

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock Friday, October 31st, 1958.

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions  
Presenting Reports by Standing and  
Select Committees  
Notice of Motion  
Introduction of Bills  
Orders of the Day

MR. R. SEABORN (Wellington): Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to point out one or two errors in the Hansard of October the 29th.

At the outset, I might say that I am probably responsible in some measure for some of the changes that occurred in the Hansard, because after all it was my maiden speech, but as the changes do in some respect change the sense of some of the sentences, I would beg to bring them to your attention at this time.

On page 24, in the second paragraph, it should read "Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest socialist's in England once said: that the dominant issue of the twentieth century IS socialism". and further down about 11 lines from the bottom of the page of page 24, it should read: "In a large modern community the public cannot own property directly as it is only in the most ludicrous sense that the 180 million Russians own the Russian railway; or the 50 million Britishers own the public - (pardon me) - own the British coal mines, when the Attlee Government was in power". And over on page 25, Sir, about nine lines from the bottom, I said: "I would like to suggest, Sir, that the Conservatives believe with the C.C.F. Party that there is much that is evil and unjust in our social order". And here is where the change is Sir: "But we believe that the big and hazy" (not the big and easy) projects of the socialist party of the C.C.F. would bring to us not betterment, but confusion and impoverishment. I thank you for your kindness.

MR. R.W. BEND (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the House that sitting in the Speaker's gallery is the 85 year old mother of the Honourable Member from Radisson. She has come down here to not only see that her son says the right thing, but that he does the right thing.

MR. L. STINSON (Leader of the C.C.F.): Mr. Speaker, I should like to welcome the mother of our honourable friend to the gallery, and say to her that her son always says and does the right thing.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HONOURABLE GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following Bills: No. 4, An Act to amend the Municipal Act; No. 5, An Act to amend The Companies Act; No. 6, An Act to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act; No. 7, An Act for the relief of Denis Beaudry; No. 12, An Act to authorize the making of agreements between the Government of Canada, the Government of Manitoba and Municipalities, for the purpose of increasing employment of persons in the winter.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair.

DR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Bill No. 4, An Act to amend The Municipal Act. Section 1, Clause (e), Sub-clause (i), Sub-clause (ii) .....

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think I should begin by apologizing to the Committee. I undertook this morning to see that copies of amendments to this Bill and No. 5, were provided to the Members before we met in the Committee of the Whole. I neglected to do that and I offer my apologies. However, the one amendment that I am about to propose is a simple matter and I hope that the Members will not have difficulty in following it. I'd like to move, Mr. Chairman, that in place of (ii) as printed in the Bill, the following be substituted: Where a grant exceeds an amount that is equal to the amount that would be raised by a rate of one mill on the dollar on the taxable property in the municipality, the making of the grant receives the assent of the resident ratepayers in the manner provided in Part 5, with respect to by-laws that require the assent of ratepayers under that part. The effect of that, of course, is to require that where the amount to be donated to these development corporations exceeds one mill on the taxable properties, that it is subject to a vote of the ratepayers, as suggested by my honourable friend from Flin Flon.

MR. F.L. JOBIN (Flin Flon): ..... the Minister is fine and dandy, and following further to what I said this morning, I know that it will happen that on occasion there will not be time to give the amendments to us. I'd suggest that some time during the Session, at least after the Bill is passed, that these amendments be made available, for the same reason that I gave this morning, and if that could be done it would be fine.

Bill No. 4. was read section by section, clause by clause and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Companies Act. Section 1 of the Bill (Passed) ... 105(a) ...

MR. EVANS: ..... as amended I think, Mr. Chairman, in line 19, the fourth word "private" has been crossed out.

Bill No. 5 was read section by section, clause by clause, and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Bill No. 6 was read, section by section, clause by clause, and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 7, An Act for the Relief of Denis Beaudry.

Bill No. 7 was read section by section, clause by clause, and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 12, An Act to authorize the making of agreements between the Government of Canada, the Government of Manitoba and Municipalities, for the purpose of increasing employment of persons in winter.

Bill No. 12 was read section by section, clause by clause.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause (c) sub-clause (i) As amended, adding the word "clearing" following between fencing and trimming.

HONOURABLE JOHN THOMPSON: (Minister of Labor): I move that the following be added as subsection (5) of the Bill: "Where a schedule under The Fair Wage Act would, except for Section 31 of that Act, apply to a person who has been provided employment under this Act, that schedule shall notwithstanding Section 31 of the Fair Wage Act, apply to that person and to the employer of that person." This clause respects the Fair Wage schedule which was agreed upon in special Committee this morning.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you would be kind enough to explain Section 31 of the Act.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, Section 31 of the Act refers to exemption from The Fair Wage Act, the municipal employees and government employees.

MR. STINSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a comment on the inclusion of this clause. I think it demonstrates the importance of having public hearing, at which time representations can be made. This morning a representative of the Winnipeg and District Labour Council appeared and urged that this be included in the Act, and that was done very quickly. And I think, Sir, it also demonstrates the fact that things move more quickly when

there is a minority government.

MR. EVANS: It depends on the minority.

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN (Premier): Well that's an interesting comment -- perhaps I should take some part in the discussion. I quite agree with my honourable friend as to the value of public hearings -- I'm not aware that anyone in this Chamber anywhere has any doubts on that score. As for things moving very quickly, they'd move a lot more quickly if my honourable friend and his friend would revert to the proper position in Opposition.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I take it the Honourable the First Minister means that we wouldn't have any arguments or discussions if that was the case.

MR. ROBLIN: No, I just want to get rid of the limpets.

MR. STINSON: Mr. Chairman, I've been insulted by experts, and I can take anything that my honourable friend may say.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, I'm an easy fellow to get along with. I use nothing but the best advisors.

MR. STINSON: Well, in this case his advisor is the editor of the Winnipeg Free Press.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm doubtful of that, Sir. I'm hoping that you'll take his advice on this particular point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Subsection (3) as amended. It was amended this morning in Committee.

A MEMBER: What is the amendment then Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ...Well here, that in "by a favourable vote of three-quarters of the Members thereof, that was instead of a unanimous vote; and the other amending clause was: Following the Minister of Municipal Affairs, with the approval of the Treasury Board.

A MEMBER: Is there not an amendment to subsection (2) "Where the .... does not exceed the percentage allowed in The Municipal Act"? That's to take care of those municipalities that are now under the Public Utility Board.

MR. THOMPSON: No, there was no amendment proposed or voted on this morning.

MR. ROBLIN: .....discussion, and I don't think it does.

Balance of Bill No. 12 read to Section 9 and passed.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman,

I note that there is some two suggested amendments here, but the one doesn't appear to me to be the one that was agreed to in Committee this morning. Have you an amendment in the Bill before you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMPSON; Mr. Chairman, if I may refer to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. There was no amendment on that section this morning. As I recall, the amendment was defeated in Committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: The amendment was defeated -- there's an amendment moved on one of the sections that we have now passed -- on the same subject, but I'm quite clear and I remember that on this question of the Minister that the amendment carried .....

MR. ROBLIN: The one that carried was the one on the Treasury Board.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: .... This amendment was defeated.

MR. CAMPBELL: I believe that's correct. Well now, if it was defeated, it was the one that you proposed a little while ago that was in the Bill, and that one was carried. This one was defeated on a vote. Well, I'm not going to go over all the arguments that I used in the Committee this morning, because after all, the Committee is a Committee of all the Members of the House, and it's a little different from one ...

MR. ROBLIN: .....would it not be better to allow the Honourable Minister to ....

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes...I'm sorry.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Section 9 of the Bill be amended as follows: That the words 'the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or,' be added after the word "intent" in the second line, subsection (1), and that the following subsection be added as subsection (2) of Section 9 - If regulations made under subsection (1) are of a legislative nature they shall be made by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, but if they are of an administrative nature, they may be made by the Minister. And further, that subsections (2) and (3) as printed in the Bill will be reprinted as subsections (3) and (4). I think, Mr. Chairman, that these amendments speak for themselves.

MR. R. TEILLET (St. Boniface): .... I was wondering, perhaps the Minister might just, take just a minute or two to outline his own thinking on this division of legislative and administrative, so that we might get a clear picture of his thinking on it.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendment is

simply to try and assure that anything which pertains to policy or has the characteristic of a legislative amendment, shall be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. For example, under this Bill a matter such as the formula which involves the financial share of the Province, might be considered to be a matter of policy, and in my opinion, would come under a legislative regulation. But there could be several administrative regulations, such as the type of form necessary, the type of application for a project, those routine administrative matters could be approved by the Minister himself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's one other point here in connection with No. 1, and that is that it should begin with subsection (3): "Then for the purpose of carrying out". . . . . Right at the beginning of 9 . . . . . Yes, it was suggested by Legislative Council it would be best to begin with those words . . . . . Yes.

MR. STINSON: A happy compromise. The silence on my right here indicates that.

MR. CAMPBELL: I wasn't going to remain silent, Mr. Chairman. I was going to say the same thing that the Honourable the Leader of the C.C.F. Party has said. This time I'm in complete agreement with him and I think it is quite a reasonable and happy compromise. Like my honourable friend, I'd rather have had my own way exactly, but I think this is a fair and reasonable compromise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're agreed subsection (2) as the new section?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 2 is now 3 . . . subsection (3), (4), (a) and (b); section 9 of the Bill passed. Section 10 of the Bill.

MR. M.A. GRAY (Inkster): Unfortunately I wasn't able to be . . . . . to the Committee . . . . . I would like to ask three questions. One is, when the Bill is passed will the Department start working on it right away, or wait until the winter months, which is January. No. 2. If a municipality refuses to co-operate and there is an unemployment situation there, will the Government or the Department still do what's possible for that municipality? No. 3. If there's no work available and the unemployment insurance is exhausted, is there any program by the Government to assist financially, or otherwise, those who are unemployed during the same period?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Honourable Member from Inkster, the answer to the first question is Yes, we will proceed immediately with the execution of this plan. Question 2. If a municipality refuses to co-operate and doesn't apply to come under the plan, I'm afraid that we have no authority to

enter that municipality and propose that they entertain a certain project. The onus of applying rests with the municipality. Number 3. If no work or employment is available and the insurance is exhausted, have we any other plan, was that the question? No, we have no other plan, other than social welfare regulations which have been in force for some time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 10 of the Bill ..... Read section by section and passed.....Will the Committee rise and report?

MR. W.C. MILLER (Rhineland): Before the Committee rises and reports, and while we're in this more or less informal atmosphere, I note that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and also the Minister of Agriculture, undertook to inform the Members of the Committee as to the content of the proposed, any proposed amendments, and I was just wondering whether the Minister of Education intends to follow that example.

HONOURABLE STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, we'll have our amendments ready for Committee meeting Monday morning at 10 o'clock.

MR. MILLER: ..... and we will have them before the Committee considers the Bill?

MR. McLEAN: Yes.....the first thing the Committee meets.

MR. MILLER: Fine.

After a voice vote the Committee rose and reported.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Companies Act, be now read a third time and passed.

After a voice vote, Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, that Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act, be now read a third time and passed.

After a voice vote, Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Bill No. 7, An Act for the relief of Denis Beaudry, be now read a third time and passed.

