



Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Chairman

Mr. Robert Anderson
Constituency of Springfield



Thursday, July 13, 1978 8:00 p.m.

**Hearing Of The Standing Committee
On
Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978**

Time: 8:00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Robert (Bob) Anderson.

IR. CHAIRMAN: We have a quorum. The committee will please come to order. The first witness is Marguerite Larson from Lac du Bonnet on behalf of the Canadian Agriculture Movement. Mrs. Larson.

IRS. MARGUERITE LARSON: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. First of all, I would like to withdraw my brief as a member or spokesman for the Canadian Agriculture Movement. We had a meeting in our area not too long ago and we made a decision that as it is a movement it does not wish to make policy or become part of a confrontation between one commodity group and another, or between one beef producer against another. This movement is not an organization and will go and die at the farmers' will. This movement crosses all political parties, commodity groups, organizations, and so on, and it does not wish to become involved in the battle.

However, I would like to speak as an individual.

Thank you for this opportunity to present a brief on behalf of a family farm unit in regard to Bill 25. As a member of the Charolais Association, secretary of the Manitoba Cow-Calf Association, spokesperson for the Canadian Agriculture Movement, head leader of the 4-H Light Horse and Beef Club, and a beef producer, I would like to express my great concern for the way Bill 25 was introduced into the Legislature, the contents of this bill, its implications and the precedent it will set in Manitoba if this bill is passed.

This bill has been drafted by the Beef Growers Association, approved in principle only by some of the other associations, and not approved at all by one other beef association in Manitoba. Even though it has been announced publicly that the Cow-Calf Association wished this checkoff, it does so without proper presentation by its membership or by the cow-calf producer and small feedlot operator in general. Some of the board directors who had memberships in their region and who were known to oppose a checkoff in the Cow-Calf Association were not notified of board meetings to discuss this proposed bill while others do not have a membership in their region and have not held meetings as called for by their constitution.

Therefore, I would submit that the Cow-Calf Association does not represent the majority of the cow-calf producers in this province and therefore has no right to speak on their behalf. Furthermore, I would suggest that those who joined this association with good intent were led down the garden path and into the hands of the Beef Growers Association.

As I submit this brief, I would like to make it very clear that I do so with respect for the House and this committee, however, with no respect at all for this proposed bill and for the individuals who are attempting to enforce it upon the rest of us without our consultation and without giving us any say at all.

The effort I have made to prepare and present this brief at such a demanding time has been considerable and should convince you of my concern for the cow-calf producer, the beef industry, and agriculture for now and the future.

Bill 25, to me, is a shocking piece of legislation. My objections to the bill are:

Bill 25 sets a dangerous precedent. It gives a small minority group the right to draft a bill and pass it through the House without consulting or making an attempt to consult the majority of cattlemen. This would mean that any small group in the future can present a draft to organize an association which will have control over and speak for the majority of people against their will or otherwise. Are we, the producer, to be made the victim of interest groups who, with the change of governments, can be tossed about as a ship in the storm?

Bill 25 has been proposed by the Manitoba Beef Growers without proper presentation from the cattle producers of Manitoba. Many groups and individuals have attempted to make their views known

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

but were given the brush-off. Only the few individuals who proposed this bill were listened to.

In that this proposed bill does not have the support of the majority of cattle producers, but only that of a minority group, it would only seem fair and democratic that this proposed checkoff be brought to a referendum in order that the wishes of the *bona fide* producer be known.

Objection number four: The main aim and intent of this proposed bill was not to benefit the cow-calf producer, but instead to provide funds for the Manitoba Beef Growers and also to prevent the cow-calf producer from ever having any say in the marketplace and I would like to offer you an example of this.

I have before me a letter from the Manitoba Beef Growers Association dated January 26, 1978 in which it states: "There has to be an appeal for membership funds to keep us operating until a checkoff becomes operative. As I mentioned earlier, we have an opportunity now to put in place a Manitoba cattlemen's association, with the funding to properly represent cattle producers in this province. We are urgently in need of funds in order to get the necessary work done between now and the checkoff becoming operational. The point to bear in mind is that this organization is our best insurance that we will not 'not' get a marketing board some time in the future. Although we have fought off the challenge of a beef board provincially, there is still a possibility of interference in the beef marketplace by the Federal Government. Most of you contributed generously to the freedom campaign and we are now asking you to help us finish the job by remitting your 1978 Beef Growers membership fees."

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, before we go on, I would like to ask Mrs. Larson whether she is prepared to table that letter, or a copy of it, for the benefit of the committee.

MRS. LARSON: Yes, I am.

MR. USKIW: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Continue, Mrs. Larson.

MRS. LARSON: It is a direct violation of human rights for the government to give any segment of society which forms a minority the legislative power to control and collect money from the majority against the majority's will.

The contents of this bill are only to benefit the large food chains involved in the food business for without marketing controls manipulations in the prices paid to producers for their product and prices paid by the consumers can be made.

Number six: This bill would endanger the family farm unit. It makes big business a producer as well as all the shareholders of the companies who own cattle. Anyone who wishes to buy a \$1.00 share in a cattle ranch or a cattle farm can become a producer, the way the bill reads now. Big business has more information, more experience, more time, in order to lobby, influence the press and do research. This gives an unfair advantage over the cow-calf producer who is already heavily burdened to make ends meet and to recover from four years of severe losses. This trend towards super farms, which is now being encouraged by this bill, in which large corporate farms swallow up the smaller family units, would have negative effects on. Number (a) the employment situation in our province. Statistics have shown that both in the United States and Canada, unemployment figures go up when the farm economy goes down, or is in trouble.

Number (b), rural life in Manitoba would be affected — and I think that's understandable — as well as rural business. If the family farm unit disappears, then these will go as well.

Number (d), consumer prices. Big business, of course, their main purpose is to make a profit while many small farmers or family farm units have stuck with farming through bad times as well as good because it was their way of life and they enjoyed it — profit is not the only motive.

The efficiency and quality of product would be negatively affected. Imagine, if you will, 5,000 head of cattle fed a dangerous chemical by mistake. You can recall cars if a cotter pin is missing but what do you do with beef, once it's in the food chain?

I would like to further emphasize this by reading an article that was in the daily newspaper, from the Kitchener, Ontario Canadian Press: "Control of food production should be taken away from the corporation-owned supermarkets and given back to the farmers, delegates to a workshop on the future of foods agreed Saturday. Delegates voiced concern about statistics which showed that about three-quarters of Canada's supermarkets are controlled by four major chains. The chains, which were not named, have interests and linking directorships which extend into the farm machinery business, banking and broadcasting, delegates said. The workshop was sponsored by the People's Food Commission, an organization composed of independent food industry representatives. Fifty teachers, farmers, nutritionists, politicians and labour representatives attended the one-day conference which concluded that concentration of ownership in the food business is threatening

the future of family farms.”

Proposed amendments. Not being a lawyer and having no previous experience in drafting a brief, I will propose my amendments as best as I am able, and should it be necessary — hopefully, it will not be — I would ask the Committee to provide the proper wording without changing the context, if my wording is not adequate.

First of all, I'd like to make it very clear that I strongly recommend this bill be withdrawn in its entirety. I would suggest that public meetings are held in the country and that a referendum be held as to whether producers wish a checkoff and a legislated Cattlemen's Association. I am, however, aware that the government has the majority and can act irresponsibly by passing this bill. If this is the case, then I would make the following recommendations to amend this bill in order to make it more democratic. Forcing cattle producers to accept such a bill without giving them the opportunity to make their views known will make them antagonistic towards and distrusting of the group that proposed this bill, and the government that legislated it. This bill would not serve the purpose suggested of unifying the cattle industry. It will divide the industry even more than it is now divided, and will encourage new associations to spring up to fight this Cattlemen's Association and this checkoff.

If this bill is to be implemented without consideration for the farmer, then at least give the producers democratic control.

No. (1), amend Section 1(e) to read: “Producer” means any person who grows beef as an agricultural product. Delete the remainder of this definition for it would give people who do not raise cattle at all, the power to control the industry. If this bill was meant to help cattle producers establish an organization, then it must give the producer democratic control.

Amend 3(1) by deleting the word “appointed or.” This would eliminate the favouritism that could be given to producers who drafted this particular bill. Also, it would erase any suspicion of favouritism, because even if there should not be favouritism, people will still think that there is such. And give the producers the opportunity to decide who they wish to run this association by democratic vote.

No. (3), amend subsection (3) to read: “The majority of members present at a duly constituted meeting of the association of the members present to constitute a quorum is the decision of the association.” This clause as it reads now leaves the association open to hold meetings improperly. If only three people attend a meeting and two out of three were in favour of a decision, it would be made on behalf of the membership of a particular region.

Amending this clause as above would put the onus on the association to properly advertise meetings and make every effort possible to draw out the membership to these meetings.

Amend Section 4 to read: “The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council divide the province into 14 electoral districts, according to the number of cattle producers, evenly divided, and shall be responsible for the supervision of nominations and elections of 14 bona fide cattle producers to represent their district and to hold office until re-elected or replaced by other elected members.”

If one feedlot has, as is proposed, 17,000 head, would that make him, or the manager of that, the whole Board of Directors for that area, or the whole executive? If it goes by cattle numbers, it should be evenly divided by producers.

No. (5), delete 6(2) entirely. If this organization is democratically controlled by producers, there is no need for this clause, for it is up to producers, through their administration by-law, to make decisions of this nature.

No. (6), amend Section 7(1)(b) by adding this: “After a producer has assigned a deduction at the time of sale.” It seems that one can only call the checkoff as it is now proposed, compulsory, if producers are forced to pay into it at the time of sale, and then have to write a letter to be allowed to withdraw their money. This amendment will save on administration costs and give the producer the right to decide whether or not he wishes to belong to the Manitoba Cattlemen's Association. To me it seems close to blackmail to be forced to become a member so that I can have a say.

No. 7, amend Section 7(2)(a) to read: “Until a referendum of eligible cattle producers be held, and a majority vote in favour of this proposed Cattle Producers Association with the powers to impose a checkoff.”

No. 8, amend Section 7(2)(b) to read: “Until an elected association is established.”

No. 9, amend 11(u) to read: “The elections of the members of the association, and fixing their time of office.”

Section 4 guarantees the producer democratic vote, if amended as previously suggested, before any administration by-law is written.

No. 10, add to Section 11(1) that the association should provide for at least one annual meeting a year to be held in a central place with the membership present. The membership has the right to an annual meeting wherein any business of the association can be conducted, and reports read.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

There is no provision made for this under the Administration by-law.

No. 11, delete Section 11(h). All registered producers who pay into the checkoff should have the right to vote. What kind of game is this when an appointed board has the right to decide who is to vote?

No. 12. To further amend Section 11(1) by adding a subsection to provide for a secret ballot "that the election of the provincial executive be made by secret mail ballot of the membership. This will prevent decision making by a few people who might attend the board of directors meetings. Manitoba is a large province. If the meeting is held in Brandon it is difficult for all board directors to be there. It will also give the cattle producers the opportunity to be involved in all decision making thus a more democratic method than is being proposed at present. My experience in past organizations which are run from the top with no grass input has made me concerned about this particular legislation.

No. 13. Amend Section 11 by adding another subsection 4 for the Revocation of The Cattle Producers Association Act. "Where not less than 10 percent of the eligible membership of this association request the revocation of this Act (Bill 25) the membership be entitled to vote on this revocation with proper hearings being held." No Act should be made or passed without any safeguards built in.

Allocation of Funds: 1. Amend Section 7(1)(a) by adding to the end of this clause "and that financial statements be sent to the membership on a yearly basis." If the producer is to pay into this association he is entitled to know where his money is being spent. All reports should accompany these statements. Members are not always able to attend annual meetings, therefore these records should be mailed out to producers.

No. 2. The bill should be amended in that instead of Section 6(2) which I have already stated should be deleted, the following section be included: "The association shall not engage in any campaigns designed to fight other agricultural organizations and that if individual members wish to organize a campaign, no moneys be allotted towards such a campaign, and that the association does not assume any debts of any organizations or campaigns of the past." The association has no right whatsoever to spend members' money fighting other organizations under the name of promotion, or other philosophies that a member may believe in. I would suggest that the same people proposing this bill have spent incredible sums of money in the Freedom Fighters' Campaign last year. Therefore, it seems of necessity to keep a new association from becoming involved in and paying for any such a campaign that is designed to indoctrinate cattle producers. No association has the right to rule from the top with the money paid by a producer without giving the producer a fair say.

In conclusion, I recognize the fact that the government has good intentions in introducing this bill. However, it has come at a most unfortunate time and without careful study. The cattle industry has suffered a severe crisis in the last four years. The checkoffs in other provinces have done little if anything, to offset this crisis. The Canadian Cattleman's Association has shown little concern for the cow-calf producer at such a time. One should learn from this example before advocating a checkoff. It has already been proven that private organizations can do nothing about falling prices. Only government can regulate imports for the benefits of cattle producers and set policy which will guarantee fair returns for the producer who is a good manager and an efficient producer.

All the beef promotion in the world, all the research, all the improvement in quality will not ensure the beef producer a profit for his product when it is so easy to manipulate the markets. The present government has been quoted as saying that its policies are like medicine, hard to swallow for the spoiled Manitoban but good for them. I would like to take that analogy a bit further in saying that even though some medicine may be good, the wrong medicine can do a great deal of harm, even kill the patient or prevent him from getting the proper cure. If the beef producer may be considered the patient, I would submit that Bill 25 is the wrong prescription.

Respectfully submitted by myself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Larson. Will you submit to questions from members of the committee?

MRS. LARSON: Yes, I will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Driedger.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Just to clarify the point, when you started off you said that you were not representing the Canadian agricultural movement.

MRS. LARSON: That's right.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. DRIEDGER: This is a personal brief that you're presenting then. Might I ask roughly how many head of stock do you market through the Union Yards or auction marts, this type of thing, in one year?

MRS. LARSON: Well, first of all, before I answer that question, I would like to point out that it would not make any difference how many head of cattle I market at the auction mart. That was just a point I tried to make in my brief, that perhaps if people could decide how many, or who the producer is, or who was eligible to vote, they might take it upon themselves to say that they have to have 100 head or 200 head, or whatever.

Now, to answer your question specifically, we have 150 head, approximately. We have 60 cows; we feed out approximately 30 steers and we have approximately 50, 60 calves.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you. Are you a member of the National Farmers Union?

MRS. LARSON: No, I am not.

MR. DRIEDGER: Do you believe in one organization for the beef producers?

MRS. LARSON: I do not see how one organization can benefit the beef producers when the beef producers are of different ideas and different . . . Well, for instance, the cow-calf producer sells his product and he wants a good price, while the people buying it from them want to get it at the lowest price possible. So I cannot see how these two can be the same organization, but I do think they can work together and discuss their problems, as different organizations.

MR. DRIEDGER: Seeing as you are opposed to the present bill the way it is standing here now, would you have preferred to see a bill of the nature that was presented for vote in the last referendum that was held under the Marketing Act, as such? Would you have a preference for . . .

MRS. LARSON: Well, as that bill . . . Or a vote was taken on the . . .

MR. USKIW: For the benefit of the Member for Emerson, there is no need for a bill for that kind of a proposal, the legislation has been on the books for 30 or 40 years.

MR. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I think my question was basically whether Mrs. Larson would prefer an organization of that nature as was proposed in the last referendum.

MRS. LARSON: I would only prefer an organization or a plan of that nature if the majority of cow-calf and cattle producers in Manitoba wished it. I believe it is up to the cattle producers to have a choice to say so, and if they do have a choice, I would respect it as such, whether I liked it or not.

MR. DRIEDGER: Well, I think the wishes of the people were spoken in the election, as such. I was asking you a personal opinion whether you would prefer that kind of an organization

MRS. LARSON: I would prefer an organization that has some control of the markets, but I'm not saying specifically a marketing board because I don't understand all the . . . I have not studied it in great detail, and before I would vote I would study it in great detail. I did not vote in the last one.

MR. DRIEDGER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does any other member of the committee . . . ? Mr. Einarson.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, you indicated in your brief as an individual, Mrs. Larson, that you did not feel the Beef Growers Association and the Cow-Calf Producers and other beef organizations when amalgamating together, if this association were formed, would nullify all those organizations and then they would become one organization for the province. Do I understand your brief correctly when you mentioned that?

MRS. LARSON: Would you clarify the question again? I missed the question.

MR. EINARSON: If I understand your brief correctly, Mrs. Larson, you do not agree with the activities and the efforts that the Beef Growers' Association, the Cow-Calf Producers' Association, and all the Purebred Associations, the efforts they have made over the years. Are you saying then that

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

these organizations, if they were being blended together, to try to come up with one association to do certain things for the benefit of the beef industry as a whole in the Province of Manitoba — that is what this bill is trying to do? Do you disagree with that philosophy?

MRS. LARSON: Yes, I do, because I believe that every association has its own purpose. I do belong to several associations, as you can see. I would not like to see them joined, because then I feel that they would be ineffective in what they are set out to do. Furthermore, if I wanted to join an organization, I would join one that covers all agricultural commodities, rather than one specific one that covers just beef, when there are so many differences in the beef industry.

MR. EINARSON: When you answer in that way, Mrs. Larson, what type of organization would you want to cover all commodities? What would you call it?

MRS. LARSON: Well, I don't really think it's for me to say what organization I would want, because again, I have not set out any plan as to what I want. I'm here to oppose Bill 25, and I'm trying to say what I do not want.

MR. EINARSON: Well, when you say you are opposing Bill 25, — I think, if I understood your brief — you are opposing the efforts of the various organizations that are representing the beef industry in the Province of Manitoba at the present time, then what alternative are you prepared to offer in place of, say, Bill 25? What suggestion have you to offer to try to solve the problems of the beef industry in the Province of Manitoba?

MRS. LARSON: Again, I would say it's not up to me to offer a suggestion. I'm not here to make policies; there are people much more qualified than myself, and the people that did set out this bill, I appreciate their efforts. But again, I'm also one that has done a great deal in farm organizations and I do not feel that I have the right to speak for anyone else unless the majority approved.

MR. EINARSON: Well you then, Mrs. Larson, speak as an individual? You have no affiliation with any particular beef organization in the Province of Manitoba, is that correct?

MRS. LARSON: Yes, I do have affiliations. I listed all my affiliations; I'm a member of the Charolais Association, I'm the Secretary of the Provincial Cow-Calf Association, spokesman for the Canadian Agriculture, head leader of 4-H, Light Horse and Beef Club, and a producer, and a consumer.

MR. EINARSON: You say then that you are a member of the Charolais Association. Are you speaking on behalf of all those members who belong to the Charolais Association?

MRS. LARSON: No, I'm not. I do not think it's my right to speak on their behalf. I'm speaking on my own behalf.

MR. EINARSON: Very well. Then you are speaking on your own behalf, and you are not interested in the purpose of Bill 25 as it is outlined in the bill? Do I understand your purpose?

MRS. LARSON: Oh, I'm definitely interested in it, but I'm also opposed to it.

MR. EINARSON: You are interested, and you are opposed to it.

MRS. LARSON: Yes.

MR. EINARSON: Are you opposed to trying to do something for yourself as well as all the other producers of beef in the Province of Manitoba — I give you one example, and I ask you — in trying to upgrade and improve the grading standards insofar as the producer is concerned in this province?

MRS. LARSON: Well, I feel as a taxpayer, some of my tax money should be spent that way. I pay a great deal of taxes, because I also have a non-farm job to keep our farm going, and as a taxpayer, some of this money should be allocated to agriculture and the research should be done by the government because you've got some very good staff there right now; they can do a much more effective job than a private organization who perhaps — said it about themselves — even sell their information.

MR. EINARSON: Do you believe in a Marketing Board for the beef industry in the Province of

MRS. LARSON: Well, the only way I can answer that, is that when I raise my beef, I'd like to know that I'm going to get a price that will give me a profit, and if a marketing board is the answer, then I would approve it, yes. But I'm not sure at this point that it is the answer as yet.

