

Index for complete Votes and Proceedings follows page 2011.



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Saturday, March 26th, 1960

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, I support my Honourable Friend from St. Matthews that this Bill should be dismissed. I think I can state my position in not more than four or five sentences. This Bill would open the way to professional show business on Sunday. Professional show business on Sunday would hurt the Sabbath. Professional show business on Sunday would hurt amateur sport. We should kill this Bill now.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, before the noon hour the Minister of Agriculture spoke against this Bill because of the clause that said 50% was required to decide whether Sunday sport would be allowed in a municipality, and he is supporting the Minister of Education for 60%. Well the Attorney-General, I thought, gave an excellent reason why 50% was adequate. The people in this Legislature are only required by 50% vote. He's afraid a minority group is going to get this in. Why would a minority group get the Sunday sport issue in? If the other people aren't interested enough to get out and support it, I suggest they can't be opposed to it too seriously. In this House today we have a government which is running the affairs of this province and they weren't elected by a majority. If you take the popular votes in this province you will find that there is more people voted for the two opposition groups than the government in power, but this is the way our democracy works, and I suggest that 50% is certainly adequate because practically in any issue, whether it's in this House or in the House of Commons, it is decided on the majority.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Mr. Chairman, I must support the Honourable Member for St. Matthews too, for I think there are too many issues involved here for us to vote on too rapidly. First of all, I do not think that sport and agricultural activity should have been included together in one Bill. That is why we have just heard various arguments on just one side of this Bill, namely sport, and no one has considered what the outcome might be of such a broad definition of recitals, concerts, cultural and artistic activities. I don't want to belabour this point too much but I can well see the possibility of some professional singer presenting a so-called recital in a night club perhaps, sponsored by some non-profit organization. The complications in this issue is too formidable to contemplate, and although I don't want it to be construed that I am against any advancement of our cultural organizations, I must in principle oppose the passing of this Bill because of the complications that could well come about through a lack of definition in this respect. The fact that I think that this Bill is of major importance can be verified from the fact that I have relinquished a program this afternoon on the CBC to vote against such legislation being placed upon our statute books that would undermine the Lord's Day and render it less significant in our lives. The fact that I have made arrangements with someone else to conduct my radio program should, I think, prove how strongly I feel about this matter.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Up until just before the lunch hour, the rural point of view in regards to this Bill had not been developed too much. The Honourable Member for Morris spoke my views. In the rural areas, particularly in the area where I come from, we are a religious group of people; we observe all the laws of the country; and we do develop all the sports; and if this Bill goes through, in my opinion, it seems to be one of the predominant factors today in this debate that we're proponing sport, that in the rural area I would think it would be a retrograde step and the sport would not be developed because there would be nothing but a state of confusion in regard to this permissive legislation that council had to put through and, therefore, on that grounds -- I'm not against sport, Mr. Chairman, I have possibly played as much sport as anybody in this Assembly and I'm all for it, but I am not in favour of this Bill.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, before the question is put, I have not taken part in this debate because I felt that when the Bill came in that the minds of the members were made up when they came into this House and all the oratory, no matter how eloquent it might be, would not change that position. The Bill came to second reading and members said that they objected to it in principle

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.)...but they would allow it to go to committee which it did. It has now come out of committee and we have had various amendments made, which I felt would meet the various points of view, and that this Bill would pass in third reading and we would be able to have Sunday sport. As you know, I come from a community that has had Sunday sport for a good number of years -- about six years. We have been in Flin Flon area for some 30 years so we've had some 21 years under the Lord's Day Alliance Act where Sunday sport wasn't permitted, but for six years we have operated Sunday sport and not to deliberately defy the law. The people up there wanted to have a junior hockey team. They wanted to have something to show pride in their community and one way to have a junior hockey team was to tie in with the Saskatchewan Junior Hockey League, which meant tying in with Prince Albert, with Saskatoon, with Regina, but Flin Flon was a long way away so they had to make some arrangement whereby they could get sufficient money to overcome the travelling costs and some way that they could help to co-ordinate the travelling activities of these teams. One way to do that was on Sunday when they could get more people out to their games; when the teams could come in on Saturday, play Saturday and play on Sunday. For that reason they went ahead and did it. Now there were people in Flin Flon certainly who didn't appreciate this idea. The Flin Flon Ministerial Association raised objections to it and they still raise objections to it, but I must say to them and to credit those people in Flin Flon who don't believe in it, that they have recognized that the majority of people do. They have stated their objections; the Ministers have stated their objection from the pulpit; they have told the people how they stood and then they have allowed the majority to rule; and it's all credit to them.

Now in the six years that we have had Sunday sport, the moral fibre of Flin Flon has not deteriorated one iota. Just as with the rural people our people there are religious people; they are good living people; they are active people; they are community-minded people; and it has done nothing to the town detrimental at all. In that six years we have another Catholic Church; in that six years we have another United Church; in that six years we have another Anglican Church; in that six years we have another Salvation Army Church; and we now have another church pending for the Lutheran people; and the people in Flin Flon, despite their Sunday sports, have supported some 13 churches and are increasing those churches. The ladies' organizations, the men's organizations, the children's organizations are all active, are all strong despite this Sunday sport. Sunday sport has had no detrimental effect at all upon the moral outlook or upon the whole community effort in Flin Flon. Now I suggest to the members here that they should take a look at that very seriously because it has been shown in six years of operation that there is no harm done by it.

Now naturally I think the majority of people in Flin Flon would want me to vote for this Bill, which I will, but I vote for it too because I think it's right. I believe in this Bill and I would like to digress just for a moment to point out to you that there are other illustrations of people who have lived with Sunday sport -- commercial, professional, professional performances, amateur sport for years; people who have lived hundreds of years longer than we have; and I look to Europe and I look to Great Britain. They have had it there for many many years with no harm. If there had of been harm I suggest to you that during the last world war, when they were being blitzed and when they were with their backs up against the wall, that the fibre of the nation would not have been there to resist and to fight back as they did. And that was a religious influence there too. It had never been subjected to any problems or to any loss of interest by the people because of Sunday sport, either professional or amateur.

Now I note, Mr. Chairman, that many of the members here say they are going to vote against this Bill after we have gone through all these hours in this House, all the hours in the committee, because of this clause in here, this section in here where we're just going to allow a straight majority vote. I would like to ask them to think that over again. It's a democratic principle and surely after all the time that we have spent, after the briefs we have heard, after the hours of arguing and ranging on it, surely we're not going to kill it now. Surely it should be allowed some time to see how it will work because it'll come back again. And they say that we're not ready for it. We'll never be ready for it until we face the problem and try it--never. We'll never be ready for it next year if we hoist it for a year, and if we hoist it for a year then we'll never be ready for it in the year to come.

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.).... Now I feel quite strongly about it, and as I say I've been quiet all this time but I felt that it was of little use to add to the mass of words because it seemed to me that the members had their minds made up even before they came in here. But I thought when we had got into this stage of third reading, and after the amendments had been made which were in many effects a compromise, that the Bill would go through. Now this last ditch stand has disturbed me greatly and made me feel that possibly I didn't do my duty toward the people of Flin Flon in arguing prior to this point, at this late date, but I certainly hope that it does go through. I believe in it and just take a good look at Flin Flon if you're worried about what will happen because of Sunday sports. I would also like to say that because Flin Flon was able to play Sunday sports and able to participate in the junior hockey team, we have aided amateur hockey right across the country. That community was able to bring a team up from practically nothing until it won and brought out West for the first time in many many years the Memorial Cup. I don't say that out of pride alone, I say it to you because when that Cup came out here it rejuvenated many more amateur hockey teams, amateur hockey teams right across the west. The Sunday sport has been a benefit not only in Flin Flon, where we have shift work and where we have active people who need an outlet for their energy, but also to the rest of the country in what it has done with a strong active junior hockey club. Right now we're in Edmonton playing against Edmonton. It has done no harm in Flin Flon and the people in Flin Flon who do not agree with Sunday sport have had the good sense and have had the courage to let the majority rule up there, and if they didn't agree with it with such force and emphasis they just didn't go to the sport that was being played on Sunday. I think those that are so strong against Sunday sport rather than restricting those who want Sunday sport should just practice that principle. If they believe in it that strongly just don't go; and allow those who wish to, to go.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman I'd like to ask the Honourable Member from Flin Flon one question--if he would answer it. Is there any doubt in your mind that if the 60% clause were in there as to whether it would pass in Flin Flon?

MR. WITNEY: Flin Flon? Commercial sport or Sunday sport in Flin Flon at any rate, I think Mr. Chairman, would pass whether it was 65 or 70% in the Flin Flon area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question before the House--or Committee, is that Bill No. 98 be not reported.

Mr. Chairman put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

A standing vote was taken the result being: YEAS 19, NAYS 30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee rise and report? Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Committee has considered Bill No. 98 and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Could we have a standing vote Mr. Speaker; the yeas and nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Those requesting yeas and nays please stand.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker I wonder if it would suit the same purpose of my honourable friend, if he would have the vote on the third reading itself, otherwise he might--but of course, if he wants it now he's entirely within his right to ask for it.

MR. MARTIN: What I wanted Mr. Speaker was that the vote should be recorded in Hansard.

MR. ROBLIN: Would third reading be satisfactory rather than report of the Committee?

MR. MARTIN: I'm voting for the recorded vote on the third reading.

MR. OBIE BAIZLEY (Osborne) presented Bill No. 98, an Act to provide for certain exceptions to the Lord's Day Act of Canada as amended for the third time.

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

MR. MARTIN: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being:

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Desjardins, Forbes, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Hillhouse, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Schreyer, Stanes, Tanchak, Wagner, Weir, Witney, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Campbell, Corbett, Cowan, Dow, Evans, Froese, Groves, Hutton, Lissaman, McLean, Martin, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Strickland, Thompson, Watt.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, if I may while the vote is being tabulated — the reason for my jumping around here, I thought that the motion was in the reverse and that's why I moved over.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 34, nays 19.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we now proceed to the budget debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable First Minister, and the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. Are you ready for the question?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether there is anybody else who wants to speak either for or against the amendment that is before the House, but I think that before the vote is taken I should make a few comments on what has been said in connection with this matter. I'm very happy, Sir, that I do not feel there is a great deal for me to reply to, because at this particular stage in the proceedings I doubt if the House wants a very lengthy speech, and I'm not entirely sure that I'm in a position to give one, because in the last days of the session we do find ourselves somewhat pressed.

I want to make just a passing reference to the speech that was made on this resolution by the Honourable Member for St. John. My impression is that he didn't have complaints of a major nature against this government, although he might have some reservations about another one. But there was one general point perhaps that deserves a little attention and that is his suggestion that we were not raising enough money by our natural resource taxation policy. He pointed out that Saskatchewan obtained \$22,500,000 from such sources whereas our source is 2.9 million. Now I'm not suggesting for a moment that he said there was a direct comparison between those two sums and, indeed, that is the case, there is no direct comparison. But perhaps I should make a comment or two on what the facts are in that connection. There are two main sources of possible revenue in natural resources, one from oil and the other from minerals. And in connection with oil it should be pointed out I think that the amount of tax you get depends on two things really, or three things of course, but two basic factors. First, how much of your land is under crown reservation, and secondly, how big your production is. And if anyone examines the situation in Saskatchewan, they will see that they have a very much greater percentage of their oil being found on crown lands than we, and also that their volume is very much bigger indeed. So that accounts largely for the difference. In fact, if the Saskatchewan government applied the same taxation schedule to their oil revenues as we do, they would get not less money proportionately but more, because in Manitoba we obtain a royalty of 12 1/2 % on the total production, on all production from a well. In Saskatchewan that is not so according to my information. They obtain 5% on the first 600 barrels of production, a combined rate of 7.7% up to 900 barrels of production and 11.4% up to 1500 barrels of production. Those percentages are all less than ours. We obtain 12 1/2% and the average size of Manitoba wells is 450 barrels of production per year. Therefore, if the Saskatchewan rate were applied to the Manitoba wells we would get less revenue, actually, than we do at the present time. So while it is perfectly true that we might think of increasing that royalty, yet I think a comparison would indicate that at the present time we are better off, from a revenue standpoint, doing what we do rather than follow the Saskatchewan line in that respect.

Now the very large bulk of their revenues from this source comes from oil, but some comes from minerals and I'd just like to take a look at that. Now it is true that the mineral taxation rate in Manitoba is 8% whereas in Saskatchewan it is 12 1/2%, but the main difference in the amount of money received is not really in the rate of tax although I will admit that substantial difference. The main difference is in the taxable value of production of the mines in the two provinces. For example, in the last year of record Saskatchewan had a total mineral

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)...production of 95,000,000, of which 60,000,000 came from uranium. We, of course, have no uranium whatsoever here. Our production in the same period was \$26,000,000. But the point I want to make is, in that period which is the one under discussion, Manitoba mines were not making enough money to be eligible for taxation at all under the regulations that have been laid down, and may I say by the Federal Government, and which are part of the tax-rental agreement. So our main difficulty in Manitoba was to get a profitable mine. The first thing you have to do is to find the goose that lays this golden egg before you can try to get some of the wealth that's produced. In that period the Sherritt Gordon Mine at Lynn Lake, and the San Antonio Gold Mine at Bissett were not subject to taxation. They had a nil assessment. The mine that was subject to taxation was the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company at Flin Flon. They took a large part of their revenue and they spent it in exploration, and because they did that, that portion that was spent in exploration was exempt, which again reduced the taxable amount that was open to us. And with that discovery money they found Chisel Lake and Stall Lake, which I think everyone will agree is good and will ultimately redound to the benefit of all of us. So certainly, while it is good, it results in a smaller tax revenue to us. Now I want to make it clear that a higher mining tax is certainly possible; but I want to warn the House that the results we get from it will be limited, and I think limited to a greater extent than seems to be realized by members who are criticizing our taxation policy in this respect, and that when you compare the very large sums obtained from Saskatchewan with the rather modest sum, and I am frank to admit that we obtain here, there are reasons for that which are much more important, in my view, than the rate of taxation.

Now that's all I want to say about that, and that's all I want to say about that speech that was made because it seems to me that was the one point about which I would like to make the position clear. We might get more money if we raised the taxes. I don't rule out that possibility, that is always possible; but it will not result in large revenues of the sort that seem to me were hoped for by those who feel that our taxation policy is too low in this respect.

Now, Sir, I want to say a few words about the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, which I enjoyed very much. I think he made an excellent reply. In fact I think that is one of the most vigorous and brisk speeches that he has made in the House, and while I am going to be critical of some of the things he said, I would like to say that I would have been very happy to have made such a good speech myself when I was in his position, or when I had some responsibility for criticizing the financial policy of the government. And I think we all enjoyed it. However, there are some things that he said which he will naturally expect me to controvert or try to argue against, because I feel that they are something less than fair to the policy that the administration is following. I am not going to cover all those points, I don't think he would expect me to, but I want to touch on some of the main ones.

The first one that I want to refer to is farm credit, because he feels and I believe he feels it rather strongly, that the government has not delivered the goods on farm credit. He feels that we have fallen somewhat short of what we set out to do in respect of this matter. I would make no claims for perfection either but I do say that we have, in a large measure, and I think in a totally satisfactory and supportable measure, lived up to what we set out to do. He accuses us, and I think this a verbatim record of his words, I quote as follows: "He led", and I think he is talking about me, "He led, and I say this deliberately, he led deliberately the farmers of this province to believe that they were going to get farm credit on a much more generous basis than they had been receiving it before." Now that's the view that my honourable friend puts forward. He says that we promised farm credit on a much more generous basis than we had been receiving it before. I maintain that we promised that and I maintain that the farming public are getting it, and I want to give the reasons why I think that case can be made. In 1958, when our policy was enunciated, members will recognize that practically the main source of farm credit at that time was the Federal Farm Loans Act and it was by and large with that Act that we were measuring ourselves. Under that Act the ceiling allowed for loans was \$15,000; under our Act it is \$25,000. Under that Act the security was limited, which limited the whole base of the loan to security of land; under our Act that was widened to include livestock, chattels and machinery. Under that Act there was no provision for young farmers; under our Act there is a provision for young farmers and at a very special

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)... interest rate of 4%. Under the Federal Farm Loan Act, appraisals were limited to the saleable assets, and that is a very important thing when considering the amount of money to be loaned. Under our statutes, and I'd like to make use of a statement provided to me by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation which is operated by an independent board of directors as you know, they say that in lending their money they place as much importance on the character and credit rating of the applicant as we do on the assets that he may possess. I think that's the critical point that needs to be made clear, that under the Manitoba Credit Act they do place as much importance on the character and credit rating of the applicant as they do on the assets that he may possess. So I say, Sir, that when you consider that comparison of the credit situation in 1958, when our policy was designed, and the present time, I think it is not unfair of me to claim that we are, in fact, making farm credit available on a much more generous basis than they had been receiving it before. I think that is borne out not merely by a comparison of the regulations or the lending policy of the two organizations concerned, but also on the results of that policy, because during the last year of the Federal Act some 2 1/2 million dollars was lent at an average of \$5,000 a farm. During the first year of our administration of our Act we have authorized \$4,000,000 plus at an average of \$10,000 a farm. Now that's exactly double in terms of the farmers that get money out of it and it seems to me that that does stand up to the claim that we made that we should have a much more generous method of providing credit to the farmers of Manitoba. And I think I can go farther than that and say that when you consider that we are looking forward to dispersing up to \$6,000,000, which will be three times what the old farm loan did in its last year, I think that one can make a case that our Farm Credit Act is much superior to anything that the farmers of this province have had before and it measures up to the claims that we have been making for it, that it is much more generous than that which my honourable friend describes to me. I say they are getting it on a generous basis; I still say they are getting it on a sound basis; that I think they are getting it on a much more generous basis than heretofore; and I think the regulations and provisions of the legislation, the policy of the Farm Credit Corporation, and the actual results in terms of sums lent to farmers, adequately substantiates that statement. I won't labour it any more.

