

| Name | Electoral Division | Address |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| ALEXANDER, Keith | Roblin | Roblin, Man. |
| BAIZLEY, Obie | Osborne | 185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13 |
| BJORNSON, Oscar F. | Lac du Bonnet | Lac du Bonnet, Man. |
| CAMPBELL, D. L. | Lakeside | 326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29 |
| CARROLL, Hon. J.B. | The Pas | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron | Portage la Prairie | 86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man. |
| CORBETT, A. H. | Swan River | Swan River, Man. |
| COWAN, James, Q.C. | Winnipeg Centre | 512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2 |
| DESJARDINS, Laurent | St. Boniface | 138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man. |
| DOW, E. I. | Turtle Mountain | Boissevain, Man. |
| EVANS, Hon. Gurney | Fort Rouge | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| FORBES, Mrs. Thelma | Cypress | Rathwell, Man. |
| FROESE, J. M. | Rhineland | Winkler, Man. |
| GRAY, Morris A. | Inkster | 141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4 |
| GROVES, Fred | St. Vital | 3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8 |
| GUTTORMSON, Elman | St. George | Lundar, Man. |
| HAMILTON, William Homer | Dufferin | Sperling, Man. |
| HARRIS, Lemuel | Logan | 1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3 |
| HARRISON, Hon. Abram W. | Rock Lake | Holmfield, Man. |
| HAWRYLUK, J. M. | Burrows | 84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1 |
| HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C. | Selkirk | Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man. |
| HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C. | Ethelbert Plains | Ethelbert, Man. |
| HUTTON, Hon. George | Rockwood-Iberville | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| INGEBRIGTSON, J. E. | Churchill | Churchill, Man. |
| JEANNOTTE, J. E. | Rupertsland | Meadow Portage, Man. |
| JOHNSON, Hon. George | Gimli | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg |
| JOHNSON, Geo. Wm. | Assiniboia | 212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12 |
| KLYM, Fred T. | Springfield | Beausejour, Man. |
| LISSAMAN, R. O. | Brandon | 832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man. |
| LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C. | Fort Garry | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| MARTIN, W. G. | St. Matthews | 924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10 |
| McKELLAR, M. E. | Souris-Lansdowne | Nesbitt, Man. |
| McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C. | Dauphin | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| MOLGAT, Gildas | Ste. Rose | Ste. Rose du Lac, Man. |
| MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne | Pembina | Manitou, Man. |
| ORLIKOW, David | St. John's | 179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9 |
| PAULLEY, Russell | Radisson | 435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man. |
| PETERS, S. | Elmwood | 225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15 |
| PREFONTAINE, Edmond | Carillon | St. Pierre, Man. |
| REID, A. J. | Kildonan | 561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15 |
| ROBERTS, Stan | La Verendrye | Niverville, Man. |
| ROBLIN, Hon. Duff | Wolseley | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| SCARTH, W.B., Q.C. | River Heights | 407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9 |
| SCHREYER, E. R. | Brokenhead | Beausejour, Man. |
| SEABORN, Richard | Wellington | 594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10 |
| SHEWMAN, Harry P. | Morris | Morris, Man. |
| SHOEMAKER, Nelson | Gladstone | Neepawa, Man. |
| SPELLIE, Robert Gordon | Birtle-Russell | Russell, Man. |
| STANES, D. M. | St. James | 381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12 |
| STRICKLAND, B. P. | Hamiota | Hamiota, Man. |
| TANCHAK, John P. | Emerson | Ridgeville, Man. |
| THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C. | Virden | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| WAGNER, Peter | Fisher | Fisher Branch, Man. |
| WATT, J. D. | Arthur | Reston, Man. |
| WEIR, Walter | Minnedosa | Minnedosa, Man. |
| WITNEY, Hon. Charles H. | Flin Flon | Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1 |
| WRIGHT, Arthur E. | Seven Oaks | 4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17 |

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, February 22nd, 1961

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees

Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge) introduced Bill No. 24, An Act to amend The Business Development Fund Act.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Real Property Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day

MR. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, a very distinguished guest with us this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, who is seated immediately to your left. I have a great deal of pleasure in introducing Mr. Frank Calder, MLA of the constituency of Atlin in our sister province of British Columbia. Mr. Calder has the unique distinction of being the only full-blooded Indian ever elected to any legislative body in Canada. Mr. Calder is here, Sir, attending the conference of Indian and Metis at this present time. He informs me that being a good CCFer he must take the plane back to British Columbia this evening in order to put our friend, Premier Bennett, back in his place. It seems that during Frank's sojourn here in the Province of Manitoba that he may have got out of bounds slightly. It is a distinct honour for me, Mr. Speaker, and a privilege, to introduce Mr. Frank Calder to this Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would want to add a word of warm welcome to Mr. Calder on his visit to the assembly here. I think we would all join with him and all members of this House would join together in wishing him and this conference every success in a matter which challenges our imagination, challenges our best intentions and challenges our wits. And we thank him for coming to Manitoba to help us with a problem which, relative to our numbers in this province, is an important one, a large one, and one towards which we are devoting a good deal of thought. And so in the name of the government, and I'm sure I would speak for everyone here, I say, "Welcome to Manitoba; thank you for coming to visit us, and a very productive and happy visit to you while you're with us."

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, my group and I would like to join very sincerely in the welcome that has been expressed by the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party and the Honourable Leader of the House to our very distinguished guest, Mr. Frank Calder, MLA. I was delighted to hear the Leader of the CCF Party say that Mr. Calder is a good CCFer, and certainly we get the distinction. I'm sure that we do appreciate the fact that, busy as he must be, that he has taken the time to come and attend a conference of such importance in the Province of Manitoba and we who have to understand what it is to have to keep a government in order can also realize that he can't just over-stay here and must get back to work. It is a pleasure for us to join in the words of welcome that have been extended to a very distinguished fellow legislator, and we, too, wish to thank him for coming down to visit us.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'm informed that in the gallery there's Mrs. L., a teacher with her class for new Canadians, and they're all here. As a new Canadian myself I wish to welcome them and urge them to preserve the democratic system of government we have here in Manitoba and Canada — probably different from the countries they came from, with more freedom and more opportunities. I would like to suggest to them to watch the working of this legislature so they may in due time take over part of the duties that some members, perhaps including myself, would like to hand over to other new Canadians. After they have graduated perfectly in the class of freedom, and in the class of democracy, and in the class of service to their new home which they have now adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I too would like to introduce a group of students to this legislature. I think it's very fitting in this particular case with the only Indian MLA in Canada seated here, that I should introduce this school from Hillridge High School in Manitoba. This is a school directly adjoining the Ebb and Flow Indian Reserve. These students are here at this time at the occasion of the Indian-Metis conference, and have taken some time off to come and visit with us today. They are immediately in the west gallery frontrow in the Speaker's gallery, Sir, accompanied by their teacher Mr. Alf These students are either from the Treaty band of Ebb and Flow Indian Reserve or largely other students of Indian descent from that immediate vicinity. They are what we normally call either an orphan or a special school under the direct supervision of my honourable friend the Minister of Education; they are trying to improve the situation; in a very few years they have developed a new school in that spot, added an extra classroom, and this year started off on their first high school, and on behalf of my constituency I am pleased to introduce them to you at this time, Sir.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to introduce to you and to the members of the House the Grade VII and VIII students from Holy Cross Church in St. Boniface, accompanied by their teachers, Reverend Sister Wilfred and also Mr. J. P. Levin. They are studying political procedure and they are interested in seeing how this is done. I would like to say that these students are from a parochial school, and I think that the way, their good manners, are an indication of the type of education that we should introduce.

Monsieur l'orateur, il me fait plaisir de pouvoir vous presenter les eleves de l'ecole Holy Cross, une ecole parossiale de Saint Boniface, 70 eleves environ, les eleves du grade sept et du grade huit. Ils visitent l'edifice et ils almeraient voir une partie de la session, donc il me fait bien plaisir de leur souhaiter la bienvenue ici aujourd'hui.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House that the funeral of the late George P. Renouf is at 1.00 o'clock tomorrow from the Clark-Leatherdale Funeral Parlors on Kennedy Street.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the presence in the gallery of children from Rosedale School in the Municipality of St. Andrews and the constituency of Selkirk. These children are in Grades V, VI, VII and VIII; there's 25 in number, and they are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Walter Manulak.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye that the House do now adjourn for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the urgency of representations being made today to the Board of Broadcast Governors re pending application of radio station CKY for a frequency that would interfere with the reception in Greater Winnipeg of TV station KCND, Channel 12, Pembina, North Dakota.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would mind holding his resolution. I have somebody to introduce in the galleries and I thought everybody was finished with that. I wonder if he would mind.

MR. SPEAKER: Go ahead.

