

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, March 11, 1963

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. ROBERT SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell): Introduced Bill No. 34, an Act to provide for the Observance of Official Time in the Province.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General and Minister of Public Utilities) (Fort Garry): Introduced Bill No. 35, an Act to amend The Coroners Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources)(Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present Gordon Wilbert Beard Esq., the member for the constituency of Churchill who has taken the oath and signed the roll and now has the right to take his seat.

MADAM SPEAKER: Let the honourable member take his seat. I would like to direct your attention to the two sections on my left in the gallery, where there are seated 72 pupils from Dieppe School with their teachers, Mr. J. Wherrett and Mrs. H. Straska. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Attorney-General. We are happy that you visited with us this afternoon. We hope you have found your visit to be enjoyable and instructive. May your observations here assist you in your studies and develop an interest in the Manitoba Legislative Assembly. Come back and visit us again.

I would like also to direct your attention to the Speaker's Gallery, where there are 35 Grade VIII students from Deer Lodge School with their teacher, Mr. Olfield. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. James. We wish too to extend to the students and their teacher here a very warm welcome. We hope that you have enjoyed your visit to the Legislature and that you will benefit in your studies from the observations that you make here today. It is our wish that you will visit with us again.

Orders of the Day.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for 1962; and Madam Speaker, there are sufficient copies here for the respective committee rooms and the leaders of the respective parties.

HON. S. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education)(Dauphin): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to table the annual report of the Legislative Library in the Province of Manitoba for 1962, and as well the annual report of the Board of Governors of The University of Manitoba for the year ended March 31st, 1962. In both cases sufficient copies are available to all members of the House.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I am sorry that I did not give the honourable minister notice of this question, but it was brought to my attention again over the week-end. If the honourable minister doesn't have the answer to my question, I wish the minister would consider this as a notice and provide the answer at an early date. Is the honourable minister aware that the people working on the winter works project in the Richer district have not yet been paid for their work starting from January? Could the honourable minister inform me when will these people get their first cheque, and for what period?

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, I take that as notice.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer)(Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might have the indulgence of the House to refer to a sad event that came to my notice this morning, namely the death of a former Clerk of this Assembly. It is not customary on such occasions to pass resolutions or to have moments of silence as we do for members of the House, but I feel owing to the nature of this office that members of the Legislature would wish

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . me to make some reference to the passing of Mr. Harry H. Dunwoody, Barrister at Law and Clerk of this Assembly for some 21 years from 1930 to 1951. I remember Mr. Dunwoody very well, because when I came here as a new boy in 1950, he was then the Clerk of the House and I am sure I speak for all members who knew him as well as for many others, when I say that he was a very friendly person; a very knowledgeable person, and one who was dedicated to maintain the rights and traditions of the House; a man who was well versed in the rules and regulations of this Assembly and who willingly made himself available on all occasions to members in that respect. I also had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Dunwoody personally, he was a charming man indeed and I regard it as a privilege to have had the opportunity to know him during those days. I think that members of the House would wish us to record in this way our regret at the news of his death; our appreciation of his service as a servant of this House, all the members of this House, in the position of Clerk of the Assembly, and to convey as well an expression of sympathy to those in his family who survive him.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, my Leader has suggested that because he did not have the opportunity of knowing Mr. Harry Dunwoody intimately as I did, that I might speak on his behalf in this connection. I am sure that our group joins with all others in the House in expressing our sympathy to the family of our late friend. Mr. Dunwoody served in the Clerk's office before he became Clerk of the House and in his early days it used to be one of his duties to come into the Chamber when a division was called and call out the names of the members. We didn't in those days have the practice that we now have of asking the page boys to take on that responsibility. Quite frankly, I'm glad that we do have the present system because I think it's an advantageous one and I never cease to be delighted with the splendid job that our young men here do in that regard, but in those days it had not been the practice and it used to be Mr. Harry Dunwoody's job to cease what he was doing in the Clerk's office and don a gown and come in and stand at the Clerk's right and call the names of the members -- and in those days we used to have a lot of divisions, too; maybe more than now. Well, that was part of his training; of course the work in the clerk's office was the other, so eventually he graduated to become the Clerk of this Assembly. As the First Minister has said, he served in that capacity for a long time. As is the custom of the Clerks of this House, even though they may be aware of many mistakes that are made by the members, not only in procedure but in other regards as well, they seem to become inured to it and bear it all with great patience and complacency and I think it can be said that Harry Dunwoody was a friend of every member of the House with whom he served. He retired, because of the age limit, from the service of the government and continued to practice law for some time and even I believe to act as Magistrate in the community where he lived. In other words he had a long period of public service and I'm sure that all of us are glad of this opportunity that has been provided, to pay tribute to that fine servant.

MR. M. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I have met Mr. Dunwoody in 1941 when I entered this House and worked with him. He was, not only mine, but every new member that came in, he was his fatherly advisor in every way possible. He was a very kind gentleman. He knew the rules; always serious, and always tipped off someone, at least he did to me, if he felt that certain things had not been done right. His greatness can be judged by his very able pupil, the present clerk, who is doing such a wonderful job, while being with Mr. Dunwoody for many years, and on behalf of our group, I want to support everything that has been said about this old, fine, real gentleman.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders . . . . .

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the increase and percentage of increase over the previous years for each year back to 1950 for the Industries of Activity mentioned in the paragraph 2 of the Throne Speech, namely, Trade, Farming, Mining, Tourism, Employment and Hydro Electric Consumption.

MADAM SPEAKER: I think the honourable member will have to give notice of this; it will have to appear on the Order Paper.

Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question

(Mr. Guttormson, Cont'd.) . . . . to the Minister of Agriculture. When will the boundaries of the proposed community pastures that are being planned in the Interlake be made available?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): I don't know.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will those boundaries be determined by the Provincial Government or the Federal Government?

MR. HUTTON: Usually through consultation.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will we know at this session?

MR. HUTTON: I can try to find out for the honourable member.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading Bill No. . . . .

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that in view of the heavy snow coming up daily now, is there any report from the forecasting committee in regard to floods this spring?

MR. HUTTON: The first report of the Flood Forecasting Committee was published in the papers about a week prior to the opening of the Session. The second report will be made available to the Legislature when the survey has been completed.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading Bill No. 11, An Act to Amend the Noxious Weeds Act. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: Presented Bill No. 11, An Act to Amend the Noxious Weeds Act for second reading. -- (Interjection) -- . . . . self-explanatory.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell us if these are new weeds in the Province of Manitoba or whether these are weeds coming up from the United States, and whether there is a change in the agricultural situation as a result of infestation from outside the province?

MR. HUTTON: . . . . of the three weeds red bartsia is a relatively new weed. As far as the Weeds Commission can determine it was introduced in the seeding of the airport at Gimli and has spread from there and it is a particular problem in that municipality and is causing some very real concern to the municipal people and to our Weeds Commission. It is a weed which competes very much to advantage with forage crops, so in this sense it is particularly troublesome because as you know often times through the seeding down of lands to forage crops the competition that a forage crop usually gives to some of these troublesome weeds tends to irradiate. The dogbane family is of particular problem in the Rural Municipality of Tache; it's a deep-rooted woody perennial and it's very tough to kill by cultivation; it is not a new weed but -- what has happened here I might say is that through the use of chemical herbicides you tend to eliminate some of the competition which may have kept some of these weeds in check. So the balance of nature is changing with man's practices of cultivation and so forth, and weeds which years ago may have been passed rather unnoticed, take on a new significance. The same argument or explanation would apply to cocklebur.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I'm glad that my leader was much more persuasive than I. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? No, he was speaking on it; he hadn't closed it. He was speaking on it; he was explaining it in answer to a request. The debate is now about to begin.

I was just saying, Madam Speaker, that I was delighted that my leader was more persuasive than I, because I would have been most disappointed if we had been deprived of the privilege of hearing that excellent explanation by my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and I hope that this will be a lesson to the House that we must not let the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture be so brief in answering his questions in future.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Bill No. 22, An Act to Amend the Vital Statistics Act. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if we might have the consideration of the House in allowing this matter to stand in the absence of the Minister of Health.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I would like to very heartily endorse everything that has been said up to this time in what the honourable members here have said about you, and I would like to congratulate you along with them on the election to the highest office within the gift of this Assembly. I hope that you have much health and happiness, and if in order to attain those two it is necessary for you to remain in your post, I wish you a long tenure of office.

I would like to congratulate the government on their election to office on December 14th last. I, like my honourable leader didn't do too much to assist them in that regard, but I sincerely want to tender them my congratulations.

I would like to, in passing, Madam Speaker, congratulate you, too, on your invitation that you extended to us about a week ago today to attend the seminars. Perhaps you did not notice that I was one of the students there and I found it a very worthwhile occasion and I'm looking forward to the one tomorrow morning.

I would like to congratulate, too, the mover and the seconder of the Speech in Reply. The three of us are staying at the St. Regis and I see them quite frequently. I know that they will make a very healthy contribution to our proceedings here.

I would like to congratulate as well all of the new members, and in particular the new member who just took his seat, Madam Speaker. It may not be known to this House but he was born and raised in Neepawa. In fact, there was a bit of a debate on as to whether he was the only member that was ever born in the Town of Neepawa. I was not born in the Town of Neepawa. I think probably that he and Roxy Hamilton have the distinction of being the only members that were born in Neepawa. So I want to extend a very hearty welcome and my congratulations to him.

Now, Madam Speaker, there's one thing that I am going to try to observe, that you mentioned in the seminar the other day, or someone certainly mentioned it, that one of the rules that we don't seem to observe in this House and that is in regard to the reading of speeches. Now I never did read my speeches and anybody that reads Hansard -- I don't read it, incidentally -- but anybody that does read Hansard would soon know that I didn't write my speeches. I know that it doesn't look nice in Hansard but I'm not going to read my speech today. So I'll try and stay within that rule.

We did learn, I believe, though at the seminar last Friday two things, in particular that we are supposed to try and stick pretty well to the subject matter at hand, but then I think it is pretty generally understood that the Throne Speech debate you can go more or less hogwild on that one. I think that in light of the wording of our amendment to it, that there's a pretty wide latitude there because what we are saying in effect is, that the government has failed to resolve all of the problems; and I think most of us will agree that they're not all resolved.

