

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 12th, 1963.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I will begin my remarks by saying, first of all, that I apologize for prolonging the Throne Speech debate. I feel that -- I don't know if others feel this way, but at this late stage we feel that there isn't too much more that can be added, anything of substance, so the members may very well find much of what I have to say as being repetitious and perhaps boring, so I apologize on that account. I also apologize for what seems to be an apparent but not a real involvement in the shenanigans last night at 8:00 p.m. It was not my intention to play Alphonse and Gaston with the Premier. I would also like to take the opportunity to, since I do have the floor, to welcome to this Chamber a group of ladies from the Hawthorne Club of North Kildonan. I take this opportunity, I think since it is impossible for you to extend them a welcome, I do so on your behalf. And with those preliminary remarks, Madam Speaker, I intend to extend no further apologies in the course of the next 30 minutes or so.

I would, first of all, like to extend congratulations to you. I don't feel it is a matter of routine; I think it's a rather historic event that you should be appointed as the first woman speaker in this Assembly. History is full of irony and I consider it to be particularly ironic that you should be appointed to this position by a Party that, in the course of past years, fought so bitterly against women suffrage and equal rights for women. I did not intend that as an offensive remark to any sense of the imagination, simply an expression of an historical fact, and I would like to suggest that lest you be inclined to not view this group with impartiality -- I don't think you will, but in case you did -- I would like to point out to you that in the past it was representatives of the group that we represent that fought for women suffrage in the British House of Commons and elsewhere. I am sure members here have heard of such great men as George Lansbury, Hardie, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, all of them Social Democrats, all of them predecessors of the kind of social and political thinking that we seven in this group represent here today.

I would also like to congratulate the new members in this Assembly for their contribution to the Throne Speech debate. All of them were fortunate enough to get into the debate at an early stage and, consequently, much of what they had to say was fresh and very much to the point. I was -- and I don't think that one need be embarrassed to express his opinion of the matter -- I was very much impressed with the speech made by the Honourable Member for Swan River, reading it in Hansard; the Member for Turtle Mountain; the Member for Burrows -- and as an aside I say listening to the Member for Burrows I got the impression that here was at last the rare creature I was looking for, a small "l" Liberal -- progressive-minded. I have until now not had the opportunity of really seeing one, nor hearing one. I hope that his stay in this Chamber will continue to be a consistent expression of small "l" progressive-liberalism.

I would like, Madam Speaker, to turn to a few of the particulars in the Speech from the Throne and, of course, because of the timing, since it is near the end of the debate, I intend to pass over many of them since they have been already dealt with. But before turning to these three or four points which I consider to be crucial and of major importance to the future economic growth of this province, I would like to deal briefly with some of the statements that have been made in this Chamber in the past week.

First of all, we have -- I think, one can summarize it this way -- we have had the speakers of the Liberal Party making the following points against the government. Firstly, that it has stolen many of its policies. All I would suggest is that if this is the case, they are not alone. I intend to come back to that later. The Liberal speakers have also accused the government of seeming to accept, or accepting the socialist ideas of economic planning, of planification, and in the last few days I think members must be aware that there has been an unusual, an extraordinary amount of attention being paid here to the concept of social and economic planning.

Then the point was made, I believe by the Member for St. George, about mismanagement to the extent of a \$2 million loss, or overpayment in the case of the Grand Rapids project. All

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) I can say in that regard is that listening to the two sides of the matter I could not help but feel that the case that the member made was a damning one; the indictment was complete; and the remarks made in defence by the Cabinet Ministers and the First Minister were very weak. Now it's true we were promised an opportunity to investigate the matter at some later stage in this House. Indeed, I think that is about all the government could have said at the time and we look forward with interest to see just what sort of defence or excuse will be made.

Can I just hark back, Madam Speaker, to this question of economic planning. I think that the Conservative Party in Manitoba is taking a rather practical and a rather rational approach to the economic problems that face us when they do turn to economic planning. The days are past when anyone, even one who purports to be a supporter of capitalism or capitalistic organization of the economy, those days are past and they can ignore the need for ordering the economy of society so that maximum results are obtained. I know that so far the two old parties have not really accepted the idea with grace. They are now resorting to a battle of semantics, so we have such statements appearing in the press as the Conservative Premier saying: "Yes, we're in favour of economic planning but we're not in favour of a planned economy." We hear that. The fact of the matter is that economic planning, like a person's health, can never be achieved in any absolute sense, and we can plan, and continue to plan without ever reaching a society where planning is completed; finalized; or totalized.

Nevertheless, I believe that one must pay tribute, in a limited sense at least, to this government for accepting, in part, the idea of ordering the affairs of this province, insofar as it is responsible, being guided by this concept. The Liberals, on the other hand, do not appear to be ready for it, although at the federal level you hear all sorts of Federal Liberal spokesmen talking more and more about the need for economic planning.

The other day I was fortunate enough to hear an address by one of the leading exponents of free enterprise in this country, a man by the name of Eric Kierens, and it was indeed a revelation. I think all members here would do well to just mull over in their minds the basic, the crucial, the central idea of what he had to say at the University of Manitoba auditorium. He said this, among other things, that we can no longer afford, in our kind of society, to be completely, unalterably, and utterly opposed to planification. And he went on to say that he could foresee that within the future it would be desirable to have some sort of marriage between free enterprise and the economic order of things, and social democracy. Social democracy, he said, to provide the social and political values by which business enterprise, the free enterprise sect of our economy, should be guided -- all in the interest of the common good -- the interest of our society. I mention this because I think it has a bearing on the attitude of some members in this Chamber -- some, not too many anymore -- some who are still living back in the 1890's, opposed to public health care on a comprehensive plan basis; opposed to it just as their decedents were opposed to high school public education in the 1870's and '80's; opposed to public boards and commissions to ascertain facts, to investigate, and so on.

These same people, of course, would oppose automobile insurance. They would oppose automobile insurance, despite the fact that it would be in the public interest to have some scheme of public auto insurance, government auto insurance, where the administrative costs on the premium dollar are substantially lower than in private schemes of auto insurance. Don't take my word for it; take the word of the investigation made by the Consumers' Union of the United States who did an extensive survey. That was quite a digression -- I was referring to the fact that the Liberals in this Chamber were castigating the government for accepting economic planning as an ideal, or as a concept by which to be guided.

The Member for Souris is in his seat. The Member for Souris is the one, I believe, last week who suggested that we in this group should think about aligning ourselves, coalescing with the Liberal Party in this province. The fact of the matter is that group is quite far from us. I hate to say it but it would appear that in substantial ways we are -- or you are closer to us than they are and I hate to say it. I wasn't too certain perhaps, or not ultimately certain, but yesterday when I heard the Minister of Agriculture suggesting that we could no longer tolerate a government that rested on laissez-faire, I knew that that was it, because the very essence of social democracy is to use government as a social instrument for the benefit of

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) the people so that we don't have to put up with human degradation and suffering all because of the invisible hand or laissez-faire, so we could sit with the Minister of Agriculture on that score any time.

The Minister of Agriculture yesterday was worrying about exaggerating by one-tenth of a percentage point most members will recall. He said 29 percent of the province crop insurance --29.9 percent--and he said oh, we can call it 30. Now it's very honest of the Minister, and I think we can allow him that much of an exaggeration, but I'm sorry that the exaggeration of the Conservative Party during the last provincial election, I'm sorry that it was not exaggeration of such small magnitude. Unfortunately, in the election that was held in December, some pretty important members of that administration went about the province making the most despicable, the most drastically untrue, the most drastically distorted statements about as to what our plans would cost, our programs would cost. It's unfortunate when we in this Chamber have to become personal, and I for one am determined not to, but I would like to know what prompts a person to make a statement regarding an opposition policy that is miscalculated, not by one percentage point or 10 or 20 or 40 or 60 but somewhere in the order of 250 percent miscalculation.

The Minister of Education tried it the other day in this Chamber, and that was a very interesting attempt by the Minister to misconstrue our sub-amendment. It was amusing. We really did not have in mind there to criticize this government's record in the field of secondary education, organization and programming. As a matter of fact, would it surprise the Minister in a pleasant way if I were to tell him that really there is very little that one can complain about insofar as the secondary school education organization is concerned. So when he went off on that tangent in trying to refute our sub-amendment, he was just simply not coming to grips with what we had in mind, which was specifically that at the post-secondary level -- at the post-secondary technical and university level, we felt that more could be done and should be done to ensure that all young people, with the capacity, are not denied the education because of financial reasons. Our picture isn't all black; certainly it's not all white either. We were simply suggesting that the loan method, the amount of loan money available should be extended; perhaps the fees should be reduced in some substantial degree; or that perhaps when students are late in paying their fees they shouldn't be assessed the six percent penalty as they are at present. I suggest that they are not paying their fees because they haven't got the money, and they pay six percent interest.

There are a multitude of ways in which this government could have implemented that feature of our amendment, but no, it was ridiculed; not come to grips with; and, to top it off, the Minister used the kind of arithmetic which the products of his system were to use, you would feel very, very disappointed and frustrated. He tried to give the impression that if we were to pay for education by means other than non-property tax -- other than property tax, that it would increase the income tax paid by the people in this province somewhere in the order of 300 percent. Am I right, more or less? It was, I think, good for mutual understanding that the Member for St. John's did such an adequate job of presenting the facts of the matter, therefore, it doesn't require me to go over all that. When we came out in November last year with our programs, we said that we are in favour of tax reform. We were also honest enough to say how we proposed to reform the tax structure of this province and we said, among other things, that the burden of education costs should be shifted substantially from property to the ability to pay tax -- income tax. Name me one other province -- or one other Party rather in this province or anywhere in Canada that is honest enough to present their source of revenue along with their promises.