Now I want, also, just to make a reference to another statement my honourable friend made in connection with some of the matters that are of dispute between us, and this is in connection with roads. He said in his address, "Mr. Speaker, our road program was a good one," by which of course he is referring to the road program of the previous administration. "Our road program was a good one; I don't have to defend it, it defends itself." That's the quotation that I'd like to make some comment on. Well I suppose there are a good number of members in this House, and probably many members of the general public, who really are not aware of the basis on which the criticisms which we raised in days gone by in connection with the government's road program were based. I am sure there may be a number of people who think that we just thought it up ourselves or that this is our own private views on this matter, but of course those who took part in the deliberations of the last Parliament in Manitoba know that that is not the case. They know that the finger was pointed at the road policy of the previous administration, not only by us but by the Kellogg Stevenson Investigation that was made into the Department of Public Works. Now the Kellogg Stevenson people were hired by the previous administration to come and take a look at their Department of Public Works and report on it; and they made a report. For my mind it is very largely based on what they said, that criticisms of the previous road policy should be based and should be considered. I would like just for the record, though I know this is old-hat to members who have been here for some time, I would like to read on the record for those who are new exactly what those people said about the administration of the Department of Public Works at that time. I am going to quote from reports that were made on this matter by one of the local newspapers, and I quote: "Administrative faults which are costing the Manitoba Government many thousands of dollars yearly have been exposed in a series of efficiency studies tabled at the last session of the Legislature. Witnesses" — and I am skipping around here, these are extracts from the various articles and I don't pretend that they entirely follow one another but the sense follows, and the data supporting each one of the assertions was carried by the newspaper at the time. I have them here but I don't propose to trouble the committee with reading them all. The first one, however, was "Administrative



(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....faults which are costing the Manitoba Government many thousands of dollars yearly have been exposed in a series of efficiency studies tabled at the last session of the Legislature." And it goes on, "Weaknesses were discovered almost everywhere in the area of investigation. The findings can be a source neither of pride to the government nor of comfort to the public." Then further along we get the quotation of "Muddle in highway planning." "Manitoba is paying in higher costs for the lack of long-range planning into highway construction. Most highway projects are now compressed into one year. Location work is done in the fall, plans and estimates are drawn up during the winter, construction takes place in the following summer. The big advantage of the system is that it provides quick results; the less obvious disadvantage is that it is conducive to wait. The study also disclosed that supervision of field projects is inadequate to guarantee efficient spending of public funds." Then they go on to say on another occasion, referring to the same report, "the Manitoba Government probably lost \$100,000 on its bridge program last year due to lack of planning. This is a central finding of an efficiency survey of the Bridge Division of the Highway Branch. The study was carried out by an outside firm of management engineers. Main criticism of the Bridge Division thus parallels the criticisms of the Highway Branch as a whole which was discussed in a previous article," etc. etc. Well, Sir, there's a wealth of material that I'm not going to quote to the House at the present time.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister tell us who the author of those articles was?

MR. ROBLIN: It appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press. I wonder if I can recall who the author was -- it may well have been. However, it's not necessary to rely on the author that wrote these articles. I merely quote that for the sake of being able to compress the matter into a small compass because it is open to any member of the House to get a hold of that study, which I believe is in the Library here, and read it for themselves, every word of it, and there are pages and pages of it. So I say, Sir, that our original stand in connection with the question of highways is based not only on our own opinions of this matter but also on the results of a study of an efficiency review carried out under the instructions of the previous administration, and done at their request. Now, Sir, I think I may surprise my honourable friend by telling him that I congratulate him on making that study because I think he did the right thing to make it. And I think I may surprise him further if I say that I'm not going to be too critical of the fact that those studies disclosed an unsatisfactory situation. I'm not going to be too critical of that at the present time because it is perfectly true that in this field of endeavour one runs into serious difficulties, and what we are trying to do now is to correct those difficulties and correct those mistakes and errors of administration and the policy which were disclosed. I do not claim, Sir, that we have succeeded entirely in doing that. It can't be done overnight. All I say is that we have made a good start, and given a little time, we will have those matters put into shape. So this is a continuing problem, but I think that this report of the Kellogg Stevenson people in connection with highways is fundamental to any discussion of the rightness or wrongness of what has been going on or any consideration of the criticism that is raised from time to time. It seems to me that this impartial report on what the state of the Highway Branch was, is something which none of us can ignore. We certainly don't intend to ignore it on this side of the House and we are doing our best to put right, and I believe we're having some success in putting right, those major errors of policy.

The first one in connection with planning we've discussed till I suppose we're pretty well tired of the subject in Committee of the Whole, and we're trying to get on with that and the House knows what we are doing and the House knows that we are in the process of completing our own plan in that respect. In the matter of engineers, which was very important in this report, we have hired a great many more as the House already knows; and for which I suppose we've been criticized by those who think the Civil Service is expanding too fast. Maybe we still haven't enough, but we have a great many more than when we came into office and we think many of these defects which were disclosed in this way are now being taken care of. So I want to mention that point.

Now another odd point here or there throughout the speech which perhaps I should just mention, because I think in one case at any rate there's an entire misconception of the matter. We were criticized because of our suggestion for tax-free bonds, and the suggestion was made

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)...to the House that all this does is bonus boupon clippers at the expense of the Federal Treasury. Well I don't think that if you think that matter through you can logically come to that conclusion, because what is the result of a tax-free bond? Well the result, if the experience in the United States is any criterion and I think it is, is that the bond sells at a much lower rate of interest because the tax-free aspect of the matter enables that to be done. And because it sells at a much lower rate of interest then the taxpayer of the municipality or the province pays a much lower rate of interest, and that is the main and principal advantage in my mind to this kind of an arrangement with respect to the sale of municipal and provincial bonds for certain types of social capital. So I think that point should be made clear. It's not the coupon clipper. It may be that the coupon clipper does get some advantage out of this, I wouldn't deny that, but I would say that the man who gets the real advantage is the municipal or the provincial taxpayer which I think we would all approve of.

Now passing on, we have this reference to tricky bookkeeping about the interest on the public debt, and more than one member spoke about that. Well I can't understand the criticism. I don't want to go into it too deeply because we did it pretty thoroughly the last Session, but I'd just like to make the point that the tricky bookkeeping which seems to be in question is the matter of offsetting interest on the public debt. Well I would like to point out to the House that it was the former administration in 1934-5 fiscal year who initiated the practice of offsetting interest when they took the interest of the utilities and offset it against the public debt. We have followed that one step further by taking interest on other earnings and offsetting it against the interest on the public debt. Now I don't think my honourable friends were wrong to do it in '54, not at all, I don't think they were wrong to do it. As a matter of fact the Dominion Bureau of Statistics shows the interest burden on the Provinces of Canada in that way, precisely in the way that we're doing now. It seems to me that it's not completely accurate to describe that as tricky bookkeeping. I don't think it is that at all. I think it's a perfectly natural and logical thing to do and which was done previously, and which certainly is recognized by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics itself.

Now, Sir, I promised not to keep at this too long and I want to keep my word. There are just, I think, two main points I want further to mention. I'm not going to talk too much about U.S. borrowings because when we borrowed previously the Provincial Treasurer of that day said, and I quote: "We still believe that we can save some money for the taxpayers of Manitoba by doing some of our necessary borrowing in the United States." My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition was Provincial Treasurer at that time and I think he was right in that statement, and I think we've adopted exactly the same attitude today. But now you'll say to me, and a number of people have been saying I notice, well that isn't what you said in 1952. You had another tale then, quite a different one, and we heard a number of extracts from my 1952 speech on the borrowing policies that I was suggesting at that time. And I want to say it was good fun. I want to say that my honourable friend did a very good job with that speech, and as far as the debating points are concerned, I think he did well and it lent a little colour and interest to what he had to say. But I wonder, Sir, whether it really constitutes an effective criticism of the present government's policies, because my honourable friend, I'm sure, knows that speech pretty well by heart. I think I can make the statement safely that every year since that speech was made the Grits have trotted it out. They've trotted it out every year and I think the Honourable Member, the Leader of the CCF Party, will remember on more occasions than one that that speech has been used to good effect by some of the gentlemen over there. --(Interjection)-- Well I want to come to that because both they and my honourable friend -- I'm not so sure about him, I won't include him in this -- but some of the gentlemen over there have been overlooking something. Surely they have been overlooking the fact that the answer to that taunt, that jibe, and it's an effective one let's face it, is so obvious. The answer to that charge is well known to every intelligent voter in the Province of Manitoba and there are a great many intelligent voters in the Province of Manitoba. I wouldn't be surprised if it wasn't obvious to some members of the House, because eight years ago it's true to say that the policy that was advocated by my party at that time could fairly be described as the policy of restriction and the policy of go slow. But, Mr. Chairman, we changed that policy. It became clearer and clearer with the passage of time that that policy was not suited to the needs of the people of Manitoba and the people of this province,

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)...and we changed it. And we changed it for a policy of growth and expansion and investment, and not only that, Sir, we didn't hide that change of policy under a bushel. We made no attempt to try and persuade anybody that we were still following the same old lines. Nothing of the sort. In fact we fought three by-elections and two general elections, not on the policy of '52 which my honourable friends refer to but on the policy of investment and of expansion and of growth in the Province of Manitoba. That's exactly what we did and we went to the people on it; and we made our position quite clear. I would say that if a policy of restrictions and go slow had been desired by the people of Manitoba there would have been very little point in replacing the Grits, because they were obviously the acknowledged experts in that field, as I believe they are today. The trouble with their method if you ask me, Sir, and it was so obvious in trotting out this speech of 1952 or whenever it was, the trouble with that method is that while they have forgotten nothing, as is obvious from what we hear in this House, it is equally true that they have learned nothing; because in those intervening years that new policy has not only been put into a force by this party but it has been approved by the people of Manitoba, and that is why we are here and that is why they are there. And just so long as they continue to introduce amendments of this sort, I think they'll be there for a long time.

Well, Sir, that really isn't the main burden of what my honourable friend had to say though. The main burden of what he had to say was in connection with the net debt, that it's up 20% -- it's up 200% since the present government came into office -- extravagance, imprudence, too much debt -- typical situation. Well, Mr. Speaker, what is the net debt of the Province of Manitoba? The net debt of the province consists of the money which we were authorized by this Chamber to borrow for certain public activities. And I think it is necessary if we are to refute the charge of extravagance and imprudence in raising this debt 200%, that we should examine what those authorizations were. I'm sure everybody here knows it. We were authorized, for example, to borrow \$6,460,000 for public buildings. We were authorized to borrow \$330,000 for the acquisition of land and land settlement projects; Natural Resource projects and Recreation projects, \$671,000; Soil Erosion and Water Control, over a million dollars; Seine River and Flood protection, \$500,000; Agricultural Research, \$937,000; acquisition of real property, \$350,000; and since we came into office, on roads, some approximately 52 or 53 million dollars; and that's what we borrowed the money for. In my speech I made the suggestion that if anyone thought the borrowing was too high or if anyone believed that we were open to criticism for raising the debt, it might help a logical discussion of these matters if they said what they opposed in those borrowing projects. It might have been helpful if we had been told at the time by those who now oppose what has happened, if they had been able to tell us what it was about our borrowing policy that they didn't like, and where they thought it was against the best interests of the people of Manitoba that these borrowings should not be made. I've never yet heard anybody respond to that suggestion in respect to our borrowings. In fact, I'll go further. I will say, and I think this is correct, every 'man-Jack' of the honourable gentlemen opposite who now criticize us, supported the projects and the borrowings that were included in our authorization. Every 'man-Jack' of them supported these things. They may say, oh well maybe we did but you've still been imprudent and extravagant. Well, was it imprudent to improve the research facilities of the university? Was it extravagant to provide money for old folks' homes? Was it imprudent and extravagant to proceed with the rebuilding of the highway system as we have done? Was it imprudent and extravagant to proceed with drainage projects of great importance, natural resources, recreational projects? Which one of these policies of the present administration did my honourable friends object to? Where did we go astray? What was wrong? We have not heard. And I'm not talking about this year's borrowings, because they don't enter into this matter; I'm talking about the borrowings of the appropriations of the last two sessions that make up the money which is included in this 200% that is being talked about.

Well, Sir, you may say "I approved of the borrowings, but I think you're extravagant and imprudent in the way you spent the money". Has that case been made? Has that point been substantiated? We spent a lot of the money by handing it over to Brandon College; we spent a good deal more by handing it over to the university and agricultural research. I could go through the whole list. We spent most of it on roads and in spite of what my

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)...honourable friends say, I am confident that the improved standard that we have introduced into our road building program justify the statement that the money is being spent in a proper and prudent way in those matters. But even if one had to concede that there was a failure to spend every dollar of that money in the best possible way, which I don't concede, how can that idea be linked with the 200% increase, because even the most casual administration of that expenditure of money wouldn't allow you to criticize the whole 200% as my honourable friends do. I do not think their case holds together in logic or in fact. I say this, that when I consider the allegations that have been made I find myself placed in a very difficult position, because I find honourable gentlemen opposite supporting the cause of the increase in the net debt and complaining about the consequences. I fail to see how you can make that statement. I say that in that case there are really only two possible conclusions that an impartial observer can draw when you find people supporting the cause and complaining about the consequences.

The first conclusion that you may fairly draw is stupidity. I don't draw that conclusion, because I know my honourable friends are not stupid, that they can follow through on cause and effect just as carefully as anybody else. So I say that when they approved and supported the cause, they knew what the consequence would be then just as any logical sensible person does. So it can't be stupidity. That brings me to the only other possible conclusion, brings me to use a description which I dislike to use but which I think fits the case. The second possibility that I draw from the situation in which my honourable friends find themselves is 'humbbug'. Humbbug, pure and simple. They supported the cause; they knew what the consequence would be; now they complain. That's humbug. I think the House knows it's humbug; I think the country knows it's humbug; I think my honourable friends know that it's humbug. And with those thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this amendment ought not to pass.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Honourable the Leader of the House with the vigor in verbiage that he has dismissed the amendment of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. But I don't think and it's not my purpose this afternoon or at any time to defend the Liberal administration or to come to the support of any amendment proposed by the official opposition. But as one of those who is in opposition I do not think that we should let go unchallenged some of the remarks of my honourable friend opposite. And I might say to use a well hackneyed phrase in this House that I did not intend to speak on the amendment to the main motion, but I feel impelled to.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled to speak to the motion before the House at the present time because it appears to me very, very obvious that the Leader of the Government has established a factor which we of the CCF have always felt applies to both the Conservative and Liberal Party here in the Province of Manitoba. When the Honourable the Premier was dealing, as I understood him, with the reasons for his attitude during the time of his speech that was referred to by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, he indicated to me that the reason that he advocated that policy was because that was the tenor of the times, that the Liberal administration of that day had adopted a policy of go slow, and the reason that they advocated a policy of going slower was because they felt that it was politically expedient to do so; and, transversely, that they only now are advocating a policy of going faster because in the opinion of editorial comments and public opinion they now feel that their policy should be that of going faster. What does this mean? This means exactly what we of the CCF have always said and repeated in this House, that neither my friends opposite or my friends right have any uniform and progressive planned policy, other than that of expediency that which in their opinion -- and in this I include both of them -- they feel that the dictates of public opinion directs them. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that at the time my honourable friend the Premier of the Province of Manitoba made his speech, that then we, as we do now, advocate an advocated progressive legislation for the Province of Manitoba, and indeed, for the whole of the Dominion of Canada. So I say, and I repeat once again that insofar as the destiny of our province and that of the Dominion, that the policies of both parties has and is now -- and to complete the phrase, appears to and always will be -- a policy of a hit-and-miss basis.

