

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, November 3rd, 1958.

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Select  
Committees  
Notices of Motion  
Introduction of Bills  
Orders of the Day

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the honourable the Attorney-General. I see in the press today, Manitoba taxes appeal quashed. This is in connection with the right of the municipalities to put a tax on the railways. My question is whether the intention of the government to proceed further with an appeal against the Supreme Court Decision.

HON. STERLING LYON (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, like the honourable member for Inkster, my first knowledge of this matter was from reading today's paper. My only comment at this stage is this, that we have not, as yet, had the opportunity to read the judgment of the Supreme Court. I understand it was a unanimous judgment and of course our attitude toward any further appeal will be dependent entirely upon the studies that are made upon the judgment as delivered by the Supreme Court. I couldn't give you a final answer at this stage, Sir.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker before the Orders of the Day, I would like to bring to the attention of the members of the House, particularly those that don't read the sports page, that on Sunday last, the St. Vital Bulldogs won the provincial intermediate football championships and next week they carry Manitoba's colours into the Western Canada semi-finals against Fort William. I am sure that all the members of the House will join with me in offering to this team, from my constituency, our best wishes for their further success.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, a considerable number of the Bulldogs come from that portion of St. Vital which I have the honour to represent. I most heartily endorse the remarks of my friend from St. Vital and extend also to the Bulldogs the best wishes of the representative of Radisson.

MR. SPEAKER: .....Committee of the Whole House.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committees to consider the following Bill, No. 13, an Act to amend the Veterinary Science Scholarship Fund Act.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. Matthews please take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the House ready to consider the Bill. Bill 13, an Act to Amend the Veterinary Science Scholarship Fund Act. Section 1 of the bill, section 2 of the bill.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? \$800.00 seems to be quite a bit of money, but that is not what I wanted to know. If any student that has no funds and he may be good material for this profession, is \$2,000.00 in the opinion of the Department sufficient?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier): The Minister is not here, Mr. Chairman, but I think I can undertake to answer that in the affirmative. The sum is arrived at because it is the same amount that is allowed for students in the degree course in Agriculture, a very closely allied business, so we are merely bringing the Veterinarian Scholarships in line. That is my understanding of the matter. I believe they are considered adequate that price, that amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1 of the Bill, agreed; Section 2 of the Bill, preamble, Title, .....Bill be reported. The Committee of the Whole has considered Bill 13 and has asked me to report the same without amendments....

DR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the honourable member for Roblin, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return, the honourable member for Fisher

MR. ROBLIN: Third reading Mr. Speaker.

MR. McLEAN: I move, seconded by the honourable the Minister of Labour, that Bill No. 13, an Act to Amend the Veterinary Science Scholarship Fund Act be now read a second time and passed. Sorry, third time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The honourable member for Fisher.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, in

MR. PAULLEY (Continued)

the absence of the honourable member for Fisher, seconded by the honourable member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for Return showing the items and questions in the name of the honourable member for Fisher.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the honourable member for Radisson, seconded by the honourable member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the questions standing in his name.

MR. ROBLIN: .....the questions put, I would like to say that I have some reservations about the scope of this question in some respects. I know that certain information here is asked for on a constituency basis, which I know have been refused in times gone by, but it's not that so much that I refer to, but some of these questions really are asking what advice a Minister proposes to give the Crown on matters of policy; and it is not customary, in fact it is contrary to the rules that questions of that nature should be asked. You can ask what advice we have given to the Crown, but not ask what advice we propose to give the Crown. Because for reasons that are obvious, that's not the type of question that is usually permitted; so while I don't think that it be necessary to go so far as to oppose the motion, I would like to have it clearly understood that there are some questions which we will not be able to answer because we will be abiding by that particular rule. And as long as it's understood that the questions will not be answered in all particulars and that the member doesn't object to that, we'll accept the motion on those conditions.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that is agreeable. We did hope that under the new regime some of the old arguments that we used to have on Orders of Return would not be followed through, but we would be perfectly happy to accept the conditions of the honourable First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: This is not an old argument; this is Beauchesne 295, sub-section cc, third edition 1943.

MR. PAULLEY: I was referring, Mr. Speaker, to the point raised by the honourable First Minister himself.

HON. ERRICK F. WILLIS Q.C. (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker if I might with the consent of the House, say but one word because it is directed to our department. I should like to inform the questioner that on the first ten questions here it calls for an expenditure of about 1 million and a half dollars, and that number eleven question all by itself is worth more than a million dollars expenditure; therefore to even get you an opinion in regard to it will take quite a length of time.

MR. R.S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, due to the fact that this particular Order for Return has already brought the First Minister and the Minister of

MR. CLEMENT (Continued)

Public Works to his feet, that maybe it should be held over until the honourable member is here himself to explain it, or ask for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition): I am sure the honourable gentleman who moved the resolution can explain it without any trouble if he would just run through it for the benefit of the House.

MR. ROBLIN: We'd be glad to supply the citation....

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): I thought there was a restriction on the size of a net a fisherman might use in this province.

MR. CAMPBELL: ....the minimum, not the maximum.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourn debate, on the proposed motion. The honourable member for Roblin--the honourable member for Assiniboia has the floor.

MR. D. SWAILES (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, now that the Leaders of the three groups in this House have spoken on this motion, we find, strangely enough, that we all have something in common. We find that the First Minister has no confidence whatever in these two groups. We find that the Leader of the Opposition has no confidence in this group and that group, we find also, that we on this side have no confidence in either those or those. We have no confidence in either of the Conservative Parties in this House.

I was very pleased and very amused when the volcanic member from Carillon had blew his crater the other night. I'd forgotten that radio speech that I had made when I mentioned the fact that there was no such thing as a Roblin team. Most of you will remember the big and expensive billboards that were spread all over the city indicating the existence of a Roblin team. And that brought to mind the experience of last year when the present First Minister who was then the Leader of the official Opposition moved a motion of non-confidence in the government and not a single member of his group got up to speak in favour of that motion. The motion went through, without a single member of his group speaking to the motion. That indicated to some extent the amount of team work there was in existence at that time. I must say, however, that frankly and truthfully, that there is now some semblance of a team, and I do congratulate the Leader, the First Minister to that extent.

Now it's evident from the speeches that have been made up to

MR. SWAILES (Continued)

now that our Conservative friends to my right here are exasperated and frustrated. I think it was the honourable member for Brokenhead who suggested that their frustrations were showing through their negligees. And, as a matter of fact, I think they're almost desperate. And it's no wonder really that they are exasperated and frustrated and desperate because it has been demonstrated very forcibly and very clearly that the people of Manitoba were tired of this lack of action and I think too, that one of the factors that contributed to their failure was the support they got from the Winnipeg Free Press.

On the other hand, the little success that we attained can be attributed in some measure to the action that was taken in Winnipeg in April of this year by the Canadian Labour Congress. I think that the future is going to show that the support and the activity of the Canadian Labour Congress in connection with the C.C.F. is going to be much more valuable and effective than any support that the Free Press can give to our friends on this side of the House, and that, having that in mind then our prospects for the future are certainly much better than theirs.

Now this frustration and exasperation has been demonstrated by the courts of action that our friends have followed in this particular session of the House. They've just staggered from one blunder to another. The first blunder was made, and this is the general opinion of people across the province, when they opposed, when they opposed, as they did, and to the length that they did the election of a speaker. The second blunder was made in the nature of the talks given by the leader of the official opposition, and the third blunder was made in the attempts that were made to amend I think it was Bill No. 8, yeah! Bill No. 8. Now, our friends had quite a number of suggestions with respect to amendments to Bill No. 8 and over the years it has been the general practice, when amendments are sought, to submit those amendments when the bill has had second reading and has gone to the Law Amendment Committee, or whatever committee has to deal with it. That has been the regular procedure. But our friends here followed two courses of action. They were not consistent in the least. They should either have submitted all their amendments in one way, or at least have let them all go to the committee.

Now then, we opposed that particular section -- we opposed that action because it would be, and it would have been properly construed as a vote of non-confidence in the government, and would have ended in the defeat of the government. Now, the policy of our group was outlined by our leader, on the 16th of June, I think it was, in the television broadcast that was made immediately after the election. And that is the policy of our movement as a whole, not the policy that he created at that particular moment. That we will at all times support good legislation, no matter who introduces it, and we will oppose the legislation which we think is not good.

And that brings us again to this particular situation. Here we had four major pieces of legislation, which were almost in the nature of emergency legislation. If we had gone along with our

Mr. SWAILES (continued)

friends on that particular vote, or in the other vote that took place this afternoon, first of all there would have been no program of Public Works instituted in order to provide employment for those who are now unemployed. And we certainly would not have had any support from the labour groups or from the unemployed themselves if we had gone along with that particular course of action.

The second was, the matter of the development, - of an industrial development fund. If the government had been defeated then that particular program would have been delayed. If the government had been defeated the matter of credit for farmers would have been delayed, and the matter of improvements to the educational system, - all those would have been delayed. To our mind, although they were not perfect by any means, there was room for quite a, and there is still room for quite a degree of improvement. Yet, those bills on the whole, were good legislation, and as good legislation we were going to support it. We intended to support it, and we'll support any good legislation, no matter from which source it comes.

Now the, both the Honourable the First Minister and the member for Carillon, suggested and said, that it was the duty of the Opposition to oppose, period. I say that is not the whole duty of the Opposition. The duty of the Opposition is to make suggestions; to suggest alternatives; to suggest improvements as well as to oppose legislation which they consider to be bad. And then I come to this point, the final point, where we were told that the duty of the Opposition is to oppose. The duty of the Opposition is to oppose. We've had four bills before us, four bills, some of which have been very intensively criticized and yet the official Opposition has not opposed them. They have agreed to them. I think the vote is practically unanimous and now they are gone to the Amendments Committee, and they are going to become, well there may be suggestions for amendments there, which would of course be the proper place for the amendments. But the Opposition did not oppose them.

And now, I want to come to a matter which was dealt with a little by the leader of our group when he answered the debate.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member a question? Is your leader the First Minister?

MR. SWAILES: Not yet, but he will be .....The leader of our group spoke on the matter of natural gas. And this is one of the responsibilities of a Provincial Government to assure that the natural resources of the province are extracted and developed to the best advantage, to the best advantage, of the people of this province.

Now, some six or seven years ago, and I give full credit to the Campbell Government for this, - the citizens of Winnipeg were given the opportunity, under what is known as the terms of Plan C, to purchase the existing gas distribution--the gas manufacture and distribution plant that existed at that time for about a million dollars. And it was due largely to the campaign that was carried on by the Winnipeg Free Press, assisted very energetically by a prominent member of the Conservative Party, but the citizens of Winnipeg turned down that particular plan.

Mr. SWAILES (continued)

Now, only just recently, the government has had an excellent opportunity of doing a public service. When the report of the Gas Distribution Commission was made, they had the opportunity to rule that this gas distribution should become a public utility, and as such, the distribution of natural gas would take place over as wide an area of Greater Winnipeg as possible, in the earliest possible time, and at the lowest possible cost. But the government goofed on this particular opportunity. The government were not the only ones who goofed incidentally, because the Winnipeg and Central Gas Company, also made a very bad mistake when they tried to set the rates so high that they would recoup, -- that they would recover the money that they had lost in the preceding three or four years, over a period of something like 15 years' time. They set their prices so high that there was a public protest. The public protested against the price of \$1.12 a thousand feet. They went to the Public Utility Board and the Public Utility Board recommended 1.03 cents a thousand feet. Well, even that was a pretty good price, as one or two other companies thought, so they dickered with the outlying municipalities and it looked for a time as though we might have two or three companies laying their gas lines down the same streets, trying to serve the same people.

So, as a result of the confusion that existed, a commission was appointed and the evidence of the engineers, and these are, I take it, are very competent men, the engineers of one of these companies gave a complete breakdown of figures, showing that within five years the gas could be distributed to the people in Greater Winnipeg at around 75 cents a thousand square feet. Now that's quite a big difference from the original \$ 1.12, and quite a bit below the maximum figure that was recommended by the commission. And I want to point out this, that the figure represented, submitted by the commission was a maximum figure, that the price should not exceed an average of 90 cents a thousand square feet. They gave no figures and gave no comment on the possibility of selling the gas at a lower rate. But the figures that were submitted by the other two companies, they corresponded in no small measure with the figures that had been submitted by the Public Utility Board and by the Winnipeg and Central Gas Company itself, therefore, we can conclude that they were pretty accurate.