Well, it appears that the policy wasn't accepted, but it wasn't all our fault. I can tell you one good reason why it wasn't. In Swan River, in Dauphin, in Brokenhead, statements were made to the effect that income taxpayers would have to pay 300 percent more in order to bring this about. The facts of the matter are that an increase of one percent income tax surcharge would have been sufficient to reduce the education costs to municipalities by about 10 mills across the board. We intend to do it by stages too. It's not just that Party that can operate in a gradual way. So even if it required a two percent income tax surcharge, that would have collected somewhere in the order of \$15 to \$16 million -- (Interjection) -- It's quite all right, we made it pretty clear.

I heard yesterday the Minister of Agriculture, and then again today the Premier of this

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) province, take the Liberal group to task for their past practice and their enviable ability apparently to take two sides on every question, and the inference of it being that it is not good for democracy; it is not good for this province when you have political parties and political leaders adopting a practice of duplicity, standing here and there. The people don't know what they stand for, in truth, and there's confusion, apathy, cynicism, about our political processes, and yet that is precisely what they did with regard to a very fundamental point. They misrepresented the cost of our program which we were very careful and honest in laying bare; misrepresented it in the most hideous and unfair manner.

MR. ROBLIN: I think that my honourable friend will have to change his language because he cannot accuse members of misrepresentation in that sense. I want to show him that I didn't misrepresent his cost and I'm looking for an opportunity, which will not be too long delayed, to itemize the bill of particulars.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I reject the interference of the Honourable the First Minister. There was no point of privilege; there was no question of order; and I would suggest to you, Madam Speaker, in all deference, that the Honourable the First Minister retain his seat unless he rises on a point of privilege or a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, as I say, I hesitate to use such language myself, but I feel that if the facts of the matter could be expressed accurately by a certain selection of words I will use them and -- (Interjection) -- No, I don't think I will. But you see already some good has been accomplished, Madam Speaker, already some good has been accomplished. We now have an undertaking from a very capable man. We have an undertaking from a very capable man to delve into the matter. Maybe we can reach some sort of consensus, and who will benefit but the people of Manitoba, because after we reach that consensus perhaps we can get down to the task at hand, namely, to reform the tax basis in this province. We have here the report of the Inquiry Commission, and I suppose it's a matter of interpretation, but to me the essence of this report is that finance in this province must be so reallocated that, at the end, property -- the municipalities property tax will be responsible for financing services to things; and the province, or through income tax, ability-to-pay tax will be responsible for services to people. I believe that this is a clear, simple but noble objective and I believe we should be working toward it. This is what we expressed in our program. The government was not prepared, but judging by the Premier's remarks today, it seems not unlikely that we shall move in that direction sometime hence.

The Member for St. John's raised a very interesting point when he suggested that perhaps we are getting off to a very dangerous precedent when we are starting to finance university expansion and university education on the basis of matching grants, one portion of that fund-raising being dependent on voluntary contributions and donations. Certainly there is nothing wrong with the principle, the idea of Christian charity, but I wonder whether we are doing the right thing when we allow such an important thing as education to be financed by any other source other than the certain source of the public treasury. Education is just too an important a thing to rest on a precarious base and -- (Interjection) -- all right, it's your privilege to think otherwise. But after all, what does the committee on Manitoba's Economic Future say among other things. It says that much of our economic future depends on the ingenuity and productivity of our people; and it follows from that, Madam Speaker, that productivity of our people will depend in large part on their skill and education. That's why education is crucial, vital and, therefore, should it be financed on a partially voluntary basis, in the sense of having canvassing, and subscription of funds is concerned. I don't know, I certainly agree with the Member for St. John's, and I suggest this is something that all of us would do well to consider. The matter of welfare is one thing, but education, it seems to me, should rest on public treasury funds.

I do not think that I will speak much longer -- it's 30 minutes all ready -- but I was very interested, and I mean this sincerely, very interested in the remarks made yesterday by the Minister of Agriculture in his comparison of their policy with the Liberal policy for agriculture. I have to confess that I find it difficult to decide in my own mind as to which of the two is preferable. -- (Interjection) -- No, no, I found it difficult but not impossible, and after some consideration I believe that perhaps the Minister is right for a change. We do have different reasons for thinking so, but one thing I do want to disagree with him on and that is it seems that

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) the whole basis of his outlook is still this, that we cannot afford -- advanced as our society is -- we cannot afford to have any kind of basic guarantee as to price, because, according to him, to do so would jeopardize our whole trend or program of encouraging diversification. I don't know if it necessarily follows.

I am informed that at the present time there is approximately 150,000 pounds of pork being imported into the local market -- just the local market here alone every week. And what does this indicate to me? It indicates, among other things, that farmers will over-produce at one time and under-produce at another. Why? Because our pricing mechanism is such that there is a real and constant insecurity, so they will not keep up a continuous level of production. We have fluctuation. I don't think that anyone here would try to justify for very long the kind of economy or sector of economy where you have considerable fluctuation in production. It seems to me that, like everybody else, if we knew just what our price would be, within a reasonable range, that we would produce in a more predictable way; the farmer would be the better for it and so would the country. I think like everything else this could be rectified under a government or under an economy where you do have economic planning; where you do have long-range forecasting, etcetera. As the Minister himself said yesterday, if planning is to be any good it must be comprehensive; it must be interlocked; and I agree with him. Well, that's precisely the direction we have to go, including agricultural production -- production of agricultural commodities.

I would not like to sit down, Madam Speaker, without sending two specific compliments to the government. I notice from the Throne Speech a matter of considerable importance, to some of us at least, the construction of the North Perimeter Bridge. Also, I would like to compliment the government, or the responsible Minister, for them having managed and steered the whole Floodway purchasing program through such a narrow and treacherous port. After all is said and done -- and I make no bones about this -- I feel that in the last analysis they have done a fairly good job. There are some specific -- (Interjection) -- No, no, now don't misunderstand me -- and I suppose I should put it on the record that it wasn't done easily -- and I'm not sure that they would have done such a good job if the people concerned had not stood up for their rights as they are privileged to do in a democratic society. There was a good deal of public meetings and meetings between smaller groups, bargaining, horse-trading -- if I can be permitted to use that word -- but in the end it seems to have worked out pretty well and, on such a massive undertaking, I feel that I should express a compliment in that direction.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I wish to add my compliments to the many congratulations you have received. I well remember the day you came to this House. It seemed strange to have a female MLA in the House, but you soon put me at ease as you proved as good as any male in debate. I also wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. They made a worthwhile contribution to this debate. My congratulations to the two new Ministers -- I know they will do their best for Manitoba. My best wishes go to the Honourable Minister for Rock Lake. While he was Speaker, I always thought of him as "Old Abe Lincoln". And to the new Members, the very best in their new endeavours. Madam Speaker, I have two new members seated one on each side of me, both from adjoining constituencies. I wish to congratulate the Member for St. John's, also the Member for Burrows -- they did a wonderful job. I was quite intrigued with the speech of the Member for Burrows. He must have been reading the NDP civic election platform of a year ago, but it shows his heart is in the right place, regardless of Party, and working for the people in his constituency.

We note in the Speech from the Throne that 1962 is claimed as one of the best economic years, in which records were broken in the field of trade, farming, mining, tourism, employment, hydro electric consumption, and other important fields of activity. It is with extreme pleasure that I read in the Speech from the Throne that it is the considered opinion of the government's Ministers that 1963 will be a year of continued good progress.

The decision of the Ministers to request substantial increase in funds for the support of the educational system of the province has been received with great satisfaction as this support is greatly needed. Since the re-assessment of the municipal tax rate caused by the introduction of the Metro government in Greater Winnipeg, Metro now takes 50 percent of the business tax which formerly went to the City of Winnipeg, part of which helped to carry out the educational program. Under the present system of provincial aid to education, as assessed realty values

(Mr. Harris, cont'd) go up the scale of provincial grants to any school division goes down. For example, in 1960, the Winnipeg School system received a grant of 26 percent of their total school budget. In 1962, this had dropped to 21 percent; in '63 it is estimated that this figure can drop as low as 19 percent. With education costs increasing, the lowest minimum rate required at present to carry out an adequate program is 30 percent. How does the government intend to cover the gap between available funds and the actual amount required? Do they intend, as in the past, to slough off their responsibilities on to the municipalities, who have no other recourse except to raise the taxes on real property to cover the costs of education.

The provincial government of today cannot plead dependence on the Dominion-Provincial Tax Rental Agreement, since Premier Diefenbaker has thrown the problem of taxation back to the provinces. The Manitoba government now has the power to raise corporate taxes, business taxes and income taxes on higher incomes. Will the government use these powers and raise the taxes of moneyed interests to cover the extra costs of education or will it further burden the small fixed income taxpayer with these costs, thereby depriving them of their basic essentials of life in order to finance the education of their children. The reason I speak on this theme is because I live in a constituency where the majority are of working people in the low income group, who can ill-afford any increase in taxes. For them, 1962 was not, as the Speech from the Throne stated, one of the best years of our economic history. For these people it was one long struggle to make ends meet, with prices going up and jobs getting scarcer. As I know with regard to my own occupation, working at a plant which has approximately 400 employees -- we are building a new plant -- when this new plant will have been built, many of these people with five years of seniority or less will be laid off. These are the people in my constituency who will be bearing the extra burden of taxation if the government does not exercise its power and tax according to ability-to-pay. I am pleased to hear that classes in pre-vocation designed to prepare unemployed persons for education in trade or technical skills will be initiated. The fault here lies in the fact that such a program is long overdue. Automation has been putting men out of work since the early '50's, and no provision has been made for their absorption into other trades.