Now then my honourable friend in his rebuttal today has criticized us on this side of the House because we supported all of the increased borrowing and the expanded programs of the Conservative Party. I say, Mr. Speaker, that there may be some justification for that

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)...aspect of it except for one very important aspect which my honourable friend omitted, because he on behalf of the administration which now governs Manitoba said that he could do all of these things without increasing the tax burden on the people of the Province of Manitoba. That to me, Mr. Speaker, is the most vital.

Now then, I have said before that insofar as our group is concerned we'll accept our responsibilities because we voted in favour of the increased health and welfare program; because we voted for expanded educational facilities and costs within the Province of Manitoba among other increases in the various departments. We say, without equivocation or reservation of any kind, that as far as we are concerned we accept that responsibility. But what my honourable friend has dodged this afternoon, and I think is vital and important, that he said on behalf of the Conservative Administration of Manitoba that this would be achieved without tax increase.

My honourable friend wound up his remarks by reference to the word 'humbug', which was used so well by that great champion of democracy, Sir Winston Churchill. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is humbug to attempt -- the Leader of the House, the Leader of the Government-- to say to us that we have not had tax increases in the Province of Manitoba. I say 'humbug' because my honourable friend opposite attempts through a narrow definition between fees and actual taxation to substantiate the position of the government. I say, Sir, if there is any humbug at all that it is in that contention. Two and a half million dollars in beer increase prices, is that not in effect, having the same result insofar as the people of Manitoba, than if my honourable friends had called a spade a spade and simply say, "in respect of beer sales, we're going to put on a sales tax of a limited percentage to achieve to us the same amount of money?" I suggest that there is no difference. It still has to come out of the pockets of the consumer. We have just passed amendments to the Highway Traffic Act wherein the Minister of Public Utilities is going to increase from \$1 to \$3 the charge in respect of having further examinations in respect of driver licences. Almost every edition of the Manitoba Gazette that we've received, there has been another change in fees, which the people of Manitoba have to pay. Those Canadians who originally came from other lands who are desirous of wanting to Anglo-Saxonize their name now have to pay a greater fee. The government tell us that this is only to pay because of the increased cost in the service.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in all deference to my honourable friend opposite that our criticism of his administration and the reason that we are going to support the amendment as proposed by the official opposition is simply because, notwithstanding the fact that we voted for the increased borrowing with the debt increase in our provincial debt, coupled with this was the firm statement and the firm commitment of the administration that this would not entail any tax increase. And I say, and I want to thank my honourable friend the Leader of the House for drawing back to my attention this word 'humbug', because I say it is humbug on the part of the administration to say what they had promised was all of this without any increase on the tax burden of the people of Manitoba, and say, that call it what they will or what they like, it is out of the pockets of the people of Manitoba that this additional revenue is coming and will have to come.

In conclusion let me repeat my first remarks that the policy of the Conservative Party today, as it was in 1952 when my honourable friend made the speech that was referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, was only dictated by what appeared to be popular without any planned program that will ensure to the people of Manitoba any material benefit for the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before we come to a vote on this amendment I'd like to say a few words, part of it arising out of the comments of my honourable friend the First Minister, this afternoon. First of all, some of the comments that he made, for example with regards to roads -- I do not propose to discuss all over again the roads program -- but my honourable friend always likes to bring that one up and how the Kellogg Report stated that we built poor roads and so on and so forth. This was used most effectively, no doubt, against us during the various election campaigns, but the fact is still, Mr. Speaker, that whatever my honourable friend says, immediately after his government came in power they proceeded to raise very substantially the load limits on the very roads that they had been criticizing for so long before. They had not built one single mile of road

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . that they had planned when they did this. It was entirely on the roads that had been built by the previous administration, the very same roads that they had gone all up and down the province criticizing, and their first action was to contradict exactly and completely the statements they had been making by proceeding to raise these limits.

My honourable friend speaks about "tricky bookkeeping". Well, I think that the statement is fair. My honourable friend doesn't hide the information so far as this matter of the debt, that's true, but he changed the method of accounting. And the timing of that change is the reason for our statement that it's tricky bookkeeping. It's true that he still shows it in the accounts but when we were in the government we showed that item of loans and investments, the income from it under our estimates of revenue, it came there under the Treasury. My honourable friend decides to change it, that's fair; he wants to show it as an offset in the estimates on the public debt page. But, when did my honourable friend decide to do that and what does he do with it when he makes that change? He does it just before the election. He proceeds to give us the estimates, this was in March 1959; and on the public debt page at the back he, by bringing in this loans and investments income shows that the net cost is \$7,000. And this was used during the election campaign to show what my honourable friends were doing. And that's why we say it was "tricky bookkeeping" because that was all that my honourable friend was doing.

My honourable friend then speaks a great deal about the new policy of his group. Back in 1952 they were a "go slow", in 1957, '58, '59 they have become a "go fast". Well he speaks a great deal and says that we were too slow, we didn't do things. Mr. Speaker, I reject that charge. I claim that the previous government made a consistent growth, made consistent investment in the development of this province. And one need only to look at the various budgets over the previous years. When I first entered this House in 1953 the budget at that time was approximately \$53,000,000. In 1958, the last budget that the previous government presented, it was something in the vicinity of \$80,000,000. Insofar as the utilities were concerned the same thing happened, there was steady progress; in the Telephone System, the Manitoba Power Commission and the Hydro Electric Board. My honourable friends now make a great deal of the Grand Rapids Development. Well I ask them, who is it that planned the Grand Rapids Development? It was the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board and it was done under this administration. And the planning of the whole development of hydro in this province is one of the outstanding developments anywhere in Canada, because no province has been able to go through the procedure of expansion that we went through in the development of hydro power and of all power, retaining costs in line and always having the adequate amount of power available. The Grand Rapids Development is one of a chain of planned projects and planned over a long period of time. And I know that my honourable friend knows it.

But insofar as the budget itself is concerned, Mr. Speaker, my main objection is the same as that of the Leader of the CCF. My main objection is that my honourable friends across the way, in the election campaigns, campaigned on the basis that they would fulfil all of their programs without increasing taxes. And now when they present us with this budget, the same statement comes out as we had last year in the budget, that all this is being done and no increase in tax. Mr. Speaker, that is not a correct statement. My honourable friends have increased taxes substantially. They don't like to use the word -- they rather claim that the fee is not an increase in tax, my honourable friend has covered that, I won't go into detail into it. I want to cover in some detail two aspects of the tax increase and that is the tax increase on liquor and the tax increase on beer. At the present time this matter of liquor revenue is one of the main items of revenue in this province. It is one of the large items on the revenue side. In the summer of 1959, or rather the spring of '59, the Federal Government in their budget increased the excise tax on liquor. The increase that time by the Federal Government worked out to a cost increase to this government comes to something in the vicinity of 11 cents per 25 ounce bottle. In addition to that the Federal Government increased the sales tax at that time from 10 to 11 percent; and this would mean approximately 2 cents on the cost to this government. So the total increase in cost at that time in liquor was approximately 13 cents a bottle; and yet what change was there made in the selling price by the Liquor Commission? It was raised on the average 35 cents. Well now what is that spread between that 13 cents increase in cost and the 35 cent increase in selling price if nothing but an additional tax? I cannot

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.)...see how else it can be described. Insofar as the beer prices are concerned it is much more difficult to make an analysis because the change in pricing, setting up of a quota system for various hotels and so on, makes it very difficult to get an analysis, but the closest check that can be made — and I haven't found that my honourable friends have objected to these statements — is that it's something in the vicinity of \$2 million plus or minus of additional revenue to this government. Now what else is that, Mr. Speaker, but an increase in taxes? I cannot see how my honourable friends can describe it in any other way.

I want to go on though Mr. Speaker, to some other matters that have come out of this budget. My honourable friend this afternoon made a reply on some of the subjects that have been brought up, but there are a number of them that he did not discuss. Last night certain questions were asked on the matter of the City Hall. This afternoon when the First Minister was speaking we got no indications whatever what the Government plans in this respect — no reply to any of the questions that had been asked. Last night as well, questions were asked on certain revenue items presented to us, particularly the sundry item under Treasury. There was no reply by my honourable friend this afternoon in that regard. In their speeches on the budget debate my Leader and the Member for St. John's asked some questions about the projections to costs in particular in the Department of Health and Public Welfare and the Department of Education. We've had no reply on these matters and these are extremely important because my honourable friends so far have just started on these programs. The total cost will be a great deal more than what we have been advised up to date. My honourable friends have given us no indication whatever of what that cost might be or of what the plans of the government are in regard to paying for them. This budget has been balanced by my honourable friends through taking in surplus from previously, through increases in fees, increases in liquor costs; but the projection of costs on these two departments in particular make it virtually impossible for my honourable friends to continue operating in the black, or even to pretend to be operating in the black as they are doing now. My honourable friend the First Minister shakes his head. Well, he has reason to because he has made certain statements that—we'll wait, we'll remember—after the election victory my honourable friend made the statement then that the sales tax was as "dead as a dodo". We shall wait and see. The financing of my honourable friends will reveal itself as time goes on. We shall see how dead the sales tax is, because these things will have to be paid for. There is no turning back on the programs now and the statement that my honourable friend made that this could all be paid for without increases in taxes are not true now and they'll be even less true in the future.

I want to cover only one item more, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend made no comment on in his reply, and that is this matter of the change of the policy of this government with regards to the sales of their debentures and bonds. It had been the policy and my honourable friend stated in his speech that these were previously sold on a tender basis, and that has been changed; and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a dangerous change. It is a change which I think is not in the interests of Manitoba. I think that in spite of my honourable friend's statement that so far it has proved very successful, that that is not quite the case. In his budget speech he told us, page 36, "We believe that this system is the best under the present circumstances and this view is supported by the outstanding success of our first issue under it". Mr. Speaker, I ask, what proof has he exactly that this issue has been an outstanding success? I presume he would say because it has sold. Well, we don't know how much of it has been sold, but I submit that the selling success of the sale of an issue has mainly to do with its price, and that the price at which this issue was sold is the proof of whether or not it's a success, not the fact that he's changed the system of selling it. Now I see no possibility, Mr. Speaker, of checking under this new system on whether or not the government is getting the best deal in its financing. What proof have we got that this government sold these bonds at the best price available? Under the previous system of tender all the firms who were interested in purchasing government bonds made a firm bid. Once that bid was accepted they paid the price and the government got its money. Under this new system, what is the policy? Do the fiscal agents guarantee the price to the government? This last issue was put up for sale at 99.25 for the 1968's and 97.75 for the 1980's. What happens if it doesn't sell completely at that price? Does the government get that listed price? Does the fiscal agent guarantee it? We haven't been advised of it.

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.).... My honourable friend says that this is the best system under the present circumstances, and yet the Winnipeg Tribune on the 7th of March had a headline at that time "Bad Time for Manitoba Issue". It says: "the issues came at a rather bad time. The recent Province of Saskatchewan seven and a half million 6% April 1, 1980 debentures originally priced at 99 1/2 now are selling at 98; while the six million Newfoundland issue still remains partly unsold". Then it goes on to tell us about some corporate issues. Now why is it that Manitoba found itself going on the market at this time? I presume under the advice of the fiscal agents. Then I think the question arises; can we depend that the fiscal agents are actually working in the prime interests of Manitoba? After all these fiscal agents have responsibilities to others; not only to other governments but also to other private investors and to other private corporations going on to the market. In this particular case, my honourable friend tells us that the Wood-Gundy group are the one who are the fiscal agents. I believe it's correct that they are also the fiscal agents of the Province of Ontario. Now I think the question arises: if Ontario wants to borrow some money and Manitoba wants to borrow some money; Ontario is very many times more important to the investment world than what Manitoba is. As a client Ontario would be much more important to the fiscal agents than what the Province of Manitoba would be. Now who would get the best advice? Who would get the first advice? It seems to me that under this fiscal agent system clashes of interest are almost bound to develop. We have no indication whatever from the statement of my honourable friend that this isn't the case. I submit that this change is one that can have very serious implications for the Province of Manitoba. We have no indication whatever that we're getting the best deal. We don't know whether we're getting the best advice. We can only depend on what this group tells us, and if it doesn't work out, it's the Province of Manitoba who pays. It seems to me that we need and the province needs a much better explanation than my honourable friends has given so far about this change in policy.

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

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): The ayes and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means moved by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition which reads as follows: This House regrets that the Government while failing to keep many of its important promises including that of no tax increases have through extravagance and imprudence raised the provincial net debt by more than 200%. Are you ready for the question?

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 33.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Motion before the House, the motion by the Honourable the First Minister, that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Are you ready for the question?

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, the order for a return that was tabled yesterday has given me ample material to make a 40-minute speech but I do not think I will do so, although I have felt and I still feel that the duty of a member of the Opposition is to oppose. I think that there must come a limit, but if I did choose to make that speech I would like the members to believe that it was not my fault, that it is the fault of the Minister of Education who took two months practically to supply an answer to a very simple question. I do not want to be a kill-joy and I reserve my right possibly to use that material on some other occasion, but I would like to take advantage of this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to tell the House that if I have opposed, at times I have been alone, like this morning, I have



(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)...done so with the full knowledge that it was my duty to act according to the dictates of my conscience; and I did it sincerely with the full responsibility that I believe is placed in me to express my opinion at all times. But in view of the remarks made by the Honourable the First Minister after I said a few words this morning, I feel that he misinterpreted to a certain extent my few words this morning. I was referring to Bill 43, which I believe restricts, not the rights but the abilities of the Opposition at a time of a general election to present its case to the people; and also with respect to the change in the rules, especially the change in Rule 34. These are two documents that were passed by this House that I believe I opposed, and they restrict the rights and powers of the opposition. I did not want him to infer from these remarks that I was intimating that he, during the course of this Session, had been unduly restrictive with respect to the rights of the Opposition, and I would like to say that I believe that he has been fair with the Opposition; he has not wanted to curtail debate or stop debate or stop adjournments, that we've had our full chance according to our rules to express our opinions at all times. So with these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I think I will, for this Session, stop speaking.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time now would be appropriate to, before you put the question, to bring to the attention of this House a matter which amounts to a grievance, and a grievance of considerable proportions in this province. I'm referring of course to the crop damage and loss that many farmers in Manitoba suffered last fall, and we all know that this government decided to go along with the other two prairie provincial governments and the Federal Government with regard to making emergency payments to farmers suffering such losses. But I would like to point out, and it has been pointed out already but no answer has been given, Mr. Speaker, so I would like to point out again to this government that the situation that is existing in this province with regard to this question is certainly somewhat less than desirable. There is dissatisfaction and there is growing dissatisfaction among rural folk in Manitoba with this government's decision not to make the Federal-Provincial Emergency Assistance payments to all those who received or thought they would receive PFA assistance. I believe that there is good reason for farm folk to be dissatisfied, chagrined with the decision that this government made, because in most cases where PFA has been paid it has amounted only to nominal sums, and in the whole general area of Eastern Manitoba, a vast majority of farmers who received PFA in fact received the minimum, practically, of \$1.00 an acre -- in some cases .50¢ an acre. What makes the situation so hard to swallow, Mr. Speaker, is simply this, that a lot of farmers who have received PFA would have been much better off if they could have refused it and qualified for the Federal-Provincial emergency payments. In many cases the difference amounts to \$1.50, \$1.80 per acre, and on a 200-acre farm, calculate it out and it runs into a considerable sum of money. Now why should this situation exist in that way? Not only that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this government by refusing to make payments to all those who received PFA has in fact failed to drive a good bargain with the Federal authorities, because it's true that this government may have saved a million dollars but they have also lost out on bringing into this province about a million dollars in Federal funds by way of the matching grant or matching payment formula.

In the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan the provincial governments have deemed it fit and proper and fair to make payment wherever loss occurred, regardless of whether PFA would be received or not. Now naturally it cost the provincial governments more money, but they brought into the province considerably greater sums of Federal money than we have. Here in Manitoba the overall cost of the emergency scheme will amount to somewhere in the neighbourhood of one million four or thereabouts, of which Federal money there will be approximately \$700,000. In the case of Saskatchewan there will be over 2 1/2 million dollars of Federal money coming in. This will help to keep the economy of the rural part of that province, and could have had the same effect in this province, keeping the economy more bouyant than it is. We cannot see that this government should remain stuck on its original decision not to make these payments to all crop loss farmers.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, and that is not the only note of disappointment. There is still another. I believe that this government has, by making this segregation, has brought on itself a situation of mass paper work and mass confusion in administering the payment from

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.)...the fund, the emergency fund. Not only has there been undue delay in mailing out payments to the many farmers but some farmers are not even aware yet if their fields have been inspected or if they haven't been inspected; and some do not know, those that have been inspected, do not know whether they will qualify or not. Now in Saskatchewan and Alberta the overall scheme, the payments and all that, were over about 30 to 40 days ago. Here, I doubt if we've reached the half-way mark toward conclusion of payment and allied matters.