Now many of the members opposite up to this time have been telling us on this side of the House that we are really living in a land of Utopia here, and they paint a pretty rosy picture of Manitoba. Now we are not quite as optimistic as they are and the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future were not quite as optimistic as them either and I certainly do not intend to read all of this report. I'm only going to read a couple of sentences. One thing I notice about this report, the pages are not actually numbered. This one that I'm referring to now is Page 11-1, and starts right out "Manitoba is at the Economic crossroads" and they go on to say that we better do something about it type of thing. The next one on page 111-1-1: "the province is at a critical phase in its economic development." Another one, on page D-2-9, the entire page sets out the average net income for farm in Manitoba, and in spite of what the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne had to say about farmers never having it so good, it reports here that the farm income for 1961 -- I suppose it's for that five year period because they seem to go in five year periods here -- from 1941 to 1946 the average farm income per person was \$254.00; in 1946 to '51, \$507, and then \$644.00 and then \$472.00 and \$499.00. So it is considerably less now than it was back in 1951 and a little bit less than it was back in 1946. Now that is hardly Utopian conditions in my way of thinking and in the eyes of the committee that prepared this huge report.

Now I, Madam Speaker, have the distinction of being the only member of our group that makes his home at the St. Regis Hotel this year, and the St. Regis Hotel as you know, because I believe that you did stay there for four or five years -- probably there are 15 or 20 members

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . there, but I'm the only one in our group -- and since this session started I have had two or three honourable members -- and since I'm the only one in our group it must have been one of the other honourable members -- say to me, in effect, "well what are you people trying to do over there anyway by preparing an amendment such as you have prepared." Isn't it a fact they say, that we have just won the mandate; isn't it a fact that the people wanted us back in office and so on and so forth. I agree with that; but Madam Speaker, you will agree with me when I say it is tradition for the members of the official opposition to prepare an amendment to the Address in Reply. I mean it is done in every free nation in the world; therefore we drafted one and I suggest it is a good one. Because, what we are saying here is simply this: that the government has failed to resolve the problems which confront the people of Manitoba and therefore lacks the confidence of the House. We don't expect that we're going to win this one when the division comes -- we may -- but this is what we're saying nevertheless -- (Interjection) -- That's right. Now there are certain things that I say, for one, is irresponsible of this government or any other government, and I'm going to refer to one of them right now. The other day when we were discussing the amendment to the amendment there were certain members who accused the NDP of planning an amendment to the amendment that nobody could vote for but them. That is we said that the government had not resolved all the problems of the people, they nailed it down to three specific things that the government failed to do, and therefore placed the House in an awkward position, because you might say, well, I'm in favour of one of them, but I'm not in favour of the other two, how do you vote type of thing. Well, I believe my honourable friend the Leader of the ND Party must have copied this type of a resolution from the government. If you go back to last year's House and look at the Order Paper of May 1st last you will see there a resolution with 24 "Whereas" paragraphs in it -- and I see my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture looking over my way and I believe it was he that proposed it -- pardon me it wasn't -- it says here it was proposed -- (Interjection) -- No, he did prepare it, he did prepare it; there's two of them there; there's a pair of them -- one by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, but it's only two pages in length. Now my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, gosh, I think his is four pages -- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 pages in length with the amendments, with 24 "Whereas" paragraphs in it. Now, I'm in favour of one of the 24 at least, but what do you do when it comes to a vote when you're in favour of one and you're opposed to 23 type of thing. Now you might expect that Madam Speaker, from irresponsible people like us, but why would a responsible government introduce this kind of a resolution. What's wrong with introducing a dozen resolutions if you can make a better job of it, rather than bringing in one with 24 Whereas paragraphs in it -- and I say let's get away from this kind of business.

Now, Madam Speaker, the honourable members may say to me: "well who said that we had resolved all of the problems of the people of Manitoba; who said that we promised all these things to start with." Well, I don't intend to talk about the last election of December 14th, or to retrash a lot of old straw, we're not here to do that, but certainly the First Minister indicated that one of the reasons that the election was called on December 14th, when it was, was because he had fulfilled all the promises made up to that time and therefore we pretty nearly had to have an election so we could make a lot more promises and go out and fulfill a lot more -- Gosh, what do you do when you've filled all your promises and you've run out of them? Now, the Free Press of November 10th, 1962 -- and this is in quotes, and they're quoting the First Minister, he said that: "without a general election, the next Session of the Legislature would have been 'a lame duck'." Well, I don't know what he meant by a "lame duck", but surely if we hadn't of had an election, and we'd have had a Session anyway, and if it was a lame duck, who is responsible for it? It would be the First Minister; but he says, that, well gosh we don't want to go along having a lame duck type of Session, so the best thing to do is call an election, make a bunch of promises and get on with the business of Manitoba kind of thing. Well, that's what he said. My honourable friend, the Minister of Health -- and I'm sorry that he isn't in his seat because I do want to read back to him what he said -- and I guess I'll do it anyway even though he isn't here. He was speaking out at Gimli, out in your country here on November 13th, 1962. "Provincial Health Minister George Johnson hinted on Monday that a bigger majority for the Roblin government in the coming election would be a "shot in the arm" -- now that's quite a medical term he used -- but it's a "shot in the arm" for the health and welfare programs that

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . he has pioneered for three years." You see they only had 35 seats so you got one more now, and I expect with that kind of a "shot in the arm" that things will go right along from now on in. He doesn't say here whether it would take 1 more or 2 or 3, but he got a shot in the arm here anyway, so we can expect great things in the field of health and welfare. "The Gimli doctor indicated that a stronger Roblin government would have an easier time maintaining its spread in health and welfare schemes and introducing new ones." -- he was having a pretty tough time there with us fellows you see. Doctor Johnson was speaking at the Provincial Nominating Convention of the Progressive Conservative Party in Elmwood constituency: "By next year" -- that's in quotes -- he said, "Figures will show that at some time in the past four years every Manitoban has used the universal hospital insurance plan", introduced the day that he took over type of thing. Well, I, for one didn't spend any time in the hospital other than visiting -- I visited some of the people, but I'm one that didn't. He, I quote again, he called the Manitoba Hospitalization "the greatest piece of social legislation since Confederation". I'm rather inclined to agree with him on that one, but my honourable friend didn't introduce it. My honourable friend from Lakeside was Premier when that Legislation was introduced and everybody in the Province of Manitoba was registered before this present government took over, but he still calls it "the greatest piece of legislation since Confederation". Well, however, what did my honourable friend the First Minister promise and what didn't he promise? Well one of the things that he promised back in 1950 -- we've had so many elections, Madam Speaker, it's hard to know -- in 1959 there was a big three page effort put out here headed "The Record of the Roblin Government" and a very fine picture of my honourable friend the First Minister and the local candidate on the other side. I'm still keeping it, and I have to keep it under lock and key, I don't want to lose this one. But here's what he says that he's going to do -- that was back in 1959 -- he was going to "lighten the load of the municipal taxpayer". Well this is one thing that my honourable friend from Radisson, the Leader of the ND Party said they didn't do, and I agree with him -- they didn't lighten the load; that is taxes didn't go down. Now if you want to conclude the "taking the shirt off your back" lightens your load, well then he may have done that; but as far as reducing the taxes were concerned, no, it wasn't done.

About the 1st of November last year I walked into the Westbourne Municipal Office in the town of Gladstone; I found the Secretary-Treasurer in attending the annual convention of the Union of Municipalities, so I asked the assistant secretary if she could pick out one parcel of land in each one of the six wards -- that is Westbourne has six wards -- six councillors -- and show me what the taxes were in 1957 and show me what they were today. She went immediately to get me the information that I asked for and I said: "don't bother doing it now, you're busy" -- there was a meeting going on -- "just mail it to me at your convenience." So on November 20th, 1962 I got the information that I asked for. No names, but I'm going to read them to you, and if I have to table it, I'm quite happy to do that. On the northwest quarter of 24-13-9, the taxes in 1957 were \$107.88; in 1962, \$165.30. The northeast of 7-14-10 in 1957, \$85.75; in 1962, \$164.00. The northeast of 14-17-12 in 1957 were \$99.53; in 1962, \$230.04. Southeast of 12-16-12, \$84.22 in 1957 and \$183.60 in 1962. The northwest of 13-14-12, \$100.11 in 1957; \$252.80 today. Northeast of 25-13-11, \$110.95 in 1957 and \$191.45 today; and a little garage, I don't know what it is, it says in Plumas, was \$43.65 in 1957; it's \$138.30 today. Well now in most of those cases they're double, some are more than double. So once again, Madam Speaker, I say that unless you consider that taking a shirt off your back is taking a load off of it, then this promise of taking the load off the municipal taxpayer's back has not been completed -- not been fulfilled. So let us hope that if there were a lot of promises made prior to December 14th last, that my honourable friends will make an effort to fulfill them more so than they have some of the other ones.

In fact I say, Madam Speaker, that there has been an increase in other fields of taxation, some very, very recently, if you consider fees an increase in taxation, and I do. About a month ago I had a phone call from one of the implement dealers in the Town of Neepawa and he said: "what's going on down there in the City of Winnipeg?" and I said, "plenty, but don't blame it all on me" type of thing. Well, he said, "I've just got a notice together with an application for a dealer's permit -- a renewal of my dealer's permit" and he went on to say, "you know how it has been up to now" and I said, "no, I don't know how it has been up to now." Well, he said you paid \$20.50 for your dealer's permit, which includes one set of dealer plates, if you

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . were in the garage business, or if you were an implement dealer who sold trucks or cars. This year you pay \$50.50 which includes one set of dealer plates, and if you do not require a dealer plate, then you pay your \$50.50. So that anyway you look at it, it's an additional tax or fee or something of \$30.00 -- anyway you look at it.