I note the Indian-Metis has been included in this proposed rehabilitation scheme. Job opportunities for the white man is decreasing. Now how are the Indians, who already find it almost impossible to obtain work, to survive this further curtailment of job opportunities. It would be more beneficial to educate the Indians in development of co-operatives for the marketing of his products, thereby helping them to help themselves. This would ensure that fair prices would obtain for their products and also lessen the break-up of family life when the man has to go into the city to find a job. Co-operatives would eliminate exploitation of the Indian, allowing him to harvest and to market his products, with the profits gained being used for the benefit of himself and his family. There should also be more access roads from the reservations to the markets to enable the Indians to sell their products.

The member for the constituency of Wellington had several derogatory remarks to make about Medicare. At one point he stated that it had little likelihood of true success. I would like to ask the member if he has any idea of the number of countries that have been successfully practising some form of Medicare for years. Germany has had socialized medicine since 1883, to the great benefit of the people of these countries. The Member from Wellington appears to be labouring under the delusion that Medicare should be for the benefit of the doctors. The whole concept of Medicare is to provide full medical coverage for all the population at the cost that everyone can afford. Under the present system in Manitoba, no one is fully covered by a comprehensive medical plan no matter how much they pay. Most families still cannot afford the medical care they need, and one-third of our families have no coverage at all outside of the hospitalization plan in force in Manitoba. There is one thing sure, it's a plan that everyone has to pay. If you don't pay, where are you going to go? So the same with Medicare. I would say that everybody has to pay, and if we all paid our fair share then we would get a medical plan. If we can do it for hospital, surely we can do it for everything. It is patently obvious that Medicare, as practised in most of the civilized countries of the world, is long overdue in Manitoba. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, prior to the Session getting underway, the First

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd) Minister was quoted as saying in the newspapers that this Session, as far as his Party was concerned, would not delve into federal politics; they would stick strictly to business. Our honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture couldn't have been listening or paying attention to his Leader because he has opened the floodgates, and I hope that later in the Session, when the federal politics are discussed in this House, the First Minister doesn't decide to go to the press and tell them that the members of the opposition are wasting time talking on federal politics, because we'll know which Minister started the ball rolling in that direction.

I was rather disappointed yesterday when the Minister spoke about the lack of knowledge on the matter of agriculture. The facts that he gave are rather erroneous and I propose to show him how tonight. He condemned the Liberal federal policy on the \$2.00 wheat. He said this was going to cause over-production in Canada, which would be harmful to everyone. Well he's certainly got his -- either he is on the wrong track or the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa is on the wrong track because they're certainly at odds on this particular subject. The federal Minister in Ottawa has advocated the production of a billion bushels of grain this year -- I believe 550 million of wheat. He's deriding the Liberal Party of promising the \$2.00 for No. 1 Northern wheat at Fort William and Port Arthur, because it's only going to give them two cents. The provincial Minister of Agriculture is condemning them because it is going to give the farmers too much. He claims that this is going to cause over-production. Somebody certainly doesn't know what they are talking about -- (Interjection) -- Which one? Well, the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba has been advocating that we could use less wheat; the Minister in Ottawa has been advocating bigger production. The Minister of Agriculture says; What has happened in the last five years? Why are the farmers doing so well selling their wheat -- in the wheat industry -- that they've sold their wheat. The government in Ottawa's done a good job. Last spring prior to the federal election the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa advocated the production of half a billion bushels of wheat. He said, "We'll sell it." What's happening in Canada today? Have we sold all the wheat? We're still on a quota system. He's advocating we sell more; we produce more. But the Minister fails to realize on the \$2.00 wheat, and based on a quota system, no matter if the farmer did over-produce it still wouldn't mean more money from the Treasury because the farmers can only deliver on a quota system, as he well knows.

Under the Liberal program -- and he didn't mention at all about the Liberal policy of the two-price system. I recall reading and being told about the Minister of Agriculture when he was a member of the Farmers' Union, he was a strong advocate of the two-price system. He shakes his head.

MR. HUTTON: Which way?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, he's sure got a short memory because he was one of those who advocated it and now he's forgotten all about that. He preached stability. The Liberal policy advocates the \$2.00 price, which will provide stability for the farmers. What has the federal party done? They give away acreage payments prior to every election. It's satisfactory if there's an election often enough but it isn't very satisfactory if there's no election. Where are the acreage payments this year? Are they coming? No answer.

MR. HUTTON: We'll answer you. The Liberals stopped that.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Pardon?

MR. HUTTON: The Liberals stopped that.

MR. GUTTORMSON: They stopped it? How? He claimed yesterday that under the Liberal policy of the \$2.00 wheat that the farmer in Western Canada would stop producing barley and oats; it would drive the farmer out of the cattle industry. Well any statement that's more idiotic than that one, I fail to know where it is, because farmers in -- (Interjection) -- Go ahead. You'll have your chance tonight to speak. The farmers who read your statement today are astounded that the Minister of Agriculture in this province would make such a remark, because by providing stability it will assist the farmers to make that transformation from one industry into another -- from grain into the cattle industry.

He talks about crop insurance. Well, in 1958 this government preached that they would put in crop insurance in Manitoba. Well, have we got crop insurance in Manitoba today? We've got test areas. By his own admission, when they put the next test area in we'll have 29 percent

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd) -- less than one-third of the province. What a far cry from the promises made in 1958. Now what does the Minister say here as recently as Wednesday, January 23rd, and he's quoted in the Winnipeg Tribune. He says: "Hutton blames Ottawa. Manitoba won't be able to extend its crop insurance program to all parts of the province until 1966 at the earliest," Agriculture Minister George Hutton disclosed today. He blamed the delay on Ottawa's failure to date to participate in the program as earlier promised. "Mr. Hutton said expansion of the Manitoba plan hinges on federal agreement to re-insure crop insurance risks underwritten by the province." Well, I remember making some remarks on crop insurance a number of years ago and predicted at that time that unless the Federal Government assisted in the plan it wouldn't become a reality, and the Minister thought it was a huge joke that they wouldn't be putting it in right away and that we didn't need Ottawa to get into the act. -- (Interjection) -- We'll talk more about planning later on. So the Minister had to find out the hard way that you just couldn't put in crop insurance alone, you'd need federal assistance. Under the Liberal federal policy your provincial plan will become a reality because -- it's certainly good and at least the farmers of Manitoba are going to get crop insurance with the federal assistance. It's good.

Now he talked to us yesterday -- he derided us for talking about the lack of policy of land leasing. He made an excuse that they had a policy. He knows very well they have no policy because people in my area, in the Interlake, their land is frozen and he knows it. They can't buy the land. We've asked -- been advocating long-term leases. How would you expect the farmers to expand their operation by being only allowed to get a one-year lease at a time. They can't build dugouts or wells, or put fences up or other buildings that are required, because they can't get long-term leases from this government. Is the Minister going to tell us that they can get long-term leases?

MR. HUTTON: They will.

MR. GUTTORMSON: They will? When?

MR. HUTTON: This year.

MR. GUTTORMSON: It's taken a long time. The land has been frozen for five years -- since this government came into office.

MR. HUTTON: Well, that isn't as long as 40 years.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The land wasn't frozen before this government came into office.

MR. HUTTON: Better it should have been.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, there's a difference of opinion on that subject. It's just a case of lack of policy; lack of planning -- (Interjection) -- Yes, the Fairford Dam is in, that's quite correct.

During the past few days we've had a number of speakers from around the House talking about how happy the people of Manitoba are with the policies of this government. They fail to realize though that a lot more people voted against them in the last election than voted for them -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I'll just bring that up on our account. The difference between your group and our group and the popular vote was just about six percent.

MR. LYON: six percent.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes, that's right. There was quite a big difference before that. The gap is pretty close right now and there are a lot of members I see in this House are here by the Grace of God, and in the next election

MR. LYON: We've got Him on our side, too.

MR. GUTTORMSON: And in the next election

MR. LYON: Who looks after you?

MR. GUTTORMSON: a lot of our friends across won't be back, and the members know who they are.

We have two new Cabinet appointments in this House. Now, as we all know, it's the prerogative that the First Minister makes such appointments. I've got no fault with the men he appointed but I was rather surprised when one man wasn't mentioned in the appointments, and that's the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. I recall very vividly last November when a certain gentleman was asked to run and the reason was we want French representation in the Cabinet. Now if this is true, what is wrong with the Honourable Member for Rupertsland? I believe he comes of the right racial origin for that position on the basis of the Premier's

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd) statement -- I see he still occupies the chair in the back row. I think it's a rather embarrassing and perhaps discouraging remark to make to that honourable gentleman and I don't think he warrants that kind of abuse from the First Minister.

Now you talk about planning on highways. The First Minister, I recall when he was sitting on this side of the House, told us about the terrible highways in the Province of Manitoba, but you know in July of 1958, or shortly after, 20 highways in Manitoba were reclassified by Order-in-Council. Roads were turned into highways just by the stroke of a pen. These were the highways that were so bad when he was in opposition, but by the stroke of a pen they become highways under the new system. I recall very vividly when the First Minister rode up and down No. 6 Highway calling it, "No. 6 Highway -- Campbell Soup". -- (Interjection) -- Well, if you didn't use that expression, you were certainly quoted as having used it by the newspapers.

MR. ROBLIN: The voters have used the expression, not me.

MR. GUTTORMSON: It's funny they didn't use it until you came into the area.