Then, too, I don't think this should come as much of a surprise but a lot of farmers, who happen to live in a PFA zone and who took it for granted that there was not much use in applying for the Federal-Provincial emergency aid because they were in a PFA zone, they now find now, Mr. Speaker, in the last week or two, they have discovered that they have been rejected for purposes of PFAA and they haven't even made application for our payments yet because they felt that they would qualify for PFA so they naturally didn't apply under this scheme. So what is the overall effect going to be? They found out last week they'd been rejected from PFA. They've probably started to apply last week and are applying this week and probably some will next week. I understand that the deadline is not a rigid one, even though it was supposed to be the 23rd of January. Inspection might be made sometime in April wherever inspection is necessary. I understand it won't be necessary in all cases. They might receive payment sometime in May or June, sometime during or after the seeding operations; and in view of the fact that springtime is always a time of stress of expenses for farmers, it would seem that this government is guilty of not taking all these things into consideration when it decided to refuse making the emergency assistance payments to all farmers who had suffered crop loss. Just let me give you a brief illustration of how many farmers in the municipality of Brokenhead--now I'll just take one municipality. Wholesale number of sections have been excluded from PFAA payment. I have here a list of about 25 sections--that's in one municipality. You can imagine how many farmers are involved. All of these farmers did not apply to the province for assistance thinking they would get PFA. Well now, if they are eligible for the provincial aid now that they've been rejected from PFA, I think that we can expect the administering of this provincial scheme to take at least another three months before it's all cleared up; because as far as I'm concerned, the applications are just starting to come in because of the mass rejection of eligibility by PFAA authorities.

I would like to take the opportunity to read in this Assembly a resolution passed at the last meeting of the Manitoba Farmers' Union local at Ladywood, and it goes as follows: "Be it resolved that this meeting of the Manitoba Farmers' Union sub-district meeting held at Brokenhead, go on record as in favour of requesting our MLAs and the Minister of Agriculture to change the crop disaster plan for snow-covered grain to allow those farmers who have qualified for PFA payments to also receive payments under the crop disaster plan if they meet the qualifications the same as farmers in Saskatchewan and Alberta". The letter goes on to say, "this resolution was passed unanimously by the farmers present at this meeting and there were around 90 farmers present". I think that I am justified in bringing this matter up, even in this day when there seems to be a sense of urgency of adjourning, because there is a matter of urgency involved, Mr. Speaker. I feel that this government, if it has the best interests of the farm folk at heart and I believe that they do have, it's a matter of how to go about achieving this. If it really has this, and I believe it has, as I said, then the government should do one of two things. And here are the two alternatives, and either one I think would be a great improvement over the present situation. The first alternative would be for this government to reconsider making monies from the Emergency Fund available to all crop loss victims; and secondly, the other alternative would be for this government to study, and it's not impossible, to study ways and means by which payment could be equalized. By that I mean simply this, that where a farmer, and I believe the member for Turtle Mountain mentioned this, that where a farmer could have received let us say \$300 under Federal-Provincial Emergency Assistance but only received \$100 because he happened to be in a PFA zone, and this is possible in many cases, that where there is such a discrepancy that this government make good this difference so that no farmer in this province will in fact be penalized financially by virtue of his being in a PFA district, which is a matter beyond and above his own control, so why should he be penalized?

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) .. Now there are the two alternatives and one of these two should be accepted; and I would not have got up, Mr. Speaker, had this government given some tangible answer to the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain. But when he made his remarks in this Assembly, the Honourable the Premier got up and said, quite properly I suppose, that they would definitely take note of this rather serious matter. So they've taken note, Mr. Speaker, but I think before we members of the Assembly leave and go back to our home areas, we should have some definite indication of the course of action that this government intends to follow. I say that for a very good reason, because the members of this Assembly will recall I directed a question to the Minister of Agriculture a few days ago asking him if it was true that the government was intending to make reconsideration and make monies available to all crop loss victims. He gave me an answer which was very—well definitely which displayed his cleverness and so on. I know the honourable gentleman is clever. He doesn't have to display it. All I wanted was a definite answer from him and I think we're entitled to that; and I think the farmers of this province are entitled to that answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a very few words in reply to the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I think it's rather useless to try and compare the amounts of money that are being spent or have been spent in Saskatchewan and those that have been spent in Manitoba, for the simple reason that the harvest in Manitoba was far advanced of that in Saskatchewan when the storm hit in the first place. Almost 90% of our wheat was estimated to have been harvested when the storm hit here. Secondly, the pattern of the storm hitting Saskatchewan and Manitoba was such that when my honourable friend tells the House that Saskatchewan allowed payments to be made to both those farmers who had received PFA awards and those who had not, it didn't really mean as much as what he apparently thinks, because in Saskatchewan the people would be disqualified who were in the areas—disqualified because they had their harvest completed, because the area south of the Qu'appelle Valley was pretty well harvested in southern Saskatchewan. And these people had their harvest completed. So I think we should just keep this in mind.

The third thing I want to mention is the fact that he objects, and I think it's typical of the approach of his group, he objects to a thorough administration of this program. He thinks that we have wasted too much time. As Minister of Agriculture in this province I'm responsible to the farmers; I am also responsible to those people who support not only agricultural programs but all the programs and policies that are carried on for all the people in this province. I have a real responsibility to see that any policy that is carried out for the benefit of a group--

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, I think my remarks are being misconstrued by the Honourable Minister. What I did object to was the fact that a deadline was drawn in January, a deadline which did in fact make it impossible for those people who might be rejected by PFA to apply, and they're only now beginning to apply. That's what I object to.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I took a different interpretation of what the honourable member had to say. I know very well that when the deadline was announced there were outcries in this Legislature that the farmers weren't being given enough time, and then the outcry today is of a different nature. They say that it is unfair to deny an acreage payment under the Federal-Provincial snow-covered crop assistance to a man who has received PFA. I would like to point out to this House, Mr. Speaker, that I have corresponded with some farmers in this province who don't qualify for either program, and there's nothing I can do about it. They're the farmers that I feel sorry for—farmers who were in ineligible PFA areas who had their crops harvested, who received less than eight bushels of wheat per acre or its equivalent, and they don't qualify for either one. They're the ones I feel sorry for and there isn't a thing in the world that I can do about it.

I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the House, that there was correspondence tabled in this Legislative Assembly which outlined the progress of our negotiations between the provinces and Ottawa in this regard, and amongst that correspondence was a letter from the Honourable Minister of Agriculture of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba in which we asked the Federal Government to bring out a program, a temporary program which would extend to the farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, who found themselves outside a PFA eligible area, and who found that they had lost their crop. We asked this because we knew that the PFAA program

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) .. has limitations, and one of the limitations of that program is that it can't deal with an individual farmer and his need; and recognizing the limitation of PFAA we asked the Federal Government to extend a temporary program for this year only because of the nature of the loss and because so many farmers had lost on an individual basis and did not qualify under PFA. We asked the Federal Government to do this. Their offer was, as you all know, for provincial participation and Manitoba did not change its mind. Manitoba went ahead with a program which would extend benefits to every farmer in the province who could qualify under the 50% clause--to every farmer in the province so that every farmer, who didn't qualify under PFA, could qualify under the special program. This is what we did. We know it has shortcomings and no one is arguing that point. At the same time I must say this, that the bulk of complaints that you have brought to my attention have come from one area of the province where PFA was granted, PFA awards were granted in general, and that to duplicate the payments to the farmers east of the Red River would put us in the position where the farmers in one part of the province receive two payments where the farmers in the rest of the province receive one. Now it's true that the farmers of this province contribute to PFA. I agree with that. I agree that they contribute and this is their money. But at the same time there is no more justification for giving farmers two payments on one side of the river, and in the majority of the cases in western Manitoba, having circumstances where they can only qualify for one payment, than there is for making sure that all farmers get some help under one or the other of the programs.

As far as the equalization policy that you have spoken of, I wasn't being funny or smart the other day in the Legislature when I told you that we had this policy under constant consideration. We have had ever since we introduced it, because introducing it we knew that there were going to be exceptions to the rule. And it has been under constant consideration and it is at the present time. But I am in no position at the present time to make any announcement with regard to these exceptions. And I can only make that announcement if it is proved to myself and my colleagues that it is feasible and that it is administratively possible. These are the problems that we face. It is all very easy, Mr. Speaker, to say that here's a case; make an exception; here is another case; make an exception. But you have to have a rule to go by. You just can't go by rule of thumb in administering these programs. And we will do our best and if it is possible to do any more we will do it.

There isn't much more, I think, that needs to be said on this particular question. It's been thrashed out many times over. I think that we have--our program has been of real assistance; I shouldn't say real assistance, but material assistance to those who were wiped out to a large extent. Certainly I am sorry, with the rest of my colleagues, that there isn't more that we can do. I am happy for the fact that I can feel that this has been administered soundly and responsibly, not only to the farmers but to all the citizens of this province.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if you would ask the Honourable Deputy Speaker, as suggested this morning, to take the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. ROBLIN: Committee of Ways and Means, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Ways and Means. Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair?

MR. ROBLIN: There are certain questions that were asked previously, Sir, that I'll be glad to deal with now if members would like to raise them.

MR. CAMPBELL: There is one that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and I have asked with regard to this new plan of dealing with the debentures of the province. Under this system do the committee that is mentioned guarantee the sale of the debentures at a certain price?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Sir. The Committee bought the debentures from us at a firm price. Now in connection with this matter I wish I were at liberty to inform the Committee of the people whom we consulted who are not interested in any way in this matter, because we took very careful pains to consult, I may say, the very highest non-political, non-financial in the sense of raising money, authorities that we could, in the Dominion of Canada. We did not enter into this policy lightly or without taking the trouble to make those enquiries. And the advice we received is the advice we acted upon when we put up this new arrangement. Now members also

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . asked, what do they get for doing it. They get one percent. Now that compared, Sir, with 1.074% on our last tender sale, so in effect these people do it at a cheaper price or I won't argue about that, I'll say the same price, as is done under tender, so that there is no extra advantage accruing to them there. Now if there are other questions on the point, I'll do my best to deal with them.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . . . was my second one about their service charge. Then I had asked with regard to what is the interest cost to the government of the province on, while I am at it: this loan, this recent loan, the \$15 million of last fall, and the US loan.

MR. ROBLIN: The \$15 million loan just negotiated averages out about 6.25. Now I won't guarantee that one-tenth of a percentum one way or another but that's about it; may be a little higher, may be about 6.26 or 7, but it's in that general neighbourhood. Regarding the US borrowings the cost in US funds was 5.412 to the Government of Manitoba. When brought home the cost in Canadian funds was 5.77% and as I explained in the House in Committee there can be a switch of 11 points as of when we borrowed it in the exchange rate before we are any the worse off, and we know that switch hasn't taken place and every day that passes we're making a little more money on the deal.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, may I direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer in plain language? If you need, say, a million dollars today in US funds, what would be the exchange on the exchange of today or your buying future exchange?

MR. ROBLIN: You can't buy futures on foreign exchange except for one year in advance. You can probably get 12 month's futures on it, but we don't do that as a rule. We buy it on the current rate of exchange. Now I should have said something else, that the cost of commission on the US borrowings that we did was .5% and just for the sake of the record the cost of commission of my honourable friend's borrowing was 1.5%.

MR. GRAY: It's still not clear to me. Perhaps I am too tired with this session. You can go to the bank today, for instance yesterday, and purchase American funds for 4 1/8 or 4 2/8; where is the commission coming in?

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, the commission that I am talking about, Sir, is not the commission on buying the money. The commission is the sale to the agency in United States that arranges for the borrowing. It's another commission altogether.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, will the bonds or debentures that will be sold, will they all be of one term; let's say all 20 year; all at one--?

MR. ROBLIN: Well they are and they aren't. Some are for one term and others a split. In the \$15 million issue some are for 12 years and some are 20. Mostly they went for the long term.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable the First Minister gave us the cost to the government, the interest cost to the government on just two of those loans. Did he give us the one, the very recent one? And the one last fall?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . the one last fall--haven't got that here--it's a six percent coupon, and I can give my honourable friend this information, but I am afraid I haven't got the exact figure. The par value is \$10 million. We receive \$9,817,600 and the coupon rate was six, so our cost was--I don't know--I think it was 6.1, 2 or 3 and was borrowed for hydro.

I would also like to say that my honourable friends opposite asked me when we were in the speech for some information about what money we got on the borrowings of last year. If you will turn to the last page of the budget speech and that table, there is a list of debentures issued amounting to \$56,925,000. We received, for that par value; the proceeds to us were \$52,973,970.16, a differential of approximately four. Now I think that calls for some explanation, and the explanation is this, that members will see that the rate of interest, the coupon rate of interest was extremely low on most of those items. It was 2% on four or five issues; 2 3/4, 3 3/4, etcetera. The reason why that is possible is because some investors will prefer to take part of their return in a capital gain rather than in the interest rates. This enables us to sell the money--to buy the money at very low coupon rate, but it calls for a discount. In effect, we actually get in all those circumstances, though I haven't got the comparable figures here, I give the Committee the assurance that we actually bought that money at less than the market cost would have been under any conceivable calculation, because these were private arrangements mostly to suit private people's particular financial requirements. They were very

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . good deals for the Province of Manitoba, and despite the fact there is a \$4 million discount as you might say, it really represents cheaper money than we can ever obtain on the market.

Now let me just follow that further. My honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose was very upset, it seemed to me, that we had abandoned this tender system; and one would imagine from that that my predecessors had always used it. Well they didn't by any long manner of means. For example, when I came into office I found that on April 1st of 1959 they had sold without tender \$17,087,149.48, not by tender. --(interjection)--Well, I've got more than that if they want them; I'm going back into '56 and '57; I'm not going to quote them all. But here's the interesting part; what was the discount on that \$17 million? The discount was \$5,126,693.97--\$5.1 million discount. Now there's nothing wrong with it. It was a good deal, but it indicates the kind of thing you get up against and you can't, I think, make a sweeping statement one way or the other on this point. It seemed advantageous to my predecessor at the time to borrow \$17 million without tenders and at a discount; and I think he was right to do it. All I want to say is that we're doing some of the same things from time to time.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . . the fact, Mr. Chairman, that I think my honourable friend will have the--through the Treasury Department, will have the experts available to him who can check on that one or the other ones that he has mentioned, and he will find I'm sure that those borrowings were below the current cost of money on the market at that time, and--

MR. ROBLIN: I well believe that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I'm sure they were. And that particular one that my honourable friend mentioned was quite an unusual arrangement as I'm sure he appreciates. But generally speaking, I think my honourable friend would agree that generally speaking, we followed the tender system. We didn't of course in the United States--that was a private deal too--and even though my honourable friend says that the commission that they paid down there was less than what we paid at the same time, I still say that the arrangement that we made at that time was a much better one than the one that has recently been made. Now there are differing circumstances on account of the present interest rates of course, but I think that borrowing in the United States has turned out to be exceptionally good from the province's point of view.

MR. ROBLIN: We don't dispute those facts. All I'm saying is that you just can't make a general statement and say this must be the policy on finance. What you have to do is play it by ear. We've got to take the circumstances as they arise and use your best judgment on them. Now I would be the last one to say we don't make mistakes on it, but I simply say that you have to deal with these things as they arise.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . . Mr. Chairman, that in asking for the details with regard to the almost \$5 million of apparent discount, in my case, that was not a criticism either, because I could easily establish approximately a million dollars of it from the Public Accounts that we have before us now. I was assuming that a million dollars of it was contained in the United States loan of \$20 million. The balance of roughly \$3 million I had no doubt would be the apparent discount on these very low interest borrowings, the type of which is shown in the present Public Accounts. I quite recognize that the information that the First Minister gives as far as I am concerned is fully authentic and I have no criticism of it whatever. It is a fact that to some of these big organizations these times that the capital gains position, and I presume the better that they are doing financially the greater weight that particular feature has with them, does mean that some of those arrangements can be made quite satisfactorily. It was not a criticism as such; it was a request for the information to be placed on the records.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that my honourable friend the First Minister and I will have ample opportunity in the future to discuss this matter of tenders on the debentures of the government. I think that it would be a fair prediction to make that my honourable friend will return to the tender system, because I am sure that he will find that the present system does not protect his interests as the Provincial Treasurer and the interests of the province in the way that I know he wants it done. So I think we'll be back to that one as the time comes. Insofar as our operations when we were there, I think he will find that there are only two cases where we did not use the tender system. Both of them have been referred to by my leader. There was the purchase--I think it was BC in the case of the \$17 million, and the American purchase before that. Insofar as these figures that my honourable friend gives us on

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . the last page, I wonder if it would be possible in the future to include there as well the cost, actual cost of the—or the selling price of the debentures. He gives us there the coupon rate and the par value. I just wonder if it would be possible in the future to have an extra column indicating what the actual selling price was so that for future comparisons the committee would have the information.

