

Name	Electoral Division	Address
ALEXANDER, Keith	Roblin	Roblin, Man.
BAIZLEY, Obie	Osborne	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
BJORNSON, Oscar F.	Lac du Bonnet	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
CAMPBELL, D. L.	Lakeside	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARROLL, Hon. J.B.	The Pas	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron	Portage la Prairie	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man.
CORBETT, A. H.	Swan River	Swan River, Man.
COWAN, James, Q.C.	Winnipeg Centre	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
DESJARDINS, Laurent	St. Boniface	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
DOW, E. I.	Turtle Mountain	Boissevain, Man.
EVANS, Hon. Gurney	Fort Rouge	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORBES, Mrs. Thelma	Cypress	Rathwell, Man.
FROESE, J. M.	Rhineland	Winkler, Man.
GRAY, Morris A.	Inkster	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
GROVES, Fred	St. Vital	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
GUTTORMSON, Elman	St. George	Lundar, Man.
HAMILTON, William Homer	Dufferin	Sperling, Man.
HARRIS, Lemuel	Logan	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
HARRISON, Hon. Abram W.	Rock Lake	Holmfild, Man.
HAWRYLUK, J. M.	Burrows	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C.	Selkirk	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C.	Ethelbert Plains	Ethelbert, Man.
HUTTON, Hon. George	Rockwood-Iberville	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
INGEBRIGTSON, J. E.	Churchill	Churchill, Man.
JEANNOTTE, J. E.	Rupertsland	Meadow Portage, Man.
JOHNSON, Hon. George	Gimli	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
JOHNSON, Geo. Wm.	Assiniboia	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
KLYM, Fred T.	Springfield	Beausejour, Man.
LISSAMAN, R. O.	Brandon	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C.	Fort Garry	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MARTIN, W. G.	St. Matthews	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
McKELLAR, M. E.	Souris-Lansdowne	Nesbitt, Man.
McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C.	Dauphin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MOLGAT, Gildas	Ste. Rose	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne	Pembina	Manitou, Man.
ORLIKOW, David	St. John's	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
PAULLEY, Russell	Radisson	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
PETERS, S.	Elmwood	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
PREFONTAINE, Edmond	Carillon	St. Pierre, Man.
REID, A. J.	Kildonan	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
ROBERTS, Stan	La Verendrye	Niverville, Man.
ROBLIN, Hon. Duff	Wolseley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SCARTH, W.B., Q.C.	River Heights	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
SCHREYER, E. R.	Brokenhead	Beausejour, Man.
SEABORN, Richard	Wellington	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
SHEWMAN, Harry P.	Morris	Morris, Man.
SHOEMAKER, Nelson	Gladstone	Neepawa, Man.
SMELLIE, Robert Gordon	Birtle-Russell	Russell, Man.
STANES, D. M.	St. James	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
STRICKLAND, B. P.	Hamiota	Hamiota, Man.
TANCHAK, John P.	Emerson	Ridgeville, Man.
THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C.	Virden	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WAGNER, Peter	Fisher	Fisher Branch, Man.
WATT, J. D.	Arthur	Reston, Man.
WEIR, Walter	Minnedosa	Minnedosa, Man.
WITNEY, Hon. Charles H.	Flin Flon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WRIGHT, Arthur E.	Seven Oaks	4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, February 23rd, 1961

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): ... (Recording trouble here)... Is the honourable minister through?

MR. EVANS: Yes, thank you very much.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you on the continued tenure of your office. I notice that you look hale and healthy and I hope that you enjoy your health for many years to come. I also wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder to the Speech from the Throne, congratulate them for their great effort and splendid presentation. I also wish to congratulate the youngest member, in office in this House and I hope that she enjoys working with the rest of us gentlemen. A special welcome to her because she also originally comes from Ridgeville, from my home town. I know some of her past history and therefore I mean it when I say, a special welcome to her.

The Throne Speech did not impress me too much and I hear out in the country going around -- I don't think it impressed the public very much either. It seemed too flat and not like in previous years very many different promises. We on this side are being accused by the opposite members of not being consistent. They say that in the first place we vote for the different projects that the government brings in and then later on we cry at the expenditure. I don't think that is right, I think that's absolutely wrong, and I think it's nonsense, complete nonsense to say so, because our sub-amendment or our amendment is quite plain. We say that the Conservative Government didn't live up to its promises; the Conservative Government did promise to improve services in the Province of Manitoba. I'm not going to say that some of those promises for services have not been improved, but at the same time the Conservative Government did promise that they'll do it, give better services to the people of Manitoba with in the same taxation -- not to increase the taxes, and that's what we say isn't right. Because the Conservative Government or the present government, did raise the taxes to an abnormal high. I voted, in the last estimates, I voted for the different projects that the government offered. I was happy to vote for them. I believed that the present government probably had some magic power by which they would be able to implement all their promises and give better services to the people of Manitoba within the same tax field. I have been sadly disappointed. True, there are some services improved; they gave us a little more, but nothing to the proportion according to the tax rise. (Interjection) That's right. Increased taxation; increased taxes in a different field. We are going to suffer. Our generation and not only our generation but many future generations will have to pay the burden of this tax and the burden of the Manitoba debt that's been incurred by the present government. Now where were the taxes increased. We definitely were promised, the people of the urban area, that if we accept the divisions, the divisions have been established -- but if we accept the divisions it will not cost the people any more money, and they believed them. Now they're finding it isn't true. That's why we objected, because the promises have been broken.

I doubt whether the honourable minister is right in what's he's saying, but I can say that the honourable minister was one of them in my area who scuttled the plan. He well remembers when I told him that I was for the divisions, but I believed in a certain amount of centralization, and I think it was the honourable minister right there that said that the government does not want to centralize. I really know what he meant, it was up to the trustees, but the people took him at his word and they thought it was no centralization. I didn't intend to speak about the schools at the present time, he brought it up. And now the people in my area, especially in the western end of my constituency, they have transportation, they have their own high schools, most of them are quite new, and in the recent hearing of the commission, boundaries commission, what happened? They said, why? I wanted them to accept the division and the last time I worked hard for it, and now they say why should we accept the division, we practically have all the same benefits as we would. We would accept the divisions if the government would have said you'd have to centralize and this is where you'd build the school, and I agree with the honourable member from Cypress who did make that statement, that the government or the boundary commission should have told the people where the high schools would have been situated. The people would have been willing to accept, but now to accept a division, that's

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . what they argue and they had a meeting at which I was not present, the meeting of twenty different school districts in the western end of that constituency and they decided that they haven't got much to gain, except the grants which they believe should be coming to them, except the grants. It will not improve their education, because the Minister of Education himself did say that we're not here to take away your present high schools. You can keep them at Ridgeville, you can keep them at Emerson or Dominion City, and they say why should we go into a division now when our education will not be improved, because most of them did believe that there should be a certain amount of centralization, and I do. But that's beside the point. What I'm trying to say is that taxes in divisions have increased. True, taxes in non-divisions they have increased some too, they have their own means of figuring they say that even staying out of divisions, their tax didn't go up as high as in some of the divisions. I'll not say all the divisions, because I realize that in some of the divisions taxes didn't soar, but in some they really soared.

