believe, by the solicitor for the YW, which brought about some discussion as to whether or not it was an adequate wording. As a result, it was turned over to the Legislative Counsel, and as the Honourable Member for Lakeside said, it was indicated by the Premier that it would be moved in third reading. It wasn't moved, but I have it here, and I think it's probably in a better form - with all deference - than the one presented by the Honourable

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . Member for Lakeside. Nevertheless, the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Lakeside does accept the principle; it provides that it is given the power to authorize by resolution a grant for a specific ceiling and for a specific length of years. I will accept that rather than to suggest that it be withdrawn and provide the wording which was prepared by the Legislative Counsel.

I would suggest this, Mr. Chairman, that if the government meets with the YWCA, reviews the costs and the budget and all the other things that are necessary to be done before a grant is made, and then makes a grant which is sufficient to take care of the needs, that that would of course be the correct thing to do and would place the burden where it properly belongs. But in the event that the government feels that it is not prepared to accept the full undertaking, then I think it should leave it to the elected body of Greater Winnipeg to do that which this government would not be prepared to do. And therefore I am suggesting that, coupled with the motion made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, there should be the additional provision that the section proposed should come into force on proclamation, and that would then make it possible for this government to carry on its negotiations, to see what it is prepared to do, and do it. And if that is insufficient, there would still be the opportunity to the Metropolitan Corporation to accept the responsibility. Now the making this section subject to coming into force only on proclamation will of course still reserve to the government a control, because unless it knows what Metro is likely to do, it would hold back proclamation and this would then again make possible a better negotiating basis for all parties concerned.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether you would accept an amendment to this motion made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, to provide that Section 39, which would be renumbered on the basis of this, would have a clause in it providing that the Act comes into force on the day as the wording of Section 39 reads, and add the words "with the exception of this section" - which was moved by the Honourable Member for Lakeside and has not yet been given a number - "which shall come into force on proclamation". This, Mr. Chairman, would then I think, give the government all the opportunity that the Minister of Municipal Affairs wishes to discuss the matter and then after the conclusion is reached as to proper sharing of cost, it would still be able to proclaim this section and permit the completion of the building.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that because the organization is known as the Young Womens Christian Association it might appear to be one which is confined in some way, one which is a private organization and some people may confuse it with a recreational organization. It should be made clear that the YWCA has changed substantially its original program to the extent where it is now doing an important welfare job amongst girls that are coming into the City and looking for opportunities of employment and integration into the community and that this job is one which must be supported, endorsed and given all the assistance it needs to develop in that field which it has now accepted as its responsibility. So that I would urge that we do help the government by making it possible for the government to negotiate freely and to discuss with Metro if necessary, what Metro's responsibility ought to be and still make it possible for the government at its discretion to proclaim this section proposed by the Honourable Member for Lakeside so that there will be the fullest possible opportunity for contribution by all parties whose concern this problem is. I would therefore urge the adoption of the section and I would need your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether my amendment to the motion would be acceptable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wouldn't it be better if the honourable member withheld the amendment and wait until the Honourable Minister meets with the YWCA?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, are you suggesting that this Bill will not be passed until after the Honourable Minister meets and then reports to this Legislature? If that is the case and if that is his undertaking then by all means, I think we should hold the motion as well and wait for his report as to the conversations which have developed at 1:30 this afternoon.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, that certainly was not my proposal, and I could not agree to that proposal. First of all let me say that I agree with everything the previous speakers have said concerning the work of the YWCA in this community. I thought that I said the same thing in my original statement although I didn't take quite so many words to say it --(Interjection)-- Meaning that I agree with the necessity for this organization in this community. I agree - I beg your pardon -

MR. PAULLEY: . . . sarcastic remark.

MR. SMELLIE: If anybody is sarcastic around here, my honourable friend should certainly be able to recognize it, because he is as fond of using it as much as anyone else in this House.

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd).....

Mr. Chairman, I have given an undertaking on behalf of the government to find an alternative solution to the problem that faces us. I am satisfied that the proposal that is now before committee is wrong; that this is not Metro's responsibility; that it is not right and proper for Metro to be even asked to commit future councils to make grants for a project which doesn't come within the ambit of Metro's responsibility in any way, shape or form; and as the Honourable Member for St. John's said, this is either a provincial or a municipal responsibility, and I have given an undertaking on behalf of the government to seek an alternative solution that will allow this project to proceed.

The Member for Lakeside raised the point of the fact that the Premier did intervene on Friday when this matter was before Committee, and he did say that an amendment would be introduced here on Saturday; but I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier at that time had not had the opportunity of discussing the matter with members of his cabinet ... --(Interjection) -- This was not included in the Bill my friend.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): This is what you get for rushing everything at the last minute.

MR. SMELLIE: Nothing is going to be rushed around here. We are taking our time and you'll have all the opportunity you need to discuss this matter or any other matter. This matter, if it was included in the Bill at this stage would be rushing things, I agree; and it would be introducing legislation without the opportunity for proper consideration.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this matter is not proper in this Bill and that it will not be considered by government as a proper amendment to this Bill and will not be supported by government. I have however, given an undertaking that government will seek an alternative solution to the problem now faced by the YWCA and I would ask the House to accept that undertaking and to proceed now with consideration of the balance of the Bill.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman I am prompted to take part in this debate because of some things that were said by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside in presenting his amendment, and thought that I would like to say a word or two concerning it, since I do not propose to support his amendment.

If I might in the beginning advert to what was said by the Honourable the Member for St. John's I think he's stated something that I'm sure all of us regard with great sadness, although perhaps he's correct that it's part of our modern day that -- in effect what he was saying is that the time, the day or the idea of voluntary contributions for worthy projects has gone and that it has now become the responsibility of government in one form or another to support all projects. That of course would be a long way from the spirit which motivated those who established the YMCA from which of course the YWCA grew, and would be a matter of grave concern to those who believe that there is still a place, even in our modern day, for people of goodwill who wish to join together for worthwhile purposes of a community or religious or other nature.

I speak with perhaps some knowledge about the -- not about the YWCA because I haven't had the privilege of being a member of the YW -- but I have had the privilege of living in the YMCA in Saskatoon as an articulated law student and subsequent to my articles. Indeed I recall that the general secretary of the YWCA at Saskatoon performed for me a service which if I live for a thousand years I would never forget, which altered the course of my life and I would want to acknowledge that fact. I have done so before and do so now. Indeed the first year, Mr. Chairman, that I was a member of the Legislature and a member of this Government, I lived in the YMCA in Winnipeg because my family were living in Dauphin. I'm not too certain that I was entitled to any subsidized housing on that occasion but I lived there.

So I approach this with at least some small understanding of the work of the YMCA and I hope perhaps some small understanding of the work of the YWCA. And let it not be misunderstood or misrepresented or suggested otherwise that we have concern and appreciation for the work which the YWCA is doing, along with many other organizations. There are many of them in our modern times and there can be no question of that. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs has stated the matter quite correctly. We agree that it is good and that whatever can be done ought to be done.

But the thing that disturbs me, Mr. Chairman, and it occurred in the Committee of Law Amendments. It has been referred to at least twice by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside -- By leaving the implication that because, as he speaks of it as a high level meeting, a meeting which was attended by a senior member of the civil service, that in somehow or other the government has become obligated or that the legislature became obligated or that in some

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) . . . way we have now attempted to not carry out our commitments. Mr. Chairman, this is a serious problem and one which I think the Honourable Member for Lakeside with his long experience - certainly the longest experience of any person in this legislature, if not in any legislature in the British Commonwealth - would perhaps do well to reflect upon as he advances this kind of argument and leaves this type of inference in this Assembly.

We are constantly, constantly asked by all kinds of groups and people to have members of our staff attend meetings for advisory or other purposes whatever the case might be. Now, if because we accede to those requests and try to be helpful as I hope we do, we are going to be hit over the head by somebody saying well you had the Deputy Minister of Welfare attend the meeting, therefore you must have agreed to everything that was said, we are in serious trouble. Of course, there will only be one answer - they won't go. We'll keep them away. What I'm endeavouring to say is that no matter how high the officer may be, he has no control over what others may say at the meeting and he cannot bind the government, much less the legislature, when it comes to matters of this kind.

So I want to protest if I may, and I recognize that perhaps the word 'protest' is a little strong, but it is the only word that I can think of that conveys the meaning that I want to get across. It was a meaning that was created I believe, or attempted to be created in the meeting of the Law Amendments Committee and again here, that because an officer of the government service attended a meeting, therefore certain things were agreed to or undertaken. And that surely must not be the case, because let it not be forgotten what has been clearly stated in the Committee and in this legislature that the purpose of the officer attending was to inform the meeting of what the Government of Manitoba was prepared to do, nothing more, nothing less. There may have been all sorts of ideas discussed at that meeting, all sorts of ideas involving either the government or other people and it surely could not be binding upon anyone because he was there. There is certainly no suggestion that he took part in the discussions or that he either agreed or disagreed for that matter, as to what was taking place.