And as a result of this action of the government in giving the green light to a private company, which, to all intents and purposes was a bankrupt company, is going to result in the people of Greater Winnipeg paying out between one and two million dollars a year more than they need pay out for their natural gas. And that's the kind of mistake, I think, which is a fatal mistake on the part of the government.

Well then, we come to something else. The government here gave its sole support to a privately owned monopoly. A privately owned monopoly whose major purpose, of course, is the making of profit out of the distribution of natural gas. Well then, just a short time later, we had a statement from the First Minister in which he recommended the course of action that would lead to the tripling and perhaps the destruction of a public utility which

Mr. SWAILLES (continued)  
has performed a really remarkable service for the people of Canada. And I refer to the Trans Canada Airlines. And here's a public utility which has given more efficient service, has been more progressive and more efficient, particularly with respect to public safety perhaps than any other airline in the whole world.

Now the T.C.A. has been something like the C.B.C. As you know, the C.B.C. extended a television service to the widest possible area of Canada. Covering Canada with TV service in such a way as it never would have been covered if we had depended only upon those who were seeking advertising revenue. And in exactly the same way, the T.C.A. - the Trans Canada Airlines - has serviced a big section of the population of Canada where the volume of traffic was too low to allow for profitable operation. Now Trans Canada Airlines operates a trans-continental, a trans-Atlantic and southern air routes. On these three routes, that is the trans-Atlantic, the trans-continental and the southern lines, T.C.A. made a profit of 9.4 million dollars in 1957. But on the other hand, T.C.A. lost 8.3 million dollars on the shorter routes, including this prairie region because they were giving service which was not profitable. The shorter routes were, to some extent, subsidized by those long and more profitable routes and to some extent, of course, by the people of Canada.

I just want to quote briefly from the Wheatcroft Report. It says, "the general consensus of these views is that T.C.A. domestic services are operating at a standard of operating and selling efficiency which compares favourably with airlines in other parts of the world including the United States. Trans Canada Airlines cost for the whole system are 17% lower than those of the Canadian Pacific Airlines. And the cost of international services are virtually identical". This comparison does not give much support to the suggestion that T.C.A. working within the same cost environment as Canadian Pacific Airlines is inefficient. And that air transport costs in Canada would be much lower under competitive conditions.

For short and medium range operations, one can go further and say, that Trans Canada Airlines have been leaders in technical progress. They were the first airline in North America to introduce turbine powered aircraft. And with the "Viscount" they have set a standard on domestic and trans-border routes which has unquestionably been some years ahead of the rest of the industry.

There's no indication that T.C.A. is resting on its laurels. Future plans show that T.C.A. is proposing progressive improvements in the domestic service pattern and, incidentally, demonstrate the comprehensive nature of the airlines forward planning.

In general, the equipment used and planned by T.C.A. is equal or superior to that operated by comparable airlines. T.C.A.'s future plans envisage a rate of traffic growth which is greater than that envisaged and predicted by most airlines in other parts of the world.

And generally, Mr. Speaker, this whole situation with respect to Trans Canada Airlines has been misrepresented by the Press and by the representatives of big business. The true facts



Mr. SWAILES (continued)

have not been given generally to the public. They've tried to picture T.C.A. as a monopolistic ogre, gobbling up the air passenger dollars without giving proper service. And the truth is that the T.C.A. is giving us good service at as low a cost as any airline in the world. And then T.C.A. has grown faster. From 1946 to 1957, T.C.A. increased its growth by 222%. The world's growth has been 178%. The United States' growth has been 152%. T.C.A.'s growth has been faster than that in the United States despite the fact that the traffic potential of the United States carriers is far greater than the potential available to T.C.A. And without competition, the growth of T.C.A. has been faster than world growth or with the U.S. growth.

If competition was going to reduce fares or improve service, surely the airlines operating out of the city of New York where the traffic potential is the highest, surely there, we would have seen an improvement in service and a reduction in fares. But as a matter of fact, just the opposite has taken place. The costs have increased because the overhead or the administration costs have been multiplied. They have had to apply for increases in fares and the safety record has certainly not been as high as that of T.C.A.

And even the Financial Post has this to say. It says "United States passenger fares have increased while the Canadian passenger fares are falling. Almost all United States domestic airline carriers are in financial difficulty. Under the present situation, T.C.A. can offer the world's best equipment at lower cost to the user than any United States carrier". This is pretty strong stuff coming from the Financial Post. And they go on to say this. "That this is a strong argument for supporters of the present system of non-competitive airline service". And yet the Honourable the First Minister in his statement the other day agreed with the idea of competition. And I think the evidence has shown that such competition will have the effect of crippling the T.C.A., and, without doubt, will have the effect of reducing that part of the service which is being given to those parts of Canada where air service is not particularly profitable.

Now when the Honourable the Minister of Labour introduced his bill the other day, he expressed the opinion that we were nearing the end of this period of recession. And that there was an upturn in sight that the old story of prosperity just around the corner. But he didn't give any reasons for that particular optimism. And perhaps the prospects, the economic prospects, are not quite as rosy as he made them out to be. And, incidentally, there is no reason at all why in Canada with the natural resources that we have, with the people that we have that we should not have steadily increasing prosperity year by year - but every year as it comes along should show better results than the preceding year. But this is just exactly what the situation is at the present time. And I don't want to be accused of being a peddler of gloom but still we have to look these facts in the face.

Our exports are down more than 6%; retail sales are down; car loadings - and that's one of the most important indicators of economic progress - car loadings are down; wholesale sales are down; the sales of new automobiles are down; industrial product-

Mr. SWAILES (continued)

ion is down; and unemployment is up. So that I think it's safe to say this, that if there is an upturn evident, that it's going to be a slow process and we have to be very careful to make sure that we take the right courses of action.

Professor Curry, a former government economist, and a lecturer in political economy at the University of Toronto, just the other day, I think it was Friday or Saturday, submitted evidence to the Air Transport Board in this Trans Canada Airlines case. And he said this: "The general business outlook is more clouded now than it was five years ago. And a large deficit, and as a matter of fact, a very large deficit is forecast in the federal budget. Anyone would be foolish to ignore such facts as unemployment reaching about 5% of our working force - a slight decline in the rate of capital expansion in such soft spots as the textile industry, agriculture and base metal mines.

Just about a year ago, last October, the Canadian Labour Congress made its submission to the Diefenbaker Government. I think I mentioned this in the last session, but we did recommend that a number of steps should be taken in order to step up this progress out of the recession toward a period of greater, greater prosperity. We suggested, and recommended that consumer purchasing power be increased; old age pensions increased, family allowances; unemployment insurance. We also suggested that public works programs should be planned years ahead, - that planning at this stage of the game is almost too late to be effective in the immediately succeeding winter: recommended that income taxes in the lower brackets should be reduced. And this is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, that for the man with \$3,000.00 a year, the married man with no children and an income of \$3,000.00 a year, in the twenty years between 1937 and 1957, his income tax has increased by 400%. But in the same period of time, the married man with \$10,000.00, a married man with no children with \$10,000.00, his income tax has increased only 150%. So that those in the lower income groups are being penalized more than those in the higher income area. Then the farm incomes need to be increased.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask my honourable friend a question? Has he the actual amounts of this income tax increase? That's an interesting point. Has he got the actual amounts?

MR. SWAILES: I can supply the First Minister with the actual figures. I haven't them here but I'll supply him with them. Of course, then, we suggested the need for increasing farm income, parity prices and so on; and that farm surpluses should be sold to those countries which need them regardless of the existence of any imaginary curtains, iron or otherwise. That there should be expanded aid to those countries in a less favoured position. We also recommended that Canada should recommend the government of Communist China; that China should be given a seat on the United Nations.

And while it is true that the Federal Government has the major responsibility for directing and controlling and guiding the economy, it is quite true also that the Provincial Government also has quite an area of responsibility.

And you are going to get suggestions from the labour groups

Mr. SWAILES (continued)

here that the minimum wages in Manitoba be increased from 60 cents to \$1.25 an hour, for both men and women; the maximum work-week to be reduced to 40 hours or less in order to spread the available employment. That vacations with pay be lengthened and that workmen's compensation benefits be increased. And that the payments for hospital service can be cut down.

All these things can be done and they all need to be done over and above whatever arrangements may be made with the municipalities for the provision of winter employment.

And with respect to the industrial development fund, I want to point out this: That no matter how many more industries are brought into being, unless the product of those industries is shared equitably among our people, we are still going to be faced with these possibilities of recurring depression, and we are going to have unnecessary suffering on the part of those who become employed in those particular periods.

Now to the degree that this government and the government in Ottawa adopt the ideas and the policies of economic democracy, of democratic guidance and direction of the economic processes and to the degree that we get away from the idea that the possession of goods is man's highest ambition, and we develop the philosophy that "being" is of much greater importance than "having" then we can expect to make progress.

These are the ideals and principles behind the C.C.F. program which was outlined by the leader of our group. And these are the fundamental ideals and principles of democratic socialism throughout the world.

And again I want to say this in conclusion, .....

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? I admit I am a little bit on the dumb side but I would like to know what an economic democracy is, please.

MR. SWAILES: At the present time, we have what is to all intents and purposes economic anarchy. To all intents and purposes we have, at the present time, in the industrial part of the world economic anarchy, that means, every man for himself. Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost. Grab as much as you can in the shortest possible time. Economic democracy means this; that there will be guidance and direction over the expenditures, of topical expenditures over the development of those parts of our economy that need developing for the benefit of the greater number of people. That is what the economic democracy is.

And I say that to that extent, to the extent that we do carry out these ideas, and I might say this that to the extent that you take the plans from the platform of the C.C.F., to that extent we'll make something you're proud of and you are quite welcome to those plans. You're quite welcome to introduce whatever legislation you please, as long it's good legislation along those particular lines.

And I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying this: the Honourable the First Minister indicated that we were falling down as an Opposition. That it was our duty to defeat the government. Now the First Minister doesn't have to wait to be defeated. The First Minister can do exactly as Mr. Diefenbaker did. He can

Mr. SWAILES (continued)

pretend to go somewhere else and bring in the Lieutenant-Governor and dissolve this House. The First Minister can do that tomorrow, if he pleases, and I dare him to do it.

MR. R.S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, at the outset, may I congratulate you on being elected to the time-honoured position as Speaker of this legislature. It has been my pleasure, Sir, to have known you for some nine years, at least, that I have been a member of this legislature. And I recall in those early days when I was a new member that you were one of the more friendly gentlemen who sort of took me under their wing. And as one of the party whips of the coalition government, you were, Sir, one of the more friendly, considerate and helpful members of the coalition government. And so with the many years of experience that you have had in this legislature, with your genial and likeable personality, I am sure you will serve this House as you have done in the last two weeks in the high office as Speaker in a very capable manner.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to congratulate the mover of the address in reply to the Speech of the Throne, the honourable member from Roblin, a neighbour of mine, who in his maiden speech I suggest gave an excellent address and I'm sure will contribute his fair share to future debates in this legislature. I, Sir, congratulate him.

Mr. Speaker, the seconder to the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the honourable member from St. Matthews is well known as a scholar and a gentleman, that has been pointed out. He likewise gave an excellent address and I likewise congratulate him.

Now, Sir, I am desirous of turning the spotlight of congratulations on the Honourable the First Minister. Particularly on the three counts that have been mentioned by other members up to now. Firstly, Sir, I congratulate him on his choice of an excellent and charming woman as his bride. Secondly, on his being elected to the position in this legislature which he now holds, namely, as First Minister. Thirdly, Sir, I must congratulate him on the group of men he has chosen to fill his cabinet, and who have taken their position in the front benches of this government. On his own admission to me, he has an excellent cabinet and up-to-date I find no reason to particularly disagree with him. He has eight good-looking gentlemen, he has eight distinguished looking gentlemen. I suggest that if they would all develop the smile that the Honourable Minister of Labour has, they might stay there a lot longer than I think some of them will. However, Sir, he has four ministers who are learned in the will, or what is the technical term, "learned in the -- learned in the law". The legal profession, I suggest are well represented in the front benches of the "Roblin" Government. He has, secondly, three men who have distinguished themselves in the business world. The business world is well looked after. He has, as well, a very - well, I would say the best looking member in the front benches - a member of the medical profession and they likewise ..... Mr. Clement!