Now what has happened to No. 6 Highway. No. 6 Highway was a far superior road in those days than it is today. -- (Interjection) -- You bet it's older and no work has been done on it either. Planning, here they build roads worth \$5½ to \$6 million north of Gypsumville to Grand Rapids and leave the roads between Winnipeg and Gypsumville. I recall very vividly in Ashern in September of 1958 when the First Minister and I attended a luncheon tendered by the Council, when the First Minister promised that something would be done with No. 6 Highway north of St. Laurent -- what has been done? Nothing. Last year when the Minister of Education was up there one day last year, I believe it was in May, the highway was so bad that the cars had to stop to let one another pass. On this particular day I knew the Minister was attending a function at Fairford. This is what's called planning. I recall very vividly the First Minister and others saying that when they got into office they were going to build better roads -- roads that stood up. You know, Madam Speaker, on No. 10 Highway, because the roads are so well built they have incorporated a new sign -- it says "Series of Bumps". -- (Interjection) -- This is planning; this is real good construction; this is road on No. 10 Highway which was built during the last five years and now says, "Series of Bumps" -- and I'm told the signs will be necessary in many parts of the province -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Where is that sign?

MR. GUTTORMSON: No. 10 Highway in your area, Sir.

MR. PETERS: Whose constituency?

HON. W. WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Mine in case you were wondering. -- (Interjection) --

MR. GUTTORMSON: They talk about the great planning and this government. The First Minister decided to go to the people because he wanted to build the Nelson River Project for some seven or eight hundred million dollars. That took real planning because I think it was on the 7th of November he called two by-elections and two days later he called a general election because Riel Coulette indicated he wasn't going to support the Diefenbaker government any longer. Well, this is planning then, you called two by-elections on a Wednesday; two days later you call a general election -- this is planning? -- (Interjection) -- Well, from a political standpoint I think the Premier made a right decision because had he waited until this spring when he planned to do so he may not have been in office -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm not so sure -- I remember what happened to you on December 14th.

MR. PETERS: Well, it was not so bad

MR. GUTTORMSON: Now this government talks about the tremendous amount of roadwork that's going on in the province. Well in 1958, the last year of the previous government, there was \$13 million worth of roadwork done under the tender system in Manitoba. In 1959 the present administration spent about \$19 million on roads -- it happened to be an election year. In 1960 this government spent \$12 million, less than in 1958. In 1961 they spent \$11 million -- and these aren't my figures, these are the figures that were tabled by the Minister of Public Works in this House last Session. I can't give the figures for last summer but I have reason to believe that they are roughly the same as 1961 -- of course had they known there was going to be an election, I think we can reasonably assume that they would have been substantially higher. We vote huge sums every spring for highway construction and the headlines

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd) . . . carry it "Legislature votes 25 million for roads." Sure we voted, but a lot of that money has never been spent, as the Order for Return proved the last Session.

No. 6 Highway which is in dire need of roadwork -- has been for many years. Every year prior when the previous administration was in office, it was done every year, and so much more was done -- it would have been built now had they remained in office. Just like other roads in the province was done on the plan basis, not on a political basis. --(Interjection) -- If we had the money that was wasted in the Grand Rapids project -- this money that was wasted could easily have built the No. 6 Highway.

There are other ways where poor planning has resulted in an over-expenditure of money. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, this Session is coming along, it is young yet.

I remember very vividly the speeches made by the Minister of Education and others during the school division plan that was being introduced and what effect it would have on the taxes in this province. It was going to lower the taxes because we would be taking the taxes from a wider tax base. Is this the truth? Taxes are skyrocketing and in the Town of Lundar, the people there are expecting to pay more money than the many people with equivalent homes in the city, and they are not getting the same services, such as paved streets, ornamental lighting, garbage pickup, and what not, and their taxes are skyrocketing out there. The First Minister admitted this afternoon the situation is similar in La Broquerie. The Member for Selkirk cited cases in St. Andrews. This is a serious matter I know in my constituency in the Town of Lundar, particularly where many people, particularly older people, are wondering just how they're going to meet their next tax bill, unless something drastically is done.

The Minister of Agriculture -- he's a jovial type and I expect him to be on his feet tonight -- I'd like for him to explain tonight his theory on the two-price system which he used to advocate, and now opposes; and why he is so anxious the farmers of this province, or Western Canada for that matter, refrain from growing so much wheat; how the price of \$2.00 is going to hurt the farmer. --(Interjection) -- Well you can leave the Farmers' Union -- he's forgotten that -- he no longer associates himself with that -- (Interjection) -- I'm pleased to hear that, I hope you realize then that the Liberal candidate in St. George is the former President of the Manitoba Farmers' Union, recognized for Selkirk as the outstanding farm agricultural authority in Western Canada -- (Interjection) -- Fine, laugh all you like -- (Interjection) -- The Minister of Agriculture -- I'm not surprised. If the Liberal candidate for Selkirk is prepared to accept the Liberal policies, a man who has worked harder for agriculture in Western Canada than any other man, is prepared to accept them, they've got to be good. I'm sure if they weren't, he'd be the last one to support them.

..... Continued on next page

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I really didn't intend to use that off-hackneyed phrase in this House to speak again on the Speech from the Throne, until I had the opportunity or the pleasure or the enjoyment of listening this afternoon to the First Minister of the Province of Manitoba. I think quite correctly that he started out his oration by stating something to the effect that the Session thus far had been rather dull, and after hearing the leaf from my honourable friend I had hoped, and expected, that he would have changed the whole attitude and the atmosphere of debate in this House.

I may say to him that I was very very disappointed in my honourable friend because if the debate was mediocre before my honourable friend spoke, then it was certainly no change at all as a result of him speaking. --(Interjection)--

I might say too that as I listened to what he had to say this afternoon, I was somewhat amazed and disappointed at some of the statements of my honourable friend. For a man who has been in the Legislature of Manitoba as long as he has been, to come out with one or two of the statements that he did was truly a revelation of the lack of knowledge of the true situation here in the Province of Manitoba. For when the First Minister mentioned the fact that he did, the fact that in his opinion -- and I am sure, Madam Speaker, that this opinion is not shared in general by the people of Manitoba -- when my honourable friend came out with the statement to the effect that Labour now recognizes its position in relation to the economy and the destiny of the Province of Manitoba, I wondered for how long was my honourable friend hiding under a haystack here in the City of Winnipeg. And I want to say that I object and reject his statement as being absolutely and unalterably incorrect, and I was surprised to hear that my honourable friend would say that Labour now recognizes its position in the Province of Manitoba. Why does he say "now"? Is he trying to infer by such a statement that Labour in Manitoba has never recognized its place in the economy of this country until he became the First Minister of the . . . Is this the inference that my honourable friend meant to leave? Is this the impression that he meant to leave in this House, and through this House, the people of Manitoba? Because I say, Madam Speaker, if this is what he intended to do, then he ought to be thoroughly ashamed of himself, because Labour has always recognized its position in the Province of Manitoba. I reject and I regret to hear such a statement from the Honourable the First Minister of this province. He stands here before us in this Assembly and says that he wants and hopes to receive the co-operation of Labour, and of management, and the other spheres of activity within the Province of Manitoba -- how can he get it, when he rejects as he did this afternoon, at least by inference, the position that Labour has held, a position I suggest, Madam Chairman, of honour and respect in the Province of Manitoba ever since we became a province. --(Interjection)-- Yes, "oh, come on Russ" -- I say, "Oh come on, Honourable Mr. Roblin" -- oh come on, read back the history of our province, and the position that Labour has had in the development of our province", and certainly no inference as suggested by my honourable friend this afternoon would be a reality. Incomprehensible that such a statement should be made. It is a fact that insofar as Labour is concerned in Manitoba, it has had many differences of opinion with management and government -- and I suggest, Madam Speaker, that they will continue to have differences of opinion, but labour has always recognized its part, the part that it has to play in the destiny of our province. I'm happy to be here --(interjection) -- I beg your pardon. No -- but I'm happy, Madam Speaker, that my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs, while I wish him very much luck, may not be so happy in some of the debates that he's going to take part in as he gets his feet wet in the department that he has been chosen to the Minister of. But I want to say this, that as Leader of the New Democratic Party here in the Province of Manitoba, which is associated with Labour, I'm happy to know of the history and realize the contribution that Labour has made to the destiny of our province.

A MEMBER: We're all associated with Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, we're all associated with labour, and labour has always realized and known its responsibility to the economy and the welfare of the Province of Manitoba. It's nothing new -- labour has always played its part and will continue to play its part, and I want my honourable friend the First Minister to realize this, and not be a johnny-come-lately, and leave the inference that labour now recognizes its position here in the Province of Manitoba. For I want to say this -- and I can say it in accuracy, that many of the statutes that are on the books of Manitoba are as the results of the labour, the endeavours of labour and the group that has had

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) the opportunity of representing at least in part of the labouring community in the Province of Manitoba.