MR. EINARSON: You're not sure that it's the answer at this time.

MRS. LARSON: Right.

MR. EINARSON: Then, you are not sure just exactly where you are going in your own particular enterprise. Do I understand you correctly when you say that?

MRS. LARSON: I don't think that I can even answer that, because I am looking for a sense of direction. I have ideas in my own mind, but I don't think it's up to me to divulge it here.

MR. EINARSON: Well, I'm interested. You presented a brief here to us to this Committee, and as a member of this Legislature, and as a producer of beef cattle myself, I sympathize with your comments. I'm only asking questions to find out what in your view personally would you like to see happen to improve the lot of the farmer who is in the business of providing beef and producing beef in the Province of Manitoba.

MRS. LARSON: First of all, I'd like to see the Cow-Calf group have a better chance to get organized. They did make an attempt to get organized, but unfortunately, it fell by the wayside. It was a young organization, the Cow-Calf Association of Manitoba, that is, and it had great potential, but as I said, it fell by the wayside. Several reasons for that: apathy, perhaps; too much of a shadowing by the Beef Growers, and many other reasons. But I would like to see the Cow-Calf Association become stronger, perhaps join with the Western Cow-Calf Association. Furthermore, I'd like to see the government come up with something that we can buy, I think we're in a bargaining position.

MR. EINARSON: That is, the Cow-Calf Association.

MRS. LARSON: Right.

MR. EINARSON: How long has the Cow-Calf Association been organized? **MRS. LARSON:** I would say approximately four years. It became organized just after the beef prices fell.

MR. EINARSON: How long has the Beef Growers Association been organized? Have you any idea?

MRS. LARSON: That I don't know, no.

MR. EINARSON: How long has the Cow-Calf Producers' Association been organized? Do you know that?

MRS. LARSON: Well, that's what I said, approximately four years.

MR. EINARSON: Oh, I'm sorry, I thought you meant the Cattlemen's Association.

MRS. LARSON: No, I have no idea of the Cattlemen's Association.

MR. EINARSON. Then, you are saying — sort of my conclusion, so that I don't misunderstand you — you do not agree with Bill 25, you don't agree with the various beef organizations getting together and trying to mutually solve the problems that they have in the Province of Manitoba. Is that what you're saying?

MRS. LARSON: There is no reason why they can't get together as they stand. They have their delegates, they can hold meetings together, but I don't think they should be legislated as a group to control the producers.

MR. EINARSON: Do you understand from briefs that have been presented to us previously that if this association is formed, the Beef Producers' Association, the Cow-Calf Producers' Association, all the breeds' associations, are prepared to disappear from the picture and form one association to speak as a united voice for the beef producers of the Province of Manitoba?

MRS. LARSON: As I have already mentioned, I do not feel the Cow-Calf Producers' Association really represents anyone at present. I telephoned the President of the Charolais Association and he said that he approved of this checkoff in principle, but that he was not even aware of some of the things in the draft.

MR. EINARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further members that wish to question this witness? Mr. Uskiw.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The witness before us has indicated that she is a member of the Cow-Calf Producers' Association. Did you say that you were on the executive, or are you simply a member at large?

MRS. LARSON: I am on the executive pending.

MR. USKIW: In what capacity?

MRS. LARSON: Pending on whether we hold another meeting in our region, and whether I become elected on the Board of Directors. Or as a President or Vice-President. I would have to go and tell the people that they would have to elect me so I could be Secretary, because I have already been elected at the Board meeting.

MR. USKIW: I see. What particular role did you play, active role, in the association to date?

MRS. LARSON: Well, in our region I feel I have played a very active role. We held meetings — I was the treasurer of our association — we held meetings every month. We started off with a membership of 200 people, we dwindled down to a hard core of 35 and at present we're not sure where we're going. We really haven't got any renewed memberships for this year.

MR. USKIW: Is it your understanding that that is the general picture throughout the province with respect to that association?

MRS. LARSON: I can't speak for all the regions but I know it is in several regions.

MR. USKIW: So you're making the claim then that the Cow-Calf Producers Association doesn't truly exist other than in name and does not represent a great number of people at the present time?

MRS. LARSON: That is right.

MR. USKIW: In your particular region, were you in a position to canvass by way of a letter or a meeting the opinion of your membership and did that opinion find its way to this committee or is it part of the package that is being presented by the Cow-Calf Producers Association?

MRS. LARSON: There was no effort at all made to find out the opinion of the people in our region. In fact they were quite disgusted at this, at some of the meetings we did hold. There were three meetings held, about the only three meetings that were held last year and my husband, who was president of our region, myself and the vice-president were not notified of the three meetings that were held to discuss Bill 25, or the drafted proposal.

MR. USKIW: Well, let me clarify then. Are you suggesting that the executive of the provincial association failed to contact your particular organization in your region with respect to Bill 25?

MRS. LARSON: Yes, I did.

MR. USKIW: Have you any reason to give for that kind of action?

MRS. LARSON: Well, I telephoned the former president of the Cow-Calf Association and he had said that he had tried to contact us the first time, it was probably the night before, and he couldn't get hold of us, but I don't see any reason for the other two times that we were not contacted about the other two meetings.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. USKIW: Do you have any particular thoughts or feelings about why you have been omitted from this particular function?

MRS. LARSON: Well basically I believe it's because of our stand. We have felt that the grass roots should have the say and that when you do have an organization, you do have representatives for those different regions. These representatives should give the feelings of the people and bring those to the board meetings and not the other way around. The feelings of the board meetings should not be taken down to the people and they should not be told what to do, as was indicated.

MR. USKIW: Do you see the 8Cow-Calf Producers Association continuing as an organization?

MRS. LARSON: No, I do not.

MR. USKIW: Regardless of what happens to Bill 25?

MRS. LARSON: I believe that if Bill 25 is not passed, there might be some hope of reviving the association but if Bill 25 is passed, I believe it will be dispersed.

MR. USKIW: Let me then ask you a very important question — perhaps you've covered it in your brief and maybe I've missed it — do you believe that it's the government's role to legislate people into associations of any kind?

MRS. LARSON: No, I certainly do not because I am an 8 individual and I feel that I have individual rights and I do respect the rights of the majority rule. I do respect minority rights but not in the capacity that they should have the rule over the majority.

MR. USKIW: If you were a member of the Legislative Assembly and a government was passing such a measure, how would you look upon the association that was formed subsequent to the passage of this bill? Would you look upon it as a neutral organization or as an arm of the government?

MRS. LARSON: I would look at it as the arm of the government.

MR. USKIW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Adam.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Larson, you said in answer to my colleague's questions that you felt that the Cow-Calf Association would disappear if Bill 25 passed into law! Just a few moments ago, the Member for Rock Lake made that quite clear because in his remarks he commented that the Cow-Calf Association was going to disappear. He made that an accomplished fact when he made his statement. So I just want to draw that to your attention that he knows, according to the statements that he made, he knows already that it's demised. You are saying that there is hope, there is hope if Bill 25 does not become law.

MRS. LARSON: Yes, I do think there's hope because in our region the people do want a Cow-Calf Association. They're all cow-calf producers and they're quite interested and they have attended meetings and quite a few people have taken active part. I'm sure that it must be the same in other regions as well.

MR. ADAM: You mentioned also that there were various reasons why the membership of the Cow-Calf Association fell so drastically. Could you elaborate a little more on that point or are you in a position to?

MRS. LARSON: Well, taking our region 10 meetings, I know at the beginning a lot of politics were brought in. We tried to dispense with that because we feel that it's a farm organization, not a political organization and the chairman did reprimand people very strongly for taking political views. Because some of these meetings were basically political, some of the people, some of the members there, felt that they did not want to become involved with this on both sides, of different political parties. Other people did not like to be ruled by the beef producer, they felt that they were a cow-calf producer and that a beef producer should not be in the Cow-Calf Association as telling it what to do.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. ADAM: Is that because the Manitoba Beef Growers are more pure bred breeders or is there a difference there between . . . ?

MRS. LARSON: Well, my own personal view of the difference, we feed our beef too and we could actually be called a feeder but our main concern is raising that calf, so we call ourselves the cow-calf producers and I think there are people whose main concern is feeding out cattle. Their main operation is based on that and they might have a few cocow-calves, so those people I would call feeders. There are feeders who contract feed for different packing companies and different individuals so they are another group.

MR. ADAM: So then what you are saying, Mrs. Larson, is that the membership of the Manitoba Beef Growers are more oriented to feeding cattle, fattening cattle, for slaughter, and buying feeders, is that what you are saying?

MRS. LARSON: Yes, I believe they are. The executive, most of the people on the executive are.

MR. ADAM: I recall attending some of the first organizational meetings of the Cow-Calf Association and as I recall, not very long after they were organized, the Beef Growers made overtures to the Cow-Calf Association whereby they would make a directorship available on the Manitoba Beef Association and they wanted the Cow-Calf Association to do likewise. Do you feel that this may have had some effect on the loss of membership of the Cow-Calf Association?

MRS. LARSON: No, I really do not, because there wasn't enough communication between the provincial board and the region. I attended an annual meeting at Brandon two years ago and I made a very strong point that there had to be better communication between the board of directors or the executive, and the cow-calf producer if we were going to survive and this became a resolution. It was passed but it was never acted upon.

MR. ADAM: I see. You read a letter from the Beef Growers in regard to an appeal for funds. Were these funds to be used to finance the new association?

MRS. LARSON: It did not indicate in the letter.

MR. ADAM: That is not indicated in the letter?

MRS. LARSON: No.

MR. ADAM: Then the purpose of the appeal was just to finance the administration of the Beef Growers, do you think?

MRS. LARSON: That I could not be sure.

MR. ADAM: It doesn't indicate how these funds would be expended, because I posed a question last night to, I believe Mr. Mayer, the president, and I asked him how the association, the new association, if it became law, how it would be funded for the first 18 months' and he seemed to be at a loss as to how funds would be raised to undertake a registration of the producers who would qualify to vote or who would be members of the association. That is not clearly defined in the bill, as many other things are not clearly defined in the bill. He seemed to be at a complete loss as to how they would proceed once this Act became in force.

You also mentioned, I believe, in your brief, and I took note of that when I perused the bill, that it was possible, and I see you have made that one of your concerns, that it would be possible for a board to establish the term of office. I believe you made that one of your concerns. I see nothing in the bill that would not prevent them from establishing a lifetime term, if they so wished. There is nothing in there . . .

MRS. LARSON: Yes, that is true, there is nothing in the bill to establish the term of office. I assume it would be under the administration by-law if this legislation were passed, but it could be anything.

MR. ADAM: It would have to be established, but presuming that they could, they could if they wished . . .

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MRS. LARSON: Yes, they could.

MR. ADAM: . . . they could make it five years, ten years, or one year, or whatever.

MRS. LARSON: Yes, they could, if there were no democratic rule from the cattle producers.

MR. ADAM: I notice that you mentioned that in one area here that it wasn't a snow job but it was a brushoff. "Bill 25 has been proposed by the Manitoba Beef Growers without proper presentation from the cattle producers. Many groups and individuals have attempted to make their views known but were given the brushoff. Only the few individuals who proposed this bill were listened to." Could you elaborate on that.

MRS. LARSON: Well, first of all, at meetings of the Cow-Calf Association, I know it was a battle. At the last board of director's meeting we had only six people who felt that they could carry on without a quorum and make rules, and it was five against one, and the one was against this bill and the other five were for it. They would not really listen. It was rather an argument for the whole period. Furthermore, we have contacted Mr. Downey's office — this is our region — and we have asked him to come to a meeting, and if he could not attend that meeting, we asked when would be a good time for him to attend because we could have made changes. This was in March and this was the meeting at Selkirk. We made it at Selkirk because we figured it would be more convenient for him or for members from the government to come down. We also invited MLAs. There was only one MLA there; Mr. Uskiw was there. The rest did not attend. We waited. We wanted to make our views heard; we wanted to ask questions, and were very disappointed that no one came down. We had given at least a week's notice and there were 50 people who had travelled a considerable distance, some as far as 70 to 100 miles to attend that meeting, and we couldn't ask questions. And when we did come to the Legislature as a body of CAM, Canadian Agriculture Movement representatives, we tried to meet with him for two days. He was Very busy at the time; no arrangements were made to ever meet with him.

MR. ADAM: I see. I could appreciate that maybe the Minister could be busy but I'm sure if given advance notice, he could have perhaps had a representative there to represent him, at least, but of course that is for him for say and not for me.

Are you aware of some of the directors of the Cow-Calf Association from my constituency going to a meeting and attempting to have the views of support for Bill 25 discontinued or stopped? Are you aware of that?

MRS. LARSON: No, I am not.

MR. ADAM: Are you aware that the directors of the Cow-Calf Association from my area have sent in a petition which is now in the Chairman's file with approximately 50 names on, I understand, I haven't seen it?

MRS. LARSON: Which area is that?

MR. ADAM: From Ste. Rose.

MRS. LARSON: Well' I heard a few people from Ste. Rose — being in the Canadian Agriculture Movement, I have contacted a great number of people and I contacted a few people in Ste. Rose and they had indicated that they were a little frightened of this bill even though at first they had approved of it in principle.

MR. ADAM: I was advised by two of the directors of the Cow-Calf Association that they had taken the time to go down to a meeting and they appealed to the directors and to the president not to go ahead with this proposal without a referendum and according to what I was told, they were advised that if there was a vote held, or a referendum, that it would be defeated so therefore they could not consider that at all. This is what I was told but the petition, I expect, will be made available to the committee members later on.

MRS. LARSON: I'm not aware of that at all; I hadn't heard anything about that.

MR. ADAM: Well, that might give you a lift, so that there is still hope for your association because there are individuals who do not agree with what has been done.

Now, the Member for Rock Lake has made quite wide-sweeping statements about many

that are proposing or supporting this kind of a bill. I want, for the record, that it should be stated that so far we have only one or two *bona fide* associations that have shown their support, as far as this committee is concerned — I'm not sure what the Minister has in his own file — but the committee, and the statements of the Minister during the introduction of this bill, and I have his statements here, however, I'm not going to go through them. But there are only a very few here. Well, there are so few, I may well put them in the record again . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, could the Member for Ste. Rose direct questions to the individual? I believe the time for speech making is in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please, order please. I would caution the committee that in the interests of the convenience of those witnesses who have come substantial distances, that you make your questions as direct as possible, so that we can conduct our business as expeditiously as possible, and I'm sure that can be done without in any way interfering with our thorough examination of this question. Would you proceed, Mr. Adam?

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, on that point, I think we would proceed a lot quicker if we did not have any interruptions. But are you aware that in the introduction of Bill 25 on Friday, May 12th, that the Minister indicated that he had received a letter of support in principle from the United Grain Growers, and that he had received a letter in support to this principle of the checkoff from the Manitoba Farm Bureau, which are not really bonafide producer associations but rather commodity groups; that he had received from the Maine Anjou Association, and also letters of support from the Diploma Graduates Association. I don't know whether they produce cattle or not; I'm not aware what they actually do. And the Manitoba Beef Growers Association, a letter of support for a resolution passed at the Manitoba Cow-Calf Association, a resolution that read — are you aware of this? — "After a lengthy discussion, a motion was carried and the Manitoba Cow-Calf Association supports the principle of the establishment of The Cattlemen's Association."

Do you believe that that is really the true opinion of the grassroots?

MRS. LARSON: No, I believe that any organization can be run from the top and it is very easy to do so.

MR. ADAM: Then, in your opinion, there is not the wide support that has been indicated by the Minister and other groups, such as the Member for Rock Lake.

MRS. LARSON: Well, as I have said before, being active in the Canadian agricultural movement, I have telephoned many people; I have talked to people right across Manitoba except for the southeastern region. I haven't been able to contact people there. But all the people I have talked to — and as I said before, they are a cross-section of many different commodities and many different cattle producers — and I have not had one person say they were for this bill without a referendum, except for some of the people on the executive of the Cow-Calf Association, the heads of the breed associations, and the Beef Growers.

MR. ADAM: You are diametrically opposed to this Bill 25 in its entirety. That is what you indicate.

MRS. LARSON: What is the question again? I'm sorry; I didn't hear it.

MR. ADAM: You are diametrically opposed to the introduction of Bill 25, all it stands for.

MRS. LARSON: Yes.

MR. ADAM: That's what you indicate here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next speaker on the list is Mr. Bostrom. I'm assuming that . . . You have not yet completed your remarks?

MR. ADAM: I just have one or two more comments. Several people have commented that where there was such legislation, as in Saskatchewan and in Ontario, support was shown because very few people bothered to apply for a refund and the Minister has indicated this in the introduction of his bill. The Minister mentioned that. I believe he said that in Ontario there was only 3 percent

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

who bothered to ask for a rebate and there were others that made the same comment in varying degrees. Do you feel that the fact that a producer who is compelled to opt in, whether he wants to or not, and the fact that he doesn't apply for a refund, that indicates that he supports the organization?

MRS. LARSON: No, it does not. I would not withdraw my money either, because I would want to have a say in the Cattlemen's Association. Otherwise, it would be run by people that just paid their money. If everyone took their money out — well, not everyone but a large majority took that money out — then I feel that only a few people would speak for the organization and I do not like to have people speak for the organization without the Cattle Producers having a proper say.

You mentioned Saskatchewan, Alberta — I'm glad you mentioned that, because I talked to quite a few people in Alberta. I was there on the Canadian Agricultural Movement. I was there to present briefs to Mr. Whelan. I was in Regina. I talked to people from Ontario, and apparently in all these provinces a number of grassroots' people are against the checkoff for various reasons and there are indications in Ontario there already is a group that has started to fight against it. I believe it's called Beef For The Future.

MR. ADAM: Are you aware that the legislation in Saskatchewan, similar legislation to this, has been amended to allow for immediate opting out?

MRS. LARSON: Yes, I am.

MR. ADAM: Well, checkoff legislation.

MRS. LARSON: I have read news about what happens . . .

MR. ADAM: It's not similar. I mean dissimilar legislation — dissimilar legislation. Let me correct myself — dissimilar legislation.

MRS. LARSON: I have read the newspapers and I have seen that they have the chance to checkoff whether they want to pay into the fund or not. I think that's a very good idea if it's going to be a checkoff. I do not know exactly how it's being run or how it originated in the first place, but I do know that some producers did not even know that they were paying into this until I brought it to their attention.

MR. ADAM: Is that so? Are you aware also that the big objection in Saskatchewan was the provision that they could only have a rebate at the end of the year? And the other very violent objection was that most of the funds were going to the federal association for administration purposes. In fact, the record shows that since its inception in Saskatchewan \$303,640 went to the CCA, out of a total of \$550,445.

But what I wanted to point out is the contention that if a person doesn't apply for a rebate, that indicates support. And here's what the Saskatchewan Association, the SSGA has indicated. I ask you here, now, to consider this. The Saskatchewan Association predicts because of the immediate opt-out feature, that the revenues will drop by 50 percent. So would that, do you think, contradict the statements of the Minister and others who have said that because people don't ask for a rebate they still support the association?O

MRS. LARSON: Well, I don't know how anyone can predict anything like that until it actually happens.

MR. ADAM: That's all for now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next questioner is Mr. Bostrom.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to congratulate the witness for a presentation of an excellent brief. I believe that she has pointed out all the shortcomings of this very regressive legislation that is being presented before the Legislature.

I'd like to ask the witness if this bill is passed in its present form requiring every cattle producer in the province to automatically become a member by law, and to abide by the regulations of this association, in the event that this bill is passed, do you personally intend to continue to protest this type of law being imposed on the cattle producers of Manitoba?

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MRS. LARSON: Yes, I will continue. I don't know how long my energy will last. I have been under grief, stress since February since I first was aware of this draft, and when it was mentioned in the Throne Speech, I did not ever think it would come into legislation, but when I actually saw it, was greatly concerned, and when I saw the bill I was even more so. But I would continue to fight as long as my energies last.

MR. BOSTROM: And my second question is, given your knowledge of the cattle producers in Manitoba, those you've talked to and those you know about through your experience in the industry, do you think other cattle producers will continue to protest this law, if it is passed in its present form?