Now, Madam Speaker, I think it is generally understood that the only way that the people back home get to know what we fellows are doing here is through the media of the press, TV, radio and so on, and in particular, the information services sheets, of which there were plenty printed last year. I got 70 sheets over the week-end -- at least 70 sheets from the Information Services Branch over the week-end. They were on my desk when I went home. And incidentally, Madam Speaker, I would commend to all of the new members here to get placed on that mailing list because I've said this before, the subscription price is nil, and it's worth every cent you pay for it -- (Interjection) -- No, I wouldn't want to be cut off, because I'm going to get it all through the weekly papers and the daily papers anyway. But I would like to say -- and my honourable friend has heard us speak about this Information Services Branch, not in flattering terms, but here's a funny thing, Madam Speaker, that famous Glassco Commission that was appointed by the Federal Government, and of all the commissions that were appointed, I say that it was a good one, because it was supposed to do away with government waste at all levels -- and true, true, it was appointed by the Federal Government and was supposed to deal with federal waste. Do you know what that famous commission said about information services -- he agrees with us 100 percent -- and I'm going to read you what they did say about Information Services, and this is quoted from the Winnipeg Tribune, January 8th, 1963: "on the general subject of Information Services the report gives a warning that deserves emphasis. Aggressive efforts to capture public attention constitutes, regardless of intent, attempts to win public support. When this occurs government information services become active participants in the political process; keeping the mass media supplied with a flood of so-called news releases is not a function of government." -- (interjection) -- Now that's what they say, and this is what we've been saying for a long time. I don't expect that the Federal Government or any other government will implement the recommendations of the Glassco Commission, because it's political suicide to do it, in certain cases. I don't expect that they will pay any heed to this type of thing, and yet this is what the Glassco Commission is saying. The Tribune continues: "this observation should be immediately noted by the government and steps taken to control the flood of propaganda" -- that's the word they use -- that's what we've said -- "which emanates from government sources at the expense of the taxpayer." That is there's nothing wrong with paying for it out of political party funds, but when they're going to pay for it out of the taxpayer's dollar before and prior to all elections, then there is something wrong with it in my way of thinking, and this is what we've been saying for quite awhile. I'm not saying all of the information is wrong, but a lot of it is, or Glassco wouldn't have said so.

Now I want to tell you about one typical item that comes from Information Services. I am not certain Madam Speaker, whether this one was printed by this government -- I think it was repeated from the Information Services here, but certainly it emanated from the Information Services Branch of the Federal Government, but it did concern me in more ways than one and I am going to proceed to tell you now. But on December 28th last, there was one came out and it was headed: "One Hundred and Thirty-two thousand, six hundred dollars for winter work at Clear Lake," and it was printed in every weekly newspaper, I think, in Manitoba; not only the weekly newspapers, it was printed in both of the daily papers -- I know it was. So what happens the next day? Well, perhaps I better read on just one little paragraph -- (Interjection) -- Well it's a short one, I'll say that for it. It says, "A winter works program, involving an expenditure of \$132,600 and providing 231 man months of employment will be carried out at Riding Mountain National Park." Well do you know what the person on the street thinks when they read that? They need 231 men -- that's what they think. It's nothing of the kind; it's 231 "man months". The next day after that appeared in the Neepawa Press I had half a dozen men, at least, call and see me -- "how do you get on this job at Clear Lake? I hear they need 231 men; how do you secure employment there?" And I said, "Well, I don't know, but I'll soon find out." So I dropped a letter to my honourable friend, the member for Portage-Neepawa and he replied -- it took him about three weeks to do it, but he replied -- because they were in recess at the time, and he says, and he congratulates even me on winning the election in the

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . first paragraph, but here's what I'm interested in, he said: "I'm advised that employment for this project is secured by listing with the NES office at Dauphin. Perhaps you would want to refer anyone seeking winter employment to register with that office. Persons writing to my office are urged to follow this procedure." Well that makes sense. So I wrote a letter then to the National Employment Service office in Dauphin -- that's what he told me to do -- so why shouldn't I write them? So I wrote up to Dauphin. I simply asked -- I quoted the letter I had received from Mr. Enns -- I simply said: "can a person secure -- that's the word he used -- employment by simply registering with the Dauphin Unemployment Insurance Office". And I want to read you the letter I got back from the Dauphin people. Unemployment Insurance Commission, National Employment Service Office, Dauphin, January 24th, 1963: "We have your letter dated January 23rd, 1963, and regret that there appears to have been some misunderstanding in the matter of hiring workers for the Winter Works Project at Clear Lake. This may have been caused by the fact that we did dispatch workers from this office as a result of calls received from the Administrator at Wasagamung. In these cases we were supplied with the names of the individuals who were to be dispatched." Well, Madam Speaker, I want to know by whom? "Clear Lake -- they go on, is in the area serviced by our Brandon office and all transactions concerning the placement of workers in that locality by the NES office have to be controlled by that office." You see, they're passing the buck; they said, "Well don't blame us, you've got to go to Brandon." After the MP for Portage-Neepawa sends me to Dauphin. So I'm getting a real run-around. But he says, "You will be hearing from the NES office in Brandon." And I did. I heard from Brandon; and I quote again: "The Park is in the area serviced by this local office but hirings on this project are being made at the Park." We're back to the Park again. "We are anxious," they say, "and have tried to obtain orders for employment to which we might select and refer workers. The Park officials, however, are only able to provide names of persons that already have been chosen for employment on these projects." Chosen by whom? -- that's what I want to know. We're bypassing the Employment Insurance Office to get help on these jobs. Now everybody in Canada knows, or should know by this time, that the Unemployment Insurance Fund has dwindled from about \$900 millions five years ago to the point that it's broke, bankrupt, today. And yet here we have a government that is doing nothing to alleviate the situation -- and I say it's bad.

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . that he has three minutes left.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thank you very much.

Well now, Madam Speaker, as usual I thought I had only been speaking about ten minutes, but I do want to read -- three minutes in which to read one more letter -- I wrote then to the Superintendent of the National Park at Clear Lake, and he isn't happy with things at all. He says, "Thank you for your letter of January 23rd, 1963, concerning winter work employment at Riding Mountain National Park. I'm sure you must be getting a great many enquiries" -- well, that's no lie -- "as we are, on winter employment at the Park. I think I should first explain that our Winter Works Program is much smaller this year than it has been in previous years, caused by the general reduction in spending by the Federal Government's austerity program. The total of our money provided for winter works projects this year is a hundred and thirty-two six." Well that's what the paper said. "This is compared to \$320,000 last year and larger amounts in previous years. It falls therefore, that the number of men that we can hire for winter works this year is greatly reduced from previous years. Of the amount of \$132,600, 50 percent is available for wages and 50 percent for materials. At the present time I have 50 men employed on winter works projects and I cannot foresee that we will be able to hire any more with the "limited" funds available. In the meantime I can only suggest that you refer any enquiries for employment to the National Employment Service Office in either Dauphin or Brandon. There is very little chance of further openings at the Park this season, but I think it is advisable for anyone seeking employment to register with the National Employment Service office. Yours sincerely, Superintendent." Well, what's the point of registering at Dauphin or at Brandon? What's the point -- He says that's what you should do -- if someone is going to do the hiring outside of the office? Now he goes on to say, "despite this Information Service Bulletin that blows it up they're going to relieve all of the unemployment pretty well in Manitoba -- in fact, the Honourable Walter Dinsdale, says there isn't any -- but despite the big hullabaloo here from Information Services, the truth of the matter is it's only about a third of what it was



(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . last year, and much smaller, he says, than it was in previous years." "Nothing wrong with Park hiring" says Dinsdale, March the 5th. I guess, according to him, everything's fine and dandy. Well, Madam Speaker, I guess that . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if the honourable gentleman wants to go on I would be pleased to name him as my speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I don't think it's necessary for my honourable friend to do that because I'm sure that the House is so entertained by what they've heard so far, they'd be glad to hear the rest of it. However, I want to assure my honourable friend that he must not consider this a precedent; he isn't always as entertaining as he is today.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thank you very kindly, Madam Speaker, and thank the House for their consideration. -- (Interjection) -- And their interest. But I want to say this, on this same subject matter, that how can we ever expect that this problem of the dwindling reserves in the Unemployment Insurance Fund -- and there's no argument about that they're dwindling, they're dwindling right off the books; there just isn't anything left. How are you going to improve that situation if governments clear across this country are going to bypass the Unemployment Insurance offices in hiring their help. It just will not improve. And here's governments that are supposed to be setting an example and bypassing the Unemployment Insurance offices. Just yesterday, Madam Speaker, I was up to Gilbert Plains and Grandview and a fellow -- I never brought this subject up -- he said, "listen, why is it, he said, I know of farmers up around the south of Dauphin area there -- and everyone knows that I believe a farmer needs all the help he can get -- but he said, we have farmers working in the camp now with 40 head of cattle and their graneries full of wheat, and they're working on this winter works project at Clear Lake." Now, someone else is drawing unemployment insurance benefits by reason of the fact that he's working there, and if they've hired 64 men on the job, or 164 men, they should have been obtained from the Unemployment Insurance offices, thereby reducing the money that was being withdrawn. But, here's what's going on and our honourable friend Mr. Dinsdale, according to this Free Press article, says there isn't a thing wrong with it.

Now, Madam Speaker, to get back to these Boards and Commissions, etc. etc., that this government are appointing from day to day. I would like to refer you to an article, I'm not going to read anything from this one, just one line: Winnipeg Free Press, Monday, December the 10th, 1962 -- that wasn't too long ago -- "When in doubt, appoint a Commission." -- Who do you think they're talking about? Not about me -- "This is a familiar governmental gambot and Mr. Roblin in the last four years has made extensive use of it." Well I agree with them; he certainly has. And here's the last one here -- and our honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce that introduced it to us the other day, and I was glad to see him pay tribute to the men who made it possible. There were at least two from the Town of Neepawa that worked on this. I was glad to know that he didn't pay them any money, because they don't need it, these two or three individuals, up there, I've nothing against them, but I guess that goes for the two hundred more that worked on it. But why did it cost three-quarters of a million dollars to print it, or where did the three-quarters of a million dollars -- that's what the papers reported that it cost, \$700 and some odd thousand -- if the hired help was all free, where did the three-quarters of a million come in for the cost of this one? I certainly hope, however, Madam, that it does something for our economy because it points out in so many places that it is necessary for us to do some planning in that regard.

Now, Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Minister of Agriculture, and I don't want a reply today, but, it's too early in the session to learn what ARDA is going to do for us. I don't know what it is intended to do, but it seems, in listening to some of the people in our home town it would seem that it is intended to do everything that the Watershed Conservation District Act was intended to do. What I'm asking is this: Will the introduction of ARDA and the implementation of the programs that is inherent in it, will it do away completely with this, or are we going to have both? We've had two "Nil" reports on this one now because the honourable minister tabled a report the other day and all it says was "Nil". He tabled one last year on this -- "Nil". Well to me, that means they haven't done anything in two years, at least on this one. Well let's hope that with ARDA that it not only is going to do a lot more but they get on and do the job -- and a lot faster than we've been doing it on this one here.

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.)