After a voice vote, Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Bill No. 12, An Act to authorize the making of agreements between the Government of Canada, the Government of Manitoba and Municipalities for the purpose of in-

creasing employment of persons in winter, be now read a third time and passed.

After a voice vote, Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of Return. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that an Order of the House be issued for a return, showing the names and addresses of all fishermen sold commercial licenses for Lake Manitoba during the 1957-58 season.

MR. GRAY: Now, I think it's a good motion, but I think the members would be interested to know for what purpose?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I have my own reasons. They will be revealed later on in the House, perhaps.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourn debate. The Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to the Speech at the opening of the Session, and the amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. M.E. RIDLEY (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with the previous speakers to wish you well and congratulate you. I have no hesitation to say that we will be proud of you in this Chamber.

I also am glad to take the opportunity to welcome all the new Members in this Chamber. I am sure you will enjoy the work. As I just came into this House last year, and I certainly look forward to coming back into the Session this time. To you Members that are in the Opposition groups, I hope and I am sure you will, receive the same co-operation and goodwill from all Departments, from the Government, that I received when I was sitting over where you are.

I do not intend to speak too long on my constituency, as I gave you quite a run of it last year; it has now changed a bit. I've taken in a little larger territory. I have a few things that I want done, but I'm not going to say anything about them now because I am quite sure that I'll never see the day when they'll be able to say to me, "Why didn't you do it when? I hope I'm never asked that question. I hope they will be done, and I'm sure they will.

There is a few pieces of this Hansard that I wanted to read to you. This is volume No. 2, page 25, the last paragraph - where the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was speaking: "Then they establish a province-wide water control and soil conservation, that has been a great friend, a great policy of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, and yet, our Government put



legislation on the statute book. I understand that. I am afraid that my honourable friend, like his Minister of Agriculture, doesn't understand it. Yes, and no attempt, so far as I know, has been made to act on that very, very useful program that was made possible at that time". Well now, as you know, when you read in the paper, shortly after the government took office, it wasn't very long that this Board was appointed on the Water Commission Board. There were four men appointed: Mr. Peters, Mr. Ed Pulford, Mr. A.A. Hamm and Mr. R. Epsom. Now this Board is functioning, they were appointed, they set up, and it is called the Lower Red River Valley Water Commission. They have appointed a secretary, Mr. D.K. Friesen. Now on October 2nd, Mr. Friesen wrote the Honourable Mr. Gurney Evans, the Minister of Industry and Commerce: "Dear Mr. Evans: At a meeting of the Lower Red River Valley Water Commission, held on September 30th, 1958, the following resolution was passed: That insofar as it has been deemed necessary by the Government to set up a water commission, under section "C" of the Water Supply Districts Act, therefore, be it resolved that the Government, give to the Commission, the services of a department to do all engineering and technical research for the Commission. I was requested to forward this resolution to you." Now, in the answer to that, Mr. Evans, on October 15th, that was 13 days after, he wrote Mr. D.K. Friesen: "I am glad to acknowledge your letter of October 2nd, in which you quoted the following resolution approved: At the September 30th, 1958, meeting of the Lower Red River Valley Water Commission." Mr. Evans says: "I am pleased to advise you that Mr. R.B. Hogarth, Director of Water Research Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources, is presently, (was already out working on it when he wrote this letter), presently carrying out a study of the possible sources of water supply. I understand that the study includes an evaluation of the cost of using all possible sources of supply such as the proposed Stephenfield reservoir, the Greater Winnipeg Water District, the Roseau River and the Pembina River. This study will implement - supplement Mr. Hogarth's report of September 6th, 1958, dealing with the Morden Reservoir. I understand that a copy of this letter has been forwarded to you by Mr. McMullen." So, I would take by that that the Department is taking some action and that there is an attempt being made." The ... I just didn't get the question.

MR. MILLER: My understanding is that there was a report by Mr. Hogarth on September 6th.

MR. RIDLEY: On September 2nd. This will supplement Mr. Hogarth's report of September 2nd, 1958, dealing with the Morden Reservoir. There was a report on the Morden Reservoir which was tied in with it.

Now also, due to the Water Resources Branch, they were down and studied the area of the Pembina Triangle, and they reported back and said that the dugouts were very low in that whole area. This was reported to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, and he immediately wired six municipalities in that area, asking them if they could help them in any way, that they had pumps and

pipes, that the water could be pumped out of the river into the dugouts. He did receive replies from two of them, who replied that they agreed they would get together, and he has had no word since from them. But the pumping equipment is here, the pipes are here. After all, for a Government that's only been in three or four months, I think they are taking very swift action in the matter.

I also, at this time, must commend the Honourable Member from Dufferin for bringing up the important question of our water through the Carman area and all through that area, Fannystelle, right down to Morris. I had intended bringing it up anyway. This summer I travelled with Mr. George Muir who is the Federal Member for Lisgar, with some of the Town Council of Carman, and we spent a whole day going down through that area. It's not that either one of us is any man to say where a dam could be built but we wanted to see the area. We did find in that area, ten or eleven miles west of Carman, where there were streams that run the year round. And there's millions of gallons of water that come down through those hills right back from St. Lupicin through to Graysville and past Carman. Now as we know, there was a resolution went in from this Government last year -- I'm sure it was proposed by the Honourable Member for Dufferin -- to urge the Federal Government to do something on that matter. And, if I recall, I got up and asked the question, "What would the Provincial Government do if there was no action from the Federal Government?" Now, I'm going to press for it, and I'm sure that every Member in this House knows the situation is serious, and I know the Minister will give us every co-operation in that review.

After Mr. Muir and I made that whole day trip, we came in to see the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, and had considerable talks with them. Mr. Willis, in the past month, I am glad to inform you, has talked to P.F.R.A. twice a week, asking them to bring in recommendations to solve this problem. Since that time, he has informed me today, that the P.F.R.A. are making studies right now and are working on the project and he is waiting for their report. I am sure that every member in this House that knows the situation involved, knows it is serious, very serious, for the towns and the farmers, and everyone that has livestock in that area.

I would just like to wind up, in passing, a few words, that we, on this side of the House, are very interested in this water project. My area is not involved very much but I am in the area of Winkler south of there, and right down to Altona and all through there. And I am sure the Honourable Member from Morris is vitally interested. And I think that with the co-operation of every one, the P.F.R.A. and our own provincial government, that we are going to get action. An I am sure we will all keep pressing for this action.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, in spite of the few remarks that I made at the time of the - the first day of this Session - when the time came to choose a speaker, I would like to assure you, Sir, that there was nothing personal in the stand that I took. I would like to congratulate you on having achieved this

high office. I have full confidence that you will treat us all with equal fairness and I would like to offer my most sincere congratulations also to Mrs. Harrison. I am tempted also to offer my sympathies to you, Sir, because I believe that your work will be quite difficult. This Session is only a few days old, and already quite a few have had to go to you for assistance. You've had a few difficult decisions to make. You have had to call to order quite a few of the members of this House, who were apparently imputing motives. And I might say that this is not surprising to me because they received a very bad example on the first day of the opening of this House. On that day, I made a suggestion. I made the suggestion that when we think of choosing a permanent speaker, that it might be desirable to look at all the possible qualifications and that outside of having ability and experience and good judgment, it would not be bad, it would be desirable, that a permanent speaker should have a certain knowledge of the two official languages of this House. I did not say that he must be a bilingual person, or a French-speaking person, as I was quoted in the newspapers; I just said that he should have a certain knowledge. And one, in another sentence I said, "some command." I had in mind, not necessarily a French Canadian - Canadian of French origin - and I said that if the choice had been left open throughout the House that there might have been other possibilities than yourself. I had in mind for one, the Honourable the Member for Rhineland, who has a certain knowledge of the two official languages. I had in mind the Honourable Member for Rockwood-Iberville, who has the same qualifications. I had in mind the Honourable Member for Radisson; my good friend, who on that particular day, had greeted me so well in the French language when I got into the building. And, of course, there were also the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose; I did not take the time to name all these persons. The Honourable, the Premier knows that these persons have a certain knowledge; but he chose, when he spoke, to insinuate that I was preaching for a call, and that he will take me into consideration later. I think that was showing a bad example, Mr. Speaker. If the Honourable, the Premier, did not like my suggestion, he should have said so, and not impute motives to me that I was preaching for a call.

Possibly, Mr. Speaker, when there's no speaker in the Chair, it is permissible to forget the elementary principle of parliamentary etiquette. There was only some hundreds of people in this House at that time when the imputation of motives was made. And I say to you, Sir, that I offer my sympathies. I might appear to be very hurt at the Premier; I was at the time; but now that I have cleared the record, I would like to say to him that, in his favour, there was the fact that we were delaying proceedings on that the great day when he was for the first time appearing on this floor, and he had quite a program arranged. I bear him no ill feeling. I would like to compliment him for having achieved the position that he has now. I wish to wish him, in his new way of life, all the happiness possible, and to Mrs. Roblin also.

I would like to present my congratulations to the mover of

the Speech of the Address in Reply. He is a young man of energy, ability, who will do well in this House. As far as the seconder is concerned, I would like to say that very seldom have I been impressed as I have been by his speech on that day. I'm not the only one. I had, going back home on that day, Mrs. Prefontaine and four girls of grade 12, St. Pierre Central School, and with respect to that address, they had very, very kind words. It is refreshing, I am sure, to hear a man get up in this House, stress the importance of spiritual values as the Honourable Member has done. He will be a credit, not only to his party, but to this House.

I would like to congratulate my leader, the Leader of the Opposition. He has been re-elected for the ninth time, if I'm right, in his constituency. Now, I have been re-elected myself six times. As the years go by, the people seem to get tired of us. It seems to be a little bit more difficult. Although I was able to end up ahead, it seems that the people say: "Well, it's time for a change. These persons do not rule by Divine Right." And I know that the Honourable, my leader, Leader of the Opposition, has not treated his constituency as well as many other constituencies; in fact, they were left behind in many, many instances. I say that he was too humble when he attributed to himself the fact that his party had not come back on top after the general election. If it had not been for him in the circumstances, instead of a slight defeat, it would have been much worse. Because this election, Mr. Speaker, was not fought on the basis of Manitoba politics, it was fought on the basis of Federal politics. And I'm going to prove that before I'm through.

There was a federal election, as you all know, on June the 10th, 1957. On election night, it was apparent that the Liberals had been defeated. Mr. Diefenbaker had been elected with the largest group in the Federal House of Commons. Leader of the Opposition in Manitoba, at that time, challenged Premier Campbell to an election. A few days after some of us who had the chance to meet Premier Campbell, suggested to him that he should accept the challenge, and go to the people right away. I was one of those. And my argument was this. Mr. Diefenbaker had made, has made a lot of promises. This I was telling to my leader. He hasn't got the majority. There must be another Federal Election soon. He will call the Federal Parliament and implement some of his major promises. He will increase old age pensions. He will give cash advances and then it will be more difficult for us, because the credit that will go to Mr. Diefenbaker and the Conservatives would work against us in Manitoba. And Mr. Campbell answered, the answer of a true statesman, Maybe you're right. But the job of a government is to govern, and to govern as long as the law states it should govern unless there are some outstanding circumstances within the province, and we have a year to go. Mr. Speaker, I for one, am sure that Premier Campbell is a man of whom it will be said, that he was not a politician but a statesman. And do you know the difference between a statesman and a politician? It is this. The statesman is one who believes the nation belongs to him.