MRS. LARSON: Yes, I'm sure they will. A lot of producers could not be here because it's understandable that now is a very busy time, whether it rains or not you always have to be there, and the rain hits one area and not the other, so a lot of producers had wanted to come but some are afraid to present a brief, others are too busy, and as a result more briefs, perhaps, would have been made if the time had been better.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That completes my questioning.

MR. CHAIAN: Mr. Downey.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mrs. Larson, I'd like to ask you, did you have an opportunity to discuss this proposed cattlemen's association with my department?

MRS. LARSON: I had tried to get the opportunity in different ways, but I didn't have the opportunity.

MR. DOWNEY: Were you not a part of a Cow-Calf Association that participated in discussions with a member from my department?

MRS. LARSON: No, I was not, unfortunately.

MR. DOWNEY: Were you not a part of the association that were invited to discuss with a member of my department?

MRS. LARSON: We never received any such an invitation.

MR. DOWNEY: As it was advertised in local newspapers, farm papers, that there was an opportunity to discuss the proposed livestock association?

MRS. LARSON: I guess at that time I didn't read the papers, sorry.

MR. DOWNEY: In regards to the meeting that was held at Selkirk, what kind of an answer did you receive from my office in regard to my attending that meeting?

MRS. LARSON: The meeting was on a Wednesday; I'm not sure exactly of the date but the Friday before the meeting — Friday, approximately 8:00 o'clock — Mr. Al Church phoned my house. He asked for my husband, because my husband is the president and he was the one that had made the invitation. I talked to Mr. Church, and he said that you, yourself, had dropped my letter on his desk and asked him to do something about it, and he questioned me on it.

MR. DOWNEY: I would just like to clarify that. I believe that I had indicated to him that I was in Estimates, and I would be unable to attend the meeting, but that the time element for one thing, the short notice made it difficult for me to attend that particular meeting, because of the fact that we were busy. Another particular time you have said that I would not meet with your group, when coming to the Legislative Buildings. I believe that I had indicated to you, or had people indicate to you that I would meet with you at a time that was prearranged so that I could have an opportunity to setup a schedule to meet with you. Is that not the correct?

MRS. LARSON: Well, answering the first question first, I believe I had indicated in the letter that we would be glad to meet with you at any other time, that meeting was called for March, but three months have transpired, and I'm sure that if you had really wanted to come to our meeting, you would have sent a letter in response to the letter we had sent you.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. DOWNEY: I would just like to clarify for the record that I receive quite a few invitations to go to different places, and I am unable to attend them all, and I believe that you did have indications from my office that I would be unable to be there, if the information that I have received is correct from my department.

MRS. LARSON: Also for the record, I'd like to make it known that I had asked for yourself, and understanding that you could have been busy and not be able to attend we had asked for someone else to be sent in your place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ferguson.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Larson, I'm glad to see you out with your brief. We met, I guess, on the Legislature steps. There are just a couple of questions I would like to ask you.

You are representing the agricultural movement?

MRS. LARSON: No, as I said before, I'm not representing the agricultural movement because I do not feel I can represent it without having held meetings, and being given the okay to present this brief on their behalf, but I am an individual in it, and everyone is a spokesman and I'm speaking for myself as an individual involved in the Canadian Agriculture Movement.

MR. FERGUSON: Okay. You are aware that Mr. Downey, as Minister, has signified that he is quite willing to accept amendments and appreciates the fact that people like yourself are appearing, and suggesting amendments. I think you are quite aware, also, that this provisional board basically has no say except to arrive at a voters list and a few of the regulations, that the only board with any say so will be an elected board.

MR. LARSON: Yes, but I'm afraid of who's going to be elected when the appointed board has the power to decide who is to be eligible to vote. This is my great fear.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, I can assure you that we, as politicians, are afraid who is going to be elected when we go into an election also.

One other thing, I take it that you and your husband run a herd of cattle together . . .

MRS. LARSON: Yes, that's what I just said, when I began my brief.

MR. FERGUSON: Did you both have a ballot to vote last spring?

MRS. LARSON: No, we did not. There was only one ballot although more than one had been sent out. We have three people, well, actually two people, my father-in-law and my husband are on the Stabilization Program, so they had both been sent a ballot. We called into the office and asked if we should fill out both ballots saying that there's only supposed to be one for each unit and they suggested that we should not do that, that it was illegal, we did not do that, we only took one vote, and I did not vote.

MR. FERGUSON: Okay, thank you, Mrs. Larson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

MR. USKIW: Yes, the Minister of Agriculture has indicated in his comments that for some reason or other he was unable to respond to a request from your organization. For the purpose of the record, am I correct in recalling that you had stated that you had given an option to the Minister's office, to change the date to suit his convenience?

MRS. LARSON: Yes, I had.

MR. USKIW: That's fine, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions for this witness? There being none, thank you Mrs. Larson.

MRS. LARSON: Thank you.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would point out to all witnesses that the same procedure that we used last night can apply tonight. For those people who for various reasons are unable to attend our proceedings tomorrow, because I don't think we will complete all the briefs this evening, for those of you who are some great distance from the city and must have your brief in tonight, make yourselves known to the Clerk, the gentleman at the small table to my right, and your brief will be heard. It has been brought to my attention already by the Clerk that Mr. Harvey Dann, for personal reasons, cannot be present tomorrow, and for that reason we will hear your brief now, Mr. Dann.

MR. HARVEY DANN: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I am appearing here tonight as a manager of a farm, a cattle feeder, and past president of the Manitoba Beef Grocers.

In a few preliminary remarks I would like to . . . In listening to some of the papers, I am wondering how many people you are forcing to stay in the cattle business in Manitoba.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: State your point of order.

MR. USKIW: I hate to interrupt our witness, but before it escapes the committee, has the Clerk picked up a copy of a letter that was read from by the previous speaker and which was committed to tabling for the purpose of the members of this committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That point of order is well taken. Would Mrs. Larson please deposit the letter referred to in her remarks with the Clerk. Could you continue, Mr. Dann.

MR. DANN: As a Manitoban, I feel we have a lot of opportunity here in the cattle business. We have spent a lot of time and effort developing and we do have the agricultural base to do it in Manitoba. We don't have the oil of Alberta, we don't have the potash of Saskatchewan, but we do have a terrific agriculture base. We have a packing house industry and we are in the middle of Canada to develop markets. Therefore, I would like to take a positive approach of what a checkoff may do under good leadership for the industry in Manitoba and the organization will only be as good as the people who are involved.

This is how I expect the 25 cent hedge to work. First of all in beef promotion and public information, we have spent a considerable amount of time trying to help people understand the beef industry, both the ones that are in it and who are only consumers in the sense that they don't produce it. Everyone is a consumer, as somebody stated earlier.

Public information: We in the organization have' in the past and in the present, spent considerable time trying to develop public information for everyone to use who markets beef. Part of the problem is the producers themselves. It is easy to always pass the buck to somebody else; somebody should provide information; somebody should do this and somebody should do that. But if we are going to be responsible, we have got to handle the situation ourselves and in a manner that everyone can understand it.

Legislative affairs is another area that I think that people in the industry who want to think positively and realistically can be a great help to you elected people. Some programs have been developed in the past that, I think if there had been some input by organization people, that if the thing went wrong, the people who are involved in doing it would be the ones responsible to the rest of the organization. Unfortunately, the buck seems to stop at the Minister of Agriculture, and he is not God, whether he thinks it or not. I would like to see input from organization people to carry out these different functions.

Market Information: Again, for anyone' any size, the availability of information helps everyone. People buying your fat cattle or people buying your feeder cattle, whatever, are not going to pay any more than they have to and if someone sells a product who is ill-informed on the pricing procedures, it disrupts everything for everyone and I think that we have got a long way to go but you can only do so much with limited resources and input.

We are sadly lacking in research in this province. We need a barley that will grow 100 bushels to the acre as a rule, not an exception, because on a world market of pricing, the dollar return per acre counts and in the same comparison, if we only produce Cadillac-type grains, there will only be a few people who can afford to buy them, and not keep us competitive in the industry.

I think seminars and workshops are a must if people are to understand what they are marketing. I would envision and would encourage that people from all parts of the province take a day or so and visit, first of all, live animals and the animals hung up in the coolers, to know what they are

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

selling. The packers are more than willing to show people around. I spent time at a packing house; I know how they feel, but again, it is a producer's responsibility and a producer organization's responsibility to help set these things up. They are available for the asking.

Industry News: With the cattle cycle the way it is, and politics the way they are, it is purely coincidental if they run together in giving out the type of information that a producer can make decisions on.

Someone earlier mentioned about membership involvement and I fully agree with it. It is hard for one who is 200 or 300 miles away from Winnipeg to get in to town a long way for a meeting, but it can be set up if given an opportunity to do this. Again, if the people who are put in there have ulterior motives, it will be for a short time. The organization is voted on every day and if 50 percent of the people pull their money out, the directors pretty seriously should look at what they are doing.

I think that in summarizing it is important to think positively and practically and to look at it. We can be competitive and if you don't feel you can be competitive it is your privilege not to be involved. We have kept the industry open, that we don't eliminate anybody from getting in. One thought in mind, or saying in mind, that I have used before: If you can't stand the heat of the fire, get out of the kitchen. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Dann. Will you submit to questions from members of the committee?

MR. DANN: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Dann whether he has any comment to make on the letter written by the Beef Growers Association and read in this committee just moments ago by the previous speaker? Having been the president of the Beef Grocers Association, how do you look upon that letter, Sir?

MR. DANN: I'm sorry, Mr. Uskiw, I wasn't here for the first part of the presentation so I did not hear the letter, I'm sorry.

MR. USKIW: In your comments, sir, you suggest that it is important to do a job with respect to market information, and I want you to comment on what market information would do for us on the basis of the report of the Inquiry Commission into beef marketing in Manitoba, the 1976 report. Yes, January of 1976, and I'm not sure if you're familiar with it. For the benefit of facilitating your answer, I will read to you some of the recommendations and observations. Then I would like you to comment on how your market information program as envisaged in this bill would do something in that regard.

On Page 3 of the Commission's report the following is stated: "In other respects, however, the marketing system is seriously deficient. The Commission found that for many producers and consumers the marketing system is a jungle, replete with misinformation, inaccurate grading standards, inconsistent price relationships, incredible price discrimination, incomprehensible merchandising practices and unconscionable service charges." Can you tell me what market information service you will provide through Bill 25 that will redress those grievances?

MR. DANN: I would suggest that we first of all could do more on a job on our railway pricing service and get it more widely recognized. I feel that people selling live fat cattle could get their sales into a central place in which they are again turned out as information, updated regularly as something new comes in. I would suggest that producers get to know their product before they're selling it and they many not feel as if they've been so badly done. I've seen some terrible examples of so-called fat cattle and I think that this is where we who are fortunate enough to have been involved and are closer to city can help out and make it a better industry and better information.

MR. USKIW: What powers do you see in Bill 25 that will allow your association to deal with absolute and blatant price discrimination?

MR. DANN: Well, I think that our past performance in our rail grade program, people who thought they had a problem, or if there was a problem, we endeavoured and got the situation corrected. Producers have called the association and in turn we have got hold of the packer involved — this is when I was involved directly with the marketing service, it's been passed on now — but I feel

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

that there has been recourse used in its best way possible and the power here gives some the right to find out information if there's a problem. Nine times out of ten it's a misunderstanding between two people. If you're familiar with the cattle business, a lot of it is done by word of mouth and becomes a misunderstanding.

I had an opportunity last week to hear a price that was quoted on hot versus cold. Now this was passed on to the association and the association is working on it and we're right back to the bill, Sir, that you brought in and brought information out. These are the kind of things that I would want to see done. If they weren't being done we wouldn't be serving our function properly.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, just to pursue the question, I am aware of your desire to redress these grievances. I'm asking you where in Bill 25 does it give you, the association, the authority to redress those grievances?

MR. DANN: In my interpretation, it would be in 7(1). That would be the area that I would think, that's my interpretation.

MR. USKIW: Well, as I interpret 7(1), the association may make regulations requiring information, but assuming you had the most devastating information, how would you go about enforcing an adjustment in a given situation where a farmer has been aggrieved?

MR. DANN: As I said earlier, if there's a misunderstanding been made, I'd say 100 percent of the time responsible people will make it right.

MR. USKIW: But, Sir, I'm dealing with the irresponsible and unethical now. Not everyone in the industry is responsible or ethical. There are some that are not, Sir, but people are not aware who they are, where they are, and how they may be harmed by them. They are innocent victims. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rock Lake says "hypothetical," if he wants me to read the whole Inquiry Commission Report I will begin now, chapter and verse, taken under oath, Mr. Chairman, and given as information to this Commission by the buyers, the meat packers of this province. Now it is their information that I will be reading to you.

MR. EINARSON: Don't waste your time, Sir.

MR. USKIW: Well, the Member for Rock Lake now doesn't want to hear, obviously, Mr. Speaker, because he may be one of those privileged sellers of cattle who indirectly is taking advantage of others who are not so privileged.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Einarson on a point of order.

MR. EINARSON: We're not here for any one member, and I say to the Member for Lac du Bonnet that he is not here to cast aspersions on other members of this committee, he's here for the purpose of asking the witness questions and seeking answers. What I do with my cattle and how I sell them is my business at the present time.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, just to satisfy the Member for Rock Lake, the Inquiry Commission did not name the Member for Rock Lake as being one of the beneficiaries of a corrupt system. I merely indicated it's possible that he could be whether he knows it or not, because this particular report deals with the problem of some people getting preferential treatment in the marketplace which is then taken out of the value of the carcasses delivered by other people who don't happen to have the same connection with the buyer. So, Mr. Chairman, I ask the witness before us, how are you able, in Bill 25, from a legal point of view, to redress that kind of a grievance?

MR. DANN: Well, I don't really feel it should go that far. If we provide the information as to what the price of animals are and a farmer knows his product, if he wants to sell it below that price that is his business.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, are you aware, Sir, that this study proved that most farmers were unaware that they were being cheated in the marketplace and therefore would have not launched a complaint?

MR. DANN: That study is taken so far out of context that it isn't even funny.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I then ask this witness whether he believes that the evidence taken under The Evidence Act is authentic or is he disregarding The Evidence Act of Manitoba and the information that was submitted under that Act and in this report?

MR. DANN: I would say that the specific situations are taken far out of context and that any marketing system is not perfect. Nobody's got a monopoly of brains on how to develop any system but we can work at it and try to achieve as best as possible. We don't have all the answers but we're willing to put our money on the line and try it.

MR. USKIW: I would then ask you, Sir, if you believe that it's proper for a government to pass a law that compels people to belong to an association that they wish not to belong to.

MR. DANN: In my opinion, they are not forced to belong to an association. They can opt out any time they want and as far as government passing laws and situations for the cattlemen in this province, it may not be perfect but it's a long way towards what was passed in the last eight years.

MR. USKIW: Well, perhaps the witness would want to elaborate on what laws were passed with respect to the beef industry in the last eight years.

MR. DANN: Programs, I should have said.

MR. USKIW: Programs. What has that got to do with legislation, sir?

MR. DANN: We are endeavouring here to set up something, that we can set up good programs that will be beneficial to the whole industry, and not give people a false sense of security.

MR. USKIW: Can you, sir, point out to me in Bill 25 where there is a section that allows an individual producer to opt out of this legislation and out of this association?

MR. DANN: It will come in the administration by-laws.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the witness, the law of the land is passed by the legislator, not by the by-laws passed by this association, and in this statute, as it is now before us, there is no opt out provision, and therefore the by-laws could not circumvent the intent of this legislation.

MR. DANN: It is our intention to have an easy opt out for people who don't want to belong, and they have every right — if someone has an opposite philosophy, I believe they should have the right not to have to pay into it. I fully agree with that.

MR. USKIW: All right then, would it be reasonable if we pursued the easy opt out procedure, to provide that opportunity before the first penny is deducted, as opposed to after it has been deducted?

MR. DANN: Administratively, we could spend all our money on that approach, we want to make it simple. The people, even though they opt out, would still benefit, they'll still be able to phone in and get market information, they'll still benefit from the research. We're not denying that, even though they're not paying.

MR. USKIW: Well, then I ask you, sir, to comment on the fact that in the province to the immediate west of us, they have had an opt-out situation after the fact. They have since amended the legislation providing that a person may opt out before any money is deducted, or at the plant gates, so to speak, or at the buyer's gate, so that the farmer indicates in advance that he wishes not to contribute to the association. Since it has been tried and proven to be not workable in Saskatchewan, as this bill suggests it should be, don't you think that it would be reasonable for legislators to make that provision for the producers of Manitoba, that is now being made effective in the Province of Saskatchewan?

MR. DANN: Saskatchewan has their problems with their Agricultural Minister too, sir, and the cattle industry has done well despite. It will be interesting, what happens in the other way. If more is eaten up in administration, that's less for research and market development and the things that we hope

to achieve.

MR. USKIW: Well. Then, sir, you are indicating that you are prepared to sacrifice the rights of the individual for the purpose of simplicity of collection of funds, so that you might generate more revenue for your objectives to be realized, even though they may not be the objectives of the person from whom you are collecting those funds.

MR. DANN: I would say, sir, that — don't refer to them as my objectives. I'm trying and attempting and will look at it as an industry-wide thing, and it's the industry of Manitoba we're talking about here, not my objectives.

MR. USKIW: Well, I am assuming, sir, that you are supporting Bill 25. At least that is what I get from your comment, and if therefore if you are, those are your objectives and I have to assume that the objectives are the same.

Do you believe in the purposes as outlined in Bill 25 on Page 1, sir? "Developing improved marketing methods, grading standards, quality standards, research and educational programs." Do you think those are very worthwhile objectives?

MR. DANN: I feel that they are very worthwhile.

MR. USKIW: Could you then explain to me the contradiction on 6(2) which removes any power with respect to improving marketing methods. Page 1 indicates that that is the purpose, and on Page 2, it takes that purpose away.

MR. DANN: They are two different things as far as I am concerned. We can try things out; we don't want to be involved, as I read it, in . . .

MR. USKIW: Who is "we", sir?

MR. DANN: The present people involved, the people that I would like to be part of.

MR. USKIW: Are you speaking for the Beef Growers Association, sir?

MR. DANN: Yes, I am.

MR. USKIW: All right, so when you say "we" you are referring to the Beef Growers' membership?

MR. DANN: I would have to say yes to that.

MR. USKIW: I see. You are satisfied, then, that the Minister is catering to the Manitoba Beef Grocers Association in that connection.

MR. DANN: I feel that the previous Minister looked after the Farmers Union for four years and I think that the Minister has seen fit that responsible efforts have come forward. He is looking at it. We are not getting everything just handed to us on a platter.

MR. USKIW: Let me pursue that point, sir. You have implied that the previous Minister did something in particular favourable to the Farmers Union of Manitoba and I would like you to know, sir — I would like to ask you whether you would support this bill if it didn't read the Cattle Producers Association Act, but read The Manitoba Farm Union Cattle Producers Association Act? Would you support the same bill if it had the same provisions?

MR. DANN: And the name was changed?

MR. USKIW: If we just changed the name and we left everything as it was but we called it the Manitoba Farm Union Cattle Producers Association Act.

MR. DANN: The name really doesn't matter to me, if we achieve the objectives that will develop the industry in this province.

MR. USKIW: I see. Are you aware, sir, that the Farm Union, which by the way presented a much more credible position to me a few years ago, that they wanted to be enshrined in legislation as

"the" association representing the farmers of Manitoba, on the basis that they had 50 percent plus of the farmers enrolled in their association? Are you aware that that request was made of the previous government?

MR. DANN: No, I wasn't, not until I heard it . . .

MR. USKIW: All right. Well, then, you are not then aware that that request was also denied, even though their provision was that over 50 percent of the farmers would first have to belong to their association before such a bill would be effective.

MR. DANN: I wasn't aware of it.

MR. USKIW: Do you agree with that kind of a request?