MR. DESJARDINS: We haven't come to the Orders of the Day yet but I don't mind at all.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to introduce a group of ladies, 15 in number, that are here with their leader Mrs. Irene Middleton. They're from the Gordon United Church which is situated in the constituency of Elmwood. I'm very happy to see that the people are taking an interest to see what their elected members are doing in this House, and I would like to add this one point, Mr. Speaker, it brings back very many happy memories to me because Gordon United Church is the church that my wife and I were married in. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for St. Boniface have leave of the House to pose the proposed motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with any further discussion of this matter I think we should remember that we are now operating under the new rules of the House as was forcibly brought to our attention yesterday, and I think that while there may have been past precedent for the type of motion which the honourable member has just introduced into the House to discuss a matter first of all which is not within the jurisdiction of this legislature, and

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . secondly, which does not affect -- is something over which this House has no control, while there was a precedent as I recall some two years ago for discussing, I think it was the Newfoundland strike, that came under the old rules when we had built up certain usages and customs in this House which applied. And, as I recall, I believe, Sir, that your ruling on that occasion was over-ridden, and that rule obtained until the rules were amended last year. Now the present situation is very much simpler. The rules in Manitoba now are practically in all fours with the rules of the House of Commons at Ottawa. I suggest that the one ground alone on which this motion would not be admissible is the fact that this is not a matter within the competency of this legislature, and secondly it is not a matter that can't be brought to the attention of the House by way of resolution or indeed by way of discussion in the Throne Speech debate if the honourable member wishes to make reference to it on the debate on the main motion, if not on the amendment itself. So I suggest that on those three grounds, which are the first three that come to my mind -- and undoubtedly if we peruse Beauchesne we can find a number of others -- that the motion is entirely out of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I hate to say that I have to differ with my Honourable friend the Attorney-General, but I think it is really urgent and I think something can and should be done by this House. The Leader of this House is in Ottawa now, or will be in a few hours, and this meeting will be held today and tomorrow and I think that we definitely should have a chance to discuss this because it is urgently -- it is very important to the people, to many people in Manitoba, and we are in a position to do something about it, especially because the Leader of this House will be in Ottawa and certainly could do something. It'll be too late to discuss this in two or three days

MR. LYON: Are we suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this House or the Honourable the First Minister of this House have any control over the Board of Broadcast Governors which is a Federal agency set up pursuant to Federal statute?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that the Leader of this House certainly has a responsibility for the people of Manitoba, and if it is for their welfare as discussed here today, then he definitely should take the trouble of trying to do something about it. I know that he is not one of the directors himself but things don't necessarily stop there. He would definitely be in a position to do something.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the procedure we should follow here first is that the honourable member should receive leave to introduce the motion. Has he leave of the House to introduce his motion?

MR. EVANS: Your Honour, this is leave to introduce a motion that the House do adjourn and then we discuss the merits of that motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, he first obtains leave and then he makes the motion if he receives leave from the House. Those who wish to grant leave please rise. The honourable member has leave to introduce his motion.

MR. LYON: With deference, Sir, I suggest that under Rule 27 of our rules it seems to be rather clear that the member, under sub-section 2 first of all -- the member desiring to make such a motion shall rise in his place, ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, and state the matter, which has been done. The member shall then hand a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed, to Mr. Speaker, which he has done. Who, if he thinks it is in order and is of urgent public importance shall read it out and ask whether the member has the leave of the House to proceed. I would suggest, Sir, that the pre-requisite to this is a statement by yourself to the effect that either this is or is not in order before leave is requested.

MR. SPEAKER: This is entirely correct, Sir.

MR. EVANS: Then, Mr. Speaker, is it in order to speak now to this matter that's before you? It is on the point of order as to whether this matter is admissible or not. I'm addressing myself to the point as to whether the matter is in order before the House, and Mr. Speaker will give his decision as to whether it is in order to ask leave; as to whether this matter can properly be brought before the House on this particular item.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may interject here, according to our rules the onus of declaring as to whether the motion is in order or not rests upon Mr. Speaker alone.

MR. EVANS: That is correct, and of course, I would admit that, but I was asking whether

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . his Honour would wish to receive comments from the members of the House before he makes his decision.

MR. CAMPBELL: I suggest on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable -- you, Mr. Speaker, have given your decision. You have followed the procedure; you have asked for those who support it, which comes subsequent to you deciding that it is in order, and quite frankly, I think you are perfectly in the right in so doing. But my point of order at the moment is that those matters have been disposed of. Mr. Speaker has already decided that it is in order. He has asked how many members are in favour of the motion being proceeded with. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there's nothing to do but call upon the Honourable Member for St. Boniface to proceed.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think you can speak for yourself without any help from the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition on this point of order. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition Mr. Speaker, knows.

A MEMBER: What is the point of order?

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend has a right to discuss the point of order. I'm sure you don't mind.

MR. EVANS: I'm merely saying, Mr. Speaker, that when I brought to your attention the fact that the pre-requisite is the determination of the question of order before leave is requested of the House that you, Sir, agreed to that. Now the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, for whatever reason I don't know, is putting another interpretation on this altogether. I still say, Sir, it's up to you, and you alone, not the Leader of the Opposition or any of that pack over there, to say whether or not this motion is in order.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, still on the point of order, now I simply discussed with the Honourable the Attorney-General the exact procedures that he himself has outlined as being the correct one. He read along in our Rule No. 27; he mentioned sub-section 2; he said that that has been done; he mentioned 3, the member shall then hand a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker; he admitted that had been done, and the very next thing after that was that he outlined the fact that you, Mr. Speaker, if you think it in order and is of urgent public importance, read it out and ask whether the honourable member has the right to proceed. Now, I'm not sure that you read it out a second time but you certainly read it out one time, and you evidently made your decision that it was in order. (Interjection - "Oh no") Oh yes! Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, because you immediately followed down to ask if the honourable member had the leave to proceed. And we said, "aye", some honourable gentlemen over there, and I do not refer to them as a pack, but some honourable gentlemen over there said, "No" and then you, quite properly, Mr. Speaker, followed the rules and said, "How many members are willing to grant the leave?" (Interjection: Let's start from the beginning). Yes, let's start from the beginning. I support you completely.

MR. SPEAKER: We haven't put first things first here, and that is technically correct and in perusing the resolution, I do not see where it's an improper motion before the House. I believe it to be in order. Make your motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I was afraid there for awhile they'd get permission before we had a chance to discuss it. I think that this is important, especially in view of the fact that the Board of Broadcast Governors are meeting today to discuss. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would you make your motion, please.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, make it again? I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye that the House do now adjourn for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the urgency of representations being made today to the Board of Broadcast Governors re pending application of Radio Station CKY for a frequency that would interfere with reception in Greater Winnipeg from TV Station KCND, Channel 12, in Pembina, North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, as I stated, the Board of Broadcast Governors are meeting this afternoon, I believe, or today and tomorrow to view the application of Station CKY for an FM station. Now, I think that the fact that the Leader of this House will be in Ottawa very shortly if he is not there already, I think that we should take advantage of this and be able to bring a strong recommendation from this province. Now there are numerous other

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.)....frequencies available that would be, I am guaranteed, just as good, and some might even be better. Now it seems to me -- I'm very disappointed and surprised to hear that Station CKY and Channel 7 after obtaining this first independent TV station in Winnipeg should try to black out, or should try to do away, to eliminate a competitor in this sort of a way. It is true, no doubt, that we are -- that the Board of Governors is responsible for protecting the Canadian citizen and Canadian interest -- there's no doubt about that at all-- and we do believe in nationalism, but I think that this is going a little too far when there are so many other stations. When this is done it seems obvious that it is done with only one purpose in mind. Now these people have spent a lot of money; they are serving Winnipeg. The people of Winnipeg have accepted this. CKY knew of this before they applied for their TV station, and if they didn't think that they should be capable of meeting this competition, I think that they should refrain from making this application. It reminds me of somebody sticking a clothesline or a pole or something in front of a nice window in a living room just to be mean, and it's also of Russia where they'll jam the airways so the people of Russia will not hear anything else. And if it was definitely needed now I could understand that our interest would have to come first. But just to hurt a competitor, even if he doesn't belong, if he doesn't live in this country, I don't think that that's right at all. Now this would also hurt a lot of people; there's many dealers that have stocked all kinds of equipment to service and to give service to people wishing special antennae, and many people in Greater Winnipeg have already had these antennae installed, and that would cost an awful lot of money. There is no reason why that should be done, and as I say, I'm very disappointed in Channel 7 and CKY -- there's no other reason. If there were any other reason you'd think they would have come forth and told the people of Manitoba about it, and they never did. I therefore think it is very important and would suggest that this House should unanimously ask our Premier to make a very strong representation before it is too late. Many of the people, of the citizens, are affected, either through their work, their business, or for the enjoyment of this Channel 12. I personally like Channel 7 very much and I listen to Jack Wells yelling in my ears to wake up also every morning, but I also like to see the play on Sunday afternoon and different sporting events that we can't get. I have a father who is 85 years old whose only enjoyment is listening to some of these things or watching some of this. And I can't see where we should be afraid of competition to that extent. Thank you.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to add a few words to this. Coming from the southern part of Manitoba, I'm going to speak on behalf of my constituents. As you know that Channel 7 is very close to the area which I represent, only a few miles across the boundary -- Channel 12, I mean. I'm sorry. Channel 12 is just a few miles across the boundary. Now, although they feel that presently CKY gives good programs, probably better than some of the other stations, the CBWT viewers sometimes have to complain that the service is very poor, we being way out in the fringe area. While on Channel 7 and Channel 12 the picture comes in perfectly, and I am sure that my constituents would feel very, very unhappy if Channel 12 would be blacked out. We are hoping that as time goes on both Channel 7 and Channel 12 will have more educational programs on their broadcasts. Therefore in the name of the constituency of Emerson, I would endorse the motion.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words insofar as this group is concerned, on this motion. We, too, wish to support the motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface because we feel that at the moment perhaps this government would be well advised to intercede and use as much influence as it has with the proper authorities to see that Channel 7, TV station CJAY, does not have its wish granted in this regard. Why -- and I think this has been dealt with already but I would like again to put the question to the members opposite, if you can at all help it -- why allow a situation to occur where people who have spent considerable sums of money in developing the TV station to the south -- why this should have been, as it appears now, money wasted? If the Board of Broadcast Governors felt that action like they are going to take now is warranted, they should have informed the people some time ago. Then, too, let's not lose sight of the fact that TV set owners in the city, a good many of them have spent small sums of money, granted, but nevertheless hard-earned money, to acquire facilities for reception from Channel 12. Is this going to be money wasted too? We in this group of course always supported the concept of one

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.)....national television hook-up. But in view of the fact that there is now allegedly competition in this regard, why not let us have the utmost in competition? Let the competition be free and unimpeded by any kind of restrictive regulation which seems to give a little bit of favourite consideration to particular private broadcasting companies?

