



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison





THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, February 22nd, 1962.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the amendment to the amendment to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Speaker . . . . . the privilege just as you called it 5:30, the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre asked me a question and I would like to answer him by handing him this article here. It's called "The Mythical Suicidal Swede."

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you on your health and I hope your continued good health continues throughout the session and for many years to come. I also wish to congratulate two newly-appointed Ministers and I hope that our business relations will be pleasant. Our former Minister of Public Works I see is absent, but I wish him good health and hope that he doesn't have to go back to the hospital. We'd like to see him occupy that seat for awhile yet - - until the next election, and he might trade places. (Interjection) Oh yes we truly mean that. I also wish to congratulate the mover to the Throne Speech. I congratulate him on the splendid effort he made to pat his own government, which is probably right being on that side on the back, but somehow looking at him from here I notice that Ripley gleam in his eye. Believe it or not. The seconder, I wish to congratulate him also. I think he made a splendid effort. He took advantage of his time to introduce some of his ideas and some things that we would like to have done for the government. I think that he did a splendid job. I really enjoyed listening to his speech.

Now, I am not going to dwell too much on the Throne Speech because so much has been said about it, and I think my leader does a very good job on that one, but I'd be remiss if I didn't refer to it altogether so I'll take only a few points. I think that the present government is frantically trying to plug the leaks in its policy of haste and waste, and on the other hand also, where they should show more action they are trying to plug the holes of stagnation and procrastination, as my leader has said previously. One very good example is in the formation of the school boundaries. You may say that I am no authority to talk because at least one-third of my constituency has not accepted the division yet, but that is their wish and it remains so, and I still say that if this government was not in such great haste at that time to make good boys of themselves that we would have had a better, a better school division plan than what we have at the present time, because I know that there are many people in many school divisions who are not altogether happy. I'll not say completely unhappy, but not altogether happy with what they have at the present time. Some of them are not happy with some of the realistic boundaries as the boundary or the boundary school division. Some of them - - most of them I would say - - are very unhappy about the increase in taxation. They were promised by some of the senior members of this government before the referendum or vote was taken, they were promised that their tax would be relieved, but I regret to say that the government did not keep its promise. Of course they were in such a hurry to implement the school divisions that I do not think that they themselves were prepared. They didn't realize what they were going into. They had no idea of the huge costs of that, the enormous costs that the school divisions would have to incur. Probably if there was more time taken, more realistic boundaries could have been formed. Another thing, if they had taken more time and not acted on a partial report of the Royal Commission on Education, taken it as a whole, they might have had a lot less trouble in many other aspects of this Royal Commission on Education. Now the government has to take the blame and suffer the consequences.

Another example of haste is the very glaring one of the floodway. Again the government wanted to make - - some of the senior members of the government wanted to impress the people and show that they're the go-getters, forging ahead. So what happened? Studies. Sure there were studies, but the First Minister was so anxious to push that through that in a moment of temper, I imagine, a moment of haste, he committed the Province to go it alone. I think it would have been nicer and much better for the Province of Manitoba if the First Minister would not have committed himself to this. Thus he lost his bargaining power with Ottawa. You may say "oh", but to a certain extent he did lose, to a great extent, I think in the millions of dollars. I opposed it when it was first brought up on the grounds that I thought that this "leave

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd) ...it or go it alone" idea wasn't right, that the cost was too enormous for the Province of Manitoba. I was agreeable on the 75-25% basis. We haven't got it now and I think it was the First Minister who lost it for us. That's my belief. You don't have to agree with me, but I really and truly believe that's what it is.

Now there are other examples that I can bring in on haste and waste, but I'll just bring in one or two on procrastination -- stagnation and procrastination -- and the most glaring example that I can recall, and I believe I'm right, is the one of the Mississippi Parkway. Most of you are familiar with this project. The United States was going to share the cost of building a road to the angle, the Northwest Angle. I think it was supposed to be half and half. The former government worked very hard with the government of Minnesota to come to some agreement, and I myself heard the First Minister, the Premier, at one of the meetings -- I think it was the Eastern Development Board -- say that he was working equally hard to achieve this. But I know that the present government was dragging its feet on that. By now we should have had something, some accomplishment, and there isn't any. And I'm afraid that the chances are quite a bit dimmer, because only a month ago I happened to be across the line and there was quite a bit of opposition to that project now and I hope that it isn't too late, because Manitoba stands to lose millions of dollars. If we do lose this project I'll place the blame squarely on the present government.

Another example where the government is procrastinating, and this concerns our amiable Minister of Agriculture, I think is crop insurance. I have no complaint with crop insurance that some of the farmers are able to insure their crops, but after three years of planning and two years of crop insurance existing in that area, I think it is high time that all of the Province of Manitoba has this plan available to the farmers of Manitoba if they so desire. There are some aspects of the crop insurance that I would like to see changed. I would like the Federal Government to contribute more towards it than they are doing at the present time, but I know in my area quite a few farmers would subscribe to it. I'll not say that there would be 25% at present -- according to the regulations we have now it's 25% -- but quite a few of them would like to see crop insurance in that area.

Now I come to another -- of course we'll forget about procrastination and stagnation. There are several other projects and problems I could mention, but we'll leave that out. But I'll come to the little town, the little village or little town of Sprague. Very little is known about this little town. Some of us know quite a bit and I imagine a few of the Ministers should know quite a bit about it since about two weeks. I understand that a lot of them were there last year and the year before last. But as far as the reporters of the press and the general public further west, it's off the beaten path of the reporters. They don't know too much about it; they have no reason to go and I imagine that they probably rely on press releases given by any party or by the government officials, from time to time we see something about Sprague and so on. It's a beautiful community. It's a thriving town, Sprague. It's not one of these depressed areas like some people would like us to believe. It isn't a depressed area. It's a good farming area and there's still quite a bit of timber, timber products in that area. The people love the place. Now we're happy to say that we have a plant, flakewood plant which has been established there with the help of our amiable minister, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and I wish to thank him for it, because he had a hand in it. But there is something I do not like about it -- not about the plant, but about the way, the way Sprague and the plant is being used for propaganda purposes. As I said before it's off the beaten path of many of the reporters; they have to take the word of some of the people and some of these people are not responsible for what they are saying, or else they are fed incorrectly by the present government. Now all this concerns grass roots -- we'll call them grass -- and it also concerns the Ministers, which we'll call the brass, and we'll mix a little bit of chaff in there too. If we refer to some of that propaganda sheet that's being published by our Minister of Industry and Commerce -- it has been referred to before as a propaganda sheet. At one time I noticed that the plant was described as a \$2 1/2 million dollar plant; the next thing we know it's a 2 3/4 - it's up a quarter of a million. But lately the Honourable Member from Rossburn used the term \$3 million. Now capital depreciates. Which one is right? And the 2 1/2, the 2 3/4 come from the government benches, I imagine, because it's principally the Minister of Industry. The \$3 million might come from the government's side again. No? What is this? Is it a

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd) . . . deliberate attempt to confuse the people? Is it a deliberate attempt to build yourself up that something so great is being done? I am not trying to devalue the greatness, if you wish to call it, of this. I'm happy it's there. Well let's go back to the grass. Some time in December the people were quite happy they had the plant completed. So what does the Chamber of Commerce do? They're the grass roots, the Chamber of Commerce; they planned a huge opening. In other words an official opening in December, planned by the grass roots. Some of the ministers were invited, I'm sure and they were expected at 1:30 -- that was in December. There were between 300 or 400 people there at the time; the Chamber of Commerce planned it; waited until 3:00 o'clock and there wasn't one minister. They expected at least two to show up -- not one minister. A very delicious supper was prepared, or dinner I should say, in the evening. One of the ministers was expected there too. They were ready for about 500 people. I would say about 300 showed up, but still the brass wasn't there, and I think the brass saw the mistake they made because only two weeks ago they took things in their own hands. The first time the grass roots were snubbed; they didn't show up, but they took things in their own hands. What did they do? The brass decided to make another opening; that would be the second opening of the flake plant.

MR. EVANS: . . . . . for a number of questions. Do you care to answer questions?

MR. TANCHAK: If you don't mind I'll finish and then answer. So about two weeks we had the brass there and I am sorry to say and regret that there was more brass than grass at the time, because certainly there were not as many people as before. Now you can give an excuse that we were down to . . . . . the same time we took a trip there. Make a big hullabaloo about it; it's good propaganda. Look what we are doing for South Eastern Manitoba. The rest of the people say well, that is wonderful government. Those depressed areas there are being well taken care of, and that is good propaganda. Now I would like the government or all of us not to use a project like this just simply for the sake of propaganda. You did a good thing. I agree with you. I am not in the government now; I don't know what I would do if I were, but in another two years I am sure that we will have a chance. (Interjection) Well, who do you think is going to be? I am sure that the friends opposite are not going to be, the friends opposite won't be. Well how could you be? You remember Jack McDowell sitting right here. He prophesied that within four years you'll be a dead duck. You're a dead duck now. That's what he prophesied. The prophesy came true. Now if you don't believe it just pinch yourself -- find out. You think you're born, newly born. I say you are, but not newly born, stillborn. You know -- now you asked for it. I didn't prepare this speech, you asked for it. You wanted (Interjection) -- you are dead, so you figured that probably "if we change our name, we are going to revive". Well, you know the ordinary bush rabbit. He is brown in summer and he is afraid that his neighbours will devour him so what does he do for the winter time? He changes to the colour of his environment and becomes white. But the poor fellow is still just a rabbit. He hasn't done anything else; he's still a rabbit. I think you fellows are hopeless. But nevertheless I love you all. I have no hard feelings; I am not speaking with venom. I just love you all, you fellows, but I truly feel sorry for you. You haven't got a party to represent. Who do you represent? Do you represent the farmer? Well, Hazen Argue should know and he says "no". Do you represent the industry? (Interjection) He says "no". What about labour? You fellows indicate that you're not the labour party. Are you Socialists? You yourself say no. Listen, I don't know what kind of a party you are. NDP - No Definite Purpose. That's exactly what I think you are. You talk about -- you and the friends across, you talk about controlled -- what do you call that? - - plan, some kind of a plan. We have our friends opposite talking about planned or planning economy, planning an economy, and I think that's right. It's up to us to plan an economy. But when you talk about planned economy I think they're two different things. You've got a planned economy. So what are you going to tell the industry? When, how, where to produce this thing? Are you going to tell the press people what they can print and when they can print it? That to me is planned economy. I don't agree with that; that's planned economy. So you can't be the next government because you have no policy and you're not a party as yet. So we'll leave you and forgive you; we'll forgive you this time. I hope there are no hard feelings. (Interjection) Well, I love you too; you're good . . . mates.