MR. DANN: They have their opportunity to put their view forward and obviously if you would have felt it would have passed, you would have tried to get it through.

MR. USKIW: Would you support me if I pass such a measure? Would you think that I, as Minister of the Crown, did the right thing in passing a law that says that the Farm Union is going to be the spokesman for all farmers in Manitoba?

MR. DANN: I think that you wouldn't be prepared to close the lid on agriculture in Manitoba.

MR. USKIW: You suggest, sir, then, that that is closing the lid? Well, since this particular group does not have to have any majority, in fact, it says only 14 people will constitute an association, you feel that this isn't closing the lid on Manitoba?

MR. DANN: If the people involved have another philosophy want to run and they become the directors of that association, then the association will have policies that they wish.

MR. USKIW: So you are making the point then, sir, that others have of your group have made yesterday, that since everyone will be able to participate and run for office and get elected and change the rules as they deem necessary, that this indeed will represent a democratic procedure.

MR. DANN: The only way we could make it more democratic for the industry to really forge on, is to have the cows vote.

MR. USKIW: All right. Then I ask you, sir, to tell me why there is any restriction in this legislation with respect to what this association may or may not do, since it is going to be democratically operated, people will run for office and will be elected before they can do anything, why do we have 6(2) in this legislation? Since you trust the election process, why do we have that proviso restricting the scope of their activities?

MR. DANN: Well, I think that being that we are supporting the bill now, we looked at it long term and what will be best for the industry, and it is our feeling that we don't want to have the product controlled. I know it won't be beneficial.

MR. USKIW: We? "We" is who?

MR. DANN: The people with the Beef Growers; the people that I work with.

MR. USKIW: Do they represent a majority of the beef producers in Manitoba, sir?

MR. DANN: There is representation from all different parts. A majority is a very hard thing to define. A majority of, say, active people who are really interested in if the industry goes ahead, I would think that they represent a good part.

MR. USKIW: Isn't it then a contradiction, sir, to say that we the minority will first predetermine the rules of the game and then we will have a democratic process to implement those rules?

MR. DANN: In my opinion, no.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. USKIW: You think that is not contradictory?

MR. DANN: No.

MR. USKIW: That the minority can decide the ground rules, and then wave the flag of democratic freedom since these people will then run for office and do whatever they want to do, and therefore there is nothing wrong with this legislation from a democratic point of view?

MR. DANN: In my opinion, no, because I'll tell you what will happen. If the directors are doing something that is opposed by a great number of the members, and a great number of members withdraw their money, there is no more organization and directors would be well advised to look at their plans.

MR. USKIW: Let's then take the most extreme proposition. Let's assume that at your annual meeting and all of your regional meetings two years from now, that you have a unanimous resolution, well, if not unanimous, 60 percent, and if not 60, 55, or 51 of your delegate body voting that we want to establish a marketing board for beef in Manitoba, do you think they should be able to do so?

MR. DANN: If the majority wants to go with it, fine.

MR. USKIW: All right, then I ask you why is 6(2) prohibiting that from taking place?

MR. DANN: Because this is the bill we are discussing right now and this is what we believe . . .

MR. USKIW: Then you are saying that the majority will not have their say, that regardless of 100 percent of the delegate body moving such a motion, that in your view, it should be predetermined today that it can never do that.

MR. DANN: I think that if a majority feel that way, that probably something will be able to put in it it can happen if the majority feel that way. We're not selling anybody on a bill of goods. We're setting it out how we think the industry can be improved. We're going behind in this province right now and want to improve it.

MR. USKIW: Then, sir, why don't we have a bill that simply says there shall be a cattle produce association and that the board of directors will be elected and they can do anything they please with the laws of the Province of Manitoba, and no restriction in this legislation at all?

MR. DANN: Because, in sitting down, there was a lot of work that has gone into this bill by interested people in the industry, and we do not want to restrict the product; we do not want to restrict anybody from getting into the business.

MR. USKIW: Who is "we," sir?

MR. DANN: We?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. DANN: The Beef Grocers organization that I happen to be part of, our company . . .

MR. USKIW: But you have told me you are the minority now, so why should the minority predetermine what the majority should be doing?

MR. DANN: I don't believe I said that we were a minority.

MR. USKIW: Yes, you indicated to me that you didn't have 50 percent of the producers belonging to your association.

MR. DANN: That's right, but the interested people in the industry in Manitoba — we would have the majority.

MR. USKIW: So you are saying that quite a number of people are disinterested, therefore, of the interested group, you are the majority?

MR. DANN: I would say that's right.

MR. USKIW: I see. And you believe that even though you are going to rely on the elected process to determine how this organization will function, that you will not trust it far enough to let it do what it wants to do once it is elected.

MR. DANN: If that's how you interpret it . . . I don't interpret it that way.

MR. USKIW: This bill interprets it that way by denying it the freedom of action, sir. This bill is not a bill to give cattlemen freedom; this bill takes freedom away from cattlemen.

MR. DANN: No, it doesn't

MR. USKIW: Well, then, tell me, under this piece of legislation, how this association will be able to introduce a beef marketing board into effect in the Province of Manitoba with Section 6(2), if they decided that that's what they wanted to do, by a majority?

MR. DANN: I wouldn't have the technical information on how to do it, but I am sure there is a way.

MR. USKIW: I see. Well, sir, maybe you have found a way in this legislation that has escaped me, sir. I can't find it.

MR. DANN: Well that's good.

MR. USKIW: Yes. Let me then pursue the bill further, sir. We notice here that a majority decision of this agency, a board of 14 people, "A decision of a majority of the members present at a duly constituted meeting of the association is a decision of the association."

Do you think that two or three people should make a decision that will affect 15,000 producers in Manitoba? Section 3(3), at the top of Page 3, a majority decision.

MR. DANN: I don't see anything wrong with that.

MR. USKIW: So if five people show up to a meeting, three people can make a decision. Is that what you are saying?

MR. DANN: If it has been properly advertised and the proper procedure done, I don't see anything wrong with it. I cannot foresee that happening if there are interested people in the province. If they are not any more interested in their industry than that, well, that's what will happen.

MR. USKIW: I suppose it is no more absurd than the 14 people who are going to make decisions for 14,000 without having been elected by the producers of Manitoba.

MR. DANN: As I recall it, in a previous vote, there was going to be an elected board to start things off.

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. DANN: I think that at the time that we were relying on fair judgment on your part for 14 people, and I think that the government of the day will have fair judgment on the people that they appoint.

MR. USKIW: No, sir, I beg to differ. The people were to be elected from day one. It was not my judgment, sir, it would be the judgment of 14,000 registered voters.

MR. DANN: In 1974, I'm talking about.

MR. USKIW: In 1974 that was, sir, your proposal, not mine, that was put to a vote.

MR. DANN: That was our proposal with your twists to it.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, I beg to take issue. That proposal was drafted by the Manitoba

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

Beef Growers Association and the referendum was carried out by the Manitoba Marketing Board under The Natural Products Marketing Act.

MR. DANN: That's right, on a compulsory checkoff.

MR. USKIW: That is correct.

MR. DANN: We wanted a voluntary checkoff, and you said if there was going to be a vote at all, it would be on a compulsory checkoff.

MR. USKIW: Sir, your form of volunteerism was very identical to Bill 25, also absurd.

MR. DANN: That just depends on whose opinion it is.

MR. USKIW: You are absolutely correct, sir, you and I don't agree. Do you believe that 14 people should make the decisions for all of the beef producers in Manitoba?

MR. DANN: We have got how many people in the Legislature?

MR. USKIW: These are not elected; these are appointed people, appointed by the Minister. —(Interjection)— Oh, yes, they do. Do you think that that is right?

MR. DANN: I think that it is a good start to getting a proper association.

MR. USKIW: Do you think that it is right that if a beef producer or a group of them don't like a decision, that they made, that there is no way they can appeal that decision?

MR. DANN: They will have an opportunity. Anybody who disagrees, who wants to be part of the organization, they can run for office and be one of those 14 people in later years, or the later year, whatever is occurring.

MR. USKIW: Well, you are aware of course that this organization becomes effective on the date of proclamation?

MR. DANN: Yes.

MR. USKIW: That could be a week from today.

MR. DANN: I would hope that it is moved on fairly fast so that we can start carrying out the job that . . .

MR. USKIW: You are aware, sir, that elections don't have to be held until the end of 1979?

MR. DANN: I know that responsible people will want to get the elections in place as soon as possible.

MR. USKIW: Well, I'm talking about the bill. The bill indicates that the election shall take place before the end of 1979. In the meantime, it provides for a provisional board of 14 persons who may make decisions non-appealable to anyone. Do you think that is right?

MR. DANN: Yes, because there has got to be a first stand taken somewhere to set up something, and then you work from there.

MR. USKIW: All right. So do you believe then that it would be right if we abolished Law Amendments Committee and that you could not present your views here today? Is that what you are saying?

MR. DANN: After last night and tonight, I could give an opinion on that.

MR. USKIW: Well, I'm asking for it, sir. I want your opinion.

MR. DANN: Okay, I think that we have seen a lot of nit-picking. It is something like going to your banker and wanting '\$100,000' and he says all the cows are going to die twice and therefore he

won't give it to you. There is not an element — you are throwing up every possible worst situation that could happen and I think that under any circumstance, if people were to believe the worst things would happen, I wouldn't be supporting the bill today.

MR. USKIW: Sir, do you think that legislators should pass bills so loosely that sometimes the worst thing could happen?

MR. DANN: I think that that is done quite often.

MR. USKIW: It is done quite often, but do you think it should be done?

MR. DANN: Well, I don't think anything is in concrete. I don't think that anybody is perfect and there is not a perfect bill written yet by anybody.

MR. USKIW: But you would not be offended if you weren't able to appear and present your views to the Legislature?

MR. DANN: I think that the people involved in the Legislature know our feelings.

MR. USKIW: But you wouldn't be offended if you didn't have this opportunity? You think that would be efficient government?

MR. DANN: That can be debatable.

MR. USKIW: I agree it can be but I want your opinion, sir. Do you believe that this is a worthwhile exercise, that you have a right to present your views on legislation?

MR. DANN: I think that it is being dragged over the coals far too much for what we want to accomplish.

MR. USKIW: Do you think the balance of your association should not bother presenting their views to this committee?

MR. DANN: I never said that.

MR. USKIW: Oh, you would prefer that they do? All right. Then why wouldn't you want to allow the same opportunity to be given to a person, individual, or group of persons, who have a grievance as a result of a decision made by 14 persons appointed to this association? Don't you think they should have someone to go to to launch their grievance?

MR. DANN: As I said earlier, the organization is being voted on every day.

MR. USKIW: No, no, this is an appointed board. This is not being voted on; this is an appointed body with no appeal provisions.

MR. DANN: There has got to be a start made somewhere in an organization. We are only 20 years behind everybody else and now is the time to get on with the show.

MR. USKIW: Regardless of anybody's feelings, of course.

MR. DANN: Not regardless of anybody's feelings, because we can stay here until sunset tomorrow and it wouldn't be any difference to anybody's feelings.

MR. USKIW: Since we now regard other people's feelings even if they are different from ours, how would we allow them to introduce their views?

MR. DANN: They are having their opinions right now and that to me is sufficient, and we get started on something. I take the view on these things that nothing is in concrete and improvements can be made as we go along, or if something is detrimental, that that should be removed too.

MR. USKIW: So you believe, then, sir, that if we pass this bill, that it is not unreasonable to expect someone who has a grievance to wait a whole year in order to bring an amendment to this Act in order to get redress? You believe that is reasonable?

MR. DANN: I believe it is reasonable because this could be dragged on indefinitely and there could never be anything established, as in any other bill.

MR. USKIW: Would you then indicate to me that all of our legislation should have no provisions for appeal then; we can always meet in the Legislature and redress the grievances on every piece of legislation that we pass? Do you think that is reasonable?

MR. DANN: I think a lot more would get done sometimes and the people would have to live with a responsible decision and that would be their part, where they would tend to think a little bit about the decision they made.

MR. USKIW: You have just confirmed my suspicions about the credibility of some people advocating Bill 25, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that complete your questions?

MR. USKIW: Do you believe, sir, that it is right that this association, appointed by the Minister, without an appeal provision, should finance another association?

MR. DANN: What do you mean by that?

MR. USKIW: Should they give a grant to the Canadian Cattlemen's Association?

MR. DANN: In my opinion, it will be the directors who decide when it gets going, if it ever . . .

MR. USKIW: Yes, but they are appointed directors at this stage.

MR. DANN: Yes, but the appointed directors do not have anything to give anybody.

MR. USKIW: They can pass a by-law suggesting that there shall be a contribution to the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, can they not?

MR. DANN: I suppose they could if they wanted to.

MR. USKIW: And they can also pass a by-law suggesting that there can be a contribution to the Farm Bureau.

MR. DANN: I suppose they could, if they wanted to.

MR. USKIW: And to the Farm Union.

MR. DANN: I suppose they could, if they wanted to.

MR. USKIW: Right. And do you think that people who object to having their money finance organizations they are opposed to, should have no right of appeal?

MR. DANN: They are appealing when they withdraw their support.

MR. USKIW: But they are not doing that yet, sir. We are talking about the provisional board.

MR. DANN: I think that, as I said earlier, it is a starting point. We get the organization going and get some of the things started, and I'll stick by that.

MR. USKIW: How is this association going to be financed before they are in a position to collect levies? Do you have any idea?

MR. DANN: I don't know, but I would assume they would probably have to borrow money, something of that nature.

MR. USKIW: Do you believe that any of the moneys that are raised pursuant to the passage of this Act should be placed in a position that would retire any debts of any past associations?

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. DANN: This is not for a past association. It is a start-up cost of the proposed association.

MR. USKIW: So are you suggesting to me, sir, that you are in agreement with me that not a penny of this money should go towards any existing associations for the retirement of debts, expenses, etcetera?

MR. DANN: If there are obligations which have been made, they would have to honour them, but if there were not obligations made, I would think honour them.

MR. USKIW: If who has made obligations, sir?

MR. DANN: Contract work, and I would think that you would honour your commitments.

MR. USKIW: Well, sir, when you say you would honour your commitments, who are you referring to because we don't have an association yet so obviously there are zero commitments until this bill is passed.

MR. DANN: Well, if there are zero commitments then there would be zero to honour, wouldn't there?

MR. USKIW: So you are suggesting that moneys collected under this legislation should be used only for the purposes of future costs of this association?

MR. DANN: I don't know the commitments. I am not a director any more and I don't know the commitments you are talking about.

MR. USKIW: What does your directorship have to do with commitments in this legislation, sir?

MR. DANN: You suggested earlier the commitments of these proposed directors, and if there are no commitments, they wouldn't have to honour them.

MR. USKIW: I see. You are not referring to the commitments of the Beef Growers Association?

MR. DANN: The commitments of the Beef Growers Association?

MR. USKIW: Yes. You are not alluding to those commitments?

MR. DANN: What commitments have been made there?

MR. USKIW: Well, I'm asking, sir, I don't know.

MR. DANN: Well, I don't know either.

MR. USKIW: Okay. That's fine for the moment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Einarson.

MR. EINARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to very briefly ask a question of the witness, Mr. Dann. I presume you have perused The Cattle Producers Association Act?

MR. DANN: Yes, I have.

MR. EINARSON: I am just wondering if you agree that the purpose and intent of this bill is in number 2, namely the purpose of it, is an important section of this bill?

MR. DANN: Yes, it is.

MR. EINARSON: I am just wondering, there are a number of aspects of this particular section of the Act, mainly the purpose of it, and one of them that interests me is the grading standards. I

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

would like to ask you, Mr. Dann, in your experience in marketing beef cattle over the years, whether you think that there is an improvement to be made in the grading of our beef, namely A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4 carcasses of beef?

MR. DANN: In my opinion, the grading system meets my needs as far as being able to fatten cattle to meet those needs and provide a product that is satisfactory to the consumer.

MR. EINARSON: Would you say that possibly an improvement could be made insofar as the discrepancies in the variation of prices paid on the various grades.

MR. DANN: This is a good observation but unfortunately animals are like people, they aren't all built the same way. You've got to work on averages.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, yes, that's fine. I just wanted to find out your views on this because I just wondered, having listened to other farmers, whether we could have some reduction in the spreads and variations, say of a A3 and A4, or even into the C classes of beef according to the weight scales. I just wondered if by doing some research in that area whether that would add dollars to the pockets of the beef producers.

MR. DANN: I would say anything we can do to help a producer understand the grading system. I think once he understands it, for instance, say seeing cutouts on an A3 to an A4 compared to an A1, he would understand what we're trying to do. There's a lot of people, in my opinion, that don't understand the grading system and we've got an educational program to do right there involve bringing people in, letting them see their animals hung up.

MR. FERGUSON: In other words, through you, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Dann, are you then saying that individual farmers themselves should probably take a little more time and greater interest in coming in to see how their animals grade and to see the quality and in this way would enhance their appreciation of the whole grading system.

MR. DANN: I would definitely agree with you.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questioners for this witness? Mr. Adam.

MR. ADAM: Thank you. Mr. Dann, I just have the one question. I know that once funds have been made available through a checkoff, once this association has the finances available, it will be up to the board to decide how this money shall be spent. I'm just wondering, as a past-president of the Manitoba Beef Growers, how would you like to see the money allocated? Are you able to give us any opinion at this particular time as to how . . . You mentioned research; that's why I asked this question, I know that that question does create some concern that there hasn't been enough research. So I'm just wondering, on a percentage basis, if you had \$100,000 available to disperse for different things that this association could do for improvement of the cattle industry, how would you disperse these funds? In your own view — never mind what the board is going to do, what would you do?

MR. DANN: Right. My own view would be that we get our market information service, put a lot more effort into that, where we get the live sales, dressed sales, and any pertinent information as weight rates, etc., by the producers, sending the information in as it happens. I would hope we could spend a fair amount of time in trying to show farmers the advantage of getting good information into the central bank to be fed out again. I would hope that we could spend a fair amount of time and effort and money in helping producers just to understand their product as far as yields and grades, what they really mean, how it affects them. I think those are the two big areas that we should tackle first.

MR. ADAM: Would you consider this to be all research, what you have mentioned now? Is that all in the area of research, or what do you define as research?

MR. DANN: I would say that research would be helping — joint efforts with other provinces — if there is some calf disease, developing this sort of thing, rather than everyone trying to go their own way — working with other provinces on a real good research program in calf scours, on things fitting at the time, whether it's in the cow-calf industry or the feeders, wherever. But it seems to

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

me that we've got to work with other people to do this and we all benefit.

MR. ADAM: What about the area of market development, to find more markets for beef?

MR. DANN: I think with our resources to start with, again we'd have to work with other provinces in order to do this. I don't think that the amount of money that would be available could significantly help that area. I feel the market information and producer involvement are the two things that are greatly needed.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I asked that question because I'm perusing the Alberta Cattle Commission budget for 1977-78 here and I notice that from revenues of nearly \$600,000, there is only \$6,500 allocated for market development and you know, I find that insignificant in an amount of nearly \$600,000 for revenue. I find that the administration costs get probably the largest percentage of the total revenues, administration costs of the Cattlemen's Association, federally and provincially.

MR. DANN: According to your figures, how many dollars are spent in administration of the Cattlemen's Association in Alberta?

MR. ADAM: Well, I have figures here for the Canadian Cattlemen's Association. I believe that's the federal body. It would be \$132,000. But then there's the provincial group as well. It is something like \$263,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would caution all members to confine their questions as closely as possible to No. 1, Bill 25, and No. 2, the presentation made by the witness. If we can confine our remarks as closely as possible in those two areas, I'm sure we can conduct our business in the most expeditious manner.

Mr. Adam.

MR. ADAM: Well, on that point, Mr. Chairman, what I was trying to clear in my mind was the purpose of Bill 25 as I see it, is primarily to find a source of finances to finance some activities of an association, part of which will be finding markets, research for animal disease and what have you. I'm asking from this witness, in good faith, and I think he's trying to answer in good faith, his opinion, and I'm wondering what his opinion is on this particular question The Alberta group allocated \$8,500 last year for market development and this year \$2,000 less. I find that very insignificant as far as finding markets for cattlemen.