A final point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, in support of the motion is simply this; I have heard allegations from one or two people connected with broadcasting to the effect that there seems to be a little bit of political hokus-pokus involved in the matter of licensing. I've heard this! And as a matter of fact, I've heard that Channel 7, Channel CJAY -- the same concern, the same concern -- was sending out invitations to certain people to attend the grand opening of their station before the Board of Broadcast Governors had, in effect, granted them a licence. If this is the case, then obviously the hokus-pokus does exist and let's not have it carried to ridiculous extremes. And so I feel that however limited this government may be in using influence, the proper place, whatever little influence they may have they should use to, as the Member for St. Boniface said, protect the interest of the public of this province.

MR. J. COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I think that it's ridiculous to suggest that CJAY asked people to come to their official opening before they were granted a licence, but I do think that the people of Winnipeg.....

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of privilege, is the honourable member suggesting that I have fabricated this in my own imagination? Is he doubting the truth of my statement when I say that I have been told this by people?

MR. COWAN: Oh, I don't doubt that people could tell you, but I doubt very much of it is true.

MR. SCHREYER: I think that the honourable member didn't make the proper distinction.

MR. COWAN: I think I did.

MR. SPEAKER:denying a rumour.

MR. COWAN: However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with others in the protest against CKY picking out, I understand, one of 40 alternates available to it and this one happened to be the one on which the American television station operates on. I think that it is a poor show that this station should operate in this way, and I hope that the Board of Broadcast Governors will not grant their application.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm delighted to see some support from the far side of the House on this matter. I was a little afraid after my honourable friend the Attorney-General first spoke that he was becoming entirely too modest.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend has been in this House long enough to know that one can object on a procedural point without indicating on the substance of motion what his opinion may be. And he might be able to take this type of licence with other people but he'd better not try to take it with me, Sir.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm glad to see my honourable friend is as touchy as ever, Mr. Speaker, It makes a much more interesting subject in the House here. So, we'll leave alone his views on the subject and deal only with his modesty in this matter that his Leader has no effect on the BBG, and I, on this subject, have much more confidence in his Leader than he apparently has because I feel at this time being in Ottawa when the -- (Interjection)-- Not a bit; not a bit; I like it over here. Now that he's in Ottawa, I think it's a perfectly fitting time for him to make representations to the BBG on this subject. It's a circumstance accidental that he is there when these hearings are held, but I think it's an excellent opportunity for Manitoba, and it's a perfect opportunity for this House to give this particular motion unanimous approval so that he can speak there on behalf of Manitobans. And I think that the case that has been put forward gives this House every justification to support this motion. As the honourable member who just spoke has indicated, there are apparently 40 other frequencies available that this particular FM station could request which would not interfere with the reception. Therefore, why not suggest another frequency? For some years now, eastern cities--in particular Toronto and Hamilton -- have had the benefit, or at least the use of American radio channels. This has not been the case in Winnipeg. Here is an opportunity when it can be made available. Why try and stifle competition? Why not simply give this station an opportunity to broadcast in this area? As others have already pointed out, a lot of citizens in the province have spent quite a large sum of money in order to be able to catch these broadcasts. Are they to have spent that money

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.).... for no purpose? It seems to me as well that the matter of international understanding -- that there's no reason that we should block out a station in this way. If I recall correctly there are understandings and agreements between ourselves and the United States -- in fact I think there are world-wide agreements on this subject -- for the use of frequencies. Now if we deliberately, as this appears to be the case at the moment, go out to block an American frequency, I don't think that it's in our best interests. I don't think that when we're dealing with our American neighbours on other subjects that this improves our case one least little bit. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in this circumstance, that this House should give its unanimous approval and request the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, in view of the fact that he is presently in Ottawa, to give his views and the views of this province on the subject, and request that the present demand to have this frequency allotted which will block out the American station be not accepted by the BBG, but that another frequency be allotted to them.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be practically unanimous agreement with the subject matter of this resolution, so I can be very brief indeed. But it seems to me that this is an example of exactly the kind of thing that our rule about adjournment of the House, or discussing a matter of urgent public importance, should apply to, because here's something that has come up fairly suddenly so far as most of the public is aware, and by what we are told it appears as though there is at least a tendency on the part of the Board to grant this frequency, which if done, would result in the blacking out of the US programs that come in over the Pembina station. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a case, in my opinion, of where the public interest is definitely involved. Many people, great numbers of people in Manitoba, wish to have that station's programs available to them, and are we to be told under these circumstances that they can't come in? If it were a case that this frequency was the only one available, then perhaps there would be quite an argument about it and perhaps the interests of Canada, in its own right, might be held to prevail. But I'm by no means technically informed on these matters, but I am told by those who are, that there are a multiplicity of channels available. Why in the name of common sense, if that is the situation, should they be allowed to fix on this one which would effectively block out the Pembina station? Now, I think this is a most timely subject, and I would suggest that, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, this is a motion that does not come to a vote, but inasmuch as the feeling of the House I think is quite unanimous on the subject, I would suggest that after this motion has been withdrawn, that the Leader of the House would immediately get in touch with the First Minister in Ottawa, tell him the feeling that exists here, tell him that it's wide-spread in Manitoba, of which I am in no doubt that he's well aware, and ask for the urgency of this matter to be presented to the Board right this afternoon. Now, surely that is a matter on which the views of the First Minister of this province would carry a good deal of weight. It seems to me that the question is so open and shut that there's no need for lengthy debate and so I'll conclude right here.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, a comment or two, that I think it has become clear as stated by my colleague, the Attorney-General, that the discussion on the point of order was a quite separate matter from the discussion of the merits of the case. I think we would agree that we're all concerned for those who have spent their money for aerials to bring in the Channel 12 -- I think is the right Channel -- the Channel 12 station, and that we would naturally like to see those people receive every possible protection for that investment and the advantage of whatever can be achieved by way of varied radio reception. I think these are all valid points; I think these are points on which the whole House is in agreement. I would draw attention to this, however, that on the basis of the amount of information that we have been able to receive this afternoon, it would not be right for us to pre-judge this case, because we must remember the interests involved have not had a chance to give their side of the case, and that we should not, here, now, judge the merits of this case. There may be technical points involved, there may or may not be some 40 channels available. The CKY may not be able for technical reasons to choose some of those channels; they may not be available to them. So I think there is a word of caution here which is in order to the effect that we should not attempt here to pre-judge this case. Now it would be a matter of routine, of course, for me to keep the Premier informed of developments in the House. A motion to discuss a matter of urgent public importance is something that of course I would bring to his attention, and I will do so. I think we must leave this matter in the hands of those competent to decide after hearing the evidence on both sides.

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.). . . . I think the discussion has been a proper one if the urgency of the matter is allowed and of course will not again mention the point of order because that would not be within the rules for me to do so. But I think the information that has been provided for the House will help all our thinking, and I shall make the Premier aware of the discussion that has taken place.

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

MR. R. SEABORN (Wellington): I just want to assure the honourable member from Brokenhead that he has been misinformed about these invitations. To my knowledge no invitations to CJAY were extended until just before Christmas. I just wanted to make this clear to him. Thank you.

MR. S. ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce has urged us not to pre-judge this decision which is before the Board of Broadcast Governors at the present time. However, we have here with us a letter signed by Andrew Stewart, the Chairman of the Board of Broadcast Governors, which states that in his view, that this frequency should not be considered as unavailable to Canada because a station at Pembina has been approved by the FCC. I do not think that we can take this position in dealing with frequencies allocated to Canada under international agreement. And then it goes on to say that they are encouraging the use of this frequency immediately before too many people go to the expense of investing in outdoor antennae. In other words, signed by Andrew Stewart, they are of the opinion that this should be given now. And then in last night's paper as you all noticed, I'm sure, the Vice-Chairman of the Board, Carlyle Allison indicating his support to the Chairman's position on this matter. So this matter apparently has already been judged to a certain extent at least. We are not pre-judging it.

MR. EVANS: If the honourable member would permit a question. Would he agree that the matter then appears even more complicated now in view of the letter he has just read ---- complicated matters.

