

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Wednesday, October 29th, 1958

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. M.A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I direct a question to the First Minister? Several years ago, this House of the Legislature was given the power to the Flood Disaster Committee to have the seventeen hundred thousand dollars left over from that fund, to be transferred to some other Committee in Ottawa. Has this House, or the Government, any legal or moral right to ask that a portion or the whole of this amount be transferred to the disaster now in Nova Scotia?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable gentleman is talking about what was left over from the contributions received when we had our own flood here in the Red River Valley. Substantial sum remained, when all legitimate claims had been dealt with and, as I recall, a Private Bill was introduced, making arrangements to transfer the management of that money to some National Trustees across the country. I'm not quite clear on this point, but maybe the honourable, the Leader of the Opposition could assist me, but I think there was concurrent Federal Legislation. I'm not positive on that point. He nods his head there was concurrent Federal Legislation. If that is the fact, I doubt that --while, I must say that I'm not making a categorical statement, but my off-hand opinion would be that there is no legal right for us to direct that body to what it should do. As for our moral rights--why, that is a matter for the opinion of every member.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, would it be in order for myself to ask a question of one of the honourable members on the other side of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: It would, Sir.

MR. GROVES: I would direct this question to the Honourable Leader of the C.C.F. Party. In Hansard, Volume 3.....

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition): I'm not

trying to protect the Honourable, the Leader of the C.C.F. party in any way at all. We have not, we are not...we haven't recently entered into any coalition but I think that --so the record would be straight, I'm sure you'd think, on reflection, Mr. Speaker, that the only time that the honourable Member could direct such a question would be if the Honourable, the Leader of the C.C.F. were on ...occupying the Floor. I think then that he can properly direct a question and even then, it's up to the honourable Member whether he answers or not. When my Honourable friend, the Leader of the C.C.F. moves to that side of the House, as he expects to do, it will be proper to ask it of the people not the Ministerial Bench.

MR. L. STINSON (Osborne): Let me suggest to my honourable friend that he write me a letter.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the proper address is, "Will the honourable Member permit a question" ...I believe ...beg pardon... only when he's speaking. I stand corrected. Address of Papers, the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. A.A. TRAPP (Lac du Bonnet): I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that a humble address be voted to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, for a return, showing copies of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada, with regard to Farm Credit from July the first, 1958, to the present date.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been moved by the Honourable, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that a humble address be voted to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, for a return, showing copies of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada, with regard to Farm Credit, from July the first, 1958, to the present date. Are you ready for the question?

MR. ROBLIN: Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that there's no objection to this order...that merely to observe that if there is any correspondence from Ottawa, it is customary to ask their permission for tabling, and you will have to comply with that procedure before we can answer. Apart from that, there is no objection to the order.

MR. W.C. MILLER (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, will the Government undertake to table that if it gets permission at this Session?

MR. ROBLIN: We will table all the replies, if we can, at this Session, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour please say "aye". Those opposed please say "nay". In my opinion the "ayes" have it and the motion is carried. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. C.E.GREENLAY (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable, the Member for Carillon, that an order of the House to issue for a return showing--  
1. the total amount in the reserve for war and post-war emergency funds; 2. a list of the securities or investments making up the fund as it now stands; 3. what amount of this fund is invested in municipal sewer and water bonds or debentures; 4. the amount available for investment under Legislation now before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable, the Member for Portage la Prairie, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that an order of the House to issue for a return showing--1. the total amount of the reserve fund for post-war emergency funds; 2. a list of securities or investments making up the fund as it now stands; 3. what amount of this fund is invested in municipal sewer and water bonds or debentures; 4. the amount available for investment under Legislation now before the House.

Are you ready for the question? Those in favour please say "aye". Those opposed please say "nay". In my opinion the "ayes" have it and I declare the motion carried. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that an order of the House to issue for a return showing, 1. the proposed location of Provincial Trunk Highway No. 4 between Gladstone and Neepawa; and 2. if construction of the proposed road is on the 1959 road program.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone ...seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that an order in the House to issue for return showing, 1. proposed location of the P.T.H. No. 4 between Gladstone and Neepawa; 2. if the construction of the proposed road is on the 1959 road program. Are you ready for the question? Those in favour please say "aye". Those opposed please say "nay". In my opinion the "ayes" have it and I declare the motion carried. The Honourable Member for Ste.Rose.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, that an order of the House to issue for a return showing; A. the total amount of money awarded under the Manitoba Regulations 35/58, being a regulation under the Education Department Act, respecting scholarships; B. the names and addresses of all recipients of awards under this regulation and the amount awarded to each.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable Member for Ste.Rose, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that the order of the House to issue for a return showing, A. total amount of money awarded under the Manitoba Regulations 35/58, being a regulation under the Education Department Act

with respect to scholarships; B. the names and addresses of all recipients of awards under the regulations and the amount awarded to each. Are you ready for the question?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the acceptance of this resolution. I would point out two things, however. One is that the length of ....the number of names....the number of awards is so lengthy that I could not undertake to have that tabled before the closing of the House because it is quite lengthy and it will take some time to prepare.

Second, the aspect is that, as you know, particularly the bursaries, are awarded to people....to scholars on the basis of need and I have some reservations about the advisability of making the names of those persons public. It is public business and the House is entitled to have it if they wish, but I do just mention that, that it is a somewhat personal matter with respect to those who have received the bursaries.

MR. MILLER: Some of the names have been published in the Manitoba School Journal. Would the same conditions apply?

MR. McLEAN: Oh, I think only with respect to scholarships that were awarded on the basis of merit only. I am not aware that any have been published of those who received bursaries or loans.

MR. STINSON: Mr. Speaker, I think that some reconsideration might be given to this matter in view of the information that has been provided by the Minister. When it is on a basis of need, I wonder, do we want to insist upon having those names made public.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker,.....this, that it is not based on need alone. It is based on scholarship and need--scholarship and need. I think that the recipients would certainly not object to that. I think that it is a matter of pride that they received that on the basis of scholarship because there are no bursaries that are awarded if scholarship doesn't accompany the , isn't part and parcel of the need.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question, Those in favour please say "aye". Those opposed please say "nay". In my opinion the "ayes" have it and I declare the motion carried. The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. W. LUCKO (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the order of the House to issue a return, showing copies of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the Rural Municipality of Brokenhead regarding the construction of five miles of highway west of the town of Beausejour in Manitoba, connecting Provincial Trunk Highway No. 22 and Provincial Trunk Highway No.4.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Springfield, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that an order of the House to issue for a return showing copy of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the Rural Municipality of Brokenhead, regarding the construction of five miles of highway west of the town of Beausejour in Manitoba, connection P.T.Highway No. 22 and P.T.Highway No. 4. Are you ready for the question? Those in favour please say "aye". Those opposed please say "nay". In my opinion the "ayes" have it and I declare the motion carried.

Adjourn Debate. Second reading of Bill No. 2. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. M.N.HRYHORCZUK, O.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, for some years now, the free world has been looking for a way to improve the various systems of education found within it and this is particularly true of the Continent. Now what is the search being made for? We are searching for a way in which to improve our educational system so that the talents and the natural aptitudes of our children could be fully developed, not only for their own sakes, but for the welfare of all others. There are various ways in which these investigations are being carried on in studies. The best brains in the free world are being picked for methods of improving the situation, and we, in Manitoba, early in 1957, together with the rest of our friends in the free world, decided in this House, that we'd appoint a Royal Commission for the purpose of finding out how we could improve the system here in this Province.

During my membership in this House, I believe that the former Government appointed two Royal Commissions. I do not recall them having appointed any more. One of them was the Bracken Commission, The Manitoba Liquor Enquiry Commission; and the other was the Manitoba Royal Commission on Education. In both of these cases, Mr. Speaker, the Government was very careful in the choice of its personnel, and in both of these cases, it has been proven that the choice was well made. In both of these cases, the commissions were given full rein, a free hand, with instructions to make every effort to study the questions before them fully, and to come up with such recommendations as, in their opinion, were just and proper, immaterial of where the chips may fall or what political repercussions may occur. We had the pleasure and the big task of implementing the recommendations of the Liquor Enquiry Commission, but it did not fall to be our lot to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education. I do want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the work of the Commission is concerned, it has been full. It is evident that they put in a great deal of study, and I want to say that they have come out with, what can be generally termed, a very good report.

By mere coincidence, it fell to the happy lot of the Conservative Party, to implement those recommendations. By mere coincidence, they can now claim, legitimately, or otherwise, that this is their program for the Province of Manitoba. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if any party has any legitimate claim for

producing this report, and the recommendations contained in there, it is the Liberal-Progressive Party. Insofar as a report is concerned, I want to repeat, that although it is only an interim report, it certainly contains some very forward looking recommendations. Now we have been, more or less, instrumental in producing the seed to those recommendations. It is up to the Government to plant that seed and nurture it properly. We have every reason to expect that if the Government in power uses due diligence and care, that we can expect, from the crop raised by this seed, a bountiful harvest. If it should fail, then, of course, the blame can only fall in one place. The implement used by the Government to plant this seed has its imperfections, and we can't expect a perfect Bill. We know that it is human to err, although the now First Minister was hard put to realize that fact when he sat where we are here. But we can hope--we can hope that, as time goes on, that whatever imperfections are found will be corrected and put straight.

Now this program, before the House, does one thing, and that is that it provides more money for education. But if those of you, and I guess all of you have studied the report, you will have found, that in the opinion of the Commission, money in itself is not the answer. There is a statement in that report, that our friends to the south of us, probably spend more money than any country in the free world and acknowledge that they possibly have the worst education. And that could very easily happen right here in the Province of Manitoba. This program will, no doubt, be of great help to the tax payers, at least temporarily, and when I say that, I simply mean, Mr. Speaker that there will always be the discrepancy, insofar as equality of opportunity is concerned, between the City, the urban centres and the rural parts. This is through no fault of either the Government or anyone else. But that discrepancy, I am afraid, will remain with us, unless we can find further solutions to the matter of equality of education. Now why do I say that, Mr. Speaker? There has been a tendency for our better qualifying teachers to flock to the cities. The reasons for that are several. The added conveniences of the cities; better teaching facilities; better salaries. Now this particular program may make some difference in the regard, but the cities will still be in the position to outbid the rural areas for the better qualified teachers. And if the same type of a race goes on that has been going on, and is going on, we can very easily foresee the time when the rural areas may have to impose additional taxes, as they are doing now, by way of special levies on the local districts, to get their fair share of the better qualified teachers. And, Mr. Speaker, after all, our system of education is no better than our teachers are, and unless we can find some further remedy, some means by which we can distribute the teaching talents throughout the Province, we will not see equality of opportunity.