MR. ROBLIN: Hear! Hear!

MR. CLEMENT: And not only is he good-looking but he's a like-

able sort of a fellow, I think he ... the First Minister wasn't so dumb when he picked out the Minister of Labour at one side and the Minister of Health at the other because they are both good-looking and likeable fellows.

Mr. Speaker, there are, however, two very important groups of our economy or society that, unfortunately in my opinion, have not been looked after. And I point out, firstly, a representative of labour does not seem to be in the front benches. A true representative of labour. And, secondly, a true representative of the most important part of our economy or the backbone of our economy, and it seems unfortunate to me, Sir, that the First Minister has not seen fit to appoint a full-time grass-root farmer to his cabinet.

MR. ROBLIN: Stick around a while.

MR. CLEMENT: I'm trying to help you, Sir, not criticize. Just wait a minute. It can be said that the honourable minister on his right is a farmer, rightly so! So am I a farmer. Maybe one of the larger farmers in Manitoba, I don't qualify myself to say that I'm a farmer. The honourable member from the old constituency of Turtle Mountain. I don't just recall the new one, is an excellent asset to any cabinet by his rightful position as Minister of Public Works, one that he is very familiar with, and I suggest that he should be named the Minister of Public Works and Acting Minister of Agriculture not vice versa.

However, Sir, since the Honourable the First Minister has at least to my knowledge one qualified member, one 'grass-root' farmer at least in his back benches, I suggest that maybe he will rectify that situation. And I would say, Sir, that probably had he been the Minister of Agriculture that bill No. 8 would have been brought in with probably, shall we say, a lower interest rate, not meaning to emphasize on it. At least the man that I'm thinking of knows what it is, Sir, to have grain in his granaries and not be able to sell it, and maybe have debts that he owes and not be able to pay them.

I suggest, the Honourable present Minister of Agriculture if he ever did it, it has been a long time, has never had those problems.

MR. WILLIS: You're quite wrong again.

MR. CLEMENTS: Well, I've been wrong before and I'll be wrong again. Anyway, that's my opinion. Now, Sir, the Honourable the First Minister this afternoon got up and gave a - what I would call a bombastic and critical address to the members of the Opposition this afternoon, and quite frankly, I don't think it fits the occasion. As Minister or Leader of the official Opposition, he gave many very important addresses, good addresses criticizing the Government as a whole, but when it comes down to criticizing individuals, I don't think that suits his pattern and I suggest that he change his ways and that attitude. He pointed out facts about the Opposition, he said that the official of the Opposition wouldn't defeat the Government but I suggest today that at least the Opposition smoked him out - if that's not an unparliamentary word - and he gave an address this afternoon that

Mr. CLEMENTS (continued)

he didn't intend to give until he came to the main speech -- main motion.

However, Sir, be that as it may, he's a likeable fellow and I hold no grievance toward any one of them. I'm in the Opposition now which after nine years, I find to be a most enjoyable experience, and I suggest to the honourable members, the new members particularly, who have come into this legislature who sit in the Opposition that in nine years they will be far better politicians than I am, if they remain in the Opposition than I am after being in the Government side for nine years. Remember that some of the men who are sitting across there today. Unfortunately, you will never be there for nine years so I wouldn't worry too much about that.

Lastly, Sir, my sincere and hearty congratulations go to the 27 new members, 27 new members who were elected to this legislature. Each and every one who has spoken up 'till now have delivered outstanding addresses. I think that it shows a great deal of credit to those members in themselves, and I think they can be justly proud. I sometimes - at least I never thought the day would come when I felt like an old farmer but like the Honourable the First Member I have only been here for nine years, and believe me there is only nine men in here who have been here longer than we have. Boy! the mortality rate is terrific. Remember that.

And may I point out a little word of wisdom that may help you stay here a little longer. May I point out, Sir, to the new members, particularly, that politics as in other lines of endeavour, you will find 'honesty is the best policy'. Maintain good relationship and you will in turn receive the public confidence. And now, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech debate is one time in this legislature, when every member has his opportunity to stand up and speak about whichever he so desires. It's pretty hard to get a foul of the law, Mr. Speaker, when you're speaking on the throne debate, and so you can wander far and wide. I, Sir, at this time, intend to confine my remarks, as far as possible at least, to the desires, the problems, the geographic location of the constituency which I have the honour to represent, namely the constituency of Birtle-Russell. But before Sir, embarking on a little talk about the, I think one of the better constituencies, I'm not going to say that it is the best. One or two other members in this legislature have stood up and said they had the best, or represented the best constituency in Manitoba. That, of course, is only in their own personal opinion. But, before speaking to my constituency I can't help, about my constituency, I can't help but point out a word or two that the Honourable and likeable member from Assiniboia, and I might say, very quick at thinking, spoke out tonight. He said with regard to the frustrations of the official opposition, showing through their negligees. Mr. Speaker, if last Friday night they had any negligee on at all it was transparent. I'll agree, I think the Honourable Member is a very capable speaker but he is only part of the opposition. In fact, I don't think he is opposition at all, he is coalition. The years that I was in this House the coalition always played

Mr. CLEMENT (continued)

around with that side, and quite frankly I think it is still there.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to get back to my own constituency, to publicly thank the constituents of Birtle for their support and in so doing honouring me by electing me as their member of this legislature. The First Minister pointed out this afternoon that that was one of the highest honours a member of this legislature could obtain, and I agree with him. I also agree that any member who enters this legislature and does not do as his conscience tells him he should do, and does not do what he thinks is right for his constituency, should either go over and sit with the Honourable Member from Logan or resign completely. And quite frankly, the honourable member from Logan is not always wrong but he is not always right.

And so, my years in this legislature, as many of you know; eight years was spent as more or less an independent, not really down to the basic lines. I was elected as an independent, supporting coalition in 1949; an independent supporting the honourable member from Lakeside in 1953; and in this last election as an honourable member supporting the Liberal Government under his leadership. And, if anybody wonders why, I'll tell you why. Because, I think the Honourable Member, and history will prove it some day, that never has there been a more honest, sincere and man who is desirous of serving his community than Douglas L. Campbell. I am stepping off the rules there, mentioning the man's name, but Mr. Speaker, that is so and I think you'll agree with it.

Now, Sir, I want particularly to thank the many men and women in my constituency who on my behalf during the election, men and women of our organization who, knowing there was some uncertainty as to my health -- one wouldn't think to look at it now -- but it is well known to many of you - that at least according to the doctors, I was quite ill some months ago; at least these men and women shouldered the extra burden that normally I would have carried in the past election. And I am quite proud of the fact that I was elected, and that in the old Russell constituency, the Honourable First Minister and his party only had the majority in one poll in that whole constituency. The new constituency, I am not condemning them, I haven't had an opportunity to show my ability and if, at the next election, I haven't been able to show that I am their representative - to do what they want to the best of my ability, then I will retire gracefully defeated.

If that may be the case, and the choice of the people, knowing that I have at least served for nine years; it is taken for granted the election will be sometime within the next six months, maybe the coalition will stay together and that won't happen, but if it does happen, I can retire to - well, maybe I'm fortunate, I can retire to one of many places and not have to worry too much, at least I think, and I have often said to my friends, that I think any man who is successful in business or farming or any other endeavour, owes to his constituency or his district, a certain amount. Why was he successful, because the people dealt with him, and in my case, we operate quite a large business or businesses, should I say, that is well known. I have endeavoured to serve

Mr. CLEMENT (continued)

them. I have never been on the town council, I have never been on the school board, I entered this legislature some nine years ago as green as any member in this legislature ever entered it, and many of you remember the maiden speech I made in this legislature and -- there's a time and place for everything and I guess that wasn't the time or the place. You know, Donovan, if I didn't like you so much, I would.

Anyway, Sir, the constituency of Birtle-Russell is geographically situated to the extreme northeast central part of the province, bordered on the west by Saskatchewan, to the north by the Riding Mountain National Park. It is rather large in area; it is comprised of 11 town, villages, five large municipalities, plus a local Government district, or commonly known as an unorganized territory of two and a half townships.

As well, in the Birtle-Russell constituency, there are two Indian Reservations, one mainly the Wawasecappa Indian reservation. It is rather large one; it has two public schools, with a large residential and high school situated in the Town of Birtle. In recent years many miles of excellent built-up gravel road have been constructed, new homes for the Indians who live on that Reservation have been erected, and hundreds of acres of good farm land broken up. I would simply like, Sir, to congratulate Lyn MacKay, a good Indian name, and his counsellor, for the constructive and intelligent manner in which they have governed their Reservation.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the recent redistribution bill, it is common knowledge that the constituency boundaries have been altered considerably in most constituencies and I suggest, Sir, the one I represent is no exception. Two complete municipalities, namely Ellis municipality and Birtle municipality, were added to the old constituency. Several towns such as the town of Birtle, the villages of St. Lazare, Foxwarren and Solsgirth were also added.

The town of Birtle, Mr. Speaker, is one of the older towns in our province, particularly in the northwestern part. It is beautifully located in the Birdtail valley, a very busy centre serving quite a large area. Boasting, and rightly so, a beautiful park on the shores of a lovely artificial lake that has been made by damming the Birdtail River. It has several cottages, ideal picnic grounds, and all the necessary facilities for overnight guests and travellers, which was made possible this last summer by a generous grant from the Department of Public Works. It is one of the wayside parks that are becoming so familiar along our highways today. Birtle also boasts a beautiful nine hole golf course which is on the shores of this lovely lake, and it attracts many golfers for miles around, and I would suggest, Sir, under the careful guidance of His Worship Mayor Pratt, a man who is well known by the older members of this legislature, as he at one time represented the old Birtle constituency as a member of this legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier Birtle is ideally situated in the beautiful Birdtail Valley, at the junctions of Highway 83 and the old No. 4. It is, Sir, on this point that I respectively



Mr. CLEMENT (continued)

ask the Minister of Public Works to give serious consideration towards building up the old No. 4 highway from Birtle to Shoal Lake, and towards the standard, with a dust proof surface on the top. During the last election I was given a solemn pledge, by the then Minister of Public Works, that this work would be done. Up to now I have no reason to suggest that the present Minister of Public Works has altered any plans or any promises that were made by that Government and I would suggest that, or hopefully suggest, or ask that this road be rebuilt to the standard so desired in his program of 1959. I hope maybe, as he mentioned this afternoon, that certain projects of next year's program will be brought out, and I'm looking forward hopefully that this will be one of them. Well, I don't know if it will get out in the winter or not, as long as its out next summer and next winter, that's all the people desire, as long as its built. If the Honourable Minister thinks it shouldn't be built, then I'll ask the Honourable, the First Minister and I hope between the two of them that I can get something from them to the effect that it will be done in the not too distant future. I might point out, Sir, that it is of great importance to the town of Birtle, as it is commonly known, many of the mail routes today are---the mail is being distributed by trucks. His Majesty's mail truck already has bypassed Birtle, does not go in to Birtle, due to the fact that the new number highway bypasses to the north some six or seven miles, and the train service is not good in Birtle, and if we happen to have one of the old fashioned winters that everyone in this legislature has seen in his day, there is some doubt as to whether buses will be able to serve the town and that I do hope this highway will be built.

Now, while on the subject of highways, Sir, I feel I should report that at last, paving has started on the present No. 4 and 83 highways from Russell to Foxwarren. I have had many people come to me with criticism about the progress of this road, that I do not intend to bring forward tonight; rightly or wrongly, it seems unfortunate that due to previous commitments, the company who received the contract for hard-surfacing this road, has been held up by the Federal Government. However, be that as it may, they have now started, that was a week ago that I was last over the Highway, and I know that if this present weather, unseasonable weather continues, it is hoped that the majority of this road at least will be paved.

Now, Sir, while on this speech -- this subject of highways as well, I should report, or I am desirous of thanking the Honourable Minister; it's not all critical, I believe credit is due to those who were desirous. I do want to thank the Honourable, the Minister of Public Works or the Deputy, the Acting Minister of Public Works and his department, for fulfilling the former Government's pledge to make extensive excavating and repairing to the main streets of Rossburn. This is now nearly completed, and with a bituminous mat to be laid next Spring the town of Rossburn will have a main street to be proud of. Now the reason, Mr. Speaker, for mentioning this - and this is maybe getting a little personal but I think it is my one point for bringing it out.