I spoke to a reeve of one municipality, not my own, and I didn't ask him for any information. He says to me your lucky you're out, our taxes went up 70%. Whether it is true or not I do not know. But that's what he said. But that's one example where the present government did not fulfill its promise. Well maybe they didn't know, maybe they didn't know the enormity of it, maybe they were completely ignorant of what they were leading the people into, or deliberately misled them, I don't know; either one or the other. But it seems to me -- maybe I shouldn't say that, it was said in confidence -- but one of the Ministers at a meeting for some responsible man -- it wasn't a meeting it was a banquet -- one of the Ministers sitting opposite. And a friend of mine, a very good friend of mine asked him why didn't the divisions pan out as you have promised the people of Manitoba, and the answer was this: "We had no idea of the enormity of the cost of this project." And if anybody would like me to prove this at any time I'll be just too happy to prove it. So if you did not know the enormity of the cost of this project why push the people over into it. That's what I say. I say that it would have been better to tell the people we have given you something better, it is going to cost you more, are you willing to pay for it. And if they are willing, we'd accept it. If they're not willing, we wouldn't accept. It's the same thing if I went out to buy a car. If I wanted a six cylinder Ford I know I have to pay \$3,000 for it. If I want better service it will cost me a Cadillac, it probably will cost \$8,000 or \$9,000; but I know I'll get better service, and I'm willing to pay for it. I'm sure the people of Manitoba would have accepted the divisions in practically the whole Province of Manitoba if they were told the truth at the time it was being established. That was "off the cuff" I didn't expect to talk about the school divisions.

Now let's go on to the hospital premiums. That's another place where the taxes, and I call those taxes, because the premiums are taxes. A man is obliged to pay it into the treasury and it is another form of tax, I can even call it a direct tax because if the ratepayer-- call him a ratepayer, fails to pay the proper authority can take him to court and force him to pay, and if he doesn't pay his land taxes, his land may be sold for taxes. So this is compulsory, so it's another form of tax. In the past most of the people were quite happy with the way things existed-- hospital insurance. They paid \$2.00 or \$4.00 single or family. It wasn't too much of a hardship, but now to raise it 50%, to pay \$3.00 per month I'm talking, and for \$4.00 per month, I think it's very unfortunate that they have to do it. That's another example of raising of taxes. And you have to remember that we were supposed to have got all these services without any extra taxation. Now the members opposite keep telling us, "you criticize us, why don't you give us any constructive criticism." I don't think it's up to me to go ahead and set out a policy. You have a policy when the time comes. We have a policy now, and you'll hear about the policy, but I don't see anything -- the speeches that I've heard so far -- what do I hear? I don't hear any constructive criticism except one or two of the opposite members; but I hear an awful lot of constructive praise, flattery and that's about all we have to hear. We on this side have been told that we are dumb-bells, not exactly in the same words, but not too much intelligence. (Interjection) Here is what our group -- I have to say to this: we dumb-bells, we're accused that our Leader did not speak in this amendment to the Throne Speech; that's probably why we have no intelligence. But we dumbbells as we are, we know that our Leader could not speak on his own amendment -- he has already spoken, so at least we know that.

Now let's go to the other taxes in all fields, in all different departments. The fees, the

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.)....so-called fees which the government tries to tell us are not taxes. They're taxes regardless of what you call them, they're still taxes indirectly. And all the way up and down the line these fees have increased. Now, boasting so much about what has been done for the Province of Manitoba. I'm not going to say that nothing has been done, progress has been made, but it's quite natural that any government should make some progress during the two and a half years that they have been in office, but the cost has been enormous, I am not objecting to that, the cost has been enormous.

I am not going to say that it shouldn't cost anything --- but it wasn't done without any extra taxation. Some of the things haven't even been passed upon that were promised. What about all the different access roads to the different towns and villages in the Province of Manitoba? That was one of my resolutions. In my own constituency there isn't one new one that has been built yet, different accesses that will cost money. What about crop insurance? Two and a half years ago, the honourable friends across promised us crop insurance in the Province of Manitoba. True, we have got some crop insurance, a few little plots here and there, and as I hear, some of the people are not too happy about it, because even that cost a lot more than what they were prepared to pay. So there are many, many different projects that have just been scratched upon.

What about the Winnipeg Floodway that my honourable friends have been boasting so much about for the past two and a half years? Immediately we take office, we'll take action. There has been action taken, yes, a lot of talk, surveying this and that and delayment for two and a half years. Nothing has been done. (Interjection) That's why I know exactly -- but I say nothing in proportion to what is promised. Two and a half years. If the people of Winnipeg were threatened with a flood this spring, would it be the protection of the present government that would save them? No, it would be the protection of the previous government. Those dikes, whatever they are, some of you say that they are not good enough, but that's the only protection they will have this spring if we are threatened with a flood. I hope there is no flood, and I say that the people of Winnipeg are entitled to this protection. I say they have protection, but there isn't so much that has been done, just a lot of talk and survey and study and so on, two and a half years there was not enough time. It was promised the people of Manitoba, a floodway. These will cost money and I just shudder to think what will happen once actually the present government gets down to work and does some of this. Could the government now, in honesty, come up and tell the people, as they did in 1958, that we are going to give you these better services without any extra taxation as was said in the last..... I'm sure no, because that will be deliberately misleading the public, but that's what was done in 1958, and that's my objection. I don't think that the people of the Province of Manitoba should be misled and fooled in that manner.