MR. ROBERTS: But this also, Sir, makes the matter all the more urgent why it should be raised today and why we as a group, representing the people of Manitoba, elected members of the people of Manitoba, must voice our opinion at this time, expressing our serious concern over the manner in which this is being handled. I think that, as has been said, the very simple opportunity, obvious opportunity, that we have of expressing our desires in Ottawa at the present time should be met today, and I would hope that unanimous approval of the House will be given to this. Because Manitobans as a whole and Winnipeggers in particular, I think, believe in fair play. This is not a picture of fair play and I think that we as a group of members representing the people of the province have an opportunity of expressing to our Premier who is in Ottawa today, this feeling that perhaps fair play is not taking place at this time and that a situation should be cleared up and our opinions on it should be expressed as being very strongly opposed to this particular frequency being used for an FM station. Now, it has been pointed out and as it once again in this story . . . quoting Carlyle Allison again, he denies that there were 40 other frequencies available for FM stations. He said there were probably four other choices. Even so, four is lots of choice. It isn't the case of "this is the only choice for an FM station." He also goes on to explain of a case in which in Seattle this was permitted at one time -- a block-out of an American station, or it was in Vancouver it was permitted -- a block-out of a Seattle station. But of course it is simple to observe that the Seattle station was an American station carrying American advertising and so forth. The Channel 12 station relies on the Winnipeg market, and I must say the Winnipeg people have shown a great interest in the Channel 12 station as well.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two in connection with this very important matter. I do appreciate the fact that the House Leader has said that we should not pre-judge the case. I don't think, Sir, that that is the intention at all. I think it's rather one of protection of those people here in the Greater Winnipeg area in particular who have made installations. And then again, Sir, as my colleague the Member for Brokenhead pointed out, we have the peculiar situation insofar as my party is concerned, where we have always been the advocates of the CBC itself, and we felt long before CJAY came into the City of Winnipeg that the CBC were doing a terrific job in the interests of the people of Canada, and of this area in particular. But here we have the situation now where it appears that if the FM channel is

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) allocated to the interests of CKY and CJAY, there may be an infringement on what my friends opposite and to my right are always trying to preach to we of the CCF, of fair competition in the free enterprise system. Now I would not suggest for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that anyone in the Chamber here this afternoon has sufficient qualifications to say whether or not the channel chosen or suggested for FM CKY will interfere. But I so think that we as members of this legislature, Mr. Speaker, should have removed any doubts of that in respect of the reception of Channel 12. Now, I can appreciate the fact that the Honourable the Premier is going to be very, very busy discussing the matter of provincial-federal relations down at Ottawa. I'd like to offer this suggestion to the House Leader at the present time. I believe, of course as usual, the motion will be withdrawn. I suggest that the Leader of the House inform the Honourable Dufferin Roblin of the fact that the matter has been considered here this afternoon. But in addition to that I respectfully suggest to the House Leader, in view of the fact that the Board of Broadcast Commissioners are meeting to consider this matter, that he also inform them of the fact that this matter was raised in the legislature today, in order that they are aware of the feelings as are expressed here this afternoon. Again Sir, I think that it is a very important matter. I, for once, am going to stand here and pronounce my support for the free enterprise system now that democracy did not prevail to the degree that I think it did when we allowed a second station into Winnipeg in the first place.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I support this resolution and the words that have been said in support of it. I've done one thing further; I have been in touch already with my federal member and given him the views of my constituents and myself.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to withdraw my motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are the honourable members in agreement?

Orders of the Day.

MR. DESJARDINS: Monsieur l'orateur, mercredi le 14 mars au Cercle Ouvrier de St - Boniface, la Societe St-Jean Baptiste tiendra sa soiree traditionnelle de la soupe aux pots. Bien que la legislature n'a pas sourit sur nous les citoyens de St-Boniface pendant les annees passees nous esperons que bientot ceci sera change. Ce sera un plaisir pour les gens de St-Boniface, pour la Societe St-Jean Baptiste et pour moi de vous inviter d'etre avec nous a cette occasion.

Mr. Speaker, usually once every session I stand up in this House without any misgivings. I know that I will be popular and what I will have to say will not be controversial, and this is the occasion. I would like, once again, to invite all the members of this House and you, Sir, and also, especially the new member, the charming Member from Pembina to visit the fair city of St. Boniface. Yes, On Wednesday, March 15th at the Cercle Ouvrier in St. Boniface, the Society of St. Jean Baptiste is holding its traditional "pea soup" night. In the name of the Society of St. Jean Baptiste, of all the citizens of St. Boniface, it is my pleasure to invite you to be with us on this evening. I would like to add also that all the members of the press and radio are welcome, and this would include Mr. Trebilco of CKY.

MR. PAULLEY: As one of the representatives of the.

MR. EVANS: Pardon?

MR. PAULLEY: I was just going to extend it from my little section.

MR. EVANS: Oh, well, please do.

MR. PAULLEY: I was just going to say, Mr. Speaker, as one of the representatives of a corner of St. Boniface I have been asked if I would join in the kind invitation of the Society of St. Jean Baptiste to the members of the legislature. Now on occasion it sometimes happens that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and myself have some small differences of opinion. In this though we are unanimous in our invitation. I'm sure that members who have attended in the past cannot do anything better than partake in the pea soup that is offered, prepared by the finest chefs, not only here in the City of St. Boniface, but of any community across Canada where the pea soup is the very excellent and stable product. We of the Radisson part of St. Boniface join with St. Boniface in this invitation.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker, it's been traditional, I think, that the Honourable Member for Radisson and myself, both representing small portions of the City of St. Boniface, assist the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in extending this invitation, and this I do at this time very gladly. The St. Jean Baptiste Society has held this function for many many years and I'm sure

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) that many of the older members of the legislature have attended on many occasions. I started attending this function when I was still a member of the council of the Rural Municipality of St. Vital, and I can join with the Honourable Leader of the CCF in recommending the high quality of the pea soup, and in addition, Mr. Speaker, there is other liquid refreshment on this occasion of equally high quality, so I am glad at this time to help extend this invitation.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think this has now become a famous occasion in Manitoba, if I recall it, for a good many years, certainly long before I was in the political field; I attended as a business man from Winnipeg; looked forward to it from year to year. I know that we all very much appreciate this great gesture of goodwill on the part of our friends of St. Boniface. This is not only a feast of pea soup which is not only the best in St. Boniface and the best in Canada but the best in the world, I suggest, and we all enjoy that very much but even more, we enjoy the feast of goodwill that goes with it on behalf of our fellow Canadian from St. Boniface. There were some references in my honourable friend's speech in French which were not included in the English text but I'm sure that he hadn't meant to raise any serious point at issue as to whether the sun shines on St. Boniface now, or will soon shine again, or smile, as the case may be. I think on this occasion we do want to thank those who represent St. Boniface and portions of St. Boniface for the thoughtfulness of their fellow citizens in inviting us on this very pleasant occasion.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my leader and our group I'm very pleased to tell the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the Honourable Leader of the CCF and the Member for St. Vital for their kind invitation and to assure them that we will be there as a group, but on my own behalf I would like to invite the new member of this House, if she wants someone to show her the way to St. Boniface. I know my way around St. Boniface.

Monseigneur l'orateur, je suis tres heureux de'accepter au nom de notre parti l'invitation du deputé de St-Boniface et nous passerons ensemble un soiree francaise en mangeant de la soupe aux pois.

TRANSLATION OF ABOVE: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy on behalf of our party to accept the invitation of the Member for St. Boniface and together will enjoy an evening in the French tradition whilst eating pea soup.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Is he prepared as suggested last evening by the First Minister to lay on the table of the House today or advise the House in any other way of any information in his possession to substantiate his charges of alleged bribery in road construction?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I made it very plain that I will be delighted to go into them at a later date when the estimates of the Department of Public Works are before us. I think the best time for something like that is when we can discuss it back and forth, and then the invitation will be extended at that time again that the government arrange for some proper place where witnesses can be called -- (Interjection)-- That's right and I think even someone as naive as my honourable friend the Attorney-General would hardly expect that the allegations that I am making were ones where the promises or threats were made to me. I require a place where witnesses can be called, but in the meantime, I will renew the discussion when the Department of Public Works estimates are before the House when we can talk back and forth here and have a full discussion on it and

MR. LYON: You can't call witnesses then.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, but then I will renew the invitation to the government to decide whether they prefer to have this hearing at public accounts or at judicial committee, anything that suits their convenience.

MR. R. G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Am I correct then in understanding the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not prepared to lay any information before the House today?

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm prepared to back up the statements that I made just as I indicated the first time and I indicate again, and will be always prepared to back up the statements that I make in this House.

MR. SMELLIE: Would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition permit a question? Would you say, Sir, that it is fair to lay a charge against any person or any government without stating what that charge is and ask for the right to introduce witnesses to prove your charge without allowing the person or the government charged the right to prepare a defence? I would suggest, Sir, that if that is your attitude, that you are not being fair to this House or to this government.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend's question developed into a bit of a speech which I don't feel that I need to reply to at this time. He can have his opinion; he's expressed it in the House yesterday. I believe he's entitled to his opinion; I'm entitled to mine. I will conduct myself in this House the way it seems to be in the public interest. I counsel my honourable friend to do the same thing and I'll run my business; let him look after his.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General? In view of the statement which I made during my reply to the Speech from the Throne in which I suggested that there were very grave charges made in this House as differentiated by charges made on the election hustings and platform, and namely that the government give consideration to the establishing of a public or judicial enquiry into these charges, has the government given any consideration to the establishment of such an enquiry commission?