Mr. CLEMENT (continued)

The editor of the local newspaper, the Rossburn Review, an excellent rural newspaper, felt he should make an issue of this project, and the taking over by the Government of the old highway, commonly known as the "Turkey Trail", the road from Erickson through to Sandy Lake, Oakburn, Rossburn, Angusville, Russell. Last summer, or last Spring he felt that he should make an issue of it and Sir, rightly or wrongly, whatever his reasons were, and many I know, and many who came to me, felt rightly or wrongly, that he had an ulterior motive. I, Sir, do not suggest he had any ulterior motive. Mr. Aylwin's responsibility to the little town---or the little---the town of Rossburn and district, in his dual capacity as a newspaper man and a town councillor, should, I suggest, be that they are, Sir, the same as mine, namely; to serve honestly, to serve faithfully, and in the interests of every citizen regardless of his or her political affiliation. I am sure he does, and as a private member of this legislature, I feel my record in that regard is clear.

If the time comes when members of the Birtle-Russell constituency think that I have been unfaithful or in any way detrimental to the progress or advance of that constituency, as I pointed out earlier on, that will be their choice. Undoubtedly, there will be another election before too long. If I am appointed or nominated as candidate, and if I am defeated, which, as I pointed out earlier on, Mr. Speaker, there is only nine members here with more than nine years seniority, anything can happen, and if that does happen, and I don't think it will, I shall resign or retire with the knowledge that I, in my own mind and my own heart, and after all that is what is important in politics as in any other public life, I will retire knowing that at least, to the best of my ability, I served that constituency. At any rate, Sir, I have no intention of raising the question any more, of who should receive the credit for this accomplishment. The important point, Sir, is this. The old Turkey Trail is now public highway #45. The main street of Rossburn has been repaired and will be hard-surfaced next Spring. To me that is what is most important. I am sure to constituents, the constituents of Rossburn, that is more important, and if the honourable individual, who made quite a point of this in his newspaper, is entitled to credit, may the credit go to him if he deserves. If he got the highway, or got the road fixed, was the reason for it, then I go along with him. Maybe we both deserve a little credit. I don't know, but the road is there and that is what's important. And, as far as I'm concerned, the book is closed and will not be reopened unless by some other person first.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, at this time I think, in fairness to some who criticized maybe, the way I voted the other night, I am not a Socialist. I think that every member in this legislature who knows me personally, knows that I am not a Socialist, but I am also a man who is prepared to go along with that there are good and bad in every party. There is good and bad across the way and there is good and bad here and there is also an element of good in what our friends here say. They are all elected members of this legislature, and if they weren't honest and sincere they wouldn't be elected, and if after getting elected, they are not honest and sincere, they won't remain elected very long. And so, Sir, as an

Mr. CLEMENT (continued)

individual who is a member from a very, very and I think one of the best agricultural areas in Manitoba, one that is famous for whatever branch of agriculture you want to speak about. If you want to speak about cattle, there are many names that are very familiar to anybody who is in the cattle business, such names as Dunn, Glaceman, Coulter, Whitticomb, and there are many more who are well known at the Brandon Winter Fair and at the Toronto Royal. They have made famous -- somebody says Clement, well, I don't say we're famous in the cattle business - we have cattle and we have farms and we have seed grain as well. I am not suggesting that I am patting myself on the back in that direction - that is not so but we do have men who are -- and well known in the seed grain business too, if we want to go into that, a fellow by the name of Joe Murray who is one of the most valued seed grain men in the Dominion of Canada, not only the Province of Manitoba. We have George McCrindle, the Graham brothers, and there are many more. That is not my intention to bring out all those names, because once you've started names why there's no ending in the constituency that I represent. There are many.

But, Sir, before leaving, not to get ahead of myself, there is one other point about highways that I do want to mention. One other request that I have from the Honourable Member, the Minister of Public Works. I know he is not trying to hide his face, he might be getting tired of listening to me, but be patient, I won't be long, Sir. I've listened to him make some marvellous speeches in my day, and they weren't all in this legislature.

MR. ROBLIN: Carry on! Carry on!

MR. CLEMENT: Thank you. I want to ask, if that is the word, in simple English I suppose it is. I feel that the continued paving of No. 4 and 83 highways from Foxwarren to Shoal Lake should be on next year's program. It is the last link, the final link, in the paving of No. 4 highway which starts on No. 1 west of Portage, straight through almost to the Saskatchewan boundary, and I would hope that he would see fit, to have this road hard-surfaced next year.

I want to say, Sir, and I could speak on for some considerable length of time about the cosmopolitan and I believe that is the word, constituency of Russell, Birtle-Russell. I could say much about the enterprising village of St. Lazare and its unique waterwork installation, installed with government assistance, or government loan, plus I might say the desire for this predominantly French-Canadian settlement, to have a liquor outlet, and I would respectfully ask the Honourable, the Attorney-General, that if this has been recommended, if it is recommended, that he give it consideration.

I could speak at length about Foxwarren and district of the work that has been done on the main street of Foxwarren, with assistance from the Department of Public Works. Much could be said about that farming district, it is a very important one, including the district of Solsgirth, which is to the east. Much could be said about the town of Russell, and that will come with

Mr. CLEMENT (continued)

time. But, one important point that I would and desire, to bring out about the town, or the district of Russell, Mr. Speaker, is that west of Russell, some 7 miles, is the site of the huge Russell dam, which has been suggested for years, this dam would build up a head of water and back it up for some fifty to sixty miles; it would create a huge reservoir of water that in time of drought would assure a supply of water for the larger centres and, Sir, in time of flood would serve as a safeguard. There is a Royal Commission that has been set up to investigate the benefit cost study of flood control. I suggest that if this dam was built and personally, I think it should be. I moved to Russell in 1936 and shortly after then surveyors made tests, and on and off, ever since then this locality has been checked over for the possibility of building a dam. I think it has been definitely agreed that such a dam could be built there. I think that it would create a terrific watershed which would be available for flood control right down the Assiniboine Valley, including to Winnipeg. It definitely would be an asset to the city of Brandon, both in time of flood and in time of drought. Likewise, to the city of Portage la Prairie, and I daresay to a lesser degree, to the metropolitan city of Winnipeg. It would be a great water reservoir as I mentioned, and last summer -- this past summer as is commonly known, it was very dry and along with my brother, we happen to have quite a large ranch in the Assiniboine Valley, which is south of this proposed site of this dam, and quite frankly it is inconceivable to point out the small trickle of water that went down that great river, the Assiniboine River, this summer. Why, you could walk across it with a pair of rubber boots, without any difficulty at all, in many localities. I suggest, with deference to the Honourable Minister from Minnedosa, when he pointed this afternoon about a dam to be built, I am not just sure where it was, transferring the water from there into the Boyne River. If he did that this summer the Assiniboine River would stop because there wasn't enough water from where I am to go over to the Boyne River, never mind keep the Assiniboine going. And, many years that might be true, but this year I think that grave concern, there was great concern in the city of Brandon, and in the city of Portage la Prairie, about the water supply in the Assiniboine River.

As far as Brandon is concerned, Manitoba Government, the Manitoba Power Commission have a very extensive hydro electric plant which is very dependent on water. Water from this dam would assure constant supply. It may be, in years to come, that irrigation may be a problem, particularly in the flat lands of the Assiniboine valley, and believe me, it does flatten out when you go south of Russell a few miles. But a dam of this size would be important, it would be of tremendous magnitude, and I am sure that it would benefit Manitoba as a whole, and standing here I am convinced that sooner or later some day that dam will take its place, and, I only hope that if it is within the power of the present Government to hasten it on, that it will take its place. Well now, that's enough about the dam. I do not intend to make any more of an issue of it, and I do not continue to say much more about the beautiful constituency of Birtle-Russell.

Mr. CLEMENT (continued)

Mr. Speaker, the---should I say, the members of the C.C.F. party, or the minority member of the Coalition Government will see to it that we are going to be here for some time, and undoubtedly I'll have an opportunity to say a few words about it again, within not too many months. There is evidence, and if the Honourable, the First Minister as he got up this afternoon, in his very bombastic speech of justice, that the opposition should force him to go back to the electorate. Quite frankly I would have no personal objection whatsoever, if he was successful in what he suggested. I am prepared at any time, and if I don't get elected as I pointed out before, I'll retire gracefully, knowing that I at least in my own opinion have done my share. But if he has convinced, and I don't think he should have made that speech this afternoon without, at least, the leader of the C.C.F. group in his seat. However, be that as it may, it wasn't his fault. If they do decide to come along with the official opposition, personally, I'll welcome you. The Honourable Member from Radisson, a personal friend, he is always agreeable. In fact, the other day he invited me to come into his caucus, after standing up here--- I guess I can't speak Ukrainian, so I guess I'll not attempt it but I could say a word or two, enough that would put you in your place.

There is evidence, Sir, that if we do go back to the electorate immediately, the Honourable First Minister must remember there are signs that the public thinking has been restored towards the Liberal party, and that the coattails of the Honourable John Diefenbaker are getting pretty short. In fact, he is somewhere on the other side of the world now, and I might suggest to the Honourable First Minister that he or any of his cabinet ministers propose a trip like that they should get it over with in a hurry, because they may have to pay for it, if they are here much longer.

Sir, what happened yesterday has passed. I---take me literally, Sir, I wasn't meaning to be rude. You're going to say 'I'm sure glad to hear that' --- You could be justified in taking, at least, a second honeymoon, Sir, the first one was very short.

MR. ROBLIN: I am going to stay right here where I'm needed.

MR. CLEMENT: I'm sure you will. Sir, what happened yesterday has passed. I have unbounded faith in our leader, the Honourable Member from Lakeside, and history will prove, as I pointed out earlier on, Mr. Speaker, and I know you to be a man of explicit honesty, and I know that you will agree that the Honourable, our leader, has a desire, a sincere desire, to serve the people of Manitoba faithfully, as he has done in 37 years and if he so desires, will do for another 37 years, if he lives that long.

I conclude my addresses, Sir, with these words; I have unbounded faith in the future of Canada, in the future of our Province of Manitoba, regardless of what Government is in power. May I suggest, Sir, achievement and prosperity go hand and hand. May we continue to have both. Thank you.

Mr. W. B. SCARTH, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, in

rising tonight to congratulate you on your recent election to office, I do not congratulate you as a matter of mere courtesy, but I congratulate you with the deep-rooted conviction that your inherent honesty and a sense of fair play will ever prevail in this House, and we all know on all sides of the house, that if an error is made, that it will be made with every honest intention.

In congratulating the Honourable, the Member from Roblin, and the Honourable, the member from St. Matthews on their very able addresses to the Speech from the Throne, I can earnestly say that everyone in this House, I believe, thoroughly enjoyed what was said and the praises received by all are only evident of the success of those addresses. I did notice that a great number of members who got up to congratulate the Rev. Dr. Martin, the member from St. Matthews, claimed a friendship to him of years; by that, I presume they intended to indicate to this House that they were regular church goers. Personally, I would have been more impressed if some of those gentlemen had filed an affidavit with the Clerk of the House setting out the last time they saw the inside of his church. How many? And, Sir, in congratulating the First Minister and his colleagues in the Cabinet, I wish to make just a little point; four new bills. That is when I say four new bills; four important bills have been brought into this House covering new territory and, I think, that every member of this House who has had any experience in drafting bills will realize the colossal amount of work entailed. Now, just let us dwell for one moment with that education bill. I don't know who all, I know that the Honourable, the Minister for Education must have had a great deal with it but, how that work could have been compiled with other work of the Cabinet and got together in this time, is amazing.

It is one thing to read the report of a Royal Commission. That can be done, but it is another thing, Sir, to frame a bill taking into consideration and providing for all of the contingencies which that report set out or suggests. Now, we know that in committee a number of amendments were suggested and the sum of them were, of course, very much to the point; were quite constructive. But, I would have one suggestion in connection with all of these four bills brought in which are covering new territory. There will be faults, there will be bugs in them and I do not care whether this House sat down for one month or six months, the whole House together could not frame a perfect bill. Therefore, we may be sure that unforeseen ground is not covered when those bills are finally brought down and, for this reason, I would suggest to all members of the House, that a latitude be given either to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or to the Minister concerned, to frame regulations from time to time or to bring into effect regulations from time to time, which are within the ambit and the spirit of this bill---of each bill concerned. And then after we see our mistakes, amendments can be brought in to cure legislative defects. I thank you, Mr. Speaker ---

MR. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of heartily congratulating you on accepting the great honour conferred upon you by this Assembly as Speaker of this House.