No, you fellows can't put me off my course. In crop insurance, as I was saying - -

(Mr. Tanchack, Cont'd) . . . . I haven't got my speech written, so probably some of my words are not just as choice as they should be and the paragraphs not as good, but I don't believe in reading speeches as some of the members are doing. I just have a few notes here. Crop insurance as I mentioned before -- and I think almost complete when I was so rudely interrupted here before. (Interjection) I think I'm about -- well you've got me so mixed up now I don't know where I was going. But I'll still come back to that. Now there is something I would like, to talk a lot on agricultural policy, but I'll have another chance. Yes, we have quite a bit in store. A few other questions and some resolutions and so on but I'm leaving that to the future. I have the crop insurance.

Now there is something else that is . . . and I did mention it last year, and that is water supply to rural Manitoba. The minister made fun of me last year, and he even offered to put slot machines in every town and in the country. That was last year, the Minister of Agriculture. Maybe you remember that? I didn't take him up on that, because I am sure that that occupation would be too dignified for any minister. (Interjection) No, I don't think . . . . but I still think that that is possible. I was told it isn't possible, but I still think it is possible. What is the plan? I am not asking for plumbing as the Honourable Minister misunderstood last year. Maybe I wasn't quite plain. So I'm not going to criticize him too harshly on that. But I think that it is possible. Only yesterday when we were at the Bay when Bonnycastle spoke to us, he did mention Lake of the Woods, that it could be a source of water supply, even for the City of Winnipeg. Lake of the Woods. That's exactly what I mentioned last year. But I did say that we could supply the water from the Lake of the Woods in this Pembina-Red triangle too, both sides east and west of the Red River, and I'm happy that there is a reference made to that in the Throne Speech. Now we know that the demand for water in smaller towns is increasing. We talk about decentralization of industry and that's a good idea, decentralization of industry. Little towns growing up. But how in the world could those little towns grow up without an adequate supply of water? Thanks to Campbell's rural electrification, that partially it is possible, and that's one thing when I use the words "Campbell's rural electrification", I'm not addressing the Honourable Member from Lakeside, but I like to call it that, because I think that is something that is going to stay. Now it is partially possible to indoctrinize smaller towns, but water supply. Many towns are suffering from this. Industry does not want to locate in these towns if they can't be assured of adequate water supply. Emerson is suffering from this; Dominion City, and all those towns east and west of the Red River, so I think it is quite possible, to get the water from the Lake of the Woods. At the present time Gretna is getting a little water, a trickle of water from across the boundary, from Neche, I believe, but I don't think that is an adequate supply. It will not be able to supply the whole area, and besides they're getting the water from Neche. They can get the water from the Lake of the Woods and would be assured of an adequate supply. I am not saying -- I'm not an expert and probably some of you may think that I am talking up in the clouds, but it's worthwhile investigating and I'm sure that the minister will check into that, and I can tell you one thing, that in not too distant a future we'll have that. Electrification was possible; I'm sure that this will be possible, and it is absolutely necessary. The water shortage is very bad. We've got the Pembina Development Association formed in this triangle. They're going to come to the government, as they have in the past, for assistance, and for goodness' sakes don't turn them down. I hope you don't, because it's a worthwhile association and I am sure that they will not be unreasonable in their demands.

Now there is quite a bit of talk about fodder assistance and I'm not going to be too critical of that, although in some areas there wasn't much help given. Probably it wasn't as necessary as in others. But I believe -- I don't know of any examples but I've heard in the House, and I believe some of the members when they speak, not all of them -- that it did help. In my area, the constituency of Emerson, it happens to be my constituency right against the American border, there was plenty of hay across the border. A lot of our farmers were able to take care of themselves. Very few asked for any help from the Provincial Government at this time. There were a few who got longer distances. Most of the distances were short. And there were a few, but very few. Most of them were resourceful enough that they got it on their own, thanks. We want them to be so; we don't want them to just depend on handouts. The government is here to help when a person can't help himself. But there is one thing, there was a little bit of grabbing there too and I'm not going to blame the Provincial Government but the

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd) . . . . Federal Government for this. If this Federal Government was so anxious to help these farmers in the drought area, why is it that the Federal Government charged these farmers \$1.06, I believe it was, per ton duty at the boundary? That was no help. In other words, "Here", it says, "we are giving you with one hand but we're grabbing it back with the other". I don't think that is fair and I think some of the senior members promised to look into this and that's why I am bringing it up. I think it's high time that they did look into this. These farmers are still coming to me and saying what's being done about it? Maybe it's very hard for Ottawa to refund that -- it might be very hard. But I don't think it is impossible.

Something else that I would like to bring to the attention of the present government, not because it's in the provincial hands but probably we could use their influence on the Federal Government. That's the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. This year, especially, I think in some areas it was very unfair. Not because it was done deliberately but because of our rules and regulations. Maybe some of these rules and regulations could be changed and should be changed. Especially this year we have narrow bands of rain or narrow bands of showers. And there were instances especially along the United States Boundary, two miles wide, a distance I would say of about 18 miles, never had a drop of rain all summer until the snow fell. But in the same quarter they had a nice shower -- farmers living in the north quarter had a nice shower -- they had a fair crop. But in the same section on the south quarter, . . . . a whole string of . . . . , they had a complete crop failure and these people have been paying all their life into this fund. This year for sure they expected to get it. They didn't. Our regulations forbid them, I presume. And that's heartbreaking. This is the year that they should have had help. And I think we should look into this. There should be some way of assisting these farmers. True, they are hoping to get a dollar an acre and I believe they will get it. But I'm sure they are entitled, maybe not according to the rules and regulations, but I'll say humanly entitled to some assistance, Prairie Farm Assistance, because they were very hard hit. I would like the Honourable Minister to look into this. Maybe he could possibly do something.

I think I will probably have another chance to speak. I would like to say a few more words but my time is almost running out. But I'm sorry to see that the Honourable Member from Swan River isn't here. He pleaded with us to help him yesterday. (Interjection) He's outside? Pleaded with us to help him yesterday. He said, "I would like one of you fellows to say something nice about us once". I'm not saying that the boys across there never do anything right. No I don't say you don't, and I don't say that you're perfect -- nobody's perfect. But I'll say that there are a lot of things that you could do better than what you're doing, but at the same time there are a few things that you're doing that you're making a good job. I know it makes this honourable member very happy. There's one thing that the back benchers, and also the front benchers, are very, very good at, and nobody can excel them. They're very good in that fine art of passing the buck. So that's a good thing to say about you people. Something that you are very good at. You'll probably say you have something to boast about. Something to . . . . . , it's a matter of opinion. And I would say I know that every one of you agree with me, that any poor merchandizing needs a lot of advertising. And I think that's what the case is. I thank you.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (LOGAN): Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my sincere congratulations to you and to wish you good health in the position you so capably fill. Congratulations are in order to the Honourable Member from Osborne and the Honourable Member from Churchill. I also wish to congratulate the two new cabinet ministers on their elevation to the cabinet. I was also quite pleased to see John Thompson back in the House again and looking well.

Now I will start on the little I will say about the Throne Speech. One thing that puzzles me is this. Why was it when Brandon Packers out there was asking for help -- I heard something said this afternoon -- from the Manitoba Development Fund, there was nothing done. There were three MLA's out there including the Cabinet Minister. We heard them people speak and there were people from all over Brandon, I would say, or the out-skirts of Brandon, around that vicinity anyway. To me the strike was over, and I felt that this thing was finished now with regard to what implications there have been in there. But the people that are going to suffer now are the people who were in that area, who were working in there. You couldn't blame them

(Mr. Harris cont'd) that they went out to fight what they thought was a decent living. They went out to fight -- they were below the minimum of the ..... That's neither here nor there. But all I'm asking is, why weren't those people helped out? Now that is one of the things that I couldn't understand. I'm of this nature myself, I think that we're here to help mankind; we're not here to push them down. Now, Sir, I've seen in the Press various reports about labour dominating this and labour dominating that. We have the Labour Relations Act here and I thought I'll bring this in today to show you and go through it in the various steps we have to go through before we can go out on strike. It says here, Grievance Procedure: Should any difference arise under this agreement between the company and the employed members of the Union it shall be settled by the following method. Each step shall be taken progressively without delay unless the difference has been settled in an earlier step. The first step: The employee or the steward of the department, or both, shall take the question up with his foreman. In respect to any settlement effected by the employee without the steward, the steward may re-open the question by discussing the same with the employee and the foreman and if the question is not settled by the end of the next work day then the second step comes in. The chief steward, with or without the steward of the department involved, shall present the question in writing to the plant superintendent, or in his absence, the company's designated representative. If the question is not settled by the end of the next two working days then the third step comes in. The Grievance Committee, composed of three men of the union, shall present the question in writing at the meeting of the committee designated by the company. This Grievance Committee comprising of the regular employees of the company who have obtained seniority, the number to be decided by local negotiation between the union and the company shall be elected by the union, and the company shall be kept informed of the personnel of this committee. If the question is not settled by the end of the next two working days, then the fourth step comes in. So you can see how things progress along. Everything goes along in its different step. If you jump one step to the other, if you go from one stepping stone and step over one stone, then you have to go back and start the whole rigmarole again. So you can see underneath this thing here that when these things come about everything progresses in its proper manner. Then we come to the end of the book here on arbitration. "Any disagreement, grievance, or dispute arising under this agreement which is not settled to the satisfaction of either union or the company under provisions of Article 4 hereof, shall upon written notice of either party be submitted to the Arbitration Board, provided the grievance involves the interpretation of a legal violation of any provision of this agreement. The Arbitration Board shall be established within 30 days from such written notice and shall consist of three members, one of whom shall be nominated by the union, and one by the company and a chairman selected by the two nominees. In event of the failure of the two nominees to agree upon the selection of a chairman, such a chairman shall be someone other than a civil servant, shall be appointed as provided by appropriate labour legislation in the respective provinces." So you can see when this thing is run out properly -- I just give you this to show you, we're talking about Labour Relations Act. I say that everything goes in there and everything is done. But you can't go against humanity. Each one has his own different ways of looking at things. You can't blame labour. You can't blame management. All you can blame is that almighty dollar in between. Each side has no consideration for the other one. Man's inhumanity to man that's all it is, Sir. Well, I guess that is enough on labour.