MR. DANN: Well, for the record, Mr. Chairman, our figures may not jive but I got them today for the Alberta Cattle Commission in the year 1976 to 1977, September 30th, and on new markets, you're right at \$8,000; you're looking at producer communications or market information, there was a total of \$68,000 spent, \$15,000 from the Alberta Cattle Commission and the rest from the province. There were \$49,000 given to the Beef Information Centre. Out of the total expenditures of some \$359,000, \$105,000 went to consumer education, promotion and market development. So the \$8,000 was only one little segment of the whole thing.

MR. ADAM: Have you any information on the Saskatchewan operation at all.

MR. DANN: No, I don't.

MR. ADAM: Well, apparently what I have here is that in 1977 they haven't allocated any funds whatsoever for market development of the amounts they receive. But anyway, I think I got pretty well the information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Uskiw.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to now pursue the question of principle. You, sir, talked about the importance of providing good information to be of some measureable benefit to the beef producers of this province having to do with prices and grades and so on. How do you view this association's role in that connection, assuming, for example, that Harvey Dann and his cattle that were shipped today received preferential price treatment and Mr. Adam's cattle shipped on the same day, of the same quality, received inferior price treatment. Do you see the role of this agency as being one that would get onto Dennis Shebannick's CBC program and shouting to the rooftops that there's been a ripoff at the packers today?

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. DANN: Well, heaven forbid if we choose the CBC to do that.

MR. USKIW: Well, take your choice, Sir, take your choice. I merely point that out because many farmers listen to the CBC Farm Program. But for whatever it's worth, what would be the role of this association in dealing with that kind of a situation?

MR. DANN: I would envision this happening: Mr. Dann's preferential treatment has come up many times, though I can't see everybody knows more about it than I do . . .

MR. USKIW: How do you do it?

MR. DANN: I don't even know. But anyway, I would envision this: If I sell cattle, live or dressed, I would forward my price to the Market Information Service. When Mr. Adam phones in that he has some cattle for sale, he gets an idea what they're worth, what the market trend has been, then he makes his decision to sell, and vice-versa. If Mr. Adam phones in first, that's what I would envision him doing.

MR. USKIW: Well, let's assume that he phones in and he knows how much Harvey Dann got but he got 10 cents a pound less. What is the role of this association in dealing with that kind of a situation?

MR. DANN: Well, if that was the case, I would say two fools met, one for offering 10 cents less and one for taking it.

MR. USKIW: Well, that, Sir, does not deal with the problems in the marketing system. You are not dealing with the fact that there are people that will not get involved in telephoning in advance but will merely use some of the information as a guideline and ship in their cattle to find out a week later, when they get their cheques, that they have been had.

MR. DANN: That is not true.

MR. USKIW: Now the process that you're suggesting can be very well handled without this association, and it is being done today. There are many farmers who know their way around the system, who phone for an adjustment and get an adjustment price. Unfortunately, the vast majority of people don't have those kinds of connections, nor do I see in this bill any means of providing those kinds of connections for the majority of people. Are you suggesting that the passage of this bill will ensure that there will be equal treatment to all producers who deliver cattle to the marketplace in Manitoba? Can you guarantee that, Sir?

MR. DANN: Never is a long time, but I would envision that if we put the market information out and a producer sells a product that you say he finds out a week later that he's been had, he obviously did not do a good job of merchandising his product.

MR. USKIW: Well, let me test you this way, Sir. If two or three years down the road after we have had the experience of Bill 25, that we get a Commission report similar to this one on price discrimination, do you think that would be reason enough to abolish Bill 25?

MR. DANN: Definitely not.

MR. USKIW: Oh, okay. Then what should we be doing?

MR. DANN: Well, I think before you again throw the cloak and the dagger out, you should have some of the background to . . .

MR. USKIW: Well, there's lots of it in here.

MR. DANN: . . . to people involved in the specific situations. I think that that would destroy your method of throwing out the daggers. It's the producers own fault if they do not approach somebody, if there's a problem, if there's been a wrong animal happened to get weighed. Nothing is infallible as long as it's touched by human hands.

MR. USKIW: But the Commission of Inquiry reported that the packers purposely have discriminated in their pricing by offering premiums to some people and discounts to others without any explanation.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

And the words used in the report are "price discrimination."

MR. DANN: That report was not written by someone who understood the cattle industry and I think that I take it in that context.

MR. USKIW: Are you suggesting then that the evidence that was compiled under The Evidence Act is not accurate?

MR. DANN: I would say if the background to that evidence had been put in there it would have been a lot better report.

MR. USKIW: You believe that Dr. Wood would sign his signature to a report that was erroneous?

MR. DANN: I don't know why the background of some of the specific situations wasn't put in there and giving a group of figures, as the old saying goes: "A liar can figure and figures can lie."

MR. USKIW: I see. Well, it's interesting to know that we can have lies under The Evidence Act anyway, even though the information was provided freely by the packers to the Commission.

Then explain to me why the Schumann Commission came up with very similar findings in 1964, I believe it was, or 1965; explain to me why the Federal Commission came up with similar findings. Are all of these reports false and not properly researched? Is it coincidental that federal and provincial Commissions of Inquiry of different governments happened to highlight the same problems in the marketing system?

MR. DANN: It all goes back to a producer, and not by any fault of his own, not understanding his product and not coming forward if he's got a problem and then if you want to achieve an end that everybody will be treated, as you say, equal, it's an impossibility because unless you are going to start putting cattle on an assembly line and spitting them out so they're all equal, all cattle are not worth the same thing.

MR. USKIW: Do you believe in the principle of equality of treatment, Sir?

MR. DANN: I believe in the principle of merchandising to the best of my ability.

MR. USKIW: Do you believe then that it's fair that you should negotiate a price advantage at the expense of your neighbour who happens to get a price disadvantage in order that you realize more money for your cattle?

MR. DANN: As I said, I believe in merchandising to the best of my ability. My neighbour has the same privilege. If information is given on my end, if I happen to be the one that's so-called getting the advantage, as you would say, if a barometer is set, my neighbour has the information on which to market his product.

MR. USKIW: If you and your neighbour both delivered cattle the same day, cattle of the same quality, kind, grade, etc., and this was a very particular close neighbour of yours, you curled together, you played pool together, you jumped into the swimming pool together, and you found out that the packer ripped him off \$500 on his load of cattle today in order to give you \$500 more, do you think you would accept that as being reasonable?

MR. DANN: I would not say that it would be \$500.00.

MR. USKIW: Well, I don't know the amount but I'm just pointing out, on a load of cattle, it could be \$500.00.

MR. DANN: First of all, you go back to all animals being the same. There are no two people feed cattle the same; there are no groups of cattle that yield the same or grade the same.

MR. USKIW: The Commission Report deals with identical situations wherein they point out very massive price discrimination and they point that out to the lack of some people's ability to publicly relate to their buyer and the, perhaps over enthusiastic relationship between other shippers and their buyer, and that it's summed up just in that way, that it depends who you know in the system, how big you are in the system, how important you are in the system. That's really the sum total

of it.

MR. DANN: I didn't realize we'd take an hour to get to the bigness because I expected to get that nailed to me the first time.

MR. USKIW: I didn't imply that.

MR. DANN: But anyway, as far as I'm concerned if you merchandise you give out the information, it's up to each individual to do the best he can. If he wants help to market his product, if he hasn't got the expertise, there are people he can hire to do it. There are all types of ways he can merchandise his product.

MR. USKIW: What, Sir, is your role in the industry?

MR. DANN: My role is a cattle feeder and cattle marketer.

MR. USKIW: You don't raise any cattle yourself.

MR. DANN: Personally, I fatten cattle, yes.

MR. USKIW: I didn't say fatten cattle, I'm talking about raising calves and feeding them out.

MR. DANN: Yes, unfortunately we do get in the cow-calf business every spring.

MR. USKIW: Every spring, accidentally.

MR. DANN: Yes.

MR. USKIW: I see, but that is not your main business.

MR. DANN: No, it is not.

MR. USKIW: What is your main line of business, Sir?

MR. DANN: Fattening cattle and marketing them.

MR. USKIW: These are cattle bought from other producers?

MR. DANN: Yes, Sir.

MR. USKIW: Do you not see some difficulty in combining the sellers of feeder cattle with the buyers of feeder cattle in the same association?

MR. DANN: No, I don't.

MR. USKIW: Whose interests shall prevail?

MR. DANN: Well, first of all, I think that again you're trying to pit one segment against the other.

MR. USKIW: No, I'm not. I'm asking you. No, I'm sorry, I'm not. I'm asking you whether it's compatible.

MR. DANN: Well, it's to our advantage to have a viable cow-calf industry so why would one try to get policies through that would eliminate cowcalf people?

MR. USKIW: Well, then let me pursue the question. Who is to determine the income of a cow-calf producer and his viability in order to bench mark the prices that he should get and the treatment that he should get in the marketplace and in turn the prices that the buyer should pay? Who should make that determination?

MR. DANN: The cow-calf operator.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. USKIW: The cow-calf operator. And you think that through this association he will be able to do that?

MR. DANN: I would hope so because as I would envision the people selling feeder cattle would be doing the same thing as we who sell fat cattle for the privilege of other producers selling feeder cattle. I would hope that's the way it would go.

MR. USKIW: Could you explain to me then why out of the last 25 years, that the cow-calf producers lost money in about 22 of them?

MR. DANN: They were not keeping a good set of records, possibly, and if they lost money for 22 out of 25 years . . .

MR. USKIW: Out of 25 years, yes.

MR. DANN: . . . they've got better staying power than I have.

MR. USKIW: Yes, that's right. They humble themselves quite a bit more.

MR. DANN: You feel so.

MR. USKIW: Oh, yes, otherwise they wouldn't be there today. Do you think that that is reasonable for a sector of the beef industry to always live in poverty while other sectors within the same industry enjoy the booms — and busts — but at least a boom once in a while?

MR. DANN: A cow-calf operator, nobody has got a gun to his head to have him stay in business. He's a voluntary person in business, just like I'm voluntarily feeding cattle.

MR. USKIW: And you believe that it's reasonable in a market economy that he might be exploited from time to time. That's nothing unusual in your mind.

MR. DANN: Again, a producer who gets to know his product he has alternatives too. Getting to understand his marketing system he can either market them himself or have a representative market for him.

MR. USKIW: Well, if we did a proper educational job to get him to understand the marketing system under Bill 25, and out of that educational process he concludes that the only way he can solve his marketing problem is by asking for the establishment of a marketing board, you would want to deny him that right in Bill 25.

MR. DANN: A marketing board for feeder cattle?

MR. USKIW: For all cattle.

MR. DANN: For feeders and fat cattle. That's an interesting approach because the fact of the matter is, if all cattle came to one spot, both feeder or fat cattle, all your cards are shown. I go out on the feeder market every Monday. I don't know how many feeder cattle are going to come. I can't wait until Thursday to decide what I'm going to do.

MR. USKIW: I didn't say that.

MR. DANN: Yes, but you're saying a cattle marketing board would solve the feeder man's problems.

MR. USKIW: No, I said that if through your education program in marketing it was discovered that that was the only solution to the problem, you would still insist that this legislation deny that solution to the cattlemen \$

MR. DANN: Yes, I would.

MR. USKIW: Because of the particular views of your minority group.

MR. DANN: It's not my minority group.

MR. USKIW: Well, of a minority group then.

MR. DANN: It is the majority of interested people in the industry in the province.

MR. USKIW: We now know that there are a handful of interested people amongst the beef industry in Manitoba. Let me pursue a more basic and fundamental question and it will be my last one. Do you believe that every association in Manitoba should be formed by an Act such as Bill 25 should the Manitoba Federation of Labour . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Downey on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: There is no point of order. You're trying to get to me and. . .

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there is a point of order. There is a repetitious question by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, that is the point of order. We've been over this question many times the same question.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture doesn't know what repetition is. He assumes that if you ask the same question of every witness, that that is repetition. That is not repetition, Sir, it is repetition only if you repeat the same question to the same witness. And the same point of order has been raised a number of times by the Minister yesterday and ruled out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would perceive the point of order raised as no point of order.

MR. USKIW: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will simply call on all members and point out to all members that we have a substantial number of witnesses to appear before us and if the remarks could be kept as much to the point as possible so that we can conduct our business in an efficient manner so that those witnesses that have travelled substantial distances to be here can be heard and inconvenienced as little as possible.

Mr. Uskiw, continue, please.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, you're not suggesting that the remarks have not been to the point, I presume.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have pointed out to all members as to how I feel they should conduct their questions. The Member for Lac du Bonnet can draw whichever conclusion from those remarks he wishes. Continue please.

MR. USKIW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now let me pursue, for the first time, Sir, this question with you. Do you believe that legislation should be introduced establishing all forms of association in Manitoba similar to Bill 25?

MR. DANN: If the people involved wish to have legislation in that manner, they should go through the proper channels and take it up with the powers to be. I'm concerned about the beef industry right at the moment.

MR. USKIW: Yes, all right, but would you agree then that we should treat people equally?

MR. DANN: If it's the desire of the other people involved, if they want to come through the same channels, I think they're entitled to.

MR. USKIW: Okay, let me then pursue my point. Should the Province of Manitoba pass a law that would indicate, that would compel, every working man in Manitoba to be a member of the Federation of Labour?

MR. DANN: Voluntarily?

MR. USKIW: On the same principles as Bill 25, chapter and verse, would you subscribe to the

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

government of Manitoba passing a law that said that every worker in Manitoba shall be a member of the Manitoba Federation of Labour with all the powers that are in Bill 25?

MR. DANN: If the people came forward and were interested in doing that they should have their opportunity to present it as we are and if it seemed fit by the Government of the Day I suppose they would put it in.

MR. USKIW: And you believe, Sir, that in keeping with consistency of approach, that the Federation of Labour should have a right to visit your farm in Miami and in Parkdale, look at your books, find out how you are treating your workers and report to their headquarters and discipline, if necessary, the employer or the employee, you believe that would be reasonable?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dann.

MR. DANN: Mr. Chairman, for the record, I don't farm in Miami. Everybody seems to know more about my business than I do.

MR. USKIW: It's good reporting, Sir.

MR. DANN: Obviously, the walls have ears.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would caution this witness, and all others, that no witness is bound or obliged to answer any or all questions.

MR. USKIW: Do you believe, Sir, that this same privilege should exist within the Federation of Labour and that they should have a right to visit your premises as provided for in Bill 25, and to open up your records to determine your profits, to determine your working relationship with your employees? Do you think that they should have that right?

MR. DANN: If I opted out of the organization, I think you have got a good point there, that if someone opts out — I'm not hung up on that.

MR. USKIW: So you believe, then, that a trucker, a buyer, an agent in an auction yard should have the right to opt out of this bill? Is that what you're saying?

MR. DANN: If he's not a member of the association we are talking about as a producer here, as I interpret it.

MR. USKIW: No, no. The powers here are not only powers over beef producers, they are powers over the transportation system, the buyers, the auction yards, we have all sorts of authority here to enforce retailers, yes, wholesalers, to enforce these provisions, and there is a penalty of fine and jail in this bill, if someone does not comply. And do you think we should provide the same powers to the Federation of Labour, who will then supervise your labour relations on your farm, and impose fines and penalties of one sort or another, should they find that you have violated a provision of their bill.

MR. DANN: As I say, I agree with you, you've got a good point, and if one isn't involved in this association . . . I want to be involved with positive thinking people to have this industry grow, so if the people aren't involved to do it, that's their problem.

MR. USKIW: Okay. In keeping with positive thinking, do you think that positive thinking would dictate that a person who opts out should not be subjected to the powers of this bill; and (b) that all persons affected by this legislation should have the right to opt out, whether he's a producer, a buyer, a trucker, an agent, an auction yard, do you believe that all and any of them should have the right to opt out? Everyone that is affected here, should they have a right to opt out?

MR. DANN: I think that in this thing, you see, what's good for one section is good for the other, and I'd be prepared to live with that. If this is what you're hung up on, I'm prepared to live with it. . . .

MR. USKIW: You just killed the bill, but that's good, I don't mind that.

MR. DANN: No. Just one little segment. I said I thought you had a good idea, I didn't . . .

MR. USKIW: It is a good idea.

MR. DANN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are no more questions for this witness, thank you very much, Mr. Dann. No? Thank you, Mr. Dann.

I would indicate for the interest of those witnesses in the gallery, who still have briefs to present at the present time there are six witnesses who have indicated that they have to present briefs this evening. They are: No. 1, The Manitoba Farm Bureau; No. 2, Lawrence Delichte; No. 3, Bruce Medd; No. 4, Mac Lelond; No. 5, Keith Proven; No. 6, Dorothy Crozier. We can proceed with those briefs in that order, but I would point out that we have taken two and three-quarter hours to hear two briefs, so it will just simply give you some idea as to the length of time that we will likely be here.

The brief from The Manitoba Farm Bureau, please.

MR. BERT HALL: Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. The Manitoba Farm Bureau is gratified to have this opportunity to express some brief comments regarding Bill 25, The Cattle Producers Association Act.

Over many years the Manitoba Farm Bureau has been concerned by the apparent lack of a strong unified voice to speak on behalf of the vast majority of cattle producers in the Province of Manitoba. In making this statement, we are in no way being disparaging or unmindful of the dedicated, selfless contributions made by many individual cattle producers through existing volunteer interest organizations on behalf of the total cattle production industry. However, it is the opinion of the Manitoba Farm Bureau that the efforts of the people who have served in this regard have been severely hampered by the lack of any satisfactory means of generating adequate resources with which to work towards accomplishing their objectives.

Over countless years, there have been a number of serious problem areas within the cattle production and marketing system, which have not been satisfactorily resolved, despite the considerable amount of attention and expense which have been focused on them. We do not believe it was necessary to take up the time of the committee in discussing the details of the problem areas to which we refer.

In the minds of the Manitoba Farm Bureau representatives, one of the major factors which is contributed to our inability to alleviate some of the difficult situations within the cattle production and marketing system, has been the absence of an effective organized effort on behalf of cattle producers to press for and seek the solutions required. On those occasions when government has moved, albeit sincerely and commendably, to assist cattle producers in the province to weather difficult economic periods, it has been with little or no meaningful consultation with the people directly affected. In the minds of the Manitoba Farm Bureau representatives, this may have been systematic, at least in part, of governments' perception of no obvious representative body to which it could turn to obtain the opinions of the majority of producers.

In the opinion of the Manitoba Farm Bureau representatives that cattle producers in Manitoba for some years had been disadvantaged relative to their counterparts of the neighbouring provinces, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario, where relatively effective cattle producers associations with provisions for funding by a levy on marketings has existed for varying lengths of time. It is with these thoughts in mind, and in keeping with the fact that the Manitoba Farm Bureau has consistently supported the concept of agricultural producers establishing effective organizations and co-operating to assist themselves, that we have sought this opportunity to express to you the support of the Manitoba Farm Bureau for the establishment of an effective cattle producers association with the ability to adequately fund itself, by means of a levy on marketings as set out in Bill 25.

In expressing this support, the Farm Bureau is not suggesting that it would not be possible to amend this proposed legislation in minor ways to make it more responsive to the needs of the cattle industry, and/or more conducive to achieving the objectives set out within it. However, it is the opinion of The Manitoba Farm Bureau that the need involved is such that the government should proceed with Bill 25, and enable cattle producers in the province to get on with the job of working towards resolving some of the problems which have plagued their industry.

In stating this position, the Manitoba Farm Bureau representatives are not unaware that there are cattle producers who do not support the concept of a cattle producers organization funded by a levy on cattle marketings, or who feel at least that the issue should be submitted to a referendum among producers. The Manitoba Farm Bureau feels that the need for an association as envisioned within Bill 25 is sufficiently pressing to justify the establishment of the proposed association at this time, and the proposed association should be given a reasonable trial period by producers.