Now, insofar as the Bill is concerned, I said it had certain imperfections, and the one, the underlying, I would say, fundamental sections under the principle of equality of opportunity is the section that gives the Minister on the

Recommendations Divisions Board, the right to name the existing school district as a division. That is definitely a discrimination. I do not know how you can get around that. It may not be serious, but it could be serious; because certain areas of the Province will be a jump ahead of the other parts of the Province and I don't think that that is a healthy situation. One other provision, that I think should be looked at, and it is very pertinent and that is where the Minister, on the recommendation of the Boundries Commission, can alter boundries without reference to the people. I think that nowhere in the Royal Commission Report will you find a statement recommending that a procedure of that kind be followed. That could be dangerous.

I think that the scale of capital grants is not in the best interests of the Province.. They are scaled according to the size of the school facilities, the number of rooms in the school. I believe they start off with 50 per cent, and if my memory serves me right, they go to 80 per cent. Now might I point out, to the Honourable, The Minister of Education, that there will be areas in the Province when formed into a division are going to cover a great many districts. The Boundries Commission may find that they have to have two secondary schools in order to avoid heavy costs of transportation. They may find that they need two six-room schools and the only grant that this division would qualify for is a 50 per cent grant. You may have an adjacent division, which is lucky to be situated and populated differently, also requiring 12 rooms, but those 12 rooms could be contained in the one building and they will qualify for 80 per cent. It is quite evident that the building of two six-room schools is more costly than the building of one 12-room school. And I think it is also true to say that in this area where you will require two six-room schools, the conditions there will be worse than they would in where you have a concentration of people, that is speaking from the financial point of view. So I think that is another provision that should be taken, we should take a good look at when we go into Committee.

Aside from that Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to the many words that have been said in regard to this Bill. I do want to say, and commend the First Minister and his Cabinet, for losing no time in bringing it in. I only regret that the First Minister found it impossible to keep his election campaign promises, and give the people of this Province a 50 per cent increase in their grants, right across the board, without any strings attached and unconditionally as I interpreted his promises.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, further to the Debate I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, that the Debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I take that adjournment, I see that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead is rising to speak.

MR. E.R.SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I also did wish to move adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I will take the adjournment of the Honourable Member for Carillon, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, that the Debate be adjourned. Are you ready for the question?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose the adjournment. The Bill has been before us now since last Friday, and we've had a considerable amount of discussion. Everyone is, as I understand it, in agreement with the Bill. It is a lengthy Bill and will take us considerable time in Committee and I am, naturally, most anxious that we should proceed with that important part of our work. If there was any disagreement as to the principle of the Bill, I would not be, of course, inclined to ask that the Debate be rushed at this stage, but I think that since we are in agreement, that it is reasonable to ask that we conclude our Debate this evening in order that the Bill may be referred to Committee.

MR. STINSON: We think that it would be more important Sir, to have discussion of this matter than to allow the Minister to have his own way in this particular matter. I think that, according to the traditions of this House, that it is only on rare occasions that we refuse an adjournment. Now I can appreciate the attitude of the Minister in one respect that he wants to get on with the mob. On the other hand, I think that we could afford to have this adjournment...we could let this stand over night and have further discussion of it. Even though there is agreement on the principle involved, I think that it will not do any harm to have further discussion. The House seems to be agreed that so far as the resolution of my honourable friend from Inkster, with respect to old age pensions and that matter has been adjourned by members opposite and by other members, and I think that in the interests of free discussion, that the Minister should exceed to the request of the Honourable Member for Carillon that the Debate should be adjourned.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Minister brought to the notice of the House the dates of the Debate on this Bill, and which, of course, we all know very well, because while I'm inclined to agree with what has been said that the Debate should continue, I do wish to point out that we solicit the cooperation of the Members on the other side, so that instead of one speech, one adjournment, we do get a freer discussion and Debate.

Now when the Bill was first introduced, I think it was said with some force that that procedure was inevitable because people wanted to hear what the Minister had to say and the subject was



fresh. Since that time I think the spokesmen of the parties have had their say and while having made a protest, we will not carry this point any further. I merely ask for the cooperation of the Members of the House in speeding up the tempo of the debate and if there is someone who wants to speak, perhaps it's not asking too much to have them be prepared to follow somebody who is debating now. I just make that observation because I don't think it's entirely unreasonable and suggest that if we could get cooperation of that sort everyone would have their say, which is desirable in an orderly fashion.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to say a few words, I would like to inform the House that I adjourned this Bill at this time, the Debate on this Bill at this time, because I have proposed to speak tonight on the Farm Bill and also on the Speech from the Throne Amendment. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when there is so much uncertainty as to whether we'll have a government tomorrow, or after tomorrow, that it would be better to dispose of this Speech from Throne before we pass all these Bills.

There are two Want of Confidence Motions before the House, it might be that the Bills would be passed and then that we could have no Government and an election facing up. For those two reasons, especially the last one, I think that the Debate on the Address should be completed before the Bills are passed and we proceed with our work, another reason. And that's why I wanted to speak on that Speech from the Throne tonight.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, everyone knows that if the Government is defeated, none of these Bills will be proceeded with to their final stage anyway.

MR. PREFONTAINE: .....Statutes and .....

MR. ROBLIN: They won't be given Royal Assent.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I think that the suggestion of the Minister is quite understandable, but on the other hand we should recognize, I think, that these are pretty important Bills and ones that demand a pretty careful scrutiny. And, in addition to the reason that my Honourable Friend, Member for Carillon has just mentioned, I think there is another factor that's very important here, and that is that we folk who have been in this House for some time realize that the real test is how much time has been lost of the sitting period. And I must say that the time has been pretty fully taken up, up to date. And so long as the sessions themselves are not being shortened, unduly, I think that some of them perhaps can be shortened somewhat if they are not shortened unduly, and there's very little loss of time. And I do think that It's important that the Speech from the Throne should be proceeded with rather than some of these.

I must say while I'm here that I am anxious, as I mentioned earlier, to speak on the Farm Credit Bill. I have been waiting particularly because I wanted the ....., since these are now available I wanted to get the remarks of the Honourable, the Minister who is in charge of that Bill. And that came on our desks only this afternoon and as honourable Members know, some of us have been pretty completely employed since that time.

The two honourable gentlemen, one on each side of the Honourable, the First Minister, and I were looking after certain social engagements that we just simply had to attend to and these things take some time, and personally I just haven't had the time since receiving the Hansard that I was missing.

I can assure the Honourable, the First Minister, that as far as we're concerned, our wish is to debate these questions on their merits and assure they'll get to Committee in good time. There's no conspiracy to murder them and we'll be anxious to hurry the debate along as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable, the Member for Carillon, seconded by the Honourable, the member for Minnedosa that the Debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the motion, second reading of Bill Number 3. The Honourable Member for Selkirk has the floor.

MR. T.P.HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I hope in having adjourned this debate that I am not going to be accused of delaying tactics.

I think that this legislation which has been introduced by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, is a very important piece of legislation. It's a piece of legislation which is very much needed in the Province of Manitoba. We have a new Minister, who is keen, who is anxious to get on with his job and I think that we should give that Minister an Act which will give him or the Corporation which is formed under the provisions of that Bill, the widest possible powers to carry into effect the purposes and the objects of things.

Now, I feel that we should approach this Bill in a realistic manner. In being realistic, I say there's no use about saying that it might be better if this legislation were enacted by Ottawa. We have no such legislation in Ottawa which would meet the conditions in Manitoba that this Bill seeks to beat. I think too, we should be objective, we should study the objects and the purposes of this Bill for the purpose of ascertaining whether or no, this Bill fully meets the requirements necessary to carry out these purposes and objects.

Now in any remarks that I have to say, I wish to assure the Honourable Minister and every Member of this House that I am trying to be as constructive as possible. There is nothing destructive in what I have to say. I realize that the only way

that we can bring about a decentralization of industry in the Province of Manitoba, and the only way that we can take up the economic slack in rural Manitoba, which has been caused by the depression in farm prices, is by trying to establish in these communities as many industries as we possibly can that will fit into the natural needs of these communities. I believe that this Bill will fill that need.

Now this is a Bill which is rather unusual - it's unique. There is a Board appointed under that Bill consisting of seven, not less than seven or more than twelve members, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the most important thing in this Bill, is the seven or twelve members who will be appointed. And I further submit, and I think we have the assurance of the Honourable Minister, that these men will be chosen on a merit basis solely and I hope that in his choice of these men, there is no partisan consideration entered into that choice.

Now I know that the Government has been in a wilderness for a long time and I know that there's a lot of camp-followers who are going to be after jobs, and I feel certain that as long as the Honourable Minister holds the portfolio that he does, that he will resent and dissuade his supporters in this House from making appointments purely on a political basis.

Now I make this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I think that this Board should represent as wide a segment of the population of Manitoba as possible. I believe that on this Board should be represented people from all walks of life and all industries. And I make this suggestion to the Honourable Minister, that one of his men, one of the representatives on that Board be a representative whose name is given to him by the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. That another representative be a name given to him by the Urban Association of Manitoba. That another representative be from the Manitoba Farmers Union. That another representative be from the M.F.A.C. That another representative be from the faculty of Commerce at the University of Manitoba, and if there is any representatives left, well, the Minister can choose them himself from the general public. And Labour is another man, Trades and Labour, Sir, ....I beg your pardon. I'm glad you called my attention to that omission.

ONE OF THE MEMBERS: No lawyers?

MR. HILLHOUSE: And talking about lawyers - I know you have power to appoint a solicitor, but I'm going to make a suggestion and perhaps the Manitoba Law Society will accuse me of being a rebel to the cause in trying to take a shingle off some fellow lawyer's roof. But I make this suggestion, that in the powers that you are giving this Corporation, I suggest that the powers that you give this Corporation be such powers as can be enforced in as summary a manner as possible. Now what I have in mind is this - that under the powers and duties of your Board, they have a right to choose the remedy and the type of action which they will take in respect of any default.

I'm going to make the suggestion that you carry out the provisions that were contained in the old Farmers Creditors Arrangement Act. Under that Act, if a farmer made an application

for a settlement or compromise of his affairs, the official administrator simply filled in what was known as a form "K", he filed that form "K" in the Land Titles Office in which the land was situated, he filed that form "K" in the County Court Office, and from the time that that was filed there, it formed a lien and charge on all the lands in the Land Titles Office registered in that individual's name. And when it was the time it was filed in the County Court, it formed a lien or charge on all the chattels owned by that individual in that district.

Now I also suggest that you enlarge your Act so as to give to your security the nature of an equitable mortgage and thus obviate the necessity of having a lot of legal expenses in connection with the preparation and registration of mortgages. That would be a very simple way of amply securing yourselves in respect of everything owned by that individual or corporation at that time, but also in respect of anything that that corporation or individual would subsequently acquire.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources):  
..... permit a question. That then is a definition of a term that is not familiar to me "the equitable mortgage".  
Could that be explained?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well, if you leave your Title with me as security for a loan and I do not register a mortgage in the Land Titles Office, I am considered to have an equitable mortgage on your title. The French have a different word for it - I think they call it a hypothecation or the French word for that.