All I can say: don't sink the Province of Manitoba in five years so badly that it'll take the Liberals twenty years to bail it out. (Interjection) Somebody says the "New Party" here. The new party, I didn't intend to speak on the new party -- let sleeping dogs lie -- I don't call myself a dog but I'm going to say that your party is doomed. You haven't got a party anymore. You yourselves admit that your party isn't good enough. You're rejecting the CCF now, you're going to hang onto something else, and there is the bridal suite already, but I'm afraid its occupancy will be very very short, very very short. I well remember when the Honourable Member from Assiniboia sat right here in this very chair where I am sitting, and how he counted the days of the friends to his left. He said, "you are doomed," he said "your days are counted." And so they were, and it proves now that it counted. I well remember; and I agree with him, the prophesy was there, and I'll continue that prophesy, that it won't be many many days now that the honeymoon of that marriage I predict and prophesy will be very very short, if it even comes about.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Emerson): You think it will be a wake instead of a wedding?

MR. TANCHAK: I think it'll be a wake is right, instead of a wedding.

MR. PETERS: At least it will be a lot of fun.

MR. TANCHAK: Well, if you like fun in politics you may have it. Now I'm going to ask my good friends opposite -- I still consider them my good friends -- to spend a little money in my own constituency, but you better -- I'm not finished -- I see the Minister laughing there.

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) Remember that I said a little, I'm not going to ask you to spend more money than the Liberals spent in 1958 or '59, but just about as much, but I'll warn you that you spend it prudently and wisely. That's what I would like you to do. But I would like you to spend some money in my own constituency. Morden-Sprague for instance, and I will remember when some of those who are presently Cabinet Ministers came into my constituency and they told the people of Emerson constituency: "it's a shame that you people, the pioneers of this Province of Manitoba have to live in conditions like these. Look at the roads you have. You can't even travel on them." Those roads, some of them have been improved, half by the former Liberal government in '57 and '58 and a little bit was done by the present government, for which I thank them. Where thanks are due I'm willing to admit it, but there's a lot of work to be done in the Morden-Sprague. The Morden-Sprague at the present time isn't even a highway, and it merits a highway. It's 100% government road; the construction should be completed and I hope to see it. The Honourable Minister of Public Works has had representations here, several this summer. I hope that the construction is finished. But it needs black surfacing too; a bituminous mat. (Interjection) I don't know. Some Minister said it that it may help if we vote conservative, but it shouldn't be that way if we live in a democracy. The #59 the construction was complete; appropriations appropriated by the former government and I'm happy to say that the #59 is complete except for the bituminous mat on it. The #12 has been completed last year; there was a section of road, about 12 miles, that didn't look -- didn't have time to check on public accounts report that we got today, and I think that was a good thing, but it also needs more black surfacing. Now what about the access road? Here's another thing that I have to remind another Minister. He happened to be at St. Jean. He's presently a Minister, and what did he have to say at St. Jean? Such a prosperous little town of St. Jean he says. It's a shame that you people haven't got a proper access road; it's just a bumpy humpy dumpy road that you have to travel on. Two and a half years the Minister said that. That road presently still is bumpy dumpy and humpy as it was before. Now where is that promise? There are other access roads, the access road to St. Joseph that should be constructed. St. Jean I mentioned; there's Ridgeville, my own hometown -- the survey has been made on that, I think it's even ready -- Wampum, Gardenton, Sprague, several access roads that should be built. . . .

Now there is another question I have to discuss here. It's the J4 roads. I'm sorry that the Minister of Public Works isn't here. The J-4 roads for those who have no disorganized areas in their constituency. A J-4 road is a main market road and that's what I'm concerned about. The J-4 roads in disorganized areas are constructed at 100% government expense, government cost, and they're maintained so, but when winter comes the government refuses to snowplow these roads, and that's what the people object to. Now I'm asking for some more money -- for the government to spend a little more money but spend it wisely again. Now truly I cannot blame the present government for this policy. This was the policy of the former government, maybe 10 or 15 years old, but again I say that if we are as progressive as we should be, there's some policies that it is time to change. At the time when this policy was introduced probably that was adequate, but now it isn't adequate. It was in the time of the horse, buggy and the sleigh and now everybody depends on wheels, travelling on wheels; therefore, that policy is definitely outdated, and the roads should be snowplowed in wintertime as well as being maintained in the summertime. The Honourable Minister had a delegation about it and he was invited to a meeting, to a mass meeting, because the people wanted to explain to him that they are even willing to pay a little levy, but have those roads snowplowed, and not beg -- every time the roads are drifted go out among the neighbors and beg fifty cents here, a dollar here and so on, to get the snowplow open. In case of an emergency you can't get out to the highway, and that policy definitely should be changed.

Now there is the drainage. Spend a little more money wisely. Not too much. Very little has been spent in my area as far as drainage. I hope that the Minister of Agriculture, who is also the Minister of Drainage as we call it, I hope he sees fit to take a look at that area. It's quite a problem.

Now let's come back to the Winnipeg Floodway. As I said before that was promised immediate action two and a half years, and I said there wasn't too much action. There was a lot of hurry and scurry and so on to pretend to the people that they're busy here and there, and

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.)....it was not only in the floodway that that's been done. Quite a few other areas have been done; a little patch of work done here, a little patch done here, a little bridge, a by-pass, say like the by-pass on the No. 1, take so many -- build a little bit at a time to give the people of Manitoba the impression that we are busy, busy, busy as bees, and actually -- probably in such a manner there's a waste of money. There's extravagance -- I don't agree with. But coming back to the floodway I say that the people of Winnipeg are entitled to some protection. They have a certain amount of protection here, not that this government is giving them, but the former, but they are entitled to certain form of protection. But I'll say this that right now I am opposing the construction of that floodway, and here is why I am opposing it. I say I am opposing it until the present government gets a guarantee that Ottawa will contribute at least 75% of the cost. I don't believe in that: "that we will go it alone." I don't think that statement was a statement that was well considered. Go it alone; I say that it would be provincial suicide for the Province of Manitoba to go it alone. They say that it might cost \$100 million. Who knows, it might go to 125, and I say that the Province of Manitoba cannot stand that. I don't know, maybe the Premier has some hidden money stashed away -- 100 million dollars somewhere in the corner -- I couldn't say, but I say that if the province is that rich which I doubt, there are other places we can spend our money, the provincial money, which would benefit the whole Province of Manitoba. We can make improved drainages all over Manitoba, or, something that I'd like to see, say for instance, supply the rural areas with water systems.