The proposed legislation does provide ample opportunity for producers to withdraw their support of the proposed association by requesting a refund of their contributions to it.

There would seem to be some concern in the minds of those in opposition to Bill 25 regarding who will provide the leadership within the association. The Manitoba Farm Bureau is satisfied that the proposed legislation provides clearly that the leadership will be chosen on the basis of democratic elections by the producers involved, and feels that it is incumbent on cattle producers to ensure that they elect those individuals who will adequately and accurately represent them on policy issues considered by the proposed association.

The Manitoba Farm Bureau has consistently supported the concept of farm organizations being funded by means of levies on commodities marketed, as being the most efficient adequate and painless means of generating the funding required. We wish to take this opportunity to reiterate the Farm Bureau's support for that concept, as it relates to the association proposed in Bill 25.

The Manitoba Farm Bureau is hopeful that cattle producers in Manitoba will see the merit in having established an adequately funded cattle producers association dedicated to working towards realizing solutions to the problem areas which plague the cattle production industry.

We appreciate having the opportunity of expressing our views relative to Bill 25 to the committee, and urge the Government of Manitoba to act swiftly in enacting this proposed legislation.

Respectfully submitted, The Manitoba Farm Bureau.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you respond to questions from members of the committee?

MR. HALL: Yes I will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do any members of this committee wish to question Mr. Hall? Mr. Adam.

MR. ADAM: Yes, are you a producer of livestock?

MR. HALL: Yes, I'm a producer of poultry, grain and livestock.

MR. ADAM: Poultry?

MR. HALL: That's right. Poultry, grain and livestock.

MR. ADAM: What are the solutions as you see them? I know that you mention that you do not want to go into the problems facing the industry at the present time, but I think that we should in view of the fact that this bill is before us, and we should try and obtain some of your views on what the problems are and what the solutions are. What are the problems first, let's have a go at that?

MR. HALL: Well, I suppose, if one wanted to or was able to delineate the problems, that it may well take some time. We've made reference to the fact that we have been aware, within the Farm Bureau, that there have been and are problems within the cattle production and marketing system. We believe that the solutions are not arrived at easily, or they are not arrived at quickly. What we're saying here, really, is that we believe that the first step that has to take place in order to try to alleviate the problems, is that you have to have the expression of opinion of the producers and we can see that that has to be done — and this is through experience — through having an effective organization that can speak on behalf of the producers.

I think that we can draw parallels from within our society, that most interest areas, professionals, and so on, that are working within our society, have organized themselves and can approach their problems in a very systematic way. Without being organized, this is not possible, in our opinion, and they have to identify the areas they want to attempt to make changes one at a time, it doesn't happen over night. I wouldn't want to enter into a whole list, with due respect to your question, but this is the approach that we as a farm bureau see that you have to take step one and subsequently then the additional steps to attempt to have a better marketing system.

MR. ADAM: You mention that other associations have organized themselves to protect their own interests. As far as I'm aware, these associations normally come into being by virtue of a private member's bill and not a government bill, and there is a substantial difference.

MR. HALLS: Well, we are well aware that there are various approaches that can be taken towards providing enabling legislation for groups to do certain things. We look upon this as a form of enabling legislation. As far as the powers and objectives, it uses the word "may", and we see this as one

of several mechanisms that could have been used to provide the opportunity for the producers in this particular instance, to have an organization that can well be structured to have input from all levels, an opportunity for all those that so desire to stand for election, to be the spokesman for the industry, and we think the basic opportunity for structure is there.

MR. ADAM: The reason why I raise the point is because I envisage that due to the fact that this is presented by the government and not a private member, that I envisage a future government — and there will be, there is no doubt about that, sometime in the future there will be a change of government — I envisage all those who oppose this bill at this particular time that they will all be pressing the government to do away with this legislation. I think the bill itself would have received a great deal more credibility, even though I object to many of the provisions in it, the powers that are extended and so forth, but I think that the bill would have received more credibility if it would have been brought in by a private member, where all members could have voted as they saw fit on the bill.

I would like to know how you feel, whether I am correct in my assumption that I am very positive that we are going to have a stampede should the government change in three years time, which they may very well be. We're going to have a stampede of opposition to this bill from those who are compelled to join by the fact that the government is regimenting producers into this association.

MR. HALL: You are stating an opinion. I don't know whether that requires an answer, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: I am asking you if you would give me your opinion. You don't have to answer if you don't wish to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would advise the witness that he is not obliged to answer any or all questions.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't think that I could give a satisfactory answer to it because it is sort of star-gazing into the future as to what might happen. I will say in response, though, that you did pose a question that I would hope and I would think that the future as to what may well take place here will reflect entirely on how effective this organization proves itself in the interim, and I'm sure that it will be judged on that merit.

MR. ADAM: I am wondering, with so many different views among the producers themselves, just how effective it will work. You know, there's such a difference of opinion on approach to the problems that you say exist and do exist in the industry. I feel myself, and I would ask you whether or not you think a little bill such as this, while it gives very wide powers over the members of that association in addition to many other people in our society who are not directly involved in primary production, but I refer to one that gives me some concern and that is the independent merchants who are retailers of beef. I know that they are buried in paperwork now of all sorts and here I see an association coming in and telling a storekeeper we would like you to keep books for us and give us all the information on the beef you sell and what kind of beef, and so on and so forth and the powers are there.

I ask you, Sir, whether or not there should be some vision for appeal, such as are in, pro aware, in every other bill there are some methods of appeal. Even if you go to court, you can appeal to a higher body. Should there not be some appeal on the regulations and an appeal for those who wish to completely opt out, rather than have a difficult and cumbersome system that was in place in Saskatchewan since 1972?

MR. HALL: Well, we said in our presentation that we feel that it should be given an effective trial period if the legislation is enacted. An effective trial period is one, I suppose, that puts the whole operation of an association really on trial that it may or may not continue. There is an implication in an effective trial period. The legislation, as I said earlier, for the most part is an enabling type of legislation, as we have in some other types of legislation. I'm sure that when we have an Act that is proposed that there is no question in my mind but that the individuals governed by the Act that the people are elected to administer the Act certainly are under the scrutiny and subject to the disciplines of confining themselves within the powers that are there.

MR. ADAM: You mention in your brief that cattle producers in Manitoba for some years have been disadvantaged relative to their counterparts in neighbouring provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario, and I presume that you made that comment because they

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

have some form of checkoffs to raise funds for an association of some kind.

MR. HALL: Yes, this is in reference to the funding for an association.

MR. ADAM: Do you feel in all sincerity that the beef producers in Saskatchewan are any better off than those in Manitoba, or beef producers in Alberta are any better off, and in British Columbia and in Ontario pricewise? Are they more wealthy?

IR. HALL: I'm sure that within the beef industry we all realize that it's not just simply a provincial problem. At the very least, it's a western Canada and a Canadian problem and certainly a world problem. I think that the Manitoba producers have been disadvantaged that they haven't been a part of an effective voice, along with the other people that they would be looking at having consultation with. It's provided for, as I understand it, as an enabling provision within the proposed act.

IR. ADAM: Sir, since you say that it's a Canadian problem and a world problem, how then does the Farm Bureau contend that the livestock producers in those provinces are better off than the ones here? Statistics Canada for 1976 show the Alberta farmers, who are faced with probably less costs because of their climate than Manitoba, are in the poverty income level.

MR. HALL: Well' this reference was being disadvantaged in not having an effective checkoff system or an organization, but the implications as to what happens beyond that are many.

MR. ADAM: Well, this is the point I am trying to make, that that hasn't transmitted itself into results. The fact that they have had these associations and these funds available, they are still at the poverty level. What has happened? So it's not proving as effective as what it's purported to be. This is the point that I am trying to make, and that opinion has been expressed by, I would think, the majority of the people at this hearing, or perhaps not a majority but certainly a very extensive opposition of opinion.

MR. HALL: In supporting this in principle, that there should, in our opinion and the opinion of The Farm Bureau, be an effective organization for the beef producers in this province, what we are really saying here is that in order to take the initial steps to deal with the problem areas, that it is the opinion of The Manitoba Farm Bureau that this must happen. How other would they approach in a unified sort of a way and when I say a unified sort of a way, we have also said in this brief that not all people support this concept. I suppose to the same extent that we do not claim to represent the opinion of every beef producer in Manitoba we are saying that the consensus of the groups that we represent have said that in principle, and have said so for many years, that for the various commodities there, in our opinion, should be an effective commodity organization to speak on behalf of that particular group. This is fundamental, in our opinion, to being able to exercise voice.

We recognize that the market climate that we live in for practically all our transactions is to some extent political. You people are well aware of this. Effective organizations can make representations to those that have power to affect, through legislation and other means, to affect the business climate that we, as farmers' exist in. My experience has been that legislators welcome having a group that have consultation within their membership and can make effective representation to the people that they feel that can have some effect on the system.

MR. ADAM: Well, you mention that there is ample opportunity for producers to withdraw their support from this legislation, but you refer only to the financial support. Where in the bill do you find that there is ample opportunity to withdraw?

MR. HALL: Well, in the very structure of the provision for the election of people that would be the directors of this association. And certainly I would feel, and would feel from experience, that the directors from the various areas that they would come from and would represent, that they would hear the voice of the people in that area, and if the voice comes through very very strongly after a trial period, that it's something that they feel is not effective and they do not want, I'm sure that they would be very, very effective in getting that message to those directors, and those directors are the people that are going to be provided for if we do have this legislation that would be in the decision-making process. If those people do not properly, in their opinion, represent their position, there is ample opportunity to elect somebody else that does.

MR. ADAM: Oh, that is what you're saying. That is how they can opt out, by electing someone else?

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. HALL: Well, not as individuals but as the total plan. If they wish so, as individuals, our understanding is that the provision is there that they can opt out.

MR. ADAM: It's the compulsory aspect that I think is most objectionable to the opposition and many people who have presented briefs here. That is the main concern. The provision that they may not opt out; they are in, but they may request a rebate. It's a question of which words you use, I suppose. But they may apply for a rebate at the end of the year, and we don't know how this will be done yet because there is an interim board that will make those decisions, but there are no complete opting out. And I, for the life of me, have difficulty, you know, in accepting the fact that we would regiment people into associations of any kind — not his kind, not this one or any other one. But we will tell people you will belong to a Protestant church or you will belong to a Catholic church, or to a Synagogue or whatever, whether you like it or not' I think we would start a revolution, and I see the same ramifications here. I find it very, very objectionable to be forced into anything, especially from a government that has been expounding so much on "Let's Free Manitoba". That's freedom; freedom of choice. I have listened to that for seven or eight years. Give the people freedom of choice.

So I find this bill — I refer to it as odious and I would like to give freedom of choice to the independent cattle producers. I don't disagree that there should be a spokesman for the livestock producers if they so desire, on a voluntary basis, and I don't object to the principle of this bill, providing that they have the opportunity of complete opting out, and that includes not only the producers but those other people who are indirectly involved, and that there is a provision of appeal, a right of appeal for anyone who feels he has been aggrieved. And I do believe that if the independent producers want to join this, they can, on a voluntary basis; if they want to opt out, they can; and if the NFU want to do it, they can, and if they want to opt out, they can; or the Canadian Agriculture movement. And I think that then we wouldn't be here till 3:00 o'clock in the morning.

MR. HALL: Well, you would note that on Page 3 of our presentation we did state that in taking the position the Manitoba Farm Bureau has, that we are not unaware that there are cattle producers who do not support the concept of a cattle producers organization funded by a levy on cattle marketings, or who feel at least that the issue should be submitted to a referendum amongst producers; we have said that simply as a statement. However, just a comment that I might make in that regard, that in the democratic system under which we exist, it's not always that we're able to fully satisfy every one. We exist on the basis that when we have a plebiscite that we establish some majority, whether it be 51 percent or whether it be some greater number, and we're always aware that the people that voted against are not in favour, and yet in our democratic system we find that in most instances all people are subjected to a particular law or whatever the case might be, so, you know, we haven't been able to reach that ideal.\$

We have said in here that there are people who would like to see it done by referendum. I said earlier that it's the opinion of the Manitoba Farm Bureau that there are several approaches that could be taken to providing and enabling provision for a checkoff for cattle producers. However, we have gone on to say that we have gone many years without this happening, and we have had individuals who have been quite dedicated in making honest attempts to try to contribute something to the betterment of the cattle industry, and they have been hampered very severely by the fact that whatever they did was money coming out of their own pockets. It's our position, as a policy position, that the Farm Bureau believes that every commodity organization should have a properly funded organization.

MR. ADAM: There's no problem there. We have no disagreement on that point. The only point is that I would like to know whether you agree that they should be compelled to be in, or do you agree that they should have a right to opt out — and I'm not talking about the money. The money is secondary, as far as I am concerned the money is secondary to the majority of the opposition here. It is the compulsory aspect of opting out.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may interject here just for a minute, I think for the record, I made it plain last evening that we would be considering amendments to the Act, to clearly state if individuals did not want to participate that they would have the opportunity to opt out, and that the Act would not have any power over them. I stated it in the past, I will re-state that for the benefit of moving the Committee on a little quicker and to facilitate some of the people that are sitting waiting.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. CHAIRMAN: I did not receive it as a point of order.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, how did you then interrupt the Member for Ste. Rose? —(Interjection)— On what basis did the Minister of Agriculture get the floor? —(Interjection)— Well then, but the Minister . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'll clarify it as a point of order.

MR. USKIW: Well, all right then. To that point of order, Mr. Chairman, is it or is it not a point of order, and if it is, I wish to speak to it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would determine that it is not a point of order and is therefore out of order. Would you continue, Mr. Adam?

MR. USKIW: Well then, Mr. Chairman, I raise on a point of order, the point of order that you are not administering your Chair responsibilities by allowing the interjection of the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would respond to that in this way. As Chairman I am the servant of this Committee, and at any time the Committee can choose a new Chairman or challenge any of my rulings, and on that basis any decision that I make will be open to challenge by this Committee.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, since we have now interrupted the Member for Ste. Rose, I wish to respond to the Minister of Agriculture. The very words that he used here tonight, in his most recent statement, indicates that he has not committed himself to a clear-cut amendment with respect to a voluntary provision in Bill 25 he said he would give consideration to. All resolutions of the Legislature, since I've been there, gave consideration without ever actions taken with respect to those considerations.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on that same point of order. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that you have been a good Chairman and you have allowed a lot of latitude, especially to the Member for Lac du Bonnet, in allowing him his repetitious questions to the same individual. I would also say that I just wanted to clarify for the record that — and I'm sure he is well familiar with the political process — that the individuals presenting briefs should have the opportunity to recommend amendments and give the opportunity for the government to listen to those recommendations, and that is the process we're in at this particular time.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, then the Minister has not confirmed for the benefit of this Committee the precise nature of his so-called amendments, voluntary amendments to Bill 25, and therefore until we are in a position to know what they are, he, Sir, is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carry on.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to comment on what the Minister has said, that to consider is not good enough for the opposition, we want him to put his money where his mouth is and tell us. We have been asking him since the 12th of May what his intentions are and he has constantly refused to make the concerns of the opposition, to deal with those questions. And he has not satisfied our concerns, or the concerns of people who have presented briefs, and people to whom we have talked throughout the province, and until we see those we will not be satisfied, and that is why I was asking you, Sir, whether you felt that there should be a complete opting out for any individual, any storekeeper, any trucker, any processor, any information reporter, who is violently opposed to being regimented into an association not of his choice, not of his liking. Do you feel, Sir, that there should be complete opting out, or should he be compelled to remain in there? And I'm not talking about the money.

MR. HALL: I'd like to counter with a question, if I could.

MR. ADAM: I have asked a question; you do not have to reply, if it embarrasses you, Sir, you are quite at liberty not to reply. I'm just trying to solicit your views in order that we may convince the Minister to eventually come out with concrete proposals that will provide. He has skirted around the issue on all sides, but he has never come out with a concrete proposal that will allow for an

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

appeal for those who feel they have been aggrieved, or for those who wish to opt out, which has been such a detriment to the association in Saskatchewan.

MR. HALL: I'll put it this way. I'm of the opinion that an organization that could be effective in the objectives that have been spelled out, would necessarily have to have access to information. If that is not forthcoming, to a large degree at least, that would be meaningful information, why then, there is a great hampering in the ability of an organization such as purported here to be able to assess what is in effect the ongoing happenings in the marketplace. As to whether there could be some further provision for opting out I think can be determined in the ongoing activity of that organization. But within our society, and the many rules and regulations that we live by, there has to be, in almost every instance, a degree of compliance or else it becomes worthless.

MR. ADAM: Do you think then, in view of what you have just said, that that information must be available in order that the association can carry on its work effectively? Do you still say that there is ample opportunity to withdraw? You have just stated that that information must be available from producers, from . . .

MR. HALL: Certainly, in the experience that I've had — and I've had at least a measure of experience in that whole area, through an office that we have in the chicken-broiler, as an example — one of the key things is to know what is happening within the industry. That information, we find, is very useful, not only to the producers but it's useful to the industry as well. It becomes a resource, and without that kind of a resource my experience would indicate that then the association cannot do an effective job.

MR. ADAM: Well then, Sir, you are saying that there is no ample opportunity to opt out. Whether a person wishes not to belong, not to provide any information, there is no right of appeal, and he will have to provide that information whether he desires to or whether he does not.

MR. HALL: In supporting the principle that there be an association established, there is the area that the Manitoba Farm Bureau would support if there were written in a right of appeal. This is something that some of our different commodity groups are operating under. However, having said that, I do not exclude that this bill would provide the opportunity for a group of people to act without being subject to the provisions that are written in the bill, and I'm sure that they would not be permitted to act beyond that, and certainly, there are constraints there. They certainly, I would firmly believe, would be under the surveillance of the Minister of Agriculture and his department, and I am quite sure that in order for them to continue to have an association under enabling legislation, that they would then have to be prepared to comply within the confines of the authority that was granted to them.

MR. ADAM: Do you feel, Sir, that if there was a clause, or a section in the Bill 25 that would provide for the regulations, subject to approval of the Lieutenant-General-in-Council, would that be a safeguard for those people who are concerned about this? Most bills are like that. When you have a private group that can make regulation that affect other people, regardless of whether they're in an association or whether they are not, should there not be some safeguards there for protection of their rights, the human rights? We're getting down to human rights here now.

MR. HALL: It's spelled out quite well in the objects and powers of the association, and spells out the association may.

MR. ADAM: That's right, it may.

MR. HALL: It may. Within the limitation of what it says it may do. It doesn't give it complete uncontrolled powers, as I see it.

MR. ADAM: But where are the provisions in the bill for any checks and balances? They may do it, and they probably will.

MR. HALL: Well, I would feel rather confident, from my experience in life that if there was an association that was not complying within the limitations of what is provided for for their area of power, that I am sure that there would be ample number of people that would challenge them very quickly.

MR. ADAM: There already have been a lot of people who have challenged this before it's even

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

enacted into law. It has already been challenged, we don't have to wait until it's in operation. We already know that it has been challenged, and this is why we are trying to solicit as much information for our guidance so that we can come up with a bill that will be at least if not entirely palatable, or acceptable, at least partially acceptable to all these divergent views and different views of people.

So, let's say for instance the term of office, the little elected appointed board who will decide the term of office of the elected meers; the districts that are to be set up are not defined. What districts are going to be set up, who is going to decide how the districts will be formed; it will be an appointed board that will form the districts. The registration of producers will be conducted by an appointed board, not an elected board, an undemocratic board, an autocratic board, appointed by the Minister, his friends — let's be frank, let's be brutally frank, just his friends, his best friends.

MR. HALL: I'm sure we have to have a lot of confidence in human nature . . .

MR. ADAM: I don't have any confidence in anyone. You know, Washington said, "Trust in God, but keep your powder dry."

MR. HALL: There so happens to be labelling legislation under which other agricultural producers operate, that is also enabling and provides that the initial board can sell out the administrative by-laws. Many of those things are something that is an ongoing development of a particular organization. . . I feel that there is an area of control here as long as it is properly spelled out, which I understand it is, that the people that will serve are people who will be elected.