Now that suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is made constructively and I know that the Minister will take it in that way.

Now, another thing I think that we should be very very careful about, and we should scrutinize very carefully is the type of businesses and the persons who are eligible for help under this Act. In reading over Section 4, it seems to me that that section is not quite clear as to what is meant by person or organization, and I think that when the Bill gets into Committee, I know my own feeling in the matter, is that the benefits of this Bill should be made available, not only to the municipalities but they should also be made available to co-operative associations. And I question whether the Bill as at present worded is sufficiently wide to embrace those two organizations. Now it may be, but to make it doubly certain, I think that that could be remedied by putting a definition in the section 1. Yes.

Now there's another thing too, and that is this - regarding the persons who are ineligible to sit on the Board. Now it may be that the Minister has a perfectly logical explanation for this sub-section which prohibits any person who holds any office or position, for which any salary is payable out of public funds. Now public funds is not defined, and I think that it would be wide enough to cover not only funds paid by the Province of Manitoba, but it might also be wide enough to cover funds paid by Municipal Corporations, and it may be that you would perhaps want some Municipal official to be on your Board. Now I think

that section should be looked into with a view to seeing, it may be there for a purpose but if it isn't there for a purpose, I think it should be clarified to show that it doesn't apply to some individual who might be a valuable asset to this Organization.

Now there's another matter dealt with in the Bill, and that is the question of a director being present at a meeting of the Board during a time at which there is under discussion any matter relating to a corporation in which he has an interest. Now, in reading that section, it does not appear to me as if you are prohibiting that fund from advancing money to that corporation in which that individual has an interest. Well now, there may be a perfectly valid reason for that stand, but it seems to me that that is a principle which is diametrically opposed to the most elementary principles that I know. In other words in the Municipal Council, no Municipal councillor can make a contract with a Municipal Corporation in respect of any partnership in which he has an interest, and this section simply precludes the man from being at the meeting, or if he is at the meeting he must disclose his interests and must not vote. Now, as I say, there may be a valid reason for having that in the Act as it is, but to me, it seems to have a certain repugnance.

Now there's another thing in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, that is notwithstanding the provisions of the Legislative Assembly Act, the corporation is not required to produce to the assembly, or to any committee thereof, any application for a loan or other information furnished by an applicant, etc. Now there again, there may be a very valid reason for putting that in but, until I get an explanation of the reason why it's there, I think it's dangerous to have it. It may be that that corporation has committed some act or omission which this Legislature would like to investigate. And that actual omission may be in respect of the application which was before that corporation. Now, we are, by this very enactment, depriving ourselves as the sovereign body in this Province dealing with this particular matter from investigating that matter.

Now, as I say, the Minister may have a good explanation for that, and no doubt, he will deal with it in time to come. But at the present moment, I feel that it is a rather dangerous departure from what has been an established principle in our laws.

Now in concluding, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say this - that I certainly support this Bill. I believe that there has been a need for such legislation in this Province. I believe, too, that in spite of the activities of the Department of Industry and Commerce, and in spite of the efforts that they have made, and no doubt their efforts have been numerous to establish industries in rural Manitoba, there is no way that you can establish some of the industries that this Bill contemplates unless there is a fund available for that purpose. And I wish to compliment the Honourable Minister in bringing down this legislation.

MR. R. TEILLET (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I only want to take a moment on this Bill. I think the former speaker has covered the ground very thoroughly, but there is a matter that

I don't think should be overlooked at this moment.

First of all, I was very pleased to hear the Minister's comments in presenting this Bill on second reading, and his statement, if I recall it correctly to the effect that he or this Board or his Department would not use the powers in their hands to move businesses from one site to another. I accept that, of course, very gladly.

I just do want to make this observation, however, that because of the reported statements of the Minister this last summer, and this little whiskey debate between my Honourable Friend from Minnedosa and myself, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there was no difference of opinion between us on this. The important thing is that these industries come to Manitoba. I think that I would ask the Minister to - at some time or other during the course of this Session - to take some means or other to allay any question there may be in the minds of people throughout Manitoba, business men in particular. By these questions, I mean any misgivings and questions that have arisen as a result of this incident last summer.

I think that we in this House, while we accept his statement and we thank him for it, I think he wants to make sure that people throughout the Province have the assurance that this kind of thing will not occur. We are giving the Minister a considerable amount of power and influence under this Bill. We think the Government should have it. We are satisfied that it should have it but I do think that an assurance to the public that it will not be used unduly would be helpful to the development of industry in Manitoba, and certainly a reassurance to interests outside of this Province that might feel they want to come in, but because of certain questions of this kind, they have some misgivings. Well, I am sure that the Minister will find occasion to do this kind of thing, satisfied in advance that he will achieve those opportunities to do so. That, Mr. Speaker, is about the only thing I have to offer at this moment.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): If no one else wishes to speak, I would like to adjourn the debate. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that the debate be adjourned.

After a voice vote, Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 8. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. C.L. SHUTTLEWORTH (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, since this Bill was introduced into the House a few days ago, we've certainly had a very interesting and, I think, Sir, a worthwhile debate on farm credit. In fact, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it has been fruitful indeed because I feel that the Government of the day are leaning our way as far as some of the principles in this bill are concerned. But I believe, Sir, that for the purpose of the record, I should take a few minutes tonight and tell the story of farm credit as we have had it to deal with in the last couple

of years.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, at the outset once again that there is no division amongst all Parties in this House on the principle of the need for farm credit. We are all agreed on that. The only difference that there has been as to whether this should be done at that Federal or at the Provincial level and that is where the difference of opinion comes; it's not a difference of principle. The basic principle we have before us in this bill of establishing farm credit is there and we are supporting it. But I do want to say this, Mr. Speaker, at the outset as we pointed out in our amendment to the Throne Speech, that while credit is important, it is not in my opinion as a farmer, one of the basic problems facing agriculture today. Because it isn't credit, Mr. Speaker, it's cash that the farmers are short of today. Prior to 1951, as farmers, we weren't discussing farm credit very much. Why? Because our year's operation showed a reasonable cash operating profit. That was the reason. I could buy a tractor very cheaply in 1950 and before that for a few years than I can now. The same with other farm machinery. The same with hiring help and that's the reason today that the farmer is looking to something in the way of credit, is because he is short of cash. And that's the basic problem that faces agriculture today and I think we keep that in mind when we are speaking of farm credit.

Don't let anyone fool us that farmers if by supplying us with credit, it's going to solve all our problems on the farm. Sure, it can be a means to assisting us, but there are other big problems that have to be solved along with it.

Now to get back to the situation as far as farm credit is concerned and the stand that we have taken on it. Two years ago, we had a special select committee of this House and, Mr. Speaker, we spent a good deal of time during the Session in that Committee. I think, Sir, that we had a good Committee. You acted on it, took a good deal of discussion, took part in all the discussions in fact on it, along with a good many of the other members. We had briefs from the farm organizations of this Province and the fact that Special Select Committee did bear some significance, we had requests from all over Canada for the report of that Committee. There was interest in it, in other parts of the country. We didn't set that Committee up because as some people said we suddenly woke up to the fact that there was a difficult problem facing agriculture. The Committee was set up because we thought that once again it was necessary to emphasize, the emphasize the difficult problems that faced agriculture.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to point this out, that the First Minister of this Province at that time, spent very little time, very little time on that Committee. He was a member of it, said very little, said very little, and when it came back into the House he rose up in his place and tore it to pieces. In spite of the fact that you, Sir, who were one of the members of his group at that time, went along to a large degree with the report. And there was a great deal that was of value in that report and I want to deal particularly with the part that has to deal with farm credit.

We discussed farm credit a good deal at that Special Select

Committee. Heard the reports of the farm organizations and finally this was our recommendation - that the Province of Manitoba negotiate with the Government of Canada for the amendment of The Canadian Farm Loans Act by liberalizing the loan limit available to individual farmers with particular attention to the credit need of farmers who anticipate entry into livestock production, specialty crops and of young farmers becoming established on farms. Such negotiations to be supported by Manitoba's offer to guarantee 50% of any accumulative loss accruing from the increase of such loans. (b) That in addition to assistance offered by the Province, to which University and Department of Agriculture, a counselling service similar to that which has proven helpful to those granted loans under The Veterans' Land Act, be provided for borrowers under The Canadian Farm Loans Act. That were the recommendations of that Committee.

Following along a few months after that, there is every year an Annual Conference of the provincial Ministers of Agriculture for the various provinces of Canada, and a year ago in 1957 - July of 1957, that Conference was held in the Province of Saskatchewan and in Regina. And at that Conference all the Ministers, with the exception of the Province of Quebec - their Deputy was there - and I believe the Province of Newfoundland, along with the Deputy Ministers, attended that Convention, and we discussed the matter of farm credit very frankly and freely at that particular Conference, Mr. Speaker, for the best part of a day. And we had there, certainly it was a dog's breakfast, to use the expression of the First Minister, politically speaking. We had the Social Creditors from British Columbia and Alberta; we had the C.C.F.'rs from Saskatchewan; we had the Liberal Progressives from Manitoba; the Conservatives from Ontario; the Union Nationale from Quebec; and so on down the line. Yes, the Liberals were there too, and as far as the political side of it was concerned, we went right across the political line.

And out of that Conference - out of that Conference, and I listened to the discussion very, very closely indeed, because we had passed a recommendation at our Special Select Committee just two or three months before, I heard Ministers from provinces where they have their own provincial set-up saying that "Yes, in my province we have this Farm Loan Board, but this thing should be done at the Federal level. We think it could be done better at the Federal level for three reasons. What is the pressing need? Long-term credit; a number of years, a low interest rate is one of the others, and large amounts. And those three things themselves, Mr. Speaker, indicate at once difficulties from the standpoint of administration at the provincial level. Not difficulties that can't be overcome, but still they are continuing difficulties as Ministers who have had experiences in other provinces pointed out at that Conference. And by the same ..... at the Federal level, they are in a better position to give that type of credit.