MR. LYON: The short answer, Mr. Speaker, is that we are still waiting to hear what the charges are.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted I believe that there were charges which were specific enough of a nature which would warrant if the government were sure of their grounds for them to establish this committee at which time witnesses to substantiate the charges could be called. Now I do not agree with my honourable friend from Birtle-Russell that all of the...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. PAULLEY: Am I out of order or am I embarrassing the government, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that you're out of order. Orders of the Day. Second reading of Bill No. 6. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 6, An Act to facilitate the Reciprocal Enforcement of Judgments for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 7. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

Mr. Lyon presented Bill No. 7, An Act to facilitate the Enforcement of Maintenance Orders for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 5. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville) presented Bill No. 5 An Act to amend The Fruit and Vegetable Sales Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment as I think is obvious. It will give authority to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to make regulations respecting registration and licensing of persons operating produce-grading stations or produce-grading and inspecting stations and it will permit the establishment of registered and central grading stations. I will deal with the significance of the Bill as it relates to the program in the Department of Agriculture when I get into estimates.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would simply wish to ask the Honourable the Minister if it isn't a fact that this authority already exists and is being exercised by the Federal Department of Agriculture?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Arthur and the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all add my words of congratulation to you and your office, on the manner you're conducting yourself, and may I also

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) add my words of appreciation for the kindness and assistance given to me by you. Further I would like to add my congratulations to the Members from Arthur and Cypress as mover and seconder in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Both did a fine job and they did well to let matters of their particular constituencies come to light.

Then I also wish to congratulate the new member for Pembina and wish her well during her stay in this House. I'm sorry to see that the First Minister is not in his seat this afternoon. I also would like to congratulate him on the presentation he made to the hearings of the Royal Commission on Transportation. The province was well represented by the Premier in the cause to maintain the Crow's Nest Pass freight rates which is of vital importance and interest to our people and those of the Prairie Provinces. I also commend the Premier and his government for the support given to the International Joint Commission; the effort made through the Department of Agriculture on the matter of water conservation and supply for the Pembina region. Water is a must for our farming communities in southern Manitoba, to maintain and also to get new industries established in our towns and to further diversify farming practices in our area.

Now I would briefly like to touch on my own constituency of Rhineland. It is the most densely populated rural area in Manitoba. It has a number of well-established industries and these are mostly brought about through the initiative and perseverance of the people themselves. A number of new industries are being established and have been established during the course of the past year. A new clothing industry was brought into Winkler, a potato chip factory has also been started in the same town, and three new concerns in the potato warehousing and production have also located there. The cannery -- the cannery's extension program calls for an increased acreage in both canning corn and peas. And a new extension to the plant is being planned at the present time. Our area, too has some of the finest well-served credit unions in the province making it possible for the people to provide for themselves the financial credit they need, and is adding to the prosperity of the community. Naturally this does not exclude the banking services that are being provided by the banks in the area.

I'd also like to mention vegetable oils of Altona which has been established for a number of years and is processing soya beans imported from the United States. Over the years most of these soya beans -- practically all of them -- have been imported mainly due to the reason that we do not have varieties that are suitable, whose yield is large enough to warrant the production of it, and also the to the maturing of early varieties. We need a variety that is early in maturing and still maintains a high yield. Thus a lot of money is going to the US just because our program of research and getting new varieties is not speeded up fast enough. We have been waiting for this for a good number of years and I do hope the Minister of Agriculture is taking this to heart and sees to it that something is done about it. Last year they imported 630,000 bushels which at a cost of almost \$2.00 a bushel -- and I was informed today that the price is going up fast. They now have to pay \$2.40 and there are indications of further rising prices. These industries and the expansion that is taking place calls for better roads in our constituency. We have three main highways that service them. Those are highways 14, 14A and 32. Highway 14A needs attention and should be widened to provide shoulder room. Highway 32 was constructed a few years ago and needs hard surfacing badly before it gets completely out of condition. A request has been made to the Minister concerned and I trust he will find his way clear to act on the matter.

Another fact we're proud of is the fine schools that have been constructed and built in the area to replace the old ones that were getting out of condition. We are continually seeing to it that new schools are being built wherever necessary. We also pay tribute to the fine teachers that we have and who are providing instruction to our pupils in these schools. However, our teachers who have had years of experience find it difficult these days because they are not getting the remuneration that teachers do get who teach in division areas. And here again I would like to stir up the Minister of Education's conscience so that it would bother him, and probably so that he couldn't sleep for awhile, until he decides to do something about it. I've brought this to the attention last year a number of times the discrimination that is being carried on in Manitoba regarding school grants. The matter is well known to you people in the House. Presently our schools in the non-division area are not receiving the same support that those of the division areas are receiving. The teachers in our elementary school earn a grant for

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . the district of a flat \$2,500 per room. Those for the secondary classes earn \$3,750, whereas those schools in division areas receive large grants according to the experience and qualification of the teacher. These amount to, I think it's from \$2,800 to some \$60 odd hundred for the elementary and \$3,500 to \$90 odd hundred for the secondary teacher.

Now this is all taking place in a community where we are contributing more than the average to the Consolidated Fund of the province. As you know, the main revenue derived and which is forming part of the budget are the Dominion Provincial Tax Agreements which are received by the province and which are based on a per capita basis. Then we have the automotive users' fuel tax. Naturally, and here again our area is the largest rural area in the number of licences sold. That is a good indication that a lot of the taxes derived from automotive fuel is coming from our area. It also shows that a lot of the monies derived from the sale of licences comes from that area, so that we are contributing in large amounts to the coffers of the province. And we feel that it is only fair that we get our portion of the grant. There is no reason why this discrimination should be carried on. I have previously said that the standards in our schools are as good as anywhere in the province. We are giving our children, our pupils, instruction under the same curriculum. We're inspected by the inspectors of the department so that we are fulfilling our duties in that respect, and we demand that we get a proper share of the teacher grants that are being given to the school districts in the province. I might also say that where in a non-division area the division plan is not accepted that the Minister give consideration to increasing the non-resident fees. That will provide added revenue and income to those towns, school districts that are providing a high school education for the pupils who come from the farming area. We feel that we want to contribute to those town schools and pay our just portion of the cost to the receiving schools, and this matter was endorsed at a meeting that I attended, and I make this submission that the Minister give consideration to this matter.

Now I wish to briefly comment on crop insurance. Here again I wish to make my position clear. The program covers three areas in the province from which they wish to derive information and see how the plan works out. Our area is in one of these areas who have subscribed to this plan. Now the people have come to me and told me that the coverage afforded is not large enough, and that the coverage should be increased rather than that the premium be decreased, which I think is what the government intends to do. And I doubt whether the subscription that was received last year towards the plan is an indication as to the support of the plan. A number of people who have subscribed to the plan have indicated that they consider it the lesser of two evils, that instead of paying one percent to the Prairie Farmers Assistance Act they have contributed to the Manitoba Crop Insurance Act and thereby had to pay less money. That was their only reason for subscribing to the plan. Now how widespread this is I do not know at the present time, but I know that it's there. Then also I think you will probably see a drop-out this year because some people suspect that this might become a compulsory plan to which they would have to contribute at a later date, and they feel very strongly on this point that they do not want this plan to become a compulsory plan to which they would have to subscribe. Those are briefly some comments that I had on the crop insurance.

Then coming to the next matter, and here again I would like to make a few comments on the Agricultural Credit Corporation that was set up by this government a few years ago. I mentioned last year that this Corporation is filling a need. I think it is helping a lot of young people to get started on the farm, and that a good interest rate has been given to the young farmers so that they are being able to establish themselves. But at the same time I wish to draw to the Minister's attention -- I'm sorry to see that he's not in the House at the present time -- but that we are becoming a party to something which later on might be very embarrassing. We know that today the farmer is in a cost price-squeeze and that things are getting more and more difficult for him. Should this get to be worse and that seizures would have to be made, bankruptcies would occur, we would become a party to those things as the government, and I think we should be very careful about what we are doing and take a good look. Just to point out the severity of the decline in the farm income, I would like to draw your attention to the Manitoba Farmers Union brief which has been presented to the government and to the other official parties and on page 5 they make the following statement: The average loss -- pardon me, I quote: "The average

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) loss in net income of Manitoba farmers for each year of the past five years as compared to the previous five years has been \$16,437,000 per year. The total net loss in terms of farm net income in Manitoba in the last five years has been \$82,186,000; estimating approximately 40,000 farmers who actually can be called bona fide farmers, producers in Manitoba, this works out to an average net loss of earning power, that is net income after operating costs are paid, of \$2,054 per farm. The constant decline in farm cash and net incomes in recent years has forced the farmer to produce more and more each year in order to meet the continuous increases in production and living costs."