MR. ADAM: Sir, an appointed board will decide on the districts, how they shall be laid out. If a group of producers in that district feel themselves aggrieved or discriminated against by the boundaries, or by the numbers of producers in that boundary, who do they appeal to for redress? To whom do they go for redress? Shall they go on bended knees to an appointed board of the Minister's friends, and say, "Please, I want this board here." Gerrymandering, they call it. Thatcher tried that in Saskatchewan, and that's how he got elected. —(Interjection)— And that's how he got defeated after as well. Do you not feel that there should be some provisions for the protection of people?

MR. HALL: We have stated fairly clearly in our brief, Sir, that we in principle are supporting that there be an association. We have also said, as I stated earlier, that there is a recognition within our organization that there are people that are looking at some particular or different aspects of it. We have recognized that. We have recognized that there are people, as I said earlier, that would prefer if it was handled by a referendum. Certainly the Farm Bureau, had that been the way it had been presented, would not have opposed that type of thing. Had there been provision written into it, certainly as I said earlier, for an appeal body, then we would not have opposed that appeal body. However in the consideration of the commodity groups that are a part of The Manitoba Farm Bureau, we have determined that they feel that there has been a long span of years has gone by without this group having an effective organization. We believe that within what is provided here there is a framework on which an organization could be built, and if the cattle people wish to have an organization, if this legislation is approved, if they demonstrate that they wish to have an organization and if they work with a determination to make it work, why the framework in our opinion is there to make it work.

MR. ADAM: I would be concerned about passing this bill, even if we had a substantial majority in support of it, the way it is without amendment, and I ask you, do you support Bill 25 in its entirety?

MR. HALL: We are supporting the concept in its entirety, that there be a provision for an organization for the cattle producers. I think I've answered you as well as I'm able to answer you in that there are areas that, within the Farm Bureau, there has been a dialogue, there has been a discussion. Certainly within some of the other commodity groups that are part of the Farm Bureau that are operating under enabling legislation, there is an appeal body, and the Farm Bureau support that there should be. In that particular instance, this is what the producers in that particular commodity had supported, and there is no quarrel with it whatsoever.

MR. ADAM: So there is nothing wrong in your opinion with an appeal body?

MR. HALL: No there is not, in the opinion of the Farm Bureau .

MR. ADAM: Would you support the Minister if he brought in an appeal mechanism to this bill an amendment? Would you agree if he did that, or would you object to it? If he brought in an appeal mechanism ?

MR. HALL: If this was something that was supported . . .

MR. ADAM: If it didn't detract from the bill, just an appeal . . .

MR. HALL: If this was something that was supported by the cattle producers that had been working towards having some provision for an organization; they have done a lot of ground work on this I have not been informed of any concern that they might possibly have in this regard, but I certainly feel that this could be an area that would be debated or dialogued quite thoroughly within the Farm Bureau organization.

MR. ADAM: We do not know whether there is a majority support for Bill 25 at the present time. The Minister has been reluctant to have a referendum to find out the views, unlike the previous Minister of Agriculture, who wasn't afraid to go through the democratic process — this Minister is more reluctant than the previous one.

I say to you, sir, thank you for your thoughts and your comments, but I still maintain that there is no ample provisions for opting out in Bill 25.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hall, I thank you for your brief; I have just several short questions.

In your brief, on Page 3, you indicated that the Farm Bureau is not suggesting that it would not be possible to amend this proposed legislation in minor ways. What minor ways are you suggesting that this legislation should be amended? In what ways would your association recommend that this legislation be amended?

MR. HALL: We didn't in our presentation address ourselves to particular amendments. We were addressing ourselves to supporting in principle that we should move forward to allow the beef producers to have an effective association. I think within the previous questioning that I have had, I've outlined areas that certainly, within commodity groups of the Farm Bureau, has been acceptable. I've been frank in answering this, and I think I've pretty well covered it.

MR. URUSKI: One other question, Mr. Chairman. You've indicated that you would like the industry to move ahead. Is there anything preventing the industry from forming this type of an association without this legislation, is there anything today preventing this type of an association being formed?

MR. HALL: I think our experience has demonstrated clearly, over the years, that a voluntary organization has simply just not worked, for a commodity group.

MR. URUSKI: Okay, you represent many commodity groups. Could you tell me how those commodity groups were formulated in terms of the groups? How did they effectively get organized.

Well, for example, the Turkey Producers, the group that I'm a farmer of, how did that group effectively get organized?

MR. HALL: I went through that experience as well, and I think to the same extent that the cattle producers are now attempting to progress further. It was a group of people, I'm sure within the turkey group as well as our group, who were dedicated to the fact that the producers, in order to have a voice, simply had to get together.

MR. URUSKI: That is true, but what was the process that they went through? I mean, was there special legislation passed for the turkey producers in order to enable them to organize at the time?

MR. HALL: To the same extent that what we're looking at now, the people that had got together in a voluntary type of organization simply made representation to government for enabling legislation, which they took advantage of.

MR. URUSKI: Would you support the removal of Section 6(2) within the legislation? Section 6(2), which restricts the association from having any . . . shall not engage in the production, sale of marketing or processing of cattle? Would your association be opposed to the removal of that section?

MR. HALL: It would appear to be a consensus, and here again we freely acknowledge that there are very significant differences of opinion within the cattle producers of this province, and we freely acknowledge that that is a fact. It is also a fact that there has been communication, that there is a significant number of cattle producers that would like to see themselves well organized, and would not go as far as a marketing board, at least at this time. I think that is fair to say, and it would appear that the people that have been developing this bill appear to have recognized that they may well have an opportunity to have an organization that can operate within the confines of what they have spelled out in the objects and powers of that association, and they have chosen at this point to tell the other producers that that is as far as they intend to go at this particular time.

MR. URUSKI: Well, could I follow that up a bit. If, by vote of the producers at any of their annual meetings as is set out in this bill, should those producers decide at that point in time that they wish to put into the by-laws that they will perform the duties in terms of marketing as is outlined in Section 6(1) and contradicted in 6(2), it would then of course have to be necessary to come back to the Legislature. Is that a necessary provision in the Act, if we are conferring on this association powers to set its own regulations and its own operating strata? Is that type of an amendment or a section in the Act, therefore, necessary?

MR. HALL: It would appear, in the opinion of the people that have worked on the development of this proposal, that it was necessary in their opinion. I would think that if there is an association formed under this bill, if at some future date they decide that they would like that section removed, I would presume that they would have to make representation and ask that the Act be amended in order to delete that section.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions for this witness? Mr. Uskiw.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Hall what his association's particular interests in Bill 25.

MR. HALL: The Manitoba Farm Bureau's particular interest is that we believe that it would be for the well-being of agriculture of this particular commodity group had an effective organization a voice to speak on behalf of that group.

MR. USKIW: Can I be frank enough to ask you, sir, whether there is a vested interest for your organization in Bill 25?

MR. HALL: We look upon it as a provision for an organization. As far as we are concerned, the name is a choice of what a name was under this particular bill and when you go to an elected group of people, there may or may not be any future affiliation with any particular farm organization; that is completely unknown.

MR. USKIW: Could you tell me here and now that the Farm Bureau does not expect to receive grants from this association? Could you tell me now that they would not expect any grants or moneys from this association for their organization?

MR. HALL: If this organization or this Cattle Producers Association as spelled out under this bill, if it does come into being, it would be exactly the same as any other commodity group within the province. They would have a free choice as to whether they became affiliated in any way with any other group. That certainly is not a foregone conclusion in any instance. The people who are elected, I'm sure, and representative of the people within the province, they may or may not choose to do that.

MR. USKIW: All right. Let me put it in a different way, then. Could it be reasonably expected that they will affiliate with the Bureau and therefore help finance the Farm Bureau?

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. HALL: Inasmuch as most of the commodity groups in the province belong to the Farm Bureau there could be that possibility that they might; that would be their free choice.

MR. USKIW: Could you give me an example of the cost of affiliation to the Farm Bureau of Manitoba Pool, per annum?

MR. HALL: The method of financing of the Manitoba Farm Bureau is one that — it is not an assessment that goes to any particular group as such' it is simply within the overall discussion within the commodity groups as to whether or not they are able to contribute to the financing of the Manitoba Farm Bureau.

MR. USKIW: Yes, I appreciate that, but what is last year's amount of moneys received from Manitoba Pool by the Farm Bureau? That is a matter of public record. I don't think I am asking your something that is not available to the public. How much money did they pay to the Bureau as their contributor to the Bureau's operations?

MR. HALL: I don't know the exact dollar. It works out on average to \$2.50 a member or \$55,000.00.

MR. USKIW: \$55,000 from Manitoba Pool?

MR. HALL: Right.

MR. USKIW: How many affiliated organizations belong to the Farm Bureau?

MR. HALL: Eighteen.

MR. USKIW: If the Cattle Producers Association Act decides to affiliate, that would become 19.

MR. HALL: That could be.

MR. USKIW: Can they affiliate without making a financial contribution to the Bureau?

MR. HALL: I don't think they would expect to.

MR. USKIW: No, all right. What is the smallest amount of contribution on the part of any commodity group to the Bureau? In round figures, approximate figures.

MR. HALL: An affiliated group, about \$250.00.

MR. USKIW: And which group would that be?

MR. HALL: \$400.00. The Women's Institute was the one that was coming to my mind.

MR. USKIW: That is not a commodity group, Mr. Chairman. I am talking about the 18 commodity groups, sir, that form your organization. What is the smallest contribution of your commodity group?

MR. HALL: I think that I should correct insofar as the commodity groups — we were using that term — the Farm Bureau is very explicit in its commodity in rural oriented groups and we do include certainly the Women's Institute. It is a very valued member because certainly they convey many things to the discussion within the Farm Bureau.

MR. USKIW: Well' the problem with the Women's Institute is that they are funded by contributions, private and public. They are largely financed by the province, so it wouldn't be expected that they would make grants to the Bureau in any large measure. But what I would like to know is what would be the smallest contribution on the part of a commodity group of the 18 groups that are now funding the Farm Bureau?

MR. HALL: It is in the range of \$400.00.

MR. USKIW: I don't mean the W. I., I mean the commodity groups?

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. HALL: I have just been given a figure here of one distinct commodity group, which is \$850.00.

MR. USKIW: Which one would that be?

MR. HALL: It is the Manitoba Turkey Board.

MR. USKIW: The Turkey Board. What would the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Association contribute to the Bureau, in a given year?

MR. HALL: I am sure we would be willing to provide . . .

MR. USKIW: An approximation, I don't need the exact figure.

MR. HALL: \$4,500.00.

MR. USKIW: \$4,500.00. What is the total revenue, then, of the Bureau through the commodity group arrangement, annually.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whether or not the question is relevant, the witness has no obligation to answer if he feels it does not contribute to the discussion.

MR. HALL: I would be perfectly willing to supply Mr. Uskiw with all the figures. There is nothing confidential about it, but I don't pretend to pull them all off the top of my head.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would caution all members to judge their questions as to keep them as relevant to Bill 25 as possible.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, there is a suggestion that this line of questioning is not relevant. The gentleman before us is presenting a brief. He is supporting Bill 25. I think it is reasonable for the committee to wish to know whether any moneys generated from Bill 25 will go to this organization which is now represented by this witness. That happens to raise a question of whether there is a vested interest, conflict of interest, etc., so that is a very reasonable line of questioning.

MR. HALL: Mr. Chairman, I think I have attempted to answer in simply saying I don't know. It will be the choice of the elected producers and there is no assurance whatsoever.

MR. USKIW: Yes, but you are confirming, however, that it would be extremely unusual to have this association affiliate with your association and not make a financial contribution. That would be unusual, wouldn't it?

MR. HALL: Oh' if they did, it would be unusual, yes.

MR. USKIW: So there is the possibility that your organization would receive funding from Bill 25 and therefore we have to look at your contribution in that context, in terms of your brief.

MR. HALL: We have absolutely no way of knowing what it might be. It is completely open.

MR. USKIW: Yes, but it is a possibility.

MR. HALL: It is a possibility, certainly.

MR. USKIW: I now raise a very relevant question to the Farm Bureau itself, sir. In all of the submissions that I have received from your organization over 12 years, or 13, the Farm Bureau always presume to speak for the cattlemen of this province in their submission and I believe that came out of the fact that the Beef Growers Association were either in some way associated or affiliated with the Farm Bureau. Would that be correct?

MR. HALL: Yes, substantially that is correct. Over the past, as we have indicated, there has been a beef association for quite some time and as it was indicated earlier, there has been a Cow-Calf Association. The Farm Bureau has listened to representation from those particular groups as to the problems they saw within the total cattle industry and it was certainly taken as information and

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

taken as the people who were certainly at least representative of a degree of the cattle producer of Manitoba.

MR. USKIW: Since the Farm Bureau claimed to represent the beef industry of Manitoba in its submissions to governments over the years, why is it now necessary to set up another association to claim to represent cattlemen in Manitoba?

MR. HALL: Because they had great difficulty in being properly funded, and to be able to achieve the objectives that they wish to achieve.

MR. USKIW: They had problems of funding, so you are saying then the only way to ensure funding for an organization would be to compel people to belong to it by the law of the land. Is that what you are saying?

MR. HALL: This is one of the ways, as I indicated earlier, I believe is available to approach a method of funding.

MR. USKIW: Well, then, let me ask you, sir, would you support a bill that would presume to fund the National Farmers Union as the spokesman for cattlemen in Manitoba?

MR. HALL: We're not hung up on names.

MR. USKIW: I'm asking really a very precise question. If this bill read, "The Manitoba Farm Union Cattle Producers Association Act," would you be behind this legislation?

MR. HALL: As I understand this bill, it really doesn't spell out that it is supporting any particular organization. My understanding is that it is a complete new structure.

MR. USKIW: That is correct, but let us assume that the government of the day decided to recognize one of the existing farm organizations, either the Bureau or the Farm Union, as being the spokesman for cattlemen in Manitoba, would that be reasonable, in your mind?

MR. HALL: Any name that applies to any organization that can effectively represent all of the cattle producers in Manitoba would be an excellent one.

MR. USKIW: Well, anyone that could do it effectively would be a miracle, because to date we have always had that problem, haven't we? So there hasn't been that capability and nor will the creator of another one provide that capability. You are not suggesting for a moment that this bill will end the divisiveness within the industry, are you?

MR. HALL: The bill itself would not. It is the provision that is there, I think, that forms a framework as a possibility, if it is the sincere desire of the cattle producers of this province to have an organization in which they can make their input and the elected people on their behalf, then the framework is there.

MR. USKIW: Then let me ask you the most important question with respect to how you have arrived at your recommendation. Did you have a general meeting of the members of the Farm Bureau who are cattle producers and who have voted a policy or recommendation to your board of directors that you support Bill 25?

MR. HALL: The Farm Bureau has been on record for a number of years back in supporting in principle that there be an effective, funded organization for each particular commodity group. In principle, we have always supported this. When this bill was available it was circulated to all of the member groups and the member groups had an opportunity to review it and to make their position known back into the office of the Manitoba Farm Bureau. We did the same thing in the presentation that we are making to you this evening. All of the commodity groups have had an opportunity to take a look at it and we feel that in this way, through our commodity group structure, that we do indeed reach many agricultural producers in this province.

MR. USKIW: Sir, you stated in your answers to questions put by the Member for Ste. Rose that it is fundamental that every commodity have an association. Does that stem from the study that was done by — you may correct me, I'm not sure — Professor Campbell some years ago, with respect to the structuring of farm organizations in Manitoba, where they had, at that time, advocated

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

a structure such as the Farm Bureau that would derive its support from commodity groups? Is that the basis, sir, of your sort of continued support for that concept?

MR. HALL: At least not mine.

MR. USKIW: I'm not sure if I'm correct as to the gentleman involved.

MR. HALL: Really, I think my conviction of the validity and the value of commodity group structure, is one of experience, Mr. Uskiw, and I feel that with the type of expertise and technology that is involved in many of these commodities, that we certainly need to have that input from those specific commodity groups into it and within the Farm Bureau we have a platform for a consensus of the areas on which we can reach agreement, but we are very very frank as an organization and as we have frankly stated here, that we recognize that this is not simply something that every individual agricultural producer says, we've said that, that there are people that take different views.

MR. USKIW: You, of course, will admit to the fact that you presume to represent people who don't wish you to represent them from time to time, that your views may be in complete contradiction to the views of some of your own membership.

MR. HALL: We make a sincere effort, and I think we're successful, in representing the views of the majority and I suppose within our democratic system that we have to recognize that nobody gets elected by 100 percent and you represent the majority.

MR. USKIW: Well, Sir, I didn't mean that, Sir. I meant that people who are members of the Farm Bureau could be members of the Farm Bureau not of their own choosing but because another association that they are members of has affiliated with your association or organization, therefore, it's quite — well, it's not only possible, it happens all the time — that you have members of different agricultural groups in Manitoba who may not wish to be represented by the Bureau but whom you claim to represent from time to time in your presentation of briefs to governments and so on. As an example, I think I can illustrate my own position in that regard. I am a member of the Farm Bureau, have been all along since its formation by the very fact that commodity groups that I belong to are affiliates of your organization but it doesn't mean that I have agreed with everything that the Bureau has done or advocated.

MR. HALL: We would be very frank in saying that.

MR. USKIW: You recognize that.

MR. HALL: Oh yes, we certainly recognize that. That's the democratic system, if you go by the majority.

MR. USKIW: Well, Sir, but that's my whole point. You have not established a majority ever on any position that you have advocated, have you? You have merely established an opinion of those delegates who happen to sit on the Board of Directors and who meet with the Bureau executive from time to time.

MR. HALL: No, that's not quite right. It goes back into the commodity groups and their meetings in the rural areas and this is the way that the policy and the positions are developed, it's developed in all areas of the country and certainly the people that are elected are merely spokesmen for what has been voiced and the policy positions that have been developed. They merely carry it forward.

MR. USKIW: Now, let's sort of go over the situation in Manitoba with respect to the numbers of different associations that belong to your organization or that may not belong to them. The Turkey Producers Association, I gather, is affiliated to the Bureau, that would be correct?

MR. HALL: I have a correct list here if . . .

MR. USKIW: Yes, all right, thank you. Yes, we start off with the Manitoba Beef Growers Association, the others are not commodity groups so I'm not going to mention them. But they have been there for a number of years and they did not require a government statute to place them into existence. The same holds true for the Beef Growers Association. They were never established by a law of the land. They were established through voluntary effort. The Seed Growers Association was never

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

established by compulsory statute. The Manitoba Chicken Broiler Producers Association was never established by a law passed in the Legislative Assembly. The Manitoba Egg Producers Association it's there, it's thriving, it's healthy, but it did not require the measure that is before us with respect to cattle. They formed their own association and they are doing a very good job at it. The Hatcher Association, the Hog Producers Association, they were not formed by legislation. The Milk Producers Association, the Pool Elevators, Turkey Producers, United Grain Growers, Vegetable Growers, nor of these were formed by a statute brought through the Legislative Assembly. Why is it necessary for the beef producers to be organized by a law of the Province of Manitoba without knowing, first of all, that the majority of producers want to be organized in such a way, and even if all of them wanted to, it violates the principle of the freedom of a person to associate with whomever he or she may wish to.

MR. HALL: I'm sorry that you are reading association in place of marketing board in some places.

MR. USKIW: Well, they're all the same, they have associations too.

MR. HALL: No, not all of them.

MR. USKIW: Well, most of them do. But in any event, do you believe that for some special reason beef producers should be singled out as having to be brought into being by an Act of the Legislature when so many other associations have voluntarily formed and successfully carried out the responsibilities. Why do we need this?

MR. HALL: Simply, I guess, because it hasn't happened. We just don't have a fully funded beef association, it just isn't there.

MR. USKIW: Well, it seems to me — you may agree or disagree — that by doing it this way you are postponing for an indefinite period the day when the beef growers will be able to stand on their own two feet and do the job that they should be doing. You are making them dependent — well, are you making them depend on the law of the land for their existence? Really, this is the implication, that they are unable to organize, that they don't have voluntary support and therefore the only way they are going to get what they want, those who want it, is by ramming it down the throats of all of the beef producers by a law of the Legislature. That's really what is happening here.