So out of that Conference, in July of 1957, we came up with a unanimous resolution, and mind you, we weren't unanimous on a lot of things, but we came up with a unanimous resolution on farm credit, that we would approach Ottawa in September of the same



year - approach Ottawa - the new Minister of Agriculture, and present an annual -- present a unanimous resolution to him on farm credit. And it followed pretty much the same line as our Special Select Committee and I want to read that resolution at that time - Whereas all the provinces of Canada recognized the need for an expansion of agricultural credits and whereas the present policy of the Canadian Farm Loan Board does not fulfill the requirements and needs for realistic farm credits. Now, therefore, this Conference urgently recommends that the Government of Canada establish a revised and realistic credit program designed to provide the farmers of the nation with adequate credit as part of a sound farm policy; and that the personnel and resources of the provincial Departments of Agriculture be made available to assist the federal agency in determining how such a program can be the greatest value to each province. We would suggest four factors required. One, a more realistic appraisal of farms and loans at a reasonable rate of interest. We considered at that time, all the Ministers of Agriculture of Canada, considered at that time, that there must be a reasonable rate of interest, and certainly, Sir, at that time 6% was never considered. A professional follow-up and advisory service so that loans will be used to put a farm on a sound economic basis. Three, that the cost of administration, including a competent advisory service, be a subsidy to the loan, that the cost of administration be a subsidy to the loan. And I think this is important, Mr. Speaker. Here was an opportunity where the people that are engaged in Agriculture, who are needing help at least at this time, could get some help at the Federal level - some help at the Federal level. They had been promised a great deal, they get mighty little. Here was a concrete opportunity for to get help in this regard -- that the agency should have a definite objective, the maintenance of the family farm in Canada and loans should be used to support this objective.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, we had a very good hearing from the Honourable Douglas Harkness, the Minister of Agriculture, and others that sat in with us, and he indicated to us that he thought there would be immediate action as far as farm credit was concerned. And I came back from that Conference feeling that we had made a great step forward in a unified approach to the problem of farm credit in Canada. Time went on and nothing was done at the last session. We heard once again the promises that swept across the country after March 11th and there has been very little heard since, and that is where the matter stands as far as that Conference is concerned.

But I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that other provinces have been into this business and their credit corporations have given benefit to the farmers - yes - but they were unanimous that this is something that should be handled at the Federal level. And we have other groups to back that up and we can look, for instance, at the reports of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life in the Province of Saskatchewan. And here, Sir, and the Leader of the C.C.F. Party mentioned it this afternoon, and here is a report here,

well documented - well documented. This Royal Commission in Saskatchewan went to a great deal of work and they went and scrutinized very closely the problems as they saw them in Saskatchewan and in other provinces, and they come up with a recommendation that the Federal agency should handle this as far as the Province of Saskatchewan was concerned.

Then we have another Royal Commission that was appointed in the Province of Nova Scotia where for many years they had had their own, what they called their Land Settlement Scheme, and there was difficulties with it because generally Royal Commissions are not appointed unless there are a great many difficulties develop. They set up a Royal Commission to study agricultural credit in Nova Scotia. Apparently the Corporation that they had down there hadn't solved all the problems for the farmers in Nova Scotia. And what was the first recommendation of that Commission as set out in this volume? That their scheme, their scheme be put together with the Canadian Farm Loans Board and make one unified Board for the handling of credit in Nova Scotia.

And so I want to say, Sir, that that is the record as far as farm credit is concerned. And I feel in this province, now that we have this legislation before us, certainly it can be of benefit to us and to the farm people of the Province of Manitoba. I really believe, Sir, that in the long run, for the long pull, and I would like to prophesize that the day will come when we will have just one credit facility as far as long term credit facilities to the farmers are concerned, and it will be handled at the national level.

As other speakers have pointed out, in the bill itself there are many weaknesses and we'll certainly deal with those when we get to Committee. And we hope that out of this there will come a bill that will be a benefit to us until such time as once again, the whole policy of farm credit in Canada can be unified and nationalized under the Federal Government.

MR. M.E. MCKELLAR (Souris): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Arthur, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable -- adjourned debate-- Order!-- adjourned debate on Bill #12, the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Minister is closing the debate.

HON. JOHN THOMPSON (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think it has been apparent from the discussions which we have heard on this Bill that the House is prepared to accept it. It does not appear necessary for me, therefore, to attempt to convince any of the honourable members that they should vote in support of it. They have indicated their position, I think, from all sides of the House, very clearly. However, it possibly and undoubtedly is my duty to make reference to some of the comments which have been made with respect to this Bill.

The last member who spoke on it prior to myself, the member for Lac du Bonnet, had some comments to make on the Power Commission and the Telephone System, the utilities purchase of Manitoba-grown poles. I wish to advise the honourable member from the information which I have, that the Manitoba Power Commission has 11,000 Jack Pine poles in stock at the present time. They have enough for 500 miles of farm land. Of course, in the recent years, the Power Commission has required and has been able to use a very large number of Manitoba poles for the farm electrification program, but as that program is now practically completed, they have not the same demand for this length of pole. They are using actually-at the present time their need is centered on longer trees and on longer poles but they have, as I say, 11,000 stock piled at the moment. And that is the reason, I am informed, why at this time there is not a similar demand as in the past for poles from the honourable member's area.

I do wish to say, however, that the Power Commission has a winter project underway in his own riding, the riding of the Whiteshell - the area of the Whiteshell, where they are constructing this winter a distribution line which, I believe, will assist in the employment of persons in winter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer also to some of the comments of other honourable members who took part in this debate. I regret that the honourable member for Radisson is not in his seat, but he soon will be. I was interested in the remarks of the honourable member in connection with this legislation. He seemed to stress the fact that the system should be changed. We are not, of course, providing for that in this Bill, or any Bill which this government will introduce. I think the people of Canada have given a rather positive decision on the system which they desire at the present time. The honourable member appeared on this discussion with regard to employment as rather a prophet of doom groping through an air of gloom. I think it was an attitude which was not suited to his very likeable personality, and very pleasant personality. He charged me with looking at the position through rose-coloured glasses. I feel that he was examining the entire economic situation with very dark glasses, but I am not going to charge him with magnifying the present situation regarding unemployment. But I do feel that he chose the, in the quotation, in the statistics which he used, he selected the worst part of the year. Of course, the very trough, as

they call it, of employment is in March. He quoted the unemployment figures this March as 617,000 Canadians taken from the Bureau of Statistics. Well, the figure in September of this year was 271,000, a tremendous drop in the unemployed. The actual figures seem to indicate, as I say, the bottom of the employment level is in March of each year and the peak is in September. And so there is a tremendous difference between those months in the number of unemployed.

It is interesting to note that in March - in September of this year, on September 20th, 4.4% of the total labor force in Canada were unemployed. Last September on the same date 3.2% were unemployed, so there is a drop in the number of employed in that period of 1.2%. It's also interesting to observe on this issue that in 1954, 3.1% and September of 1954, 3.1% of the total labor force of the country were unemployed. Just .1% less than last year, so I do feel, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the comments of the honourable member, that while we have a recession, that we are holding the line; that the monster of depression has not broken through and there is no indication that it will break through in the visible future. But as I say, I am not charging the honourable member with magnifying the problem of winter unemployment. We feel that it is an emergency situation. It is aggravated by the recession to which I have referred. Seasonal unemployment is with us and it is aggravated by the general level of employment. That is why, of course, we launched this program and that is why we conceived this Bill to attempt to bring some measure of relief to that situation.

Now, I would like to refer to the remarks which were made in this debate by the honourable member for Portage la Prairie. The honourable member, as I understood him, agreed with the general principle involved in this Bill. He was prepared to support it but he disliked certain measures, certain provisions which are contained in it. He didn't like the references to the Municipal Act of Manitoba. He said that he was not prepared, I believe, to support some of the provisions which, as he said, bypass the Municipal Act of Manitoba.

Now, as you know, it may be necessary for municipalities in entering upon projects under an agreement which they may make under the provisions of this bill. It may be necessary for them to borrow money and to issue debentures. Normally, as the honourable member pointed out, it would be necessary for them to seek the ratification of ratepayers of the municipality in order to borrow money over a period for longer than one year. I believe the honourable member supported our view that where the council of the municipality unanimously requested - unanimously in favour of a project under this scheme, and where the minister approves, it shall not be necessary for that municipality to seek a reference to ratepayers to put through their debenture - loan. He agrees, I believe, with that but he disagrees with the principle that we should not make it necessary for municipalities to seek the approval of the Municipal and Public Utility Board to their debentures. Of course, under present municipal legislation, it is necessary for every municipality who borrows by way of debenture to obtain the approval of the Municipal and Public

Utility Board and the duty of that board, of course, is to examine their financial situation and to approve of the borrowing.

Now, I am not prepared to argue with the honourable gentleman on that issue. He may be right. Perhaps it is unnecessary for us to remove that restriction. Perhaps it is better not to interfere with the Municipal Act and still require the approval of the Municipal and Public Utility Board to any borrowings by way of debentures. That issue we are prepared to decide in committee. If the honourable members feel that we are removing some safeguard which should not be removed in municipal financial affairs, then we are prepared to accept their decision. I do feel, however, and in this I am in agreement with the honourable member who spoke from River Heights, that this is emergency legislation, and that these restrictions and controls which are carried out normally under the Municipal Act require time. And in these projects, under this legislation, time is of the essence and that we should be prepared for this winter, at least, to remove any obstacles and impediments in the way of a quick and early and expeditious execution of agreements under this Bill.

Now the other municipal restriction which we have removed, and which was questioned by the honourable member for Portage la Prairie, was the provision which says that a municipality shall not have a debt greater than 20% of its total assessment - of its taxable assessment. I believe, as he said, the figure for rural municipalities is 20% and for urban centres is 25%. The debt shall not be greater than that under the present legislation. Our bill says that that restriction shall not apply. That where there is an emergency problem we will not confine them within those limits. If there are unemployed which can be put to work under the Bill, we will not ask them to be hemmed in by those provisions.

Now I say again--if in Committee it is felt that we have gone too far in lifting that restriction, I'm sure we will be prepared to consider the views of all honourable members on that subject. I do stress, however, that this is emergency legislation and during this winter in particular when we are just launching this scheme, it is necessary to enable any municipality who qualifies to come under it to be able to use the plan as quickly as possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have commented on the observations which have been made by some of the members. I do feel that this legislation will produce worth-while results--we hope it will. I think that it can create work during the winter and work will create employment and employment will produce social and economic benefits for the people of Manitoba.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion for the address to his Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor and amendments thereto. The honourable member for Seven Oaks has the floor.

HON. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I did not

think I would be rising to speak this early in this special session because, although I have had 12 years' experience in municipal government, I have so much to learn on a provincial level. However, after listening to the discussion up to this point, I would like to say something of my first impressions on becoming a member of this Assembly.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your appointment to the Speakership of this House. I hope my conduct will be evidence of my respect, Sir.

I also wish to congratulate the mover of the Speech from the Throne, the honourable member for Roblin for the very capable manner in which he made this address. I shall look forward to knowing him better.

It is also a pleasure for me to compliment the honourable member for St. Mathews for his address and seconding the Throne Speech. His many years of working with the problems of people give him qualifications which make him a worthy member of this House.

My first impression of the Honourable, the First Minister is a good one, and although Conservative governments of the past have been associated with poor times, his desire for quick action is appreciated and his sincerity is unquestionable.