I want to say this very sincerely, because I know of the interest of the Honourable Member for Lakeside in the democratic process and in the work of the government - not the work of this particular government, but the work of government in Manitoba, that he not press that point too far because he could, like Samson, he could destroy the whole House, because I certainly know what I would do as a Minister if somebody is going to use that fact to hit me over the head, then I'll solve that problem right at the beginning. They won't be there and that'll be it.

But I think there's something else that has not been sufficiently emphasized. This problem of the YWCA has been in the public domain for a long time and the suggestion became current that the Province of Manitoba should make a contribution. And there is frankly a difference of opinion about this because while I might be in favour of the YWCA, there may be others who are in favour of other public projects which, depending upon one's point of view are either more or less important. But let it not be forgotten, and let it be recorded, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Welfare, who was the member of the government who was concerned, very sincerely and very carefully and at the expense of a great deal of time to himself certainly was not in any way negligent in bringing the matter to the attention of the government, brought this matter forward and nowhere along the line have I heard any acknowledgment, none whatsoever, of the fact that the Province of Manitoba, the Government of Manitoba, and it's not our personal money over on this side, agreed to what I would submit, Mr. Chairman has been a very generous, a very generous arrangement so far as the YWCA is concerned, namely to provide through the mechanism of the arrangements made \$262,000 for the provision of this facility.

That's a lot more generous, Mr. Chairman, than has ever been provided under similar circumstances at any time in the history of the Province of Manitoba. And while I'm not one who draws comparisons between previous governments and others I just put it on the record so that if there's any disposition to suggest that we have been unfair or are attempting to be unfair, I reject it outrightly and indeed submit that it is not correct. The Minister of Welfare has been very diligent in his assistance to the YWCA in the program which they have outlined - and which, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, was undertaken initially by the YWCA without any arrangement with the Government of Manitoba. So that assistance is quite clear and I believe it to be a generous assistance for which some recognition should be made.

But, Mr. Chairman, that was the extent of the commitment by the Government of Manitoba and it is a commitment which we are going to carry out fully, completely, and in every respect

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) . . . and there has been no suggestion otherwise. And the other matter which has arisen without direct consultation with the Minister of Welfare, with whom the YWCA was carrying out their negotiations, and who in turn represented the Government of Manitoba in bringing these matters to our attention and in arriving at this arrangement - this is another matter for which we're not asked for, much less made any commitment.

So, Mr. Chairman, on that basis I simply want to say that the Minister of Municipal Affairs this morning has made his position and the position of the government quite clear and I think that we are entitled, if I may say so, we are entitled to credit for the same sincerity and goodwill in this matter as we are entitled to for what we have in fact done and agreed to, and that under the circumstances, the motion which is before us ought not to be accepted, that we should proceed with the bill and leave the matter in the hands of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I am sure he will be seeking the assistance of the Honourable the Minister of Welfare in that same matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I want first to touch on the point made by the Honourable the Attorney-General in relation to my comments as to government responsibility in welfare matters. He quoted me I believe, as saying that "It has now become a government responsibility." I didn't say that. I said that the trend had become such that it is becoming, there is that development.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the honourable member that the tithing system which was brought in by the religious bodies for the purpose of providing for the poor and the needy was in effect a tax system and that throughout history it was recognized originally as being the responsibility of the community and as the community developed and there was greater and greater discrepancy between the abilities of the rich and the poor to contribute, it became a charitable thing for the rich to look after the poor, sometimes in order to keep them in the strata where they wanted to have them.

I would indicate that the history of my own forebearers is such as would indicate that if it were not for the fact that a community accepted a responsibility to look after its own, there would not be a continuation of the Jewish people. Therefore when the community as such ceases to recognize its responsibility on an individual basis, which I'd say is the trend, then it becomes more and more the responsibility of the representatives of that community who have taxing powers to make sure that the needs are looked after. I think that for all time there will be a great need for people to come together, to joint together, to use the words of the Attorney-General, to foster and promote this type of work, but their success or failure must not be dependant upon voluntary giving and indeed as I say, it can no longer rely on that alone, but the representatives of the people must see to it that the contributions are made through the tax dollars, if necessary, in order to maintain the work that they are doing. There will never be an occasion, to my way of thinking, where it will not be necessary, good and important that people in the community should join together to promote this work, but their fund-raising ability should not determine the extent or quality of the contribution that they make.

The Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs stated this is not a Metro responsibility. That's correct. I've read the Act as so many others of you who have had something to do with passing it. It's not a Metro responsibility. He says it's not right for Metro to do it. Well, it's not right for Metro to do it because the responsibility was not given to Metro in the Act and yet it is very easy to change both of these sentences around and say that it is Metro's responsibility and it is right for Metro to do it if we make it possible for Metro to do it by passing this motion. That would then make it not only right but a responsibility of Metro.

But still I think it is a provincial responsibility and yet the Minister of Municipal Affairs says that it is a provincial and municipal responsibility. That's what he said. So apparently he is thinking in terms of sharing the provincial responsibility with the municipalities. He said that leave it to us, accept our statement that we will seek an alternative solution.

In the face of that, the Attorney-General who wants to make sure that the government does get credit for what it does, and I think it should, has already said that the Province of Manitoba has agreed to a very generous undertaking. Now in the light of his statement that the undertaking made by the province of \$262,000 is very generous, then how much more will the cabinet think it ought to give to work out this alternative solution? -- If it is already considering that it has been very generous, I'm just afraid that this might not develop the way it ought to and therefore I - well the die is cast, Mr. Chairman, it's pretty clear how the government members will vote -- but I would like for the record again, to suggest that the motion

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . coupled with what I think is, on my part, a logical amendment, will enable the government to carry out that alternative solution in the event that the government is not prepared to accept the full burden and responsibility. I would suggest that my proposal does nothing but help the government in making it possible to provide this alternative solution so that it can assess the responsibilities of the people of the Province of Manitoba as compared with the responsibilities of the people of Metropolitan Winnipeg.

I would therefore again come back, Mr. Chairman, to my original question as to whether or not this amendment could now be made coupled with the motion so as to make this possible for the government to work it out. Your reaction was a wrong one and that is that the Minister did not propose to let the matter stand until after he had the meeting; I think he wants it settled this morning, and now, and put out of the way of this Legislative Assembly. Well he and the government control our procedure and certainly if they decide that the Bill will be passed today, with or without this motion, it will be passed this morning so that it will be settled by the time he meets with the YW.

I am suggesting a way out. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has proposed that this power be given to Metro. I agree the power be given. Once the power is given then there's no question as to the right of Metro to do it. But in order to be able to assist the government in undertaking the full burden, which I think it should, my thought was to bring it in on proclamation and then the government can negotiate and still have a door open to see to it that this project, which we all agree is worthy, does not fail because of lack of funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . proposed motion would come into effect - the proper time to bring that proposed motion in would be after the motion by the Member for Lakeside is approved.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . after it's approved then you'll invite me to bring another motion for the final section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . as to whether or not it should be brought in by proclamation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then I'm quite willing to wait until this Committee accepts the motion, passes the section and then I'll bring in my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And would you have it in writing please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you have it in writing please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well let's see it pass first then I'll put it in writing.

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of order though Mr. Chairman, that you are raising at the present time, I think otherwise, because there is a directive contained within the amendment as proposed by the Member of St. John's which puts the motion itself into a different perspective than that suggested by the Member for Lakeside and I think that they both should be considered together in view of that fact.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . not a different proposal. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the diversionary tactics of the Honourable the Attorney-General will not lead the attention of the committee away from the main point under discussion here this morning. My honourable friend is a skilled advocate and he knows when to play upon the strength of his position, if he has one, but he's equally successful when he attempts to play down the strong position of his opponents and concentrate on something that is entirely beside the point.

I did not urge as a matter of importance the fact that a senior official had been at the meeting; that was only one in a series of conferences and meetings that were held. I could have related even more than I did of those meetings. I was simply laying a little bit, just a little bit of the background. I could easily have mentioned the fact that Metro Council had forwarded to representatives of the government - or again, officials of the government, the actual amendment - the proposal that amendment be drafted to cover the point that is needed. And certainly, certainly, Mr. Chairman, we - this is the main point, to get Metro in a position that they can implement the undertaking that they have willingly given. This wasn't something that was forced out of them; this was something that arose from a series of meetings and serious discussion, I am not trying to blame the government because of the fact that an official was there, and I don't urge that as a commitment, but I do say it's one of the links in the chain that led to this motion being passed by the Metro Council and I think we should make it possible for them to implement that undertaking.

My honourable friend the Attorney-General also wants to be complimentary to me by talking about my long experience and saying that I must be aware of these different things and that I suppose he was referring to my record of being rather careful with the shekels when

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . he emphasized the fact that this was a very generous grant that the government was making. Well, let it be said right now, I give the government credit for making a grant. This is fine. If somebody wanted to be ungenerous in this position, I suppose he could compare the proposal of the Metro Council to give \$375,000; the Province of Manitoba, the senior organization, giving only \$262,000. But I don't raise that. My honourable friend says this is a generous amount. Well to me it's a big amount. I agree. I'll give them full credit for that. But that doesn't change the fact that we want to know where the \$375,000 is coming from.