And I have said, and I repeat, that this election of last

June was fought on the basis of federal politics. I have with me certain quotations of our daily newspapers. I wish I could have had brought these papers here; I think that the headlines would be big enough for you to be able to read them from your places, most of you. I went to one paper and I was told that they don't keep them for more than four months. So I had to copy from the scrap book of the library, by a secretary, certain statements that were made in the last provincial election. At Arborg, on May the 22nd, Mr. Roblin was speaking. The Tribune reports some of his statements under the pen of Mr. Peter Desbaret, if that's the way to pronounce it. The headline is this: Back One Party, Declares Roblin. In the story, following through his attack on the C.C.F., Mr. Roblin called for a March the 31st vote, on June 16th. Vote as you voted on March 31st. He made a strong bid for splinter-party votes, as he placed the Campbell Government in the shadow of the old Liberal regime at Ottawa. I'm quoting--there are quotation marks on this, "The Howe-Gardiner Government refused to give cash advances to farmers and stable prices for farm products." The speaker was trying to revive these men who had been defeated by the polls, to fight the provincial election on the bodies of Mr. Howe and Mr. Gardiner. "It couldn't be done," continues the speaker. And the, the writer writes this under the title, the new title, "Pledged Co-operation." Mr. Roblin said his party backed the policy of long-term farm credit - voluntary crop insurance; province-wide soil and water conservation measures and more agricultural research. He promised the co-operation of the Tory Government in Ottawa in implementing these schemes. Mr. Roblin promised the co-operation of the Tory Government in Ottawa in implementing these schemes. And this must have been very successful. The heir apparent to the federal throne certainly should carry a lot of weight with the federal government. And he promised the co-operation of the Tory Government in Ottawa in implementing these schemes.

But this is not all, Mr. Speaker. In the Free Press of May 31st, 1958, a report by Gordon Sinclair, about a meeting in Grandview. Quite a meeting. I read it, I remember very well that Mr. Roblin stated there, the reporters stating, that the Conservatives keep their promises at Ottawa, they will keep them in Winnipeg. And there is so much along that line that the editorial writers at the Free Press here, write in big headlines, flashy headlines: "IF YOU FOLLOWED JOHN, FOLLOW ME." I think that that was quite some thought. It's to say that it was the federal election really that June the 16th, Manitoba election. There's another one here from Dauphin. It's under the pen of Peter Desbaret, May 14th, 1958, in the Winnipeg Tribune; "DAUPHIN Gives Duff a Diefenbaker Welcome. Triumphant Entry"... Gosh, I forgot a quotation here... You're clapping now. I would like to quote from Jimmy Hayes, I believe, when he says that Diefenbaker has a much greater appeal than Mr. Duff Roblin, but I haven't got it with me right now.

MR. ROBLIN: It's true. I have to admit. It's true.

MR. PREFONTAINE: The second headline is triumphant entry.

Mr. Roblin's campaign opener here resembles Prime Minister Diefenbaker's triumphant visit last March 17th, when he made an unscheduled stop here in response to a petition signed by hundreds of young Conservatives. Mr. Roblin spoke here because of a similar petition signed by 250 supporters. And here are the words by Mr. Roblin, as reported: "The people of Manitoba deserve a better government; a government which has watched the example of John Diefenbaker, who has shown us the way". Sure, he has shown us the way. Everywhere in Manitoba very many Conservatives M.P., also preaching the same gospel, that the Conservatives had done marvelously well in Ottawa -- that they would do marvelously well in Manitoba. And, they were in every part of the Province - in my own Constituency - reviving Mr. Howe and Mr. Gardiner. So that I would like to say to my Leader, that if it hadn't been for him that we would not have nineteen. And their victory is not so great after all....so great. They did not receive nearly as many votes in Manitoba as Diefenbaker received on March 31st. Not nearly as many.

And the cry of "time for a change" has always an appeal to certain people, and that is the cause for some votes going to the C.C.F. party; but I don't think that it was such a victory for the Conservatives to come back here with only the number that they had.

And I would like to say to Mr. Campbell that the people of Manitoba consider him as a great statesman. To me, in spite of the fact, and I will be told that I opposed him at certain times - and I did, I thought that after nine years in coalition that the Leader of the Liberal party should withdraw from coalition. But, I respected the man all my life and I say that the people of Manitoba today have confidence in him, and I wouldn't be a bit surprised if they would re-elect him if we had an election now. It is possible to have one; if this motion passes we'll have one by December 15th. And, I would like to offer my good wishes to him and to his charming wife.

I would like to offer my congratulations to the new cabinet ministers, and here I will use first the French language: Je desire offrir mes felicitations les plus sincereres a mon distingue com patriote qui occupe maintenant un siege d'avant dans cette Chambre en qualite de Secretaire Provincial. Je sais qu'il est un homme digne, distingue; l'honneur qui est le sien rejaillit sur tous les Canadiens-francais.

I would like to say that I have been here for quite awhile, 23 years, and it's the first time that I have seen so many new men occupy the front benches. That proves that the crop of men that we have after this election is the best crop that we have ever had. There are good men, not only in the front seats, but also in the back rows. I think it's the best crop of men, by their actions up to now, that I have seen in this House in the seven legislatures that I have had the honour to sit in. In all parties - yes - definitely in all parties. I would like to say to the young members that they should be true to their party. That we are operating in this Province under the party system and that they should stretch their conscience to quite an extent, to follow their party. We can't all get what we want all the time.

But I might say, that if the time comes that on a question of principle you feel that you cannot follow your party anymore, you should have the courage to follow your conscience. It pays in the long run.

Now, on coming to the amendment before us - want of confidence motion. The Honourable, the Leader of the CCF party, was ill at ease when he got up to speak on this motion the other day. He says it's a "phoney" amendment; a clever manoeuvre. Mr. Speaker, may I read from his address. (interruption) No, let me read, and we'll see who is right or wrong. "It is a phoney amendment" (that's on page 2 of the Hansard of volume I, Number 3). "It is a phoney amendment designed so late for partisan advantage. It was no doubt thought by them" -- Oh, pardon me!....."by them of designs to be a clever manoeuvre". Yes, I was wrong! I admit the correction.....It wasn't the.....O.K. I'm glad I mentioned that term anyway.

It's not, Mr. Speaker, a phoney amendment. What is the job of the Opposition in the legislature? The job of the opposition is to oppose. It is to defeat the Government (hear! hear!) in order to become the Government. And that's what we've been trying to do, and that's what we're trying to do now! Absolutely. And we banned an amendment that would do that purpose, that would not force the CCF to renege their principles to support; because the CCF have always claimed that the protection of farmers was the provincial responsibility. They claimed that all over the country during the election that they would take care of farmers; that they would protect the farmers if they were in office here. And, the Conservatives have claimed the same story. I would like to quote here from a speech delivered in Swan River by Mr. Roblin on May 30th, reported by Jim Hayes. Headline, "Farm Policy Rapped". Mr. Roblin concentrated his fire here on the Liberal farm policy, charging that the Campbell Government had repeatedly declined opportunities to aid the faltering agricultural industry. Quote:"We have asked the government to do something to help the farmers caught in the cost price squeeze. The Premier replies that very little can be done", implying that they could do very much provincially. Quote again:"We asked for a Manitoba crop insurance program". (Interruption) That's what you said during the election. We asked that. You said, they appoint a commission and then tell that commission it can't make a recommendation; and then the reporter adds "The Conservative Leader promised action in B.C". What action has been done with respect to this crop insurance? With respect to soil and water conservation? What action? I don't see any action at all at the present time. And, as I quoted before, agriculture research was mentioned. They were supposed to get co-operation from the Tory Government. We haven't seen any action. But, when I repeat that the duty of the opposition is to oppose and try and get the government to bring about an election in order to become the government, we planned an amendment that you of the C.C.F. party, (Mr. Speaker, pardon me if I'm addressing myself to people) that they would support, because you haven't got among these eleven members, to renege your principles.

Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. party pretends that they are the

party that people of Manitoba want but they are afraid to go to the people. They are afraid, absolutely. They are trying to stay in office here. We are not afraid! (Interuption) Laugh as you may. Nothing proves it as well, Mr. Speaker, as the wording of this resolution; and I'm telling the C.C.F. that if they would get off their program and policies and bring a resolution that would not force us to become socialists, we would support it. Their resolution the other day was this: "We regret that the government has not implemented socialism". And, they expected that we would support that? (Interuption) Yes. You converted one man. They expected that we would blame the Conservatives for not having implemented socialism; we're not socialists. They knew very well that we could not support that. It is ridiculous to expect it, but we can expect that they will support ours, at least they can, without having a remorse of conscience, because they have always preached that the help of the farmers should be provided provincially. I know they are saying now on the air the other day that this government now is not doing enough for the farmers. And in the House, they don't want to support us. We're not straining their consciences at all; we're asking them to support us. And, I say that the job of an opposition is to defeat the government, to become the government! And, if it doesn't become -- if we would not become the government after December 15th, if they would support us, it will be the will of the people and it would be good for this province. Absolutely! Good for this province. I believe that is the ..... of every statement in this House. Statement. and that party that pretends that it is a party, that it has a program! You're sure they found that program not on the floor of this House, as was stated by the Honourable, the Leader, but on the hustings of this province.

I was surprised to ... Oh, by the way, before I quote. I might say that I was astounded that the Honourable, the Leader of the C.C.F. party said the other day about this amendment. In the circumstances a vote for this amendment would mean that we favour putting the Campbell Government back into office. What a surprising statement from a man who has been in this House for 13 years! What a surprising statement. Of course, being in the position he is now, he is not himself anymore! Not himself, anymore. I do not recognize the man, Mr. Speaker, I do not recognize...He used to be so happy, to be able to able to criticize all the time and always vote "no". Now it is very embarrassing. Very embarrassing. He knows very well that voting for this amendment means a general election. Does he think we will come back? I think we would make a darn good show; but why would he say that voting for this would put Mr. Campbell in office? I just can't understand it. But, he goes on to say -- he goes on to say -- he didn't know what to say really on that famous day when he moved his amendment and spoke. We believe, Sir, that it is our job in this group to promote our own program. His job, as Leader of an Opposition, is to defeat the government and go to the people and promote his program and come back and be the government and establish socialism in this province. That's his job. We were elected on a certain platform



and that is what we are here to fight for. He's here to fight for his platform. Men of this party have been here now since I'm here, and they have repeated the same stories; but they are here to defeat the government, if they pretend that they are a party, and to try and become a government themselves as soon as possible. That's what. They're not here -- nobody -- none of us is here to propound a platform. To fight for a platform. I can't understand that. We're here to consider the laws brought in this House by the government. We're here to submit proposals and bills to this House. Let them do so. But, to state that they are here to fight for their platform seems to me not very, very good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, very surprising to see that the C.C.F. party comes to the rescue of the government. Mind you, the government is not anxious to be rescued. Oh, no. I know that they would possibly consider an election. Yes, absolutely. But the job of the Opposition is to oppose, to replace the government. The job of the government is to govern. The job of the government, (and I compliment the government, they are bringing forward legislation and they are governing) it is to govern until they are defeated. Statesmen do that. Like Mr. Campbell, Leader of the Opposition. He could have called an election for political purposes right after June 10th, 1957, but he said: "I'm not here to play politics, I'm here to govern". That's what he did. Laugh as much as you may, that's what was done. And, I say that the job of the government is to govern. They might hope to be defeated, but it's not their job to dissolve the House and call an election on their own. They must go on as if they have the full confidence of this House. It's too bad if they did not get a larger majority. They will go through difficult periods, but that's because they didn't get more electors to vote for them. Their job is to govern as long as they've got the reins of office. And, I'm quite sure that the Premier will govern as long as he's not defeated, unless there is some very important matter, outstanding matter, that necessitates a provincial election.