And with your experience, and I've noticed your patience, I think we have made a wise choice. I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will be patient and tolerant with the newly elect members until we have learnt the rules and regulations in parliamentary procedure. Meanwhile, we won't mind if you chide or reprimand the senior members so we can avoid their pitfalls. I want to compliment the mover and seconder on their final reply to the Speech from the Throne. I want to congratulate the First Minister in prevailing upon such a fine woman by power of persuasion to become his wife but he is not running true to form. For in the Old Testament, in the book of Deut. Chapter 24, Verse 5: "when a man has taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war, neither shall he be charged with any business but he shall be free at home one year and shall cheer up his wife which he hath taken" . . . Now, the leader of the Opposition ---

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a request that that piece of information does not get in the paper! Thank you.

MR. REID: Now the Leader of the Opposition has been in Provincial public office so long that he is known as "Mr. Manitoba" but being a true politician it is his moral and physical obligation to contest every election until the polls say otherwise. Then, he can honourably and graciously retire from politics. I won't elaborate on the honourable member who is the Leader, who is our leader as he is quite capable of doing that himself and I am sorry that he is ill tonight and not here to be able to defend for himself. Nor elaborate on the platform of our party which has been put before this House on many occasions. But this, I must say, Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member chose his vocation, he picked that of the Ministry dedicating himself to save and serve humanity and we were most fortunate when he joined the C.C.F. party because now he, as Leader of said party, has the opportunity to save and serve humanity to the utmost.

It is indeed a great privilege and honour for me to be here tonight and I very humbly and gratefully thank the people of the newly formed constituent of Kildonan in electing me as the first representative of that area and it is one of the greatest honours that the citizens of any area can bestow on one of their own: that of electing one to represent them here in this local legislature. And I shall endeavour to uphold that great tradition with dignity and honour by attending regularly, being attentive to proceedings of this House and abiding by the rules and regulations set forth by the Honourable, Mr. Speaker, and assist sitting members in fulfilling their duties and responsibilities whether it just pertains to their respective areas or Manitoba as a whole, providing it will be beneficial to them and not controversial or contentious to other areas during this special Session.

Now many of you have travelled or visited Kildonan constituency and know what an enterprising community we have. I have lived there all my life and I've seen it practically grown from a village to one of the finest metropolitan areas in the North American Continent. Last year, my colleague, the Honourable Member for Radisson, had the privilege of proposing a bill which made us the youngest city in Manitoba but what we lack in quantity,

Mr. REID (continued)

we make up in quality. Because in area we're not much larger than five square miles. It has taken in the present three wards of our sister Municipality, North Kildonan but as far as our mutual relations is concerned, no boundary exists. The layout of our residential area is unsurpassed anywhere. I have travelled in Canada and the States and seen none that can compare. Our school district is one of the finest and most efficient; not only in Manitoba but in Canada. We have attracted to our teaching staff some of the finest in the profession and by the result we have shown, pupils have graduated with marks and honours that were unbelievable. This, Mr. Speaker, is due to our civic administration which has been studied by our Federal Government through the office of our Secretary, Mr. P.F.G. Byers, acting at times in advisory and consulting capacities not only to Canadian and American municipal men but European and Asiatic as well. This he accomplishes by having an efficient staff and by his love and understanding of municipal affairs.

In public office we have been very fortunate in having officials civic---having officials---pardon me--In public office we have been very fortunate in having available citizens of high calibre and ability who had the foresight and guidance from civic officials to engage and develop this district. The only sites we have available now are desirable industrial areas to be completely serviced by all utilities and all this at a nominal cost. Recreation; we have one of the finest golf courses in Canada. Eighteen holes, designed by the famous Norm Wood. Parks, community clubs. St. Boniface has been known as the City of Cathedrals but when the building, the present program of building churches is complete in Kildonan constituency we will run them a close second.

This may all sound like an Utopia to the honourable members but it must be seen to be appreciated, and I'm at liberty to show you, to take you any place in Kildonan. So, I hope some of you accept my invitation. Up to the present time, Mr. Speaker, my observation of the House in Session, is that similar to a boxing match where both parties are sparring and waiting for an opening to knock the other fellow out. The C.C.F. are in the unpopular position of being a referee. But, I firmly believe, Sir, that personal animosities and self-importance should be left at the portals of this chamber when we enter. And, no one member is more important than the other but he is a symbol of his constituency in which we represents 20,000 people - urban: and 14,000 rural, and they are the ones that are important. To that cause, one and all must dedicate themselves.

I shall endeavor briefly, Mr. Speaker, to put before the Session here but -- likely at the regular session, a few points of fact which I figure would benefit Manitoba as a whole. Many members have heard here before but the old saying is - repetition If you repeat a thing often enough, you believe it yourself. And, I hope I don't have to wait 18 years as my colleague, the Honourable Member for Inkster but his patience will be rewarded by a bill from the Government on improved assistance to old age pensioners and also approved widow's allowance.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment to the Election



Mr. REID (continued)

Act; to permit anyone to advance, to vote at the advance polls, providing they will be absent on the election date. At the present time, the only people who can vote at advance polls are those that are absent on business and many districts they have an advance poll and regardless of whether one person votes or 1,000, I believe the cost is fixed.

Another point, Mr. Chairman, I've noticed and I've had quite a few complaints on it myself, I've heard people talk to me, an amendment to Highway Act, Section 55, Sub-section (3) Phrase (4), which states: "any person driving a motor vehicle 15 miles an hour through playgrounds, rinks, school areas, etc." Now, under the present set up a Magistrate has no recourse but marks the offence on the driver's license, regardless of circumstances. In many instances, a man may be just going through an area at 18 miles an hour without thinking and the offence is marked down on his license and the Magistrate has no other alternative but to do so.

What I think is one of the most important issues, Mr. Speaker, at the present time are minimum wage act. We've heard it repeated here many times; at 58 cents for women and at 60 cents for men. And how in the world we expect a family to exist on same especially with the high cost of living is beyond me. Also, many employers evade this issue by putting their employees on weekly and monthly basis and then working them in excess of arranged hours; thus the hourly rate is even below the present minimum rate and I sincerely agree with our Leader that the minimum rate should definitely be at least \$1.00 per hour. Even at that rate, you would have quite a problem in making ends meet because I am a working man myself and have many friends in the same category. The average man or woman who works for wages and not living off a business or investment just manages to get by these days.

Provincial school grants; we've heard many debates and, of course, I think right now we have something coming up on it, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, should definitely be increased by a higher percentage. This could be easily implemented by increased taxation on mineral rights, oil concessions, pulp or any of our other natural resources which are utilized by corporations or individuals but whose share of taxes is not equivalent to the average citizen. And, I believe, some other method of financing our school districts should be established: thus those most able to pay would contribute the largest share and would leave the low income personnel, old age pensioners, residents with fixed income and we would all face a lower real estate taxes.

Another hardship the working people must contend with is certain clause of Compensation Act. The Act states you must have an injury by accident if any claim is to be entertained. Now many cases are difficult to prove so. So I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that as long as an employee is injured at his place of employment, regardless of cause, it should be sufficient enough and the words "by accident" should definitely be deleted from the Compensation Act.

Another question we have heard quite often is this, some of the members I've heard have lack--in water and others recently,

we've had too much. The matter of land erosion caused by water. And, I believe, that areas that are built up that river banks of said areas should actually have a proper retaining wall constructed. This would be a good project for the Government to follow this winter to relieve unemployment and also save many valuable buildings. But new areas which have rivers or streams running through them, I definitely believe the local authorities should not encourage building on said site for in the near future they will have a similar problem.

Now, many honourable members have witnessed the terrific traffic jams we had last week due to the closing of Provencher Bridge which I believe put thirty-three percent more traffic on the other three river crossings. And I think the Government should consider the feasibility of the railroad bridges in an area West Kildonan - North Kildonan as being converted to a one-way bridge alternately controlled by lights to relieve pressure on existing bridges or, in a matter of emergencies. And I was hoping, Mr. Speaker, that in the regular Session the Minister, the Honourable Minister of Public Works might bring in a program of a bridge building program in for the Greater Winnipeg area.

Now the question of natural gas, Mr. Speaker. The honourable members of this House know our policy on same but I definitely believe that our Government as administrator in theory, through the Natural Gas Commission, should insist at the present time that the gas company extend it's mains to serve all areas. I understand that for the current year they intend to curtail this by about 85% which would mean that in the near future, they would apply to the Utility Board for a raise in rates above the present, due to the lack of sufficient consumers. But, the company could encourage new customers if it gave a guarantee that the present rate would be set for at least five years. I believe many people would convert that hold on rate for others which depends entirely on company management. But I definitely believe that expropriation eventually will be the only solution. Thus natural gas would be put on similar basis as other utilities which are publicly owned.

There's another small point, Mr. Speaker, the amendment to Municipal Act to permit municipalities or cities who so desire, to put a referendum -- to put to a referendum a by-law for recreational purpose when required.

Mr. Speaker, all those remarks and challenges that have been hurled across the floor by both parties, to my mind, are just a high pressure publicity scheme, to appeal and attract the public. But they are not that gullible, and can see through it all, and they know what happened when one party had too large a majority, or if one stays in power too long. Now the Liberal party reminds me of a cat, that just swallowed a bird, and is comfortably relaxed - digesting its meal. They have been comfortably relaxed for a long time as the Government of this Province, leisurely digesting the needs of the people, but naturally in that position, do nothing about it. Now the Conservatives, have been sleeping so long, like Rio Van Winkle, and they are still dormant.

MR. CAMPBELL: Hear! Hear!

MR. REID: Now--now the sudden burst of enthusiasm on both sides, the first time it has happened to either one of them, and they can't understand it, but its easy to explain - there stands the C.C.F. in the centre, with a sharp prong in each hand, prodding the Liberals to keep them awake, and strong jabs at the Conservatives to wake them up, so we can pass some legislation that the people of Manitoba have waited for, a long time. And then the public will realize that there stands the C.C.F., the party of action, who are getting things done, and at the same time carrying the other two parties along. Thank you very much.

MR. J. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you on your high position, on the election to your high position, and as much as I know of you, I'm sure that you'll discharge your duties to your best ability and impartially.

I wish to congratulate also, the Leader of the House, the Premier, on attaining his life's ambition, to.....I suppose, congratulations are in order also on his changing his marital standing and joining so many of us happy men. Not so long ago, I heard the Premier stating that if he would have known how happy or how nice it is to be married, he would have done so many years back.

I would also like to congratulate the mover, and the speaker of the Speech from the Throne. I am not an old-timer here, I'm comparatively a newcomer. Last winter, or this past spring, I had the honour of sitting in my first Session, and last--at the opening of the Session, I had the honour of seconding the Speech from the Throne. I know it's a great honour, for the constituency, for the people who live in the constituency, and I'm sure that the two honourable members, the mover and the seconder of the Speech feel likewise about that.

We have heard quite a few maiden speeches in here, and I wish to congratulate all those members, I know it is quite a task to get up for the first time and speak to all these intelligent gentlemen in here, and you have a kind of feeling that you may say something that isn't quite right. I was quite interested in a number of these speeches, from the younger ones and the older ones too. One that impressed me most was the speech made by the Honourable Member from Carillon. There was comment made on that before, I've heard several speeches last year, and before I had the honour to represent Emerson constituency, I used to sit up in the balcony, in the gallery there, and I listened to quite a few speeches, but I must say that was the best speech that I have ever heard.

Of course, the Honourable, the Premier made a speech that was quite impressive today too, but I don't think we noticed that so much, because I think, being a Premier is quite a responsibility, and a man in that position, should be expected to make a very good showing. But, that speech impressed me quite a bit. I do not agree with everything that the Honourable Premier had to say, naturally I wouldn't, but there was subject for thought there.

Now, a few of the other younger members, especially our young expert on negligees, I understand he's the youngest member here - about 22 years, and not married, I just wonder where he got to know--where he got the experience on the negligees so far.

Other members that I really enjoyed to listen to, just not so long ago, the member from Birtle-Russell, some of us like to say that not so many days ago, he was a socialist. Oh, he expressed himself pretty well, and I do not think that the honourable member is a socialist.