This one is on the economic future. It says here on convening the committee. This is all to the good. That is a good thing. I'm glad to see that come about. But what I'm wondering is this -- the proof will come when the report is in -- will the government take necessary action or take the easy way out? Do nothing? We've had all these different commissions and everything bring in reports and what have they done on these things? After they've brought in the report there's been nothing done on it. I would like to see these things implemented. It was brought down, so let's implement them. Yes, we're paying money, not you, but we're paying money; we're all paying money -- all of the Province of Manitoba --and I feel that we should have what is our just dues.

Now here is one that I haven't heard spoken of in this House. It is on your Throne Speech but nobody has ever mentioned one word and it's a big thing that's coming up. It's a thing that's going to affect us. We have our Precambrian Shield up there; we have our wheat; we have all these different commodities in here. What I am referring to is the European



(Mr. Harris cont'd) ... Common Market. Newest and gravest among the new problems which Canada will have to deal with single-handed is Britain's decision to join the European Common Market. This may well turn out to be the most important turning point in British policy since the repeal of the C..... Laws in 1846. It means the end of British isolation from the Continent. It means that Britain will step inside on European tariff; will erect a wall against the rest of the world and into a European free trading area wherein the members raise no barriers against each other. Therefore, it means the end, or at best a very drastic modification of Commonwealth effort that now gives special protection to Canadian goods in British market. The final result of this monumental decision may be splendid for all but its immediate result for Canada will be bad. The pattern of our foreign trade will be shattered. No longer can we count on a surplus with Britain to reduce our deficit with the United States. Indeed, everything about the British market becomes uncertain. Nobody can be sure that we can sell there or how much of it. Canadians may be dismayed at this outlook but they can hardly claim to be surprised. Ever since the European Common Market was formed, or at least ever since it began to succeed, it has been clear that the British would have to be one of two things -- either join the Common Market or find a substitute for it. They have tried hard to find one, an offer to which Canadians -- as they offered four years ago to form an industrial free trade area with Canada -- an offer to which the Canadian Government was too stunned to reply, but which Canadian manufacturers instantly described as unthinkable. Britain then tried, with more success but still not enough, to form a modified free trade area among the seven nations of Europe. But now it has been obvious for at least a year that these half measures would not do; that there is, in fact, no real alternative for Britain. She is joining the Common Market because she must. She can't afford not to. So far, the Canadian rejoinder to Britain's move has simply been to oppose it as long and as strongly as possible. The tactics have reached the end. Now what? What can Canada do in the new situation which is now to all intents and purposes an accomplished fact? This is not the kind of question that is answered in partisan debate. It calls for sober thought, a difficult decision and some collaboration from all parties.

The Diefenbaker Government entered the crucial year maintaining that the British move was a dire threat to Canada and possibly a fatal blow to the Commonwealth. But the opinions differ and with conflicting views and properties flung at them almost daily it's no wonder that Canadians are so confused. But the so-called experts aren't much better off. The core of confusion for Canadians lies in the fact that with the British negotiations still in the early stages, the views of both doomsters and boosters are solidly founded. Undeniable. The short run effect will be bad for some Canadian exports, notably manufactured goods. Just as undeniable the long run effect will be good for the major Canadian exports, by which expanding Europe will be an expanded market. There's no guess work in assessing what the Common Market has already achieved for its six founder members. Now folks, listen to this. France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg, in less than five years since the Treaty of Rome was signed, industrial production in the six has increased by a quarter; trade between the member countries is up by one half; foreign investments sold by six hundred million; and the E.C.M. currency reserve stands at 16 billion. These 170 million people now conduct a quarter of all the world's trade with only the first phase of integration completed. They plan to remove all internal trade barriers by December 31st, 1969. Their cost of living has risen since 1957 but only half as fast as Britain's. There are a few unemployment sore spots. Southern Italy is one, but broadly across the six it's capable labour that is scarce of jobs. All Common Market capitals report the biggest spending Christmas ever. The present stores were cleaned out of power kiddies' racing cars at \$350 each. When the figures are finally totalled up they're sure to show that 1961 was one of the biggest trading years in Western Europe history. Canada is already profiting by this prosperity. Our exports to the six united states of Europe rose 39 percent between 1959 and 1960, from 314 millions to 436 millions, and early figures indicate another massive increase in 1961. These exports -- wheat was the largest single item -- are already successfully hurdling the RCM tariff, which by the way, are generally speaking lower than the previous tariffs. The common tariff levels are computed by first taking the average of the national customs duty in force in the six countries in January 1st, 1957. This figure was 9.1 percent. After making some cuts as a concession to GATT's desire to liberalize world trade, the ECM average tariff now amounts to 7.4. The common tariff is thus lower. For

(Mr. Harris cont'd) . . . . instance, Britain's present average tariff against Continental exports for Canada's average tariff against foreign imports. Those prophets who say the addition of 52 million Britons to the Common Market and the addition of Denmark, Norway, Ireland and others later will turn out to be a good thing for Canada are further convinced by the knowledge that all of these European countries still have a long long way to go before they catch up to the general standard of living in North America. Consumer spending in the six, something over a hundred billion dollars a year, is still running at less than half the U. S. rate alone. Though they are difficult to compare operatively, wage rates in Belgium stand at only one third of Canadian equivalent. Germany still has about 60 washing machines per thousand population against American rate of 250. The Europeans aren't satisfied with this picture -- far from it. As their prosperity grows they'll be demanding more and more of the world's goods and more good things to eat. Now I would like to say this, Sir, we have had a trying time in this free world of ours. We have had this cold war which has been thrust upon us and nobody knows what is coming tomorrow, and I think myself -- I'm only speaking for myself-- that this is one of the best things that would ever happen because we are showing to the man behind the iron curtain, the little man behind the iron curtain, that we as free people of the world are really actually doing something. And that is one of the best things that I have ever seen in all my life because you are actually showing this man -- here is fettered down, as we are told anyway, fettered down, and here are we free. Sure we have to work a little harder; sure we have to knuckle down a little better. But I say all in all when I say labour and management has to go hand in hand together. United we are OK but divided we fall. So now is our time I say. We've got to get united; we have to stay united, for if we don't, we certainly will fall.

In the Throne Speech there was some mention of housing. Now in my constituency and my colleague from St. John -- I'm not talking about the rest of Manitoba -- I've heard here today about Indian villages hidden in the bush, and this and that -- I'm not talking about them; I haven't actually seen them. But I know my own constituency and through Winnipeg where things are in such a bad plight. You go down into the centre of Winnipeg and you see a big house, a big rooming house. That was all right about, oh, sixty-five or seventy years ago. That might have been a fine house at that time but what is it now? It's just bare walls and it's full of vermin and everything else. And it's the same in my constituency. We have houses there -- I don't see why the City leaves them stand. As far as I'm concerned they should be dragged down; they should be termed this and that and everything else. Here is something I have here that will bring you some idea of what I'm talking about. "Manitoba record in slum clearance and low rental housing is a long series of disappointment and frustration. The session of Legislature just ended has added another tattered page. The government failed to give leadership to local authorities. No one asked the province for a dollar during the Session." That was in that last short session we were on. "All that was expected was a statement that the government was in favour of slum clearance and decent housing for low income families, plus assurance that the provincial government would contribute towards any project which it approved. Instead of showing such leadership the government took refuge in another study of housing needs. After years of study the surveyors report the province wants still another study. The Liberals have no great reason to boast about their performance either. Confronted by a resolution that the province should provide funds for low cost rental housing the Liberal MLA's split. Six voted in favour of a resolution and five voted against it. It is common knowledge that Premier Roblin is concerned about expenditures but he is not being asked to sign a blank cheque. Even after he announced the policy of provincial participation in slum clearance and housing he would have the final say as to which individual projects would be proceeded with. With his record of belief in social justice, Mr. Roblin must have misgivings about his government's record in this year. Fortunately he will have a chance to redeem the government within a short time. He should not let the special session in July end without a policy announcement." Now, Sir, we're on a regular session. This was said about our First Minister on the end there. Now they've come out and said they are going to do something this time. I only hope that they will do something, not just talk. We have had enough of that. Let's get down to business; let's show them that at least we are going to do something in Manitoba. We're not just going to sit back and do nothing. We want to be Manitobans who want to say to them in Alberta or B.C. or Prince Edward Island

(Mr. Harris cont'd) . . . . or wherever you are: we're Manitobans, we are proud of our Province; we do things there, not just sit back and do nothing. So I would say, Sir, in all sincerity that when this housing will come up again that you will actually do something about it. I thank you.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if the honourable member would care to answer a question? I understood him to say that there was no reference in the Speech from the Throne touching on the common market.

MR. HARRIS: I said there was reference in the Speech from the Throne.

MR. EVANS: Oh, then I misunderstood my honourable friend.