But, I say to the C.C.F., that it is not their job to govern, it's their job to oppose. The Leader is not very comfortable in the position of having to support. I'm wondering at times if there have been any promises, but I'm sure that the Honourable, the Leader of the C.C.F. will find out, unless there has been promises, that they might be going for the people anyway. Now I can see why the C.C.F. party is not anxious to go to the people now. I can see and I know why, because there are two parties of the left now in Manitoba and they're going to be swallowed by the other one. They are being swallowed by the other one. Of course, not the men, but I mean the vote that elect the men. Even this afternoon, the Honourable Member for Radisson made this speech. He was nearly crying to see how the Conservatives have moved forward and have adopted their ideas. As far as I'm concerned, it was a shock to me, when I heard the Honourable, the Minister of Health and Welfare the other day approve holus-bolus the resolution of the, of the C.C.F. member for Inkster, with respect to old people; I'm quite sure that

some old Conservatives that have parted and left us years ago, must be turning in their graves. Absolutely! Absolutely! You may say: "Well, you of the Liberal party, you support this amendment". Yes, we haven't got the job of finding the money, it's your job now to find the money; it's not our job. And, when for all this legislation was promised to come next spring, to implement the three points, brought by the C.C.F., I can see, why the member for Radisson was lamenting that fact, to quite an extent, because they're stealing the ammunition from the party.

There are two left side parties in Manitoba now. This one has no chance to be elected, so the people will vote for this left side party. And, this afternoon the member for Radisson suggested that the label of the Conservative party should be changed. Well, that party certainly has a new look. I don't know if we can call it the new look party or the Progressive Conservative Socialist party; I don't know. But, certainly it's not the party that we would expect from a party that calls itself Conservative. Oh, yes, possibly -- yes possibly. To a certain extent. In itself to me that's a contradiction. (Have I got the word right? Yes. Tres bien.) It's a contradiction to call oneself Conservative and Progressive at the same time. But when we add socialist to it, it adds more confusion, but there are a lot of people who are confused by the statement made by the Honourable, the Minister of Health and Welfare the other day. But I say when there are two parties of the left, it is quite comprehensible that the C.C.F. doesn't want to go to the people now. Oh no, they want to wait for a time, as long as possible. I don't want to impute motives, I'll not ..... they want to wait for a while. But, Mr. Speaker, I predict very short life to many members of the C.C.F. party.

MR. STINSON: Will the honourable gentleman permit a question?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Yes, certainly.

MR. STINSON: Does my honourable friend recall the prediction that he made to me just before the last election?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Yes, yes. I did but -- the actions of the Liberal Government in Ottawa, the old Liberal Government, which I did not support fully, was instrumental in creating an atmosphere in this province, of doubt, and the people did not know exactly where to go. They were not quite satisfied, something should be changed. Some voted for you, the majority voted for the Conservatives. But now that the Conservatives have promised the welfare state in this province, they voted to abandon your party. I was wrong in my last prediction. I will be right in this one.

MR. STINSON: Mr. Speaker, may I put another question in order to clarify this matter?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Not too many -- my time, my time.

MR. STINSON: Oh, the Speaker won't count this time. Will the honourable gentleman recall the prediction he made with respect to the number of seats that we would have in this House?

MR. PREFONTAINE: I think I did say five. Is that right? five? Well, my prediction stands for next time. Mr. Speaker, we have two left side parties in Manitoba and one party of the

centre.

MR. STINSON: The right!

MR. PREFONTAINE: Right, the party of the right. This party -- that follows the party that passed the legislation that this party has passed? The party that last year raised the allowance of the old age pensioners or the contribution to municipalities. The party that went ahead immediately when the federal party increased their old age pension by nine dollars, went ahead immediately to contribute it's share in a fifty-fifty basis right off the bat. The party that increased their revenues, that's the party of the centre. Reasonable. Reasonable. Not on the extreme side. The party that spent forty million dollars on roads. The budget of one hundred and five million dollars. The party that provided the best Manitoba Telephone System in any province. Are you up to stop me?

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. I was keeping an eye on some of the other members, here.

MR. PREFONTAINE: The party that has provided rural electrification in this province? Is that a party to the extreme right, Mr. Speaker? The party that has brought in this new redistribution system? That's progressiveness, Mr. Speaker. I say that we are the party to the right. And, I say that some parties in Manitoba will have to see that after all the government is not the milk cow on which somebody can draw endlessly and inexhaustively the money that the taxpayers pay; that some stop will have to be brought some place. And, I say that there will be a lot of voters who will vote for the centre party next election. The sooner it comes, the better. And this is our party, the party of the centre. In two parties of the left, the C.C.F. party is going over the way side. My prediction stands for next election. I'm not the betting type. But, I am very much surprised to see that the C.C.F. party would place their confidence in the Conservatives at this time. Right after the election of June 16th, they were the first to call us and examine the situation. They would give no promise of support for session. Not at all, no. We want to run our own boat ourselves. O.K. That was the largest group. It was only proper that we should hand over the reins. Now, we're sitting in this side, and they are sitting over there. If there were enough seats, they should be all sitting on that side. Too bad that there aren't any more seats over there. But, it's surprising, in the light of what they said about the Conservatives, during the election, (and I have a few choice quotations here that I would like to give you at this time). It's surprising how the Honourable, the Leader of the C.C.F. party has become a friend of the Tribune. In big headlines the other day, "Nimble Tongued Stinson"--one-inch column, right on the front page. They certainly treat him well now. But he did not treat the Conservatives very well during the last provincial election, and I have here, a news story from the Winnipeg Tribune, May 28th, 1953, under the pen of Peter Desbaret, from Grandview: the headline - "Stinson says Liberal P.C.'s sane." Here is the story: "speaking to sixty people in the parish hall here Tuesday night, Mr.

Stinson indicated his awareness of the growing Tory strength in the current election campaign, by criticizing the Conservatives even more strongly than the Campbell Government". Quote. "It doesn't matter whether they call themselves Liberal Progressives or Progressive Conservatives", he said, "they're both Conservatives, and neither one is progressive". But, here is a choice statement that this nimble-tongued Mr. Stinson made: "If they were elected, the Tories would be no different than the Liberals, at that separates the parties right now is a pair of horn-rimmed glasses and a mustache". At least, between the leader and the deputy leader, there are two pairs of glasses - horn-rimmed.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to inform the Honourable Member for Carillon that he has spoken his forty minutes.

MR. ROBLIN: ..... continue, Mr. Speaker, he is making a most interesting argument.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I wish to thank the House.

MR. STINSON: Since he quotes my speeches, I think he should continue.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Well, I'll carry on then, just quoting your speeches. And the writer of the story goes on now: "The C.C.F. Leader charged the Tories have lost any consistent political philosophy, when the Roblin Government was voted out of office in 1915. At that time, they were opposed to votes for women, compulsory education and any kind of reform". Here is a quotation: "Since that time they've been veering with the wind. They reverse themselves on every major policy except their professed loyalty to the British Crown. In recent sessions of the legislature," Mr. Stinson said, "Conservatives have voted against the C.C.F. resolutions advocating support of the co-operative movements, hospital insurance, farm security legislation, larger government revenues from Manitoba's natural resources, free diagnosis and treatment of cancer, and the provincial Civil Service Right - Civil Rights Bill. That's the party that he wants to support in office at the present time. At the expense of the chance of forming a socialist government in this province. Carry on. Their voting record shows they are against the welfare of the people and in support of big business. Now, that's one of the -- it's the Leader of the C.C.F. party and that's his opinion of the party that he wants to carry on in office. One other statement here - I think that I've had enough questions. I have a long speech to make and ...

MR. STINSON: Oh, but this is a good one.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Well, no, I don't think so, I'll give you -- not this next time, I'm speaking about the -- your colleague now. I consider there are three strong men in the C.C.F. party, I've quoted from one. I want to quote from a radio address -- in the Tribune, report of Tribune on May 29th, 1958. The headline "Roblin Called Dief Imitator". "Assiniboia C.C.F. candidate Donavon Swailes, Wednesday, unclosed a scathing attack on the Conservative party - Leader Duff Roblin in particular, in a radio speech. The Conservatives, he said, as a most disorganized party in the province, and Leader Duff Roblin is trying to conduct a one-man show, trying to be the candidate in every constituency. It is amusing," Mr. Swailes said, "to watch the per-

formance of Mr. Roblin as he tries to copy the election tactics of John Diefenbaker. It would be interesting to find out where all the money's coming from that they are spending so freely" - (I was interested with that too!) "Duff Roblin" (and I'm reading from that article) "Duff Roblin Just Hasn't got a Team," the C.C.F. candidate said, "they are just a group of disorganized individuals. The leader of the Conservative party should be the last person on earth to criticize the inefficiency of the 'Campbell Government.' Besides, the C.C.F. is the only genuine alternative to the present administration", in a couple of centuries, I guess.

I would like to quote now, words from the third strong man of the C.C.F. and that to my mind, the member for Radisson.

In the Free Press of May 26th, 1958, under the headline: "Tories Are Bamboozlers," Paulley says. Now the story: "The Conservative and Liberal parties were renamed the bamboozlers and the bamboozled by Russ Paulley, C.C.F. candidate in the Radisson constituency at the week-end meeting of campaign workers. The Tories, he claimed had little respect for the mentality of the average voter. They bamboozled and befuddled, he said. This method is their only hope. They certainly can't stand on their past record or on their non-existence of policy." (Interruption) You don't seem to think so. Now, I will not quote any more, Mr. Speaker, I just want to show to you, that it's not good for democracy when the political party abandons all that it believes in. Even socialism to carry on a government that they have no real confidence in. They are the party that would give Manitoba the kind of government that Manitoba needs; they say so, they've said so in this House and in the province. And I say they should repeat the same story, all the hustings, and to save the time of the House a little bit.

They have been using so much time in the 23 years that they have been here, preaching their program and policies, and accusing us of speaking from their policies to put things into practice. Well, they have been advocating everything under the sun, and we're going along -- some say slowly, but we're a democracy and we're going along quite quickly. And this party is going along also.

And, I might say, that I am surprised by the antics being played by that party at the present time. When they insist on recording the votes when there is not a single person opposing it. I haven't seen that in the 23 years that I've been here. Is that statesmanship, or playing politics? I don't know what the purpose is. Maybe it will carry on the tradition and encourage the Free Press to show a certain young man in his kilts, I don't know; at least to keep the impression that there is something childish. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is here to defeat the government at the time, at the proper time, on a want of confidence motion. And this is the time and we are right on it, not here to defeat every bill. It's here to try and improve the bill. That's what we have done when there is something good, we go along, and that's what we did.