MR. LYON: More money!

MR. TANCHAK: More money, but I say if the Premier has \$100 million stashed away on the "go it alone". (Interjection) I don't know, the Minister isn't here. So that's a project that's worthwhile and it would be a project the Honourable the Minister -- the Attorney-General says more money. I don't think it's more money. We've got an example of the lights here. Hydro, that cost an awful lot of money, but it's revenue bearing that project. It brings money. You could borrow the money and the money comes back. Now if you did the same with this project, supplying water to different towns and villages it'll be revenue coming back the same as in Hydro. Some of these friends, maybe none of them sitting here thought that that was an impossible project when the Hydro plan first was talked about, but it's proved to be a great success and everybody is very happy about it, and I am sure that if water supply was installed in different towns it'll help the Province of Manitoba tremendously. It will definitely encourage industry and so on.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question?

MR. TANCHAK: Certainly. I'm not....

MR. HUTTON: I wonder if he thinks it would be a good idea to install a coin lock on the doors of all the bathrooms in Manitoba so we'd get our money back out of the program?

MR. TANCHAK: A coin lock? No, I can say this (Interjection) It would be pretty hard to save the present government even with that kind of a regulation, or that kind of a tax. It would probably be a new tax and my honourable friends are very famous for increasing taxes and inventing new taxes. But last year we had some kind of a water system here that was introduced and it seems to me at that time I said I wasn't going to speak too much on it because I was afraid of accidentally pulling the chain and the whole plan would go down the drain. And that's exactly what's happened. I don't think that there was too much done on that plan. I don't think it merited a mention in the Throne Speech; nothing of it is being said now probably because I think the other plan would be better. But if the Honourable the Minister would like to put a coin tax on the toilets, he's welcome to it -- maybe the toilets will be richer. I don't agree with him.

I haven't got too much more to say, I don't think. I'm not used to criticising too much and I don't like it personally, but sometimes when the other fellows across the line unreasonably criticize us you know even the mouse, if you step on it, it will fight back. I would just have to say one more little thing and that's regarding the feed mills. My name has been mentioned in the House here that I might have something more to say about it. I am not going to condemn the plan wholly, the plan is quite new and it may succeed -- it may be a good thing. I'm not saying it is. I know that some of the feed men, the hog men, the dairy men, the

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.)....poultry men are quite happy about it because now as was advertised immediately the feed mills will take advantage and not lower the price of commercial feed --- they have lowered the price of commercial feed, and considerably. Therefore those feed men are quite happy at the present time. Some of the farmers are quite happy too because they can get rid of their surplus grains. The present government at Ottawa couldn't help them too much in that. But, they are selling it at a lower price; they're sacrificing it. But here are three fears that I have. It may be that a thin edge will be cut into the policy of the Wheat Board, and it is quite possible that it may disrupt the Wheat Board and I know that the farmers of the prairie provinces have great confidence in the Wheat Board and I'm afraid that that may happen -- I'm not saying that it will. Another fear that I have about the feed mills is that it doesn't matter what business, even profession I'll say, I won't say that they're not ethical, but even professions -- there's some unscrupulous people that will take advantage of this kind of a concession, take advantage and actually invite competition in the sale of feeds. And that is definitely going to hurt the farmer. The poor farmer needs the money very badly, and to sell it he'll probably offer it at a lower price. And that may hurt the farmer and the economy of the whole province -- I say not only the single farmer.....price competition. Another thing that I'm afraid may happen, which mind you I'm willing to wait and see, take the wait attitude. Here's something that may happen. We know that the tendency now is in volume production, volume business, everything big volume. Naturally when the mills can buy their grain directly from the farmer, they will want to increase their volume. They'll be competing so the prices may be cheaper. But they may also build small mills in the vicinity or right in the consumption area. They may build those small mills, because I know that there are feelers sent out already even in my area, about three people -- three different companies -- what about building a feed mill. Well, let's presume that they did build a feed mill in our area but the volume wasn't there -- wasn't enough volume -- what is there to stop the same company from building a big piggery right beside -- a pig barn right beside the mill and thereby increase our over-production? Those are some of the fears that I have.

Now there's one more thing and probably I'll be laughed at for this also by some that like to say it's a ticklish subject and that is Health and Welfare. I'm not going to argue the point, the necessity of raising the premiums -- I think that will be explained later. But there is something that concerns me as far as our social allowances. We have a lot of men here, a lot of the members in this House and everywhere, everyone speaks up for the under-dog, the needy, and I agree with them. I'll stick with the needy too, but I think it's high time that somebody did stand up here and speak for the man who pays also. And I am sure that there isn't one in Manitoba that's not willing to pay when he sees that his neighbour or his friend or his colleague is suffering, but I do not think -- I think that some of our rules and regulations concerning welfare or the authorization of handing out of, I think that some of them are too lax. For many people it is quite easy, non-deserving people to get different kinds of allowances, and I hope that the proper authorities will look into that because I know several cases where people undeserving did receive and people who deserve probably and are more honest or ashamed don't receive any help from the present government. I always believe and I always say that let us help the needy but make sure that we don't help the greedy --- he doesn't need help. I think that's all I'll say at the present time. I thank you!

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Speaker would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. TANCHAK: Yes, but I don't grant you I'll answer it.

MR. WAGNER: You stated that J-4 roads are built 100% except snowplows. Do you mean gravel too in disorganized territories?