Then they also go out and point out to the matter of increasing debt that the farmers in Manitoba are getting into. They have three charts, one from the Canadian Farm Loan Board, another on the Farm Improvement Loans and then they have the following comment to make: "We estimate that the total debt of Manitoba farmers now has reached 84.7 million. The highest in our history except for the years 1933, '34 and '35 when it averaged 85.9 million. This is an increase of 88% since 1950." The report continues: We note with some degree of relief that our universities and departments of agriculture are beginning to question the theory that the solution to the farm problem rests in larger production, greater efficiency, better farm management, greater productivity and such other related matters alone. We note the concern of people other than ourselves who are questioning proposed solutions to the farm problem which exclude price as a basic and prime concern in the farm policy. Farmers need an overall farm policy to solve the farm problem on all sides but they must concern themselves with the marketing and pricing mechanism inherent in our agricultural economy, to solve the first basic problem on the majority of farms in Manitoba. Low prices for farm production."

Mr. Speaker, I brought this to the attention of the House last year and I do so again, that even though some of these matters are not too much of our concern because they belong to the federal field but still I feel that this House has a responsibility and should make representation to the Federal Government on some of these matters because they are a vital concern to us. If the farmer doesn't have a fair price, how can he make his living? How can he stay in business? It is impossible to do so.

I would also like to bring to the attention the matter of the so-called surpluses. It is not a matter of over-production as far as I'm concerned; it's a matter of under-consumption or rather of distribution. The farmer under the present prices has to produce more to meet steady rising costs in order to operate. Commodities the farmer sells are still the same of five years ago, especially the prices referred to on grain, yet the things he has to buy keep rising putting him into an ever-tighter squeeze, and this is amply demonstrated, as I already pointed out, by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics where they have gathered some of the statistics that I quoted. Better prices are needed to keep the farmers going and remain solvent. It is our duty to speak up on behalf of the farmers and the party in this legislature and getting the Federal Government to act. While attending the recent Trade Conference here in Winnipeg at which the Federal Trade Minister, the Honourable Mr. Hees, spoke on the necessity and the ability to compete with other industrial nations both as to design and cost of our product, I think more emphasis should have been put on the extension of credit to other countries that could be buyers. In the case of wheat certainly those countries facing famine are experiencing very great trouble, and they certainly would take our wheat and grain if satisfactory financial arrangements could be made. But there is too much red tape and too many restrictions. Why does our wheat have to be sold for dollars only? Why can't we accept currency for wheat? Why can't we barter or take other goods in exchange for wheat? The restrictions in our trade agreement such as the Wood agreement and even the Canadian Wheat Board, the Crown agency is far too restrictive and monopolistic in order to enhance trade and offer relief. According to press reports China purchased substantial quantities of wheat and grain, but apparently this will mainly be used to feed their troops and a privileged few. The common people will have to face starvation and death. Some day the western nations will have to give account for their actions by not assisting these people in their hour of need. Surely Canada as a nation can do more in this respect than it is presently doing.

Further in regard to distribution, it is evident that we need additional purchasing power introduced to the people of Canada and I'm sure that consumption would automatically increase and provide for greater markets. Were our 3/4 million unemployed people employed that

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) would mean a vast difference in our markets for our staple goods. The trouble is that our present monetary system, in our present monetary system every new dollar that comes into existence comes into existence in the form of a debt. That is also the reason why our Federal Government is getting into a worse and worse situation day by day. We cannot borrow ourselves into prosperity for long. We have evidence to the fact in the federal conversion loan of 1959 where the government spent millions just to extend a debt, and our government here in Manitoba is plunging the province into a terrific debt. I am sure were our people made to pay presently on a pay-as-you-go basis the expense of our government, they would be up in arms about it and demand a reversal of some of the policies and practices followed by the present administration. It is being clearly demonstrated by two of the greatest spending departments in our government, namely the education and health and welfare departments. Both are set up on a so-called escalator basis and can go nowhere but up, and there is no indication of holding the line on cost.

Last year I advocated a two-price system for wheat in Canada and I'm sure this would be of great assistance. I am unable to see why the western farmers should be compelled to subsidize the people in Canada with cheap wheat when he has to pay full cost of other products. There's no reason why the export price should govern the price of wheat in Canada. Machine companies have a two-price system in effect -- one price for Canada and another for foreign countries. Why not the same for wheat? While I consider the two-price system a stop-gap measure, I say the farmer should receive parity prices for all his grain. It is high time that we speak up and make representation to the Federal Government on this matter.

I would also briefly like to comment on the matter of unemployment. I am glad that the situation is being recognized in Manitoba and that our government is admitting that we have an unemployment situation in Manitoba, because once we admit, at least there's hope that something can be done about it. I also wish to congratulate the government that at least it's trying to do something about it, although it is probably very feeble and mainly patchwork. And here I am referring to the winter works program. The Throne Speech indicated just how much they were doing and how many people were being employed of those who would otherwise be unemployed. They're also considering that the Provincial Government do some retraining of unemployed. The seriousness of the situation concerns everyone in Canada and eventually, if not at present, it will affect all of us in one way or another. However, the root of the matter goes much deeper than appears on the surface and cannot be corrected by patchwork as is carried on today.

I read in a newspaper clipping the other day: it is from the Tribune dated February 21st. It's headed "Grits Launch Attack on Monetary Policy." Further on in the release it has this to say: "The Liberal Leader Pearson opened the two day supply debate by describing government irresponsible in monetary policy and debt management as one root cause of current high unemployment". I would wholeheartedly agree that it is a case that our monetary system has something to do with our unemployment situation in Canada. We know that the administration in Ottawa, the Minister of Finance is not taking the responsibility for the Bank of Canada and that there has been a controversy between the two. I would like to read a statement from the book, "The Economist Versus the Bank of Canada", written by H. Scott Gordon. On Page 4 he has this to say: "By denying that he has any responsibility for monetary policy or the actions of the bank, the Minister of Finance has created a situation in which it is impossible for Parliament to discuss the bank's policy to any purpose. The bank has become a free-floating autocracy; a power unto itself subject neither to government nor to Parliament. It is an institution of immense power whose actions reach into every area of the economic and financial life of the nation, but it wields its power without responsibility. The bank need answer to no one for its actions and there is no one prepared to answer publicly for it. In the whole fabric of democratic government one will not find a breach that is wider or more dangerous than that presented by the existing constitutional status of the Bank of Canada". Here we have a man controlling the monetary system in Canada and he's responsible to no one. He can do as he well pleases and his term of office is such that he can only be put out of office -- as the Act states that he holds office during good behaviour. This is a very significant phrase which governs the tenure only of a most independent public servant. Here again, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the problem of unemployment is much deeper; that we need introduction of more purchasing

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.)

power and that this purchasing power be debt free, otherwise we'll never get out of the situation that we are in at present. Anything that is being done is only of a stop-gap measure, and sooner or later things will become worse because of the debt situation that is prevailing in Canada as well as in Manitoba. And today, the second largest item of the National Budget was for interest on our Public Debt. Here in Manitoba we see our debts rising, and already there have been indications from the Throne Speech that further monies will have to be provided for certain projects.

Now they also have mentioned in the Throne Speech of Savings Bonds. It is the intention of the First Minister -- is it because he is no longer able to borrow money at reasonable rates, or why is he going out to sell Savings Bonds? Here again I might briefly mention that B. C. started out with parity bonds several years ago. They are 5% bonds and their first issue was for \$35 million. It was to go for the financing of the P. G. E. Railway which was started by the previous administration, which started nowhere and ended nowhere. There was no connection. Then they had very good success in that. The response was very good and later on they had another subscription where they were going to get 35 million for the Power Commission. This was over-subscribed to the point of \$175 million. The response was terrific and they had to allot the bonds so that the purchaser would only get a certain amount. I think we in Manitoba are rather late on the scene with this matter. Now when times get bad we are trying to get some of the money from the public. This should have been initiated earlier. I was also astonished last night when the First Minister mentioned and said that the former government should have gotten deeper into debt and borrowed money. My! I couldn't for the life believe what I heard, because we shouldn't be going into debt; we should be paying our way as we spend the monies for government and not create debt for the future generations to carry.

I would also, briefly, like to touch on the Health Plan -- or the Hospital Plan as we have it today in Manitoba. While I have as yet not been able to study the Minister's report tabled last Friday, I might just make some general comments regarding the plan however. First of all I, and also the people I represent, the people who subscribe to the principles that I represent, do not believe in a compulsory plan. I think the plan should be a voluntary one. It would be more competitive that way. And then it should also contain some deterrent clauses to avoid costly abuses, through either one of two things. Either a daily small charge to the patient or an entrance fee like the Blue Cross had when it was in operation. I think the main thing we're concerned with, and should be concerned with, is to avoid catastrophic losses to individuals when they become sick and because of sickness. I have also discussed this matter with some of the people back home and found out their reactions. Apparently we're shifting a lot of responsibility, the responsibility of collecting premiums, to the municipalities. I have been given to understand that the cost of pre-payment is similar to that that they had to pay under the previous system whereby they would just cover the cost of those people that were unable to pay their hospital bills, so that we are not any ahead. I will have some further comments on that matter when the thing is up for discussion, either at the estimates or on another occasion, so that I will leave the matter of the hospital plan at this time.