If my honourable friend wants to compliment me on my long experience, I can tell him that one thing that I've learned in my long experience, and that is that when you have an arrangement made the way the people who sponsored this YWCA Building Fund have succeeded in getting their arrangement and getting the different ends tied up and getting the money arranged for and dealing with the Central Mortgage and Housing and all the various agencies that they have had to try and correlate, my long experience tells me that when you've got that job done, consisting of dealings with three governments or government branches, then the thing to do is tie it up as quickly as possible, because once you drop one of those threads it's mighty hard to pick it up again. And this \$375,000 thread is a pretty thick one, I can tell you. It's a pretty important one in the whole strand that we're weaving here.

My honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs - and I don't want to play on words - but when he says - and I took his term down very carefully - he says that he is prepared to "meet and seek an arrangement." Well seeking arrangement is fine, and I give him credit and I am sure he will seek with diligence, but if you just pass this amendment, we have the arrangements made. We don't have to seek. It's tied up. And this is the thing to do. For goodness sake, Mr. Chairman, for goodness sake let's not make it so difficult for these folks to have to go all through this thing again, start seeking an arrangement with my honourable friend, and if they already feel that the \$262,000 is pretty generous, they won't likely be wanting to, without some discussion, pick up the other \$375,000, and to whom will they go?

They say it isn't Metro's responsibility. My honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs says it is either a provincial or a municipal one. Well if it's a municipal one, if it's to a large part a municipal one, then isn't it more sensible and reasonable and logical to have Metro deal as a unit on behalf of all the municipalities in its organization rather than try to get the different municipalities to deal with it individually. To the extent that it's a municipal problem, I say Metro is the right organization to deal with it. This bridge has already been crossed. This has been done. And all we need to do is the simple thing of putting a section in here that gives them that authority, and the deal is complete.

My honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs says that he thinks that this proposal, of my amendment or my motion, is wrong. Well does he say that Metro Council was wrong? Metro Council thinks this was a proper policy for them to adopt, and I agree with them. I would urge the House, I know that the Honourable Minister is going to be prepared to meet with the representatives of the YWCA, but they have the whole thing opened up again, and it's not an easy matter to close. If I can call upon that experience that my honourable friend the Attorney-General refers to, then my experience is tie this thing up just as soon as you can and that's the way to get it settled.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I think that in this whole discussion we have to go back to what has happened in this whole development. This isn't something that has been developed overnight. The ladies who are behind this project have been working on it for a long time. My understanding is that their original plans called for something in the order of \$1,900,000 of capital expenditure. Now something has been said about the lack of volunteer contributions. I think it must be pointed out that there have been very sizeable volunteer contributions. As a result of the work of the ladies who are behind the YWCA decision to proceed, they have raised some \$925,000 across Canada from volunteer contributions. A very sizeable sum of money. A tremendous undertaking for a group of volunteers to raise that sort of contribution from the general public for this fund. So I think it must first of all be emphasized that they have taken the steps to get volunteer contributions; faced with demands from all over the place, with requests for things like the Arts Centre, the Centennial and all these other contributions, they have nevertheless been able to raise almost a million dollars.

Well, having obtained that sum of money, what steps did they then take? They proceeded, I understand, to check over again their capital expenditure and see if they could in any way

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) reduce the total expenditure. And that was brought down to \$1,755,000; which left then something in the order of \$800,000 to be found from other sources. These women then approached the government, the government at various levels - the Province of Manitoba, the City of Winnipeg, the Metropolitan Corporation. They gave the government at that time all the details on what they had been able to accomplish and what their plans were. The Provincial Government agreed to a grant of \$262,000 based on a 50-year period. This quite obviously left still a very sizeable sum, something over \$500,000, closer to \$600,000, which had to be raised from other sources.

Well having raised already almost a million from volunteer sources, faced with the fact that they are a United Way Agency, and so are not in the position to go out raising funds individually as they may have been in the past, faced with the other demands that are now before the people of Manitoba for the Centennial and so on, they nevertheless were willing to undertake on their own a part of that balance. When they obtained the commitment from Metro for \$375,000, that still left the YWCA with an obligation to raise some \$280,000 to \$300,000, provided that the costs of the projects don't increase in the meantime. The estimates of cost are based on figures about a year ago, so it could be expected that when the final project goes through it will be somewhat higher than now. So these ladies have already accepted over and above the \$925,000 that they have raised by a volunteer contribution across Canada, they have accepted another roughly \$300,000 which they will raise still on their own. But surely we cannot at this stage, after having gone through several years of planning, after many years of obvious hard work to do what they have accomplished, surely we cannot say to them now, we will cut off one of the major sources that has been promised to you. Because where does that leave them then?

Well the Minister says we will seek an alternative solution. If the Minister is prepared to get up in his seat this morning and say that he will guarantee that the \$375,000 will come from other sources, either the Province of Manitoba or some other source that he can absolutely guarantee, then I'm sure the members of the committee are prepared to pass the bill as is. But let us assume that in the discussions with the YWCA that the Minister proposes to hold this afternoon - and I endorse fully that the discussions should be held - let us assume that no solution is found that is satisfactory to the YWCA. Then where would that leave them? They cannot go back to Metro at that point because the House has not given Metro the right to do what Metro is prepared to do. Is it the solution then at this time to pass the amendment proposed by my colleague the Member for Lakeside, let us pass it, let us give Metro the right to do this; let my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs have his discussions with the Board of the YWCA; let him seek alternative solutions; but we still have, if we pass the amendment, we still have this matter to fall back on if no alternative solution is found. Because we will still be in a position where the YWCA can then accept what Metro has agreed to do and Metro can do what it has promised it is prepared to do. So the alternative is there.

But let us assume that we don't pass the amendment this morning, Mr. Chairman. The House is likely to rise within - possibly today, possibly tomorrow. Where does this then leave us? Where does it leave the YWCA? It means that for the next year, if no alternative solution is found, they cannot proceed on the Metro promise and they cannot therefore get their Central Mortgage and Housing loan. It means that the whole project -- unless, I repeat, the government is prepared to commit itself to another \$375,000, it leaves the whole project in abeyance for a year which means that by then the costs will be higher and possibly by that time Metro may itself change its mind. Surely the solution at this time then is not to miss any opportunity to get this project settled. It has been in process for a long time. There has been a tremendous number of hours of effort put in by the ladies who are behind this; they have shown what they can do. Let us put them in a position where they can complete the project that they have set out to do.

I suggest to the government this time, let us have a free vote on the question this morning. Let's not have a government vote on the matter. Let the backbenchers on the far side vote freely on the matter. I'm willing to predict that this amendment of ours will pass because it is an eminently sensible suggestion to the predicament in which we find ourselves. It's unfortunate that this predicament should exist. I don't think it should exist in the first place because surely it was obvious all the way through this that the YWCA would have to go to other sources -- when the government promised \$262,000, the balance left was still such that they must go to other sources. I believe it was obvious to the government that they knew that they were in

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) discussion with Metro and with the City of Winnipeg, and to say today well, we didn't know about it. — However, that part is another argument. What I'm interested in now is settling the matter at this time so that the project continues.

So I suggest to the government have this a free vote. Let the members of the House make their minds on this. Surely looking at the situation, looking at what's been done, let us leave no opportunity alone that might settle this matter once and for all. Let us leave Metro in the position that should no other solution be available they can proceed with their offer and the YWCA can then complete their project. I say to the Minister do not take the position that you've taken this morning that this must be a government decision — let your private members vote as they will; let us pass the amendment now, then proceed to seek other solutions. If you find them, well and good. If you don't find them, this solution will still get the project into completion.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I was unable to be here earlier on in this morning's session, so I haven't heard all the debate that has gone on on Bill No. 109 this morning. However, I've heard the statements made on previous occasions by the Minister of Municipal Affairs on the situation in connection with Bill No. 109 and with the situation of the Young Women's Christian Association finding themselves in because of a certain situation that has arisen.

Now, I in my opinion find that I would have to side with the government on this occasion because here they are asked to adopt a new principle in giving Metro the right to look after welfare and which as has been pointed out, the government has not considered in that respect and that they take exception to this. No wonder they take exception because they're now put into a place where they're supposed to adopt this principle without having given it sufficient consideration and I certainly will not be one to criticize them for taking this stand.

I realize the embarrassment that the Young Women's Christian Association is being put in because of this, but I do not think that the motion before us is one that I could fully support, because it says that Metro is now supposed to be given this authority and that they provide \$375,000 payable over a period not exceeding fifty years. This would be tying the council's hands, the future councils of Metro Corporation, and as we know under the Metro Corporation any by-laws of this kind do not need the consent of the electors, whereas any by-laws of this nature under a Municipal Act or under the City Act, as I understand it, requires consent of the electors. So here again is another point that I would like to make because we have had situations brought to this House — the City of Winnipeg has brought one, not only once I think but twice or probably even more than that, in connection with the CPR exemptions where they are supposed to have exemptions in perpetuity and where they are trying to get out from under this arrangement.