I wish to pay my respects also to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, not only for the tremendous amount of experience he possesses but for his very human qualities. He will no doubt find it difficult to agree with us at times, but he will never become really disagreeable.

Last Thursday afternoon we listened to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition speak at great lengths in the debate on the appointment of a Speaker, and as we grew restless and the fragrant aroma of coffee wafted through the halls, I thought I saw the look of victory steal over his face. I was reminded of that day long ago when Nero fiddled while Rome burned.

Last Friday in moving an amendment to the Throne Speech, I thought I saw that same twinkle in the eyes of our honourable friend.

It would appear to me as a member of only a few days, that that despite what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said about there being no recriminations, I fear for the worst. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Seven Oaks consists of the entire area of West Kildonan plus fringe areas of the City of Winnipeg and of the Rural Municipality of Old Kildonan. This constituency has been well named and we are very proud of our heritage. Many changes have taken place since the first settlers came over from Great Britain in 1812 by Hudson Bay, and by the way they came over in sailing ships of course, and made their way down the Hayes River and then into Lake Winnipeg and then to the comparative safety of the settlement. Our Community has grown from the handful of Anglo-Saxon pioneers to a cosmopolitan residential area, where people from many lands, bringing with them their many fine cultures, live today in harmony. If I were asked to say what important characteristic stands out among our people, I would, unhesitatingly, say unselfishness. Because, like the settlers of those early days, many sacrifices are being

made today for the things that really count, our homes and our children. And while we have no developed industrial area, as yet, to ease our tax load, our people refuse to believe that good homes, happy children, fine schools and capable teachers should be looked upon as a luxury, and therefore, beyond our reach.

It is understandable, then why such a quiet community should have sponsored the now famous West Kildonan Resolution of November the eighth, 1956, calling for a new deal in education. I have before me, from my scrap book, the Winnipeg Tribune of November the ninth, with very big headlines which say "West Kildonan Starts Cry for Political Pressure in the Battle for Increased School Grants." Another editorial on the next page of my scrap book says, Winnipeg Tribune, Saturday, November the tenth "Good for West Kildonan." I say this, Mr. Speaker, because I am quite proud of the area I represent because if there is any one constituency that should take some credit for the prodding which resulted in this Royal Commission on Education, I think it's the community that I represent, Sir.

Then even the Free Press had an editorial of November the 13th, which was quite a lengthy one. It talked about "grumbling about grants," and it said that some of Premier Campbell's educational chickens have come home to roost, and so on---I don't want to quote too much. But that was the famous West Kildonan Resolution of November the eighth, 1956, my birthday, by the way. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said, the other day, that the Government has been in office for four months and that we should expect great things and he---to quote him, he said "come an alert, vigorous, dynamic, atomic age, jet age, youthful Government. Perhaps we should expect more and we will certainly have something to say about that. But I suggest that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition should have been the last to criticize at this time. Perhaps if my honourable friend had paid more attention to the West Kildonan Resolution, not four months ago but two years ago, then he might still be sitting on the other side of this House today. I represent a sensitive, enlightened and charitable constituency and I know it is there wish that I represent them by assisting the present Government to implement legislation which we consider good, and oppose strenuously that which we do not like. Temporary loss of face is of no importance to us. I can well remember the advice of that revered member of the House of Commons, the late G. S. Woodsworth, when he said, "Never mind who gets the credit---let's get on with the job." May I respectfully suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, that we set our sights a little higher and get on with the job.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. R. SEABORN (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the discussion, I would like to say first that I feel greatly honoured to represent a constituency that is not only my birth place but has been my home for the greater part of my life. I must confess that I have more than just an interest in Wellington. I have an affection and a pride that can only come from a place that one considers home. I would like to thank the

people of my district and assure them that I will do everything in my power to serve them with sincerity and honour.

Next, Sir, I would like to join with the other honourable members of the C.C.F. in congratulating you on your appointment and the able manner in which you are performing your duties and I would like to thank the honourable member from Radisson for his words of welcome to us new-comers in the Legislature and it is indeed heart warming to hear such words of friendliness from a member from another party that is so distinct from ours. We are grateful.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest Socialists in England, once said that the dominant issue of the twentieth century of socialists---that in every country in the world the Socialist movement will be found. Socialism may be submerged for a time, under nationalism, and where there is a rule by Priest it may become violently anti-clerical; and where there is no training in democracy, it may become ..... and intolerent. I am quoting the words of Clement Atlee and Mr. Atlee replied to a question by saying "the plain fact is that a socialist party cannot hope to make a success of administering the capitalistic system because it simply does not believe in it." I think he was probably echoing the sentiments of every Socialist that's probably sitting in this House. Sir, when the honourable member from Radisson told us yesterday that the C.C.F. did not have to look for a program, he was telling us the absolute truth. The Socialists are irrevocably committed to abolishing all private ownership in the means of production, distribution and means--and exchange rather.

The various parties throughout the world may differ on the question, whether the extinction is to take place all at once or on a gradual process, but the Socialist cannot, without denying the many formulas that have been written in hundreds of pamphlets and books and that have been preached from an almost equal number of platforms, they cannot deny that their ultimate goal is the same, to extinguish all private ownership in the means of production, distribution and exchange. Socialists everywhere are also agreed on what is to be substituted for private ownership. It is the public ownership of the means of production and exchange. This is a phrase that sounds very comforting to those who use it but what public ownership means is by no means as clear as the fact that public ownership is to be extinguished. In a large modern community, the public cannot own property directly as it is only in the most ludicrous sense that the 180 million Russians own the Russian Railway or the 50 million Britishers own the British Coal Mines when they asked the Government for some power. Public ownership can only mean the vesting of property in the hands of institutions who presumably act on behalf of the people as a whole and among such institutions the State is pre-eminent, and public ownership means in the first place, State ownership.

There is one great element of confusion that exists in our society today, Mr. Speaker, and that is the failure to clearly distinguish between Communism and Socialism. They are, as a matter of fact, by no means entirely separate, but a certain amount of definition is required. In the first place Communism



is a comprehensive world view, implying its version of morality and its own program of strategy for social change. But within this general scheme there is a narrower sense in which the word "Communism" can be used. In this sense it refers to the final stage of social development when in the class of society which it is supposed to exist, the State has withered away and industrial production has reached such a stage that there is no longer any competition for material goods. This final Communism is not pictured by any of the Socialistic philosophers as succeeding immediately on the overthrow of Capitalism. There is, it deems, a socialistic stage in which, while the means of production are collectively owned and administrated, work is rewarded according to its social usefulness and since production is still short of the total human demand, it has to be distributed unequally in proportion to value of work done. In this scheme, then Socialism is that stage of social organization which follows on the overthrow of Capitalism---the stage in which the principal of material distribution is from each, according to his ability; to each, according to his work or worth. Communism succeeds on Socialism when production is at such a pitch, that everyone can have, without a struggle, whatever material goods are necessary for happiness and when principal of distribution is from each, according to the ability, and each, according to his needs. A good deal of talk at cross purposes, could be avoided if it were remembered, for example, that Russia has never claimed to be Communist in this final sense.

What it does claim is that, under the leadership of the Communist Party, it has instituted Socialism where skilled workers are materially rewarded for their work by a greater share in the total product and where, since, for instance, there are not yet enough cars to go around, as Mr. Krushev said last year, there is not enough meat, milk or butter to even approach our standards of living. Of course, while Socialism is used in this sense of a particular type of economic organization in which the main means of production are collectively owned, it is also being used in the wider sense of a general philosophy and a progressive social morality. In this sense, the term "Socialism" is wider than Communism and the Communist Party is normally found as one party among others in the general socialistic movements.

This brief explanation will, I trust, prove the substance of the statements of the honourable member for Radisson, that we should not be surprised at the policies and ambitions of the C.C.F. but, before sitting down, I would like to suggest, Sir, that the Conservatives believe, with the C.C.F. Party, that there is much that is evil and unjust in our social order. But we believe that the big and easy projects of the Socialist Party of the C.C.F., would bring to us, not betterment, but confusion and impoverishment. We believe that private enterprise must be in the future, as in the past, the main spring of progress, and that to destroy private enterprise, in the hope of producing social betterment, is like taking the main spring out of a watch, in the hope that it keeps time better.

We feel, contrary to the thoughts of the C.C.F. Party, that the fact that there is too much private enterprise, is not basically true. We feel, and rightfully, I believe, that the reverse is

true---and there is not nearly enough private enterprise. It is very encouraging to me, to see that our Government is meeting the problem with realism and honesty and action. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster has the floor.

MR. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, may I add my good wishes to the others, to you Sir, occupying high office as the Speaker of the House, and hope as to your predecessors, that I will not be a burden. I occasionally break the rules, just to find out the rules and not because I want to break them. I hope I will be forgiven. I wish to congratulate the honourable member from Dufferin. I was very, very much impressed with his delivery his ability of English and his youthful appearance. Personally, I think that he joined the wrong party. He is still a young man and he has a lot ahead of him, and I think perhaps, he may give some consideration to join a Progressive party in spite of the opinion by the last speaker about the C.C.F. To the seconder of the motion, I must make a confession. I'm reading the church page every Saturday for the purpose of trying to find a sermon of a general topic and I have visited, for a couple of time, and have taken the opportunity, everytime it was possible, to attend an address of the Honourable Member from St. Matthews. I think that he is an asset to any Legislative Assembly, no matter to which party he belongs. He is a gentleman, a scholar, and I hope he will be a guide, not only to his own party, but to other groups here and will take anything that is of good that will do us and perhaps, take the privilege or the pride to--object--to oppose anything that we do not like. I wish him many years of health and useful contribution to the welfare of this Province.

I should like to congratulate, at this time, the New Prime Minister--the new First Minister on his achievement on becoming the Premier of the Province. His continuation in office, however, still depends entirely upon his actions. The public increasingly demands of its' representatives something more than promises and they are not forgetful as election time rolls around.

The Liberal Party must, of necessity, blame itself for it's defeat. They have been in power for a long time. It would be most interesting now to observe, or to be able to, how they will react in the role as the Opposition. Although the probability of the honourable members of the Liberal party returning to the Government - returning to power is not too bright. Neither, I believe, is the present Government.

A word of congratulations is also due to my own leader of the wonderful success in the last election. Our party representative - representation in this House, is now increased over 100% and it is composed of such able and willing men, who are anxious to do their job well in order to qualify themselves to take over the Government at the next election.

MR. CAMPBELL: Hear! Hear!

MR. GRAY: In the best interest of the people of Manitoba, there is absolutely no alternative but that the C.C.F. party will

rise victorious at that time to lead our population out of the wilderness - a progressive Manitoba with the C.C.F. In one of these - as one of the senior members of this House, senior in years probably and senior in service, I should like to welcome the newly elected members. There are many qualifications which a member of any law-making institution must possess in order to perpetuate democracy. One of the greatest poets of all time best illustrates the qualifications of the public representative, and I refer to King David in 19th Psalm.