But the C.C.F. and the other party seem to take fun in working together, not always, not always. And I would advise the

Leader of the C.C.F. to be more careful. He has embarrassed the Premier, the other night. He has embarrassed the Premier twice. And that's pretty risky because the first thing that he knows that he will be called. The Leader of the House, the Premier got up wishing to prevent an adjournment. I think the honourable member for Fisher had moved an adjournment and I think the Honourable the Premier got up, "no we shouldn't allow this." The honourable member for Lac du Bonnet, there are two occasions - I don't remember the other occasion: there are two occasions, lately that the Leader of the House wanted an adjournment, the Leader of the Opposition opposed it. The Leader of the C.C.F. got up, not with too much energy, but he got up, and said that maybe it would be better to allow time, that an adjournment was proper and it was quite humiliating for the Premier to allow the adjournment when he had mentioned that he was against it, and I warned the Leader of the C.C.F. not to do that too often, for his sake, but for our sake too.

No, it's not pleasant to lead a government when you haven't got a majority. But it's because there is no majority, and democracy will endure as long as men who belong to a party will think of the state before thinking of the party. I trust that the Leader of the government will do that. And I have just one more word to say. Success is never final - and these words go to the Premier; failure is never fatal: These words go to the Leader of the Opposition; and the last words, it's courage that counts; and these words are for the Leader of the C.C.F., when there is no courage there is no success.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, I would just like to say that the Honourable Member for Carillon, that I'm going to try to make him happy and be able to say from the Speaker's chair, Ici un parle Francais.

MR. C.E. GREENLAY (Portage la Prairie): I just have a very few remarks that I'd like to make at this particular time. And, Mr. Speaker, I feel at a little disadvantage in rising after such an eloquent address as we have heard just now. However, I think this is the proper place to bring in some of these points and I rise to do that at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, at your election to the high office that you have attained and to wish you every success in that position.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes get quite a little bit of pleasure and self-satisfaction, if you like to put it that way, satisfaction in the party which left the other side of the House as of the first of July, when we pick up the press and read some of the stories which are included in it and I would go back to the, for instance, to the Winnipeg Tribune of Saturday, September the 13th, in which there is quite a little headline, quite a headline: "Tory Team Scores, But Big Test Still To Come." And we run down through the story that's included there and it's very interesting and very gratifying to see the, what is being done with the material which the party on this side of the House left, and prepared, and the foundation that they built to carry on from. And I would refer to a few of those we have the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, who made quite a play going

around the country in this summer, and quite justifiably so, with regard to the program that he set up for the transportation of fodder, and I wonder if you sit down and just take a little look at that program. What did it do? What was it? It was the old Liberal program carried out by the Conservative Minister. The only thing that he accomplished, Mr. Speaker, was getting in touch with Ottawa and making, after some misunderstanding, making an agreement with them, for them to pay a part of the cost.

Mr. Speaker, we go on in this particular item, and we find the Minister of Health and Public Welfare has made arrangements for a fine big Salk Vaccine Program. Well, it was carrying on the program that was so ably started and set up by the Honourable Member for Rockwood-Iberville.

Then we go down to the Minister of Public Utilities and there's a nice little story here. I'd like to read this one. There's a nice little story here: "Another new-comer, Public Utilities Minister Jack Carroll, moved quickly on the Natural Gas Enquiry Commission report, adopting step one of the report. He gave Winnipeg and Central Gas Company 45 days from publication of a report to produce a 90 cent per cubic foot, thousand cubic foot gas rate for Winnipeg". The interesting part of this is, who set up the commission? Who provided the information on which he proceeded? And another interesting sidelight is that, I was following the press fairly closely along about that time and it seemed to me that up until this particular story, that it was the First Minister that was making all the announcements and setting out that they had to do this and they had to do that. But when you come along to this story it's the team and it's the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities that has made the, has done the whole thing. Now, Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is this, that he wouldn't have been getting anywhere if it hadn't been that this administration set up the Gas Enquiry Commission which collected the dates and formed the basis on which they could proceed.

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other things here that I'd like to mention. One is, another gentleman here in the, that's in this particular story, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. And I doubt very much, knowing him as I do, I doubt very much if he said this and started it off in the way that it is written up here. But the story is that he instituted, he instituted an enquiry into the operation and the problems of, with regards to the timber in the south-eastern part of Manitoba. I wonder who instituted that? I wonder who it was? There was a report that had just come to hand before this government left office with regards to that particular problem. There had been a committee working on it for some, for about a year, and the report was in our hands, and the committee was still working to work out some kind of a program to follow through. And he had all that to start off with, and yet the story is here, he instituted a program, or investigation in south-eastern Manitoba. That's right, that's right but going on ....

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources): You hadn't done anything with your report. It had been lying there for months.

MR. GREENLAY: That right, going on from where we left off and with the information that we had provided.

MR. EVANS: You never even met on that report.

MR. GREENLAY: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to contradict the gentleman to his face, but, Mr. Speaker, that statement is incorrect.

And so we go on down through the story, this being repeated over and over again. Mr. Speaker, the other thing that I view with some concern and I think the people of the province should view with some concern is this. We heard much this morning in committee, Mr. Speaker, about this streamlining; we've heard about it in the press. You notice another name that they call that, the streamlining, and that is concentration of authority. Mr. Speaker, when you streamline it in the way that things are being set up here, the most of the Ministers over there become chore boys for the central group, the Treasury Board. The story in the press is the Treasury Board is the big-shot. They're the group that say what you do and what you don't do, and the rest of the fellows run around and do the chores. Mr. Speaker, that is a concentration of authority, because the authority all funnels through to one or two people. What does that lead to? Dictatorship, Mr. Speaker, and that's the way it comes about. Probably the people that are doing it are not conscious of it, but I say, Mr. Speaker, that, as one of the honourable members said this morning in the committee, that it is well to have more heads sitting in on those problems than two or three. And everyone has his little bit to contribute, whoever he may be to the deliberations, and the thoughts, and the consideration of the various problems that come up in Cabinet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to pass on to say a little bit about some of the problems, one of the problems, which I think faces agriculture, and we heard some of this this afternoon from the honourable member from Dufferin, with regard to the lack of moisture, and the lack of water. Mr. Speaker, I think this is not peculiar only to the southern portion of this province. You will find that up through the central part of the province, even in around Portage, that there is the question of lack of water and we have, the one thing which brings this particularly to your attention is if you look at the flow in the Assinaboine River. The flow I think, is as low, or almost as low as any time that I have ever seen it and I have seen the river continually for all of my life. And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that should be considered, this has already been spoken of to the P.F.R.A., the matter has been discussed with them about a year and a half ago, then at later intervals, and this year the Portage Council passed a resolution requesting the present administration here, in the province, to try to do something about the construction of a dam at Portage la Prairie for the purpose of storing water to assure a good permanent and continuous supply of water for the city of Portage la Prairie. Now, Mr. Speaker, this isn't only a matter of immediate city concern. Mr. Speaker, you will know that adjacent to Portage la Prairie there are two airports which are served, serviced with water from the city water plant. You will also



know that quite recently the construction has begun on the Campbell soup plant in the city of Portage la Prairie and, one of the things which of course is important to them is a good continuous supply of good water. Though it has never occurred yet, that the city and people dependent on that water supply, have been short of water; but there is a possible chance that if the drought period should come about, and a more severe drought period than any we have had so far, that there might be some difficulty in supplying a sufficient quantity of water. So it seems to me that it would be very, very, a very advantageous project, one which would be in accordance with the general operations of the P.F.R.A. to construct a dam at the city of Portage la Prairie at a point just west of the city itself, in order to build up a reservoir of water at the intake to the water port. Mr. Speaker, I think that this is extremely important at the time, because, I don't know whether the honourable members are in the House, know that the city, the agricultural area adjacent to Portage has always been very progressive in adopting some kind of new crop, which they can grow, and which do not compete directly with the grain growers. We have had the advance in the growing of peas, and that not so prevalent as it was a few years ago. We have had quite a large acreage of sugar beet grown there; we've had some soya beans, and now with the coming in of the Campbell soup plant there is quite an interest taken by the people of that locality in growing crops which would be, which could be sold to the plant, and would thus take some of the production of this land out of competition with the grain growers. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree that that's one of the prime objectives, one of the very fine objectives of any agricultural policy in the province. That is to try to get diversified crops, which can be marketed in some other way, and not in competition to grain. So I think that one of the important things would be, to go ahead with a dam which would assure a good water supply, so that the plant would never be in a position of having to say, well we can't operate because we haven't got sufficient water and therefore we can't take your produce off the farm. Not only a vegetable crop that can be grown there but the fact that this plant is located there will mean that there will be quite a considerable market for fowl and other meat products, which can be used in the preparation of some of the soups from that plant. So, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention that particular project, because I think it is important, and I would suggest that the administration should approach the P.F.R.A. and urge them to look into this project, very, very closely and as soon as possible, because it seems to me, that there are many other projects undertaken by that organization which would not be of as much benefit as this particular one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would go on from that just for a few moments, to mention something about another matter of water control. Over the years I have always heard and we have observed that in the area south of Lake Manitoba, as far south as Portage la Prairie that if you get a prolonged high north wind as following a prolonged high south wind, that you will find quite a difference in the water level in the well. Now, Mr. Speaker,

that seems almost unbelievable but it has been observed over the years in our particular area, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that one of the big things that should be looked after in this Province, and we have now a report here which is very comprehensive, the Lake Winnipeg and Manitoba Board Report, it's very comprehensive, there's a lot of information in it but rather strangely in that particular report I don't think there's very much reference to the benefits that Lake Manitoba has on the agricultural area extending back from the lake to the south. The problems here, that they have dealt with are more particularly those of the area directly surrounding the margin of the lake. And those are problems, of course, and particularly they appear to be problems at the time of high water, while people crowd in in the dry years, then when it becomes wet they say well the water shouldn't come back there and it seems to be that particular problem that focuses the attention of people, more particularly, on the fluctuation of the lake. But I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, and I think this view is held by a good many people in Manitoba, in this central part of the province and by some people who have lived many years close to the lake, I venture to say this, Mr. Speaker, that there would be far more damage, and far more loss, throughout that portion, all of the central portion of Manitoba, if Lake Manitoba were to recede a great deal more or dry up, which is not a remote possibility, Mr. Speaker, with the trend. If it were, I think the effect on that whole area would be much more detrimental and a great deal more loss than any high water has ever done during my lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the things that we should be particularly concerned about in Manitoba, is the conservation of water. And I think that I would expect to speak a little more on the particular problem with regards to the lake and the control on the lake on the resolution which I see is on the Order Paper; I had intended to do it now, but I think that I should leave that for a little later on, but I did want to mention what I think is a serious prospect of the lake receding further than it has at the present time. I think in particular of an elderly gentleman who has been well acquainted with Lake Manitoba for, Oh, I don't know how many years, well over seventy, in the person of Dr. Cadham, Sr., and he tells me that during his lifetime, he can go to places in that lake, many places in that lake, where the bottom of the lake has built up, and where there is not nearly the same depth of water that there were some years ago. And he said, in his opinion, and this is backed up by some of the fishermen who have fished on the lake over a goodly number of years, that the lake is gradually becoming shallower. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that while this resolution which is on the Order Paper and a great deal of thought and a great deal of this report deals with the matter of control at the lower end of the lake, control of the outflow. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the problem is so particularly the one with regard to outflow, but I think the big problem is, where are you going to get any water put into it? That's the problem. There's not, there have been times, Mr. Speaker, back in the early forties, when the lake was down pretty nearly to the level that it is at the present time,