I don't like this type of arrangement one bit where we're authorizing by provincial legislation matters of this type and while I sympathize with these people that this situation is being brought about in this way, I feel that we should put the confidence in the government that they will try and make as best an arrangement of this matter without having to give Metro this power at the present time in Bill 109.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is my position in this case. I feel the government in not giving consideration to allowing Metro to proceed with this, is in order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid that the last speaker did not understand the proposal of my leader at all. He's saying that we should have confidence in the government and the Minister to bring in a solution to this. Well, this is exactly what my leader stated that we would encourage this meeting that's supposed to be held this afternoon. The Minister brought in an undertaking only of trying to find a solution, of meeting these people, and we're told that on Saturday the First Minister had also brought in an undertaking of bringing in an amendment to this Bill, which has not been brought in. So these undertakings could be changed many times. And this is exactly what we want. We do not want to be in a position where it will be too late then — that nothing could be done. If there is another way — this is only giving the power to Metro. I think it is a little too late. The last speaker spoke of being in sympathy with these people — sympathizing, but this will not help them. We want something a little more than this — than sympathy.

So therefore, this is a very ordinary amendment, it's just granting the power to Metro. To say that this wrong that this has nothing to do with Metro at all, is absolutely wrong. Who created Metro? Who created Metro but this government, this Assembly here, and if you want Metro to have responsibility, a right of doing things, there's nothing wrong with that. And then

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) . . . to say that you're tying up the future Councils of Metro to do something that they might not do. Well, this is an undertaking, you could say then that they pay the full amount right now. They are taking the undertaking of paying \$375,000 so this is not something - this could be done right now. So there's nothing wrong in saying, all right this will be done up to a period of fifty years.

Now we're asking this, either the Minister in the name of the government get up and say, all right we have this money, we definitely will provide this money. If he can do that, that's fine. If not, we're asking to have this a free vote and let the backbenchers - let all of the members of this committee vote as they wish, not just follow a party line on this and then we would have something in the Act that would provide Metro with the possibility, with the power of doing something - if nothing else can be done. Well, if we're so sure of this, if something else can be done, if the Minister can resolve something this afternoon, what will this amendment mean? Nothing. This is just precaution. This is all we're asking. The Minister, apparently is not even ready to have this Bill set aside until this afternoon. I don't know why. This might be the solution. He claims that he is going to meet with these people at 1:30. Aren't we wasting an awful lot of time here. Couldn't we just, Mr. Chairman, suggest that this Bill then be set aside for the time being? What's the great rush? Where are we going? We haven't accomplished very much for a few months and all of a sudden in a few days we're trying to do everything. I still say, that we're rushing this. If we want to give responsible government, our responsibility is here. Where are we going? The farmers can't get on the field for a while. You can't use that excuse. You can't use that excuse at all. And you're not fighting the flood now. --(Interjection)-- Let's not think of the next election. Let's think if we were elected to do a job and the Minister accepted this responsibility as the responsibility of the government or municipality, of the provincial government. If it is our responsibility, all right, let's do something about it. Let's decide something now. Lay this Bill aside for a while. Just till this afternoon at 2:30. Is that asking too much? The Minister is not ready to do this. He wants full confidence in the government. Well, we're ready to give confidence but he's never said that you're sure to raise this money and if this bill is passed without this amendment there is no hope or chance this Session of doing anything at all to provide the way to help these people. I say that there's more than sympathy that we need. We need understanding. I think that the Minister would do well to either set this bill aside -- permission of the committee -- and I'm sure we'd give it to him to set this Bill aside until he's had this meeting. And if not, I don't think that rightly he has any, certainly not morally he hasn't the right to make this a government bill and to whip the backbenchers in line to vote against this. I think this is too important to these people, and the people of Manitoba, that we should do everything possible to help them.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Chairman, the honourable member who just finished speaking made a statement about the farmers. You said that seeding time was not here. I'd like to inform you that the Honourable Minister without Portfolio has already got wheat sown and it's the case with the rest of us, if we could only get home. And you who were not here on Saturday come here and make a long speech today, saying that we are trying to speed up the business of the House and goodness knows if we hadn't sat all day Friday and all day Saturday and got some of the business done we might be here until a week from today.

I think as a rural member, who has great interest for these projects such as the YMCA, and I must say - the Member for Brandon is not here - there is a new building, YMCA, which has been built in Brandon. I think it's just about ready to open, if it isn't already open. This money was collected in the Brandon district by myself and other people who were interested in that very valuable community project. I'm interested, too, in the YWCA because goodness knows if I live long enough I might have a daughter that might want to go there, I think we could clear this whole matter up right now and there, if we'd stop talking and say, that the city members, the urban members here in the City of Winnipeg would donate \$10,000 and everyone else here in the Legislature would give \$5,000 we could relieve this whole problem and get on with the business of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, maybe we've had the indication why the Minister doesn't want to take a chance with the backbenchers. We have had a bit of platitudes. What was he trying to say, I don't know, except that he's in a hurry to go on the farm or maybe he wanted to indicate to the members of this committee and others that I wasn't here Saturday. This was quite a little political thing to do. Well, Madam Speaker, I think he knows why I wasn't here Saturday. I think he knows, and this is exactly my point. It wasn't sure that we'd

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) . . . sit on Saturday until one of my members suggested, one of the members of our caucus, that maybe we should, and when the First Minister found out the reason, definitely we were sitting on Saturday. And I'm here today. I'm here today. Oh yes this was done. Is the member trying to tell me then that I was wrong in stating that we should look after the affairs of Manitoba, in his hurry to go back on the farm -- that the farmers are in a hurry. Is this what you are trying to say? It must be because we could settle this once and for all very easy by accepting this amendment. If the solution - it's very simple, - if a solution is found before this, this amendment will not mean a thing. If we can't find a solution, we'll have something to go on. It's very very clear. I think that we certainly have the responsibility and notwithstanding what the last speaker said, we will say what we think. We're still in Session for my honourable friend, although we've tried to rush, we've tried to work 18 hours a day so the members of the Opposition will be too tired to be able to say anything or too anxious to get out.

Well what's the reason then? Why did we sit Saturday afternoon? Can my honourable friends tell me? What are the reasons? I'd like to know one reason. We were elected to do a job and we don't have to think of the future, we are thinking of the present. I'm talking about the future, about ourselves. This is a resolution that is strictly in order, Mr. Chairman. There's nothing wrong with this at all. We just want to make sure that something can be done; this is something that Metro has accepted and we are just asking that this be a free vote. There's no reason in the world that we shouldn't -- there's no reason in the world that I shouldn't have the opportunity to speak, even if I wasn't here Saturday my honourable friend, I certainly endorse this amendment and certainly will vote for it.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, I think suggested that the House appoint him to head up a Committee to collect the money that is necessary to proceed with the building that we are presently discussing and I think he said that every member, and he was speaking for every member on his side, I'm certain, when he said that they would make a \$10,000 contribution each and we would make a \$5,000 contribution. I think that's the way I understood him to say. I challenge him to do that, Mr. Chairman, and the minute that he collects \$10,000 from everyone on his side, I will see and guarantee that I will get a cheque for \$5,000 from each one on our side; and the sooner he gets on with the job, the sooner he can get back to seeding down in Souris-Lansdowne. He can start right now and just send a little note around there and gather up the cheques and we'll gather up the cheques on this side and we'll do it just the minute that he gets them done over there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps he can do that before 1:30 or whenever my honourable friend has a meeting this afternoon with Metro and the whole solution will be solved. He can present the cheque to them and that will settle the whole issue, but let's get on with the job. But I suggest if he is not prepared to do that, then I'm certain that his Caucus will excuse him and he can go home and start seeding this afternoon because there's very few farmers over there on that side and they can do that.

Furthermore, furthermore, what is wrong with this free vote? What's wrong with it? Maybe that would be a way to get my honourable friend back on the land? Let's have a free vote on it and let's see where we stand, I've offered you, Mr. Chairman, and the government, about three alternatives pass the cheques around; have a free vote and let's get on with the job.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have just a few words. I'm still puzzled why didn't these people go to the City of Winnipeg instead of going to Metro?--(Interjection)-- They did? I'm at a loss to know why they wouldn't go to the City of Winnipeg because this in my opinion would be the proper place for them to go for this. If we had a resolution of this type, directed at the City of Winnipeg, I'd be all in favour of it, but to go to Metro and then to attach the last part of it which says "payable over a period of not exceeding 50 years" I don't think it's up to this body to set the terms or the time of a repayment of this type. I think this should be left in the hands of the Corporation that is making the advances or the loan. I'm still not satisfied. Are there any reasons why they did not go to the City of Winnipeg or why would the City send them to Metro? This I am at a loss to understand.

MR. PAULLEY: May I first of all, Mr. Chairman, say that unfortunately the Members of the New Democratic Party are not in the same position as either the government or apparently the Liberal Party, insofar as contributions of \$10,000 and \$5,000 to the YWCA or any other organization. Possibly after we have been in government for a lengthy period and not have to toil by the sweat of our brow, on hourly jobs, we might be in that particular position.