What about the Willard Report? We call this a big one -- the Willard Report was twice that big. It was thicker than that and twice as long. Well what has come out of that one? What's come out of that one? I have always said, Madam Chairman, that if I were forced to place the Cabinet Ministers, the Honourable Cabinet Ministers to judge them so to speak, that I would put my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Welfare at the top of the class. I haven't changed my mind on that one yet -- of course, we haven't seen the performance of some of the new ones -- but I still place him at the head of the class. And yet I say that here's one place that we're dragging our feet is in implementing some of the recommendations of the Willard Commission. I don't think we've done anything at all as far as I can see. Here's an Information Services bulletin that's a year old now, and here's what the honourable the minister is saying: "Since hospital care became universally available there was an understandable reluctance -- and that's in quote -- . . . . by patients to leave the hospital and to face the costs of care in nursing homes, hostels, boarding homes and the like" said Dr. Johnson, "as well with the rising costs of drug therapy which is an insured service to in-patients of hospitals, doctors face pressure to admit patients to hospital to avoid this expense." That's what the Minister of Health says. I agree with him, I told them the story twice in this Legislature of what happened to my own aunt. I know that's a fact; and yet what are we doing about it? What are we doing about it? We want to build a nursing home in Neepawa or a home for alternative care -- when you talk about nursing homes and all these other various types of homes now, you become so confused after you listen to some of the honourable members opposite, you become more confused, and from now on in I'm going to call it "home for alternative care" and surely that will cover a multitude of things. But what are we doing to alleviate some of the problems outlined in the Willard Commission and enunciated in this report of my honourable friend the Minister of Health -- Let's get on with the job.

Now, Madam Speaker, I don't want to earn the title of being the "longest" winded fellow in the House. I know that I will have the opportunity of speaking again and I want to thank you and the members of this House for your kind consideration in allowing me to go overtime. Thank you very kindly!

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. J. MILLS (Kildonan): Madam Speaker, speaking as a new member here, I've never had the opportunity to congratulate a Speaker. And in all modesty I would like at this time to offer my heartiest congratulations to you, Madam, on your appointment to this high office; and at the same time, offer my salutations to the Honourable Member for St. Matthews on his conferment as Deputy Speaker. May the good Lord reign over and prosper you both in the fulfillment of those high and important duties in this House. I would also like to take this opportunity to say that at no other time in my career have I met at one time so many people who have been so wholehearted and friendly in accepting me, in their midst, and to be so helpful in this counsel and advice. This applies not only to my distinguished Party, but to all members of all parties. I shall always remember them with deep gratitude; surely such goodwill and understanding are a unique tribute to a parliamentary institution as this.

Harking back to my election, it goes without saying that it has been one of exciting and a thrilling experience. At the same time, one could only hope, hope for his worthy opponent and himself that this finish line should never be as close again. I have great respect for the generosity and friendliness of my erstwhile opponent, and trust the events of the past few weeks will in no way hamper this very happy relationship. This House has been told by the Leader of the Opposition, the New Democratic Party, that it is their intention to refer the decision to the Courts on my election to a higher court of Canada, the Supreme Court of Canada. This, of course, is their prerogative and I certainly would be the last person to try and dissuade them.

With the indulgence of the House, I would like at this time to extend my personal greetings to all members from outside Greater Winnipeg. I feel it would be informative to give them a bird's eye view of the City of Kildonan, which happens to be my constituency. Located on the sunny side of the Red River, the original settlement dates back to 1812 when the Selkirk settlers immigrated from Scotland to the Red River Valley and brought with them the name Kildonan. Indeed, throughout our City today, numerous names of the founders of Western Canada are perpetuated; these are found mainly as streets, such names as Monroe Avenue, Breden Drive,

(Mr. Mills, Cont'd.) . . . Henderson Highway. Also recalling the early settlers are schools which bear such names as Polson, Angus McKay, Neil Campbell, and then we have the Miles Macdonell Collegiate, the latter being named after the first governor of the illustrious Hudson Bay Company. Helmsdale and Dunrobin Avenue are named after two castles in Scotland. Fern and Dunbeath Avenues and Golspi Street are other examples and represent the names of villages to be found in the northern part of Scotland, and whose sons are among the original settlers. Small wonder Kildonan is known as the home of the Selkirk settlers. To give you some idea of its growth, when the Second World War ended in 1945 the City had a population of some 8700; today it is in excess of 30,000. This is a great testimony to the remarkable foresight of the early settlers. Since today we feel our rapid growth classifies Kildonan, which I represent, a place where people like to live and bring up their families. There is a splendid community spirit over there and we justly feel that we have grown with Canada.

But I rise particularly at this time, Madam Speaker, to take issue with the charge made by the Leader of the Opposition, with the Speech from the Throne which states "The government has by its indecision and procrastination failed to resolve the problems which confront the people of Manitoba." Surely the Leader of the Opposition must have had his tongue in his cheek or was parroting something that has been bandied across the country lately. But surely the record of this government gives a lie to any such vague charges as we have heard here. Some six, seven years ago, I became interested in Provincial politics and I had the pleasure then of meeting the honourable the First Minister for the first time, and being connected with several organizations whose ranks contained some of the leading businessmen of Winnipeg, I felt here was a man eminently capable to lead the destinies of this province; a young man, smart in appearance, aggressive and confident; and, above all, a man of wisdom who saw great things ahead for this province. The record will show that as a leader of the government he has measured up abundantly to all his qualifications in handling the affairs of the House, and shows every evidence of continuing to do so with even a greater success, bolstered as he is by a mandate given him by such a large majority of electorate in the last recent election. In my humble opinion, Manitoba is on the march and will continue to march progressively and proudly under such capable leadership.

The Leader of the Opposition speaks of indecision; the dictionary defines the word as meaning "want of decision, slowness in making up of one's mind, fickleness, the state of being undecided." Let the Leader of the Opposition review this progress made in the business of this House in the last four years, then ask himself whether indecision typifies his conduct. For example, I would suggest you take a look at some of the accomplishments, make a date by this so-called indecisive government which, according to the indictment, also procrastinates. First, the financial record: the Roblin government has never presented an unbalanced budget. It has only -- not only balanced the budget but has also produced cash surpluses. Indeed, our net direct debt compares favourably with any other province in Canada. Our tax level is low. Manitoba shares, with the oil rich Alberta, the distinction of having the lowest provincial tax structure and is the second lowest in the nation.

Those who say the present government is a big spending government are distorting the facts. Manitoba can pride itself in being a low level businesslike government. Municipal taxes are also relatively low. The municipal per capita tax in Manitoba is \$80.00 per person, which compares with \$86.00 in B. C.; \$93.00 in Saskatchewan; and \$100.00 in Ontario. Let those who charge that the municipal taxes are high in Manitoba, as compared with other provinces, take another look at the facts. During the regime of the present government aid to municipalities has increased by 119 percent and grants for school is up 75 percent. If, as our accusers say, the government lacks decision and procrastinates, do you not think this would have reflected in the sale of our Manitoba Savings Bonds? No, my friends, such was the confidence that the people of Manitoba placed in the prudence and integrity of their government, that each of the flotations were vastly over-supplied.

So much for the financial arrangements, except to say the government displayed sound business acumen with bold and reasonable financing, and for what? To build a greater Manitoba; and, at the same time, maintain the province as one low in taxation and high in service. As I already pointed out, it has increased aid to municipalities and, moreover, has multiplied aid to education as well as social welfare agencies. Along with these the government has

(Mr. Mills cont'd) . . . . . invested heavily in other programs of growth and expansion. I could go on and tell you the road development programs, our educational plan, the investment in human resources, and finally tell you something about the activities in the realm of mines and natural resources of this province, but I feel that I would be encroaching on my time limits and, as a new member, I have a desire to keep in the good graces of Madam Speaker. In closing, I would say that if what I have stated is evidence of indecision and procrastination then there's something wrong with the terminology and the charges are not supported by the facts.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, I, along with all the rest who have spoken during the last few days in the Throne Speech debate, take great pleasure in congratulating you upon having been elected to this very high office in this Assembly. I, for one, wish you well and also hope that you will be spared many, many years to spend in that particular office. I also wish to congratulate the new Ministers and one in particular, the Minister of Labour, who has the distinction of having one of the finest roads leading to his campsite in the Whiteshell. Do you know that even the beavers have helped him a great deal, so that from his very window from his cottage he could very well have a very fine view of the lake to the south of the cottage. They went to work and removed all the fine birch trees that obstructed the view. I also wish to commend very highly the Mover and the Seconder of this Speech from the Throne. Two fine members -- new members -- have done a very very fine job of it.

Now, Madam Speaker, upon listening to the opposition for the last few days about indecision, procrastination and delays, I felt right along just like that particular farmer who went out to chop wood in the bush in the fall of the year and, after working two or three hours very hard, along came an Indian and, after the usual greetings, he says to the Indian: "Sit down, we'll discuss a few things, because I'm very happy that you did come to see me, because I would like to know just what kind of a winter we're going to have. They tell me that the Indians could forecast the winter seasons very well in this country." The Indian looked at the farmer for awhile; looked at him again; looked around; and finally he said: "We're going to have a long, cold winter." "How do you know?" said the farmer. "Oh", he says, "I see white man chop wood." This is exactly how I feel right now. I am at a loss to say that I do not know exactly what the opposition meant by the indecision of the present administration, procrastination and the delay. You know it is very, very easy to see the great progress that was made.

First of all, the electorate in Manitoba decided that question in June of 1958 and repeated that again with greater effort in 1959; and finally, what about December 14th, 1962? The Leader of the Opposition, I think, refuses to recognize progress when he says that this government is a government of indecision, a government of procrastination and delay. Since 1958, to my knowledge, and many, many people of Manitoba, it is quite evident that the keystone province is on the upsurge. It is swinging along to greater progress all the time. A great deal of planning is done. Look how fast the division schools were established. Was there procrastination? What did you hear right along before? Too far and too fast. Now, how could anybody today try to accelerate too far and too fast or make it go faster? Just look at what happened during the dry summer of 1961. Was there procrastination? There was no lip service; there was action.

When the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture of Manitoba and some of the western agriculture ministers and the Honourable Alvin Hamilton, Minister of Agriculture from our Ottawa Government, held a meeting in Winnipeg, decisions were made fast, and what happened then? All the municipal men, so were all the M. L. A.'s, especially those concerned with the farms, summoned their meeting with the government and they were informed as to what was going to be done about feed, about pasture, about water supply, so that our dairy herd could not be depleted or would not be depleted; so that we would all be assured of a good supply of milk. Furthermore, the beef and cattle were looked after well; hay was found; water supplied. Did anybody suffer? I didn't hear anybody from the opposition even raising an eyebrow and kicking about it. So what's wrong with it? Somebody says "Old stuff." Well, old stuff is sometimes a pretty good worker.