My honourable friend this afternoon when he was winding up his remarks, made reference to the fact that we should concede this debate; that we should get on with the job of Manitoba; and while I don't recall his exact words, but he says let's get on with the job of Manitoba in the fields of housing; if I recall correctly as he was waving his arm in the empty atmosphere -- in the fields of housing, in hospitalization and in welfare services. Madam Speaker, we have a number of new members on all sides of the House here in this new Legislature, and I respectfully suggest to them that they go back over the record of my honourable friend the First Minister and his party in the fields of housing, hospitalization and social welfare. Certainly, and I agree with him, that he could castigate the Liberal opposition for its procrastination in many of these fields, but I suggest to the new honourable members in this House, that they should go back over the journals of this province and they'll find that the party that my honourable friend is the head of today, aided and abetted in the procrastination and delay of the very things that my honourable friend this afternoon said, "let's get up and do the job for Manitoba." I had an opportunity over the lunch hour to look at some of these journals, 1953, an Amendment to the Amendment to the Throne Speech proposed by Donovan Swailes, who was a member of a CCF group at that time. He proposed the amendment to the amendment which says, or said, that this government has failed -- this was the government of my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside. The amendment said that this government has further -- further has failed to meet the needs of the people of Manitoba in respect to housing, hospitalization and social welfare. And who voted in favour of the amendment to the amendment -- only the members of the then CCF Party! And who joined with the government of the day in defeating this very resolution that my honourable friend says today that is so necessary for the progress of Manitoba -- him and all the Conservative representatives that were in the House at that time. Oh yes, Madam Speaker, Johnny-come-lately. Johnny-come-lately. My honourable friend, the Minister of Health, during the last provincial election, while speaking at Elmwood, as recorded by my honourable friend and colleague from Elmwood, mentioned the fact of the greatest advance in social legislation in the Province of Manitoba, namely, hospitalization. And on each and every occasion in the past that a resolution was before this House calling for universal hospitalization, who voted for it -- my honourable friends opposite or their representatives at that time -- they voted against it, on each and every occasion. Oh yes, Madam Speaker, let's get on with the job of Manitoba. I said this afternoon, while my honourable friend was speaking, in reference to some of their propositions and their adoption of it, that it would be through the basis of political expediency that many of these would be adopted. I think a referral back to the journals of the day -- not so long ago -- will substantiate my remarks.

My honourable friend talks about let's get on with the job of Manitoba; let's finish with this debate. We've been in session now for less than two weeks. My honourable friend says let's put an end to it; let's get on with the job of Manitoba. I say to my honourable friend, why didn't he continue doing the job of Manitoba, as he could have done by continuing the last Legislature. So what if we lost three seats -- we did lose three seats -- and we make no bones about it. The government gained a seat, but their total vote went down considerably, as did ours, and it's fortunes of war. As the Honourable Member for St. George just pointed out, that percentage-wise and otherwise it can make a tremendous difference to the number of seats that you are holding in an assembly like this. My honourable friends opposite I think hold less than 45 percent of the support of the people of Manitoba -- I think it's less than 45 percent -- (interjection) -- 43? Something like that. Yet we are and they are the government of the day. But let them not be under any misapprehension that because of the fact that their numbers increased by one and ours went down by three, that it's a true reflection of the tenor of thinking of the people of Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it'll do, Madam Speaker -- it must do for the time being. We have no alternative, and we have to accept the will of the people. But I want to say to my honourable friend, the Attorney-General and all others over on that side of the House, that when they're taking matters under consideration for the benefit and the welfare of the people of Manitoba, let them take into consideration that they have less than a majority of the people of Manitoba supporting them. So I say, Madam Speaker, the contribution of labour to the destiny of this province -- who was it, Madam Speaker, that first of all suggested

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) in this House that there should be a representative of industry and the Province of Manitoba in the Old Land. I'll tell you who it was -- to save the honourable member who figured that their government is so great-- I'll tell you who it was -- it wasn't an industrialist; it wasn't a Conservative; it was Donavon Swailes who was representing Winnipeg that presented the first resolution to send a trade delegation to the United Kingdom. Yet my honourable friend talks about labour being a johnny-come lately in the field of economy of the Province of Manitoba.

Who was it, Madam Speaker, that introduced for the first time in this House a resolution for an industrial development fund for the Province of Manitoba? Was it a Conservative industrialist, or a Conservative? It was not -- it was me who introduced the first resolution into this House setting up an industrial development fund. Is this labour being a johnny-come-lately? I suggest that it is not and that labour has done its part and will continue to do its part. Reference is made to the labour participation in comment. I'm sure that labour is happy to make its contribution but I do note, I do note though, Madam Speaker, that as one looks over the list of the advisors in the Committee that consider the economic development of the Province of Manitoba that representation of labour was very, very small and I sometimes wonder whether it was not in order to give my honourable friends opposite an opportunity to say, "well we had labour representative on the panel." --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon.

MR. EVANS: It was all the representative of labour that we could give.

MR. PAULLEY: Did you ask labour?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: Who did you ask?

MR. CARROLL: I asked the Federation of Labour at their convention.

MR. PAULLEY: You did, eh? Did you send them an invitation?

MR. CARROLL: I extended it personally.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, well sure. Oh, I did it personally. I've extended many a personal invitation to you Mr. Minister to do certain things and you've never done them but when I do send them to you in written form you take some notice of them. Oh sure I invited them personally! What poppy-cock. --(Interjection)--

MR. CARROLL: I also wrote a letter Russ.

MR. PAULLEY: What poppy-cock.

MR. CARROLL: offered to pay part of the expenses, Russ.

MR. PAULLEY: Now I want to say this -- (interjection) --. I want to say this, Madam Speaker, that as far as labour is concerned and as far as the group that I'm presently leading in here in the Legislature of Manitoba, we will continue to lead in this House and if perchance the propositions that we put forward for debate in this House are not accepted this year, or not accepted next year, we know as surely as day follows night eventually they will be accepted by the government opposite and we can prove this by going over the resolutions in the Journals time after time after time. I just mention two of them. Paid delegations to the Old Country, adopted through our resolution. Mentioned the fact of an Industrial Development Fund adopted after our resolution; mentioned the fact of other matters; mention the fact of hospitalization -- bitterly opposed by my friends opposite year after year. Now the Minister of Health proclaims to all and sundry we're here the greatest piece of legislation that was ever passed.

The same thing holds true in many other instances. In our resolutions here we're going to find I suspect and I don't know whether I can anticipate what my honourable friend is going to say in a little while on the question of retarded children and the school for deaf. I predict, Madam Speaker, that eventually as a result of the efforts of my colleague from Inkster that we will have re-established here in the Province of Manitoba a school for our deaf children as we did once before. My honourable colleague the Member for Inkster made a proposition here two or three times for the setting up of a dental school in the Province of Manitoba -- and have we got a Dental School in the Province of Manitoba, as a faculty of the University? Yes. The johnny-come-lately has adopted it and I say that these things will occur as a result of the endeavours of those that I've had the opportunity of being associated with for ten years and that we will continue our endeavours for the benefit of the people of the Province of Manitoba. My honourable colleague the Member for Brokenhead was speaking just this evening on the question of statements of the First Minister -- Swan River during the election -- and he was calling to task

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) the First Minister because the First Minister had misrepresented, as he said, the party platform of the New Democratic Party in respect of taxation. I recall news reports, and I think that these were accurate because they were repeated elsewhere by my honourable friends, that the First Minister of this province did make the statement that the adoption of our program on our policy would mean an additional \$100 million to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba -- (interjection) -- I'm glad to hear him say it.

MR. ROBLIN: I can tell you all about it.

MR. PAULLEY: And he's going to tell me all about it.

MR. ROBLIN: You bet.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm going to listen and wait with interest how my honourable friend the First Minister, the wizard that he may be, is going to substantiate the statement that he made at Swan River -- he made elsewhere -- and he says tonight that he's going to justify it. Madam Speaker, if he doesn't justify it any better than the Minister of Education did the other day, he's in for a rude awakening. And I suggest that he is because in our proposals during that election it was simply a transferring from one over burdened group of people to equality based on the ability to pay -- and my honourable friend knows it; and he knew it in Swan River; and he knows it here. And I say to my honourable friend that capable as he is, be very very careful that you don't get your head into the same noose as the Minister of Education did the other day when he tangled with my colleague, the member for St. John's.

MR. McLEAN: Heaven forbid.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, heaven forbid. Heaven forbid, because you know, Madam Speaker, there's the old saying about them being cheaper by the dozen and I wouldn't like to see any more than one neck in a noose at the same time. But if my honourable friend adopted this then certainly his noose will join -- or head will join that of the Minister of Education in a noose.

I felt, Madam Speaker, that I could not allow this debate to end without some reference to the idiotic statements of my honourable friend the First Minister this afternoon and I want -- (interjection) -- Oh, I'm too kind, yes I know. It has been written somewhere, so some say, about the jovial member from Radisson. I think maybe as age goes on and my hair gets a little thinner and a little bit grayer, the joviality must of necessity wear off -- whether it's necessity or not, it does wear off. But I ask you, Madam Speaker, how can one be jovial after listening to the utterances of the Honourable the First Minister this afternoon. Well whether I'm right or whether I'm wrong, have devoted all of my adult life in what I believe to be the betterment of the people of Manitoba; to the betterment of labour; to the betterment of education; to the betterment of the welfare of the people of the Province of Manitoba, no matter what activities did it take part in, then to hear this afternoon from the Honourable the First Minister, even to suggest, that labour now realizes its position. It is just too much, even for a jovial representative for Radisson to accept and swallow from the First Minister of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CAMPBELL: Apparently, Madam Speaker, the government of the day has decided to rest its case on the speech that the Honourable the First Minister made this afternoon and on the speech that the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation made yesterday afternoon, but I think that both of those should have some answer. I would not attempt to duplicate the performance of the honourable and jovial gentleman from Radisson, who has I think quite properly taken exception to the First Minister's suggestion that it's only now, only now, and only since that government came into office, that labour has started to perform its proper function in the Province of Manitoba. This is, in my opinion, quite unwarranted.

I think that some of the statements of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture were even more unwarranted and I propose to have something to say about them as well.