I also liked those speeches made by the honourable member from, now, what's the name again? Oh, Radisson! The honourable member from Radisson, a very likeable chap, and what I like about him and some of the other members, that when they get up to speak here, even if they criticize, and criticize harshly, they haven't got the venomous tongue -- take the honourable member from Carillon, he

MR. TANCHAK (Continued)

criticized different parties, but that criticism was given with a smile, it wasn't venomous. And somehow, a speech that is delivered with venom, and animosity, and kind of shows hatred, I do not think that that is in place in this House. Maybe I'm wrong, as I said I'm a new member, I don't think that's good statesmanship. I think it's a place where we should debate and criticize the opposition. Maybe I wouldn't agree with the Honourable Member from Carillon entirely, what was said last night. Maybe it is the duty of the Opposition to overthrow the Government and become the Government. It may be that that is the duty. I feel that it is our duty to oppose the Government, if we think that the Government is not taking the right steps.

It was mentioned before by the Premier of the House, that we have the choice of not supporting, or voting the Government down. But if I notice, in the Speech---copied Speech from the Throne, it says that "you have been summoned on this occasion to consider proposals dealing with certain, specific matters," and as far as I see, I think these specific matters--it looks that way, that they were deliberately chosen, so, and placed before us, so that we couldn't support them, and still be honest to the people that we represent. We couldn't object to them, I mean, I'm sorry. We couldn't object to them with a conscience, because most of these - they were specific ones - most of these are bills for projects that the people do desire. But, I think, that we have a perfect right to bring in amendments, an amendment that was brought by the Honourable, the Leader of the Opposition, I think was quite in order. Because, if we take up--pick up some of the pamphlets that were distributed in the Spring - here is one, it says the next step forward is the Roblin Government. That has been realized, we don't quarrel with that. That is the Roblin Government. But, I notice here, and I have it underlined; there is a promise, "the Campbell Government has abandoned Manitoba farmers to the pressure of the cost price squeeze," and that's the first sentence on agriculture, so evidently that was the most important one. Well, what did the present Government do? They have done exactly the same thing. Doesn't this pamphlet infer that the new government, if elected, is not going to abandon the farmer to this cost price squeeze. Sure it does, the facts say that "you didn't do it, you should have, that means I am going to do it." And still, in the Speech from the Throne, nothing was mentioned about it. Truly, the Honourable the Leader of the House says that "why should we say that you should do it, when you were in office you said it was a federal affair." Yes, it is a federal affair, but maybe they could help make some suggestions. And if this was a Special Session to deal with emergencies, why, at least suggest -- suggest this, suggest to Ottawa government or ask for suggestions. I don't think we are wrong in criticizing the Government. Today, sitting in the committee, there was a suggestion made by one of the honourable members that this bill on education was too hastily prepared. Maybe it was - prepared. I think it was too hastily prepared.....and that's no reflection on the Honourable Minister. I'm sure that the Honourable Minister did the best he could, but the time was short. It's only a few months since that bill was--that interim report came out, that

MR. TANCHAK (Continued)

was presented to the public, and there wasn't really enough time to do it.

The honourable member suggested that this bill should be shelved. What happens, there was a remark, I should say a cocky remark, throw us out, I don't know who did it. Throw us out. Well, I don't think that is the right attitude. Why, if all of us sit in that committee and there is several suggestions that says maybe 16 or 20 says that it was too hastily prepared. Why couldn't the government take that into consideration and withdraw the bill maybe, shelve it..... The Honourable Member from across there just a few minutes ago stated that we will never have perfect bills. But it is true then, the longer we study them the closer they'll come to perfection. So I suggest that this bill on education there wasn't enough time to scrutinize it very carefully. I still have no quarrel, I agree that we should pass this bill through. We have done it in second reading and I think it will be fine legislation but I still think the suggestion made by that honourable member - I am speaking in defence of him - was quite in order, and I do not think that that remark was of a very fair one, he says throw us out, just because a certain member makes a remark that it probably could be shelved.

I think all of us that's why we're sitting here, no one man has all the brains - there are over 50 of us here and probably every one of us has a certain good suggestion to make. Why not listen? We didn't come here to quarrel, I don't imagine. We came here to legislate good laws for our people, and not to sit here and jeer at others and quarrel and see how badly we can hurt them, one on the opposite side. Maybe it isn't for me, I always felt, still feel that I am a young member for me to try to tell these older members, the veterans, the politicians that have been here for 5, 6, up to 9 or 10 years or more, what to do but it is just an observation that I make as a newcomer and it isn't my intention to hurt anybody in here, it is just my views.

As I said before, I had the honour of sitting in the session last spring. It was a full House, the same as we have this session --this special session. There is only one remark I would like to make. Last year we had the good old Liberal Party, and the Conservative Party. I am not going to pass judgment good or old about the Conservative Party. Every party has some good and some bad in it and we had the C.C.F. and we had a Social Credit and we had the Independent, and we even had one Communist, Labour Progressive. And this year it seems to me that there is only two parties, one, the good old Liberal and the other, the Conservative Party. What has happened to the C.C.F.? We just don't actually see them. I wonder why does the ostrich stick his head in the sand? As I mentioned before, I am sitting on this side, last year I was sitting with the government, this year I am sitting with the opposition. I think I had the honour last year of representing the government, this year I am having the experience, good experience sitting in the Opposition and I am enjoying it. Who knows, and I believe that after the next election, and whenever it comes, we don't know, I will be sitting probably, I'm almost sure, sitting on the other side again. We have a Leader -

MR. TANCHAK (Continued)

the Leader of our party in whom we have faith and with no slur on anybody I do not think that in the future, that's my feelings, in the future---in the past we've had as good a Premier in the past as we had the last few years in the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and I do not believe that in the future anybody will surpass our great leader. Therefore, I believe that we'll be back on the other side pretty soon.

There was a suggestion made just now, kind of a whisper, and it says "Yeh, if you come to our side." I don't know what that suggestion is - probably they feel that maybe I am going to change colors -- no, that's not what I meant - I meant that the Party-- I don't believe in that changing colors. I am not an animal - the weasel changes colors - brown and then changes to white in the winter; the rabbit does that, too, but Gee Whiz! I wouldn't dare. No, I don't like carrots, is right and it's true, I don't like some of his angles, I don't like it.

Now, let's--I think I am rambling a little too much, Mr. Speaker, I hope you don't ask me to sit down. I didn't intend to say that much -- I intended to be short - only about five minutes but--and something else that comes to my mind. I read an interesting article and in lieu of all these promises of the Conservative Party, and I hope they fulfil them, because it will be good for the people, and I'll give them credit--I'll be the first one to give them credit - I'll have no quarrel with them. There is quite a slate of all these promises here and they're all good - very good. The Diefenbaker Government did the same thing - the Diefenbaker party before the first election, and then what happened -- in the second election, they were lucky to win the election. And that's quite simple - I think, and maybe I'm wrong in my thinking.

In the past few years under the good leadership of the Liberal Government in both the Province and in the Federal the economy of Canada was buoyant, the people got used to spending a lot of money - buying things and they did exactly the same thing as the Government is doing now. And I think these two leaders, we have to give them credit, took advantage of that - they could see what the trend is and they understand human nature. There was plenty of money - money was abundant. People are buying things right and left, they're buying on credit, on instalments - pay later, pay later - that's exactly what the two Governments are--I'm not too sure, I'm not accusing the present Government because the budget isn't.. ..we'll see when the budget comes out. But we know the Ottawa Government did that. What are they doing? They are exactly doing the same thing as the people in the past few years did. They buy on instalment with the hope that sometime in the future, they'll be able to pay. That was the feeling of the people and if you promise the people a lot of money and scatter money right and left those are the things the people want and they're used to that because they have been living quite highly in the past few years and as I say, under the Liberal Government in the past. So now, the Conservative Party took advantage of that. They understand human nature and you've got to give credit to the man who can do it and naturally they follow the same trend -- promise the people a lot of money, spend a lot of money like the people want but someday

MR. TANCHAK (Continued)

there'll come a time that the money has to be paid up. It's fine and dandy to budget for deficit for one year, two years, three years, four. What will happen? We have to pay the interest and it's just like throwing interest on the world or it's just like throwing that money into the river.

We know not so long ago that in the Province of Manitoba, about a third of the Provincial revenue went into paying up the interest alone - one third, and what does that bring to Manitoba? Nothing and that's probably the same thing may happen in Ottawa - the same thing exactly - there comes a time when they cannot have deficit budgetting. They'll have to pay it up - it's not going to last forever. So the people will start asking questions then. But what I was referring to was an interesting article in the Carillon News and that was the honourable M.P., Mr. Jorgenson, at a meeting at LaBroquerie - it was this last week - the farmer's called a meeting and there was about 75 of them present and they called the meeting with the intentions of making the sparks fly and they were mixed - they were not Liberal all Liberal or all Conservatives - mixed - just farmers from La Broquerie. They were dissatisfied with the farm policies of the Ottawa Government and when Mr. Jorgensen came there - they didn't make the sparks fly. He is an eloquent speaker - I like the gentleman very much. He is a very nice gentleman, but what did he say - this is the main point of his speech - the theme. He says, it looks different from the towers of Ottawa - the situation looks different from the towers of Ottawa than when I was a farmer. From the lofty towers of Ottawa it looks different to when you're a farmer - when you're a small man. I wonder who convinced him that. He was very convincing during the election campaign but we went there, he was convinced otherwise and what did he say at the meeting? He says that the Federal Government is not--shelved the idea of farm credit - not forever, mind you, it's in Carillon News, there's a story, I meant to bring it but I didn't, in there. And when he was--was asked about another question - deficiency payments - what did Mr. Jorgenson say - they are not practical; deficiency payments are not practical. I am not going to say that Diefenbaker promised to pay these payments - deficiency payments but the people understood that he did -- they understood that he was going to do something about it--on deficiency payments. But now Mr. Jorgenson says it isn't practical. It would be quite possible to subsidize farm products or products used by your own people or for home consumption. But nothing that goes.....They are quite right but didn't they know it before the election? So why promise that to the people as they did.

Those are some of the remarks. The only reason I am doing this is to say that I hope that the present Government does not renege on it's promises like Ottawa did. I hope and I'm willing to help and do all I can to help the present Government - maybe I can, too, maybe they wouldn't want my help but I am willing to help and see that the present Government fulfils all its promises and not the same as Ottawa. Not go back to the people in a few months and say from the Golden Boy in Winnipeg the situation looked different than when I was right here, when I was a little fellow. No, I hope that the Government fulfils all those promises



MR. TANCHAK (Continued)

and there's quite a lot of promises here so I still say that we had perfect right to amend this Throne Speech because we can voice our--our dissatisfaction with that, probably, or the Government should have probably done more and what bad did it do? It didn't do any harm. At least it brought the Ministers out to explain here and they did explain and I give them credit for that - that they do intend to implement these other things later on in the next Session, and I hope they're right. But at least we had the explanation to that and I don't see anything wrong in bringing about an amendment to the Throne Speech. I suppose the C.C.F. could have voted with us and the Government would have been defeated and we would have had an election. They didn't see fit to overthrow. Maybe -- I'm not getting at you, in your hair, honourable member, I was just going to say something nice about you but I think I should change my mind now. No, well then I'll say it. Maybe partly they are justified and some of us members are justified too, because they're quite - not only are the Liberals out in the country but I have spoken to quite a few Conservatives and there's one thing that they don't like and some C.C.F. and Conservative and Liberal and they all say, Gee Whiz, whatever you do fellows, don't have another election this year. We're sick of them. So maybe this is partly justified - maybe I'll get it in the neck for this from some of the members here but I'm just expressing my views and it doesn't necessarily have to be the views of the rest of the colleagues here. It's my own.