2206

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd)

However, Mr. Chairman I'm going to try and endeavour to bring the problem that we have before us into a more proper perspective because it seems to me that 99 percent of the debate that has been before the Committee since it started its deliberations this morning, have been of a political nature, purely so.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, first of all, that I have before us the Journals of 1960 in which the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable Member for Rhineland, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface voted against the concept of Metro when it was first introduced to the House. I also draw to the attention of the Committee - and I was one of them too - so in this I am taking, if there is criticism of our actions this morning, I'm taking it onto myself as well, because I was one of those who fought hard against the suggestion of a 20 percent contribution being paid by Metro for the construction of hospitals. If you recall that debate, Mr. Chairman, one of the prime debators was the Honourable Member for St. Boniface because there was no relationship between Metro and hospitals, it was a governmental responsibility. And basically we say this is so today insofar as the contribution suggested for the construction of the YWCA

But here we have a specific problem for a specific purpose, namely the guarantee or grants of \$375,000 for a specific purpose. Now if the government wants to fault us, I'm prepared to accept it; fault us because of the fact that we tried to get the government to accept the 20 percent responsibility for hospital construction. But I would say this Mr. Chairman, there is one slight difference, however, that insofar as the hospital construction is concerned, it applied to the whole of the province of Manitoba and we suggested that that was a government responsibility.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we accept the words of the Minister of Municipal Affairs that negotiations are going to continue or re-start, whatever the case may be, insofar as the situation prevails between the association and the government; and I have some confidence, Mr. Chairman, that as a result of more consideration and more negotiations that the situation will resolve itself insofar as the association is concerned. I, too, however suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the government support the contention that if one fails, then here is another alternative.

My colleague from St. John's has suggested an amendment that the Bill would only come in, that section of the Bill would only come in on proclamation. And if it is not proclaimed of course, Mr. Chairman, this proposition dies, or the Session will die, and then the result is that the Metro Act hasn't got this particular provision for all time in it. Or, if in the alternative, the government isn't favourable in . . . to accept the proposition of the proclamation, let us then put a time limit on the section. That this section dies six months hence or three months hence, if in effect negotiations are not concluded between the government and the association satisfactorily. There are all sorts of alternatives. It doesn't of necessity have to put the government on the spot.

But as I said at the offset, Mr. Chairman I think that we have discussed the matter long enough. I am not supporting the contention that I'm saying this simply because I want to get out of here, because you will recall, Mr. Chairman, I think, in fairness it was my own suggestion or primarily my suggestion, that we met here all day Saturday in any case. I'm prepared to sit here 'til doomsday if there's still business of the House to be done. So I'm not anxious to get out of here.

The only thing I am anxious to do, Mr. Chairman, is to accomplish something while I am here, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that would be the proper thing for us to be doing at the present time in respect of the Bill that we have before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have the motion before the Committee I'll have to vary it a wee bit, instead of saying that a further section it will read "that section 40 be renumbered as section 41 and a new section 40 be added to Bill No. 109 as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any provision of the Municipal Act or any other Act in the Legislature, Council has the power to authorize by resolution, a grant to the Young Women's Christian Association, Central Building Fund, an amount not exceeding \$375,000 payable over a period not exceeding 50 years."

Mr. Chairman presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: Could we have a recorded vote on that please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Members.

A counted vote was taken the result being: Yeas 11; Nays 28.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost.

Bill No. 109 was read page by page and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 108, Page 1 --

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, we are on Bill 108, an Act respecting the Establishment of the Manitoba Productivity Council and when I spoke on it before I pointed up how necessary it was for us to do something in this whole field of agriculture to bring Manitoba in line with many of the other provinces. I know the government does hesitate to admit that agriculture has been lagging behind the rest of Canada but my honourable friend has repeatedly said this at Farm Outlook Conferences and other places throughout the province and indeed was repeated in the Third Annual Report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board. Now what I am concerned about is that the Bill does provide for certain items that I consider very major in this whole field of agriculture and I think that the extent to which this Bill will be of value hinges quite largely on what it proposes to do in the whole field of soil and water conservation, because if we neglect this field you do not have productivity at all on the farm.

I know my honourable friend is quite aware that the people in the Gladstone area were very enthusiastic about this whole field of land-use and management. So much so that they formed a committee nearly 12 years ago now to look into the matter and report to the government of the day. And yet I'm rather disappointed that in the estimates that we passed some months ago I guess now on Agriculture and Conservation, did not suggest - the estimates we passed at that time did not suggest that the government intended to pursue this field of conservation to any degree of vigour, because under Resolution 16, Water Control and Conservation, it was up but very very little from the previous year and under Canada-Manitoba ARDA agreement it was actually down very very slightly. So I was concerned that it appeared that my honourable friend did not intend to pursue this field with more vigour.

No, I know that the objectives outlined in the Bill are pretty wide, pretty wide, under 4 (2) (a) and (b), (c) (d) and (e). Under (b) it says: "The consideration of obstacles to the economic growth and development of the agricultural industry of Manitoba and the development of means of overcoming them". Now, Mr. Chairman, that is pretty broad and I suggest that one of the obstacles to high yields in this province is because for many many years we have not been making proper use of our land and forests and streams and lakes. I know, and my honourable friend knows that the people in my area are pretty concerned that they leave the land and forests and so on in a better condition than they found it in their pioneering days, and I sincerely hope that it is his intention with the Bill and the 12-man committee that is intended to be setup to implement the provisions of the Bill, will take particular caution and action in this very very important field.

The other day too, before the Orders of the Day, I asked my honourable friend if provisions would be made in The Seed Cleaning Plant Act, or whatever it is called, to liberalize the measures in it to ensure that more seed cleaning plants would be developed in the province and my honourable friend of course on Orders of the Day could not get into any detail on that one, and he said it was government policy and so on.

I was referring at the time to Publication No. 425, and I described it as a rather shocking report. It is called "The Seed Grain Survey, 1965, (Manitoba)" and as I read it it is the first one that has been made for 10 years - that is, one was made in '55 and 10 years later they conducted another survey and the conditions today are even worse than they were 10 years ago.

Now if we are going to have high productivity in agriculture, what is more important than soil and seed because this is the whole basis of production. Sure, you've got the weather, you've got to depend on Providence to provide the weather but we've been doing that for many years and there's little we can do about that. But in this survey, and I'm sure my honourable friend has studied it very diligently, it resulted when various people in the fields, and I suppose most of them ag reps, a year ago just now, took from seed drills throughout the province 856 samples of seed. They went right into the field and took samples from 856 drill boxes and analyzed the seed that the farmers were sowing. They analyzed them for the presence of other kinds of grain in the seed; the presence of weed seeds; their germination; the presence of disease such as ergot etc., and quality factors, and at the time the samples were collected the collector was required to obtain the following information from the farmer: the variety or name of the seed; the source of where he obtained it; the class of seed being planted and the seed cleaned and if so the method used in cleaning it. So a pretty thorough job was made.

But, of the 856 samples, there was only 131 of them that was rated as No. 1 seed, 295 as No. 2 seed and 430 rejected -- that is well over half, or slightly over half -- '50.2 percent

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . " of the seed sown was rejected for one reason or another" according to this survey. And the reasons for rejection - that is of the 430 samples that were rejected, 242 were rejected because of the presence of altogether too many weed seeds in it. And there are other reasons. Now this is a kind of shocking report, I suggest, when over half of the seed that is sown by the farmers was rejected for one reason or another, but principally because of the presence of weed seeds in it.

Now in the back of the book it points out the recommendations and conclusions - what they're saying is what are we going to do about this shocking report - and it says that "The seed must be cleaned more carefully." Well, that is an understatement. There's no doubt about that. It must be. And it goes on to say that, "The elevator, the grain elevator is no place to have your seed cleaned." They're warning the farmer, don't go and have your seed cleaned at the elevator; this is the wrong place. They end up by saying that there is a definite need for community seed cleaning plants where farmers may have their seed cleaned to reasonable seed standards. These plants should be situated in areas not adequately served by commercial institutions who handle pedigreed seed.

Now The Seed Cleaning Plant Act or whatever it is called, I believe was put on the Statute Books in 1958 or '57 or thereabouts and probably an amendment or two was made since that time. But it is evident since there was only one plant established in Manitoba - and I believe that was at Rivers - it is evident there is still something very much wrong with the Act or there would have been other ones built throughout the province. And if this is the answer to the rejected seed, then I suggest, Mr. Chairman, we take a look at this Act and see if we cannot do something to further encourage the community seed cleaning plants.

I understand that the Manager of the Auction Mart in Gladstone is presently in correspondence with the Department of Agriculture to see what might be done in that area to erect one of the community seed cleaning plants. I believe that they envisage that perhaps, since they have the organization there, that perhaps they could sell the same shareholders of the Auction Mart further subscription and erect one of these plants. But in talking to the senior civil servants of the department, I understand that really what is necessary under the Act, the existing Act, is that the minimum number of farmers that they recommend who buy shares or subscribe to the plant, is 300, and the minimum amount per member of subscription would be roughly \$100.00. That is it is necessary for them to raise approximately \$30,000 locally under the existing legislation. Now it seems to me that that is quite a job to get 300 farmers in a given area to put up \$100 a piece to get the ball rolling. I suggest that the Act should be liberalized to the extent that money could be made available from the Manitoba Development Fund or some other source that would allow them to erect one of these plants with about ten percent or fifteen percent down and have it possible to pay the indebtedness off over a long period of years.