Before doing so however, Madam Speaker, I would like to join in the congratulations and compliments that have been extended to you because I think that you have the capacity to make a very excellent Speaker; and I think you are to be congratulated on the fact that you are the first of your sex to occupy this exalted position in our Chambers. I wish you well. The position of Speaker is a most important one and one that all of us have an interest in. There have been some who have been so unkind as to suggest on other occasions that in your first speech in this House you indicated that you were not very fond of me. I have laboured under that feeling for a long time because my erstwhile colleague from Carillon use to continue to tell me how much more popular he was with you than with me, but now that he is gone, now that he has gone, I

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd).....hope that I can retrieve to some extent my position so far as you are concerned.

I would like to extend my compliments to the mover and seconder of this Speech from the Throne. The mover I have known for some time, and favourably, and he lived up to advance notices; and the seconder I have not had the pleasure of hearing up until that time. I think he's going to be well worth hearing from on other occasions. Certainly I congratulate the new Ministers and wish them well in their portfolios.

But I simply cannot go along with what my honourable friend the First Minister had to say this afternoon, when he returned to his text of so many times since this government has taken office, of pretending that things had been so badly neglected before the time that his government took over. I simply have to remind him once again when he talks about neglect of the roads, I have to remind him that it was only a comparatively short time ago--10 years I believe--when the honourable gentleman, anxious at that time to achieve the leadership of the Conservative Party, which at that time he rather felt was being "conservative" and he should clothe himself with that mantle as well, was advocating in this Chamber that we should strike one million dollars off of the Estimates that we placed before this House for highways in this province; and the Estimate at that time was the magnificent total of \$16 Million and my honourable friend suggested that a million dollars should be struck off of it. I think I shouldn't fail to remind my honourable friend that about the same time he was inveighing loud and long from this side of the House against the growth in the debt of the Province of Manitoba and warning us -- warning us that the debt was getting to unmanageable proportions--this is the honourable gentleman who tells us, after he was making these suggestions to us and recommending that we should go carefully, just ten years ago, who now stands up and tells us about the years of neglect.

Madam Speaker, these things may sound well when you're making a speech as my honourable friend did this afternoon, but they don't show up well on the record, because the fact is that it's very easy for any of us to have hindsight, the thing that you need is foresight, and my honourable friend didn't have the foresight that he tries to clothe himself with at these times. There are many other examples. If my honourable friend dares me, I will read onto the record once more what he said about farm credit. I've read it onto the record more than once. My honourable friend

MR. ROBLIN: Go ahead.

MR. CAMPBELL: Do you want me to?

MR. ROBLIN: Sure. I don't think I can stop you.

MR. CAMPBELL: As my honourable friend from Gladstone says, I just happen to have the text with me.

MR. ROBLIN: You brought your violin. I knew you would.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, my honourable friend has played a good many tunes that he would just as lief not have played back. We'll hear one of them right now.

MR. ROBLIN: Go right ahead.....

MR. CAMPBELL: Now this is when my honourable friend the present First Minister was an editor. He's had a lot of different jobs in his time. He was an editor at this time, in the editorial page of the Winnipeg Tribune.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, that's the one.

MR. CAMPBELL: The Tribune was April 16th, 1958. He got quite a spread on that. I know my honourable friend would like me to read it all. I have to read quite a little bit of it because I don't want to take my honourable friend out of context. But here, this was the time--so that I give you the background of it-- this was the time that my honourable friend had decided it would be popular--and I do give him the credit, I think that he thought it was good for the province as well--because I do not challenge my honourable friend's motives in this regard. He thought it would be popular to advocate credit for the farmers of Manitoba, provided by the Government of Manitoba, and he had so suggested in the House, and then he broke forth in print on the Editorial page of the Tribune which kindly placed him in the editor's chair for several articles.

This is agricultural credit. It's the second in the series. The heading is: "Manitoba's Liberal Progressive Government is Debt Depressive." That's a term that he admits he

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd).....borrowed from one of the professors at the University, W.L. Morton. He was holding out the prospect to the farmers of Manitoba that they would get credit on a basis easier than what they could obtain from other sources--a new concept of loaning to the farmers of Manitoba, and he was explaining why this was necessary. Now I quote him: "Why is it necessary for government to move into the general field of long-term farm credit. Briefly, because the need is critical and is not being met. Banks, of course, are not allowed to extend long-term credit on farm property. Mortgage companies do not do so to any substantial extent because they are able to locate more attractive investment areas. Private people hold mortgages and agreements of sale, but this is frequently done reluctantly, simply to facilitate a sale of a farm, and the Canadian Farm Loan Board is not meeting the needs of the farming industry. Primarily interested in safe loans" -- safe is in quotation marks--"Primarily interested in "safe" loans, it extends credit where by definition, it is least critically needed. Modern lending agencies extend credit on the security of the borrower's character and record to a substantial degree. The Farm Loan Board wants saleable assets".

Now I ask my honourable friend, is the Board that loans money from this government, does it loan on any easier terms than the Farm Loans Board? Not a bit. Not as easy--not as easy. We told my honourable friend at that time that the Federal Act was going to be modernized and liberalized; it was going to be made to meet the situation; but no, we must have this agency that was going to loan on the borrower's character and record to a substantial degree. I have said before and I say again, that this was misleading the public of Manitoba and the record of the Board since it has been set up shows that it follows the practices very closely of other loaning institutions, including the federal agencies. When the honourable the new Minister of Municipal Affairs--who now shakes his head sideways--when he spoke in the House on this matter he went into great lengths to prove that they should do so, and completely nullified the arguments that the Honourable the First Minister had used as to why this should be brought in. Well, I mustn't spend too much time on my honourable friend the First Minister, except to remind him once again of the fact that although he's very glib at telling us now what should have been done years ago, the fact is that he was telling us when we were in office that we were spending too much money; that we were spending too much on roads; and there are other instances as well -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that's right. That's right, and that was the honourable gentleman who was telling us this. This is on the record. My honourable friend doesn't like to be reminded of that. -- (Interjection) -- Good! Well, I'm glad that you enjoy it because I can assure you that I enjoy reminding you of it, so it's distinctly mutual, and when my honourable friend stands up and goes into these flights of oratory as he did this afternoon, I think he should just recall to his mind what he was saying 10 years ago and less. But we'll have an opportunity to talk about that some time again.

Now I want to say something about -- we've disposed of the motion of confidence that was before the House yesterday, but I want to say something about why, in my opinion, this government has lost, to a considerable degree, the confidence of the people of Manitoba. It still retains the confidence of this House, as demonstrated in the vote yesterday, but the confidence of the people of Manitoba it has lost to a considerable degree and there's no question about that. My honourable friends who have spoken here have said, "oh yes, look at the number of members we've got". Sure, this is the whole argument -- look at the number of members we've got. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews was delighted to say: "Ha, ha, just look around you; that's the answer to any question of confidence." The answer to the question of confidence is how many votes did this government get? The fact is that they got 13 percent less than they did the time before -- 13 percent less than they did in 1959 -- and this is after all these wonderful things that my honourable friends have been telling us that they are doing. What did the public say about them? Thirteen percent less people voted for them in December of 1962 than had back in '59 -- 13 percent down -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. EVANS: We must have had about 30-odd percent.

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend who interrupts me will be delighted when I mention the next figure, because he's an expert on percentage. This might be a ground for a fruitful study by my honourable friend. I would think that he could appoint a commission or two on this subject. The government support was down 13 percent; the Liberal total vote was up 17 percent. What does that mean, except loss of confidence in the government. What does it

(Mr. Campbell, Cont'd.) . . . mean except gaining confidence in this party under the new leadership, and the new leadership was a big reason for the change in the fortunes of the Liberal Party because the people of this province had been glad to see that the Liberal Party has not only one but several young men of character and capacity coming forward to take their place here and to fulfill the destiny of this great Party, and it has shown that it is coming back. This is no idle guesswork; this isn't any whistling to keep up the courage like my honourable friends have been doing, who say: "ha, ha, look at the number of members we've got." This is on the basis of the votes that have been recorded. Thirteen percent down for my honourable friend's government; 17 percent up for this Party; and in consideration for my dear friend the honourable and jovial and absent member for Radisson, I will not go into the figures with regard to his Party.

A MEMBER: Don't worry about us.

MR. CAMPBELL: Nothing worries me less than to see what happens to my honourable friend. So I think it is appropriate to ask why, why has there been this loss of confidence in the government. Let me tell you on of the reasons. It was quite common a few years ago for people to talk about the arrogance of the government at Ottawa, and I remember that the government at Ottawa some years ago got a very bad public relations situation because of the pipeline debate and the skillful use that was made by the opposition of that situation -- and I'm not defending what was done at that time. There was an attempt made here to suggest that the government of that day in Manitoba was arrogant. My honourable friends, some of them who are here now, have used that term. I ask anybody who has ever known the previous government to this one to judge as between their arrogance, and the example that we saw yesterday given by my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation was a demonstration of the kind of arrogance that we shouldn't have in this Chamber.

My honourable friend has been taking a lot of territory in when he's been discussing matters in this House a few times and yesterday he exceeded himself, and I say to you, Madam Speaker, and to the First Minister, that it is not conducive to either the best of debates in this House and it's not conducive to democracy when we have people in this Chamber using the type of language that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture did yesterday. There is no necessity for anybody here to characterize people or parties with such terms as the "kiss of Judas." -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. HUTTON: What person did I refer to?