Now I heard a lot said during the last session and throughout other times: "Too bad about that floodway, it'll never materialize." I've seen reports in the paper the other day that everything is proceeding according to schedule, and there is very good evidence of it. You know I am reminded of a little thing that happened during the famous flood of 1950. We know who was procrastinating then. I happened to look at some of my old papers and I happened to see a

(Mr. Klym cont'd) . . . . . cartoon of the then Premier of Manitoba sailing down the river on top of a chimney of a house which was coming along very nice. Somebody called out: "What are you going to do about the flood?" The premier says: "What flood?" Now that was procrastination, I believe. There was indecision; there was delay. Now, Madam Speaker, we see what happened, all right. We know very well that the former administration in that regard only offered lip service. The present administration acted and acted fast and did a very good job, otherwise as somebody has said, "the shot in the arm would not have been administered." The shot in the arm was well administered in Manitoba in 1950 to begin with.

Now the Honourable Member for Gladstone mentioned quite a few times, but I happened to be talking to a man the other day who was really giving me a work-over, or at least he thought, over taxes, especially school taxes in Manitoba. What did he tell me? "You know, since you fellows went into office in June of 1958, my school taxes on my half section went up by \$63 and a few cents." I said, "Oh, did they? Good luck to you, but first of all, have you any children attending school?" Of course I knew that he did. "Yes," he said, "seven." "How many in high school?" "Four." "What grades?" "Nine, 10, 11 and 12." "What about the rest?" "Well there's one in grade 7, one in Grade 5," and then 3 or 2 or whatever it was. "Well," I said, "your taxes went up by \$63 and a few cents." "Yes," he says, "that is true, and I have to very well pay it." "All right," I said, "what about the textbooks? Did you ever realize what it would cost you to supply your seven children with textbooks?" He says, "No, I would not know" he says. "Well," I said, "try and consider, but I'll just roughly tell you it's \$150.00 just for the sake of argument." I said, "You're still money to the good. There's fellows like myself who do not send children to school who pay those things and there are many other people -- (interjection) -- ." Well, I'm willing to admit it. After all, why not? I'm doing it, I'm paying the taxes as well as anybody else.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I do not think that I should have the distinction of taking up too much time or too short a time, but at this moment I will just nicely sit down and if I have anything to say further in the session, I will.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. The Honourable Member from Emerson.

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I, too, wish to congratulate you on attaining the highest office in this House, and I can assure you that I'm very happy to see you sit there. I think it's a privilege to work with you. I know that for any person in your position, a person who has been very active in party politics before, it is quite a problem to overcome partisan politics, but I know that you, Madam Speaker, have made up your mind to be as impartial as anyone in the House could possibly be and I'm sure, I'm fairly convinced that, Madam Speaker, you will do justice to the Chair you're occupying.

I wish to congratulate the new ministers. I'm sure that the new ministers will add quite a bit to the government of this province. I also wish to congratulate the new members, new faces appearing for the first time in this House. I am sure that they'll contribute to the legislation and to the work that's being done in the House. One of the new members last week sometime, asked me, "Isn't it the custom in the past to take a group picture of all the members?" I told him I didn't think it was the custom to take pictures" group pictures of all the members. Maybe if all the belligerents ever got together, it might be a very, very good idea. I think it may be a good suggestion. Sometime in the future we could view the picture and say "here I sat with this person or that person" and so on -- like the teacher who was trying to persuade her children to contribute two bits towards a school picture -- group picture -- and says, "Listen, just think some time in the future you'll look at this portrait and you'll see Johnny here and say, 'Johnny, he's now in the Air Force, and here's Peter -- Peter is now a farmer somewhere in the Minister of Agriculture's riding' ," and little Billy pipes out from behind and says, "Yes, and this is the teacher; she's now dead."

The election; some mention has been made about the election -- the Honourable Member for Gladstone didn't go too far -- and I'm just going to skim over it very shortly. It was a snap election, and I give credit to the Premier for calling it at the time because I think that after April 8th he would have had more difficulty than he had on December 14th of last year, because we know that Dief is sliding for the bat, and he himself said that he was the disciple or the pupil of Dief, so he would have had quite a bit more trouble, especially after some of the labourers filed their income tax returns. So it was a snap election and quite timely.

Something of some note or word from the Member from Gladstone -- he referred to the Pork Barrel tactics, somewhere up north there in the Park. Well it's nothing new -- even in our election, provincial election, there was some of it, and quite a bit I could say, and on top of that a little bit of coercion and a little bit of intimidation, and so on -- which shouldn't be. Of course, I'm not pointing fingers at the Ministers because they didn't do it, but probably some of the workers. And I think that the members who ran as candidates shouldn't condone any such .....I'll give you just one example: a certain postmaster in a small poll, around 30 voters, had a meeting in that poll, and the night before one of the workers came up there and he said, "Listen, if you attend the meeting tomorrow night, in a few days -- I'll give you a week -- you'll lose your post office. Don't attend." He didn't. But first he said, "How do you know which way? Even if I didn't attend, I could vote that way." "Well, " he said, "we've got it figured out. There are 13 Liberal votes in this constituency, and if there are 14 you're going to lost the post office." That's intimidation. What happened? He was right. He had it figured to the dot; there were 13 Liberal votes in that constituency.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): All one family John?

MR. TANCHAK: No, not all one family; there were scattered.....

Now to the Throne Speech. I wish to congratulate the mover in Reply and the seconder. I think that they did a splendid job. I enjoyed listening to them, and I hope that they find their work here pleasant.

I'm not going to criticize or be critical of any former speaker because I think it's bad taste for anyone to come up and say such and such a party made a poor speech, he was a poor speaker. I'm not going to criticize but I'll take issue with some of the statements made by a few of the speakers before me. I think that the Throne Speech could be divided into four parts. The first one -- I'm not going to say that the handsome gentlemen across are no good, that they can't do anything right; I'm sure that sometimes they do something that's right -- some times by accident.....

MR. EVANS: By accident?

MR. TANCHAK: Yes, by accident. Even a blind hen sometimes finds a kernel of grain. You asked for it. (interjection) I didn't intend to have that in my speech. So there is some legislation that I approve of -- good legislation. That's the first part. Now, the second part of it is backslapping, braggery, a little conceit, and a plug for the Federal Government. The third part -- stolen ideas. The government seems to be void of ideas. That "shot in the arm" didn't seem to help very much and they're taking ideas, especially from the Liberal Party, and incorporating them as their own. And the fourth is what our amendment states, government of procrastination, indecision, and I'm going to prove just by reading parts of the speech.

Now let's go back to the first one: what does it say? "Nineteen sixty-two was one of the best years in our economic history. My Ministers inform me that records were broken." What's new about that? Records were broken. We should break records. Every succeeding year should break the former -- if there's any progress whatsoever, there should be records broken. Our population is increasing, and we should break records every year. Every succeeding year should break the record of the former year, so there's nothing new about it -- I hope it continues that way -- "were broken in the fields of trade," -- I don't think there's anything fantastic there -- "farming" -- what kind of records were broken in farming? The Honourable Member from Gladstone just proved that there were no records broken. The net income was far lower than five or six years ago. So there wasn't any. "Mining, tourism," -- I agree that there was tourism -- an increased record might have been broken in tourism. It was, but is that anything fantastic? No. We expect that. "Employment," -- records broken in employment. I think this word must be misspelled, misprinted -- it should have been "records broken in unemployment." "Hydro-electric consumption," -- naturally, we should consume more; maybe a few more industries, more people using it -- so it's quite natural -- "and other important indices of activity." I wonder if taxation is included in that. Records were broken in taxation.

Now, No. 2: "The government of Manitoba has received an invitation from the Government of Canada to attend a conference to discuss biculturalism." Biculturalism -- quite a nice word. Mr. Pearson used it first. Everybody else ..... I think this is simply a plug for the Federal Government but with ..... we're invited to come and attend -- and we'll do it. There's nothing much to that.

Now let's come to the second part: where the present government hasn't any new ideas. No. 1, and on the second page, middle of the page; this was stolen from the Liberals. I'm sure that you'll agree that we on this side of the House, the Liberal group, asked the government many times in the past that the Farm Credit Act should be extended to cover purchase of cattle, beef cattle, or purchase of cattle. Now, they're coming across and doing it. So this idea wasn't a new one. It was taken from the Liberals. At the same time we insisted that crop insurance be extended. It was promised to the people of Manitoba and we haven't got crop insurance in Manitoba. We've got a few ..... postage stamps. But there is no set crop insurance as it was promised. He promised crop insurance to the Province of Manitoba. That's what they said, but there isn't. They've got a few patches here and there -- trial areas, but it's not being ..... So that's another one.

Here is the third one that was taken from the Liberals -- no ideas of their own. "My government has entered into a general agreement with the Government of Canada for joint programs under The Agricultural Rehabilitation ..... research." I well remember when the Honourable Member, former Member from LaVerendrye -- every year he spoke on this and said that the present government in Manitoba is lagging, dragging its feet in research. Now we're going to have a little more research. A Liberal idea stolen.

Here is another one. What about the teachers' pensions? Quite a bit has been said last year about teachers' pensions. We have been promoting a teachers' pension scheme similar to something like the Civil Service is enjoying, and the government has been dragging its feet just promising to do something -- and now again the government is promising to do something. Procrastination. Finally they accept the Liberal idea, Liberal plan -- I don't know exactly what it will be but I presume it will be something along those lines. But the government has been dragging its feet on the pensions.

Now the next one is the fifth one: curriculum. I'm sure that the Minister himself --

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd) . . . .he's shaking his head; I don't know if it's up, down or sideways -- but we didn't ask the government yesterday, last year and the last Session to look into the curriculum to improve it, to make a uniform curriculum, change the curriculum. The government has been dragging its feet on this matter.

Now as we go further on, here is a sixth one: "My Ministers will propose amendments to The Child Welfare Act." Where were the Ministers last year? We had an amendment; we had a resolution here; the Liberal, the Honourable Member from Selkirk -- it was turned down by the present government. I don't know whether it will be a similar resolution or not but there is -- something is going to be done in this direction now.

Now here's another one -- a very, very good example. At last the Honourable Member, the Liberal Whip, may get his factory. Rough fish. How many times has he mentioned and asked the present government to look into the possibility of establishing one in the Interlake area. Finally, finally the present government is going to do something about it. I don't know how much. But that's another Liberal one.