MR. ROBLIN: There is something I think that should be said about this question of the agency versus the tender. I quite agree with my honourable friend when he says that we may revert to the tender. That's certainly within the realm of possibility. The real compelling factor in the judgment of my financial advisors, not all of whom are on the staff of this government is the state of the market. If the market is overcrowded with new issues then the syndicate system is the way to sell a clean issue and get your money and keep your reputation in good shape. When that situation improves, and I might say there has been a phenomenal improvement in the market in the last three weeks, why then you go back to the tender system. It's just as simple as that. It's a question of the state of the market; and I want to assure my honourable friend that if in our opinion the state of the market justifies abandoning the syndicate system or whatever we call it and going back to the tender system, no one will be happier about it than I am, because I quite see the point of that. But I want to stress that these things are not—you don't decide them on the basis of a general statement. I think you have to deal with the circumstances of the market at the time, and that's the main point that I want the committee to keep in mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions? Are you ready for the resolution? Main supply resolution: resolved that towards making good certain sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1961, the sum of \$89,527,779 be granted out of Consolidated Fund. Resolution passed.

The supplementary estimates: resolved that towards making good certain further sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1960 the sum of \$3,249,750 be granted out of Consolidated Fund. Are you ready for the question? Passed. Capital supply resolution: resolved that towards making good certain monies for various capital purposes the sum of \$208,275,000 be granted out of Consolidated Fund. Resolution be adopted? That's all then. The committee rise and report? Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means have adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Cypress that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN presented the resolution from the Committee of Ways and Means for second reading and concurred in.

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 113, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1961.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm out of order here.—(interjection)—I read it, I read the motion for concurrence, but you haven't read the—

MR. CLERK: Resolved that towards making good certain further sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1960 the sum of \$3,241,750 be granted out of Consolidated Fund; resolved that towards making good certain sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1961 the sum of \$89,527,000 be granted out of Consolidated Fund; resolved that toward making good certain sums of money for the various capital purposes the sum of \$208,275,000 be granted out of Consolidated Fund.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Now I trust, Mr. Speaker, it is in order to move first reading of Bill No. 113.

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

Mr. Roblin introduced Bill No. 121, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the public services of the province for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March 1960; Bill No. 127, an Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital

purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same (1); Bill No. 128, an Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same (2); Bill No. 130, an Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for capital purposes of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board and to authorize the borrowing of the same.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider Bills Nos. 113, 121, 127, 128 and 130.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair?

Bill No. 113 was read section by section and passed; Bill No. 121--

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, we've arrived at a place in our session where--it's frequently happened in the time that I sat on that side of the House--that we seem to get a certain amount of criticism in the Press or even from the public, because of the fact that the impression seemed to be that when we did things in this way that we're doing now, that because I think it does look a little unintelligible to the person who is just looking on perhaps from the public gallery, the way we pass these bills so quickly and even in committee pass them so quickly. Perhaps even the new members feel that way so I thought maybe I would take two minutes to say to the new members, and any of the public that are listening, that we're doing just the same thing here as we do with any other bill that comes before us. Well, a little different because these are essentially money bills, but the reason that they are delayed until the end of the session this way is because they can't be brought in. I'm not looking for an opportunity to criticize the government in this. I'm trying to say that in this, I think the government has acted in the only way that it can do. They can't be brought in until the motion has been passed that we dealt with a short time ago. Then I think we are in a position to deal very quickly with them and even "by leave", so that we have all the readings on the same day and Committee of the Whole and all the rest, because of the fact that each and every one of these bills has been gone over in pretty close detail as the session proceeded. Not the individual bill, and not the wording of the bill, but they are practically identical year after year. Let me just summarize in this way, Mr. Chairman, if I may, that the one you are at now, I think it's 121, is really the supplementaries of the present year, which we have already passed item by item as the House knows. The one we have just passed before, 113, is the current estimates of the year that we're just moving into. The next one that we deal with, if I'm not out of order in mentioning this now, is one of the Capital Supply, one portion of the Capital Supply, and it's the part dealing with the Telephone System, the Power Commission, the Water Supply Board and some buildings and grants and loans, etcetera, which was included in the Capital Supply estimates they had laid before us. Bill 128, after that, deals with the Agricultural Credit Fund and the Manitoba Development Fund which were, I think the honourable members would agree, carefully scrutinized at the time we were in Capital Supply; and the last one is the big vote for the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board. I know that to people who are not acquainted with our system that this looks like a rush and that we pass, as sometimes was said, a great many million dollars in so many minutes; but these millions of dollars have been pretty carefully looked at before this time, and when we arrive at this stage, I think we're in a position to deal with them pretty quickly. I think I'd say that for the benefit of the public and the newer members.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think that comment by the Leader of the Opposition was very well worth making, because to strangers who are not familiar with our procedure this looks like the sort of situation that he described, but we in the House know very well that this is the culmination of eight or nine or ten weeks detailed study, item by item, and Heavens knows how much expenditure of energy and time in talk and discussion in the Committee of Supply. This is, in a sense then, the formal wrapping up of the real labour of our session; and I do hope that those who are interested enough, either to watch or record what we do, will be firmly seized of that principle.

Bills Nos. 113, 121, 127, 128 and 130 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has considered Bills Nos. 113, 121, 127, 128 and 130 and directed me to report the same, without amendments, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Cypress, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

Bills Nos. 113, 121, 127, 128 and 130 were read a third time and passed.



MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if you and I could capture the attention of the members for a minute or two, I'd like to suggest that the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on Education grants of 75% would now lapse in view of the Bill that's been passed, and we can move on to the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fisher and the amendment thereto on which we are awaiting your ruling, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say in respect to the ruling that I find the motion is in order. I think there was a misunderstanding by everyone in the House, including myself, as to the exact meaning of the motion and I would rule it in order. Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, I was sitting here, I believe I said a month ago, and didn't say anything. At least I am going to take the opportunity at the closing of saying something now. I am really surprised and disappointed that such a resolution appears and it's all -- to my interpretation it reads as consultation with the farm organization. The farm organization have been functioning for many years and this government and other governments have received delegations and briefs and whatnots; they could have consulted the farm organization from time to time if they so wished. And now what has happened? They are going to consult the farm organization knowing very well what the answer will be, and then they are going to request the Federal Government, which we know very well what the answer will be as it has been in the press just recently announced. Therefore, it doesn't give me any choice to speak any length of time or to vote against this amendment, so I say that our group will vote in favour of this amendment and not to make any long speeches.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment as amended by the amendment. Are you ready for the question?

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, it would be an appropriate time now to speak on that question, but I am not going to speak on it. --No, that's not the one.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The main motion as amended by the amendment to the amendment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, and the further amendment to the amendment by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, the deck has been cleared now for Sunday sport and it would be an appropriate time to speak on physical education, but I am not going to do it. I think that the Minister of Education should implement the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Education on Physical Education, and I am sorry we are going to vote both against the amendment and the amendment because I don't think further study is needed on it and we want action on it. If the members really believe in the principle of physical education, they will support the main resolution. Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Amendment to the main motion by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Dow, Evans, Mrs. Forbes; Messrs. Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney.

NAYS: Messrs. Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Schreyer, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 37; Nays, 15.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The question before the House is the main motion as amended.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just before you put the motion I want it clearly understood as to why we voted against the amendment in connection with this resolution. The resolution itself calls for the implementation of the report made to the Legislature by the committee that was set up on Physical Fitness which was submitted to this Legislature on June 26th, 1958. Subsequent to that time we did receive a report of the Royal Commission on Education; in the Throne Speech the government announced its policy that it was going to undertake consideration of all of the recommendations of the final report of the Royal Commission Report on Education. The reason that we have opposed the amendment is because we feel that sufficient study has been given to this problem by the Commission that was set up and made its report on June 26th, 1958, and that by referring this matter again to the Minister of Education we are in effect going against the recommendation or the adoption shall I say of the Throne Speech which said that the government is taking under consideration these recommendations. For that reason, not because of the fact that we do not want implemented the recommendations of the Commission that reported on June 26th '58, we figure that the reference to the Minister of Education is redundant.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I want my honourable friend to follow me closely here. I'm not saying his argument is unintelligent, but I'm saying it is unintelligible, and I can't understand it.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I can understand that with my honourable friend.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I was just thinking, perhaps I should make this comment that members will not overlook the fact that the Royal Commission on Education made a number of recommendations respecting curriculum, all of which will have to receive very careful study and indeed on which many people are making recommendations now or at least studies and suggestions, and obviously it would not be wise to consider sort of in isolation the recommendations of the committee on physical recreation and education, because many of those recommendations must be carried out in the context of the curriculum of the school and which is a subject with which the Royal Commission Report dealt extensively and which will require very careful study.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, since we last discussed this resolution the Minimum Wage Board has brought down its recommendations, with which I disagree completely. I think that 66¢ is a completely unrealistic amount, but it demonstrates conclusively the validity of our resolution because obviously some of the members, certainly the labour members, could only have supported that proposal on the basis that it is impossible for any one province to get very much out of line with the rest. And this demonstrates as far as I'm concerned more than ever the need for action on a national scale. Now action on a national scale may be difficult but it's certainly not impossible. It's the way in which we got unemployment insurance; it's the way in which we've had improvement in health and welfare legislation, and it's the only way in which we can move to wipe out the inequities in wage rates between one region and another, between one province and another. And our resolution in my opinion is more justified today than it was even when we moved it in the light of what the Minimum Wage Board had recommended.

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

MR. PAULLEY: The yeas and nays, please, Mr. Speaker. Unless it's the same division.

MR. ROBLIN: I doubt that I'd be willing to agree to that. I think it might be a much different division.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest that my friends on the right should decide that. -- (Interjection) -- Not you; them.

MR. SPEAKER: Question before the House is the adjourned debate on the proposed

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.)... resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood which reads as follows: "Whereas the cost of living..."

A standing vote was taken, the result being;

YEAS: Messrs. Gray, Harris, Hawryluk, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Schreyer, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardings, Dow, Evans, Mrs. Forbes, Messrs. Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Molgat, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; Nays, 44.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I stood this for the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few brief comments on this resolution, and to use a time worn phrase, it's with mixed emotions that I do it. On the one hand I'm honoured because I drew only the fire of a crack Minister of the Crown in regard to this resolution, the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare; and on the other hand I'm a little disappointed because it seems as though the Private Member's resolutions have been placed at the back of the Order Paper now for some, it seems like two weeks to me, and it seems that it's sort of rushing things at this minute. However, I'll try to be brief.

The Honourable Minister reviewed my speech and he almost repeated word for word what I said in regard to giving credit to the Canadian Cancer Society and to the Manitoba Cancer Commission. He was sharp however to pick out a mistake that I made, and I thank him for it, because I had no intention of misrepresenting the facts. I said that there were some 20,568 new cases of cancer, when what I really wanted to say was there were 4,883. The figure that I used was the number of people seen at both clinics in the year 1958, not the number of new cases. I think he supported my contention that free treatment of cancer is possible for only those people who are indigent, and that people of modest means are certainly suffering as a result of the present situation. I notice in Time Magazine an article here where they're selling insurance for cancer similar to the insurance we had here for polio, and just briefly it says: "the reason for this popularity for this insurance is the belief that fear of the high costs of cancer care keep many victims from their doctors until the disease is too advanced for effective treatment." The Honourable Minister said that there were other diseases as insidious as cancer; and with that I agree. I think the Province of Saskatchewan realized this too although they have had there free cancer treatment for some 15 years. They have now embarked on a comprehensive prepaid medical scheme. And I would just like briefly to refer to an editorial in the Star Weekly of February 20th. It's a large editorial which says: "medical insurance within ten years". This is following the observation of the Honourable Minister in regard to other diseases as well as cancer being so insidious. It says that "Premier Douglas of Saskatchewan predicts that national medical insurance will be a fact by 1970 and only time can prove him right, but it certainly will be a public issue in the next few years." I'm not going to burden the House with all this but I'll pick out parts. It says "possibly so, Saskatchewan may trail blaze again. The CCF Government will introduce medical insurance if re-elected this year and hopes to have it operating by 1961. The government promises it will cost less in direct payments than the \$7 a month now paid by a Saskatchewan family man for private medical insurance." I would like the House to note this too. It says, "Saskatchewan Liberals say they may legislate medical insurance, but conditional on a post-election plebiscite and a government study to assure it is financially feasible." That sounds like my friends the Liberals. I would like to draw to the attention of the House that in June of this year an election will be fought and this is the basic issue in Saskatchewan, but not on post-election promises. Now I don't want to delay the House but I just wanted to get home the point that that editorial, written by a paper certainly not socialistically inclined, is a sign of the times. It says, "few Canadians are so rich that they can escape a haunting fear

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.).... that sickness or accidents might loose the landslide of medical bills atop of them, and no matter how thrifty most can't save enough to guarantee against all medical emergencies, or if they have a nest egg for old age put by, it can be wiped out in a month by sudden illness". I think that's the point that I wanted to stress, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion I would say that this issue could very well be the next big issue in Manitoba at the next provincial election, just as it will be in June in Saskatchewan this year.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I note that a number of the members have left all sides of the House. May I suggest that if it's agreeable to the Leaders of the other two parties we consider this on the same division as the last resolution, without the necessity of calling the members back. If there is any disagreement with them, then I would ask for the yeas and nays.

MR. ROBLIN: At this stage I am the last man to complain, but if a member isn't here I hesitate to see how we can have the same division on it. There is just nothing can be done about that because it would establish a precedent here which I am sure we'd regret.

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed resolution by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, whereas cancer continues to take a heavy toll of human lives in Manitoba. Are you ready for the question?

A standing vote was taken, the result being:

YEAS: Messrs. Gray, Harris, Hawryluk, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Schreyer, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Dow, Evans, Forbes, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Molgat, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; nays, 41.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I just interject before you call the next motion, if members would be kind enough to stay in their seats until we finish the order paper, we may be able to avoid some of these yeas and nays.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say that already one member has left the Chamber and another one has entered.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is my intention on the others that are standing in the names of my members just to simply have it recorded on division.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, the operative part of this resolution is that Manitoba study the factors involved in obtaining within its boundaries the mainland portion of Keewatin, including Boothia and Melville Peninsulas. We have, Sir, in the Honourable Member for Churchill, a quiet modest man, but he knows his north and perhaps he is 25 years ahead of our thinking. I hope, Sir, that this House will not make the same mistake that the British Government did in 1842 when, as historians say, it did not bother seeking to obtain for Canadian territory the area now comprising the State of Maine. In 1908, Sir Rodmond Roblin and his associates and other businessmen in Manitoba had the foresight to get territory added to this province, and as a result of it, we now have a large and effective seaport; The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting mine; International Nickel at Thompson Lake, the largest known nickel deposit in the world I believe; Lynne Lake; Grand Rapids and several other resorts. Sir, I am informed that the Kazan River running into Baker Lake has falls in excess of those of Niagara. There is the Maguse River, and if we have not the foresight to see that this proposition has possibilities and probabilities, then I think we are devoid of imagination. It should always be borne in mind that southern Manitoba will reap a great benefit of this most productive land which is very rich in mineral resources and in other resources.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this on behalf of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on the Fair Wage Act, we feel that mechanics are worthy of the same rate of return for their labour irrespective of where they reside or work. I thank you.

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

MR. PAULLEY: On division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On division. Adjourned debate on the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this resolution because it duplicates organization at present supplied by National Housing. I realize fully -- I think we all do realize fully, the need and great need for low cost and low rental housing. If one studies the housing and the planning involved in such housing, one starts and finishes in planning. Therefore, I contend that the authorities control this planning and that is particularly true today, Mr. Chairman, when we have a Metropolitan Planning Board and also a provisional planning board. I cannot support this resolution.

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

MR. PAULLEY: On division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On division. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and the resolution thereto standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin, and further amendment by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make exactly one sentence in length. I would like to say that as far as we're concerned we accept the amendment and we hope that the ideas put forth in the resolution will be also put forward by this committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Main motion as amended.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster, and the resolution in amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Leader of my group.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two in connection with this resolution. First of all I thought that it was out of order. However, you, Sir, ruled otherwise. The recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education suggests that the present day school in respect of the deaf children in particular, of the Province of Manitoba be closed and that all deaf children in the Province of Manitoba go to the Province of Saskatchewan. Further to that it's the same comment that I had in respect of the resolution on physical fitness, that in the terms of the Speech from the Throne we had agreed, or at least it was contained in the Speech from the Throne that "My government," if I recall the words correctly, "My government is giving consideration to all of the recommendations of the final Royal Commission on Education and will in due course make its views known." In this it is taking from the commitment of the Speech from the Throne "whereas all of my Ministers would take this under consideration," placing the responsibility in the hands of that of the Minister of Education. I think it is contrary to the Throne Speech; I object to it and object in any case to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education which suggests that we should close our day school here in the Province of Manitoba. I think that rather than closing the facilities that we have that the Province of Manitoba should be forward-looking and attempting to have within the province a residential school in respect of the deaf children of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the Winnipeg League for the Hard of Hearing to present a petition in respect of this resolution signed by 202 people. The petition reads, "Winnipeg League for the Hard of Hearing, Winnipeg,

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.)...Manitoba. February 25th, 1960. Because we know the handicap of deafness and because we do not think that deaf children should be sent to a school far from home thereby depriving them of the comfort of their own home and families, we the members of the Winnipeg League for the Hard of Hearing would petition the Government of Manitoba to keep the present School for Deaf Children operating and that it be built up to take care of our increasing number of deaf children."