MR. HARRIS: Yes, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

.....Continued on next page

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iverville). At the outset Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey my delight in seeing you back once more and carrying out your duties, making your job as easy as you do, and I certainly wish you well and hope that you'll come back to many, many more sessions to carry out your responsibility to the province. I would like to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder in reply to the speech from the Throne. They did an excellent job and it is a great source of strength to us as Ministers of this government and the Crown to have the support of such stalwarts as these members. I would like to extend at this time my congratulations to my Cabinet colleagues on their appointment and tell them how much I enjoy their company in the Cabinet, and also the fact that a responsibility which becomes onerous at times is made a great deal easier by the contribution that they are making to the Province of Manitoba. I should also, I think, extend congratulations to the New Democratic Party on their change of name. I think it's going to get them into some trouble; I think it already has. But nevertheless I trust they'll make the best of it.

Mr. Speaker we were treated yesterday to a very pensive, thoughtful talk on the meaning of liberalism. I was a little at a loss as to be able to determine to whom this particular lecture was directed, whether it was the Assembly, or whether it was the gallery, or whether it might be the Federal Constituency of Provencher; but in any case it did raise some questions in my mind, because there appeared to be some glaring contradictions. I could agree with some of the things or conclusions that the Honourable Member for La Verandrye came to, and I could take issue with some of the conclusions that he came to. One conclusion that he came to that I have difficulty in following is the fact that he equated -- in the end he equated the small liberal with the big "L" liberal, and this considering all the evidence to the contrary. I was quite taken with his remark that if you're going to be a liberal with a small "l" you have to show leadership. I quite agree with that. I tend to equate his concept of a small "l" liberal with a progressive. Anybody that's going to be progressive naturally has to get out in front and lead. Maybe it's true that a liberal and a progressive are the same thing, but then when you consider the fact that it wasn't only the New Democratic Party that changed their name we had another party in the Province of Manitoba who found it to their advantage to change their name and they lopped off the progressive part of it, so they're just plain big "L" liberals. Then when one considers their record in the past decade, especially in Canada and in Manitoba, one has just a little bit of trouble in reconciling the concept that a small "l" liberal is in fact a big "L" liberal.

On this question of leadership, it is hard for me to understand how a member of the House who voted in favour of a referendum, in respect of the implementation of Metro, could turn around and accuse this side of the House of not showing leadership. It is difficult for me to see how this member can reconcile the six buck boys in Ottawa with leadership and small "l" liberalism. It's difficult for me to reconcile or to understand how he can feel that things have changed very much, either here in Manitoba or at Ottawa, in respect of the big "l" liberals. Everything points to all the evidence here and there, points to the fact that they have not come up with any alternative and attractive policies. There seems to be no leadership at all. There's lots of criticism, lots of criticism, but very little leadership. In fact here in Manitoba, in respect of a matter which you would think the Honourable Member for La Verandrye would find his greatest love at least I think it was at one time--he had really very little to say on the subject of agriculture. Ah, yes he made a suggestion or two, I'll come to them, in respect to one at least, I wonder what measure of liberalism and leadership was in the suggestion of this kind. It seemed like a very easy way out, and as he said to us--it is hard to be a liberal, it isn't easy; if you're going to be a leader, it isn't always easy. And believe me we have had occasion to know on this side of the House that it isn't always easy, and believe me we haven't had very much help from the big "L" liberal party in Manitoba.

I'm quite impressed by a bright young man with a fine personality and a fine mind who has these fine thoughts about liberalism, small "l" liberalism and leadership and progress, and what these things should mean to the province, and to the individual, but I feel sorry for him at the same time that he is unable to distinguish the physical manifestation of these ideas when he sees them; that in fact he is tripping over them in Manitoba almost every way he turns, and yet he is unable to extricate himself from that web which has been spun around him.

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . I would say to him, Mr. Speaker, that it's not too late, it's never too late, and that maybe, maybe it's possible for him to see the error of his ways as others have seen the error of their ways and that he might start off afresh. There are other seats in this House. I don't think that he has to run off to far away places to get away from it all, and I don't think that when he gets there, if he gets there, if he gets there, that he would find very much difference, if he seeks out the people, his counterparts in Ottawa. I would hate to see a young man, a bright young man, disillusioned, sadly disillusioned, as he must be today, that liberal policy in Manitoba is driving him away from our midst. I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that this member, this honourable member, this personable young man has something to offer the Province of Manitoba--in spite of what he says about the big decisions being made in Ottawa, I think there are some pretty important decisions being made right here in Manitoba and I think that he has a contribution to make if he would only make it, but I know the difficulties as he has stated of being a Liberal today in Manitoba. It is so tough to make any contribution when he is almost hamstrung by the philosophies that they are determined to carry out in this province. But you know there was another Apostle, he wasn't an Apostle of Liberalism, but he had a great deal of difficulty; there was a great deal of wrestling with his conscience before he made his decision on the road to Damascus, but he saw the light, and I think that this modern apostle that we have in our midst of liberalism, I think that he too, can wrestle with his conscience and that there is an opportunity for him to make amends and to make his contribution to the Province of Manitoba. Heaven knows, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the best efforts of the best government that this province has seen in many a day, there are still many problems that need to be solved, and we need all the help we can get.

He referred, and now I'm going to deal with some of these contradictions, these points that I find so hard to reconcile with the things that I know are urging him onward and causing him all this difficulty within himself. He says there are some nebulous references to agriculture in the Throne Speech. We had a historical conference here in the Province of Manitoba, less than a year ago, to deal with a matter which the Honourable Member for La Verandrye has often confessed to be a matter of grave concern to him--the lack of information with respect to the marketing problem in the very broadest sense, which our farmers faced for so long. There was a reference to the hopes that we had, which are pretty firm hopes at the present time, that at long last something is going to be done. Now whether it was by oversight or otherwise, he neglected to mention this, there was reference to a very important study to the people in south Central Manitoba I think that part of this area, I'm quite sure, falls in Provencher, the present Provencher constituency and it is very difficult for me to understand why the hopeful would or hopeless, I don't know which it will be why the member wouldn't even give a passing reference to it. He certainly ferretted out those measures which he felt he could find some fault with. As usual he didn't give very much consideration to what he was saying. I think the source of his information was a newspaper account in the one case, and I don't think he was thinking in terms of his small "I" liberalism when he suggested that as the Minister of Agriculture I should introduce a program of what I think boils down to the furnishing of wild oat control chemicals to the farmers of Manitoba on a subsidized program. I think that both of us as members of this Legislature agree that there is a place for subsidized programs. But I think that if we are to implement them holus bolus without establishing priority, that we could do a great deal of damage to a society which he as a small "I" Liberal and I as a Progressive-Conservative, both want to maintain. I know that wild oat control has been a long time problem with us. I know that annually it costs us a lot of money. But the government is spending considerable moneys today through funds appropriated for research at the University of Manitoba to perfect ways and means of controlling this troublesome weed and costly weeds. I would suggest humbly to my honourable friend that in establishing priority I believe that the money spent in research in perfecting these weed killers is of much more far reaching benefit to the farmers in Manitoba than a dribbling out of a few cents a gallon, or even fifty cents a gallon or a dollar a gallon in order to get these farmers to use this means of weed control. I believe that when we have perfected this particular chemical, or a number of these chemicals to be used in this manner, that our farmers will adapt them to their needs and will make full use of them. He drew an analogy with the grasshopper control program and I suggest that this is a fallacious argument because although both the wild oat and the grasshopper

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . . have a tail, it's just the grasshopper that has wings. It is true that by wind and by birds, and animals, the wild oat can be spread from one farm to another. It doesn't take place in nearly the same magnitude, or as quickly as a grasshopper infestation can move from one farm, indeed from one community to another. So the arguments that would sustain, or validate, the introduction of a grasshopper control program would not, I think, hold, or be equally valid for an introduction of a wild oat control program on the same basis.

Now I have a little difficulty also, Mr. Speaker, in understanding--and I think this is something that the honourable members should learn--that either as a provincial member or a federal member he should acquaint himself with the problems of his people, and he should advocate, or at least avoid advocating policies which would obviate programs that are of inestimable value to his own people. But here, lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, we have the Honourable Member for LaVerandrye with his feet firmly mired in the Red River gumbo, finding fault with the Province of Manitoba, and particularly with the Minister of Agriculture, because part of our water control program has to do with flood protection and drainage. I think this is the way he put it--Oh yes. The most important messages from this government consists of ways and means of spending huge sums of money to get the water out of the grain growing areas of Manitoba as fast as they can and yet they call it the Department of Agriculture and Conservation. Is this conservation? Well I can hardly believe what I'm hearing because, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member of LaVerandrye knows very well, because he's lived closer to that area than I have, that if it weren't for drainage in south central Manitoba, the richest productive area in this province would be nothing but a big bog. Because that's what it was to start with and it was the initiative and the energy and the vision of the people of the Province who came before the honourable member and myself, that turned it into that tremendously productive area that it is today. And just to illustrate that these people have not forgotten the value of drainage and flood control, I had a delegation again from part of this federal constituency that the honourable hopes against hope that he might represent--but he's got a tough row ahead of him--I had a delegation in from one of the water short areas, Rhineland and Stanley, and they wanted me to hurry up on the Hespeler Floodway. The Hespeler Floodway is a major undertaking, it runs over half a million dollars-- well over a half a million dollars-- and it has to be staged over a number of years so that it can be integrated with our overall program. But here in a very area where they need water they also recognize the value of water control, flood control. They know that if it wasn't for these large floodways and for the feeders into them that they might as well go out of business. So we are just trying to deceive and confuse the people in Manitoba when we raise this question about water conservation. I would make an appeal, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member from LaVerandrye and his colleagues. Yes, it's hard to be a liberal, it's hard to be progressive, it's hard to lead. Give us a hand, give us a hand on this. Don't confuse the people on this question of water control and conservation. The people of Manitoba need this program and it's a difficult thing to sell, but if we're going to take advantage of every occasion to confuse the people in this province on this issue-- and it's a big one. (Interjection) We'll leave Fairfield to his own devices--and it's a big one (interjection).