MR. HALL: We have many precedents in our society and I'm not prepared, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. USKIW: Well, would you single one out, Sir, would you give me an example?

MR. HALL: I'm not, Mr. Chairman, prepared to . . .

MR. USKIW: Would you give me an example of a precedent? I would be very interested to learn where such a measure has ever been passed before anywhere in Canada as Bill 25. I would be extremely interested to find one.

MR. HALL: You're attempting to find one that would be identical, I suppose.

MR. USKIW: Well, not exactly, but essentially identical. The powers, the idea of a private association being introduced by a government bill rather than by a private member, all of those things. One example, I would like to find somewhere.

MR. HALL: The Quebec organization, UPA, . . .

MR. USKIW: The Quebec organization, I don't know who they are, so I'm unable to respond to you, Sir. Who is the UPA?

MR. HALL: It's the farm body in Quebec which is a compulsory checkoff.

MR. USKIW: It's a compulsory checkoff?

MR. HALL: That's right.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. USKIW: And does it have the features that are in Bill 25 with respect to compulsory membership, no appeal provisions . . .

MR. HALL: I haven't seen the bill.

MR. USKIW: Oh, I see, then you don't know if it's identical to this one.

MR. HALL: No, I don't think that was the question.

MR. USKIW: I said is there anything comparable, not exactly but relatively comparable to Bill 25 anywhere in existence in Canada, that is the question.

MR. HALL: And I think I responded.

MR. USKIW: Yes, well, to be comparable then it would have to be a statute introduced by the Quebec Legislature, forcing people to belong to an association without appeal, without redress, as this one. That is the whole relevance of our debate here today, is the autocratic approach that is being used with respect to Bill 25, that's the comparability that I'm looking for, anywhere in Canada.

MR. HALL: Well, I think I responded.

MR. USKIW: You think it is . . .

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. USKIW: . . . autocratic as Bill 25.

MR. HALL: I haven't seen the bill . . .

MR. USKIW: I see, okay.

MR. HALL: I just merely know the way they operate.

MR. USKIW: Well, Sir, then let's pursue this on a matter of principle. And I put this question to almost if not every witness before this committee. Do you believe that the Federation of Labour should be given similar powers over all workers in Manitoba and their employers as is provided in Bill 25 over the cattle industry?

MR. HALL: I think that's a different question?

MR. USKIW: No, it isn't, it's exactly the same. It's a human rights question. Should we treat all Manitobans the same, equal rights for all Manitobans, regardless of who they are and in what walk of life they are? Because this is a precedent, this legislation, and once you set a precedent and another group asks for the same rights, you are almost obligated to introduce legislation giving them those rights, or you must remove these. That is the position you put yourself in as a legislator. You must either go all the way and yield to every pressure group eventually, or you must repeal this one to remove the other pressure groups, that's the position we are being put in as legislators in Manitoba. Do you not see that as a very grave danger, that the government would be delegating its responsibilities to private clubs and associations throughout society in Manitoba and completely — not completely but largely — largely pass on the role of government to private organizations?

MR. HALL: I guess that's a question that legislators are going to have to debate.

MR. USKIW: Well, that is essentially the name of our debate here today and during second reading and will continue into third reading and will continue forever, as long as this kind of legislation is on the books, Sir. My point is, is it not a problem in your mind that we are introducing a measure that is not going to bring unity but is going to bring about greater degrees of friction because of the obnoxious piece of legislation that we have before us?

MR. HALL: In the Farm Bureau position which we've stated very clearly is a clear support in principle

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

that there be a provision for a funding. I think we have also made it quite clear that we were addressing ourselves to that particular area. I have indicated that within some amendments that could be included would also be acceptable to the farm community as we read it.

MR. USKIW: Well, in your submission you made reference that minor amendments would satisfy you, Sir. I can assure you that an abortion of this bill and nothing less would be satisfactory to myself in keeping with the human rights principles that I believe in, Sir, basic, fundamental human rights, that's all we're talking about. We're not talking about cattlemen; we're talking about the rights of human beings in the Province of Manitoba. Cattle have nothing to do with that issue. And that is the importance of this debate. It isn't whether cattlemen should have a checkoff, it's whether people should be subjected in this way by a state authority, especially after there have been questions of a similar nature put, referendums held and rejected on two occasions in the last five years in Manitoba. On three occasions, we've had referendums two on grain and one on this question in 1974. So it's obvious to any government and to any individual that this cannot be brought about voluntarily and therefore, can you condone an authoritarian approach such as this in spite of the historical facts facing us. That is, that this proposal or a similar proposal — not this one because we would never allow this kind of thing to even go to a vote — a similar proposal providing for a checkoff without these abusive powers was turned down by the producers themselves in 1974. How could you condone this challenge to that fact? How can anyone give credibility to this bill on the basis of that experience? It just doesn't make any sense to me.

MR. HALL: Well, your description of what happened is your words and not mine.

MR. USKIW: But is it not true then that in 1974 there was a referendum on a checkoff to finance a cattlemen's association in Manitoba? Is that not a fact?

MR. HALL: I suppose then, Mr. Chairman, in order to respond to that particular question, a person would have to elaborate to a considerable degree and I'm not too sure if it's useful to the . . .

MR. USKIW: No, but it is a fact that there was a referendum on this question, not on Bill 25, but on a checkoff fund to finance a cattlemen's association.

MR. HALL: It was a different approach and we have to evaluate every approach on its own basis.

MR. USKIW: Oh, I agree with that, yes, absolutely, but essentially the main purpose of that approach was to provide for a means of raising funds to finance a cattlemen's association, that was the nature of the question in 1974 and with an elected producer board, not appointed. But that went down to defeat, Mr. Chairman, so in light of that, you know, it takes an authoritarian mind to introduce such a proposal. It doesn't take a mind that believes in a freer Manitoba, it takes one that believes in a strong arm and a hard fist. That's really what this is, and it is on that basis that I raise the question of conscience. How, in all conscience, can anybody support that kind of measure? It's just unbelievable. It has never been done in the history of this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No more questions?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm not through. You indicate on Page 2 that one of the major factors which has contributed to our inability to alleviate some of the difficult situations within the cattle production and marketing system has been the absence of an effective organized effort or behalf of cattle producers to press for and seek the solutions required. What solutions did you have in mind here and what problems were you relating, or what was in the thinking behind that paragraph because it doesn't spell out the problems or the solutions, it only generalizes.

MR. HALL: I think those that have been involved in the cattle industry in the last some time realize that there have been problems and there has been need for some changes that would be some improvements to the system. I don't think there is any question in our minds about that. The first thing in our opinion, in the Farm Bureau, that has to happen is that you have to have an effective voice for the people that are concerned and that they, within that particular group, make the decisions as to what are the steps that they wish to take or would like to attempt, to make improvements within that system. Without that kind of an organization, then it is not effective and it is not meaningful unless they have that kind of an organization through which to work.

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. USKIW: Well, but doesn't, Sir, that presume that there is a consensus of opinion on the question amongst cattlemen in Manitoba? To introduce a bill that would embody every cattlemen in Manitoba as to presume a consensus, does it not?

MR. HALL: Well, there is certainly, I think beyond question, a consensus within the cattle producers that there needs to be some measures, ongoing measures, to improve the total marketing system. I think there is a complete consensus that way.

MR. USKIW: Yes, I agree with that, but are you saying that there is a consensus with respect to the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we halt the proceedings for a few minutes, until the tapes are changed?

Mr. Uskiw, you may proceed.

MR. USKIW: Yes, you were saying, sir, that there is a consensus for the need of some organization but there is a lack of consensus on the nature of the organization. Would that be a fair statement?

MR. HALL: The nature of the organization, as I would see it, spelled out here is a complete fresh concept. If the producers sincerely wish to have an organization, if what they are saying is factual, then I think it gives them an opportunity to determine whether or not that this is something that they feel strongly about, why, then, I suppose, one could expect that they might support such an effort. They are certainly, as I said earlier, they are certainly saying that there is need.

MR. USKIW: Well, all right. You, sir, have indicated that there are numerous problems within the beef industry that must be dealt with, problems of extreme depth. Everyone has said it, yet this still . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister on a point of order.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the witness that is before us has been asked that question by the members of the committee. When the Member for Lac du Bonnet says there has been no repetition, our witness has answered that question more than once, and from one committee member, and I think there should be some consideration given to the individual for the answers that he has given and a closer track kept by the individual who is asking the questions over and over again. We do have a lot of people here and I think consideration should be given.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have not dealt with this witness before, and the Minister of Agriculture is out of order for the third time tonight, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: On a point of clarification, I did not indicate that it was the Member for Lac du Bonnet, but a member of the committee had asked the same question of the witness that is before us.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have my own way of pursuing my own ends with respect to the debate in this committee, and the Minister of Agriculture is not about to intercede to prevent me from carrying out those responsibilities.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, on that point, it is my understanding that the individual was asked if he would permit questions, not to enter into debate with the Member for Lac du Bonnet, which he has indicated that he is doing.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, it has been indicated to the witness that he may answer and he may or wish to answer; that is his own privilege or prerogative. Every witness is told that that is their opportunity, to answer or not to answer, as they wish. So therefore no one is under duress, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister of Agriculture is out of order for the fourth time tonight.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I had the floor, Mr. Chairman. Did you recognize the Minister of Agriculture?

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture is still responding to the same point of order?

MR. USKIW: There was no point of order, Mr. Speaker. Who raised the point of order for the purpose of clarification?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. As I recall, the point of order was raised by the Minister of Agriculture, and to which he still is responding and has the floor.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, to further clarify the point of order that I have raised that the Member for Lac du Bonnet is asking repetitious questions of the individual before the committee, questions that were asked by other members of the committee. That was the point of order and I think that there is a particular reason not to ask them again, because they have been answered and I think we are prolonging the committee far longer than it should be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Adam, on the same point of order. Mr. Adam. Order please, order please. Mr. Adam, on the point of order.

MR. ADAM: Yes, on that same point of order, Mr. Chairman, I did touch upon the concerns of the Farm Bureau on the problems, but there are other areas that the former Minister, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, wants to elaborate on, areas that I didn't touch upon. And I see no reason why that can't be expanded upon. This is what the Member for Lac du Bonnet is trying to do: To probe out other areas of concern that I have not touched upon, and there are many. I would never be able to touch on every problem that faces beef cattle producers tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not perceive a point of order in this matter. However, I do detect, in my observation, a very meticulous line of questioning. There does appear to be a very common thread through a great number of the questions, and it may be also a point of debate as to just how much repetition there might be. I would caution all members of the committee that we do have a great number of briefs to hear, and they should judge and frame their questions in such a way as to get the greatest amount of information in the least possible amount of time, having some consideration for all the witnesses who have taken the time to make their views known to us.
Mr. Uskiw, please continue.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, would it be reasonable, would it be reasonable to suggest to this committee that where a member raises a point of order three times in one sitting and he fails to have the acknowledgement of the Chair that it is a point of order, that he must not again speak that evening, or that same meeting, because that is what's going on here, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Agriculture has not had a point of order all evening, and he has raised it four times, and you, Sir, have not considered it to be a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I do not perceive that to be a point of order. I am not an expert on the rules, but I know of no such rule that would apply in that case. Can you continue with your line of questioning?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, when we were interrupted, rudely interrupted, I was pursuing the question of the problems in the beef industry in the eyes of the Manitoba Farm Bureau, and there are grave problems, as he has indicated, that have to be dealt with. Given that they are so grave and important, wouldn't it make sense if we were compelled to legislate to deal with those problems: that we not restrict at all the democratically elected board of directors, which is supposed to be part of this legislation; that they be given full powers to do what must be done for the beef industry including intervention in the marketplace if they deem it to be necessary, and if the producers want them to do so? Wherein lies the logic of restriction in this bill if you are saying that the beef producers should do their own thing, make their own decisions, and operate democratically? What is the logic of those restrictions in Bill 25, in your view?

MR. HALL: I'm not too sure whether you are just asking me to agree with you.

MR. USKIW: No, I want your opinion. Is there any logic in Section 6(2), which restricts the activity of this association with respect to finding solutions to marketing problems? That is a restriction. That's a prohibition in this bill, yet we are told that once we elect this board they will run their own affairs, they will do as they please, except that if 100 percent of them want to go in the direction of a marketing board they must not do it because the bill does not allow them. Do you see that as logic, as reasonable, as rational?

MR. HALL: There is extreme logic in listening to the voice of the producer back on the farm.

MR. USKIW: Absolutely. That's just my point.

MR. HALL: And the producer back on the farm has indicated, in the consensus that we have, very clearly that at this point he is not prepared for a full marketing board.

MR. USKIW: That's correct; that's correct. That is correct. But, Mr. Chairman, what I am asking is should the producers, after having studied their problems, decide to move in that direction, should they not be given the freedom to do as they wish to do, by a majority? That's all I am saying. I am not suggesting that they should adopt a measure that they do not wish; I am suggesting that they be allowed to adopt the measure that they wish, in majority, and therefore should we not ask that the Minister remove the restrictions on Page 2 of the bill, Section 6(2). Wouldn't it make sense to amend the bill . . . ?

MR. HALL: Mr. Uskiw, you have made a statement that I previously said that I did not agree with.

MR. USKIW: That you did not agree with.

MR. HALL: That's right.

MR. USKIW: You do not agree with what, sir?

MR. HALL: I do not agree with the statement that you have made that the producers want to have that . . .

MR. USKIW: I didn't say they wanted to; I said they didn't want to, sir. I said that it is abundantly clear that at this point they do not want a producers marketing board for beef. My question is: should they wish to change their opinion after this particular Act has provided them with research funds, funds that would allow them to engage in educational programs, fact-finding programs, after that exercise should they conclude that they would like to reverse their position, should they not be given the right to do so?

MR. HALL: If they have faith in the democratic system, as I have, why, they probably could.

MR. USKIW: They could. Well, how would they do it with the prohibitions . . . ?

MR. HALL: They could ask for an amendment to the Act.

MR. USKIW: Oh, so now you are suggesting that we want to imply, or are you suggesting, sir, that we are implying that the producers will run their own affairs, that once this association is established that they will do as they please and that we will not interfere with them, as a government. They will manage their own affairs, excepting we are not giving them the freedom to do so.

MR. HALL: Mr. Chairman, I feel I have completely covered that area.

MR. USKIW: Fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The witness is under no obligation to answer any or all questions.

MR. USKIW: On page 2, sir, you have indicated that Manitoba producers feel disadvantaged as compared to the neighbouring provinces who have some means of raising funds to finance an association. Would it not be fair to say that some people in those provinces feel disadvantaged that they have such an agency?

MR. HALL: I fully responded to that question as well, from a previous question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: How long, sir, in your view, is a reasonable trial period? Three years? Two years? One year? What would be a reasonable trial period?

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

MR. HALL: This is just a personal opinion. We haven't discussed that within the Farm Bureau I think that normally, in order to provide for the operation, that we would be looking at a period of two to three years to see, it takes a bit of time, as we well know from experience, in order for something to become functional.

MR. USKIW: Would three years be adequate to determine that?

MR. HALL: It could be reasonable. It depends just how quickly their structure becomes operative. It takes some time, as I have experienced, and through our group, in order to compile the type of information on the whole system that you are fully conversant with it.

MR. USKIW: I will ask you one last question, sir. Assuming Bill 25 is passed, giving the distinction of government support — not only support, but government creation of an association that will respond to and speak for the cattlemen of this province — assuming there is an association of cattlemen formed outside of this association as a challenge to this association, what would you expect the government to do in terms of recognizing either body? Do you think that they would sort of look objectively as between the two groups, or do you believe that they would somehow be tied morally to this association because of it being their own creation?

MR. HALL: I just think it would be unfortunate if there was a splinter group. I think any of our commodity groups have to learn to pull together; certainly as agricultural producers it's the only constructive approach we can take to it.

MR. USKIW: Well then, sir, why wasn't it recommended — or was it? us. W Perhaps you might clarify it for why are we proceeding with a government bill instead of a Private Members' bill so that we don't have any political stigma attached to this association? Wouldn't it make sense, so that this association would be credible before all political bodies, that it not be a government bill?

MR. HALL: In the democratic process of election of people to represent the producers, I don't see any need for it being political.

MR. USKIW: Well, can I help you follow my line of reasoning. Traditionally, bills establishing private associations are introduced by private members so that the government isn't looked upon as favouring any particular group in society simply because it's recognized that not everyone may wish to belong to that group and may want to form another group, and therefore the government would have to be neutral on the issue. The introduction of this bill, sponsored by a Cabinet Minister, takes away the neutrality of government and therefore handicaps not only this association for all time in the future, but handicaps any political party that will be in power in the future in having to deal with this association objectively. Whether they wanted to or not they would be handicapped.

MR. HALL: Mr. Chairman, I think that's a statement of opinion, and I don't think I can respond to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions to this witness, thank you very much Mr. Hall for your presentation.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next witness is Lawrence Delichte. Mr. Delichte.

MR. LAWRENCE DELICHTE: Mr. Chairman, honourable members of the Committee. My presentation is a personal one expressing my views only. I am a farmer, cattle and grain, they are both equally important, and my farm is owned and operated by myself and family. I am asking myself this question: what am I doing here in this unfamiliar surrounding? I would rather repair a fence or pick stones or pull weeds. It is concern about the future beef business that brings me here. I am worried that in the future my sons and daughters will not have the privilege of making personal decisions, as I did, that their choice of markets may be disrupted, that they may be forced to rely on subsidies, that they will lose control of their sources of income, and lose their independence, independence being the uppermost reason for choosing a farming career.

Now, why do I think this way? Something very serious happened during the winter of 1977. As you know, the producers of beef were in deep trouble. Along with that came a vigorous campaign to blame all our troubles on the market system. Proposals to change our marketing habits were put forward. Worst of all, an attempt was made to take control of the marketing of slaughter cattle

Standing Committee On Agriculture
Thursday, July 13, 1978

id to form a marketing board. There were meetings held during the early part of 1977, information eetings held on behalf of the government to sell this planned takeover of slaughter beef. The two eetings I attended were well attended, for everyone was anxious to know what was in the wind. didn't like what happened there, though. It was made frightfully clear to me that the wishes of ipable, informed and sincere producers were not heard. It seemed to me that we were told what think, and we were manipulated to respond via a questionnaire, the result of which led one to yree wish something he didn't want. I don't like being handled that way. And that's another reason hy I'm here tonight.

Beef producers need a strong, independent organization, entirely under the control of producers f beef. The main purpose of that organization, I would hope, would be to keep producers dependent and to be able to counter public pressure. I therefore came to express my support r Bill 25 proposed by our Minister of Agriculture. I believe his intentions to form a funded beef rganization are fair and straightforward, and that he wants it to be according to the wishes of l producers of beef in Manitoba.

I don't want to go into details of this plan because I am not prepared to do so; furthermore, know there are individuals and organizations represented here who have given the matter much ough. I recommend that the members of this Committee heed the recommendations set forward y the President of the Beef Growers or its directors. If the resulting bill is good for them, it will e good for me.

And that's all I have to say, gentlemen.

R. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Delichte. Will you submit to questions from members f the Committee?

R. DELICHTE: Mr. Chairman, the Committee meetings are dragging on unnecessarily long, I think. ne questions are prolonged and becoming useless, I think — meaningless, because of the length e time that they drag on, and they are the same questions. There are people here who are waiting o speak and are much more capable than I am, and qualified to answer those questions. Furthermore, was here yesterday — I drove 100 miles to get here — I got home at 6:00 this morning. I have o be at Brandon tomorrow morning to pick up cattle, and I'm tired. I'd like to decline uestions.

R. CHAIRMAN: You are under no obligation, Mr. Delichte, to answer questions. Thank you for our presentation.

Committee rise. The Committee will meet tomorrow night at 8:00 o'clock to consider further riefs.