But certainly, Mr. Chairman, something must be done and it is clearly, clearly pointed up in this report, and so I propose, Mr. Chairman, that the Bill 108 that is before us, that the Minister instruct the 12-man committee, or the terms of reference, if they are to be given terms of reference, that these two projects be placed high on the list of priorities. That is better land use and a new look at this whole field of soil and water conservation, so that we will have a higher productivity in the whole cultivated acres of the province, and furthermore that the seed that we sow will be of better quality. I hope that my honourable friend can assure me and the House that this will be done.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I kind of have a little bit of fear getting up and saying a few words, because it seems to me that it is the intention of the government or at least the government members on the other side to rush these bills through because we have a deadline to meet or something. We must get out of here, and after hearing what the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne had to say, my fear has increased. He seems to be anxious to get his wheat in. In other words I don't think that we should put our own interests before the interests of the people of Manitoba. I am sure that all of us have something to do. I for one would like to get this over tonight and go home and maybe you'll say, well then quit talking. Because I have interests. But I am willing to stay here as long as necessary. We are getting paid for it, for discussing this, and it's in the best interests of the people of Manitoba. I think we should have time, we shouldn't be rushed in here.

But before the Chairman calls me out of order, I better get to the Bill. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me I can see that this bill before us, Bill No. 108, one of its objections -

(MR. TANCHAK, cont'd) . . . - the objectives of the Manitoba Agriculture Productivity Council, if this bill is passed, and I presume it will be passed, will be to consider the obstacles to the economic growth of agricultural industry in Manitoba. There is one obstacle that I am sure that most of the rural members are aware of, and on which I have very strong opinions; and this is the government's present policy in relation to disposal or rental of the Crown lands in Manitoba.

I know that this does not affect all of Manitoba but it does affect these areas, unorganized areas, and the farmers in these areas are very very much concerned about the present restrictive policy of the government. The government seems to adhere to a policy of restrictive practices in this respect and there are many farmers, very numerous farmers engaged in livestock production industry. Lately the trend is to increase their holdings or to increase their livestock. Otherwise they are not economical enough. The trend seems to be similar in all of our agriculture. A lot of these farmers are now in possession of say, one or two quarters and they find it very very difficult to expand. Now I realize that some of these Crown lands are probably not suitable for agricultural purposes for grain growing but surely even the Minister will agree with me that many of these areas could be utilized as grazing farms or even for haying purposes. Still the government refuses to offer these lands for sale.

Now when I say that they are suitable for grazing purposes -- and I have the opinion of the government behind me on this -- now why do I state that? Because in many areas this government says that certain tracts of this land are suitable for grazing by virtue of the fact that a lot of them have been set aside as future community pastures. Now if they were not suitable for grazing purposes, they would not be set aside for community pastures as in some areas they are set aside for future community pastures. Still when a farmer who lives adjacent to it would like to expand, the government will say, "Well, it's the government policy". I am not blaming the civil servants in this, they adhere to that policy, they have a policy. They say, "No, we cannot sell this land." Therefore this farmer who wishes to expand cannot expand and he'll either have to give up because he is not economical enough, or just keep on being uneconomical. That's one of the great obstacles that these farmers have to live with.

I have had certain cases where a farmer even wished to lease part of this area which was set aside as a community pasture, and he was not permitted even to lease it. I presume that the government in this respect is afraid that there'll be some improvements made on these lands and eventually if these lands are taken over by the community pasture, the lessee, the one who is renting, the farmer will probably say, "Well I've made improvements here and you people will have to pay me for that." But in many instances these people have even promised that they would fence the areas and they are willing to sign an agreement with the department concerned, and still they are having a hard time to get these leases authorized. In one particular case I know that the proposed or the future community pasture, nothing has been started on it. I find quite a few coming to me and I have to go with them, sure; I'll have to admit that after a lot of persuasion we were able to get a lease but it was an agreement signed waiving all rights to any future claims if the community pasture is constructed there or if the fencing is complete and the area is taken over for the community pasture. I think that at least this one obstacle could be overcome immediately. We don't even have to wait for this council to be instituted before this obstacle could be overcome. I would say that the government should consider selling some of these lands so that these farmers would have a chance, give them a chance to become more economical.

..... continued on next page

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, I thought that we had finished debating the Agricultural Estimates. I understand we spent about 16 hours. But I can't let these statements go by without making some comment.

While one relatively prominent Canadian made this statement about the Liberals in another sphere, but I think it's equally applicable here, and certainly to the remarks that have been made especially by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that they're walking backward into the future. And when it comes to agricultural policy I think they are particularly guilty in this respect, because for the life of me, how they can look at the modern agricultural industry and look ahead and make some of the comments they do, is just beyond my comprehension. At a time when economists all over the North American continent are thinking in terms of perpetual mortgages; at a time when the Ministers of the provinces and of Canada spend part of their conference time, their annual conference time in the consideration of the need for perpetual mortgages, here we have a member standing up and saying that the solution to our farm problem is the sale of Crown land which to date appears to be best used for the purposes of grazing.

Now one of the great problems in agriculture today is this once every generation problem of transferring the rights from father to son or from one generation to the other, and as the price of land increases it becomes increasingly difficult to negotiate this. Today we talk in terms of needing at least \$100,000 worth of capital assets in order to yield a farmer a return which will cover his investment and yield him a living. One of the great problems of today in farming is that even amongst our more affluent farmers they may have large estates and may be adding to them year to year, but they have a very difficult time to build up that estate which the business demands and at the same time to enjoy a standard of living equal to other people in our society. And I put it to you, is it reasonable that a man should expect, during his lifetime, to enjoy a standard of living comparable to the responsible position that he holds as a farmer does who is the steward of very valuable resources, is it reasonable to believe that he should be able to have and enjoy a standard of living equal to other people in society and be able to accrue an estate which today has to be at least 100,000 and in another decade may well be 200,000? That's why people in responsible positions today are thinking in terms of the need for perpetual mortgages, where a man will pay for the use of the land that he won't even endeavour to try and gain ownership of it? You think that this is a far off thing here? Just go across the line where the cheapest land runs from \$450 and up, and some of it \$750 an acre, \$800 an acre. And here we have leaders telling us that the solution to the farm problem is to sell off these grazing lands.

What the government has attempted to do here is to give proprietary rights to the leaseholder so that he can enjoy the benefits of improvements that he wants to make; so that he retains the rights of ownership to them and is in a position to dispose of them when he is through with it, to the best advantage. And this has been done. But for some unknown reason the honourable members in the Opposition keep harping away about the solution to the farm problem being the sale of Crown lands whose highest use is grazing. Certainly the fellow who buys them today may use them for grazing but there is no guarantee that they'll be continued to be used for that purpose. And there's another thing too. It's very possible that these lands having been alienated from the Crown will certainly go to the highest bidder, and the highest bidder that I know of in Manitoba today are USA interests. They are the people who are willing to come up here and buy our land, because I think they have maybe a greater appreciation for the value of that land than what our own people have. We've had some rather dramatic examples in the last three or four years of American interests coming in here and buying half of that land, great gobs of it, thousands and thousands and thousands of acres. Now if my honourable friend thinks that's in the interests of the farmers of Manitoba I'd like to hear him get up and say so, because I can't see it.

I think that the present policy of the government is a sound policy and it is in the best interests of our farmers and our ranchers, because this land is made available to them and any improvements that they make are safeguarded and insured to them through the provision of certain proprietary rights that are granted to them where they make these improvements. But I say that to talk about selling this land today is walking backward into the future, because the really great problem that we face -- and one that frankly I can't see the solution to right at this point - but I can say that we are talking in terms of perpetual mortgages -- and that is the transfer of the ownership of land from one interest to another. Frankly today, looking 20 years ahead, I don't know where this is going to end; but I know that we have a tremendous

(MR. HUTTON cont'd). . . . inflation in the price of land today and it's outstripping the productive ability of that land to return a reasonable profit to the man with his investment in it and a reasonable living.

That inflation in land price is due to the fact that we don't have any more land and we still have people who want to farm; and we have this other condition where we have to go - in order at present day prices to remain solvent - we have to go to volume production to keep afloat. We have a tremendous demand for the land resources that are available in this province and as a matter of fact, available in Canada. And for my honourable friend to get up and try and suggest that the solution, that the main obstacle to productivity is in fact the unwillingness of the government to alienate these lands whose highest use is grazing, to suggest that this is the solution is ridiculous.