We'll just leave Fairfield to his own devices. This is a difficult place to lead but if you're going to take advantage of every opportunity, every opportunity to confuse the issue, if you're going to take the opportunity to confuse rather than lead, then you make the job that much tougher, and if that's your concept of small "L" liberalism, progress, leadership, you can have it.

I would like to assure the honourable member that the amendment has been made in the regulation respecting marketing in Manitoba and that 66-2/3% of those actually voting is the requirement to pass a proposed and approved marketing scheme. We do some things without being prompted.

MR. S. ROBERTS: You didn't advertise that.

HON. G. HUTTON: Oh yes, it's advertised.

MR. S. ROBERTS: Get your friend. . . . . there to put out a release on it. Lets see it go into all the country papers. You're proud about everything else you do, why don't you advertise that one? That was an announcement.

HON. G. HUTTON: Well we haven't started that. We've got so much to talk about, that

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)... sometimes there is a little bit of lapse.

MR. S. ROBERTS: You just announce that one, that's all. Just put out a release in it the same as you do on the rest of the things you do.

HON. G. HUTTON: Everybody knew it was coming. We made the promise and we keep our promises. We made the promise a year ago and we keep our promises. Well we had some interesting observations from the member for Emerson tonight, about water supply, and here again it is very difficult to follow our honourable friend. He knows that very well all you have to do is go back two years ago, to 1959, prior to that summer session, there was no legislation, there was no program for water supply to the towns in Manitoba. We had the Liberals--I don't know, you draw your conclusion as to whether they were big "L" or small "l"--all we have left of the remnants of those that were here and we can only judge them on their past record. They are the same people. I don't think they have changed very much. I think that we would have very little water supply in Manitoba if they had been permitted to carry on their reactionary, unreconstructed grit programs that we had to live with for so many years in the Province of Manitoba. But here we have a program in water supply which has given new hope to these country communities, new hope and will bring them new vitality. You don't need to press us, we're carrying this program on as quickly as we can, because we believe it is one of the very fine programs of this government. We have, and I will bring in evidence at a later date to prove that we have right across the board--not only on the Red River and Assiniboine River programs--but right across the board on water conservation, we have had a program under way that in its magnitude was substantially larger than that when you gentlemen were running the Province of Manitoba. We have this program on the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. You don't want us to go ahead with it, you don't approve, some of you don't approve of giving protection to Greater Winnipeg. You say it's alright if we get 75 percent from Ottawa, but if you don't get that, just leave it alone; don't go ahead with it. You are as a party prepared to deny to almost--and it won't be long until it will be--half a million people, an element of protection that they have sadly needed over the years. You think that the same arguments that held in the horse and buggy days and because you never required that protection in the past, you got along without it, that we don't need it in the future. This sounds like small "l" Liberalism--oh I mean, pardon me, big "L" Liberalism. That's big "L" Liberalism--I get confused. It's going to give the citizens of this province a six dollar return for every dollar that Manitoba invests in it (interjection) A six dollar return.

E. GUTTORMSON ( St. George ): Who said so?

HON. G. HUTTON: Better authorities than you.

E. GUTTORMSON: Yeh, prove it.

HON. G. HUTTON: I think Mr. Speaker, that I will have to draw the Honourable Member for St. George a picture (interjection) I think words are lost on him. He was in a great dither to get the people he represents protection, but he's lost his enthusiasm for the whole thing now. Nevertheless the facts are, as closely as we can determine them after the most prolonged and far reaching study, that Manitoba will get back \$6 for everyone they invest in this program, and this is a pretty good investment in any man's language. I feel badly that those people who, although they are poorly qualified, evidently are the only ones to stand up for Liberalism in Manitoba have decided to go against this project. It's a sad day for Liberalism in Manitoba.

Now I would like to answer a question or two that was raised by the New Democratic Party members. I'm told that I don't hold with parity. I am informed by the Honourable Member for St. John's that this government doesn't speak up for the farmer in respect of matters which fall under Federal jurisdiction. I was informed by one of the members, and I think he got on pretty dangerous ground, when he asked me what we were going to do about the fact that we have imports of pork and lamb into Canada and into Manitoba. Now someone from the Liberals suggested that the New Democratic Party were the great proponents or were pretty good proponents of free trade, but I think we got an example this evening, or this afternoon, of what happened in the thinking of the New Democratic Party when self interests run smack bang up against the problems that free trade can pose for individual groups in our society, and this is just the problem in respect of lamb and pork imports. I am sure that our honourable friend never took into consideration the hundreds of thousands of cattle that moved out of Canada, out of Manitoba, into the United States, and I am sure that he never thought of

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . . the consequences of shutting our doors to imports of pork and lamb and what this would mean to our beef producers in Western Canada. As a matter of fact I have written to the Federal Minister and taken this matter up with him in person, because I know that there is a contradiction in our policy whereby we try to promote the production of sheep in Manitoba, and at the same time magnitude of the imports from Australia and New Zealand almost makes it economically impossible for our sheep men to come out with any kind of a fair return, and often times they come out with a loss. This is a tremendous problem, and here is the reason why: Canada has a favourable trade balance with New Zealand and Australia, very favourable. We sell them much more than we import from them and. . . .

S. PETERS: . . . . .

HON. G. HUTTON: But they come by way of U. S. A. (interjection) I don't know just the commercial channels that they come through. But we also trade with the U. S. A. and even our very liberal friends who love to expound on the merits of free trade like (interjection) Art wants to get up and say, let's knock off the quotas on turkeys; let's knock off the quotas on a lot of other agricultural products. They wouldn't want to get up and do that. They'd be frightened to do that. And I'll tell you why; because the Member for LaVerandrye hit the nail right on the head when he said it's easy to be a free trader when everything's going along fine, but it's not so easy to hold to these principles when you run into difficult problems, and we have seen that born out by some of the members in the Federal House, who belong to parties that believe in free trade, but when their own were hurt it was a different story. But our farmers understand what the story is. The New Democratic Party better educate itself, because in Western Canada, even when it isn't always to their advantage, by and large your farmers are free traders, and in spite of the fact that we have problems with imports and certain commodities our farmers had sense enough to understand--our farmers have sense enough to understand what the implications are of trying to protect their own little nest.

Now, a matter was raised here about standing up for Manitoba's farmers on the question of parity and a fair return. Now no one in this assembly can get up and tell me, or anyone else, what parity is in Canada. (interjection) Nobody can tell you what parity is. Where they have tried to extend this parity price, they have made rich men rich and squeezed poor men out. I don't know just what the answer is. I take issue with some of the aspects of the Agriculture Stabilization Board. I take issue with the fact that we in the Department of Agriculture in Manitoba try to encourage our farmers to establish economic units. Then we run smack bang into that--it seems a contrary philosophy in respect of eggs and pork--that if you produce more than so many units, you're out of luck. It does seem a little bit hard to reconcile. And yet maybe we don't know all the answers in spite of the fact that the supports on pork was restricted to a hundred units, a hundred animals, the price has been pretty fair, the small man has had protection, and the big operator during the last while hasn't done badly. I don't know what'll happen when we get into a cycle of production. I suppose the price will go down. On the other hand the Federal Minister just recently increased the support price on hogs five cents a pound to give a little further support. I think in all fairness--it's not my business to stand up here and advocate, be an advocate of the Federal Minister of Agriculture or the Federal Progressive-Conservative Party--but it is my business to see that the farmers that I am working for are not misled by a bunch of tripe that is pounded at them. And the story that the Federal Government has failed in all its promises to the Western Canadian farmer is so much tripe. I'm not going to say that because of all these policies the farmers' problems are over. Because that isn't true at all. It may seem to many that we are not making very much progress, but I am sure of this, had it not been for the conscientious and extensive efforts of the present administration of Ottawa, and especially the present Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa, the conditions of farmers, especially in Western Canada, would have been a great deal worse. I shudder to think, Mr. Speaker, what the situation would have been if the former administration had stayed in office any longer. It would have been absolutely a tragedy, because they were completely indifferent; they had lost their social consciousness, in fact, towards the western farmer. All you have to do is add up the bills that the people Canada have footed in their efforts to alleviate the situation to know that they have tried. They have tried and I believe that they have had a measure of success. At least, today, for the first time in many years, and I'll admit that some of it, a great part of it was due to the fact that we have had a major crop loss



(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... in this year, in this past year. But in addition to that with increased sales of something in the neighbourhood of 30 million bushels per year for every year that they have been in office, since they have taken office--with the extra monies that they have pumped into the western economy by way of those acreage payments, that so many people abuse, or spoke abusively of, and by monies expended in supporting farm products under the Agriculture Stabilization Bill, they have given a great deal of help to western farmers. I hope, and I trust that the farmer in Manitoba and other provinces in Western Canada, will remember this when the day of accounting comes, because their memories aren't quite that short.