I'm probably exceeding my time so I will not have too much to say, but the other day I requested that the Honourable Minister, the Provincial Secretary give consideration and reconsider the matter of providing me with office space. I did check with one of the other provincial governments in Canada as to what they are doing, and I might refer to Alberta, that they have been very fair. As you know, they have one representative in the opposition from each party, the Liberals, the Conservatives, a Coalition member and an Independent Social Credit member. The party members divide between themselves the portion that is due the Leader of the Opposition. In addition to that they get private offices; they get secretarial help; they are allowed to speak more than once in debate on a question; and are given special privileges; whereas here in Manitoba I'm not even given the private office I was requesting and which was given to me last year. They already recognized that I was a House Leader for my group. And this year, evidently, they have a change of policy which I cannot understand. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this matter will be reconsidered and something will be done about it. I thank you.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the last speaker? I did not want to interfere while he was speaking. Will you permit a question, please?

MR. SPEAKER: He will use his own opinion if he answers it. You don't have the right to expect an answer but you may ask a question.

MR. GRAY: Well my question is, will the Honourable Leader of the Social Credit Party of this House answer a question?

MR. FROESE: It depends what the question contains.

MR. GRAY: What would the Social Credit Party -- what would be their remedy to alleviate unemployment as it exists today and not what they are going to do in a hundred years from now?

MR. FROESE: I have explained how we hope to correct the situation. That would require that we be in office in Ottawa in order to change the monetary system to restore that responsibility back to Parliament where it belongs, and then we would be able to introduce purchasing power debt free to the people in Canada and that would in itself provide employment and get rid of the unemployment situation.

MR. GRAY: My question was that we have the unemployment situation before us today, and here's a Leader of a Party that says they could remedy it. When? Can you do anything today?

MR. FROESE:in power.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I join with other members of this House in wishing you well in your position as Speaker, and we appreciate the impartial manner in which you carry out your position. We also hope that you will be Speaker of this House for many, many years to come. I congratulate too the mover and seconder in their fine speeches in their Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. And I congratulate our new member from Pembina on her election to this House.

I would like to draw the attention of this House to the amendment that is before us this afternoon-- to the wording -- "But this House regrets that your Honour's Government, with many of its pre-election promises unfulfilled, has added greatly to the burden of Manitoba taxpayers, both provincial and municipal, and at the same time has drastically increased the Provincial Debt." So here we have, Mr. Speaker, a Party trying to ride the one horse both ways at the same time. They approved of every item that went into building up our provincial debt; they approved of every item of expenditure that has passed this House; and yet they disapprove of the total. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is a very contradictory position for them to take and surely the people of Manitoba will realize this position. There's one item where, in the last four sessions, where the Leader of the Opposition asked that the item be reduced by \$1,000. That was the item with respect to the increase in the salary of the Leader of the Opposition, but otherwise the Liberal Party approved of each and every expenditure that came before this House. One after another, and in fact at the last session of the legislature on March 15th when the estimates were being passed, again and again they expressly concurred in certain estimates and regretted that the government did not spend more money. And we have them, for instance, saying that the government has failed to assume a fair share of the cost of education and has left too large a portion to be borne by the municipal taxpayers. And they wanted us to spend more money under the crop disaster plan. And in the next resolution they asked that the government proclaim more sections of the Social Allowance Act. And they ask that the government disclose an effective and consistent program of road construction in unorganized and disorganized territories. And one could go on and on.

There were, for instance, resolutions before this House asking that the government pay 75 percent of the cost of construction of high schools on the basis of \$20,000 a room instead of \$15,000 a room. And there was another resolution that the government pay 75 percent of the cost of all high schools whether it be a one-room high school or a twelve-room high school. And then there was the request to pay a much larger portion in respect of the losses that the farmers suffered in the fall of 1959. It was estimated that their losses were twenty-five million so one must assume that the Opposition wanted us to spend many many millions more. And one could go on and on. We've had it repeated again this year that the government should be paying a greater portion of the cost of crop insurance. And we've been told, too, by one of them that they would like to see a health insurance plan. However, we find out that there's

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.)....some small print in regard to that platform for a health insurance plan, for we are told that that is only to come when the country is in a financial position to carry the load.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what kind of a piece of propaganda is that? Isn't that a platform? Isn't that a type of a plank of a platform that could mean nothing? I can truly say that I would like to see, and I'm in favour of old age pensions of \$100. a month when we are able to financially carry the load. I'm in favour of a minimum wage of a \$1.00 an hour, of a \$1.25 an hour when we are financially able to carry the load. So it would seem that this plank in the Liberal's platform of health insurance, "when we are financially able to carry the load," means very little. If they wanted it to mean something they should say that when they are elected they would put that into effect, not when they are financially able to. If the Liberals want to reduce or cut out some of the expenditures which make up our expenditures which are passed by this House, surely they should bring in a motion to this House and ask that the expenditures on Medicare be reduced; that the expenditures on social allowances being paid out to old people and to disabled persons be cut out. Surely if they want the expenditures reduced they should ask in this House that they be reduced and state a specific amount; and state it in respect of a specific question instead of, time after time, voting for every expenditure that's been before this House and then saying they don't like the total.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution of the Liberals should be, in order to be consistent with their actions in this House, should not be what it is before us tonight or today but should read something like this: "But this House regrets that your Honour's Government has failed to add a heavier burden on Manitoba taxpayers and regrets that at the same time it has not increased the provincial debt to a greater extent." Now that would be a resolution that would be consistent with the actions of the Official Opposition in this House. How can the people of Manitoba have respect for, or confidence in a Party which approves of every expenditure brought before this House and then says it doesn't like the total. I am sure that the people of Manitoba will not have the wool pulled over their eyes by these contradictory actions of the Official Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre has made some very interesting observations. Born and raised a horseman, I find it difficult to quite see how one can ride a horse going both ways. And so I would like to make a few passing remarks on the talk at the present time. I think the honourable speaker will note that during the past three years we have voted for many programs. We have voted for many programs as they were presented in the House in a very fine picture being painted for each one. In other words, the program for education was painted to us in a manner in which we had to vote for it. The program for agricultural credit, for crop insurance and other fields were painted to us by the Ministers who presented them in a manner in which it would have been impossible for us to vote against them because they were to be fine things. But then when the truth comes out on how these programs are operating at the present time throughout the country, you will see that we have reason to criticize what has taken place as compared to what was promised to us in the House. And for instance, particularly of course in the field of education in which the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre aims most of his remarks, the program for education was presented to us in this House and in the country and in every town in Manitoba by the First Minister and the Minister of Education and other Ministers of the Crown as a program in which the Government of Manitoba would invest more money into the education of the province, and that the rural taxpayer would be relieved of the burden. And, of course, what has happened is that the Government of Manitoba has invested more money into the education of the province, and the people of Manitoba through their real estate tax are paying far far more than they ever paid before. And it has become a very serious problem throughout the country, this burden on the taxpayers, because this was an education plan which they bought on the good word of this government on the basis that they were to be relieved of some of the burden of the extra costs of this education. And, in fact, they have had to put up a large portion of the increase of the cost of the education in Manitoba. And I think our criticism of this is justified, because as this education plan was presented to us in the House and as it was presented to every town in Manitoba, it was presented on the basis that there would be a lesser load on the real estate taxpayers of the province. And so I think that our criticism

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) in this particular regard is only fair.

I would like to straighten out the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in his remarks when he said that some member of the Liberal Party was promoting no university fees for university students and of course I have never heard such an offer. I think that perhaps he was referring to me, and I would like to therefore repeat what I did say in that regard. I felt that, as the Honourable Minister of Education does, the most important thing that can be presented to the children of Manitoba is an equalized opportunity for education. And this does not only mean equalized opportunity at the secondary level, the primary level; but it also means in my opinion in 1960, it means an equalized opportunity to go to university. And this means that a child born and raised in Vassar or Swan River or The Pas or Boissevain, of parents perhaps not too well-to-do and parents perhaps that are well-to-do, but in any case a child born and raised where he may be in Manitoba, if he has the ability and the desire and the academic standard, then should be allowed through the courtesy of the taxpayer of the province to continue his education. This does not mean free university fees to all those who go to university.

And then in health insurance he made a few remarks. He suggested that we as a Party should be offering a bribe to the taxpayers, saying as soon as you elect the Liberal Party then you will have health insurance. I think that it has been established now that the Liberal Party of Canada is on record as being in favour of a health insurance plan. This, I think, is sound and this, I think, we'll all stand behind-- (Interjection)-- Just as soon as you wisen up and vote Liberal you'll get it. I have a slightly different view than other people have. I feel that in times when we are in the throes of a bit of a depression caused by, in most people's opinion, the present government at Ottawa, that this is the time when the people of Canada need the greatest help and this is the time when they are apt to vote for another Party, particularly the Liberal Party, in the coming election and will vote for the remedies which are being proposed.

Mr. Speaker, in the departments of the government many things have been said about the great things that were going to be done to remedy the situations in Manitoba which have existed or are still existing. For instance, the Department of Mines and Natural Resources -- representatives of these departments spoke in my constituency as they did in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Carillon and the Honourable Member for Emerson and I'm sure many others, saying of the wonderful things they were going to do for the woodsmen of the constituencies represented -- the eastern part of Manitoba with which I am greatly familiar particularly. And what has taken place? Well this year, Mr. Speaker, the department has seen fit to reduce the amount of wood that each person in the district is eligible to cut, in many cases to 23 cords from 40, and in other cases to 13 cords from 40, meaning that the people in these areas, in areas that are well known marginal areas and sub-marginal areas, have absolutely no income for this winter. I shouldn't say absolutely no income, their income has been cut to less than half, because they were able to just manage before and now they of course have no way, other than through the Department of Welfare, of managing to get through the winter. And so this is the reason why I can say I voted for plans which were to help the people who lived in these under-developed areas and find now that, after the plan had been promoted as being a good one, we find that it has become a great hardship to the people who live in the area.