Now, I should come back to the speech from the Throne. I did mention that there was specific matters here and only the goodies were brought up which we could not conscientiously oppose and say they are no good. And we didn't say they were no good, we said we'd support all of them. Take for instance, the bill--the bill on education. We supported the principle of it but as I stated before, I did not think that the bill was--all the different clauses were really really mulled over and it could have been studied more closely. Evidence of that is what? In those last few days since the bill was presented to us--was printed and placed on our desks and inside of four days, the Government comes in itself with a whole lot of amendments that we have to put in. So in four days they found amendments - four days they found something wrong with them, what if we give it another four days -- there will still be more. We will give it another month, another four months, there'll be more amendments so that itself proves that the bill isn't quite ready to be presented. But we'll have--we'll need something like that, another suggestion given by other representatives in Committee today - some of them weren't too happy with it and some of them were of the same opinion it was too hastily prepared and some just outright didn't like it and I know out in the country the people are confused. For instance we have right in my own constituency, right in my own village, we started building a brand new high school just three weeks ago. Hired carpenters here from the city and it's about half completed - a high school that's going to cost over \$50,000.00 and it's a four room school - two elementary rooms and two high school rooms. Now, what is going to happen to that? They are all asking those

MR. TANCHAK (Continued)

questions. I'm not asking but the people....what's going to happen. We're spending \$50,000.00 now. Now if this other thing comes in and it seems to be a good thing and we can't stay out of it because if we stay out of it, we won't get the grants and the whole thing is confused - they are all confused. I did advise those people in the Spring. They come up to me and they asked me, they said Jim what do you think of it? I told them what I think of it. I think you should wait a year. Immediately they jump up - same two fellows - he was sitting up here not so long ago last week, happened to be one of the trustees. He says, "you have no children and you don't care for a High School - your children are through." Okay I said, I'll go along with you but I advise you to wait a year and wait till that report is made public and then see what you'll do. Wait a year - Emerson took that suggestion - they were going to build a high school in the town of Emerson but they took that suggestion and they waited but Ridgeville didn't. Probably got nobody to blame but themselves but they are wondering, these people, what's going to happen then. Of course today or tomorrow or next year, some people would have been caught anyway because the world doesn't stand still.

There was a suggestion made before. Why didn't the Liberals do it when they were in power? Why didn't they bring in this legislation when they were in power. Well, I could ask the same question. Why didn't the Honourable the Premier, get married ten years ago or 20 years ago? You know the world keeps on going - - they, probably 20 years ago there was no necessity for a farm credit bill. I don't say - I don't think I'll continue the comparison anymore. But now there is a necessity for a farm credit bill. It was necessary to implement it, times have changed and we need it. So we can't accuse the past Government that they didn't do it ten years ago. Maybe you can accuse them of not doing it last year or the year before last - they didn't do it. Ottawa isn't willing to do it even now because according to Mr. Jorgenson he says its been shelved for a year. Probably if the Liberal Government was in power right now, they'd have done it. Some of you say we just procrastinate but you have no proof of that. You can't definitely swear that they'd do it, that they wouldn't have done it.

This report - - interim report, Royal Commission on education. It's a Liberal baby. The Liberals organized that commission and now the report is before us - just the interim report. The Conservative party promised last Spring just before the election - they promised to increase educational grants by 50%. It might have been quite difficult to do it - I don't see why they didn't do it. I don't know, - that was a promise and it should have been kept. In some places maybe it wasn't possible because I know in fact a few districts that have been financed 80% by the Government and if you increase it by 50% those people when they heard that and knew what the finances of the school were, look at it - what's wrong? Something is silly here. We've got 80%, it's just a few districts that were very poor, and the Government is going to increase the grant by 50% they are going to give us 120% - we'll have money for ice-cream on top of that. But the Government probably, the Conservative Party or the

MR. TANCHAK (Continued)

Government, had a pretty rough time trying to implement it's 50% grant increase - I suppose certain parts of Manitoba would have really been getting something for nothing so along comes the interim report and here they jumped at that and took it and that was a life saver, I say. In my opinion it is. I see the Honourable the Premier, doesn't think so but I think, I think that that saved their life - the interim report because now they can say they're following the interim report and if there is anything that's wrong, 'we are not to blame for it, that was the report of the Commission and we just followed it'. Maybe the Liberals would have done it. They did that with the Bracken report - followed it to the letter. Maybe they would have - - and I'm not saying the present Government shouldn't do it. I hope they do. I think the report is good myself in principle but there are many different ways of implement it, I suppose.

Now, I don't think I should say too much more on education but the next one and I'll read it from here, "The Government intends to initiate a vigorous industrial and tourist development program which will benefit all sections of the Province. I have no quarrel with that, I think it's a good thing. All I can say is I hope that some towns and villages in my constituency will merit this - this what shall I say, money or this - merit consideration of the Government. We have towns like Emerson, Dominion City, Vita, Sprague, larger towns in which industry could flourish and I hope that they take advantage of it. I have no quarrel with it. I think it is a good bill and I don't think any of our members had anything too much to say against it. Now, the next one. We also have, I should say, quite a few tourist attractions in our constituency and I hope that the government sees fit to improve them.

Now, the next one is unemployment. "My government views with deep concern the seasonal unemployment." Last year there was an unemployment program. I do not say that this legislation is necessary but it seems to me that it kind of follows almost on the same lines. It was a fairly good program. Most of these works were touched upon. The Federal Government helped 50% in some cases in forest areas but I agree with the Honourable the Premier, that this is a better one. Well, it's not quite the same but there was an unemployment program. It wasn't legislated but there was a certain program for unemployment. We read it in the papers - - with the help of Ottawa but I think I agree with the Government of the Honourable Minister that this covers more fields than that, and I have no quarrel with that and I hope that the Government through this will see fit and I have a few suggestions for Emerson constituency for winter unemployment, probably there is nothing new but I am just making them for what they are worth. I've been asked to give a few suggestions. I know there's quite a few here. There is clearing and brushing of the Sprague to Middleboro road. That's the old road not the new one - it's the old road between Sprague and Middleboro. They will have to use it this winter and any, I suppose the Honourable Minister of Public Works has been through there and the Honourable Minister of Mines & Natural Resources. I know he was

MR TANCHAK (Continued)

through there and he could see those poplars on both sides of the road and it is nothing but a snow trap in the winter, so that would be a good project.

Then, another one, maybe, the proposed Mississippi Parkway, if the location is already agreed upon, maybe that could be cleared and there was a suggested road from Lake of the Woods somewhere towards Moose Lake, maybe that could be undertaken during the winter. And there are many drainages suggested in the area - probably some of that could be cleared this winter and in tourist camp sites fire breaks could be made during the winter quite easily in the forests, trimming of forests.

Now, there is another project, the people at Badger have been requesting a telephone line for quite some time and haven't got it and I think it would be a good project for the winter time providing that the winter is not too severe. The telephone line to Badger - I think it is quite necessary that those people should have it. The hydro, the people from Moose Lake and around Moose Lake have asked for hydro extension. I think it could be done in the wintertime.. There's another one, the bridge at Stuartburn on the Morden-Sprague is an old rattletrap and it's time it was replaced. Maybe some of this work could be undertaken during the wintertime and to relieve the unemployment situation. I would be willing to help wherever I can in this respect.

Now as far as farm credit - that's the next one on the Speech from the Throne. I don't think I'll have to say too much unless I go back to the interest figure and I don't think Mr. Speaker likes that too much but - - my time up?

MR. SPEAKER: You have five minutes, yet.

MR. TANCHAK: Five minutes, thank you! All I can say that I still say and I still think one of the members from the opposite side said it is our duty to also - to see that the interest rates are low. He didn't like the interest rates that are being charged by some of these big - or some of these installment companies, 20% and up. And I agree that we should - it is our duty to see that the farmer gets as low an interest as possible. Even the First Minister, not the First Minister, I'm sorry, I think it's the Minister of Agriculture if I am right, did suggest that one of the reasons that 6% interest was written in was, and not at 5% interest, one of the reasons - that wasn't the only - but one of them just so that we would not be in competition with the other plan from Ottawa so that there is an implication that the 5% interest would have been - they could have worked on the 5% if that's one of the reasons why we didn't have the 5%. We had to put 6% in because we didn't want to compete with Ottawa - that's only one of the reasons.

Now the next one comes, Adding additional monies for road construction. I go along with that. The Government this year, has done quite a bit in my constituency and I wish to thank the Minister responsible for it, the Honourable Minister of Public Works. I've always respected and liked the gentleman and even

MR. TANCHAK (Continued)

now when he comes and criticizes us, I enjoy it because he still does it with a smile and it doesn't hurt so much when you are being criticized even if you don't deserve it, if it's done with a smile. And I wish to thank, the people have asked me to thank the Minister for the work that has been done on the Morden-Sprague, on the 59. There is quite a bit of it done this year. I know last year - last year when I did say that we had a million and a quarter to spend in the Emerson constituency, one of the Ministers, I'm not going to say he's one of the present ministers now, did state that I was the only one that knew about it, and the Minister of Public Works didn't know that there was that much money to be spent. But these are some of the things that the people they have asked me to thank the Government for doing what there was and there was quite a bit done - the only thing that was neglected this year I think is the drainage in places like ....., Zhoda, around Stuartburn and Rosa on the Rat River - not those were, but others were - there was quite a bit of work. I'll have to hurry now because I guess I've only got about three minutes. Completion of the Morden, Sprague to Piney - - the people are asking for that and the black surfacing of Piney to South Junction and the J4 road between Gardenton and Tolstoi. The Grunthal milk route right through Rosa, ....., Woodmore down to the two miles, two and a half miles from the 75 to the Red River. That piece is really a continuation of the Morden-Sprague, from the No. 75 there. Then the access roads. There is also a section of Highway from Letellier to Altona that they are asking. Now, access roads. One of the honourable members sitting opposite now, at St. Jean meeting deplored the fact that St. Jean, a fast growing town like St. Jean, and he says it's a crime that this town hasn't got a proper access road. At St. Jean, one of the members sitting across now. Well, all I can say is it's still a crime because it hasn't been done. I'm not saying that the Government could do it all in four months like I say but I hope that it's done. Well, that's not the only place that needs access roads. The only one that is lucky this time is Vassar. Vassar had an access road built two years ago from the north-easterly direction and this year, they had another access road - they are very lucky and I wish to thank the Government for building another road this year - they have two access roads now to Vassar. But there are other towns - Letellier, St. Jean, Emerson, Ridgeville, Arnaud, Carlowrie, ....., Gardenton, ....., South Junction and Sprague that haven't got access roads, and I think - I think that the Government should take care of these towns and build access roads to everyone. They deserve it. They all deserve it and I intend to press this most vigourously to have access roads built to every town, because in my constituency they did say that. They said if you give us - we'll build the Morden-Sprague in one year. I don't say that the officials sitting opposite said that but it was part of the party program, build it in one year - the Morden-Sprague completely and the 59 in one year and every town should have an access road. Well, let's do it - not only in my constituency, let's do it all over Manitoba. I think it would be a wonderful project to build access roads to all these little

MR. TANCHAK (Continued)

towns. I do not say that the Government has to take them but I say to - to maybe study the advisability of it but I'm not making it in the form of a condition.

Now, I could say more about dry water but I'll end my speech now by saying that I wish to thank all the people of my constituency who voted for me this last time and who placed the confidence in me and I especially wish to thank those of the new part of my constituency across the Red River who didn't know me too well but supported me in this election. I wish to thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Emerson, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. ROBLIN: The Honourable Member for Inkster is not here. He sent me a note to the effect that he was not feeling well, and asked for the indulgence of the House in having this particular motion stand until tomorrow, and I thought I was right to give him the assurance that that could be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone) I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that whereas the Riding Mountain Whitemud River Watershed Committee was organized in 1956, and whereas the watershed area encompasses approximately 1,635,000 acres, and whereas they now desire to incorporate and establish watershed boundaries, and whereas legislation was passed on April 10th, 1958 granting the authority for the establishment of watershed authorities and the setting up of an overall watershed and soil conservation commission; therefore be it resolved, that the Government give consideration to the desirability of taking immediate action in appointing the commission under the act, and the incorporation of the Riding Mountain Whitemud Watershed.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, whereas the Riding Mountain Whitemud River Watershed Committee was organized in 1956, and whereas the watershed area encompasses approximately 1,635,000 acres. Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I thought that I would be speaking on this resolution last Friday evening, and with the kind permission of the First Minister and the assistance of the messenger boys, I had distributed to every desk one of these pamphlets and another

MR. SHOEMAKER (Continued)

one entitled, "Your Watershed". Now I hope that you haven't destroyed them, because I thought that it might be more effective if you had them on your desks at the time. And of course, as I say, that was three or four days ago, but perhaps most of you have them in your desk now.