Permit me to draw a parallel to my remarks through two of David's quotations. In the first of these, in the 15th Psalm, David asks, "Who shall lead in God's grace?", while in the 24th Psalm, he asks, "Who shall rise high enough to receive God's glory and who shall be permitted to stand before the Almighty?" David answered, saying, "The man who is to enjoy God's grace must be noble in spirit, he must walk uprightly, he must do good, or work righteousness, and he must be true to himself and pure of heart," or as the Psalm says, "he must speak truth in his heart."

In reply to the second question, David said, "Good deeds, sincerity, honesty, honesty, humility and truthfulness, will bring an individual God's blessings. These riches will, indeed, permit a man to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." The parallel is--I am trying to draw, should now be obvious. At Legislatives in this land of democracy, men and women chosen by their electors, voted for by their constituents and elected to office are indeed blessed, for the spirit of liberty, justice and service is given into their hands. It's up to them to keep this spirit alive and ever-growing. An individual entering into public office, be it parliament, legislature or municipal office, should indeed be considered as an individual sitting to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. He must be willing to serve, eager to promote justice, and ever striving to enhance liberty. Welcoming the new members of this assembly, let me entreat you to be ever aware of these holy tasks. I would like to encourage you in your dedication to the public by reminding you again, that your merit or worthiness to hold this office, will be judged by your good deeds, sincerity, honesty, humility and truthfulness of person. Anyone who can fulfill this message to act is qualified to be a member of this Holy Shrine here today, and at least to me, this chamber is a Holy Shrine.

I am one of the older members of this House as I have stated, having had 34 years of service in public life, and 50 years service in communal life, which entitles me to speak with pride about Manitoba's splendid progress, since I entered into the public arena. I have seen Manitoba grow. Men and women of diverse races, creeds and nationalities, and out of it all, there has come forth a fine spirit of tolerance and understanding, making this province truly one of the most progressive and liberal places in the world. And I use the word "liberal" in this sense--I am not referring to the Liberal party. This is due to the fact that the people are forward looking, are engaged in the constructive task of building homes, and have learned to make the Canadian and British ways their own. In Manitoba it is possible for men, in a positive manner, to learn life's greatest lesson, the art of living together. To this end,

my party and I dedicate to carry on this task and keep our beloved Province of Manitoba in the foreground of progressive development.

In having introduced much progressive and needed legislation after years of application by our group, the situation concerning all the extensions, social service, health program, attempt at prison reform, dental clinic and others is far from being justified--rectified.

Just a word on the Speech from The Throne. Although it's as you well realize, that this is a special session of the Legislature, I'M very sorry to note that there was a---not a word mentioned in the speech from the throne concerning financial assistance to the old age pensioners of our Province. I am very thankful to the Minister of Health and Public Welfare for this announcement the other day. But the problem has been bad all the time, and I was expecting that a word would be mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

I am also sorry to note that another very important matter has not been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. The omission I refer to is the policy of this Province with regard to the bill of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The bill, which has been introduced in Ottawa, is far from being satisfactory. Many things have been left out. However, the principle of the bill of human rights was introduced and I am very glad of it. But on the other hand, we're expected, and I think the Federal Government will expect, something definite from our--from this Province, something definite as to their own bill to embody in the general bill of rights. At least, I think that this Government should go on record in principle for a bill of rights. And I don't think it is yet too late to do it now.

A third situation which is not included in the Speech from the Throne, is that of the Metis and Indians. This problem is becoming steadily worse, particularly in this city. Unless something constructive is done soon, the situation will become extremely serious, tragic and costly.

There are other messages which have been omitted from the Speech from the Throne, but I have no intention of discussing these at the present time.

Now, I would like to say a word about the amendment before the House, holding for a vot of non-confidence. The Opposition are the pot calling the kettle black. They are casting the first stone against their own windows. The present Opposition, when it was the government, had for years---for many, many long years the opportunity to put into law that which they now find so grievously lacking in the agricultural bill. Why are they so suddenly concerned more with the plight of the farmers? They are beginning to sound more like a C.C.F. everyday.

The criticisms now being voiced by the Leader of the Opposition against agricultural bill are in fact the same criticisms we of the C.C.F. have been making for as long as we remembered--we can remember. And well does it---well does the honourable members know this. The public leader of the Opposition hopes in support to believe that the failure of support of the want of confidence motion means that we support the Conservative party, and the only reason that he wants to push an immediate election

is that it is through the hope that his party can regain some of the seats he lost in the election---the last election.

The opposition isn't calling for an election because the present government is proposing bad legislation. Admittedly, as I've already pointed out there are many shortcomings in the Speech from the Throne, but the Leader of the Opposition is not concerned about that---about this legislation. He is concerned about loss of power, and perhaps putting us on the spot. Now, without giving the Government a chance to show what it can do, if it can do anything, the Opposition decides to come along with the very same suggestions of criticism and so conveniently ignored when it was the Government. These criticisms and suggestions were made by the C.C.F. and they will continue to be made by the C.C.F. until something is done about them. But what did the Opposition do when it was the Government? What did they do about the old age pension? How many years did they wait for a badly needed dental college? When did they decide to be human about mother's allowances? Did they do anything worthwhile about the rehabilitation of offenders

(continued on next page)

MR. GRAY (Cont'd.): ..... and particularly those who became ..... repeaters. He was finally forced to create public ownership of Hydro Electric Power. It was only this year after a decade of opportunities that he took a definite stumbling stand on hospitalization. What about the comprehensive Medical scheme, Mr. Leader of the Opposition? Would a thought cross your mind, if we didn't remind you about it? Former Government also failed to act in all the natural gas problems. What reason did they have for failing to put the distribution of natural gas under public ownership? We realize that this action would have brought gas to the consumer at a much lower cost, than he can get it today. If opposition is trying to put C.C.F. on a spot, we will accept the challenge. In my long years of public experience, I have found that you can't fool some people at all. During the last quarter of a century, every progressive idea proposed to the former Leader of Government, was rejected. Now later, when the handwriting on the wall became too obvious, these same progressive ideas were again considered and reluctantly accepted. Of course, it doesn't do, the bill doesn't do enough for the farmers. We agree with them - but no bill could be, but one bill, could not do enough. We are ready, and should try to improve everything that comes before us, but that rule is something which is an improvement in which the public is expecting it.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I have to curtail my remarks on account of my inability to speak, physically. I should like to conclude my remarks with a warning to the administration of this Province. We cannot build a fence around Manitoba, we cannot isolate ourselves and ignore the world's problems. The tragic situation in the near East and far East, should concern us here because they, direct or indirectly, affect us. Human life becomes too cheap when dictators prepare to sacrifice millions of lay people, lay people but not themselves, to achieve their aims. We all hope that the peaceful solution to all these problems but they cannot be solved unless they will try from our own little corners. And only today, we read in the paper, where the leader of the Catholic world, Catholic Church, Roman Catholic Church said, he appealed to the world leaders to abandon the monstrous instruments of war, and lead the people into peace based on the legitimate life of every individual. Allow me to conclude again to bringing you the words of someone else, but my thoughts are more aptly expressed by the words of one of the great prophets centuries ago, and I could possibly express them today. I wish to take no credit for these beautiful prophets of Isaiah, for it was he who prophesied that the nations shall come together, turning their swords into plows, and their spears into pruning hooks and that we shall all live in close harmony of peace. To me personally, Mr. Speaker, and to my people which I already mentioned and to the whole world, only in peace, only in a free world can everyone be happy, contented. May the consequence and deliberation of this legislation, this legislature help to hasten the day when his beautiful promises shall be fulfilled and then their vision shall become realities.

May this House show a living example, by any, by the Government of today or by the Government of tomorrow to the world, that we are not isolated from the rest of them and shall do everything possible to within our means in our own little corners to create the world which we all hope for.

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

MR. T. TEILLET (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to wonder if we were going to get in on this side this evening. However, may I first of all express my congratulations to you Sir, on the election, on your election, to the high office which you occupy. May I also address my compliments to the mover and seconder of the address. To the mover, because of the able manner in which he addressed himself to his task, and secondly perhaps, we should congratulate ourselves here, rather than congratulate him. The pleasure of hearing that worthy gentleman and that oratory for which he is famous. I am sure that we all welcome him in this House.

Je veux aussi bien sincerement feliciter Monsieur le Premier Ministre de sa victoire et de la position qu'il occupe aujourd'hui. Je sais qu'il me croira sincere quand je lui dis que ca nous fait plaisir de le voir circuler autour de cette Province se servant de nos deux langues canadiennes avec une facilite qui demande l'admiration.

I do want to say a word of congratulations as well to those younger Members of the newly elected group and the impression they have already created in this House. I am sure, that this will turn out to be one of the better Houses that we have had in Manitoba, because those young men, with the many years ahead of them will certainly develop to be outstanding leaders.

Je veux particulierement felicite notre jeune ami l'honorable depute de LaVerendrye et de la facon qu'il s'est acquitter de sa tache et du fait que lui aussi comme le Premier Ministre s'exprime aussi facilement dans une langue que dans l'autre et je sais que son avenir dans les annees a venir le Manitoba entendra beaucoup parler de lui.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I do want to make a few remarks about some of the motives which have been attributed to the people sitting in this section of the House. It has been suggested that we are completely insincere, that we lack integrity, that we make phoney motions, and a number of other political crimes. I want particularly to quote, the Honourable, the Leader of the C.C.F. party, in his remarks the other day, and these you will find on Page 2 of Hansard, of October. I'm sorry I don't know how these are numbered, the second section, when he said "the new Leader of the Opposition has moved a Want of Confidence Amendment in the new Government". "It is a phoney amendment, designed solely for partisan advantage." Now, I'll come back to this quotation a little later when I deal specifically with the amendment this evening which I will, to which I will hold myself beyond a few general remarks that I want to make at the beginning. There is one particular crime that the Liberal Party is being charged with, not only in Manitoba, but in Canada, and, if it is a crime, Mr. Speaker,