I think, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, that when you consider the leadership that has been given in Manitoba, in the field of education, and we had a tough battle there, not a great deal of help, especially from those Liberals--with the fact that we had to implement Metro over their dead bodies; when you consider the agricultural programs that were brought in--and although they didn't criticize them really at the same time they weren't adverse to pointing out the costs of all these programs to the people of Manitoba--when you consider that they have tried to frighten the people of Manitoba, this has been their chief cudgel. Fashioning a club and running about the country, frightening the people of Manitoba on this question of taxation, they have showed a complete lack of leadership and have, in fact, proved that the Progressive Party in Manitoba, the true Liberal forward-thinking party in Manitoba, is the present government. Thank you.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE: (Carillon) Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that the members applauded. I am not rising to make a long speech at all. I am prompted to rise and say a few words because my genial friend always seem to have the knack of forcing me in a sense to say a few words. Now he came out with some figures tonight that surprised me very, very much. He stated that for every dollar that Manitoba puts in the floodway, Manitoba will get six dollars back. Mr. Speaker, I just can't figure out how he comes to these figures. Unless he forgets that the dollar that the Federal Government puts in is expected to reward it or Manitoba somehow. If he takes the two governments together, he certainly cannot quote and say to this House that in Manitoba out of this project we will get six dollars for one. It is ridiculous. It doesn't stand up. I had before me even before he spoke, this report, the Manning Report on the floodway. And it states the benefits and costs for the three major projects. Greater Winnipeg Floodway benefit cost ratio 2.89; Portage Diversion 9.06; Russell Reservoir 6.18. But there is a note, a quite important note. I'll read the note for the benefit of the members of this house. In this report annual interest and amortization--if that's the right way to pronounce it, it's a long word for me--costs have been calculated on the basis of a four (4) percent rate of interest. This is close to the average rate paid by the Province of Manitoba over the past ten years--that's when this province had a government that was not extravagant--but the Commission is aware that current interest rates are higher than this. The use of a higher rate would result in a lower benefit cost ratio. It would not result in any change in the recommendation of the Commission. With an interest rate--and mark this, with an interest rate of five percent instead of four percent on the three major projects recommended, the benefit cost ratio would be 2.30. That's not six to one; 2.30 to one. If I can read. And now, Mr. Speaker, I say that estimate was made in 1957. The costs have risen; the interest has risen. Have we an estimate of the cost now? Furthermore this estimate was made on the basis of the floodway starting north of St. Norbert; I understand you have gone four miles south of St. Norbert. It will add some 5 million dollars. What about the cost-benefit ratio? What about the cost of purchase of properties that have gone up? I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the government will have to pay more, and I wouldn't blame them for the land, than was estimated. I say we don't know what the cost will be of this huge project. I say that for the minister to come out with a figure that might be reported in the Press to the effect that for every dollar we put in, we will get six back, I say that doesn't stand up.

MR. HUTTON: Correct.

MR. PREFONTAINE: It should not be reported that way in the Press because it doesn't stand up. If you have other figures coming from representatives of a responsible body to present to this house upsetting the report of the Royal Commission, that's another story, but we haven't had that pleasure yet. I say that the Minister has changed his mind. He states that in my constituency that Manitoba will get four times its money's worth. Now it's about six

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.). . . . times what we'll get. That's within two or three months. He was speaking at Grunthal, it was reported in the Carillon News that we would get four dollars to every one we put in (interjection) we've had better deal. Well you did not know about that deal at this time. Did you hope to get only 50 percent at that time from Ottawa or 40 percent, and you got a better deal. Well this particular night, Mr. Speaker, I was looking in at this famous Conservative Convention in Winnipeg and when the professor or teacher of our First Minister came to the point of the floodway, our First Minister was standing back of him, and when the figure was mentioned I don't think that our First Minister was very happy. When you realize that he would get not even 60 percent. We had gotten 75 percent when we were the government on a dike around Winnipeg. We got 75 percent in Ottawa. When the honourable members were laughing a few minutes ago when the Member for Emerson was mentioning the fact that we in this province had lost our bargaining power, I don't think Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister should have laughed. Because we didn't get a good deal; because 80%, it is stated in this book, of the water comes from the south, and if he had waited and consulted properly with Ottawa before making his foolish announcement, I think he could have gotten a better deal. I am satisfied he would, and Mr. Speaker every day when I travel, or every week, when I travel from St. Pierre to Winnipeg on St. Anne's Road or 59 highway, I come to these big signs: "site of Greater Winnipeg Floodway"--they're about a mile apart--and I can imagine this new St. Lawrence River there; it might happen once in a 100 years, possibly, that there would be water. But Mr. Speaker I feel like stepping out of my car and writing on this sign, site of Roblin's political floodway--and I think it should be done. I think it's nothing but a political floodway, this floodway that we'll be getting; it doesn't stand up under close examination. We may be laughed at, certainly, they are sitting, they are strong, but there are lots of people in Manitoba who think that it is a foolish project, and these people will someday express their opinion in a way maybe that the First Minister will be sorry for.

Now I would like to say a few words with respect to the jibes I should say, I don't know what my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture said about the Member for La Verandrye. It seems to the Honourable Minister that it is not right, not proper for a young man to have ambition to serve this province in the field that he chooses to serve his province. He rightly stated that the Member for La Verandrye was a bright, able young man--capable. Absolutely it is true, and there are different ways of serving a province. A province can be served in Ottawa and can be served in Manitoba. He is a trained man, as you know the Member for La Verandrye, in agriculture, and the great problems of agriculture they are in Ottawa, they are not in Manitoba. Marketing, price--that's where the great problems are decided. Absolutely I am, that's where, and you said so yourself; you have your eyes, First Minister, on Ottawa, I am sure. Someday maybe the Honourable, the First Minister will be looking to other fields also to serve Manitobans. There was a good leader, in the province at one time, the Premier of this province, Mr. Bracken, who decided that he could best serve Manitoba by going to Ottawa, and I say that the member for La Verandrye is most welcome in the constituency of Provencher where I live and where I will have the pleasure some day to vote for him. We think in Provencher that in Stan Roberts we have a good candidate, and I don't agree with the Minister of Agriculture that he is hoping against hope to win the constituency. I think the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture would have another guess coming, not before very long when the election is called, of course. Mr. Speaker, I think that it's a noble ambition to serve your people. As far as La Verandrye is concerned there are quite many able men. I am sorry to see him go in a sense from Manitoba, but I say, hence my hat off to him. I say that he can serve, and serve us well, serve agriculture. How is agriculture served by the 14 M. P.'s from Manitoba in Ottawa now--14 silent members doing nothing--just waving their hands, approving everything. That's what they're doing, all of them shaking their heads this way. Never that way--oh no that's too dangerous, no it couldn't be done. What about the voluntary quotas from Japan? Oh yes, oh yes, they approve everything. This is hurting the farmers of this province, the farmers who depend on trade with others countries, all countries in the world, and Japan is one of our good customers. We should trade with Japan, not restrict trade by voluntary quotas, and our 14 M. P.'s should not wave this way, but should say no, we don't want that. What about British cars-- the tariff against British cars being sold here. Again they desist, our fourteen. It's good that we should have someone who will go to Ottawa,

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd).....and when the next election comes there won't be 14 Progressive Conservatives--I don't know how many NDP's will be there. I don't think there will be many, unless they come to see the light as Mr. Argue has come to see the light, and join the party that is dedicated to doing something for Agriculture, the Liberal Party. If I am Liberal today it is because I have been a free trader. Of course the Liberals have had certain tariffs, but theirs is a low tariff as against the Conservatives; there is no comparison as far as I am concerned. Now the high cost of everything the farmers buy, which is brought about by high tariffs, is what's wrong with farming today. The high cost of machinery, of overalls, of shoes and everything that a farmer needs. That's where we should address ourselves, and I say that the policies of the Conservatives from time immemorial, as far as I am concerned, has been one to protect industry and to neglect the farmers and the primary producers in Canada, and that's why I say that we need good young men like Stan Roberts to go there where the big things are done, and I bow to him.

No Mr. Speaker, I said a little while ago that our First Minister might have eyes towards Ottawa. I believe he has. His policies and his meetings that he's organizing now address themselves to the whole of Canada, and I hazard a guess now, Mr. Speaker, that if the, his boss, I should say Mr. Diefenbaker does not form an election soon, maybe we'll have an election in Manitoba before our new leader gets properly established and the New Party, of course it won't go very far. With respect to the New Party, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of this businessman, who on the Monday morning opened his door, he had a big sign on the door. "Open for Business", and on Friday the door was closed and where was a big sign, "Opened by Mistake". Now I think this NDP, this name was chosen by mistake, because it's not going to bring them very far, neither in Ottawa nor in Manitoba. And by the way I think possibly, Mr. Speaker, that we have two good young farmer friends in this new party; I think they belong really to the Liberal Party. I think they will follow their leader, Hazen Argue, at least a man who wants to help agriculture, and nobody has said that he's a fool. Hazen Argue has promised and has shown that he wants the interests of the farmers. He didn't join the Conservative Party oh no--the Conservative Party especially and possibly in Ottawa.

I bow here to my friend Mr. Hutton. He has done some good things. Last year when we had the drought, I do, Mr. Speaker, say that he was on the spot. He worked hard and diligently to protect the farmers of this province at the time of the drought. I do bow to him. He has some very good points Mr. Speaker--about the floodway I don't agree with him. But I say that the Conservatives in Ottawa, they're not the friend of the farmer. They haven't been. They can pass some temporary legislation, but they don't solve the great problems. In fact they create the big problems, the big difficulties, the fact that we cannot buy in a free market and we have to sell in a free market. Now with respect Mr. Speaker, my impromptu speech is finished, thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House.

MR. G. MOLGAT: (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before you put the question. Due to the fact that this will be my last opportunity in this debate to speak, as I am unable to speak on the amendment or on the main motion, I would like to make a few comments before we close off. I am tempted of course, to make a two or three hour discourse, as apparently my last contribution was considered to be too short in certain quarters, and I could, of course, very well do that, if I were to list even only some of the sins of omission and commission of my honourable friends across the way. I will, however, limit myself to fewer items than that this evening. I was very interested to hear from the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I had hoped as well to hear from a number of other ministers. I thought, possibly, the Minister of Education would explain his stand on teachers' pensions, for example, or shall I say his lack of stand on teachers' pensions? I thought possibly the First Minister and the Treasurer, along with the Minister of Health would tell us what they are doing with our provincial income tax, if they're not turning it over to the hospital plan, which they are obviously not. This would be very enlightening to the people of Manitoba and very helpful. There are a number of other topics which my honourable friends could cover but so far they seem to be unwilling to do this. However the Minister of Agriculture did give us a few comments. It seems to me that he missed some of the very important points. My honourable friend's a very touchy individual, almost as touchy as his leader in fact. Anytime there is

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) . . . . criticism of any of his programs he immediately jumps up and says you're against everything we are proposing. That's the automatic reaction. We went through that last year and we're seeing it happening again. Same proposition each time. But my honourable friend doesn't get down to the point of the questions that we're addressing to him and the criticism that we're making of his programs. What exactly is the deal that we're getting on the floodway? That's what we have been asking you people across there, and we still haven't got an answer. What exactly are we getting by comparison to other provinces, and we still haven't got an answer from you. Now you come along and you chide us, you chided the Member for La Verendrye for some of the things he said yesterday. Well at least my honourable friend from La Verendrye is prepared to stand up and say the things that he thinks should be done for Manitoba, and when he chooses as my colleague, the Member for Carillon said, to enter the Federal field -- and I say that I regret to see him leave the provincial field -- but when he does that, at least he'll go to Ottawa and be prepared to stand up there and speak for Manitoba, which isn't the case for the 14 members there now. If those 14 members had been prepared to assist the Province of Manitoba, we would have had a much better deal, I would think, on the floodway than what we've got. We would have had a better deal on tax rental agreements than we've got, and that isn't what we've had. That's the main criticism I have of this same government. You don't dare stand up for the rights of Manitoba. You knuckle down under your chief at Ottawa, and the First Minister is the first one to do so, and you get up here and you accuse us of criticizing your programs and your plans. Tell us what your programs and your plans are exactly. We still don't know and the people of Manitoba don't know in this case. You talked all around the subject on floodway and the things that it would do, but you didn't tell us the questions that we asked you on the subject.