when there was hardly any water flowing out at Fairford, hardly any water flowing out at Fairford, and yet the lake is receding because the evaporation on that large expanse of water is so great, that it takes a lot of water coming in to offset the evaporation during the summer months.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think one of the big problems is to get water into it, and I notice in here they have the reference to the Assinaboine River and the diversion from the Assinaboine River. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that when you look at it and read it, you will find that the water that would be diverted from the Assinaboine River to Lake Manitoba would, I'm not sure, I wouldn't like to quote it other than I think that they say would increase the level probably an inch ..... it's very, very little, probably about equivalent of two days evaporation in the summer. They figure that it will evaporate about a half an inch a day in the middle of the summer, in the heat of the summer. Now, Mr. Speaker, the point that I would like to make with regard to the Assinaboine River, I don't think that the **diversion** is worth the paper that they have drawn the plan on, because they find that when you want the water into Lake Manitoba as now, there isn't any water in the river. There isn't any there that you could put over. There isn't any more than a trickle coming down the Assinaboine River now. And so I think that the trouble with the Assinaboine River is, making a diversion from it, that the time when you don't want the water in the lake probably there's lots in the river and the time you want lots of water into the lake there isn't any in the river to send over. I think there are other sources and I would speak a little more on it a little later on, on the other resolution, but I do think that it is a very important thing, not with regard to fishing, not with regard to summer resorts, or any of those things, but with regard to the effect that large body of water has on the surrounding area, and I say on all sides of the lake, the effect that it has on that, by way of having moisture there, and it seems to me that it is one of the most important assets there is in the Province of Manitoba and I think it should be protected, and I think that the work on the Assinaboine River should be pushed ahead if at all possible by way of a dam, in order to be assured that the market for those agricultural products will be continued.

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I agree in part, with the sentiments echoed by the Honourable Member from Carillon when he states that possibly this past provincial election was fought with a little bit of federal ammunition, because I can remember Liberals going up and down this province from one end to the other saying: Don't vote for the Conservatives, they're in too strong in Ottawa, we don't want a sweep in Manitoba and they knew very well that the strength in Ottawa had nothing to do with the strength of the Conservatives in Manitoba. And I think possibly that campaign had a little bit to do with the fact that we have a minority government on this side of the House. And regardless of Mr. Swailes, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia says, I think possibly we could have a lot better government if we had twice as many Conservatives on this side as we've got now. Twice as good a government. (Interruption) I think I will see that

we have twice as many on this side as what we have now in the House that comes, if we have an election in the meantime. (Interjection) I beg your pardon, Sir. Compared to what we'll get afterwards, I agree with you.

I was very surprised to find the Honourable Leader of the Opposition moving this amendment in the terms that he did. I would like to take him back to a meeting in the constituency of Roblin, in the town of Roblin, this spring. I forget the exact date, but I'll remind him that it was the Liberal Nominating Convention, for the purpose of nominating a candidate: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, or the Premier, as he was then, was the guest speaker. One of his then cabinet ministers was also present, who was then representing the constituency. Also present was the candidate who hoped to represent the constituency, and I must say at that meeting that there was possibly 450 people there. Maybe I should explain why 450 people in Roblin went to a Liberal meeting. They weren't all Conservatives, they proved that at the poles, but there was 450 people there, and I think the fact of that a bit of curiosity on the fact there was a cabinet representative leaving the constituency and a lot of people wanted to know what was the reason why; and there was a lot of curiosity seekers there to find out and hear what was going to be said. And I must admit that I was one of the curious Conservatives that was there. Conservatives, Progressives if you want, my good neighbour, but, because I, for two reasons, I wanted to hear the Premier of Manitoba was going to say. I had never had the honour of hearing him speak before, and I wanted to take this opportunity in my home town. And I also thought it was going to be an excellent opportunity to hear the Liberal agricultural program. Here we had the Premier of the Province, here we had a cabinet minister representing the constituency as another guest speaker, and I thought, what a wonderful opportunity to find out what I'm going to have to fight against this coming campaign. Well, I found out. That meeting lasted from roughly eight o'clock, quarter after eight, I believe, it was called for eight, but it was going about quarter after eight, till a quarter to twelve at night, and honourable members, there wasn't one thing mentioned during that whole period about the problems of agriculture. It is true that the Premier claimed that he lit up Manitoba; but that was in 1948, I think that that main program got going. And during that whole length of time, we heard nothing on either the platform of that party for the coming election and that was his main speech in the constituency of the honourable member of the opposition. Nothing of their platform, nothing of the problems that were facing the farmers at that time. Now we find that to quote "they ignore the many other immediate and serious problems facing the farmers of Manitoba." Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the farming conditions in Manitoba have deteriorated so much this spring and this summer; or has the Honourable Leader of the Opposition changed his mind in the last few months. It is a great change -- one way or the other.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when we compare that meeting in Roblin and the feelings that members of the Liberal party had at that time on the problems of agriculture, and take a look at this

amendment, I don't know who the honourable members or the Honourable Leader of the Opposition thinks he is fooling. I can assure him, however, that this amendment is certainly not going to fool the farmers of Manitoba on the stand that the Liberal party in the past has taken on the problems of agriculture in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House.

MR. S. ROBERTS (La Verendrye): I haven't previously had the opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the high office which you now hold. You have had and probably will have many more occasions to find fault with our manner of conducting ourselves in the House, but I wish you much luck, Sir, and I am sure you will do your usual fine job.

I would like to congratulate the new government and already we have had clashes, we have had heated discussions but I am sure the First Minister himself and all the other members of the government will be the first to agree that we must have opposition for a good government to be healthy. I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder to the Throne Speech, glad the honourable member for Roblin got in in time for me to congratulate him for his fine address, and I am pleased of course that he is a farmer, and I am always happy when a farmer speaks up for the farm province.

Now, in this amendment to the Throne Speech, I would like to, just like to, just briefly point up some of the things, some of the problems in agriculture and I wouldn't in any means try to point out them all because it's impossible. But some of the glaring things facing the farmer today, the things which this government on the hustings only a few months ago proclaimed that they could fix up. And I don't know particularly where to start but I could with all sincerity start with the agricultural credit plan and congratulate the government for bringing it in and once again I'm perfectly sincere when I say to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that I am pleased to hear that the resolutions will be coming to us in committee in a form which he feels is better than the form that it is in now and we will be most happy to support it when -- if it is in the form that we feel is necessary. And I most sincerely hear that there will be improvements made in the bill when it comes to the committee. Now, unfortunately there are many, many other problems facing the farmer today, and unfortunately again these problems are not of his own making. The problems of the farmer are problems that are made off of the farmer. They are problems not of his own operation, but problems particularly of his high cost, and the reasons for his high cost are not necessarily of his own making; and in particular the main reasons for the high cost on the farm are decisions made entirely away from the farm. And I can point out the most glaring of all of the reasons for the high cost to the farmers operations, and point it up as being that the protection given to industry by tariffs. And I think that it is a very general statement but it is nevertheless true that the western farmer is at all times in competition with the eastern manufacturer for the dollar of the import and export: And many, many estimates have been given as to the amount of money that the

tariff costs the people of Canada each year in extra spending and I'm not suggesting the farmers, farmers spend all this, or even half of it, but nevertheless it's an astounding figure and the estimates come all the way from \$400,000,000 to here I see in an article by Blair Fraser in this issue of McLeans Magazine, where he quotes Dr. John Young, a Canadian economist now on the faculty of Yale University, who calculates that the tariff adds \$1,000,000,000 a year to the cost of living in Canada. And I say that while this money naturally doesn't all work back onto the farmers extra costs but I suggest that a great deal of it does. The machinery the farmers buy, tools, equipment, the tires, no matter what it is he uses in the farming of his land -- all of it, the price of it, is increased by the protection provided to the manufacturing industries that manufacture these products.

And the other side, the other hand of this problem of tariffs, meaning that other countries can't ship to the Dominion of Canada the products that they wish to ship to Canada because of this tariff protection, means that they have not got the dollars to buy Canadian produce, wheat, pork, beef. They have not got the dollars because they were not allowed to sell in Canada sufficient of their products and I think that we cannot underestimate the -- overestimate -- the costs, the obstacles placed by the tariffs of this country. And this, I suggest, is one field where the Province of Manitoba, the Government of Manitoba, through representation to the Federal Government could press, press for an easing of the trade which would ease the farm situation. And I hope sincerely the Government of Manitoba is continually pressing the Federal Government to keep this flow of cattle which is going into The United States at the present time a free flow, so that we do not do anything to the American people so that they could come back on us and stop this wonderful source of dollars - American dollars - into Canada in the form of Canadian cattle.

And then there is the other subject that we heard so much about in the hustings, the crop insurance plan. And I certainly don't need to tell the people of this House the value of crop insurance plan because we've heard so much of it. All I can say is we haven't seen it yet, haven't seen any sign of it yet and we were promised it as soon as the government was elected. I don't need as I say, to give all the reasons for the need for crop insurance plan, but I suggest that the lack of stability on the Manitoba farm, the problem of continual perils of the elements beyond the farmers' control, weather and the like, is something that is of tremendous importance to the farmers of Manitoba. And I suggest that either the Province of Manitoba convince the Federal Government to establish a proper crop insurance plan in Manitoba or else they must themselves be willing, be prepared to establish it, because they have promised it that we would get it. And then we talk so much about the prices that the farmers receive for their products because we have finished - we have just considered the cost that the farmer was involved in as he produces his products. The other half of the bargain of course is what price does the farmer receive for his products? Because if the farmer receives a sufficient price for his products then of

course he can afford to pay the higher costs which he is being -- which he is encountering at the present time. We all know that the costs have gone up 50% on the farms in the last seven or eight years; at the same time, the price of the products that the farmer has been selling have remained about stable. We know that the Conservative Government at Ottawa, on the hustings, as they were elected, told us of the Price Stabilization Bill, of the price support which they would enforce once they were elected. And now we should see this bill. The honourable member for Fisher in his resolution, which unfortunately he withdrew the other day, discussed, or mentioned in the preamble of the resolution, how the price of hogs doesn't seem to have risen too greatly with the new Price Stabilization Bill.