MR. CAMPBELL: Just read your speech. The Liberal Party. The Liberal Party is made up of persons. My honourable friend thinks that it's very smart and very wise to stand up here and show this arrogance that he has developed in the recent years. This is bad business, Madam Speaker, and when anyone becomes so assured of himself and of his policies that he cannot debate public matters without using language of this kind, then it's time that we stopped and took a look at the situation. There are honest differences of opinion about what should be done on almost every kind of a question that comes up in here. There is certainly room for difference of opinion about what is the right policy with regard to wheat. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead, who is one of the intelligent young men of this Chamber, says that he's not certain after studying it very closely as to which is the right solution. There is lots of room for honest differences of opinion. There is no room, in my opinion, for people to use the kind of intemperate language that has been used by my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, and it does not add to the information that should be given by any of us when we speak on these serious subjects to castigate the people who hold differing opinions from you. It's not necessary. Just because there's a federal election on now; just because the two parties and goodness knows they compete with one another in promises of different kinds, then don't think -- don't think that the party that my honourable friends over there support is "lily white" any more than any other party; that the air of sanctimoniousness that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture adopts here, as though anybody who has the temerity to disagree with the position that he takes is either plain stupid or a bad Canadian or needs to be compared with Judas, is something that I resent, and I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that it's something that this House can get along without. If we can't debate on a better level than that, let's stay in our seats.

Now as to what the contents of what the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture said, I'd

(Mr. Campbell, Cont'd.) . . . like to ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture why he continues to use the expressions that he does with regard to the sale of wheat. Goodness knows this problem is difficult enough without anybody giving this information and I have sat silent, on at least two occasions before, when my honourable friend has used the term that the Liberal government lost the wheat market in the 1950's. He's used that expression more than once. The Liberal government did not lose the wheat market and the figures are there to prove it, and I'll give my honourable friend some of them and he'll have the opportunity of checking up on these figures. He should have done so before he spoke -- he's indicating that he has done so -- I suggest to my honourable friend that either he is ignorant of the fact or he must think we are ignorant of them if he can use figures like this time and time again and not be corrected on them.

Now let us look at what happened. I checked carefully on his words today in Hansard just to be sure that I'm not misquoting him. Perhaps I had better look at them again. This is the report of my honourable friend's speech and I'm quoting from him now. "To think, Madam Speaker, that the farmers have fought their way through the worst of the times in the '50s when they lost their markets, and when the Liberal government of the day said of any prospective customers, "let 'em come and get it if they want it." We went through all that. We know that they were quite satisfied if they sold 250 million bushels of wheat a year, and if they got up to 275, they thought they were going great guns. Now we got through those tough times, we got our commercial channels opened up; we're selling the wheat today; we've got a good price," etc. Now we're on the next page -- that's the end of the quotation. Over on the next page he says again: "Now we know that the government in the past took the attitude that if the people of the world wanted Canadian wheat they knew where to come and get it, and we know how much wheat we sold under that. We know that we had wheat backed up from here to the Rocky Mountains, and we know what a policy of getting out and selling and of providing credit for sale can do."

Madam Speaker, I repeat, we did not lose our markets in the '50s, and for my honourable friend to suggest that any government, the Liberal government of the early '50s or the Conservative government of the later '50s and up to recently, to suggest that either one of those governments took a "come and get it" attitude is just plain plumb ridiculous. No government -- no government is silly enough to do that. That there have been some changes in policy I admit, but as far as the increase in sales are concerned, my honourable friend I'm sure is aware of the fact if he would only admit it, that the real change has been the fact of the drought in China and the need for wheat there and the wheat sales that were made to China. That's the one real change and, to some extent, the Japanese sales as well.

The real reason for the wheat being piled up to the Rocky Mountains, that my honourable friend speaks about, is that in three years hand running -- three years hand running in '51, '52 and '53, we had the biggest three crops that Canada ever grew. The biggest three that we ever grew, averaging more than 600 million bushels each year for three years. That's what backed the wheat up to the Rocky Mountains. Even with normal sales -- and when my honourable friend tries to say that we have lost the markets in the '50s, let me tell him that there is no ten year period in the history of Canada when the sales have been as high as that ten year period. No ten year period in the history of Canada when the sales were as high as that ten year period which he happened to pick out, and he tries to tell us that that's a loss of markets. I'd like to hear my honourable friend comment on that. In that period the highest single wheat sale that Canada ever enjoyed took place -- 385 million bushels -- and yet my honourable friend says that they were quite content with 250 and if they got up to 275 that was fine. I can tell my honourable friend the year -- 385 million that year. My honourable friend, if he were as smart as he likes to appear, would have checked this before he made the statement that he made.

Looking now at the Canadian Wheat Board crop year of 1960-61 and the figures that are given there on page 4, if my honourable friend before he speaks the next time will check on the authoritative sources he will find that in the crop year 1952-53 the exports of wheat and flour were 385,527,000 bushels, and that has never been equalled before or since -- '52-53 -- and in the year just before, the year following the huge crop, 355 million. Well, if my honourable friend knows when it was and what it was, why did he tell us yesterday that 250 million was

(Mr. Campbell, Cont'd.) . . . what they were quite satisfied with and delighted to get up to 275. Why did he say they'd lost the markets when the fact is we had the highest sales of any ten year period that Canada has ever known.

MR. HUTTON: Now quote 1954, 55, 56 and 57.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'd be glad to quote them. I gave you, I think, the average of the total — the average of those. I'm quite glad to. Why didn't my honourable friend check them before he made that statement which was completely inaccurate and misleading. If you want them here they are: 50-51, 230,961,000; 51-52, the one I mentioned a moment ago, 355,825,000. The record one of all, in the next year '52-53, 385,527,000; '53-54, 255 million-odd.

MR. HUTTON: . . . very far off.

MR. CAMPBELL: You were very far off when you get to the 385.

MR. HUTTON: . . . that's 255.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, and if my honourable friend had just been sensible enough to say that in one year they got down to 255, then he'd have been staying very close to the truth, but he gives this kind of a scatter-gun type of an argument and expects this House to believe it. What is anyone going to think of the Minister of Agriculture giving information of that kind on a subject that is of such importance -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. HUTTON: I wasn't very far out.

MR. CAMPBELL: You were just more than a hundred million bushel out.

MR. HUTTON: Well, if we could live in the past we'd be fine.

MR. CAMPBELL: And another reason when I mentioned the fact that these were the three highest crop years that Canada ever had, in '51, '52 and '53, and the fact here that has to be taken into account is that the production of coarse grains was exceedingly high in those same years, which makes a considerable difference to the -- at least the local consumption of wheat.

Now the question that I asked, Madam Speaker, is why does a person in the position of my honourable friend make such statements as that, because he gets carried away with himself in discussing the federal election campaign. He got into all of this because he started talking about how bad the Liberals were with regard to the proposals that they made. Now I have no objection whatever to federal policies being discussed here if the members wish to discuss them, but I have a most definite objection to my honourable friend or anybody else giving such complete misinformation and drawing the conclusions that they do on that misinformation.

Madam Speaker, is there anyone here who does not agree that one of the great reasons for the increased exports recently is because of the sales to China and Japan? Is there anyone here that isn't sorry that the exports recently have been lowered to our traditional best customer, the United Kingdom? I'm glad that the Wheat Board or the government or both took the position that wheat should be made available to China. I think it's something that, in these tense and troublesome times, it's something that is of considerable importance in the international sphere that we should make wheat available, even to people who do not hold to the same ideological principles that we do. I think it's proper; I have no complaint whatever; but I do say that it's the biggest single factor in the increase in the exports that have been mentioned recently. And why should my honourable friend in this Chamber, dealing with matters of interest to the people of Manitoba, why should my honourable friend discuss the federal political situation and try and gain some mileage, apparently for the federal party, by trying to pretend that they have been selling wheat in a way that the other government was not doing. And to make this completely unwarranted statement that any government, any government of Canada would be crazy enough to not try to sell wheat under conditions like that, is just something that passes the imagination.

Well now, Madam . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to remind the Honourable Member that you have five minutes left.

MR. CAMPBELL: I should mention, Madam Speaker, that I have quite a few minutes left because I propose to move A Want-of-Confidence Motion. I shall make the motion in due course. If you wish to have it at the end of the five minutes, I'd be quite willing to do that.

The other matter that I am suggesting is the reason for the loss of confidence in the government of the day is because of the broken promises that have been mentioned by other

(Mr. Campbell, Cont'd.) . . . speakers, and I shall not dwell on them unduly. The question of taxation has been well covered. My honourable friends don't like to be reminded of the fact that their promises to the people of Manitoba, that with the new school plan coming in, that the local taxes would be lowered. My honourable friend the Minister of Education doesn't like to be reminded that it's right on the record of the House here, that he so stated in this House and the after the election material that my honourable friend from Gladstone mentioned in the House yesterday, where the First Minister allowed his picture to appear with the advertising of the local candidates, promising that taxes would be lowered. These are the things why the public has lost confidence because they see that the reverse has been true; and then, of course, there is this question of increased municipal taxes. My honourable friend and colleague from Selkirk gave an exemplification of it this afternoon.

Then there's the question of the debt increase in the Province of Manitoba. I mentioned a little while ago that my honourable friend the First Minister of the province had been very concerned about the debt of the Province of Manitoba when it was much less than \$ 200 million, and he warned us, "don't be talking, don't be talking, don't camouflage the situation by talking about net debt or gross debt. Debt", said the First Minister when he was sitting over on this side, "Debt is debt, no matter what you call it." He said that if we balance our terms nicely we could call pretty nearly anything self-supporting, and he said this debt is something that should give a lot of cause for concern to the people of Manitoba. The debt was well below \$200 million at that time. I've been checking up recently about the debt now. If I read the Public Accounts correctly, the total direct debt as of March 31st, 1962, the direct debt of the province was \$372 million-odd. The guaranteed debt was \$198 million-odd, a total of almost \$571 million. Would you believe this possible, Madam Chairman, after what the First Minister said years ago when he was talking on this subject? Would you believe it possible that the sinking fund to meet this \$571 million in debt, both guaranteed and direct, appear by the Public Accounts to be lower today than they were when the debt was \$231 million. And if we can believe the article that appeared in the Tribune paper of a few days ago, which I ask the Honourable the First Minister to clarify for me, if we can believe this item, then the debt of the province, direct and guaranteed, is not this \$571 million that I've been talking about, but by the end of December '62 was \$632 million.