And here's another one -- uniform time. Wasn't it the Honourable Member from St. Boniface who introduced this resolution last year and was turned down by the present government -- dragging its feet again and shirking responsibility, trying to get some other parties to decide for the present government? They couldn't make any decisions themselves. No, get somebody else to decide for us. Pass the buck always, as the former Premier says . . . (interjection) . . . Diefenbucks. Here is another one: "My Ministers state that a trucking agreement." Well, I'll have to admit that some of it has been implemented, and I'm glad to read in the paper today that there have been further steps taken. But we've been asking the present government -- the Liberal Party here -- to do something about it. A lot of ideas, and I like the phrase quoted by the Honourable Member, the Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, when he says, "Some ideas crystalize into action." I agree with him -- a lot of ideas crystalize into action. I hope so -- but they were Liberal ideas being crystalized into action by the present government.

Well let's go back to the honourable member who has just spoken -- says there was no procrastination and delay, indecision. If you'd read the Speech from the Throne -- how many times will you find the word "assist" in it? All the government is doing is asking for assist here, assist there, assist that -- they can't do anything themselves. Maybe they haven't got the time. I do not say that they are not capable -- I'm looking at the Honourable Member the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who I think, is very capable, and we always get along fine, and other ministers too -- but probably they haven't got the time. They're traipsing all over the country, opening up great swimming pools, curling rinks, and so on -- maybe even new banks -- I haven't heard of it. All over the country -- they haven't got time to pay attention to their duties. No, politics every day. Quite often we come to the House here when we are not in Session and try to see a certain minister. We go to one -- half of the ministers are away. Maybe one of those floating cabinet meetings that they are having somewhere, which costs people money, and they're not attending to their business. They haven't got time to look after the affairs of the country. Politics is more important than looking after the affairs of this country.

Now here's the first one, and I think over half a dozen times, about nine times, the word "assist" is in here. What are they doing? Appointing commissions and committees to tell them what to do. Even on margarine they had a commission. They didn't know what to do on their own. Commissions and committees, the very first one assist. I have nothing against the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Development. It is quite a report, but there is a lot of controversial material in there, but here is one thing. "My Ministers propose to recommend legislation providing for the constitution of an Economic Consultive Board to assist. . . ." -- they need assist, that's the first time, "assist" -- can't decide anything on their own. Here is another one, in Manitoba; what are they going to do? Three more committees or commissions to be appointed. In the second paragraph on the second page, what are they? Manitoba Design Institute, Manitoba Export Corporation and Manitoba Research Council. What will they be doing, all of which are designed to "assist" in the development of industrial enterprise. Assist again. Asking for assistance; crying for help; the government dragging its feet; indecision.



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

Now let's go on. On the next page "assist" again. "The Department of Education Act has been carried out and that special provision will be recommended to assist and expedite the matter of curriculum revision." The government has been dragging its feet on this, on the new curriculum for Manitoba. Now they are asking for an assist. A new commission, I suppose, or a committee, and then when the committee reports just put it in the corner on the shelf and let the cobwebs hang on it. Here are some more assists -- "To assist their clients in returning to a productive role in society" -- it's the third paragraph on page four. Here is another one -- "My Ministers will propose amendments to The Child Welfare Act to invoke the assistance of the courts in dealing with this matter." Assist again, procrastination, delay, indecision. They can't decide on their own. We still have some more -- "An inquiry committee has recently been convened to consider particular problems of labour." Wasn't there indecision and dragging its feet on this, on labour? Ask the courts to decide certain problems for the government, and what do the courts do? Throw it back at the government; say "This is your responsibility not ours." They're asking for assists again so no matter where you look it's assist and assist. The government can't do it on their own. Here's some more assisting. What about the Metropolitan Review Commission? What are they going to do? Assist the government to make up its mind -- premature commission -- the government doesn't seem to be able to do anything on its own. Needs assistance; a government of procrastination and indecision. Here is another one -- "A royal commission under the chairmanship of the Honourable Roland Michener" -- assist again. I'm not saying that Mr. Michener will not give a good report, but the government can't do anything without all these committees and commissions. They seem to have about come to a stop.

These are many things the government could do if they put their own shoulder to the wheel. There are certain areas -- what about making new rules and regulations, legislation, legislate something to put these cars off the road, used cars with poor road ability. That's something that the government could look into. And then many, many other things, but no. Before this government does anything, what will they do? They'll have to appoint a commission to tell them what to do. It's fine for the honourable members across to say . . . (interjection).. Pardon?

MR. HUTTON: The Liberals should have one.

MR. TANCHAK: A Commission?

MR. HUTTON: Yes. Tell them what to do.

MR. TANCHAK: Well, after the next election, we'll see what we'll do.. (interjection) . . I hear that the honourable members from across the way get up and they boast about the wonderful roads and the wonderful things that this government has done .. (interjection).. Fine, go ahead. Keep on patting yourselves on the back, it's wonderful -- not to many. Great wonderful roads built in our constituencies .. (interjection).. Good luck to you, and I'm happy that you're happy, but how many members on this side of the opposition can get up and boast and say we've had wonderful roads built in our constituencies. You've heard very, very few-- very few. Yes, what about the Leader? I heard a certain speech on television just before the last election and I must say that the party who quoted these words lied about it ..(interjection) . . Yes, about Ste. Rose, that's the one, but it was deliberately misleading. It wasn't true. When the certain party gets up and he says "Well what are they complaining about? We spent \$2 million in the vicinity of Ste. Rose." -- Well that was deliberately misleading the people. It was not true, because it happens that in the vicinity of Ste. Rose, the Honourable Member representing Dauphin Constituency -- the two are side by side and the work was done mostly in the other constituency but it was in the vicinity and the people took him at his word. They believed that it was right, and I know it's deliberately misleading and that's what I'm coming to. We come to the House and ask about certain roads and what are we told? I'm not going to accuse the Minister of Public Works. I'm not accusing anybody for that matter, but I'm accusing the government. They say it's a matter of priority, a matter of priority. What kind of priority is it? I would suggest it's a matter of priority among the members of a certain group only. It's not a matter of priority in the whole province. Yes ..(interjection).. No, the members, just certain members of a certain group, and I call this discrimination. It is rank discrimination because all the people of Manitoba are entitled to the same treatment.

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

There are many other things that could be discussed but as the time comes I think I can bring in some suggestions. At the present time I think that we conclusively and decisively have proved that this government is a government of procrastination and indecision.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Chairman, I will confess my gratitude and the faith that I have in you for fulfilling the important task you have been elevated to in this House. And should I err in any manner, Madam Chairman, I would consider it an honour to be corrected by you. There is another house that I live in and I do not always have the last word in that house. And I'd like to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder on the Speech from the Throne, and I would like to also congratulate the ministers that have been appointed before the opening of this Session. I would say to them that there will be times when it might appear a little tough, that the going might be a little rough, but I know they'll carry through their jobs and will have the respect of all the people of Manitoba. I would also like to welcome the new members that are sitting in their seats in this Chamber for the first time.

There has been some discussion going on in this House for the last few days about procrastination and indecision and suchlike, and I was just wondering when the Honourable Member from Emerson was speaking of just what party in the Liberal Party did he belong. Does he belong to that element within the Liberal Party that have been accusing this government of going too fast or too far, or does he belong to the group within the Party that say that we are dragging its feet? I think it's the duty of a member to tell us just what party he belongs. He also mentioned along with another one of his colleagues in the House this afternoon that if we were a Conservative Party and a Conservative Government for Manitoba, that we most likely would have to have a shot in the arm to make things go. And I was just wondering what part of the Liberal Party's anatomy you could give a shot to to get them going. I have sat in this House since 1949, Madam Chairman, and I have enjoyed every minute of it, in the House and out of the House, and I always thought it was the duty of the Opposition -- and I made it my business while I was sitting in the Opposition that any criticism I had to offer it would be in a constructive manner, something that we knew for a fact that the people of Manitoba needed and wanted, not to just stand up for the sake of talking and have something to say and, especially to the new members, there's reports in the Library, the journals are there, the estimates are there, and the Library staff, you will find, is very good to help you, and all any member has to do is to go back to the journals, look at the journals and then you'll see where the effort was put in to give the people of Manitoba the government that they deserve.

When we look back over this word "procrastination" it makes one go back to the previous government that we had in office here, and if you could use the word that I would like to use in this House, it wouldn't be the word procrastination. Because if there ever was such a thing as indecision, it was the previous government in Manitoba that had it. When we were asking in 1957, later than 1957, you were asking for something to be done for agriculture. At that time, Mr. Clark I think was a member for Turtle Mountain at that -- no, not, just north of Turtle Mountain -- (interjection) -- that's where you should be. Rock Lake, I think it was -- and he introduced a resolution in the House that was accepted by the House, that we should set up a select committee in this House to discover all the resolutions that had been brought in to the House so far as agriculture was concerned. We did that -- wonderful idea -- but the resolutions that came into the House at that time were things that the Roblin government has been carrying out and when that resolution was suggested, it was a wonderful thing. It was brought into the House for conclusion, to be forwarded to Ottawa immediately. The House closed and that was, I think if I remember rightly, around the 14th of April, and this resolution wasn't presented to Ottawa until some time after the June election in 1958. Now I think that was procrastination, when the House agreed that that resolution would be sent to Ottawa, so there could be some action before the House in Ottawa dissolved at that session.

Now, some of the recommendations that were put in there were that we ask some assistance, if need be, for crop insurance, and that was not acted on, and if we stop for a moment and go back to 1948 when the previous government set up a committee to study crop insurance policy, if it was possible or practical for Manitoba, that J.W. Parker, who was president of the Manitoba Pool, or other chaps, made the study, and when one will read that

(Mr. Shewman, cont'd). . . . study and the one that was turned in in 1956 or '57. -- I just forget the year -- on crop insurance, they were both, you might say, identical. Now I don't know where the procrastination was, but there was procrastination. And then we go on to a resolution that was introduced in this House when we were asking interest free on cash payments to the Canadian Wheat Board on stored grain. Now to the new members, you'll find out just who introduced that resolution in the House at that time; you'll find out who spoke on it; you'll find out the wording how it was amended, and if ever there was procrastination or indecision, it was on this resolution.

Now we go on further; we asked for farm-stored grain -- cash advances on farm-stored grain -- and look up in your journal on another item where there was procrastination. Then you'll go along to the different resolutions at different times. A resolution I introduced here in the House and others introduced were a Hansard for this House .. (interjection).. Oh boy, you bet it is; it's worth a barrel of money to any man's budget. . (interjection).. you bet it's long overdue. And what did they tell us then? You couldn't do it; it cost too much money; it would break the government; no government could put out a Hansard. That's what they told us, and now they say it's the best thing that ever happened. Boy, I just don't understand that kind of language. It looks like you want part of a legitimate child or something like that -- you're afraid to own up to that child or something like that. But that's indecision, procrastination. And then we go on where the resolution was introduced into the House by the Opposition members at different times, about asking the government to do something about this PFRA Act as it was in those days. True, they did, but very little; there was a lot of indecision in that respect according to that Act because . . . . . three or four years before we got, really got down to any action on the previous government.