I would just like to point out to the members of this House another incident of how the Price Stabilization Bill has affected the people of Manitoba. And I'm thinking, at the moment, of the price of eggs. Now this is one of the products that was brought into the bill and when the bill became -- took action on the price of eggs -- set its laws on the price of eggs, -- it increased the price of eggs three cents per dozen to the Manitoba farmer. At the time the bill -- before the bill -- before the Conservatives were elected, the price of eggs at the floor price here -- a year ago -- two years ago today -- was 30 cents for "A" large and 28 cents for "A" medium. And so the Conservative Government broadcast from Coast to Coast, "We are raising the price of eggs three cents per dozen". And now you look in the newspaper and see what the price of eggs is, - after they have raised the price of eggs three cents per dozen. It is 31 cents for "A" large and from 21 to 23 cents a dozen for "A" medium. Meaning on the usual proportion of eggs that the farmer manages to market from his flock, he has naturally a certain number of egg smalls, mediums, cracks and so on, - but the majority of his eggs are "A" large and "A" medium. We will say the ratio is two to one, - two "A" large to one "A" medium. And at the old floor price with the price of eggs at 30 cents a dozen for "A" large and 28 cents a dozen for "A" medium, if he had marketed two dozen of "A" large and one of "A" medium, his average price would be  $29 \frac{1}{3}$  cents per dozen for his eggs. But now, with the new bill 237, the Stabilization Bill which was to increase the price of eggs, if you market still two dozen of "A" large and one dozen of "A" medium, your average price would be 28 cents a dozen,  $1 \frac{1}{3}$  cents per dozen less than he would have received under the old no good price support act. And so I suggest, has this government looked into the thing? Has it taken action? Has it made representation to Ottawa as to the situation as it exists? Does this government know where the three cents per dozen increase in floor price went? And this is one of the things which I feel that this government, in all honest, to the farmers of Manitoba, should bring in to any Special Session of this House.

I don't want to go on with any further points, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to suggest this. This government is at this time, in this Session, this Special Session, ignoring all except one of the major problems affecting our agricultural economy.

MR. R.W. Bend (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, since it might be that I did not speak on the Throne Speech itself, I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating you, Sir, on your election to the high office that you hold, the highest office that this House can give. I think it is a tribute, Sir, to the years of faithful service that you have rendered to your constituency; and certainly I, for one, congratulate you most sincerely, and I hope that you will find your new duties pleasant ones indeed.

I would like to congratulate as well, Mr. Speaker, the Mover and the Seconder in reply -- for their address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. In the case of the Mover, I know exactly how he felt, because it wasn't too long ago since I, Sir, had the pleasure of taking part in the same way in this House. And certainly his chore was even much more difficult than mine, because of the fact that he had many more people and guests, and certainly I thought he conducted himself in a way that was a credit to this House. I also wish to congratulate, as I say, the Seconder. I was not surprised, because I knew the honourable gentleman had not only experience as a private member, but as well, experience as a Cabinet Minister, and so, as I say, I expected his address to be a good one and I wasn't disappointed.

I would like, Sir, to congratulate as well the Honourable the Premier. I know he ribbed me good-naturedly the other night when I was out of my place in the House, sitting back in this very seat, and he referred to me as a "back-bencher" or some such term in a friendly way, of course. But I would like to draw to his -----

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier): I just said you weren't in your usual seat, the seat you are in now.

MR. BEND: Well, I think there was a little insinuation. I didn't mind it a bit - because I'd like to draw his attention to the fact that that's the seat I believe he started from.

MR. ROBLIN: A very good seat too.

MR. BEND: However, I do congratulate him, and, while I can't go as far to wish him a long tenure of office, certainly, to the victor goes the spoils. It is true that I couldn't be said to have been one that toured the countryside trying to see that he got there. Now that he did, he has my good wishes. I would like to congratulate him too, and you know, although I did paint some pictures about how black things might be if he succeeded, I am very happy to say that it wasn't as black as I thought, because soon after he got married and that of course, helped a bit. And I certainly congratulate him on that step and his bride as well. ----Right ----And that made me feel a little better. But then when I knew he had married a Liberal, that made me feel even better and I was sure things wouldn't be quite so bad as I thought. But I, in all seriousness, I do wish them both well.

I would like to say a word about our Leader and I know I



don't need to dwell very long. In point of service he is the most senior member in the House, and when he was talking about taking the responsibility for the loss, I want to assure him publicly that he needn't feel that way at all. In this democracy of ours if the day ever comes when we can't go out in the country and put forth what we think is right, and both sides of the House fight a battle, go down with flags flying, either one way or the other - then it will be a sorry day indeed for democracy as we know it, and he need apologize not one whit for the battle he put up.

And so, Mr. Speaker --Oh, one more thing --I would like to congratulate all the new Members in the House. Of course, I am not a senior Member, but still I have seen three Houses, and I know those three, and I wouldn't wonder but what this statement couldn't be made equally truthful of many Houses - that I haven't seen, or it hasn't seen, as many new able Members come in, and I refer to all sides--all political Parties. Powerful additions have been made as has been demonstrated here in a very short Session by new-comers coming in from all Parties and acquitting themselves well. And I think that that statement cannot be contradicted and certainly it is one, at least, that has impressed me.

To the new Minister of Health and Welfare. I was pleased again that things weren't quite as bad as they were, because we still have a Liberal, I believe, as the Minister of Health and Public Welfare.

However, I would like to say this, that he will notice that I have not criticized him in any way, this Session. I can remember only too well sitting there - lack of experience - with three heavy departments - because that is what they are and he knows it as well. There is health; there is welfare; there is hospitalization. And I know that his time is well taken up indeed. And so, believe it or not, when I drove by the other night and took a short-cut through here, quite late, and I saw his car sitting out there, and I thought, "Well, gee, isn't it nice to be able to drive right on home".

And so, to the other new Members as well, as he himself, I congratulate them on coming up to the front benches. It is an onerous duty and a responsible position, and one, I think, which carries with it a great deal of satisfaction in the work that you are able to do for your fellow-citizens. And so I will not profess that I will always agree with the steps that you take, but I will say this much, that after having been there just a wee while, I know the problems and the difficulties you face.

And now, Sir, it is not my purpose to speak very long. And indeed we have spoken at considerable length in the various stands that we have taken in this House. But I think the record--and I would like especially now that we have a Hansard and that we can put on the record and even take a copy home with us -- and as the Honourable Member from Morris says, "keep it for our memories"-- that I would like to be quite clearly on record where I stand as an individual and where our Party stands as was much more ably stated by my friend and colleague, the Honourable Member from Carillon.

I don't believe that a person should sit in this House ten

minutes longer than he thinks the majority of the people at home don't want him here. I think that democracy depends upon the fact that the membership of this House should reflect as accurately as possible the feelings of the people back home. And as far as I'm concerned in supporting this amendment, and if it means an election, that isn't the problem that faces myself as an individual. I know that the Honourable the Leader of the House, the new Premier has said, "If you have a new election, see where you'll be". Maybe that's so. I know that our friends to the left, Mr. Speaker, have said "Now you know what it means -and if it is an election you will come back here a lot worse off than we are". In fact they have been so uncharitable as to suggest that maybe when they said that "you" they meant it, not me personally, but the Party. Well, maybe that's so, but is that the important issue, Mr. Speaker. I don't think it is, at all. I think the important issue is this - and I wouldn't want to think on the other hand or anyone to think that we are criticizing, as we have done the past few days, just to be obstructious. I believe that if you take the speeches from this side of the House, sure, I don't profess to say that they were all masterpieces, but certainly in those speeches you could find, I think, an idea, a suggestion. I hope a constructive one. You will notice that when we had said our piece, Mr. Speaker, and when we had made it perfectly clear, what we thought, that the Bills went on their way. I do not expect, or indeed, maybe we wouldn't be right, or it wouldn't be right if we had won every point, because maybe, indeed, we could have been wrong in some. But if we were, it was not because we knew we were. It was because we thought our criticisms were justified.

Now let's take a look at the two amendments that were placed before this House. I am not going to go into the type of speech that I might have if the Honourable Member from Carillon hadn't already made the points that I would have wanted to establish, in his own way, far superior to the one I could have, and so I will content myself with speaking only briefly, and only saying this; I ask any honourable member to read the amendment that we have proposed. Was that proposed in order that certain thought in this House because of a certain party policy could not support it? Was it framed in any way that anyone could say "Well here is a matter of principle I can't go along with". Certainly we know the Government can't go along with it. We know that. I'm not speaking about that. Is there anything there? It says we regret that with regard to agriculture, Manitoba's basic industry, the Speech from the Throne refers to one matter only and ignores the many other immediate and serious problems that are facing the farmers in this Province. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to do a great deal of campaigning, as much as one could do. And we ran into this criticism and I felt it when a person would say to me, "You are doing nothing for the farmers. What are you doing?" And I used to say, "Well it must never be forgotten that a Province, Provincial Government, cannot do what a Federal Government can". No, you are passing the buck. What about prices for our goods. What about the fact that everything we buy is going up and everything we have to sell is either

holding even or going down. Why don't you boys do something about that. Why don't you do something about crop insurance. We felt then, and we still do, that crop insurance on a provincial scale only was no other wider base to work from. We do not believe it can work on a voluntary basis. I am not going into a long discussion why. We felt that way then; we feel that way now.

However, the Honourable the First Minister and his colleagues said quite clearly, "We think we can do something about this. No, we not only think we can, we know we can". All right, the argument waxed quite strong and there were other items I'm not going to mention at the present time. And the election saw the ..... of the Conservative Party with more Members. Now then, we were having a Special Session. Wouldn't it be right and proper when during that whole campaign the point was made that something could be done at a Provincial level for the farm position? Wouldn't it be right and proper to see that program here? Sure we were ready to come in and say "Well, you didn't do it". But we expected to see what we had heard so much about.

I am not going to belittle the Bill that you put here. Not a bit. But I am going to maintain that that is not the most serious problem that the farmer has. And I know I have agreed with my leader many times, but I never was more in agreement with him when he said this, "Isn't the main thing to try and put the farmer in a position where if he borrows money, someday he can pay it back. Isn't the main problem that faces him is to put him in a position where he can expect to go ahead". Where is crop insurance, where are the other things that speakers on that side of the House said could be done and should be done. Well, maybe, maybe indeed the other side of the argument is this - we didn't have time. You can't expect us to do all that. But I haven't heard it said though, in this Session. And so there is our amendment. Exactly what we feel - that in the light of what was said in the election campaign - in the light of the criticisms that were levelled at us, because we did not do this or we did not do that. And in the light of I think as far as definite promises that the new Government could and would do any of those things that we were unable to do. And so here is our amendment. And if any Member sitting to the left of me can say where there is any principle in that amendment that he cannot support, I would like to know what it is - because it just isn't there. I'm not going to quote speeches that were made. You don't need to go back any further than when the Honourable Leader of the C.C.F. Party spoke on this and pointed out that he wasn't satisfied with the farm program.

(continued on next page)

MR. BEND (Cont'd): What about the amendment he brought into this House - and said why it's all right for you over there to yell about this and that - why didn't you support our amendment? Well certainly the insinuation was there. Now then, Mr. Speaker, could you honestly expect members of this group to support that resolution? Could you honestly expect, when you had at least five parts to it, that you might go down and say, "Well, I'll take one and I'll take two, and I'll take part of three. But certainly there would be one there that there was a fundamental difference between the two schools of thought. There is no fundamental difference in the two schools of thought in our amendment. When the charge was levelled against it as being a phoney amendment - is it phoney to say that there are many other immediate and serious problems facing agriculture in this Province? Is that phoney?

There, Mr. Speaker is the difference between the two amendments we are faced with. I have no hesitation and no trouble at all supporting the one that's in front of us now; but I certainly could not support the other amendment - and there isn't an honourable member in this House that doesn't know why I couldn't support it.