Now, I did speak at some length on the Whitemud Watershed in the - - speaking to the Throne Speech this afternoon, but - and I would like to thank the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture for his remarks - his enlightening remarks in bringing us up to date on what has been done, and I think the Honourable Member for Pembina also suggested two or three days ago, that something had been started in this - - in relief for these measures, but the letters read by the Honourable Member for Pembina, I noted, were of quite recent date.

Now there are perhaps many reasons why I should be the member that moves this resolution, because we feel that in the town of Neepawa and in the constituency of Gladstone, that we pioneered in the field of soil conservation. Some two or three years ago, we realized the problems that were facing us, and indeed facing the various municipalities and formed through the co-operation of the agricultural representative in the area, various soil conservation clubs. And they, in turn, did a lot of the educational work that was necessary in the field and then through the co-operation of the municipal men, they progressed over the years to the point that they formed what they called, "The Riding Mountain Whitemud Watershed Committee". Now every acre of the Gladstone constituency - every acre of it - is in the watershed and if you have this yellow booklet in front of you, you will note that it extends quite a bit beyond the constituency of Gladstone, and indeed includes part of the constituency of Ste. Rose, a good deal of the constituency of Cypress and quite a bit of the constituency of Minnedosa, and quite a bit of the constituency of Lakeside. I believe that is correct.

Now, the problems of soil and water are certainly not limited to the constituency of Gladstone, as I've said earlier this afternoon, that the - out of 18,000,000 acres of farm land in Manitoba, 11,000,000 acres are cultivated and of that 11,000,000 acres there is about a million and a half acres in what we call the Riding Mountain Whitemud Watershed area. Our problem - or the problem of soil and water - - the problems of soil erosion is worsened perhaps in the Gladstone constituency, because of the variance in elevation. That is, the Riding Mountain escarpment at the west has an elevation of something like 2,200 feet and all of the water from the Riding Mountain escarpment must find its way to Lake Manitoba, or most of it does. And of course the level of Lake Manitoba is something like 814 feet, so that the water in travelling from the escarpment, 2,200 feet up the Riding Mountains and passing all through the lowlands, some 60 or 70 miles east and getting into Lake Manitoba, does cause plenty of problems. Two or three years ago, it really did present problems in the way of flooding. This year, by contrast, we're all out of water.

Now, I think one of the most vivid examples of what water

MR. SHOEMAKER (Continued)

can do -- I saw just recently near the town of Riding Mountain a man there, a very good farmer there, by the name of Thomas Stanford and I think that at one time he was President of the Manitoba Seed Growers Association - he may still be, but he asked me to go up and have a look at, not a section of his farm but a section of a farm just immediately west of his, where a farmer went in, about seven or eight years ago with a breaking plow, and plowed one furrow to divert a little stream that was trickling down the mountain at that time. He wanted to divert it and run part of it one way and part of it another way. As a result of that one furrow that was made about seven or eight years ago, Mr. Stanford told me, that now you could put all of the grain elevators between the Riding Mountain and Winnipeg in and you wouldn't see them. Now that sounds like quite a statement, but that is a fact. Well, if you can put all the grain elevators in a hole that size, why there was a lot of dirt came out of it, and the composition of the soil in that particular area is very shaley so that, all of this soil that came out of that cavity spread all over the land for several miles east of it. So, as a result, you have a lot of land that was good that is no good any longer.

Now, I think that I should read you a little article here that was written up as a result of our Mayor, Mayor William Whitmore, in speaking to the municipal men at Morden the other day, and I know the Honourable Minister of Labour was there. I don't think there were any other men present here, that were at that meeting, but here is what Mr. Whitmore had to say, and he was describing the incidents that were leading up to the formation of the Whitemud Watershed. It says the incidents leading up to the birth of Bill No. 108, an act to provide for the establishment of authorities in watershed and soil conservation districts, was the subject in an address delivered by Mayor William Whitmore of Neepawa, at the Manitoba Urban Association Conference, on Thursday. The flash floods in the area surrounding Neepawa, Gladstone and McCreary, combined with an excessive run-off through heavy winter snows during the winter of 1955 and '56, said Mr. Whitmore, brought sets of circumstances together, from several divergent sources in our area, which combined to point to the need for concerted action. A mass meeting held in Neepawa, including representatives from all rural and urban municipalities and other interested parties, decided that problems of soil and water conservation and control transcended in its municipal boundaries. Some 15 to 20 municipal bodies attended the meeting, drawn together by the disastrous havoc wrought by the gathering of the waters that came from the highlands to the north-west into the basin of the lowlands to the south and east, Mr. Whitmore declared. Out of this meeting emerged the Riding Mountain Whitemud River Watershed Committee. They set out their aims and objectives, which in brief envisage the formation -- the formulation of conservation policies, and the furthering of co-operative action among the member municipalities and in conjunction with the senior governments. We found both the Provincial Government and PFRA quite interested



MR. SHOEMAKER (Continued)

and co-operative, and particularly the provincial department of agriculture, who made personnel available, through their extension service to assist in the project and further the work, stated Mr. Whitmore. 1957 saw the groundwork of the committee organization laid, and the plan generally developed. Sub-committees were appointed with such matters as publicity, legislation, etcetera, receiving due attention. The municipalities were generally brought together in their thinking through the committee meetings as a whole and the executive body of same. As the work was publicized throughout the districts, so the interest grew. It was apparent, and agreed among the members of the watershed committee by the close of 1957, that its work as a purely voluntary association of interested citizens, while valuable, would of necessity be quite limited in scope, and that the results would certainly be disappointing unless it was set up in a form of an authority.

And here I quote from a brief which was provided -- prepared and presented to the Provincial Government, "We decided that if this watershed committee is to do a really useful job, it is our feeling that we shall have to be incorporated by Provincial Statute, and granted certain powers." The brief presented to the government early in the new year of 1958, was a well prepared and well documented effort. It bore fruit and at the spring session - sitting of the Legislature, in the form of Bill No. 108, being an act to provide for the establishment of authorities in watershed and soil conservation districts. Since the passage of that bill there has of course, been a change in the provincial government. But we have been assured by the present Minister of Agriculture and Public Works, that they have in mind a considerable modification of this bill, which will give it much, in large scope, in application throughout the province.

Now, I'm quoting Mr. Whitmore, "Member municipalities have practically sent in their primary resolutions requesting the formation of a watershed authority and their inclusion in same. And, our Whitemud River Watershed authority could become an accomplished fact once the provincial government have cleared the way.", said Mr. Whitmore. "It will be interesting for your sake, and for your association to note, that in Bill No. 108, now an act of the Provincial Government, were to set up a watershed and soil conservation commission, who would be the guiding forces between the province and the local authorities, and that the composition of the commission was to be three civil servants, two nominees of the union of Manitoba municipalities and one nominee from the Manitoba Urban Association. Thus, it will be seen that the Provincial Government of the day, when formulating Bill No. 108, recognized the stake that the urban municipalities have in the soil and water resources of our province, you have a vital interest in the conservation of that greatest of all natural resources, our soil, which is so elemental, that I do not need to elaborate on it at all. The regulation and control of surface water, in fact all available water, is a primary requisite of urban communities. Life cannot exist, let alone thrive and prosper, without adequate and constant supplies of good quality

MR. SHOEMAKER (Continued)

water", concluded Mr. Whitmore. And Mr. Whitmore certainly was very, very active in all the years that this committee was active.

Now, I don't know whether I need to say much more because that Morden Report certainly covered, pretty well, the early history of the forming of the committee, and I don't think anyone here questions the necessity of it. The thing that does concern us at Neepawa is simply this, that when a delegation met with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture about September --- here on July 25th - here it is here, we were a little discouraged when we came home because we felt -- the committee that day, we felt that we were the -- were about all ready to go, all we needed to do was to get the authority to set up under Bill No.108, and we have not been able to do anything since, because we did not get permission to do that. And it is very, very difficult to keep a committee working, unless you have something for them to do.

Now we have - - since the delegation, we have submitted resolutions to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, and he has replied and we hope that some action will be taken. I think it might be well, Mr. Speaker, to just read the bottom part of the letter, when we sent him the resolution requesting authority - this is just briefly what he said. I would like to very briefly, restate some of the objectives of the watershed committee: (1) This group was organized to promote better land use, and thereby a more efficient and permanent agriculture in the watershed. (2) Our understanding of the watershed concept in simple terms, means controlling soil erosion and floods on the watershed basis that would transcend local government district boundaries. The action to date has been for each local government area to attempt to cope with the problems on its own. This has not been successful, hence the watershed concept is the only logical approach to the problem, (3) These problems of wind and water erosion which plague the farmer, also create administrative and financial problems in municipal affairs. It is apparent that all three levels of government have an interest in any efforts made to stabilize the soil, and create a type of agriculture in the area, which is more settled in terms of personnel and income. (4) We recommend the establishment of a separate department of government, with a deputy minister and if possible, a minister, to bring together the present sections of legislation presently in different departments so that co-ordination of efforts may be achieved. (5) We recommend that the watershed authority should have precedent over the municipal councils when dealing with projects, which affect more than one municipality, but there should be the allowance of the right to appeal." And then they enclosed the minutes of the last watershed meeting and that -- the resolutions from the 13 municipalities. So I think that pretty well covers the history of our development there.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, if I might have five minutes, I think we might conclude this discussion.

MR. WILLIS (Continued)

We accept in principle, the resolution. We have never had any other idea. It is to be noted that the Whitemud River Watershed Committee was formed in 1956, and that legislation was not brought in until April 10th of this year, shortly before the provincial election. No commission has been appointed but we've gone so far as to select the chairman of the commission, and if it is the wish of the Watershed Committee, they desire to move ahead on that basis, it is possible to do so. We had a discussion - I explained to them our proposals. They went back and, there has since been correspondence in regard to it, and if it is the desire of the Committee to move ahead now, even although our commission is not yet fully formed, if they would write me to that effect, we could take action. There is no difference of opinion in regard to it. The Watershed Committee is important. It should continue its work. I have told them so. I have written to the Chairman, recently, in regard to the matter. I said to him, and I read, "Mr. Joseph F. Rogers of Plumas. We have at the present time at least a dozen pieces of legislation in about five different departments dealing with the water control. I was glad to see in your resolution that you think all of these should be co-ordinated if we are to get satisfactory results. We are having frequent meetings of cabinet these days discussing legislation for the special session, also some work for the winter session. I am hoping that we will be able to consolidate our present acts and amend others in order that through your activity and our help, we may be able to carry out the objectives which your Committee have in mind." And I have from Mr. Rogers, a letter, he is the Chairman, and he thanks me for the letter. He said, "may I predict that your letter will be encouraging to the members of the Watershed Committee, as I assure you it is to its Chairman", meaning himself. There is no disagreement in regard to this matter. We are all of the one mind, as far as the necessity is concerned.

The only question which was in doubt at all was that I had outlined to them what we proposed to do, and in view of that proposal it was up to the local committee to decide as to whether they wanted to move forward. If they do, we shall do so. Your resolution in principle is accepted.

MR. SHOEMAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I didn't intend to be critical, but I thought perhaps that I should go into this in some detail for the benefit, in particular, of 27 new members and I know that - or I feel that there are so many people in the province that haven't the foggiest notion what you're talking about, when you talk about a project of this kind. They have the problem, but they really don't know where to begin on the thing, and that's really why I did elaborate on it in some detail, and why I distributed the literature. Thanks very kindly.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): ..... closing the debate. I don't think it was the intention of the honourable member, if that is the decision of the House, then I will abide by it. If

MR. MOLGAT (Continued)

not, I would move that it be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: ....definite decision that this is settled, is it? Oh, I was under the impression that the Honourable the First Minister was advising the Speaker at this time. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, that this debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker put the question and following a voice vote, declared the motion defeated.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Question before the House, motion of adjournment of the debate of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. Are you ready for the question?

A standing vote was taken, the result being:

YEAS: Messrs. Bend, Campbell, Greenlay, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Jobin, Lucko, McDonald, Miller, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Shuttleworth, Swailes, Tanchak, Teillet, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Boulic, Carroll, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Jeannotte, Johnson, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Shewman, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Willis.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 23, Nays 23

MR. SPEAKER: I cast my ballot in favour of the adjournment.

MR. ROBLIN: I see now it's past our usual closing time so if no one has any objection I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon and may I just say, Sir, before you put the vote that the committee meets at 10 in the morning for those who may have overlooked that matter.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote, declared it carried and the House was adjourned until 2:30 the following day.