For several months now, long before Christmas, the Department of Mines and Natural Resources have not employed any of the local people for the purposes of cutting fire-guards, for cutting trails, for all the purposes of reforestation that were so beautifully spoken of here in this House only a year ago, or two years ago or three years ago. At the present time the only people working in the eastern part of Manitoba, at least that I have been able to find, are the trainees of the Department of the Attorney-General and the Forest Rangers and a few permanent employees and all the people who worked for the Department of Mines and Natural Resources throughout the fall and assumed that they had a winter job and did not apply for permits to cut wood, now find that they are out of work and have no opportunity of being taken back on till spring. It wasn't very long ago that spokesmen for the Department of Mines and Natural Resources said that they were going to set aside an area, an area along the highway and along the Greater Waterworks District line, which could be used for the purposes of the local citizens, the local settlers; the people who fight the fires when fires start; the people who work for the area; the people who supply the area with the permanent inhabitants; and the people who purchase their goods at the local stores; that an area was going to be set aside for these

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.)....people to cut wood and that sales would not be sold to big lumbermen in these areas, but in these areas the local settlers would have the opportunity to get a permit. And now of course the exact opposite has happened in that there are less permits than ever being issued and the permits themselves are smaller than they ever were before.

It was only, for instance, Mr. Speaker, two years ago when I brought in the subject of tobacco farming to this Legislature. The then Minister of Agriculture made a great fuss about how important the tobacco farming would be to the Province of Manitoba, of what great possibilities there were for tobacco farming; and said that this government, and that's the government of the day, is going to strive to take great strides forward in seeing whether or not tobacco farming could become a great agricultural outlet in Manitoba. And what has taken place? Well they've discontinued the experimentation at Hadashville or Prawda, I presume because they were out of money. They are doing a little bit of experimenting down at Marchand and virtually none at the University of Manitoba. The one employee, which they had for a short time working on the tobacco in particular, no longer is employed by them and virtually no experimentation, virtually no trials of new varieties, virtually no trials of hybrids or crossbreeds is being done, and tobacco farming is at a stalemate in Manitoba. This is the government with the vision; this is the government that was going to try new things, new ideas, new varieties, and bring great new things to Manitoba. And one new thing, tobacco, they all swore was so great, it has less than \$5,000 spent on it this year -- (Interjection)-- One hundred thousand? That's good investment; cheap investment. If there's ever a possibility of growing tobacco in Manitoba, bringing millions and millions of dollars of resources to this province, and I am now quoting the last Minister of Agriculture, he says, "We will go to all ends to bring tobacco farming to Manitoba." And what is this "all ends"? They won't even hire one person to do full time experiment on it.

Other products -- rapeseed, oil seed, what experimenting are we doing? Where is this new look, this bright new vision? Died already. And what are we doing? We're sending agricultural representatives around the province doing the same thing they've been doing for years, encouraging people to grow more livestock, more pigs, more eggs, more wheat; the very thing the government at Ottawa tells that we're producing far too much of, and boys, you've got to cut down on these things, we're producing too much wheat, too much eggs, too much pork. Now with this division of Manitoba, having our employees, our extension service in every part of Manitoba encouraging the people to produce the very products the government of Canada is telling us not to produce, and yet how much money are we spending on new products? How much opportunity is being given to the people of Manitoba to try out new products? How many experimental farms are going for the Province of Manitoba at the present time? It's a dead loss.

And so there are many other fields in which situations could be looked into from this government's point of view. They say they have done all the things. They accuse us of being on the wrong side of the situation when we vote for their projects and find out that the projects die on their feet. Has the Government of Manitoba, for instance, looked into the situation of Unemployment Insurance for farm workers of Manitoba? Has it made representations to Ottawa on this subject? This I would be interested in knowing. And how sincere is the government, and particularly the Department of Agriculture in Manitoba, in promoting the unification of the two farm organizations of Manitoba? I know an effort was made through the Dean of Agriculture and it fell through immediately. Is this a sincere and hard-fought attempt? Because this is important to the farmers of Manitoba. I think that there are many such situations which arise and which are of day to day importance to every proud person in Manitoba whether rural or urban. There are many situations where promises were made to them, plans were put forward and they've all, to a large extent, fallen through. And so, therefore, I feel that our sub-amendment is well worthwhile.

MR. W. H. HAMILTON (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your appointment to your position and hope that you may hold it for many years to come. My congratulations also to the mover and seconder in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and a special word of welcome to our new member from Pembina.

Having the honour of representing the Constituency of Dufferin since 1959, I have taken a great interest in the proceedings of this House. Being of a tolerant nature I welcome

(Mr. Hamilton, cont'd.)....criticism of my own actions and also that of my government, but I believe criticism should be of a constructive nature and hardly as violent as some I have listened to. The Leader of the Opposition condemns our road building program and has claimed it is a poor performance. In reply to that charge I want to say that never in Dufferin's history has there been such improvement made in roads. The diversion of the new highway through the Town of Carman and the construction of a new bridge over the Boyne were the first major jobs undertaken. This will greatly facilitate the traffic through the town. No. 13 Highway was built to grand improvements over the last two years and no doubt will be equal to any highway in Manitoba. No. 3 from Carman was hardtopped in '59 through the junction of 14 and is a motorist's dream. The government's access road program was well received by the people of Dufferin. Almost a mile of hardtop was laid in the Town of Winkler and that's giving improved access to that town -- and almost a mile was built. Further access roads in the Towns of Roland, Myrtle and Miami received improvements in their streets and in their towns, and they're going to be improved in the future.

The Town of Carman, in conjunction with the Dufferin Agricultural Society and the municipality, is just beginning to clear the ground for the erection of a new agricultural arena. This building will be used for the new 4-H Clubs and the Agricultural Society for any affairs, and in the winter will be used for a curling rink and a lovely skating rink. A very hearty welcome is extended to you people to come and enjoy this wonderful building and also the beautiful swimming pool that Carman Kinsmen built last summer.

Some mention was made that crop insurance was not well received. May I state that in my particular area it was well received, and it was considered not to be excessive or expensive. Naturally, when trying out a new scheme inequalities will show up, but at least this government has tried to do the right thing by the farmer and no doubt changes will be made as we gain experience. Again I say, do not criticize until you have something constructive and better to offer.

In the Throne Speech mention was made that a greater amount than ever was paid for drainage in the province. Let me say that was welcomed. I have been in charge of drainage maintenance for Dufferin for 15 years, and over that period of time -- it is only in the last three or four years that we have been able to go from a "hold the line deal" to one of reconstruction which was badly needed. Thanks to increased government aid the Norquay channel, for several miles on each side of Brunkild, was reconstructed to modern specifications and this should relieve the pressure on Brunkild each spring and also relieve pressure on the Red River. Rather than hurry the spring run-off of water through our areas, I have long advocated a series of dams in the Pembina Hills to conserve and control this annual flood and the damage to property, and I'm glad to say this idea is being investigated by the Department of Conservation and Water.

Now the new school divisions plan was well received by my constituents, despite sharp criticism by some. In the town of Roland a new school was opened last year, and just three weeks ago a three-room addition was opened, bringing increased educational facilities to the young people of this area. At the present time a 12 room collegiate is under construction in the Town of Carman which we hope to have in operation within a few months. This is a long overdue need in this area to take care of the expanding student population. In the Town of Miama a new school is nearing completion, and I must say at this time that the Midland School Division, which was recently formed, is very very fortunate in having such a good chairman and board of trustees. Without their patience and good judgment such progress might not have been obtained and I do hope that other divisions have, or will have, men of equal high calibre to guide this vitally important segment of our educational program. Criticism of the additional cost have been voiced, but personally, with three children attending school, one in high school, I consider what I pay in school taxes to be the best investment in the children's future that I can make.

Criticism has been made of the new Manitoba Farm Credit Corporation. All I can say of this criticism is it's totally unwarranted. I do not know exactly how many loans have been made in my constituency but I have been told on many occasions, by young and older farmers alike, that needed finances easily obtained from the Corporation can prove to be a great benefit in enabling young farmers to obtain a start in agriculture which they might not have

(Mr. Hamilton, cont'd.) been able to do otherwise. The only way to keep Manitoba strong agriculturally is to encourage the young people to continue in this field.

Such has been the happenings in my constituency during the short time this government has been in office, and I think they have been momentous considering the doldrums we were in under the former administration. And I would like to say at this time, despite the brickbats thrown at us by the opposition parties, we intend to go forward in all departments and make this province the greatest in all of Canada.

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Our next motion is the proposed resolution by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that has been adjourned by the Leader of the Opposition, and I understand there is some arrangements been made

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I consulted with the Clerk and it seemed to be the fact that I should give notice of a motion for reconstitution of the committee, so that has been handed into the Clerk and will come up in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster that this House request the Government to petition Federal Government for an increase for Old Age and Blind Pensioners in the Province from \$55 to \$75 per month. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. J.A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I would pray the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that we've come to the end of the Order Paper, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.