MR. B. CORBETT (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, in line with ordinary procedure, I am very pleased to congratulate you on your elevation to the speakership of this House. I am sure you will do honour to the position and also bring honour to this assembly chair by occupying that position. I also wish to congratulate the mover of the address reply, of the address to the throne, who happens to be in a neighboring constituency of mine, and naturally, being in such close proximity to my constituency, he must be a good citizen as well as a very able speaker. And I also wish to congratulate the honourable member for St. Matthews for his inspiring seconding of that address. I could go on and congratulate you considerably, and that is a very good way of putting in time, I believe - congratulating people rather than commiserating with them, or reviling them.

But as you're supposed to say something when you get up here that means something, well I will cease the congratulations I believe it is usual to give a more or less enthusiastic eulogy of the district from which you come from. Well, I have been advised in my younger days that a good debator doesn't needlessly reiterate a well known fact, or a certain fact, so I will taking advantage of that sage advice - I will pass lightly on the merits of my own constituency by merely stating what is an established fact; that the Swan River Valley is the finest district in Canada, combining as it does, great fertility with great beauty, with maximum fertility, and which has been splendidly developed by a very fine class of residents. As stated before, this is a well established fact, and I will modestly refrain from any further elaboration.

I might say, that I was rather surprised when the honourable member for Fisher gave us such a gloomy picture of his constituency. I have happened at various times to be up in that constituency and I thought it was a very fine country. And, Mr.

Speaker, he almost had me in tears when he told me of the depressed condition of the people, the water level, and I don't know what all, I couldn't remember it all - but it was very sad. And I must say that it was with some diffidence that I rose to speak. During the few days that I have had the pleasure of sitting in this House, of occupying a seat in this House, I have listened with some awe - in fact I've been frightened - by the various rules on parliamentary procedure as quoted from the various written authorities, and elaborated and confirmed, and compounded sometimes too, by the various experts sitting on both sides of the House. And I had some grave misgivings that if I opened my mouth to speak that I might be, metaphorically speaking, putting my foot in it, and be strictly disciplined for breaking some of the rules of parliamentary procedure. However, Mr. Speaker, I am treading lightly and carefully so as to try not to offend.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that many things I have listened to have been enlightening, and also surprising. I believe in the field of letters that the unauthorized copying of articles of copyrighted literature is - of any sort - is called plagiarism, I think that is the way to pronounce it - I'm not sure of it - And if convicted of such an act, a person can be penalized by law quite severely. From my observations in listening in this House, I'm always ready to believe that the Honourable Leader of our Party and his Cabinet, and the bounds of his humble supporters have been guilty of something closely alike to plagiarism. A large part of the legislation now before us, according to various honourable members of the Opposition, was conceived in the hearts and minds of those now in Opposition, and only required a little more time to be brought into the light of day. Unfortunately, the electors of the province, on June 16th, after waiting many years for the lion to bring forth something greater than a mouse, prevented the former government from putting into effect the legislation now before the House. I am afraid that there is no legal redress that the late government can obtain, but I'm pleased to observe that they are not entirely repudiating the present legislation which they have fathered.

I was listening with some interest to the honourable member from Carillon. He went back into the old days, when I was a young boy, and there was a certain gentleman in the House, who is now deceased, for whom I had a great admiration - that was the Honourable Albert Prefontaine, who I believe was the father of the present member of Carillon. The only point that I've noticed about him was at the time I admired him so greatly, I believe he was sitting on the Conservative side of the House. I also heard him take considerable credit for bringing into effect, and that the Liberal party had brought into effect the hydro and telephones, and some other things. But I believe, if my recollection serves me right, and it's a pretty fair recollection, although I'm getting kind of grey haired and a little weak in the knees. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the hydro was developed by a farmer's non-partisan party in the first place. It later on, sort of slipped a little I guess, and has since - I was going to say degenerated, but I guess that's not a parliamentary word, so I won't say it - into the present Liberal party. There was.....

I was interested too in the honourable member from Dufferin and Manitou speaking on their water troubles, and they - Mr. Speaker, I have unintentionally made a rather vulgar pun, but I assure you that it was entirely unintentional, and I hope that I will not be called to order for that.

And then, Mr. Greenlay he come - oh, pardon me, the honourable member from Portage la Prairie, he come up with some more water troubles from Portage. My -- I've had a few years in this country, having been born in this country and lived in this country all my life and I've had water troubles too, in connection with drainage and also in my engineering profession. And I think that these are things that are very hard to control. But it - there has been a kind of a sequence in our weather conditions in regard, so far as precipitation is concerned, we seem to run through certain cycles. Some are near 50 year cycles, and I believe that there is dry cycles and wet cycles, and I'm quite sure it's a very good idea to do all we can do to remedy conditions during the dry seasons by impounding water and preserving what water that we can for use of our soil; but its very hard to arrive at anything standardized along these lines because one year, one cycle, we have too much water, and there is a constant call for drainage and opening up outlet channels to lakes because the land on each side is being destroyed.

I believe that there has been a commission studying the flooded areas around Lake Manitoba, and I don't know whether they have completed their report as yet, or not, but Mr. Speaker, its very probable that now we are troubled with being too dry, and we've got to dam the Fairford River, more scientifically than it was damned here some 25 or 30 years ago. We also damned the Dauphin River, which was very satisfactory for awhile, but then the water came too fast and we had to widen out that dam and let the water away again, so it's very hard. The only thing we can do is deal with them to the best of our knowledge at least, as the various troubles arise. I'M not going to waste your time any further by speaking about water troubles. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to put myself on record as being strongly in favour of whole hearted action insofar as further assistance to the old age pensions and construction of senior citizens homes is concerned, and hope that in the near future much will be done along these lines. We have quite a serious need for something along these lines up in my own constituency.

I am very proud to be a member of the government that has been privileged to bring before the House the forward looking program dealing with education, highways, farm assistance, economic development and relief of unemployment, and I feel that if all the various groups in this House take, possibly rather belated credit for their good points, I feel assured that there will be little delay in getting this very important legislation placed on the Statute books and in operation for the betterment of all residents of the province.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that I've been connected with various organizations, municipal and ordinary local problems, and there is always a certain amount of argument and dissention, but at the present time, this Assembly has been one of the more

amiable with which I have ever been connected. I thank you.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I had no real desire to take part in this debate on this resolution because I thought that it had amply been placed on the records as to our reasons of non-support for the amendment as moved by the Leader of the Opposition, by our Leader, the honourable member for Osborne. But during the evening, one or two speakers, whom I admire and respect to the utmost, have raised one or two points that I think should be clarified.

First of all, may I compliment the honourable member from Carillon on one of the finest speeches that I have heard in this House - and certainly one of the finest - or the finest that the honourable gentleman has given in my hearing. And as I said to him out in the corridor after his delivery, notwithstanding the fact of quotes of the so called three principal officers of our party - and I want to thank him very very kindly for the promotion that he has given me within the rank - but notwithstanding that, that I admired him, and appreciated it. I said to him, that had he of delivered fine speeches of that nature with that vim and vigor during the recent provincial election, he would have still been on that side of the House; and notwithstanding the failings as he said himself he possesses, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would have carried him along with him. So I compliment him.

But there's one thing, Mr. Speaker, that he did say, with which I wish to differ. The honourable member said that the duty of the Opposition is to defeat the government - to become the government itself. I think in that, Sir, that he is entirely incorrect. I think it is the duty of the Opposition to see to it that the government whether they be a minority or majority government, does its job in the best interests of the people of the Province, or area that they are governing for. If, the definition of Opposition as enunciated by my honourable friend were correct, then we would have.....government on many occasions here in the Dominion of Canada. So I say that it is wrong to say that the purpose of government, or a purpose of Opposition is to defeat government in order to get there themselves; but again that the purpose of Opposition is to keep the government on its toes, to make sure that the government does not abuse the authority that it has under the Statutes of the Province, or under the provisions of the British North America Act. And it is the duty of the Opposition that when in its opinion, that those duties and privileges are usurped, to defeat them. And I say this, and I say it in all fairness, and a whole background throughout my life and generations preceding me, that on the basis of British free play, that at this particular stage in the game, that it is not the duty of Opposition to say to a new government that - four months has been long enough for you honourable gentlemen to assert your policies and have had a fair trial here in the Province of Manitoba. Speaker after Speaker -- in answer to that, Mr. Speaker, I would say this, that I will give the honourable gentleman opposite the full length of the term which is permissible under the laws of the Province of Manitoba, providing that they do those things

which are in the best interests of the Manitoba.....with those things that we believe in too. I do not mean by that, Mr. Speaker, and do not get me wrong--I do not mean by that, that we would impose all of the doctrines which we hold dear to our hearts upon a government of that nature. After all, rightly or wrongly, the people of our respective constituencies - the 11 that are represented here - are people of intelligence and I would suggest this, that, that being the case as it is, they expect us here in this legislature to act as responsible representatives of those areas, and also to use our common sense.

So I say to you, Mr. Premier, and you members opposite, despite the taunts that we have been receiving both from there and from here, that our position is a responsible position, and we realize it quite fully; but we are responsible people and will acquit ourselves in the position in which we are in, in that and on that basis.

Why - why are we supporting - now my friends here are suggesting that we should go along with this motion of theirs dealing with agriculture. They even attempted in dealing with the farm credit bills to suggest by an amendment that possibly we should go along with them on that also. Mr. Speaker, it's firmly established in the records of last year where we stood on that, and we stood behind the motion in amendment - or motion that was proposed - last year, by the honourable member from Morris, in amendment to a motion which was proposed by the honourable member for Ste. Rose, where the amendment asks that we establish a farm credit loan in the Province of Manitoba, in co-operation with the government of Canada to meet the needs of capital for agriculture and especially to assist young people.

MR. G. MOLGAT: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, certainly.

MR. MOLGAT: Would he also quote to the House what the final vote was on the original motion that I presented.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, certainly I would do it with pleasure, because it establishes the point that I am raising, Mr. Speaker, that at that time we of the CCF supported the contention of the Independent member then for Morris, and the Conservative member in the support of the amended resolution. And in answer to my honourable friend, that after the defeat of the amendment to that resolution, we agreed to the main motion....It's common practice.

MR. MOLGAT:.....Unanimously, as I recall....

MR. PAULLEY: Why, certainly, Mr. Speaker. Because in keeping with the former policy - policy of the former government, we in Opposition came to the conclusion that even a crumb of bread given by them in any watered down resolution, at one stage, was better than nothing at all. And so their agricultural policies were exactly the same as the rest of their policies --



a practice of watering down resolution after resolution, in order that eventually we meant naught. Then they wonder why we stand here today and say we will not support them in a resolution asking us, not to give the gentleman opposite a chance in agriculture, but to support.....in the type of administration in the fields that they formerly gave to agriculture.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, we're on firm ground in voting against this resolution, and I have no hesitation, though I belong to an Urban community, though my knowledge of the operation of farms is limited, except for a few years during the 30's, but I would have no hesitation in going to any corner of the Province of Manitoba, and saying I could not, and I would not support a resolution, which in effect, might give them an opportunity to carry on the aggressive policies that they had in agriculture before their defeat on July 16th.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier): Sir, its past the hour of 11, I know there are some others who wish to speak on this important amendment, so I suggest we allow this matter to stand and continue our debate on Monday. I would just like to reiterate that the special select committee examining bills will meet again at 10 o'clock Monday morning; and I expect that the Education Bill will be up first.

I now move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that this House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Monday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Monday afternoon.