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief, although you still owe me three minutes on my budget speech which I have not delivered. At the outset I would like to suggest to the powers that be that in the future something should be done to take care of the private member's resolutions which are usually introduced very early in the session and not leave them for the last dying moments of the session. I think perhaps--I realize that the members are impatient, are anxious to close and I don't think that my words or anybody else's on any other resolution will penetrate in the hearts of the honourable members here; and I also realize that whatever I am going to say is going to be a voice in the wilderness. But the resolution, covers only four lines; "Therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should give consideration to the advisability of expanding educational facilities for the deaf, blind, crippled and retarded children of the Province of Manitoba." It doesn't say a single word that they are not taking care of it in some way or the other. It just asks for the advisability for study on the part of the education, on the part of the Health Department, a study what best can be done for them.

The Honourable Member from Osborne made an amendment, which in my opinion, is just one of these amendments which I have listened to here for very many years; an amendment to kill the original resolution irrespective of the wording. Now why is an amendment necessary here? All you could have done is vote down the resolution. But there is an amendment here that refers to the Education Commission, which is not an amendment at all -- you are either for it or against it. And by the way the Honourable Member from Osborne made a very classic assertion at the beginning of his speech. He said "Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity" --no-- he said "It seems to me that once again the Honourable Member from Inkster has indicated to us that his heart is bigger than his head." Well, I don't know what he meant by it but I just want to assure him -- and he ought to know, he's a doctor, and he knows anatomy -- that the brains of a human being do not require a deluxe suite in the human head. Am I right doctor? So, I think perhaps that in spite of my age --(Interjection)-- over 51 - in spite of my age I think that perhaps my head is still functioning. As a matter of fact, I am not making this statement seriously, but I did not need to put on a chef's hat to make my head bigger.

However, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is very very important. I have had prepared more evidence to support my original motion and I have destroyed it just three minutes ago, because I felt that this is not the time to make an appeal to the members as this is not the time they will listen to it. But I do appeal to the government, or to the front benches, that irrespective of whether this resolution is carried or not, please, give this matter consideration. I have mentioned figures taken out from the reports of the Education Committee and the Health Committee, but I understand from the Honourable Member from Osborne that I was entirely wrong; there are many more, there are 18,000 children coming under this tragic situation; and let's not forget that these 18,000 children, if the figures are right, have 18,000 mothers and have 18,000 fathers and they have friends; and their tragic situation I have already described in introducing this resolution. So I do not think that this resolution will now carry, but I do want to say emphatically, in my own humble opinion, that this amendment was for the purpose of killing the bill and not for the purpose of referring--otherwise this resolution could be accepted. I am only asking for consideration, and if the Minister feels consideration could be given under the report of the Royal Commission on Education then what harm does it do to accept the resolution. I think it will be a great comfort to many people in this province -- and as outlined by the Honourable Member from Selkirk now with a petition that he has received -- that the original resolution be carried, the amendment be defeated and then the government can carry out, or the Department can carry out in any way they feel, either under the Royal Commission Report or on their own. So I do appeal that if in your wisdom or otherwise you decided to defeat this resolution please take into consideration

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....and put on your desk the defeated resolution.

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....

MR. PAULLEY: What did you say, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: What did I say?

MR. ROBLIN: I heard very clearly that you said the ayes had it; and I think you're right.

MR. PAULLEY: The ayes and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment of the Honourable Member for Osborne to the main motion, which reads as follows "....."

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

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

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanehak, Wagner, Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 33; nays, 21.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The main motion as amended. Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I realize I'm practically taking my life in my hands to rise at this time to make a statement, but the subject is of sufficient importance that I think we should say something of it. I am opposed to the resolution because it would take the responsibility for proper mesh size from the fishermen and this, I feel sure, would be wrong in principle. Now I brought along a Selkirk Net Gauge and a hunk of web with which I was going to show the committee why it would not only be wrong in principle but almost impossible in practice, but I'm not going to go through the speech that I had prepared to substantiate this. Rather than just knock it on the head and throw it out though I was going to propose an amendment, and I'll read you the substance of the amendment: Whereas present regulations do not effectively discourage the objectionable practice of taking fish before they reach proper maturity or proper market size, therefore be it resolved that the government give consideration to the advisability of amending the fishing regulations to include the principle of regulating the smallest size of fish which may be removed or marketed from the Lakes of Manitoba. I won't move this amendment. This is the basic principle behind the fishing regulations as they are now, and if this practice could be put into effect, it would enlarge the field of regulation and hence of protection to the fishing industry. I would ask everyone then to merely vote against this resolution because it doesn't offer anything really new.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised and disappointed at the attitude my honourable friend has taken in this regard. I thought I had made it clear that this was in no way an attempt to get down to a smaller mesh size or anything of the sort, or to remove responsibility. This is strictly a question of protection of the fishermen. My honourable friend has some net there. I've done that many times in fish sheds on the shores of Lake Manitoba; and you'll take your Selkirk Gauge, check those meshes, you'll find that within the same mesh you have variations as you go down, and that once you get out in the lake this same thing will occur when you measure your nets. This is a very difficult problem. I know it's tough to do, but the present situation is that the fishermen has no protection. I'm not trying to remove some responsibility from him. I've no desire to see the fishermen with small nets, but as it is right now, I feel that he has no means of protecting himself and this is all I'm asking in this resolution. I'm afraid that my honourable friend has misunderstood

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.)....the point of the resolution. I think that this has definite merit. It's not easy to do, but I think that the government should investigate this to see if a solution can be found, and I would ask that the members support this resolution.

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

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

MR. CAMPBELL: We would be prepared to accept the same division if everyone else is.

MR. PAULLEY: We accept the same division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: .....the same case here, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: I don't think that the time is opportune to introduce this resolution and so I would beg, and I don't think I'll have to beg too hard, beg the indulgence of this House to withdraw the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to begin debate. I would ask leave to withdraw this resolution, and I give notice it'll be the first one I submit next session.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution withdrawn. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, after such a good example has been set for me it looks as if I should follow it. You know "Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned" but a politician with an unspoke speech comes pretty close to it, and I've got an unspoke speech here but I daresay that I'll find another opportunity to deliver this because it's an important matter on which there's been some publicity, not all of which is correct, and which I look for an opportunity sometime to clear up. But in view of the present circumstances I also will join my honourable friends in asking permission to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution withdrawn --Agreed.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Mr. SPEAKER addressed His Honour in the following words:

May it please Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly at its present session passed several Bills which in the name of the Assembly I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. CLERK:

- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Bill No. 2.  | An Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act.  |
| Bill No. 3.  | An Act to correct Certain Typographical Errors in the Statutes.  |
| Bill No. 4.  | An Act to amend The Pollution of Waters Prevention Act.  |
| Bill No. 5.  | An Act to amend The Insurance Act (1).   |
| Bill No. 6.  | An Act to amend The Insurance Act (2).   |
| Bill No. 7.  | An Act to amend The Motive Fuel Users Tax Act.   |
| Bill No. 8.  | An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Manitoba Health Service".                                       |
| Bill No. 9.  | An Act to amend The Greater Winnipeg Water District Act.   |
| Bill No. 10. | An Act to amend The Greater Winnipeg Transit Act.  |
| Bill No. 11. | An Act to amend The Portage la Prairie Charter.  |
| Bill No. 12. | An Act to repeal the Acts of Incorporation of Certain Corporations.                                    |
| Bill No. 13. | An Act respecting The Arborg Memorial Medical Nursing Unit<br>District No. 36.                         |
| Bill No. 14. | An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act.  |
| Bill No. 15. | An Act to amend The Judgments Act.   |
| Bill No. 16. | An Act to amend The Registry Act.  |
| Bill No. 17. | An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act.  |
| Bill No. 18. | An Act to amend The Vacations with Pay Act and to amend An Act to<br>amend The Vacations with Pay Act. |



- Bill No. 19. An Act to amend The Wages Recovery Act.
- Bill No. 20. An Act to amend The Interpretation Act.
- Bill No. 21. An Act to amend The Apprenticeship Act.
- Bill No. 22. An Act to amend The Loans Act.
- Bill No. 23. An Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro-Electric Development Act.
- Bill No. 24. An Act to amend The Manitoba Power Commission Act.
- Bill No. 25. An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.
- Bill No. 26. An Act to amend The St. James Charter (1).
- Bill No. 27. An Act to amend The Manitoba Evidence Act.
- Bill No. 42. An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "St. Charles Country Club".
- Bill No. 43. An Act to amend The Election Act.
- Bill No. 44. An Act to amend The Regulations Act.
- Bill No. 45. An Act to amend The Well Drilling Act.
- Bill No. 46. An Act to amend The Public Printing Act.
- Bill No. 47. An Act to amend The Attorney-General's Act.
- Bill No. 48. An Act to prevent Discrimination against any Person with respect to the Provision of Accommodation, by reason of Race, Religion, religious Creed, Colour, Ancestry, ethnic or national Origin.
- Bill No. 49. An Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act.
- Bill No. 50. An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act.
- Bill No. 52. An Act respecting The Glenboro Medical Nursing Unit District No. 16B.
- Bill No. 53. An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (1).
- Bill No. 54. An Act to amend The St. James Charter (2).
- Bill No. 55. An Act to amend An Act respecting the Rural Municipalities of Lakeview and Westbourne.
- Bill No. 56. An Act to amend The Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District Act.
- Bill No. 57. An Act to amend The Watershed Conservation Districts Act.
- Bill No. 58. An Act to amend The Mechanics' Liens Act.
- Bill No. 59. An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.
- Bill No. 60. An Act to incorporate The Manitoba Federation of Agriculture.
- Bill No. 61. An Act to incorporate The Corporation of the Synod of Manitoba of The Presbyterian Church in Canada.
- Bill No. 62. An Act to establish The Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg and to provide for the Exercise by the Corporation of Certain Powers and Authority.
- Bill No. 63. An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.
- Bill No. 64. An Act to amend The Health Services Act.
- Bill No. 65. An Act to amend The Law Society Act.
- Bill No. 66. An Act to provide for the Education of Psychiatric Nurses.
- Bill No. 67. An Act to incorporate Elmhurst Golf & Country Club.
- Bill No. 68. An Act to amend The Taxicab Act.
- Bill No. 69. An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act.
- Bill No. 70. An Act to incorporate Ste. Rose General Hospital.
- Bill No. 71. An Act to incorporate St. Boniface General Hospital.
- Bill No. 72. An Act to Incorporate St. Boniface Sanatorium.
- Bill No. 73. An Act to incorporate Tache Hospital for Chronic and Geriatric Patients.
- Bill No. 74. An Act to incorporate Residence Ste. Therese Home for the Aged.
- Bill No. 76. An Act to amend The Hospitals Act.
- Bill No. 77. An Act to amend The Hospital Services Insurance Act.
- Bill No. 78. An Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act and The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1959.
- Bill No. 79. An Act respecting the Trust Fund of the Forty-fifth Battalion of Canadian Expeditionary Forces.
- Bill No. 81. An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.
- Bill No. 82. An Act to amend The Dental Association Act.
- Bill No. 84. An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "The Winnipeg Canoe Club".
- Bill No. 86. An Act respecting The Psychiatric Nurses Association of Manitoba.

- Bill No. 87. An Act to incorporate The Mennonite Educational Society of Manitoba.
- Bill No. 88. An Act to amend The Municipal Act.
- Bill No. 89. An Act respecting the Civil Service.
- Bill No. 90. An Act to amend The Soldiers' Taxation Relief Act.
- Bill No. 91. An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Sobelco Foundation.
- Bill No. 92. An Act to incorporate The Abram Arthur Kroeker Foundation.
- Bill No. 93. An Act to validate By-law No. 1422 of the Rural Municipality of North Kildonan.
- Bill No. 94. An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 18152, 18276 and 18311.
- Bill No. 95. An Act to validate By-law No. 4225 of the Rural Municipality of Fort Garry.
- Bill No. 96. An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the Winnipeg Board of Trade.
- Bill No. 97. An Act respecting the Town of Carman.
- Bill No. 98. An Act to provide for Certain Exceptions to the Lord's Day Act (Canada).
- Bill No. 99. An Act to amend The Education Department Act.
- Bill No. 100. An Act to amend The School District Debenture Interest Guarantee Act.
- Bill No. 101. An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2).
- Bill No. 102. An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act (2).
- Bill No. 103. An Act respecting the Provision of Planning Services to Municipalities and Agencies of the Government.
- Bill No. 104. An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act.
- Bill No. 105. An Act to amend The Teachers' Retirement Allowances Act.
- Bill No. 106. An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.
- Bill No. 107. An Act respecting Provincial Parks and Provincial Recreational Areas.
- Bill No. 108. An Act to validate By-law No. 19/59 of the Town of Swan River, By-law No. 1628 of the Rural Municipality of Swan River, By-law No. 127 of the Village of Benito and By-law No. 1349 of the Rural Municipality of Minitonas.
- Bill No. 109. An Act to amend The Brandon Charter.
- Bill No. 110. An Act to amend The Manitoba School Trustees' Association Act.
- Bill No. 111. An Act to amend The Town Planning Act.
- Bill No. 114. An Act to amend The Dower Act.
- Bill No. 115. An Act to amend The Limitations of Actions Act.
- Bill No. 116. An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.
- Bill No. 117. An Act to amend The Municipal Act (2).
- Bill No. 118. An Act to amend The Securities Act.
- Bill No. 119. An Act to provide for a Guarantee of the Payment of Moneys payable under Debentures issued by Certain Hospitals to secure Moneys Borrowed.
- Bill No. 120. An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (3).
- Bill No. 122. An Act to amend and interpret The Consolidated School District of Seven Oaks Consolidation Act.
- Bill No. 123. An Act to amend The Mines Act.
- Bill No. 124. An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act.
- Bill No. 125. An Act to amend The Ophthalmic Dispensers Act.
- Bill No. 126. An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2).
- Bill No. 129. An Act to amend The Treasury Act.
- Bill No. 131. An Act to authorize the Transfer of Land by the Rural Municipality of Fort Garry.
- Bill No. 132. An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.
- Bill No. 133. An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.
- Bill No. 134. An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.
- Bill No. 135. An Act to amend The Housing Act.
- Bill No. 136. An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Brandon College Incorporated".
- Bill No. 137. An Act to amend The Shops Regulation Act.
- Bill No. 138. An Act to amend The Loan Act 1959.

**MR. CLERK:** In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

**MR. SPEAKER:** We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills:

(No. 113) - An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1961.

(No. 121) - An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1960.

(No. 127) - An Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same (1).

(No. 128) - An Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same (2).

(No. 130) - An Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for the capital purposes of The Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board and to authorize the borrowing of the same.