Then we were after them for a policy for flood control -- Lake Winnipeg, Lake Manitoba, the Red and the Assiniboine Rivers. Now there was a lot of indecision and procrastination in those days, but this government has moved on these things. As I mentioned before, these are the things that we were trying to ask the previous government to do, and we stand here -- sit here and be accused of indecision and procrastination. I don't know just what the people are going to think of the Liberal Party. I have a certain amount of respect for them, and I hope that I'll be able to maintain that respect, because we do need a strong Opposition. Regardless of what party is in power we need a strong Opposition, and why the Conservatives are in power today in Manitoba is because of the strong Opposition that they had to face in those days. No other reason for it -- just the indecision, procrastination and not knowing where they're going.

Now we also had a vote -- non-confidence in the government -- over drainage. Also, we had a resolution before the House here of asking the previous government to give some municipalities some help. You could see back eight or ten years ago that there was such a thing that the day would come when they needed help, and we were asking at that time for the government -- the previous government -- to bring out some program -- get in contact with Ottawa -- bring out some program that would help the farmers of Manitoba. Land use; soil conservation; water control and suchlike. There was a lot of procrastination along that line. Today you can stand here and say that we have a plan that we are developing with the federal government and this has all happened since 1958, called the ARDA Plan, and it's just in its infancy, and in the next few years that we will have such as soil testing -- and there is a soil-testing laboratory going to be established at the University -- where the farmers will be able to bring in a sample of their soil to find out what fertilizer they should be using and just what crops they can grow. Well that test is going ahead and it's the kind of information that we've been asking that the farmers in Manitoba should have and have been asking for a good many years. Now there have been studies made -- studies are being brought forward to determine what types of land we have, that we can possibly irrigate in the near future, and that is a thing that you might not think possible today or practical today, but it's not going to be too long in the life of Manitoba where there will be a lot of irrigation done within this province.

Then there's a special program for land use classification being conducted to work out with the local people, and this is one thing that this government is doing, and all these projects that they're putting forward are working with the local people. They're taking the advice of the local people, and through their taking their advice with the local people we're getting very close to the basic problems of the farmers in the farm communities in Manitoba. Now the

Mr. Shewman, cont'd). . . . government representatives of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation, and Mines and Natural Resources, worked out a scheme of recommended land use, and they took within this scheme well over a million acres in southeastern Manitoba. The member from Emerson should know something about this, and if he had been paying attention to his P's and Q's he wouldn't have stood this afternoon and criticized this government on account of procrastination and indecision. And there's other things that we're doing and able to do because this government goes right ahead with the co-operation of the government at Ottawa, the co-operation of the people of Manitoba, and the willingness to get things done that we're able to do it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable gentleman would permit a question? I'd just like to ask the honourable member who has just spoken, while he's dealing with the question of procrastination, would he explain how it is that the committee that he has been heading for two years shows up on the notices in the Votes and Proceedings today as needing to be reconstituted?

MR. SHEWMAN: Madam Speaker, as I mentioned before that I had faith in the Liberal Party and I come in here quite green -- I will admit that -- possibly green yet -- but the Honourable Member from Lakeside time after time has told this House, the members of this House, he said, "When you've got to do a job, do it well and do it right." Now that's what we're trying to do -- to do it well and do it right.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the . . .

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, may I first of all congratulate you on your election to your high office and tell you how happy I am to look upon your smiling countenance each day as you administer your duties in this Assembly, and I certainly wish for you a long and successful tenure in that office. I'd like to extend congratulations to all the new members in the House, and tell them that I am looking forward to their contribution, to the debates that will take place in this Chamber over the next four years, and I would especially like to congratulate the mover and the seconder to the Reply to the Speech from the Throne, because I thought they did an exceptionally good job, and one had only to listen to them, Madam Speaker, to realize that these two gentlemen are going to make a major contribution to the business of government in Manitoba.

I have sat here and listened really with amusement to the speeches that have been made by the Liberal Opposition, and the complaints and the reason -- or should I say the lack of reason and logic -- with which they have promoted what in a very broad sense might be termed their point of view. You know it reminds me of a story of a Sunday school teacher who was trying to make a good impression on the minister who had stopped by to see how this class of hers was getting along. She'd been teaching the children on the omnipotence of God, and of course she tried to phrase her question to the class in such a way that they'd make a good impression on the minister. She turned to her class and she said, "Is there anything that God can't do?" and much to her chagrin a bright little boy said, "Yes," and she said, "Do you want to think again Johnny? Is there anything that God can't do?" And he said, "Yes" She said, "I'll give you one more chance; you've got to explain." "Well," he said, "He couldn't please the Liberals." When I listened to the Honourable Member for Emerson, I couldn't help but think of how much his constituency has gained from a Conservative government in Manitoba over the past four and a half years. As I listened to some of the others complain about too much planning and in the lack of planning, one wonders what it is they really want. I'm at a complete loss to know whether they want long-term projects; well planned projects built on a sound foundation; or whether they want us to build this House on sand, but a house built on sand doesn't last so we're told. They don't want to take any time to lay any foundations and if anything goes wrong they accuse us of having not taken the time to lay the foundation, so it's very difficult to understand what it is they want.

They say that we haven't got enough research. Well, if they don't want research -- or if they want research, how can they be against the planning, the investigations and the surveys that are carried out to determine what the proper approach is. How can you be against commissions and investigations and still be in favour of research? Which are you for? Are you for research or against research? Well, this is their approach. The Leader of the Liberal Party in the House accused us of planning too much and not planning adequately. I don't know

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) . . . . whether this is their policy, one of taking a position where we must be wrong on every count. Personally, in the administration of my department, I have come to the conclusion that we pay little heed to the Liberal Opposition in this House, because if you listen to what they advocate you get yourself in a peck of trouble with the people of Manitoba, and so we follow our own course and almost turn a deaf ear to them because their proposals and their criticism is well calculated to get the government of this province into trouble and that's the only reason for their putting it forth.

Occasionally they have advocated a course of action which, on the surface, seems to recommend itself. For instance, it is true that when The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Act was introduced in this House, they made some bid to have the amount of security that could be offered in the form of livestock to be increased beyond 40 percent of the security offered, but I read that Hansard and I couldn't find any place in it where they advocated that loans should be made at that time on the security of a chattel mortgage on cattle only. It is true that last fall, during the election campaign, the Leader of the Opposition made an announcement that they would amend The Agricultural Credit Act so that they could make loans on the security of livestock. It is true. It is also true that the Department of Agriculture has been studying the possibilities of this program for some two years. As a matter of fact, in the fall of 1961 we sent a team from the Department of Agriculture and the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation down into the United States to examine the credit facilities that were offered to the people down there--to the farmers down there, to determine the ways and means that we could extend credit for the development of livestock herds in Manitoba and do it safely and soundly. As a result of those studies, we did offer and are prepared to make this offer to the farmers in this province.

But let me tell this Assembly, Madam Speaker, that we are going into a field that is entirely new. As far as we can determine, we will be the first jurisdiction on the North American continent to offer such credit on such favorable terms. I think it behooves the government well to be careful and to make careful study of a matter of this kind before we plunge into it. Wouldn't they be quick--wouldn't they be right off their mark if we were to introduce such a program and it didn't work? Oh, how they'd fly off that fence onto the other side, and wouldn't we get it? I know, I've listened to them. They're the greatest advocates of parish pump politics that have ever offered their services to the people of Manitoba. They talk about planning. They don't want planning. How could one member of the Party go to one jurisdiction or one constituency in an election campaign and talk against a project and another one go into another constituency and talk in favor of a project. What do they want with planning? They don't want to lay down any program and adhere to it that's in the interest of the people of Manitoba. No, they want to play both ends against the middle and they've been doing it for years and years and years. They could cover it up a little better when they were a government, but in Opposition they make no bones about it. They have one member of the Party off in one part of the country preaching against a particular project; they've got another leading member of the Party in another constituency preaching for a project; and they hope by confusion to win.

One of the members put the question in the House the other day that he didn't understand why the people in his constituency didn't agree with part of the Water Control and Conservation program for Manitoba. Well, I don't think I need to tell him why they don't understand. There was a deliberate attempt, a concerted and a prolonged campaign waged in that constituency to draw the people astray and to put the wrong--to distort the facts--and to create this opposition for political purposes.

Well, they object when my humble self introduced a resolution into the House which had 24 whereases and they said that I should have introduced 12 different resolutions. That would have been right down their alley because they could have been for some of it and against some of it. The fact is, if you are going to have a plan it's got to be a plan. If they want a plan in highways; if they want a plan in water control; if they want a plan in agricultural policy, you've got to buy the plan. You can't just pick it to pieces or you won't have a plan, and this is the case in water control and conservation. There is a plan; it's a provincial plan and the whole thing is inter-related. If you take out one pump the water runs out of the whole thing, so you have to relate them and they have to buy the whole thing, but they don't like that, you see, because that doesn't work in with parish pump politics. They don't want to have to go to the

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . people and say this is the best thing for the province as a whole. They like to go and tell some it's good for those over there but it's no good for you; and then they tell these people over here, this is good for those over there but no good for you. Divide and rule--it's been their policy for a generation or more.

These same men who get up and criticize this government can thank this government for some of the rural progressive steps that have been taken in their constituencies. The member for St. George, for instance. His predecessor, who was a supporter of the former administration, told me that 40 years ago he was advocating the new control works up at Fairford but he could never get anywhere, and he extended his--a wonderful predecessor--but he thanked me and asked me to convey his thanks to the government of the province because, he said, you have removed one of the causes, the greatest causes of instability in that part of the Interlake area. The worst years that we have ever had up there were when the Lake Manitoba got out of control and went wild, and the people had no feed for their livestock and there was no pasture for the livestock. I wasn't in politics at that time, but I remember some of the heartbreaking stories that came down out of that country about conditions up there, but it was this government that solved it within about three years of coming into office, something that had been on the books and under consideration for years.