MR. TANCHAK: Yes, the gravel is out there -- also gravel. The J-4 roads are built and there's a certain amount of gravel, at least in my area they are gravel.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I believe we'll all agree that the most important element in the world is the human element and a power behind the elected representative is not their respective parties, any organization or any group of citizens, but the average Mr. and

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.)....Mrs. Citizen. I was highly amused this afternoon to hear the members from the government side expound the virtues of their government and how much they were doing for the people of Manitoba. A little piece in Tuesday's "Under the Dome" of February 21st hit the nail right on the head. "One of the things that keeps legislative proceedings interesting is that few things ever get finally settled", and that, Mr. Speaker, I believe is absolutely true. Because once we have finished the Throne Speech and jockeyed for position and publicity, what happens? We pass a few amendments to certain charters and bills for different organizations and so forth, but what about the legislation for the average citizen? My group has presented, year after year, legislation for minimum wages, assistance to old age pensioners, comprehensive health plan, housing and many others. What happens? The two old line parties -- and now they have an ally in the Honourable the Leader of the Social Credit Party who always vote against them -- and they're saying they're doing so much for the people of Manitoba. They are, Mr. Speaker, they're doing the people. I listened keenly to the Minister of Industry and Commerce this afternoon and I give him credit for all he expects to do. But I was wondering when he said that his department was instrumental in getting the supply line for the DEW line in Winnipeg, Sir, because I was active in the Civil Defence and I know how much assistance we got in that department from the Federal Government -- in fact they have now abolished it and established their own department, the Department of Emergency Measures Organization. And I'm quite sure that the Defence Department of the Government of the United States would not consult a rural and urban provincial government, such as we have in Manitoba, as to policy and location of their defence units. True I'm happy of the market it will bring to Manitoba and will help our economy. Sir, we might as well face the facts, you can't fool the people all the time and we must pass legislation to benefit our people regardless of who proposes it instead of loading them with taxes and no results.

I'll endeavour to briefly give you some constructive criticism to alleviate some of our present problems. The government claims we are in an economic crisis in Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not only in Manitoba but prevalent right across Canada, and I think one of the first things we should bring to the attention of the government is establishing a national fund from which provinces, cities and municipalities could borrow money at a very low interest rate or possibly just administrative costs. Because Sir, there must be thousands of local improvements in cities and municipalities that cannot be carried through on account of the high exorbitant interest rate. For example in the City of East Kildonan they're constructing an incinerator at the cost of \$350,000. Twenty-year period, the interest rates are over \$200,000 coming out of the taxpayers money. There must be many more projects throughout the country which would be instigated if interest rates were lower. Now, our provincial government thinks that unemployment is not too serious in Manitoba. There, Sir, I disagree with them, and I invite any member to take the opportunity like I do -- I visit the Unemployment Office about once a week -- there I find many of my constituents and many of my friends in line. And I ask them certain questions on how they're getting on and, Sir, at the present cost of living where a married man is getting \$33 a week when he has to meet payments on a home and two or three kids going to school, it's pretty tough. And I'm sure, Sir, that where our government says that the percentage is lower than anywhere else, well the average is about one person in ten is unemployed. And this, Sir, in my estimation is a national crisis or an emergency. At such other times of disaster or in time of war, money is very easily raised for such purposes, and I think the same could be done in the case of unemployment. I believe it is just as important and it would be an injection to our home market and also it would be putting our people back to work.

Now, Sir, in the field of education the department should be congratulated in taking some initiative steps. But I was wondering if so many new school rooms are needed in proportion to our population. This I actually do not know. But this I definitely do know, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of education is becoming exorbitant, not only to the people of Manitoba, but to Canada as a whole. I have here a tax statement for the City of East Kildonan, the total mill rate of 55.5 mills. Out of that 35.45 mills is for school purposes. In other words, Sir, of every tax dollar collected in the City of East Kildona, and I guess it's general right across the country, 65 cents is spent for school purposes. And I firmly believe that the financing of education should be reviewed and revised because as I have stated from the municipal tax

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.)....statement here, the municipal tax property taxes are no longer adequate or appropriate for the financial task of education, and the Federal Treasury should definitely bear the major share of this burden. The federal financial resources could be placed to the credit of the schools, but management and control would be left on a provincial and municipal basis. True, Sir, much study would have to be required in a program such as this, but I believe a basic educational program could be defined and established as a national program. The cost of this part of the education program would be met partly through provincial but mainly through federal taxation, which would be transferred to the province and then to local school boards. Thus, Sir, with the local districts with their basic cost of education met each community would be free with revenue derived from a reduced local tax in real estate to add to basic services and if so desired. I believe we have such an organization in Canada that could do the research and study on it. It would have to be an independent body naturally. Such an organization as the Canadian Education Association, and I think, Sir, that we would not only all benefit but the standard of education would be improved and the cost would be more equally distributed over the whole area.

Sir, I'm not going to say much more but I deem these three subjects one of the most important subjects on our curriculum: unemployment, financing of education, and our comprehensive health plan. And Mr. Speaker, with the old-time warning to the government, "Beware the ides of March."

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. KLYM: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak right now I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your very fine and fair performance as Speaker of this Assembly. May you enjoy many years in your position. I also wish to take this opportunity to extend hearty congratulations both to the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech. The two members did a very excellent job. I also must take this opportunity to welcome the charming Member for Pembina. I know she'll make a great contribution in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to deal at present with a subject which has been kicked around for quite awhile both on TV, radio and the newspapers, and I believe it has been mentioned twice in this assembly just lately, That is the subject of feed mill regulations. I know all those who have mentioned that particular subject were somewhat kicking it around. They're expressing every bit of gloom; however I do not share that gloom with them. I think that there's a bright side and silver lining somewhere to it. Let's give it a try. The Canadian Wheat Board as I understand it, Sir, has issued an order allowing western feed mills which is complete in agreement with the Wheat Board to buy, and 1960-'61 grain delivery permit holders to deliver to such mills, wheat, oats and barley outside of delivery quota regulations. The grain so required by the feed mills will be purchased at prices negotiated with the permit holders of course, and must be sold by the mills solely in a form of prepared feed stuff within the province in which the mill is situated. I think that that is very plain. There will be some control somewhere by the Wheat Board. Opposition has been strongly voiced both in western and eastern Canada against such an order. Those opposing think that this system would weaken and finally destroy the functions of the Canadian Wheat Board. I well know, and I think those who are opposing it well know, or should know, that such an extreme position cannot be justified. In the first place the authorities of the Canadian Wheat Board if they would see or fear any such terrific catastrophe would never have permitted this particular freedom to the feed mills. Then again the new order is not as far-reaching as at first glance it might appear. Prior to this order there were 182 feed mills in Western Canada; only 60 of these were bound by elevator contract to buy their grain requirements at Canadian Wheat Board prices, and to stay within the quota regulations. Then again 122 out of 182 mills were not bound by regulations and were free to buy their grain by direct negotiations with the farmers. Quotas on them were not strictly enforceable or observed. The order made it legal for them all to deal directly with the farmer if they so desired. By that order 60 mills have been released to be on equal grounds with the 122 mills as formerly. Could these 60 cause much harm? I wonder. There's nothing evidenced to prove that as a result of that order the quota regulations have been weakened in anyway in recent years. If that weakening of quota regulations as stated by some few people was going to undermine the quota system, some indications would have been quite apparent by now.