it must be plead guilty, and that is of having remained in office a long, long time. Now, I am one of those people, and I am sure that most people believe, and particularly Liberals, will believe that it is not good for a parliamentary system such as ours to have one party in office too long; that we should have changes occasionally. I think that is fundamental to our parliamentary system, but I do suggest Mr. Speaker, that the decision to stay in power a length of time does not rest with that party. It rests with the electors of the country and in this instance, with the electors of this Province. I don't think the First Minister would claim for a moment that it is his personal decision that he sit where he is today. I'm sure he wouldn't claim that. I suggest to him that it is the people of Manitoba who have made that decision, if he wishes to call it his, possible, and in the final analysis, we rest on the decision of the electors. And, this also suggests this to me, that the Canadian electorate, as well as the Manitoba electorate, have found it possible, to keep that party in power, with some misgivings, I suggest to you, because that, our people both in Manitoba and in Canada, I am convinced are amongst the most stable political people in this entire world, and I suggest that most people in this House would agree with that statement - that our people are politically stable. I think they exercise good political sense, and the fact that after many, many years, they do decide that in order to further, and in order to maintain our institutions as we know them, they decided that there should be a change. I suggest to you they're showing good sense, and I accept that decision. But let's look at this backdrop, why did they not see fit to do it earlier? Let's go back a few years, I think particularly the Conservatives, and I suggest to you that it is the Conservative party that is on trial at this moment, from now on, and in the next little while, before the Canadian electorate. I think they became aware of this fact some years ago. And, you will recall the campaigns, Provincial and National of 49 and 53, and what was their slogan "Time for a Change", "Time for a Change". And, what was the answer of the electors? They said, "No, we will not change for changes' sake - you must come up with something that we will accept beyond just the will to change." This, our C.C.F. people as well, might well consider. And the Canadian electorate said "No". Then the Conservative party finally woke up and decided that it was just not good enough to try to get elected because they thought the others had been too long in office. They could not count on the



good sense of the electorate to say "Well now, just because we must have a change, these fellows have no ideas, but we'll put them in anyway." So, what did they do? They elaborated quite a platform and quite a program, and particularly this last Provincial one, afforded me a great deal of amusement - a great deal of pleasure, and a great deal of fun with my Opponent during the course of the election. I noticed of course, that he avoided, at any time meeting the public, and I think as I suggest, it was difficult to answer any charges involving the promises contained therein.

And now, both federally and provincially, this party has promised many, many things, to the Province and to Canada, and I'm dealing now particularly with this one - this Party has promised many, many things to Manitoba. They have said the party in power does not agree that we can solve our agricultural problems in Manitoba. They have said to you, there are fundamental problems that are beyond the immediate control of this Province, -We will fix those things. And the Honourable Leader of the Opposition the other day read a series of promises made by that party to the Manitoba electors, and I suggest that many of the honourable gentlemen sitting over there today, are there because of those promises. Well now, he moved a motion of non-confidence, and why did he do it? He explained pretty thoroughly why he was doing this, and essentially, it was this - that the government had failed to implement its promise to the Canadian electorate to bring in before this House, measure to ease the difficulties of our farmers. And I suggest to you, in all sincerity, that they have failed to do that. They have brought in one measure, excellent as it may be, good as it may be, it has failed in the total picture. And if we follow the .....of the honourable member for Morris, when he was speaking the other day, I would like to see it, because it's here, I noted them down, they were so extremely interesting. I suggest to him that he agrees with that. When he was talking about failure of the Provincial Government to deal with crop insurance, failure of the Provincial Government to talk about, to bring in measures to pay storage on farm; to pay advances on farm stored grain; failure of the government to bring in more Ag. reps. Well there's nothing before us suggesting that this Provincial government is doing that at this time.

MR. H.P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I don't think I said that. I said the government had failed to act in these matters.

MR. R. TEILLET (St. Boniface): I accept that - that is quite correct. What he said is that the government had failed to act in these matters, which he recited. So now, that is the provision, that is the reason, the move - the amendment of want of confidence in the government was moved. I think it was our duty to bring before the electorate the fact that the government has failed to implement its promises, and we will go on doing this. Not only ourselves, because in a little while, a moment ago I suggested that the Conservative party was on trial -

I think that bears repeating. I hope the First Minister should well consider these things. Not everyone has forgotten the famous promises of 1930. I suggest then, for his own sake, for the sake of his party, that he dwell very seriously on that thought, and I am sure that he must intend to do these things, but should not expect that we would sit back here and just wait for him in his own good time. I don't think that is the way an institution of this kind can function.

Well now, we have been accused of bringing in this amendment because we were thinking only of partisan advantage. It was called a phony amendment. Then it went on to say, and I quote again, the honourable Leader of the C.C.F. Party "A want of confidence, Sir, should be moved in Ottawa" - that's an interest one - I'm sorry it's the next line - "In the circumstances a vote for this government for this amendment, would mean that we favour putting the Campbell Government back into office." Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that's a lot of nonsense. But it would mean, it would mean - it would mean this, that it would give the electors of Manitoba another opportunity of putting them in office, and not this House. I do suggest that, and I suggest to you that is exactly what the Honourable gentleman was afraid of.

MR. ROBLIN: We'll take the risk.

MR. TEILLET: Now, so, this I think Mr. Speaker, I don't think I need elaborate these factors any longer. I think it is clear to all people, right thinking people, that this amendment was brought in in good faith, and that we had a right to bring in such amendment at this time. But, the coalition decided that we wouldn't get away with it, and they worked hard on an amendment, and they must have worked really hard because I suggest to you Mr. Speaker, that we worked hard - I certainly did - to find ways and means of supporting this. And you know, if you would stretch the meaning of some of these words a little beyond those intended by the Party which moved it, you know it was awfully tempting to go along with a good section of it. But I suppose that that was foreseen as well, because later on, they made so very sure that we were dealing here with an absolutely socialistic amendment, that we could not, in good faith, we could not in good faith, support it. That we made, they made sure of it. In good faith we could not support this amendment because then if we did, then if we did, we would with justification be accused of playing politics. In good faith, we cannot support an amendment of this kind, the party which moved it knew it, and Mr. Speaker, I don't want to accuse the party in power, but I would be very surprised if somewhere along the line there wasn't a hand in that. Well, I suggest to the honourable member of the C.C.F. party, or the government, that if they re-word, they re-word that amendment, we will support it.

MR. ROBLIN: I only wish I had that much influence with them

MR. TEILLET: Well, you seem to have.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, no, I must, I can't take the credit for it. Can I take the credit?

MR. TEILLET: It's awfully tempting of course, in a discussion like, of this kind, to go back into the debate of private ownership and private enterprise versus public ownership. I'm a little surprised, of course, the honourable member isn't in his seat at the moment. I wonder if the C.C.F. party has reversed its field again. It seems to me last year that they brought in their famous platform, or was it the year before, where they'd finally broken down and admitted that some free enterprise was quite admissible in our society. And in the debate at that time, they suggested that after all, they could change their minds, and they admitted some free enterprise. We noted of course, that Saskatchewan is out after private capital, and they do encourage private enterprise. I was very surprised to hear the honourable member for Radisson the other day, suggest to us of course, that ultimately this must all be owned publicly and taking the old stand that private enterprise is the work of the devil and that we must go back to public, we must go to public ownership. That, of course, is contained essentially in this amendment. I don't want to elaborate - all the members know it, socialized medicine, the other items that are involved in here-knowing full well that we can't go along with that.

Well now, I want to, the honourable member again in moving his amendment said this, "Sir, to prevent part of our program to the people of Manitoba, we feel under obligation to put forward our ideas and plans at every opportunity, and we regard this as a suitable time and a suitable place to speak of these things. Now I haven't a great deal of experience in this House, Mr. Speaker, as you know, I've only been here for some five years, and every year, of course, we've talked about these matters, and, every year, it has come by form of a Resolution. However, this year, because we had an amendment which was a little difficult for the C.C.F. to ignore, I suggest they could have supported it in good faith, they decided to bring in this amendment, and which was doing what was suggested by the honourable member for Burrows the other day, getting the C.C.F. off the hook. And I quote one of their own party members. They, so in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote to you again into the House, these remarks of the honourable leader of the C.C.F. "It is a phony amendment, designed solely for partisan advantage." I leave it to your judgment where it applies.

MR. D. SWAILES (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the other members of the House, who have extended to you their congratulations. I'm doing this now, but at the same time I'm giving you fair warning - I'm giving the members of the House fair warning - that I'm going to speak again on the main motion.

I also want to congratulate the mover, and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I want to congratulate the new First Minister, and the new members of his Cabinet, and congratulate all those, the new members and the

old members who have been elected to this particular legislature.

Now, I want at this time to confine myself to the sub-amendment, and this sub-amendment is a vote of non-confidence in the Government, and at the same time, is a vote of non-confidence in the Liberal Party. We, know only too well, of the records of this House over the years; we know exactly what their record is, and as this Resolution shows, we have no confidence in either of them. And, we are not going to allow ourselves to be fooled by any of these specious amendments submitted by the official Opposition, either to the address and reply to the Speech from the Throne, or to any of the legislation which is being presented to us in this particular session. And, we are certainly not going to be fooled Mr. Speaker, by the billious editorials of the Winnipeg Free Press.

This government is a minority government, and I suggest this, that next to a C.C.F. government a minority government of any party is the best thing that the people of this Province can have. A minority government must be on its toes. A minority government must seek the goodwill of the people. A minority government must introduce some legislation which will be beneficial to the people. And we find, that a minority government is susceptible to a squeeze.

MR. ROBLIN: Just try it and see.

MR. SWAILES: We already have tried it - we've tried it, we've put it into effect and it worked! Just now! Just now, in this Session, the minority government introduced a few measures which they thought would be beneficial, which would win the approval of the people, and would in the, would help, or at least they think, would help them to win an over-all majority in a subsequent election. There was one thing, however, that they overlooked - and we tried it out, and it worked. We introduced a resolution which has been introduced many years in succession, which has been voted against by both sides, with respect to Old Age Pensioners, and the government swallowed it - it worked, and now, it's going to be implemented. So, this little bit of squeeze-play has worked, and the Old Age Pensioners are going to benefit from it - they're going to benefit from the fact that we have a minority government here, because I feel absolutely certain that this has been an overwhelming majority of that side, that this would not have been accepted.

MR. ROBLIN: You're wrong. Assembled Members: You're wrong.

MR. SWAILES: Oh, you say "No", well, I'll ask you to look at your record over the years, and then say No.

MR. ROBLIN: YOU're wrong.

MR. SWAILES: You look at your record over the years, for fifteen.....

MR. ROBLIN: You're wrong. MR. SWAILES: ..for eighteen years..

MR. ROBLIN: You're wrong..

MR. SWAILES: ...As long as.....look at your records....

MR. SWAILES: You say "No".

MEMBERS: You're wrong, you're wrong.

MR. SWAILES: And so, Mr. Speaker, for the present at least, we are going to give support to the legislation which is introduced, which we think has some points of benefit, not, not a great deal, but we are not going to kill at this time the goose that is laying one or two very small golden eggs.

Now, we know, we know quite well, we know quite well what would happen if anyone, any, either of these groups, this side of the house, is elected with an overwhelming majority. We had a good demonstration of that, just recently, in the Federal House. We had the same kind of a primossary session last year, last winter, in the House of Commons. All kinds of promises were made; the people were made to feel that this was the government that was really going to legislate on their behalf. The election was called, they were returned with an overwhelming majority, and then what became of those promises? Not a single thing. They promised parity prices; they reneged on it. They promised crop insurance; they reneged on that. They said no one would suffer from unemployment, and they've done very, very little indeed to overcome the problem of unemployment. And now we come to the part of the motion dealing with the agricultural community.