**MR. CLERK:** His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these bills in Her Majesty's name.

**HON. ERRICK F. WILLIS (Lieutenant-Governor):** Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly, the work of the second session of the 26th Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the members for their faithful attention to their duties, including many hours devoted to the consideration of Bills and Estimates, both in the House and in the Committees. I convey to you my appreciation for your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our province. I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of the government. In relieving you now of your present duties and declaring the Second Session of the 26th Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence our province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health, the happiness, and the well-being of all our people.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly, it is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

INDEX TO VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, 1960

Introduction of New Members .....	5
<u>Speech from the Throne Debate:</u> Mr. Groves, Mr. Jeannotte, Mr. Campbell .....	6
<u>Resolution:</u> Rules (Mr. Lyon), Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Paulley .....	32
<u>Motion:</u> Election Act (Mr. Lyon), Mr. Paulley, Mr. Campbell .....	34
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> Nos. 43, 27, 14, 18, 45 .....	35
<u>Orders for Returns:</u> Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Dow .....	37
<u>Speech from The Throne Debate:</u> Mr. Paulley .....	38
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> Nos. 20, 3, 19, 49, 36 .....	49
<u>Speech from The Throne Debate:</u> Mr. Froese, Mr. Orlikow .....	50
<u>Bill No. 2</u> (Mr. Hutton) 2nd Reading: Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roberts .....	60
<u>Bill No. 4</u> (Mr. Johnson, Gimli) 2nd Reading: Mr. Campbell .....	62
<u>Bill No. 5</u> (Mr. Roblin) 2nd Reading: Mr. Campbell, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Gray .....	62
<u>Bill No. 6</u> (Mr. Roblin) 2nd Reading: Mr. Campbell .....	64
<u>Bill No. 8</u> (Mr. Johnson, Gimli) 2nd Reading .....	65
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> Nos. 52, 54, 15, 16, 50, 52, 17 .....	67
<u>Statement, re Television,</u> Mr. Carroll .....	69
<u>Motion, re Agricultural Credit Corporation,</u> Mr. Shoemaker .....	70
<u>Resolution, re School Construction Grants,</u> Mr. Dow, Mr. Schreyer .....	73
<u>Speech from The Throne Debate:</u> Mr. Peters, Mr. Stanes .....	76
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> Nos. 55, 56 .....	81
<u>Bill No. 3</u> (Mr. Lyon) 2nd Reading .....	86
<u>Throne Speech Debate:</u> Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Seaborn, Div. to Amend't to the Amend't ...	87
<u>Introduction of Bill, No. 57</u> .....	95
<u>Throne Speech Debate:</u> Mr. Martin, Mr. Hryhorczuk, Mr. Christianson, Mr. Dow, Mr. Desjardins, Mr. Weir, Mr. McLean, Mr. Hutton .....	123
<u>Motion, re Agricultural Credit</u> (Mr. Shoemaker) Mr. Smellie, Mr. Wagner .....	134
<u>Tabling of Reports, Questions</u> .....	141
<u>Motion re Agricultural Credit</u> (Mr. Shoemaker) Mr. Roberts .....	151
<u>Motion re Pensions Increase,</u> Mr. Gray .....	152
<u>Throne Speech:</u> Mr. Reid, Mr. Scarth, Mr. Tanchak, Mr. Roblin .....	154
<u>Statement re Fire at Kelsey,</u> Mr. Carroll .....	173
<u>Ruling, Mr. Speaker, Division on Ruling</u> .....	174
<u>Second Readings: Bills 17, 14, 15, 16, 21</u> .....	175
<u>Throne Speech:</u> Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Froese, Mr. Guttormson, Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Roberts, Division on Amendment .....	177
Mr. Gray, Mr. Hutton, Mrs. Forbes, Mr. Klym .....	197
<u>Bill No. 13,</u> (Mr. Groves) 2nd Reading .....	210
<u>Resolutions re School Construction</u> (Mr. Dow) Mr. Hamilton .....	212
<u>French Addresses:</u> Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Roberts .....	214
<u>Select Standing Committees, Report</u> .....	215
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> No. 58, re Mechanics Lien Act (Mr. Lyon) .....	216
<u>Resolution re Agricultural Credit</u> (Mr. Shoemaker) Mr. Alexander .....	219
<u>Resolution re School Construction</u> (Mr. Dow) Mr. Paulley .....	221
<u>Resolution re Pensions</u> (Mr. Gray) Mr. Cowan .....	223
<u>Resolution re Agricultural Support,</u> Mr. Wagner .....	225
<u>Resolution re School Room Grants,</u> Mr. Dow .....	228
<u>Bill No. 11</u> (Mr. Christianson) 2nd Reading .....	229
<u>Throne Speech Debate:</u> Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Harris, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Seaborn .....	229
<u>Motion re Education</u> (Mr. McLean) Mr. Campbell, Mr. Orlikow, Mr. McLean .....	238
<u>Bill No. 12</u> (Mr. Evans) 2nd Reading .....	240
<u>Throne Speech Debate:</u> Mr. Wright, Mr. Shoemaker, Mr. Johnson (Assiniboia), Mr. Cowan, Mr. Wagner, Mr. Bjornson, Mr. Carroll .....	243
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> No. 63 (Mr. Ridley), No. 64 (Mr. Johnson, Gimli) .....	269
<u>Second Readings: Bill Nos. 18, 19, 20, 27, 43, 45, 46</u> .....	269
<u>Throne Speech Debate:</u> Mr. Tanchak, Mr. McKellar, Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Shewman, Mr. Froese, Mr. Molgat, Mr. Guttormson, Mr. Lyon, Mr. Roberts, Division .....	271

<u>Introduction of Bills: Nos. 9, 65</u> .....	299
<u>Resolution re Discrimination Mr. Paulley, Mr. Gray, Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Lyon</u> .....	299
<u>Motion re Agricultural Credit, Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Hutton</u> .....	301
<u>Motion re School Construction: Mr. Paulley</u> .....	305
<u>Motion re Pensions (Mr. Gray) Mr. Wright</u> .....	307
<u>Motion re Pulpwood (Mr. Roberts)</u> .....	310
<u>Committee of Supply: Mr. Roblin, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Froese</u> .....	311
<u>Address in French, Mr. Molgat</u> .....	315
<u>Introduction of Bills Nos. 57, 49, 50</u> .....	318
<u>Committee of Supply: Debate on procedure</u> .....	320
<u>Bill 26 (Mr. Stanes) 2nd Reading</u> .....	326
<u>Bill 54 (Mr. Stanes) Bill No. 55 (Mr. Shoemaker) 2nd Readings</u> .....	327
<u>Motion re Agric. Credit (Mr. Shoemaker): Mr. Guttormson</u> .....	328
<u>Motion re Pensions (Mr. Grey): Mr. Reid</u> .....	328
<u>Motion re Agric. Support (Mr. Wagner): Mr. Strickland (amendment)</u> .....	329
<u>Motion re Schools (Mr. Dow): Mr. McLean</u> .....	331
<u>Introduction Bill 68, re Taxicab Act (Mr. Carroll)</u> .....	335
<u>Discussion re Points of Order</u> .....	339
<u>Committee of Supply: Legislation</u> .....	341
Executive Council .....	365
Libraries and Historical Research .....	377
Treasury .....	380
Provincial Secretary .....	390
<u>Introduction Bill 80</u> .....	397
<u>Committee of Supply: Provincial Secretary</u> .....	398
Education .....	459
<u>Introduction of Bills: Nos. 83, 62, 81</u> .....	489
<u>Motion re Agricultural Credit: Mr. Dow, Mr. Shoemaker, Division</u> .....	497
<u>Motion re School Construction: Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Orlikow</u> .....	500
<u>Motion re Pensions (Mr. Gray): Mr. Wagner</u> .....	503
<u>Motion re Agricultural Support: Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Guttormson</u> .....	505
<u>Motion re School Room Grants: Mr. Prefontaine</u> .....	510
<u>Second Reading: Bills 9 and 52</u> .....	513
<u>Committee of Supply: Education</u> .....	515
<u>Introduction of Bills: Nos. 88, 90, 89</u> .....	545
<u>Committee of Supply: Agriculture, Administration</u> .....	548
<u>Law Amendments Committee Report</u> .....	599
<u>Motion re School Room Grants: Mr. Strickland, Mr. Gray, Mr. Molgat, Mr. Stanes,     Mr. Lissaman, Mr. Scarth, Mr. Shoemaker, Mr. Wright, Mr. Hryhorczuk</u> .....	601
<u>Motion re Pulpwood: Mr. Alexander, amendment; Mr. Hryhorczuk</u> .....	608
<u>Motion re Teacher Grants: Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Alexander</u> .....	610
<u>Motion re Physical Fitness (Mr. Schreyer)</u> .....	616
<u>Motion re Minimum Wage (Mr. Peters)</u> .....	618
<u>Motion re Cancer (Mr. Wright)</u> .....	619
<u>Motion re Fair Wage Act (Mr. Harris), Mr. Schreyer</u> .....	621
<u>Bill 56 (Mr. Scarth) 2nd Reading</u> .....	623
<u>Committee of Supply: Agriculture</u> .....	625
<u>Private Bills Committee Report</u> .....	655
<u>Introduction Bills: Nos. 87, 32, 37, 38, 33, 31, 34, 28, 29, 36, 30, 35, 41, 40, 42, 60, 67, 71,     72, 73, 74, 70, 85, 91, 92, 86, 61, 84, 79</u> .....	656
<u>Privileges: Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Lyon, Mr. Speaker, et al</u> .....	657
<u>Third Reading: Bills 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 20, 27, 46, 52, 59</u> .....	661
<u>Bill 62 re Metro, 2nd Reading: Mr. Roblin</u> .....	663
<u>Committee of Supply: Agriculture, Livestock Branch</u> .....	669
<u>Introduction of Bill No. 10 (Mr. Stanes)</u> .....	677
<u>Committee of Supply: Agriculture</u> .....	678
<u>Introduction of Bills: Nos. 94, 96, 93</u> .....	729
<u>Resolution on Birth of Son to Her Majesty, the Queen</u> .....	729
<u>Committee of Supply: Agriculture</u> .....	734

<u>Introduction of Bills: Nos. 82 and 75</u> .....	757
<u>Brotherhood Week: Mr. Gray, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Paulley</u> .....	757
<u>Committee of Supply: Agriculture</u> .....	759
Attorney General .....	789
<u>Introduction Bill No. 95</u> .....	823
<u>Orders for Return</u> .....	825
<u>Adjourned Debate: re School Grants (Mr. Dow): Mr. Smellie</u> .....	825
Re Pensions (Mr. Gray): Mr. Froese (amendment) .....	826
Re Agriculture Support (Mr. Wagner): Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Prefontaine .....	828
Re School Room Grants (Mr. Dow): Mr. Desjardins .....	831
Re Pulpwood (Mr. Roberts) amendment (Mr. Alexander): Mr. Wagner .....	832
Re Teacher Grants (Mr. Tanchak): Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Paulley, Mr. McLean, Mr. Hryhorczuk .....	833
Re Physical Fitness (Mr. Schreyer): Mr. Cowan .....	838
Re Minimum Wage (Mr. Peters): Mr. Seaborn, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Schreyer ...	840
<u>Adjourned Debate: Re Cancer (Mr. Wright): Mr. Johnson (Gimli), Mr. Paulley</u> .....	851
<u>Motion re Compulsory Insurance (Mr. Paulley), Mr. Hillhouse</u> .....	855
<u>Adjourned Debate: Re Fair Wage (Mr. Harris): Mr. Christianson</u> .....	861
Re Housing (Mr. Orlikow) .....	863
Re Retaining Wall (Mr. Desjardins).....	866
Re Crippled Children (Mr. Gray).....	866
Re Fish Nets (Mr. Molgat), Mr. Hryhorczuk .....	869
<u>Bill No. 28 (Mr. Shewman): 2nd Reading: Mr. Campbell, Mr. Lissaman</u> .....	872
<u>Bill No. 85 (Mr. Groves)</u> .....	874
<u>Bill No. 62 re Metro, adjourned debate: Mr. Campbell</u> .....	881
<u>Bill No. 53 re Traffic Act, 2nd Reading: Mr. Carroll, Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Paulley,     Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Carroll</u> .....	884
<u>Bill No. 63 re Municipal Affairs, 2nd Reading: Mr. Ridley, Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Ridley</u> .....	888
<u>Bill No. 64 re Health Services Act, 2nd Reading: Mr. Johnson (Gimli)</u> .....	888
<u>Bill No. 66 re Psychiatric Nurses, 2nd Reading: Mr. Johnson (Gimli)</u> .....	889
<u>Bill No. 68 re Taxicab Act, 2nd Reading, Mr. Carroll</u> .....	890
<u>Committee of Supply: Attorney-General</u> .....	891
<u>Introduction of Bills: Nos. 97, 101, 51</u> .....	905
<u>Flood Forecasting Report, Mr. Hutton</u> .....	906
<u>Bill 62: Mr. Paulley, Mr. Desjardins</u> .....	906
<u>Committee of Supply: Attorney-General</u> .....	915
Health and Public Welfare .....	960
<u>Adjourned Debates: Re School Grants, Speaker's Ruling, Mr. Smellie, Mr. Paulley, .     Mr. Smellie, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Speaker</u> .....	971
Re Pensions (Mr. Gray) .....	972
Re School Rooms (Mr. Dow): Mr. Schreyer, Division .....	975
Re Pulpwood (Mr. Roberts): Mr. Bjornson, Mr. Roberts, Division .....	976
Re Teacher Grants (Mr. Tanchak): Mr. Froese .....	979
Re Minimum Wage (Mr. Peters): Mr. Groves .....	981
Re Keewatin, Mr. Ingebrigtsen .....	983
Re Motor Vehicle Insurance (Mr. Paulley): Mr. Wright, Mr. Scarth .....	985
Re Housing (Mr. Orlikow): Mr. Harris .....	990
Re Farm Buildings Exemption (Mr. Schreyer), Mr. Hillhouse .....	991
<u>Committee of Supply: Health and Public Welfare</u> .....	995
<u>Introduction of Bills: Nos. 98, 102</u> .....	1025
<u>Statement re T. V., Mr. Carroll</u> .....	1025
<u>Bill 62 re Metro (Mr. Roblin): Mr. Wright, Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Gray,     Mr. Froese, Mr. Roblin, Division</u> .....	1027
<u>Bill 48 re Discrimination (Mr. Lyon), Mr. Gray, Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Hawryluk,     Mr. Froese, Mr. Lyon</u> .....	1047
<u>Committee of Supply: Health and Public Welfare: Health Services</u> .....	1052
<u>Introduction of Bills: Nos. 104, 76, 105, 99, 103</u> .....	1083
<u>Adjourned Debates: Re Teacher Grants (Mr. Tanchak): Mrs. Forbes</u> .....	1086
Re Physical Fitness (Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Cowan), Mr. Desjardins, Mr. McLean	1088

Re Minimum Wage (Mr. Peters): Mr. Klym .....	1091
Re Keewatin (Mr. Ingebrigtsen): Mr. Martin, Mr. Orlikow .....	1094
Re Motor Vehicle Insurance (Mr. Paulley), Division .....	1099
Re Housing (Mr. Harris): Mr. Peters .....	1102
Re Retaining Wall (Mr. Desjardins): Mr. Corbett, Mr. Schreyer .....	1103
Re Crippled Children (Mr. Gray): Mr. Baizley, amendment .....	1105
<u>Bill 28</u> Hutterites, Mr. Shewman: Mr. Campbell, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Scarth, Mr. Lyon, Mr. Gray, Mr. Weir, Mr. Christianson, Mr. Cowan, Mr. Hryhorczuk..	1105
<u>Bill No. 60</u> re M.F.A. (Mr. Alexander): Mr. Paulley, Mr. Alexander .....	1121
<u>Bill No. 67</u> (Mr. Klym), Bill 70 (Mr. Molgat) .....	1122
<u>Bill 61</u> (Mr. Hillhouse) .....	1123
<u>Bill 75</u> re Dental Technicians (Mr. Christianson) Mr. Stanes, Mr. Paulley .....	1124
<u>Bill 65</u> re Law Society (Mr. Hryhorczuk), Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Stanes .....	1125
<u>Committee of Supply:</u> Health and Public Welfare, Welfare Division .....	1126
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> Nos. 107 re Parks (Mr. Witney) .....	1135
<u>Motion of Urgent Importance:</u> Mr. Prefontaine .....	1136
<u>Committee of Supply:</u> Health and Public Welfare, Welfare Division .....	1141
<u>Report:</u> Law Amendments (Mr. Lyon) .....	1163
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> Nos. 111, 109, 110, 108, 100 .....	1163
<u>Bill 58</u> re Mechanics' Liens (Mr. Lyon): 2nd Reading .....	1166
<u>Report:</u> Special Select Committee, re Rules: Mr. Lyon .....	1166
<u>Committee of Supply:</u> Health and Public Welfare .....	1167
<u>Mines and Natural Resources:</u> Administration .....	1171
<u>Adjourned Debate:</u> Re Deficiency Payments (Mr. Wagner): Mr. Hutton .....	1247
<u>Committee of Supply:</u> Mines and Natural Resources, Lands Branch .....	1250
<u>Public Utilities:</u> Administration .....	1269
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> No. 106, St. Boniface Charter (Mr. Desjardins) .....	1279
<u>Third Reading:</u> Bills 42, 60, 61, 67, 70 .....	1280
<u>Second Readings:</u> Bill 43, re Election Act (Mr. Lyon), Mr. Paulley, Mr. Roblin .....	1280
<u>Bill 77,</u> re Hospital Services Insurance Act (Mr. Johnson, Gimli) .....	1284
<u>Bill 78,</u> re Mineral Taxation (Mr. Witney) .....	1285
<u>Bill 81,</u> re Legislature Assembly (Mr. Roblin): Mr. Campbell: Division .....	1285
<u>Bill 88,</u> re Municipal Act (Mr. Ridley): Mr. Prefontaine .....	1285
<u>Bill 90,</u> re Soldiers' Taxation (Mr. Ridley) .....	1286
<u>Adjourned Debate,</u> re Rules (Mr. Lyon): Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Paulley, Division .....	1286
<u>Committee of Supply:</u> Public Utilities .....	1299
<u>Announcement re Education:</u> Mr. McLean .....	1351
<u>Committee of Supply:</u> Public Utilities .....	1352
<u>Public Works</u> .....	1373
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> Nos. 117, 114, 115, 118, 47, 116 .....	1379
<u>Committee of Supply:</u> Public Works .....	1380
<u>Committee of Supply:</u> Public Works .....	1405
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> No. 120, re School Act (Mr. McLean) .....	1445
<u>Second Readings:</u> Bill 51, re Margarine (Mr. Seaborn), Mr. Smellie, Mr. Tanchak, Mr. Johnson (Assiniboia), Mr. Wagner, Mr. Desjardins, Mr. Groves, Mr. Stanes, Mr. Scarth, Mr. Weir, Mr. Johnson (Gimli), Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Corbett, .....	1448
<u>Bill 82,</u> re Dental Association (Mr. Christianson), Mr. Paulley .....	1467
<u>Bill 83,</u> re School Act: Mr. Lyon, Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Speaker .....	1469
<u>Condolences:</u> Re George Milne, Francis Ferg, Q.C. ....	1471
<u>Committee of Supply:</u> Public Works .....	1473
<u>Municipal Affairs,</u> .....	1496
<u>Municipal Affairs</u> .....	1515
<u>Labour:</u> Administration .....	1516
<u>Industry and Commerce</u> .....	1545
<u>Committee Report:</u> Law Amendments (Mr. Lyon) .....	1579
<u>Introduction of Bills:</u> No. 122 (Mr. Wright) .....	1579