(Mr. Klym, cont'd.)....After all 122 mills out of 182 have been added for several years. The mills I have been given to understand handle an estimated amount of some 4 to 7 million bushels of grain annually. That in anyone's opinion should be evidence enough that that amount is far too small in relation to the amount of grain that Western Canada produced annually in order to have an undermining effect. Furthermore, farmers with surplus grain over available quotas at country elevators have always had the opportunity and the right to sell such grain at negotiate prices outside the quota regulations either to stock feeders and directly through intermediaries such as car, machinery companies and so forth. These amounts we can readily assume as far greater than those handled by the feed mills. The Canadian Wheat Board on that account was faced with a difficult situation in order to determine what was just and what was unjust. The Canadian Wheat Board recognized the discriminatory features of its regulations and decided to try the plan outlined in the order until the end of 1961 crop year. And, we all know, the 1961 crop year ends on the 31st of July next. In the meantime, the Board will have a record of what the feed mills have been doing. If at the end of 1961 crop year it is evidenced that the new regulations are in any way dangerous they can then be rescinded. Therefore I see no danger of any type. Even if this becomes necessary, the Board will be in no worse position with regard to quota enforcement than it was prior to issuing the order. Again, I have been given to understand that feed mills are largely interested in wheat which grades No. 5 or thereabouts. Not much of this I know is found in a country.

MR. WAGNER: Would the honourable member permit a question? Would the feed mill buyer buy No. 2 wheat for No. 5 grade?

MR. KLYM; Not necessarily. It will be up to the farmer to negotiate and I don't think that any farmer would be anxious to give his wheat away. If it's a better grade he'll expect a better price. I hope he would.

MR. WAGNER: Wouldn't it decrease the prices?

MR. KLYM: I do not think so. As I said awhile ago, Sir, that the prices would not be decreased unless a farmer probably -- one farmer out of a thousand will want to probably undersell himself by a nickel. I know that criticism is always being thrown at the government, at the Wheat Board and everybody else. However, I believe and I welcome criticism any time, but I welcome only constructive criticism. All those criticizing have never given anything constructive. What is the alternative?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I guess that probably one of the most hackneyed phrases in this Legislature is the old one that says that "I really didn't intend to speak tonight" -- and that's my alibi. Now there are a few other hackneyed phrases that we've heard in the past, indeed even in this legislature. There was the one "follow John", you remember that one you don't hear it so much now since John's going the other way. And then there was the other one, "Why didn't you do it when" and they can't say that to me because I never had the privilege of sitting opposite here. (Interjection) Well I didn't say that I would because I'm getting on you know. And then there's another one, "Well you voted for it and that really doesn't entitle you to criticize." Now, Mr. Speaker, I take objection to that.

What really has prompted me to get up here now, Mr. Speaker, is I didn't realize until a few moments ago how close we are to having the members opposite vote for our amendment. Practically every member of the government that spoke this afternoon -- I should refer to them Mr. Speaker, as honourable members, excuse me -- they have admitted to a part of the amendment. That's the one that concerns the drastically increased provincial debt. Now I don't know whether they've agreed to drastically because they haven't defined it, but they have agreed that the provincial debt has increased because they went to great lengths to tell us why it did increase. They said it increased because it was necessary to fulfill their promises. Now they, I think have agreed also that the municipal debt has increased. I think they agreed to that and therefore all that's left for us to do is convince them that they have some unfilled promises. The wording used, Mr. Speaker, "many unfilled promises," so really what we have to do is to determine how many that many is and then we'll add them up, and if we reach a certain total we'll expect them to vote for the amendment, so it would help a little bit, Mr. Speaker, if they would tell me now how many many is, so that I could then start listing a few more here or get some assistance from some of my friends. So, Mr. Speaker, they have

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) agreed too, I believe, that the educational program has resulted in a tax increase. I know they don't like to admit that. Pardon me a moment, my ammunition has fallen on the floor here. Neepawa incidentally, Mr. Speaker, is the only town in the province that has a bi-weekly newspaper, and it is notable for many other things; on at least three occasions we got the shield for the most beautiful town in the province, but what I would like to show you here now, Mr. Speaker, is two issues of the Neepawa Press, one dated Tuesday, February 7th, and one dated Tuesday, February 10th, that is they are just three days apart. (Interjection) Pardon me. Friday, February 10th. When we get working in here we just forget what time of the day it is , what time of the year it is, or what day it is. Tuesday, February 7th, Friday, February 10th. Now, Tuesday, February 7th says, and I quote: Town finances in good shape at year end." I think they can all read that, Mr. Speaker. Three days later what does it say? "Tax increase for Neepawa eminent and why? Four and a half mill hike for education likely." Right there, that's why; that is the finances were in excellent shape until they got their school budget and then they were in terrible shape and we need a 4 1/2 mill increase. Now (Interjection) Well 4 1/2 is likely, it says, it may be more than that.