We know that under present circumstances, agriculture is of necessity in a depressed position because it has not the same kind of organization that the industrial sector of the community. We know that the farm organizations have been asking for parity prices, they have been asking for deficiency payments, they have been asking for crop insurance, and now they are seeking help to offset this matter of vertical integration with respect to industry in the agricultural community. And I recall quite well in this House, when the matter of the payment - advanced payment for grain that was stored on the farms. Both sides wanted to insist that interest should be paid on those - Oh, yes you did - you look at the records and you'll find that you yourself said that interest should be paid. Both sides said that interest should be paid. They didn't make any particular amount, but they said that interest should be paid. And again, neither side, neither the Liberals nor Conservatives put any pressure whatever on the Federal Government, and the Federal Government is the government which has the greatest amount of power with respect to economic conditions. Neither side put any pressure on the government - Federal Government, to introduce parity prices, or to introduce deficiency payments. So this section of our amendment which condemns the government at the same time is a vote of non-confidence in the Liberal Party.

Then we come now to the matter of labour legislation which is contained in the amendment, and by understandings with the labour organizations, we are not introducing any labour legislation, or any labour resolutions at this special session of the House. The Manitoba Federation of Labour has just finished its annual convention. They are going to be making a submission to

the government in the very near future. We don't want to anticipate that submission, but I can assure this House, that in the next session of this Legislature, if there is another session, that those resolutions that they wish to have submitted here, will be submitted in the next session of the legislature. But again I want to come back to the record. The record of both parties over the years, with respect to legislation. You can go back to the records - you can see the resolutions that have been introduced and you can see who has voted against them. Both parties have voted against the labour resolutions and the labour bills that have been introduced from time to time, and therefore once again, this amendment is a vote of non-confidence in both the government and the Liberal party.

Then, we come to this matter of public utilities, which is part of the amendment, and here I do want to give the Liberals credit for showing more judgment and greater sense of progress than has ever been shown by the Conservatives. I want to commend them very sincerely - the Campbell government - for undertaking the responsibility of public ownership of the generation of electric power. And that was opposed by that group on that side. They opposed the public ownership of the generation of electric power in this province.

MR. WILLIS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SWAILLES: Yes, they certainly did vote against it -- and I want to commend too, the Liberals in Ottawa for their - with respect to public ownership. Because as a result of their initiative, they did develop one of the finest, most expensive and certainly one of the most highly developed and cultural radio and television services in the whole of the North American continent. And again they instituted and initiated and developed, on the basis of public ownership, the most efficient, the most progressive and possibly one of the safest airline services in the entire world. And I certainly want to give the Liberals full credit for their action with respect to public ownership on these particular lines. So that this part of the motion of non-confidence is more applicable to that side of the House than it is to this side.

Now the next item in the amendment deals with health insurance, and again we have the records of both sides of the House over the years. Because, for at least 15 years, we in this group have been introducing resolutions and recommendations with respect to hospital insurance and health insurance. You can look over the records and both sides have voted them down. Of course, we had last year the introduction of a plan of hospital insurance. It was introduced, I know, very reluctantly, by the former Minister of Health, but it is now in effect, and it is a step in the right direction. But what we are seeking, and what we need, is a much more comprehensive plan of health insurance. It will cover all the hazards of health for all the people of this country. Something along the lines of the plan that has been in effect in Britain for quite a number of years. And I would like to point out for the honourable member for St. Matthews, that

although the government of Britain has assumed the responsibility for the health of the people, they cut the cost of the health care - the number of voluntary organizations that are working in connection with that plan is greater now than at any other time. Quite a number of ordinary citizens in Britain are working along with governmental agencies in order to ensure that particular plan of health care is being carried out most effectively. And that particular plan is financed from the central treasury, which means in effect that the people are paying for their own health care on the basis of ability to pay, and in the face of the record over the past. This amendment again, is a vote of non-confidence in both the government and in the Liberal party too.

And then finally the last item on the amendment dealt with those corporations who are exploiting our natural resources and not playing their proper part in the - contributing to the maintenance of the work of this province. We want the natural resources of this province to be developed for the benefit of all the people of Manitoba, -Instead, at present being owned by relatively few people, a relatively small number of people, many of whom don't live in Manitoba, and who make no contribution whatever to the life of this province. And again, I want to say this, that this is a vote of non-confidence. It is a vote of non-confidence in both the old parties. It's a motion - but you still have the opportunity you know

MR. MILLER: Oh, you don't want us to vote.....

MR. SWAILES: We're coming to a vote pretty soon, but in the light of the record of the past, we know that its going to be opposed by both parties. But I want to say this, that this is the most - material contents of this motion is one which in the fairly near future will be supported by the majority of the people of this province, and will lead to a mugh higher standard of living for all the people in Manitoba.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, as is the custom of this House, I would like to congratulate you Sir, on the election to the high office you hold. I am sure you will serve this office with distinction during the tenure of your office. I would also like to congratulate the First Minister on attaining the office he now holds, and the members of his executive council. I would also like to congratulate him on his recent marriage to a very charming and gracious girl. I have known his bride for many years and feel qualified to say the Premier is a very lucky man.

Congratulations are also in order for the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech. I thought they did an excellent job and appear very capable of adding a lot to the debates in this House. I would also like to extend my congratulations to the member for Brokenhead who succeeded me as the youngest member of this House. I believe he has a great deal to offer to this Legislature.

In speaking to this sub-amendment, I would like to bring to the attention of the members the obvious absurdities of this motion by the C.C.F. party. Our motion said the government had

failed to meet the basic problems of agriculture. The Leader of the C.C.F. party replies and says, "It was phony and he couldn't accept it". But what did the C.C.F. Leader propose? He issued a sub-amendment which was designed in such a manner that it would be impossible for anyone to support, except a member of the C.C.F. party. This was made apparent by the statement by the honourable member for Burrows, who said as the Leader said again to mention in his speech that he was going to introduce an amendment. The member from Burrows quickly interjected and says, "And here's where we get off the hook". I have - ..... into a C.C.F. caucus because I'm not a member of that party, but anyone can well imagine the delicate job which confronted the members when they met to decide on what type of amendment they should put forth. Usually a member attempts to make - attempts when they issue a bill or a resolution - make it attractive in such a manner that all the members of the House will support it. But what was the task in this case? They draft a sub-amendment which no one except the members of the C.C.F. party could support. We can well imagine the picture scene in the C.C.F. caucus room when they drew this masterpiece up. One could well imagine the scene that perhaps was the member for Assiniboia suggesting a proposal, and the Leader quickly replying - "Heavens, the Liberals might vote for it", - and also we might well imagine the member for Radisson making a suggestion, and the leader quickly, probably replied, "What do you want to do - defeat the government?"

And so after many hours of the best brains in the party, they came up with this. And I must say they were successful in their task, because no one can support their amendment but members of their own party. You're certainly right - we're not Communists over here.....Well, I can only judge by your legislation. The member for Osborne is referred to us in this House as the leader of the C.C.F. party. I think we have been quite incorrect in referring to him in this manner. I think it would be quite proper to refer to him as the Deputy Premier of this House. This is a historic occasion in more than one way. It is the first time that the government back benchers have been seated on the opposite side of the House. The Leader of the C.C.F. says he wants everyone to be logical. He says that if the C.C.F. votes for our amendment, he will be putting the Liberals back into power. What did he mean? He meant only one thing. If he defeated the government, the Liberals would be returned to power. In effect, he was predicting we'd win the next election. Socialism in Manitoba has hit a sorry state. The Socialist Leader is the Deputy Premier of a Tory Government. He feels he cannot properly go along with any criticism of the Government. The member for Assiniboia is in for a talking to tonight when he reaches his office.

And yesterday we had the prize travesty of them all. What would the late G.S. Woodworth have said if he could see his modern day followers battling hard to increase the interest rate on farm loans. And who did handle this intolerable task? They thrust it upon the youngest member of their group. I confess he made a valient effort in a bad cause. You can rest assured that if keeping the interest rate high was a good thing for farmers



the leader of this party, and the member for Assiniboia would hurriedly have jumped on the band wagon. But what did they do? They stayed strangely silent, and it wasn't until this afternoon that the leader took part to try, in a feeble way, to justify his stand on the matter. If there was a majority government in this House today, there is no question in anyone's mind that the C.C.F. would support our amendment. But minority government or majority government, it would be impossible for this group here on this side of the House to support the sub-amendment. I believe the whole attitude of the C.C.F. group during this session is so aptly summed up in the statement by the member from Burrows, when he said "And here's where we get off the hook". No words that I could add would better unmask the contemptible hypocrisy which appears to be in the sub-amendment.

MR. STINSON (Leader of the C.C.F. Party): Honourable gentlemen, really that's what he said in the last remark. I think perhaps I might ask him to withdraw it. But I don't think we take him very seriously, and I don't think anybody else does, so perhaps I will not.

MR. ROBLIN (Premier). It's 11 o'clock and our rules call for adjournment at 11. I understand my honourable friend there wants to speak. There may be others so it would be agreeable to me if the House wishes, that we let this matter stand, as we are not entitled to another adjournment, and that will enable us to continue the discussion tomorrow, as I'm anxious to have my honourable friend opposite expressions felt quite freely on this important sub-amendment. Good-night.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Honourable the Leader of the House is trying to be very fair to the House, and I think we should try to be the same way. I don't know how many might still speak - it seems to me that one of us encourages another to speak, but if there were only the Honourable the member for Carillon, if there were only that one, then perhaps we should agree to extend the 11 rule. That could be done by unanimous consent, and carry on and get the amendment to the amendment disposed of. As far as I'm concerned I see no objection.....

MR. STINSON: Mr. Speaker, I object! I love that 11 o'clock rule and this is the first chance I've had in 13 or 14 years to take advantage of it.

MR. ROBLIN: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I take it that my suggestion is agreeable to the House, so I shall now move, seconded by the honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.....I might just make this announcement, Sir, before you put the question. It would be my intention to suggest that the Special Select Committee of the House would meet at 10:00 o'clock Friday morning to consider the Bill that received second reading today, and perhaps other Bills that might be ready at that

time. So I would like to make that notice and request, if I may, that those in the Press, who hear of it, see that it receive suitable publicity as we are anxious that any members of the general public who wish to appear and make representation should have notice, and so that they can conveniently do so.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that the amendment to the amendment to the Throne Speech stands, and moved by the Honourable the First Minister, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn. Are you ready for the question?

After a voice vote the motion was carried, and the House was adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.