Plans pay off. We believe in planning, but not in plans that can be changed here, there and everywhere; the kind of plans that the Liberals would have us indulge in. Oh, they took a great deal of issue with our handling of land in Manitoba. Well, let's go back and look at the record there. They did some great planning. There are abandoned farmsteads, abandoned basements, abandoned roads, abandoned drainage ditches, even abandoned power lines in Manitoba, which stand as mute evidence to the kind of planning that our good friends in the Liberal opposition indulged in. Yes, even Hydro, even abandoned Hydro lines, where they let people go in and settle on land -- their *laissez-faire* attitude to the handling and the management of lands in Manitoba. There are all kinds of monuments, not only in broken-down farms but broken-down lives, so that they can well look back on their own record when they start making charges of lack of planning on our part and the lack of a cohesive and coherent program. Sure it's taken us time. You don't mend the faults and the mistakes of 40 years in four, and this is what they're asking us to do.

Well, what are we doing, along with our program in loans for the beef cattle industry? We have promised the livestock people and all the farmers of Manitoba that we are coming out with a new program, and the Minister, the responsible Minister will be making an announcement in this House in due course. It was part of our program when we went to the people in the fall of '62. What have we done? We realize that farmers have to have security of tenure if they're going to get these loans, but it takes a lot of planning. There are a lot of wrinkles that you've got to iron out before you announce such a new program, and it has taken, it's taken years. In that four short years a lot of work has been done to try and perfect a practical system of handling and managing lands, Crown lands and Local Government District lands, that will meet the needs of the farmers and which will be in the interest of the Province of Manitoba.

Now, one of the reasons that they criticize us on this land use and system of land tenure in Manitoba is that they find people who are told that they can't buy a piece of land, either in Local Government District territory or in the case of Crown Lands. People get turned down. Either you believe in a *laissez-faire* policy where everybody can just pick up this land and use it for any reason they want to whether they've got a chance in the world of succeeding, or else you lay down a policy and you adhere to it, and when somebody wants to buy a piece of land you say, "no, you can't buy that land. It's stoney; it's poorly drained; you'll get in trouble." We sell land. We have a Land Board and representatives of the Department of Lands and representatives of the Department of Soils and Crops sit on that board together, and when a person wants to buy a piece of land they make application. These applications are reviewed and if there are services, if there is a road, if there is a school, if there is power, if there is drainage, they'll sell it; or if it's a piece of land that is adjacent to that which the man holds and it's going to help that person to get this land, they'll sell it; but if there are no services and if it's going to create a demand for new services, and if the person's chances of operating successfully, of making a living for himself in that area are not good, they'll say "no." It's got to be that way.

(Mr. Hutton cont'd)

Now if you believe in a planned land use policy; if you believe in a policy on the part of the government which is going to eliminate these areas that have been a great problem to us in the past, to the people first of all, and then because you have to maintain roads and services to a decreasing few, an uneconomical, an impractical policy; if you believe that we should be against that thing you've got to support the government, and the government says "no" when a man comes in and asks to buy a piece of land that he shouldn't have. Sure it's an arbitrary thing, but either you believe in one thing or you believe in the other. You can't be on both sides of the fence. What has been done? We're trying to buy up these lands. We're buying them up for community pastures. We're just buying them up to get control of them and we intend to lease them in the future. We're not going to sell them again. We'll let them out on a grazing lease or a hay lease, but we're not going to sell them. Some of them are going into wildlife habitat; some of them are going into forestry, such as down here in the southeast, and I might tell you that that program that was worked out between the Lands Branch and the Department of Agriculture and the people of southeast Manitoba is a pattern for the rest of Canada.

Well, as the member for Morris has mentioned, we started soil testing. We'll be offering this service -- well, somebody's laughing over there. They better go back to school and find out what's going on in agriculture. The farmers aren't laughing; the farmers voted for that program, and I notice the farmers, not too many of the farmers, voted NDP -- not too many of them.

What about a community pasture program? We announced that in 1963 we're going to build six new pastures in Manitoba, which represents a 40 percent increase in the number of community pastures available to the farmers. The new pastures will have a combined capacity of 15,000 head. And you say that this isn't a program? You say that we're a government of indecision and procrastination? Yes, it just depends on -- it just depends on which side of the fence the Liberals are on. Nobody can be sure which side of that fence they are on, and that's why we can't pay very much attention to them.

Well, there's one more item which I want to deal with and that's \$2.00 wheat. And boy-oh-boy if the Liberal policy -- if my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP is concerned about the Liberal policy on nuclear weapons for Canada, I can tell him that I'm just as disturbed about their policy for wheat in Canada. It's got all the explosives -- it contains all the explosive powers that their other policy has insofar as the western Canadian wheat farmer is concerned. To think, Madam Speaker, that the farmers have fought their way through the worst of the times in the '50's when we lost our markets, and when the Liberal government of the day said of any prospective customers, "let 'em come and get it if they want it." We went through all that. We know that they were quite satisfied if they sold 250 million bushels of wheat a year, and if they got up to 275 they thought they were going great guns. Now we got through those tough times; we got our commercial channels opened up; we're selling the wheat today; we've got a good price; and now the Liberal party comes along and offers \$2.00 a bushel -- a guaranteed price -- well calculated to inject a rigidity into our production complex; a rigidity that we have fought against, and even they fought against it for 20 years. They didn't want any part of it because they knew that it was bad policy, a thing that the President of the United States is trying to get off his back -- guaranteed prices. And here comes the Liberal party -- anything to get votes. But that doesn't disturb me. What the Federal Liberal Party does doesn't disturb me, but when the provincial leader of the Opposition tags along like a puppy dog everywhere he goes and claps this fellow on the back and says this is good for Manitoba, this does disturb me, because this policy is no good for Manitoba; it's no good for Western Canada and they know it.

What are the results of a program like this -- and there's no need for it at the present time. The price of wheat is \$1.94; they're guaranteeing \$2.00 -- (interjection)-- Yes, six cents. But what's it likely to do? It's likely to encourage our farmers to go out and produce wheat -- more acreage into wheat at a time when we're preaching diversification; at a time when even the Leader of the Opposition in this House is advocating loans for beef cattle. What sort of consistency is this? Is this planning? How much thought was given to this plan? It certainly isn't a plan that's designed to help Western Canada. It's a design that may help the Federal Liberal Party, but I couldn't care less about the Federal Liberal Party. I don't care

(Mr. Hutton cont'd)

whether they win one seat or 100 seats, but what they advocate and hold out to the farmers of this province and other provinces in the west; when they start leading the farmers astray just to get some seats, I get concerned. We've been struggling and working hard here to get programs that will help in adjustment; we're talking about ARDA programs; we've invested millions at the University in research and research facilities; we're lending money to farmers through the Agricultural Credit Corporation -- we've got 18 million out and I'll be asking for more at this session; we're trying to bring about adjustments in agriculture; we're sending over Trade Missions to try and find new markets for new products; and along they come and say, "Ah, we'll give you \$2.00 a bushel for wheat." They don't say anything about oats, or barley, or anything else, just wheat.

Now there's something else that worries me about this, because it's a big-in-a-poke -- it's a pig-in-a-poke -- they're only talking; they get the farmer's eye on the \$2.00 and they hope that he doesn't ask any rather searching questions. It costs -- for every cent of spread between No. 1 Northern, world price, and the \$2.00, it costs \$3 million. If the price is \$1.99 Fort William and the guaranteed price is \$2.00, then it is going to cost the Federal Treasury \$3 million if we sell 300 million bushels of wheat. Well if that price ever drops down so that there is any substantial monies required to meet this obligation to the western farmers -- supposing it dropped to \$1.70 -- it could do it -- that would amount to \$90 million. And do you know what the farmer is exchanging? He's exchanging the uncertainty of market prices for the uncertainty of political policies, and it would mean that there would be -- and let no one think that there wouldn't be -- strong pressures in the Federal House against the kind of a subsidy coming out to Western Canada. And what do you create then? A social pressure against making sales of Canadian wheat because they'd be in a position where every time they sold a bushel of Canadian wheat it would cost them 30 cents. Now we know that a government in the past took the attitude that if the people of the world wanted Canadian wheat they knew where to come and get it, and we know how much wheat we sold under that. We know that we had wheat backed up from here to the Rocky Mountains and we know what a policy of getting out and selling and of providing credit for sales can do. We did two things. We got rid of the wheat and we got a decent price for it. We're going backwards here, it's a policy of retrogression; it's a policy of despair -- the despair of the Liberal party -- and it's not going to do anybody any good. In the long run it will hurt the Liberals just as much as it would hurt the Western farmer, and I hope they forget all about it.

But here is this, and I come back to it in closing, here we have this chameleon characteristic of the Liberal opposition. They're on every side of a question. Even when they appear to be friendly with us -- beware. The kiss or the friendship of the Liberal party to the voter is just like the kiss of Judas, and nowhere is this more apparent than in their present love affair with the western farmer. We have had good programs here in Manitoba in the last four or five years. We have helped a lot of farmers in this province. I said here once before that when the next election rolled around the opposition was going to find that when they got on a lot of farmers' land in this province, talking campaigns, they'd find they were standing on a tory platform, because he likely had borrowed money from the Agricultural Credit Corporation. From the results in the rural constituencies in Manitoba, I'd say that that statement was probably pretty accurate, because they didn't forget that they got programs or they got policies that were helpful to them. They ran around the Province of Manitoba last December and told the farmers, "why this government promised crop insurance and all you've got is a little wee test area program." Well today crop insurance is available, and I'm not going to exaggerate it, 29.9 percent -- almost 30 percent. Even a politician should be able to exaggerate that much, shouldn't he? There is no justification for the charge that has been made that we don't plan; that we don't act; that we are guilty of indecision and procrastination. If the Liberal opposition would take as their example what has been done in the last four years, and take as their example the policy and the procedures followed by this government and apply them to their work in the opposition, we could give real good government, even better government than we're giving right now, to the people of Manitoba.



MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, will the Minister permit a question? Do you agree with the Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable Mr. Alvin Hamilton, when he's asking the farmers in western Canada to produce a billion bushels of wheat. Would you agree with that?

MR. HUTTON: He never asked them.

MR. TANCHAK: Wouldn't that be over- production?

MR. HUTTON: He never asked them to produce wheat. You aren't even reading the newspapers.

MR. TANCHAK: Oh yes, that's what he did.

MR. HUTTON: No, he didn't. He asked them for a billion bushels of grain. He didn't ask them for a billion bushels of wheat.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend and I were both going to speak on this motion and I defer to him -- (interjection) -- Well, I'm going to defend the government, so I think probably I should be allowed to speak a little later.

MR. PAULLEY: It all depends on what happens . . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend is worrying about the time and he would like to start after dinner, I'm sure that would be agreeable to most of us here. If Madam Speaker would like to call it 5:30.

MADAM SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and leave the chair until 8:00 o'clock.