Let's just talk about this a little bit more. A man has certain limited resources, we know that one of the great problems is to get enough capital together in respect of the one farm so that it will yield him a living. Now why on earth should a farmer tie up money in land when we can have all the rights of ownership through leasing without tying up that capital, when capital is so scarce, relatively speaking and the industry needs so much of it. How can it be good policy, how can a leader of the people today advocate that farmers should tie up their available capital in land when they don't have to; when they could be putting it into larger breeding herds and other alternative investments that would yield them much greater returns.

I know what it is, it's the Jeffersonian concept of land ownership, that every man has a right to sit under his own fig tree. It was a wonderful concept in the days when we were opening up the North American Continent; and it was even a legitimate concept 25 years ago; but with the price of land today, and the economic conditions of the agricultural industry today, it is no longer a legitimate concept. It's wrong to advocate to farmers that no matter what the cost, no matter what the cost, no matter what the sacrifice involved, no matter how much denial to their wife and to their children and to themselves, the greatest thing in the world is to own a piece of land. Sometimes if you can afford it, it is a legitimate thing, but it doesn't cover the whole waterfront. I say life is just too short for a farmer to think in those terms today and I think that leaders such as you and I have got to apply ourselves to finding a better solution. We haven't got any different solution today. If you want to farm today most of the time you have to buy a farm at prices which I say are not realistic, relative to the possible or potential return of that land.

I'm not saying that we should discourage ownership but on the other hand I think that we have a responsibility to look at the facts of the agricultural industry today and to face up to them and try and find a solution to the greatest humbug that we have, this tremendous capital requirement of this industry for the individual.

My Gosh, at one time if you had \$10,000 invested in farming - not too long ago, 25 years ago - you had a big, big investment. Today, this year, the average investment of the boys in the diploma class at the University of Manitoba was \$113,000 -- \$113,000. Now some of them would have less and some of them would have more or would come from farms where it was greater. But let's start to really apply ourselves and not give superficial answers to very complex problems.

Seed - well I think the Honourable Member for Gladstone is right. We should have better seed. But the answer just isn't in making a seed cleaning plant available - and we learned this at Rivers. Now they have got a successful operation today and it's a successful operation because today they have got the participation of hundreds of farmers. Originally they got started and because of the small investment that the farmers had, many of them, there was no incentive for them to make use of that investment and in spite of the fact that they had put up substantial sums of money, really, they found that their patronage wasn't enough to pay the operating costs. This is what their difficulty was. And there's an offender in this thing, and that's the local elevator. I don't know what you do about this situation. The farmer can take his grain to the local elevator in most cases and get it cleaned for a penny or two. If he takes it to a commercial plant he's going to have to pay anywhere from 6 to 10 cents and maybe more.

And then we have chemical weed control. Now in the years 1955 to 1965, the techniques of Chemical Weed Control have been refined, enlarged, to the point where - I know it isn't right but many of the farmers don't feel that the question of seed is as critical as it used to be, because after all, if they sow a few mustard seed, they can knock it out with an application of spray that they are going to make in any case. I'm not saying the farmer is right in this, but I can understand this way of thinking.

(MR. HUTTON cont'd)

Another thing I think you want to take into account is the fact that where you have these community seed cleaning plants, such as Rivers, a man has to drive by - if he's located 25 or 30 miles away from that plant - he's going to have to drive by several elevators before he gets there and the natural inclination, and a very understandable inclination, is for the farmer to take it to the nearby elevator where he can get it for a penny or two. You and I would have an awful time you know to criticize this. We know it isn't right but after all the farmer is an independent individual and in spite of what we tell him he is going to do what he thinks is best and he's going to follow - he's just a human being like everybody else and he's going to follow his inclination here. But because of the advent of chemical weed control and because of the convenience of the local elevator, because of economy, the short run economy to the farmer of getting it cleaned there, all too often he uses these conveniences.

We would very much like to see more seed cleaning plants. I don't know, I have been - this matter was brought to our attention by the Union of Rural Municipalities and I turned around and I said probably the answer to it was to pass a law making it unlawful to have seed cleaned at the local elevator, and I asked them, which of them would like to associate themselves with that law, and none of them did. None of them did and I don't think the Honourable Member for Gladstone would want to be associated with this sort of thing. So it's just one of those problems of continuous education. I think that we've had as I say, a couple of things to buck here and probably of the two, maybe the emergence of very effective chemical weed control has been the greater one in influencing the farmer this way.

Now as far as my honourable friend from Gladstone's concern with soil and water, I don't think that this is the first concern of this Council, but I think that if we move towards greater productivity, we are going to have to adopt methods and husbandry which will at the same time as it brings about greater yields from the soil, will at the same time conserve that soil for the future. In other words, what I am saying is that the best conservation that you can practice is that which is going to give the greatest productivity from the soil of this province or any other province.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I took up the time of the Committee here but I just had to say something about this question of land tenure because I think that probably the greatest problem that the farm community faces in the next twenty years is to find the solution to the transfer of ownership of assets and the problem of making the land, the buildings and equipment available to the farmer who is going to be asked to produce the food for this nation. I don't believe that the answers that my honourable friend from Emerson is suggesting are the right answers. They may look right to him but if he looks at them in the light of the over-all problem of the agricultural community, he must admit that even if the government sold the land today that it's no guarantee at all that these grazing lands that he's talking about wouldn't be part of the greater problem that we have in the transfer of capital ownership in the farm industry from one generation to another. And I wish he would think about that.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I think I should answer some of those points raised by the Honourable Minister. I see he was quite carried away with it, but strangely enough I'll say that I agree with at least 95 percent of his philosophy. I'm not arguing with that. But he took the wrong angle. When I said that for expansion purposes, I did not suggest wholesale sale of Crown lands. I mentioned a few suitable areas for expansion for existing holdings already and not wholesale sale of Crown lands by bidding, for the Americans or somebody else, completely. I agree with the other part of his philosophy, but if there's a farmer who has already holdings there, two-quarters - I have in mind a farmer who has already invested \$75,000 and he finds that he hasn't got enough room, he hasn't got enough grazing land. An adjacent quarter is a Crown land, just as good as the one that he has. So if he wants it for expansion I cannot see why it could not be sold to him.

I agree with the Honourable Minister about these investments to get rid of them and to pass them on, but I don't think that the Honourable Minister should worry so much about the father passing it on to his two or three sons. I think those days are gone. If one son stays on the farm, the others will go away. They will go to school and they'll pursue other interests. One son may stay with him and if this one son sees that he is squeezed there, he hasn't enough space, no elbow room, naturally this son after the father gets of age, will say no, I'm not going to undertake this because there isn't enough room. These are the farmers I am concerned about. I'm not concerned about selling out all the Crown lands. There are many Crown lands that the Crown holds right now which are not suitable for agricultural purposes.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)... maybe just for reforestry; but if a farmer wishes to expand his holdings to become more economical, he has a quarter right next to him, that is the policy I say is wrong. He should be given that privilege of buying this extra land to become economical, because now he needs more. And he has a huge investment there. If he does not get this extra land, then this huge investment is not being justified.

I agree with the Minister that we should not sell our Crown lands wholesale, sell it to some other interests, but I cannot agree with him when we restrict some of these existing farmers, the farmers who have already established themselves and they cannot expand. And they must expand because they find that it is almost impossible to become economical with their present holdings. These are the farmers that I am concerned about. He doesn't have to give me a lecture on the huge investments required on the farm. I own a farm and I have over \$100,000 investment in that farm. I know that it is difficult. But when a man is already established and he wishes to expand a bit so that he would stay economical, I cannot see any reason if that land is suitable for the purpose that he wants, that we could not sell.

Most of these Crown lands are not so high priced as the Minister would like us to believe. Some of these lands, grazing lands, could be bought for under \$5 an acre, and it is not going to involve great investment. So these are the farmers that I am concerned, not somebody to come in there and start farming again. I agree with the Minister this should not be done wholesale sale of our Crown lands, because to become economical, they have to invest so much money. But the farmers I am concerned with are those that are there already and unless they are permitted to expand a little bit they have to give up all their investment - nobody else will go in there because there isn't enough elbow room, and his investment will be lost. The son will not take over. I have a specific example, this one that I mentioned, \$75,000 investment, he has a son working with him now and he has threatened his father; he says, "If we cannot expand our holdings, father, I don't want this investment that you have put in. We need at least another quarter." And those are the ones I am concerned.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. TANCHAK: Certainly.

MR. HUTTON: Wouldn't it be just as good for this man that you're talking about, if he could get the use of this capital asset through a long term lease? Wouldn't it be just as good to him?

MR. TANCHAK: Yes, I'll agree with the Honourable Minister that it may be just as good to him, but policies change and as I said before, he lives - this particular farmer lives right on the edge of a community pasture - where maybe you've taken over for community pasture. If he doesn't have ownership of it, and once a community pasture is established he'll lose it, and it doesn't solve his problem. He is interested in keeping his son on the farm and his son will not take the farm unless he is permitted to expand. There are little particular cases. And those are the cases that I would like the government to change its policy; wherever there are established farmers and they wish to expand a bit, the government should be more lenient with the policy. Those are the ones I am concerned about. And I did mention leasing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Interjection) Now we'd like to get ahead with the bill.