Now I know that the Honourable the Minister of Education does not like to admit to ever having said that this new educational program would reduce municipal taxation, and I don't suppose he'll ask me to prove it now that he ever did say it, and I can't say that he prepared this bit of propaganda that was put out at election time, but it says here that every Conservative candidate has endorsed it, and one under the heading, "The Record of the Roblin Government", it says as regard education,"a new program to provide equal educational opportunities for every child in Manitoba, free text books for every child to Grade XII, 6 million dollars more appropriated by the new Roblin Government for education, and an effort to equalize education cost in the province, to lighten the load of the municipal taxpayer." Well, I don't know how it was in the other school divisions but I know it's going to cost me about another--if this is correct, because one mill to me means about \$30.00 so it looks like I'm going to have to pay about another 150 bucks in 1961, and I don't call that lightening the load. (Interjection) That's right. Now I don't think most, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that Professor Parkinson -- and most of you know who he is -- I don't think for a minute, I don't really think that he was thinking about this government when he made the statement that the only economy that was made in government was in. I really don't think he did, but he did warn us that the increased cost of government, or the cost of government, that is the three levels -- we've got about six levels now -- he was talking about three, the Federal, the Provincial and the Municipal, has risen from 10% to 35% in one generation. Now I guess he's correct, Professor Parkinson, because that has been supported by other very prominent men, but it does scare me and makes me wonder what the next generation will produce. Now I am a pretty agreeable sort of a fellow, Mr. Speaker, as you know, and that accounts for the fact that I haven't any money, I'm too agreeable at times -- and I will admit, and I've said this many many times, that I do think that Duff is making a better job than Dief. Now that may not be saying very much, but I will admit that, and I will admit that the several members opposite this afternoon said, "You just have to look around the province to see what's going on." I admit that. That's all you've got to do is look around to see what's going on. I don't admit that it's all favourable, but I admit that you just got to look around and see what's going on. Anybody can do that. I will admit that the government Ministers, certain of them, are experts on certain things, and I will admit that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce who we had the pleasure of listening to about four hours ago, certainly produced some very rapid results at times, I will admit to that, and he told us of some, but I didn't really think he was as fast at the trigger as he is -- I didn't appreciate it -- until I went out in the hall here when he was speaking and I see that we have a new industry right within shooting distance of the Assembly here, and I know that he is responsible for issuing, or so the CCF members claim, that from his department comes the information -- what do they call these? -- The Honourable Leader of the CCF refers to them as the propaganda, the Minister of Propaganda -- however, here's one here that's headed "The fast-growing trend in camping outdoors". Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the Honourable Minister was on his feet more than about five minutes today when they set up their tent right in the building here, and I would suggest, I would suggest that

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.)....perhaps we could send out a bulletin like this, send it all over United States and say: "Don't let money or the weather bother you or prohibit you from spending a winter in Manitoba. Come with your tent, set it up in the Parliament Building", and that really might attract a lot of tourists that we're now missing.

MR. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): That's the first constructive criticism we've heard for a long time.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, I'm going to tell you about some more in a minute. Now, Mr. Speaker .. (Interjection) .. Pardon. I've only been speaking about five minutes now by my watch. I do think perhaps though, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Propaganda as is referred to by the Leader of the CCF -- I'm not calling him that, incidentally -- does go a little too far at times. I really do think that, and I think this government goes a little too far in a lot of their advertising of pre-election campaign or campaigning or call it what you like; I really think they go a little too far. I refer in particular to an incident that happened at Dauphin -- and to the honourable members opposite, I'm not going to read you that Dauphin speech again that I read you last year and the year before -- this happened at Dauphin, and the Honourable the First Minister was there and here's what he said. Do you want me to read it all? Okay it's just a short one. And I quote from the Free Press, Thursday, November 24th, 1960. That's pretty recent, pretty recent. "The Premier covered a wide range of provincial government activities in his address to more than 850 delegates and wives at a provincially-sponsored banquet." (Interjection) I don't know, it says 850 here and the Honourable the First Minister in speaking night before last said -- if you want the facts just look in the newspaper, when he was referring to some matter in particular, well that's all I'm doing, Mr. Speaker, is referring to the facts here -- he said: "Provincial grants to municipalities now make up 50 cents of every dollar of provincial revenue totalling some \$30 million more than all the money the province receives under the tax rental agreement." Well that can't be right, Mr. Speaker. I say the press have made an error, and despite what the Honourable the First Minister said about reporting the facts, that can't be -- cannot be correct -- I don't think! But the point is this, that it was a provincially-sponsored banquet. I guess the province paid the shot for 850 people, and I don't blame them for telling them how much money he was going to give them, the municipal men, because he was speaking to municipal men, but I still don't think it was \$30 million more than we get from Ottawa under the federal-provincial Tax Sharing Agreements. I don't think it is. And then

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q.C. (Dauphin) (Minister of Education): I'm greatly interested in this because of the reference to my own constituency, but what function was this that the honourable member is speaking about? Can you identify it?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Pardon?

MR. McLEAN: Can you identify the function you are referring to?

MR. SHOEMAKER: It is the annual meeting of the municipal men or the Union of Municipalities or

Well, it was November 24th, 1960. You must have been there.

MR. McLEAN: They -- Dauphin 850 people that are provincially-sponsored?

MR. SHOEMAKER: That's right exactly. I'm surprised that the Honourable Minister wasn't there in his own town.

MR. McLEAN: So am I!

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable members opposite doubt that he ever went out there at all because, golly, you'd think the municipal men would know that they had an annual meeting and that there were 850 there. The only thing they're not sure about is the \$30 million more than we get from Ottawa. Now, in regard to -- I'm still on the subject of propaganda -- I think that too big a hulla baloo -- is a pretty good way to describe it -- was made and a pretty typical example of the propaganda that was dished out -- a pretty good example of that was this year when they made the presentation of the two -- I think it was only two -- the two first cheques that were paid into the crop insurance plan. Golly, that went into about 160 weekly papers, I think, and they showed pictures of them presenting these cheques -- I forget, I think one was for about 300 bucks and the other one for about 1300. Now I may be a little bit out but I think it was in that neighbourhood. Well, I imagine it cost about \$300 to pay this guy \$300! I don't know, but it seemed to me to be overdoing it a little bit, and I'm going to have a little more to say on this crop insurance plan, I

(Mr. Shoemaker, con't.)....hope. I'm not -- I haven't said anything critical about the plan, Mr. Speaker, I'm just condemning the propaganda that goes along with it, but I will say this if you will permit me, that it's interesting to know that the farmers paid premiums totalling about \$225,000 -- I think I'm correct on that, am I not, Mr. Minister -- roughly that was the farmers contribution to the plan this year. The cost of administering the plan is reported as \$140,000. Now we don't do a big business in our office under the firm of Shoemaker-McGillvray, but we certainly handle more money than \$225,000 and our operating expenses are in the neighbourhood of about \$10,000. Now surely that \$140,000 figure is incorrect. It must be one of those errors that the papers do make occasionally. That must be wrong! Well, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HUTTON: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Right.

MR. HUTTON: Would he give us the breakdown of what is included in that \$10,000 cost of administration some meaning?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Would you like me to give them to you right now? Well, roughly this Mr. Speaker -- now if I go over my 30-minute limit, it will be because of the questions from across the floor -- but our rent is twelve times \$47.50, if you want to take that down; our telephone runs about \$30 a month; and our advertising runs roughly about \$300 a year -- are you getting that down? How much more have I got to go?

A MEMBER: \$8,800 yet.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Oh, I got a long way to go, and we have one girl there -- a pretty good one -- so we pay her no, we don't pay her as much as the school teachers get, no, but we do pay her about \$2,200 a year.