Going on to other matters. My honourable friend says that he laughed at my friends on the left here, because they talked about parity. He said that you can't define parity. Well, now, what about his federal leader before the last election? What was his great cry? "Parity not charity". Did he have an explanation for parity? Did my honourable friend ask him what he meant by parity? Did he have any comments to make about it? Oh no, none at all, that's to be forgotten. My honourable friend doesn't like to forget though, the previous government here in Ottawa; he's still fighting back the same old elections from before. That isn't the point. We're discussing your programs and your policies; we're discussing today, not yesterday; today and tomorrow and the future of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to the amendment and the sub-amendment which is proposed. I must say I'm a little disappointed with my honourable friend, the Leader of the NDP. We had proposed an amendment which was wide enough to permit him to support it; wide enough to permit him to add everything that he has added in his own amendment -- just tack it on to the end. This would have suited us much better because we could very easily support an amendment of that type. It becomes a little more difficult when he insists on cutting out completely our own amendment and proposing another. I suspect that my honourable friend doesn't really want us to vote for it. He's playing a little politics again; he likes that. He's having a little game on his own there and hoping to . . . . . But we've read very carefully the amendments that he proposes here and the first one, the first part of it, he says that the provinces failed to provide the incentives and the economic planning necessary to stimulate the economy whereby the industrial and agricultural sectors would have a high level of growth. Well, that's exactly part of our criticism of this government, that their planning has not been proper planning. They've jumped in certain directions and they've stalled in other directions and they haven't taken the proper action in those matters. Now, this is what we call planning. When my honourable friend talks planning he at times, well, not too often now, but he used to talk Socialist. Now if that's the sort of planning, we're agin' it, completely agin' it. But proper, decent, regular planning, which is what we did when we were in office . . . (Interjection) . . . It's quite alright; it's quite alright. I can cite you many programs, but as I said, we're discussing today and tomorrow but not the past. Proper planning is a function of government and must be done. We have no objections to that part of it. Socialist planning - No! The next step he says that the province does not share the revenues on an equitable basis with the municipalities. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was part of the speech that I made here last Monday. It was when my honourable friend was speaking to the Speech from the Throne about the uncon-

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) . . . . .ditional grants to municipalities. They are, in my opinion, not talking of what we want and that is an increase in the per capita grant. They are talking about a changed distribution, and we say that it's high time that the municipalities of this province be relieved of a large extent of their taxation. My honourable friend across the way said that before the election but since then he's put more burdens on them. The facts are in the Province of Manitoba today, the costs of taxation on real estate are too high; they are carrying too large a burden of the municipal and provincial costs, and this has got to be changed. We agree completely with this move over. I might say at this moment too that in my opinion, this is one of the fields where we can assist the agricultural parts of our province very much, because this is one of the costs that hits very highly on the farmers of this province -- their realty tax. My honourable friend here across the way, from Roblin, chided me for not having mentioned the word "agriculture" in my speech. Well, it's true, I didn't mention the word agriculture, but then I'm not in the same position as my honourable friend here who represents another group completely and specifically, and of course feels the necessity to get up and prove that he's for someone else as well. The stand of the Liberal Party in the past is clear enough in that matter. There's a further point. We don't believe, in our Party, that one individual has to do the speaking on all the subjects. We have an excellent group and an excellent team -- we believe in having different people speak on various subjects. So he needn't worry about the agricultural field. You will hear plenty from the Liberal Party in the field of agriculture.

The last point he has in his amendment, Mr. Speaker, is that the province has failed to provide an adequate program for the social needs of our citizens. Well, there again, a number of our members and myself spoke of such things as urban renewal, basic social needs, urgent social needs. My colleague from La Verendrye pointed out yesterday, the cost-benefit ratio which the Minister of Agriculture so frequently speaks of is very high in this field as well. Another member spoke today in your own group on this subject. This is an urgent need. Any time wasted in this field is a great addition to the costs of this province in the long run. Action is required! On this basis, Mr. Speaker, our group will support this amendment.

. . . . . Continued on next page

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, looking at the clock, I see that there is time for me to say a word or two in respect of the motion that is before us now. I think that I will take the liberty of restricting myself to some of the statements that appear in the sub-amendment that is before us and make some reference to the comments that have been made by the leaders of the two parties opposite with respect to the terms of that sub-amendment. I look forward, however, to perhaps rising again in the debate when another opportunity may present itself. I must confess that until the Leader of the Opposition had spoken tonight, I had not thought that I would trespass on the good nature of members. Perhaps it is just as well however, that I should do so, because in listening to his remarks tonight I must say that I can hardly recall an occasion in which I've heard a more hypocritical--perhaps I shouldn't use that word, it may hardly be parliamentary--but heard a line of argument that so crossed the clear evidence of the facts that I should sit still and let it be left on the record of this House without contradiction.

Mr. Speaker, we are accused of failing to provide the incentives and economic planning necessary to stimulate the province in agricultural and industrial lines. Where was the Leader of the Opposition when we were trying to promote the Industrial Development Fund in this province? I'll tell you where he was. Sitting in his seat in this House voting against it. Where was the Leader of the Opposition when we were bringing in Agricultural Credit to revive the economy in the agriculture in certain respects? Right in his seat in this House voting against it. Where was the Leader of the Opposition when we were trying to implement the platform of crop insurance for the people of Manitoba that has proved so beneficial in this province? Right in his seat in this House voting against it. When we were asking for increased research facilities, where was the Leader of the Opposition? Sitting in his seat in this House voting against it. When we were asking for more money for education, when we were asking for money for highways, when we were asking for money for the many other activities which this government advocated in opposition and is carrying out in office, where was the honourable gentleman? Sitting in the House and voting against it. He was indeed. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I must confess that some members of the Liberal Party in this Legislature are being dragged, kicking and screaming into the second half of the Twentieth Century. They don't like what they see; they want to go back to the old days. They are the kind of people who believe that the government should do as little as possible and let the blind forces of the economy have their way. Yes, many of them do sit over on that side. At least on any occasion when we have tried to bring in the measures that would benefit, as we have thought, the economy of our province, they have opposed. They talk about the revenues that we're sharing with the municipalities. I do not have the figures with me tonight, but I can say, speaking from memory, Sir, that since we came into office, in the various proposals that we have made the support that the province gives to municipalities has increased by some 15 or 18 millions of dollars, and I want to tell the House that when they see the estimates that are coming down for this year that they will see that two or three or four million dollars has been added to the provincial contribution to municipal and local governments in the Province of Manitoba. We are doing the things they never did. We are doing the things they refused to do. We are implementing the policies which are promoting the industrial and agricultural development of this province, which the Liberal Party turned their backs on every opportunity they got, and the Leader of the Opposition was sitting in his seat aiding and abetting them. (Interjection) What about what? What about unconditional grants? My friend will see that when the unconditional grant schedule comes down that the people of this province generally, are receiving more money under this system than they did in the previous year. That is perfectly true. He singles out one thing -- unconditional grants. Well, he's going to get the figures on Tuesday when we table the estimates. But I say to him that he can't stop there. I say to him that he's got to go through the whole of the provincial support to the municipalities of Manitoba. He's got to see what's been done in Education. He's got to see what's been done in the field of Social Welfare that's been sneered at by several members today. And I see in this little sub-amendment that we have here that we're blamed for not giving adequate support to the social needs of the citizens of Manitoba. Well, I really don't take offence at that resolution coming from the Leader of the New Democratic Party--and I hope you'll remember I got his title correctly tonight--I've been working on that. I

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd. . . .) don't really object to his saying that because I must admit that his idea of Social Welfare goes a little bit beyond mine, and I quite understand if he perhaps thinks we don't go far enough. But to have the Leader of the Liberal Party, to have them stand up and tell us that this business of Social Welfare isn't being very well handled, that we're not putting enough money into it. They didn't do anything for the old age pensioners when they were in office. They didn't introduce The Social Allowances Act, which provides--I think the payments average out about \$20 per case to the people who are being served under this Act. They didn't bring in Medicare. They didn't do any of the things in the Social Allowances field that we're doing. They didn't take the 2,000 people who are in nursing homes in this province that can't pay their bills themselves and help them with provincial funds. They didn't do that. They turned their backs on them. We did it. We did it. We paid the bill; we took it off the backs of the municipalities. We carried on--(interjection) fighting the last election. Well, I want to say this to my honourable friend, I'd just like to say this to him. I know something--perhaps there are others who know a good deal more about what it is to be the Leader of the Opposition. I remember so well the first time that I ever spoke in that capacity, the way in which my efforts were described by the then-Leader of the House -- a wonderful phrase really, it sticks in your mind: "A characteristic manifestation of political immaturity." That's the way he described me when I made my maiden effort as Leader of the Opposition. And some over there seem to think that I still can be described in that way. Well, one's entitled to one's opinion. I wouldn't, I don't like to say insult, that's probably too strong a word, but I wouldn't cast any such phrase as that presently to the Opposition because I think he's a man of some ability. I hope for the sake of the people of this province that he turns out to be a man of some ability, not because I really anticipate that he will be charged with executive responsibility in the near future, but I do know -- and I say this seriously -- I do know in my heart what a good Leader of the Opposition can do to help the government of this province, because that has been the effort of some who have sat in the seat that he sits in before him, and I hope that he can live up to those traditions--and I speak not, I speak not of my performance in that office.