Now this is quite a change. I don't know why my honourable friend hasn't answered the questions that I asked him, because I asked him three questions. I didn't take the time to read this article, but I ask him the first question, has the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer seen this article? Second, is it accurate? Third, has this same information been furnished to the members, because it appears, according to the press report, to have come from the Treasury Branch; and fourth, is it correct that the total direct and guaranteed debts of the province is now approximately \$632 million? Those questions were asked last Friday. The Honourable the First Minister said that he would take it as notice; he has not yet replied. I would like to ask him to reply at his earliest convenience and to tell this House whether the Treasury Department is giving information to the press that has not been furnished to the members of this House, because it seems to me that the first people who should get this kind of information, which goes into considerable detail, are the members of the House and not the press. It should not reach us through the press. I would think that the First Minister would accept the first opportunity to try and clear this matter up.

This article also mentions that for the first year this government admits having a deficit. We will be interested to hear about that. It tells us that the savings bonds were used: \$27 million went into public works; \$7 million for flood protection; \$1 million to agricultural research. Madam Speaker, is that information that should reach us first through the columns of the newspapers, or is it something that we should be told in this House by the Minister himself. This also makes mention of the fact that there is an increase -- there is a decrease, thank goodness -- that there's a decrease in the direct debt of the province. I presume

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may I rise to the point of order about time, because if my honourable friend intends to introduce a motion of non-confidence, I would like a few minutes before 10:30 to reply to it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Am afraid that -- I'm afraid that

MR. ROBLIN: I am asking Madam Speaker if the time has elapsed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George -- (Interjection) -- pardon? Oh yes, I'll speak on the amendment. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the motion be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words: "But this House regrets that Your Honour's government has been responsible for raising the debt of Manitoba to an unprecedented level."

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would like to speak on that amendment, Madam Speaker, because I had a couple of points here that deal with that

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend could enlighten me on what basis he is speaking. He's spoken for forty minutes, and he has exhausted his time when he's done that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Chairman, the rule is perfectly clear, that a member who is moving a motion of non-confidence has unlimited time, and

MR. ROBLIN: May I just ask my Honourable Friend a question? Does he intend to prevent the government from making any reply to his motion of non-confidence, because he knows that at 10:30 the rule is that all motions on the Order Paper must be disposed of in connection with the Throne Speech. Surely he is going to give me some opportunity to say something.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Chairman, I was just . . . -- (Interjection) -- Has my honourable friend forgotten last year? Well, Madam Chairman, I had a few comments that I want to make with regard to interest. My friend the First Minister, in his capacity of Provincial Treasurer, showed in the estimates that he introduced early in his career as First Minister that the net interest payment of the Province of Manitoba was \$7,827. You remember that I commented on more than one occasion on the fact that that particular figure was achieved by tricky bookkeeping. My honourable friend doesn't like that term -- I've used it before -- I use it again. I maintain it was tricky bookkeeping, but that's what the honourable gentleman showed as the net interest figure in his first estimates, Seven Thousand -- (Interjection) -- Not quite, not quite. I would consider my honourable friend an authority on provocative expressions, but I would think that even he would be pleased that he had carried off the honours on this occasion. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, thank you, I consider that that's travelling in pretty fast company. By that bookkeeping method, it was shown that \$7,827 was the net interest cost that the province had to pay on its debt. Now I would like to compare the figure that's shown in the estimates of March 31st -- estimates for the year ending March 31, 1963 -- \$3,600,000-odd. If my arithmetic is correct, that is something like 468 times as large an interest bill as the one that my honourable friend first submitted to this House. Now I know that the first one was achieved by some juggling of the figures. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: I still don't like your phraseology.

MR. CAMPBELL: You don't like this whole argument.

MR. ROBLIN: No, and I don't like your discourtesy in preventing us from replying.

MR. CAMPBELL: This is what you don't like.

MR. ROBLIN: This is the humble Mr. Campbell. This is arrogance.

MR. CAMPBELL: Even the humble Mr. Campbell can probably get a little bit annoyed when we listen to a speech like that one that we had yesterday afternoon. If my honourable friend wants to see the humble Mr. Campbell and his colleagues act in the way that he'd like to see them act, let him have some control of the way that his Ministers act and himself.

MR. ROBLIN: All I ask is a little fair play from you, and I'm not getting it.

MR. CAMPBELL: So I come back to the final question, Madam Speaker, why this loss of confidence in the Conservative Party? This loss of confidence that's shown by their total vote being down 13 percent from what it was on the last time that they consulted the electorate while the vote for the Party that I have the honour to sit in was up 17 percent. Well, I think it's just because of the kind of thing that we've been talking about here. My honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture has to take his due share of it; my honourable friend the First Minister has to take his due share of it; and a lot of the other Ministers do; because the philosophy of this government has been that they've been telling the people all the time, in this House and out of it, the burden of their remarks has been the amount of money that we've been spending -- the amount of money -- we've spent this much money for this program; we've put this much money into another program; we've given so much, the ministers vie with one another as to

(Mr. Campbell, Cont'd.) . . . which one has the highest spending department. My honourable friend the Minister of Education relates with great relish the fact that his is the highest spending department. He relates with relish the fact that the other Ministers, even though they are anxious to have their own departments doing the same thing, are deferring to him to get that money for education.

The philosophy of this government has been that if we can pour out the money -- pour out the money -- that that's what will get the people to vote for them. And this is the same program that the federal party is using, and it has used it successfully on other occasions. I would be surprised, Madam Speaker, I would be surprised -- and I agree with the Honourable Member for St. George -- that if my friends in the government party think we should not be talking federal politics here, then let us lay the blame for it where it belongs, because my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture introduced it into this discussion and introduced it in a way that couldn't help but raise a storm of this kind. And I would be amazed, Madam Speaker, if we do not find that in this last few weeks of the campaign, if the present federal government follows its practice of the past, I would be amazed if we don't see a flood of cheques going out to the farmers of Manitoba. Their own money, that's it, but this is their own money undoubted-ly, and I think from the record of the sales that we have heard about that some of that money should have been paid to them already. But when will it be paid? I wouldn't be a bit surprised, Madam Chairman, if we should find that an acreage bonus, applicable to last year, would be announced also. This is a thing that is wrong with politics, whether it's done federally or provincially. If I can find the -- (Interjection) -- Fair play says my honourable friend. I like this term coming from my honourable friend.

MR. ROBLIN: No chance to reply.

MR. CAMPBELL: Because anytime that my honourable friend gets the chance to . . . I had a quotation from my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture that I wanted to use in this connection, because there was one that expressed this philosophy of the government's handing out the money. This is reading from Page 204 of the 10A of 1960, when my honourable friend was fairly new in office, that he said: "And I think, Mr. Speaker, that we must remember this -- and certainly I would just love it, if I had a cash register on one hand and a filing cabinet with all the names of the farmers in Manitoba on the other. I am quite certain that if the cash register didn't run out, that I could return this government every year for a long time." Isn't that a fine philosophy? That's the philosophy that the federal government has been using, and this government has been using. And I say -- (Interjection) -- No, we didn't.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . bribed them with No. 10 Highway in '58.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ROBLIN: Before the question is put, I merely wish to protest the arrogance of the honourable member for Lakeside who has deliberately prevented us from having any opportunity to reply to this motion of non-confidence.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Chairman, I presume that the honourable member is raising a point of order, otherwise he shouldn't have been talking. I would therefore like a . . . on the same point of order. I am unable to speak in this debate, Madam Chairman, and have not been able to participate and I don't intend to now. However, I want to say this, on the point of order raised by the Leader, that what he is complaining about is exactly what he did to us last year, when he exactly carried on substantially over his time, and my honourable friend does that frequently in this House, sometimes beyond the hour of 5:30, and I see no reason why he has any reason to complain. What my honourable friend did is perfectly in order.

MR. ROBLIN: It's perfectly in order, but it is simply contrary to the canons of fair play, because we have the right to defend ourselves. He prevents us from having that right.

MR. MOLGAT: That's exactly what you did last year.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, will you kindly repeat the amendment that is before the House?

MADAM SPEAKER: That the motion be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words: "But this House regrets that your Honour's government has been responsible for raising the debt of Manitoba to an unprecedented level."

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. ROBLIN: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. ROBLIN: Campbell's closure.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniak, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 12; Nays, 40.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

The motion before the House is that of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that a humble address be presented to His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor as follows: "We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address us at the opening of the present Session."

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. PAULLEY: No, it's not the same Division.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniak, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 33; Nays, 19.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be engrossed and presented to His Honour by such members of this House as are of the Executive Council and the Mover and Seconder of the Address.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, Estimates of sums required for the services of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964 and recommends these Estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and the Estimates accompanying the same be referred to the Committee of Supply.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that this House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee to consider of ways and means for raising of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that the House do now adjourn.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the House adjourns, could the First Minister indicate the sequence in which we will be going through the first part of the Estimates?

MR. ROBLIN: I shall deal with that on the motion to go into Committee, Madam Chairman.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.