<u>Adjourned Debates: re Margarine (Mr. Seaborn): Mr. Froese, Mr. Gray, Mr.</u>	
Hryhorczuk, Mr. Baizley, Mr. Bjornson, Mr. Reid, .....	1581
<u>Bill 83 (Mr. Schreyer): Ruling by Mr. Speaker .....</u>	1590
<u>Bill 93 (Mr. Schreyer), Bill 80 (Mr. Orlikow) .....</u>	1590
<u>Bill 96 (Mr. Cowan) .....</u>	1593
<u>Bill 97 (Mr. Hamilton) .....</u>	1594
<u>Bill 98 (Mr. Baizley), Mr. Martin, Mr. Seaborn, Mr. Dow, Mr. Guttormson,</u>	
Mr. Pauley .....	1594
<u>Bill 95 (Mr. Shewman), Bill 106 (Mr. Desjardins), Bill 94 (Mr. Cowan), Mr. Gray,</u>	
Mr. Hillhouse .....	1603
<u>Bill 85 (Mr. Groves), Mr. Johnson, (Gimli), Mr. Christianson, Mr. Hillhouse, amend...</u>	1607
<u>Bills 39, 40, 30, 41, re Hutterites (not proceeded with) .....</u>	1613
<u>Bill 72 (Mr. Desjardins), Bill 74 (Mr. Prefontaine), Bill 91 (Mr. Cowan),</u>	
Bill 71 (Mr. Desjardins), Bill 73 (Mr. Desjardins), Bill 79 (Mr. Lissaman),	
Bill 84 (Mr. Groves), Bill 86 (Mr. Martin), Bill 92 (Mr. Cowan) .....	1613
<u>Re Pensions (Mr. Gray): Mr. Speaker's Ruling: Mr. Gray, Mr. Pauley, Mr.</u>	
Orlikow, Mr. Johnson (Gimli), Mr. Froese, Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Campbell,	
Mr. Roblin, Mr. Shoemaker, Mr. Cowan: Division .....	1614
<u>Re Municipal Act (Mr. Schreyer): Mr. Alexander, Amendment .....</u>	1622
<u>Re Flood Protection (Mr. Desjardins): Mr. Groves .....</u>	1623
<u>Re Crippled Children (Mr. Gray): Mr. Speaker's ruling: Division on ruling .....</u>	1624
<u>Committee of Supply: Concurrence in Report .....</u>	1625
<u>Committee Report: Law Amendments (Mr. Lyon) .....</u>	1637
<u>Introduction of Bills: Bill 124 (Mr. Hutton) .....</u>	1637
<u>Committee of Supply: .....</u>	1638
<u>Committee Report: Law Amendments (Mr. Lyon) .....</u>	1667
<u>Introduction of Bills: No. 123 (Mr. Witney) .....</u>	1667
<u>Committee of Supply: .....</u>	1667
<u>Budget Address, Mr. Roblin .....</u>	1710
<u>Committee Reports: Public Accounts (Mr. Scarth) .....</u>	1711
<u>Introduction of Bills: No. 125 (Mr. Scarth) .....</u>	1711
<u>Resolutions: Re Government Borrowing (Mr. Roblin) .....</u>	1711
Re Hydro Electric Borrowing (Mr. Roblin) .....	1712
Re Traffic Act Fund and Fees (Mr. Carroll) .....	1712
<u>Bill 51, re Margarine (Mr. Seaborn): Mr. Alexander, Mr. Cowan, Mr. Guttormson,</u>	
Mr. Hutton, Mr. Wright, Mr. Campbell, Mrs. Forbes, Mr. Pauley,	
Mr. Seaborn, Division .....	1715
<u>Bill 82, Re Dental Association (Mr. Christianson): Mr. Groves, Mr. Orlikow,</u>	
Mr. Lissaman, Mr. Stanes, Mr. Hawryluk, Mr. Shewman, Mr. Smellie,	
Mr. Christianson .....	1731
<u>Bill 80, re Labour Relations (Mr. Orlikow): Mr. Smellie .....</u>	1734
<u>Proposed Motion re Sitings: Mr. Roblin, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Pauley, .....</u>	1738
<u>Bill 43, re Election Act (Mr. Lyon): Mr. Campbell, Mr. Lyon, Mr. Pauley,</u>	
Mr. Hryhorczuk, Mr. Smellie, Mr. Campbell: Division .....	1739
<u>Bill 89, re Civil Service (Mr. Evans): Mr. Pauley, Mr. Evans .....</u>	1743
<u>Bill 99 and 100 re Education (Mr. McLean): Mr. Pauley, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Gray,</u>	
Mr. McLean .....	1743
<u>Bill 102 re Libraries (Mr. McLean) .....</u>	1744
<u>Bill 103 re Planning Service (Mr. Evans) .....</u>	1744
<u>Bill 104 re Crop Insurance (Mr. Hutton): Mr. Shoemaker, Mr. Hutton .....</u>	1744
<u>Bill 105 re Teachers' Retirement (Mr. McLean) .....</u>	1745
<u>Third Readings: Nos. 15, 50, 58, 77, 78, 81 read and passed .....</u>	1745
<u>Bill 62 re Metro: Mr. Desjardins, (am.), Mr. Roblin, Mr. Pauley, Mr. Prefontaine,</u>	
Mr. Tanchak, Mr. Groves, Mr. Froese, Mr. Schreyer, (am.), Mr. Roblin, Mr.	
Froese, (am.) Mr. Roblin (am.) Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Scarth,	
Mr. Pauley, Mr. Groves, Mr. Desjardins, (amend.), Mr. Froese (amend	
Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roblin (amend.), Mr. Froese (am.) Mr. Desjardins (am.)	
Mr. Campbell (am.), Mr. Campbell, Mr. Pauley, Mr. Prefontaine, Mr.	
Scarth, Mr. Froese, Mr. Schreyer .....	1745



Nos. 48, 96 .....	1761
<u>Committee Report: Law Amendments (Mr. Lyon)</u> .....	1763
<u>Introduction of Bills: No. 44 (Mr. Lyon): No. 131 (Mr. Christianson): No. 24</u> <u>(Mr. Roblin): No. 25 (Mr. Roblin): No. 132 (Mr. Johnson, Gimli)</u> .....	1763
<u>Committee of Supply, Budget: Mr. Campbell: (amendment)</u> .....	1766
<u>Bill 76, re Hospitals Act (Mr. Johnson, Gimli)</u> .....	1776
<u>Bills 22, 23 (Mr. Roblin): Bill 69 (Mr. Hutton)</u> .....	1777
<u>Bill 116, re Liquor Act (Mr. Lyon)</u> ... ..	1778
<u>Bill 118, re Securities Act (Mr. Carroll)</u> .....	1780
<u>Bill 112, re Predator Control (Mr. Hutton)</u> .....	1780
<u>Bill 89 and Amendment: Mr. Lyon, Mr. Groves, Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Paulley</u> .....	1780
<u>Bill 98, re Sunday Sports (Mr. Baizley): Mr. Desjardins, Mr. Johnson (Assiniboia),</u> <u>Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Hutton, Mr. Lyon</u> .....	1781
<u>Committee of Supply: Budget: Mr. Orlikow, Amendment</u> .....	1793
<u>Second Reading of Bills: Nos. 2, 14, 18, 19, 21, 49, 57, 89, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 106, 104</u> .	1800
<u>Bill 62, re Metro: Mr. Campbell, Mr. Desjardins, Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Froese,</u> <u>Mr. Paulley, Mr. Lyon, Division on Third Reading</u> .....	1801
<u>Bill 98, re Sunday Sports (Mr. Baizley): Mr. McLean, Mr. Hryhorczuk, Mr. Evans,</u> <u>Mr. Tanchak, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Froese, Mr. Baizley: Division on 2nd Reading</u> ...	1808
<u>Resolution, re Onus of Proof (Mr. Lyon), Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Paulley</u> .....	1815
<u>Bill 108, re Swan River (Mr. Corbett)</u> .....	1817
<u>Introduction of Bills: No. 129, re Treasury Act (Mr. Roblin)</u> .....	1819
<u>Committee Report: Private Bills (Mr. Smellie), Municipal Affairs, (Mr. Christianson)</u> .	1819
<u>Resolutions: re Fuel Tax (Mr. Roblin)</u> .....	1819
Re Superannuation (Mr. Evans) .....	1820
Re Hospital Borrowing (Mr. Roblin) .....	1821
<u>Second Readings: Bills 24, 25, 111, 115</u> .....	1822
<u>Bill 117 re Municipal Act (Mr. Ridley): Mr. Reid, Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Ridley</u> ....	1822
<u>Bills 101, 109, 85 re Denturists (Mr. Groves): Ruling by Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stanes,</u> <u>Mr. Paulley, Mr. Johnson (Gimli), Mr. Paulley, Mr. Johnson (Assiniboia),</u> <u>Mr. Seaborn, Mr. Gray, Mr. Scarth, Mr. Desjardins, Mr. Orlikow, Mrs.</u> <u>Forbes, Mr. Shewman, Mr. Molgat, Mr. Froese, Mr. Alexander, Mr.</u> <u>Johnson (Gimli), Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Lyon, Mr. Hawryluk, Mr. Groves,</u> <u>Mr. Hutton, Mr. Tanchak</u> .....	1823
<u>Introduction of Bills: No. 134, re Workmen's Compensation (Mr. Carroll)</u> .....	1847
<u>Third Reading of Bills: Nos. 26, 11, 54, 55, 63, 88, 90, 93, 95, 97, 10, 71, 72, 73</u> .....	1849
<u>Bill 79 re 45th Battalion: Mr. Cowan, Mr. Lissaman, Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Scarth,</u> <u>Mr. Smellie, Mr. Hryhorczuk, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Lissaman</u> .....	1849
<u>Bills 84, 86, 87, 91, 92, 22, 23, 24, 25</u> .....	1851
<u>Bill 85, re Denturists (Mr. Groves): Mr. Campbell, Mr. Martin, Divisions</u> .....	1852
<u>Adjourned Debate re Rules (Mr. Lyon): Mr. Roberts, Mr. Orlikow,</u> .....	1858
<u>Committee of Supply: Budget: Mr. Paulley, Mr. Scarth, Mr. Alexander</u> .....	1863
<u>Resolution re Brandon College (Mr. Lissaman)</u> .....	1867
<u>Committee Reports: Privileges and Elections Committee, Report</u> .....	1869
<u>Bill 43 re Election Act (Mr. Evans): Mr. Paulley (Amend.), Mr. Campbell,</u> <u>Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Lyon, Mr. Gray, Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Molgat,</u> <u>Mr. Hryhorczuk, Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Paulley, Mr. McLean, Mr. Desjardins,</u> <u>Mr. Froese: Division on amendment; Mr. Evans, Bill in Committee</u> .....	1869
<u>Law Amendments Committee (Mr. Lyon)</u> .....	1881
<u>Bill 7, re Fuel Users Tax (Mr. Roblin): Mr. Evans</u> .....	1882
<u>Adjourned Debate re Report on Rules (Mr. Lyon): Mr. Molgat, Mr. Hryhorczuk</u> ....	1882
<u>Budget Debate: Mr. Froese, Mr. Cowan</u> .....	1884
<u>Bill 122 re Seven Oaks S. D. (Mr. Wright)</u> .....	1888
<u>Adjourned Debate re Agricultural Support (Mr. Wagner): Mr. Paulley,</u> <u>Mr. McKellar (Amendment)</u> .....	1888
Re Teacher Grants (Mr. Tanchak): Mr. Tanchak, Division .....	1892
<u>Bill 137, re Shop Regulations (Mr. Smellie)</u> .....	1895
<u>Bill 138, re Loan Act (Mr. Roblin)</u> .....	1895
<u>Third Readings: Bills 43, 108, 118, 116</u> .....	1897

<u>Bill 119</u> , re Hospital Loans (Mr. Roblin), Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Paulley ....	1898
<u>Bill 107</u> (Mr. Witney); <u>Bill 114</u> (Mr. Lyon) .....	1899
<u>Bill 120</u> , re Public Schools Act (Mr. McLean) .....	1901
<u>Bill 123</u> , (Mr. Witney), <u>Bill 124</u> (Mr. Hutton), <u>Bill 126</u> , re Traffic Act (Mr. Carroll) Mr. Tanchak, Mr. Molgat, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Carroll .....	1903
<u>Bill 129</u> , re Treasury Act (Mr. Roblin) .....	1905
<u>Bill 132</u> , (Mr. Johnson), <u>Bill 134</u> (Mr. Carroll), <u>Bill 119</u> (Mr. McKellar), <u>Bill 125</u> (Mr. Scarth), <u>Bill 131</u> (Mr. Shewman), <u>Bill 136</u> (Mr. Lissaman) .....	1906
<u>Committee Reports: Law Amendments</u> .....	1907
<u>Bill 129</u> , re Treasury Act .....	1907
<u>Committee Report: Law Amendments</u> (Mr. Lyon) .....	1911
<u>Bill 135</u> , re Winnipeg Charter (Mr. Roblin) .....	1911
<u>Second Readings: Bill Nos. 47, 135, 137, 138</u> .....	1913
<u>Third Readings: Bill Nos. 7, 44, 69, 76, 101, 107, 109, 110, 111, 114, 115, 117,</u> <u>120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 131, 132, 134, 136, 47, 135, 137, 138</u> .....	1915
<u>Committee Report: Law Amendments</u> (Mr. Lyon) .....	1919
<u>Bill 133</u> , re Superannuation (Mr. Evans) 2nd Reading .....	1919
<u>Bill 98</u> , re Sunday Sports, 2nd Reading .....	1920
<u>Bill 82</u> , re Dental Association, 2nd Reading .....	1932
<u>Budget Debate: Mr. Roberts, Mr. Christianson, Mr. Molgat: Division</u> (amend.) .....	1942
<u>Adjourned Debate: re House Rules</u> (Mr. Lyon): Mr. Speaker (ruling), Mr. Molgat, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Roblin .....	1951
<u>Bill 98</u> re Sunday Sports (Mr. Baizley): Mr. Lyon, Mr. Guttormson, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Reid, Mr. Lyon, Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Evans, Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Seaborn, Mr. Desjardin, Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Cowan, Mr. Lissaman, Mr. Hutton, Mr. Scarth, Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Froese, Standing Vote on main Amendment .....	1955
<u>Amendments and Divisions</u> .....	1964
<u>Third Reading, Division</u> .....	1981
<u>Budget Debate: Mr. Roblin, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Molgat, Division</u> (am.) Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Hutton .....	1982
<u>Committee of Ways and Means</u> .....	1996
<u>Bills 113, 121, 127, 128</u> .....	1999
<u>Adjourned Debate: Re Education</u> (Mr. Dow) .....	2001
Re Agricultural Support (Mr. Wagner) .....	2001
Re Physical Education (Mr. Schreyer); Division .....	2001
Re Minimum Wage (Mr. Harris); Division .....	2003
Re Cancer (Mr. Wright); Division .....	2003
Re Keewatin (Mr. Ingebrigtsen) .....	2004
Re Fair Wage Act (Mr. Harris) .....	2005
Re Housing (Mr. Orlikow) .....	2005
Re Land Taxation (Mr. Schreyer) .....	2005
Re Crippled Children (Mr. Gray); Division .....	2005
Re Fishing (Mr. Molgat) .....	2007
<u>Royal Assent and Prorogation</u> .....	2008