So my Honourable Friend from Carillon--oh, yes, with his subtle French intellect you know which sees the double entendre in every phrase, can perhaps relax and sit back. We promise not to drag him into the second half of the Twentieth Century, because I realize an impossibility when I see one. But I want to say to the Leader of the Liberal Party that he's been here long enough to know that what I say is true. If his own friends will not support him in this direction I must say that I feel sorry for him. But for all of the facts that I disagree sometimes quite heatedly with the Leader of the New Democratic Party in this House, there's one thing I must say for him, and that is that he's got some ideas of his own. One thing I must say for him is that he does present an alternative approach to the policies that the government might be following. I don't agree with him on all occasions. Sometimes I do. I think I can learn from him on some occasions, and I'm not ashamed of doing so, but I say that he does present an alternative. And while it is the duty of the Opposition to criticize, while it is the duty of the Opposition to ventilate the issues of the day and make sure that they receive full consideration and discussion in this House, and while I recognize the importance of that function, let me say that there's something else that must be done, and that is the Opposition must present a few constructive alternative ideas. If the Opposition expects to be accepted seriously by the people of this province as an alternative to any administration, they must do that, because I'm going to tell my honourable friend something that I discovered some time ago, and he may learn too, that something always beats nothing, and just as long as the policy of his party represents the negative unconstructive critical nothing that it does at the moment, they won't be doing their duty to the people of the Province of Manitoba. And I say to him that I look forward to the time when he will stand up in his place and along with his criticisms, and along with his ventilations of the issues which are very important, he will have something to say of a constructive policy-forming nature so that we may see whether there is a real alternative to the present administration sitting over there on the other side of the House. Mr. Speaker, I'm not worried. (Interjection) No, I think that the wave of goodwill that I feel emanating from the other side of the House will sustain me for another few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I found it difficult I will admit, to sit here

(Mr. Roblin cont'd).....quietly and listen to what the Leader of the Opposition has to say about the policies of the administration. If at any time he had demonstrated his willingness to submit alternative policies as the Leader of the CCF Party has done; if he had supported us in any of these measures that we had placed before the Legislature at any time, particularly when we were introducing him in opposition, perhaps he would have some right to take the stand that he takes here tonight. But I don't think he's earned it. I don't think he's earned it at all. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the CCF Party in introducing this motion spoke--I'm sorry-- the New Democratic Party, when introducing this motion spoke on many subjects, but he really didn't seem to me to present any detailed argument in support of the sub-amendment that he's placed before us. I would be quite willing to admit, in fact I would agree with him, that there is nothing in the immediate economic outlook that entitled anyone to be complacent about the affairs of this province. There's nothing in the economic forecast as we see it that leads us to think that we have solved the problems that beset us in the field of unemployment and in other aspects as well. But on the other hand, there is nothing to be downhearted about, because I think it is quite true to say that the number of jobs available in Manitoba has increased. Not enough, I agree; we have to keep on working. I think it is quite fair to say, and quite true to say, that the income per head, per capita, per family, per worker in Manitoba increased last year -- Not enough. Somebody quoted the figures of 1959 which showed the very low incomes which some of our people have to exist on and there is no reason here to be satisfied or complacent about the matter. I agree with that and I say that we have to work hard to try and increase the income of the people of the Province of Manitoba, but there's nothing to be downhearted about because we are making progress in this direction. We are increasing the number of jobs in this Province. The Industrial Development Fund alone, and it's a very small thing really when you compare it to the great scope of the economic activity of the Province; has provided we reckon about 1,000 new jobs in the course of its operation in the last year or two. Now that is nothing that solves our problem but it is certainly a step forward in the right direction, and it seems to me that under the existing circumstances as we have them that this represents a commendable effort on the part of the Industrial Development Fund, and although we don't run it, we have to take the responsibility for the policy that developed it. Somebody said a little while ago: "Why don't you use it to help the situation at Brandon and in Brandon Packers? Does anyone think that we sit by complacently and see a plant of some 200 people not functioning when it is the largest single plant in that area? No Sir. But we cannot step in and make political decisions in the operations of the Industrial Development Fund. That is something that has to be dealt with on an economic decision, and when the affairs of that Company are placed on a sound economic footing, as I have every confidence they will be within a very short time, then I feel certain that they will be able to present a sufficiently attractive economic proposition to the Industrial Development Fund that they will be assisted in restoring that very important industry in the City of Brandon. But I do not think that it would be wise, and I'm sure that members will agree with me on reflection, that it would not be wise for us to step into the centre of that particular problem until the financial reorganization of the Company has been carried out in some way that meets the desires of the people who own it and is realistic under the circumstances. But when that is done the assistance of the Industrial Development Fund will be available. I don't wish to indulge in the gratuitous exercise of prophecy, but I have every hope that perhaps before this House rises that we may see that important industrial institution going again in the City of Brandon and for the assistance of the people of western Manitoba.

I must say that the Leader of the New Democratic Party was, I think, in a constructive vain when he was criticizing the government. I realize it is his duty to bring in an amendment of non-confidence of this sort, and I take it in that way. I wish to congratulate him particularly on one thing, as I also wish to congratulate the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks for their expressions on the problem of Metro Government. I want to tell them however, that not all the people who are trying to play politics in the unfortunate sense of that term with respect to Metropolitan Government, are outside this Chamber. I don't think they are. I think there are some in here. I have not the time tonight nor is this the occasion on which I will speak as I hope to do before the House concludes its business with respect to



(Mr. Roblin cont'd). . . . Metropolitan Government. I have not the time tonight nor is this the occasion to have an examination of the financial structure of Metropolitan Government. That I certainly intend to see is carried on in this House before we rise. I want to make it quite clear to all who will listen to me that we are not in the position of a parent spurning or casting aside its child in this connection. We recognize that just as we have the final and ultimate responsibility for the activities of any municipal government in this province, so we have for the Metropolitan Government of Greater Winnipeg, and we do not intend to stand idly by and deprive it of any valid assistance that we can, or any support that we may properly bring, all things considered, now or at any time in the future, and members of this House may expect to hear from us before we're through, what our views are in that particular matter. And others too will add their contribution to the debate I have no doubt.

The issue of the Red River Floodway has been paraded before us. The Leader of the Opposition wasn't content with making one speech, he wanted to make two on the same subject. Well I'm going to tell him he'll have to make another. He's going to have to make a very considered speech before we're through in this House if he's going to measure up to his responsibilities, because we intend to see to it, as we stated in the Throne Speech clearly and unequivocally, all matters in connection with this that we are able to give the House will be placed before the House. And further than that we will demand an expression of opinion from all sides of this House as to the wisdom and the value of the policies that we are pursuing. We are not interested in conducting any hole in corner negotiation. We are not interested in trying to disguise the import or the fact or the reality of this, or of any other measure that we propose from the people of this Province. We wish to give them the full facts. Our problem is in the floodway. Our problem is in these policies of water control and conservation, which in their magnitude will I think surprise some here; our problem is one of communication. It's not that we're biding the facts, it is that we have the difficulty of making them known and getting them across to the people who should be asked to judge. We can't even get it across to members who sit within twenty paces of us in this House, because a man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still, and there are some members of this House that cannot be convinced on this issue no matter how valid or realistic the facts may be. I'm afraid we give some of them up. But I believe that we have a duty that we intend to perform to see that the people of Manitoba, to the best of our ability, have all these facts, all of them that are relevant to this issue; that the points that are raised by the public at large need answering, must be answered and will be answered. We assure the members of this House as we assure the public that these aspects of our policies will be placed before this Legislature and you'll all have a chance to say what you think about them, and those who are in positions of authority in Opposition parties I think should look well, should think well, of what they are to say because gentlemen, it may be rather simple of me to say this. . .

MR. GUTTORMSON: It's 10:30, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: When Mr. Speaker calls it I'll take my seat, but I'm just about ready to conclude. It may be rather naïve of me to say this, but some of the issues perhaps I may say, some of the issues that we discuss here really are not political issues in the sense in which some of us sometimes approach them--they're provincial issues--and our job is to rise above the temptation to take the quick trick, to rise above the temptation that make the quick advantage or the quick comeback, or be one man up as we see in some other circles in connection with Metro. It's a test of character to see whether sometimes we can remember that we are here in the interest of the people of our province and not in the interest of our parties, and these issues, some of which are of great importance will be before you on this occasion. I must admit that I shall not support the sub-amendment, but I do feel this, that while I trust the sub-amendment will be defeated and the government will be given an opportunity to carry on, we hope that the House will look at some of these matters we have placed before them in the spirit of good citizenship in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Leader of the New Democratic Party to the Speech from the Throne which reads as follows: That the Amendment be amended by deleting all the words after the word "Government", and substituting the following: 'Has failed to provide the incentives and the economic planning necessary to stimulate the economy of the Province whereby the industrial and agricultural sectors would have a high level of growth and have not shared the revenues of the Province on an equitable basis with the municipalities, and have failed to provide an adequate program for the social needs of our citizens, and have therefore lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Dow, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Scarth, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Mrs. Forbes, Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 18, Nays 30.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the Throne Speech that the motion be amended by adding the following words: That this House regrets that Your Honour's Government by taking action in numerous fields without adequate preparation and by failing to accept in other fields its clear responsibilities has lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba. Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: I'm almost asleep, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. MCKELLAR: Let the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, having reached the end of our agenda I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock, Friday afternoon.