MR. TANCHAK: I didn't catch what the honourable

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've told us that, what you just expressed, about ten times. There's few rules in this Committee but one of them is against repetition.

MR. TANCHAK: Well I disagree that I said it ten times. I may have repeated myself but I don't think it was ten times. Well I am just about through, Mr. Chairman, on this. I just want to emphasize that I did not speak up for the wholesale sale of Crown lands, just in these particular cases. And I wanted to stress this lease part of it. I have had occasion to go with this gentleman to have it leased and he was refused the lease. Finally it was settled after some persuasion -- air tight agreements that he had to have. But he is not assured that in a year or two years from now he'll be able to hold that on a lease, because it's only a one year lease at a time. In two years or in one year he might be kicked out of it. Then his son will say, "I am going, I am leaving." These are the people I am concerned with. I am sure the Minister understands me and he sympathizes with me in this matter. Not wholesale sale of Crown lands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 1 passed. Page 2 --

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be too much to ask my honourable friend when he or the government are appointing or selecting this 12 man committee -- incidentally I don't know what the qualifications are to sit on this committee yet. I would like

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).....him to enlarge on that a little. But if when they're appointing this committee, would it be too much to ask him to appoint someone who is vitally concerned and knowledgeable in this whole field of soil and water conservation because this is one of my pet subjects, having been on it for about ten years, and I think that it is one of the most important, if not the most important field, in the whole field of agriculture. If you have not got soil, if you do not use soil and develop proper soil and conservation management then you soon will have nothing, and I hope that when the government is setting up this 12 man board that someone will be selected who is knowledgeable in this particular field.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture said he was sorry he had spoken so long. I am not sorry at all that he did because he made a very distinct contribution I think to the agricultural discussion of this Session. As a matter of fact, it seemed to me that the dissertation that he gave today would have been most appropriate on the introduction of his own estimates because at that time we could have had a very good discussion of that point. I realize it's late in the Session for us to undertake such a large subject now and I won't anymore than comment on it. I would like to say to my honourable friend once again though, and I say it in all kindness, Mr. Chairman, that my honourable friend having the capacity that he has and being so knowledgeable in these matters, should not take the suggestions that come from this side of the House just because they come from this side of the House, as though they were not worthy of consideration and that they deserve a lecture per se and from that lecture that you even divert to the philosophies of the different political parties.

Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend just has to realize that whenever he uses terms like ridiculous and whenever he feels constrained to say that the Liberal Party is walking backwards into the future, then it is he, not we, who is running the risk of a considerable continuation of the debate. I do not object to my honourable friend expressing any opinions that he wants in this House. This is a place that is dedicated to the right of free speech and we all have, so long as we stay within the rules, the right to say anything that we want. My honourable friend can have whatever opinions that he wants to have about the Liberal Party - and express them here. This is quite right. But the thing that he can't have is that and then expect the discussion to terminate immediately. However, I am not going to say any more than that and we can reserve discussion on that subject for another time.

But my only brief comment on the philosophy that he expressed - and I found it very interesting and challenging - my only comment on it would be that it seems to me that it's a very difficult one to fit into the concept of the family farm, which he himself has been a great advocate of in the past and I think he would be disinclined to say that he doesn't still advocate that as the basic foundation of agriculture. So with that brief comment, I'll leave that subject.

But I do want to support what my honourable friend the Member for Gladstone has said about the particular watershed and conservation program that he has mentioned, because my constituency happens to have the downstream end of that area and we had some brief discussion on this matter from the point of view of flooding this year and mercifully that area had a respite this year so far as flooding was concerned, but it has had more than its share in the years gone by. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have spent much time and much money and much planning on both the Red River and the Assiniboine River out of proportion to what we have as yet devoted to the Whitemud River. And as my honourable friend has mentioned, it is a very large area that is concerned there and I would hope, like my honourable friend, that we can through this agency or through the agencies that already exist, or some program, get a policy started in that area that will guard it, at least that we will be able to feel that we have taken the measures to guard it. We don't always know that these things are going to work as well as they are expected to. I still harbour some doubts about some of the projects that are planned, but at least let's try and get the program going and then I think the people up there who have suffered too long will have some cause to look forward.

And one word of technical advice to the sponsors: remind the engineers once again when they're doing improvement work, to start at the downstream end. That happens to be my area.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I could let the statements of the Minister go without comment. I think it was a very interesting debate that we had going here for some time now on this matter of ownership versus leasing. In my opinion this is very interesting because while I agree with him that the investment of a farmer is increasing year by year, and that because of the inflation and the cost of equipment and the rise of the prices of land and so on, this all adds up to large investments year by year and at the same time you have larger farms coming about. So that there is this trend.

(MR. FROESE cont'd).....

But I would not go as far as to discourage ownership at all and I hope that this committee that we are going to set up here for this productivity council is not going to be charged with this, that they are going to start discouraging ownership. To the contrary, I would feel that we should encourage ownership because I always feel that the people that own the land, they will take better care of it. I think this has been demonstrated time and time again, when you have renters or leasers that too often these people don't take as good care as the owner would and that as a result, I think we should have learned a lesson by now, that we should encourage ownership rather than discourage it.

I know that we have this trend of corporate farming coming along and this is growing. I think another answer would be estate, rather than to wind up the estates as presently is being done, that the estates rather continue and that the sons would not necessarily have to repurchase all that whole enterprise. I think this is the answer. In this respect I would think Alberta is doing the right thing at the present time by dropping succession duties or refunding them. I think this is a good thing.

This is another reason why I objected so strongly to Bill 80 that is coming in, because under Bill 80, if this committee was charged with discouraging ownership and that we had state enterprise coming in and taking over the farms, which they could do under Bill 80, that this would be completely contrary to my way of thinking and I am sure to many many farmers in Manitoba. But on the other hand, I think we should be working toward probably having a study made on estates, the matter of farms being taken over by estates or left in the estates, and that the sons could invest in there and that the other members of the family would leave their investments in the estate, and in this way so that the young farmers coming along would not have to repurchase the whole acreage or the whole estate as such.

I think this is an answer to our problem in Manitoba. I was certainly interested in the debate and also in what the Minister had to say because this I think is very important that we express our concepts and especially the government as to its policy for future farming here in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 108; Bills Nos. 103 and 127; and Bill No. 126, Pages 1 to 10, were read page by page and passed.)

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, Page 11, - I would move that we delete Part 4 on this Bill. This part has to do with scrap automobile yards, and in my opinion this part doesn't even belong in this Act. It should be under The Municipal Act in my opinion, and some of the actions advocated in the various sections, in my opinion, are too strong and while I agree that something probably is needed to be done about this matter, I feel it is too strong legislation in my opinion, and also I don't feel that it should be in this particular Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Much as I sympathize with the position that the Honourable Member for Rhineland takes about some of the sections here, I am afraid I couldn't support his amendment as it stands because I think there is a necessity for this type of legislation. My point would be, as some of us mentioned in Committee - and I see, Mr. Chairman, that there is an amendment proposed to a section that I thought was the most dangerous of all - but it seems to me that there still are some very drastic provisions even if this later amendment is put through. However, I wouldn't want to - because I do believe that it's necessary to have some control of these scrap automobile yards and because I think that we might as well be making some start now - I wouldn't support the motion of the Honourable Member; but I do think that we should look rather carefully at a couple of other sections later on.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost. (Pages 11 to 14 of Bill 126 were read and passed.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 15, 24 Sub-section 1, in the third line after the word "whether" is inserted "as owner or"; and in Section 25 of Section 1, in the fifth line after the second "may", you insert the following: "after 30 days written notice to such person or notice prominently attached to such scrap automobile 30-days prior to its passing." Page 15

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, that's one of the sections or subsections that I had in mind and I wasn't aware -- was that amendment moved in the Committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think that is an improvement. Would you just read it again stating where it comes in? I don't have

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the fifth line of subsection 1 of Section 25, after the second "may", "After 30 days written notice to such person or notice prominently attached to such scrap automobile 30 days prior to its passing." Page 15 as amended

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. ((Provincial Secretary)(River Heights): Mr. Chairman, on Page 15 we have an amendment there - I beg to move that subsection 6 of 25 be amended by striking out the word "person" in the second line thereof and (b) by adding thereto immediately after the word "any" in the third line thereof the words "reasonable and necessary".

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, this is the other subsection of the same section that I was concerned about -- in the first one - strike out "person"?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the sixth one you strike out the word "person" in the second line thereof.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And you add immediately after the word "any" in the third line thereof, the words "reasonable and necessary".

MR. CAMPBELL: I think that's a big improvement too, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me it's still pretty drastic but that is an improvement I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion passed. (Remainder of Bill 126 was read page by page and passed.)

(Bills 87, 90, 95, 99, 98, 115, 113, 94 were each read page by page and passed.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 101 --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is 12:30 is it not. I have some questions to ask on 101.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): I move the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee has approved of Bills Nos. 109, 108, 103, 127, 87, 90, 95, 99, 98, 115, 113 and 94 without amendment and Bill No. 126 with an amendment, and requests leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River that the report of the Committee be received.

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

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

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