A MEMBER: Oh, you tight-wad.

MR. SHOEMAKER: She's just out of school! She's just a kid, and then my automobile expenses and my partner's automobile expenses and gasoline, well we'll say a fair thousand dollars apiece. We'll say that. And I don't know -- you see I'm only up to \$5,000 now. Gosh, I've already got a surplus.

A MEMBER: Entertainment?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Postage, put down another \$300. I've still got \$4,000 to go. You fellows can prepare the rest. However, Mr. Speaker, I'm supposed to be talking about the amendment to the Throne Speech and not about my operating expenses. I know they're high but they're not nearly as high as the crop insurance administration has proven to be. But in regard to unfulfilled promises, there has been quite a number of them mentioned this evening by members of our group, members of the CCF group. I think, I'm not certain on this one, but I do think that the government promised us a soil and water conservation program. I may be wrong but the new bill only provides for water conservation and it does not provide for soil conservation. I think that is in error; I think it should. I do believe, too, on that subject, and I'm going to talk briefly on that, that I think the watershed areas are too large in that there is supposed to be one created or about to be created, we hope, in the Neepawa-Whitemud River Watershed and it's anticipated it will have 1,600,000 acres, and it seems to me that's a little too large. I understand in the United States that they are limited in size to 300,000 acres. That is the one that we hope will be created is five times as large as the areas in the States. I think there is an advantage in reducing them in size. I know that I have certainly been supporting this for several years. The first resolution that I had in the first Legislature I attended concerned this, but I will speak on that later on. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning, it's just a matter of determining how many that many is and I hope that we've reached the many and that we can look forward to having every member of this House, because really I do expect the CCF will vote with us, and I expect that if we have reached or determined how many that many is, that everyone here will vote for our amendment. Thank you!

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you on the position that you hold and I would take this opportunity to express my appreciation as one of the younger members in the House and least experienced, for the able way in which you help us to do the job that we have to do in the House -- All of us of all parties. I would also take the opportunity to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Reply to the

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.).... Speech from the Throne; I think they did an excellent job. It's a great pleasure to have them as members of the Conservative Government. I also -- and I'm sorry she is not present -- but I do take this opportunity to congratulate the lovely member from Pembina. I had the pleasure of campaigning along side of her. She is a very courageous lady; she would tire the best of us in her endeavours for the party and for the government that she believes in, and I know that she is continuing her efforts without any let-up at all on behalf of her constituency of Pembina.

I'm not going to say that I didn't intend to speak. There have been a lot of things said in this Legislature as there always are, some of them I can agree with, some of them I take issue with. I am indebted somewhat to the honourable the Leader of the Opposition; he has always been so kind to me since I came to this House. In fact he seemed to go out of his way during the last session to give me a great deal of publicity -- a lot more than I deserved. He always addresses me, at least to start with, with those bland statements of his confidence in me but I realize like the little red hen, that he's a wily old fox. And I might fall for his blandishments if he didn't mix them up with some darts for some of the other members of this side and I would remind him that although there seems to be some uncertainty about the leadership of the Liberal Party of Manitoba, there is no uncertainty about the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party in Manitoba; and those of us who serve both as Ministers and as members take it as a personal challenge when his darts are directed to the First Minister. I don't challenge for one minute the ability, the wisdom of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I think that we must take it for granted that anyone who has been successful as he has been in steering his political-ship of state through the reefs and shoals of political life for almost 40 years, is certainly a capable individual. I would, I think, at this time add a word of advice to the honourable young member from LaVerendrye that he has his work cut out for him in wresting the leadership from this experienced and wily old man of political warfare.

I am reminded of his skill when I read some of the statements which he made in his speech on this amendment. I did have a great deal of difficulty in finding my way through and trying to reach some conclusion as to what he was driving at. Although he holds to his one central theme in respect to agricultural policy in Manitoba, he does have the ability to jump from one side to another, but he usually allows at least one year to lapse between changing his position and in this manner he tries to avoid detection. Last session he took me to task because I undertook to state that the chief problem of the farmer was the loss of markets that we had experienced during the past decade, and at any rate, the failure of our markets to expand. I would like to quote to you from page 577 of Hansard of February 15th, 1960, "And that's the problem of the farmer today and it's not lost markets as my honourable friend tried to indicate this afternoon, because over the period of years the markets have been holding up very well. So what can we do. The price is what he needs in these times and he's got to look to the Federal Government." And then a few days ago in one sense he admonished me, congratulated me. He congratulated me on changing my point of view to agree with his when he said, "it's not one of the most serious". Speaking of markets, it is the most serious, and I'm glad that after two sessions, or not quite two sessions, we have come to agreement on this that markets are the most important factor in the well being of the farmers of western Canada. He went on to make some quite remarkable statements on crop insurance but I believe for the most part the Honourable Member for Portage dealt very effectively with them and showed the absolute ridiculous position that he has taken on this. He went on to say something else about crop insurance. He intimated, Mr. Speaker, that unless the Federal government was willing to contribute at least one-third of the cost of premiums and the Provincial Government was willing to contribute another third of the premiums there was never any hope of this thing working, and he had held this out as an answer to the farmer, in years gone by, or an excuse to the farmers as to why they couldn't undertake a crop insurance program. Well, I can certainly agree that taking a stand such as that that he put crop insurance completely out of reach of the farmers of Manitoba or any other province by suggesting that the Federal and Provincial Governments should make such a contribution, because I would expect that he had in mind that as well as this remarkable contribution to crop insurance they would as they are today, carry the administration of the program. It's true the Province of Manitoba is not contributing to the premium. We never promised the farmers that we would, but it is true that we are contributing half the cost of

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)....administration, and I'm afraid it's true, Mr. Speaker, although it seems to shock the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa that the costs of administration for the current year are \$140,000. I was much interested in the comparison that the Honourable Member for Neepawa-Gladstone gave to our costs. It seems that he thinks that he can make a reasonable comparison between his office costs as an agent and those of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Agency which is charged with the responsibility of organizing, doing research, finding agents such as himself in the province and all the myriad of other details that go into introducing a program of this kind into the province, and get away with something that would compare favourably with his. Well, I would ask the honourable member what the administration costs of his company are, the Head Office, and add to that all the costs that accrue to them from agents such as himself, and this will give you the total cost, a total cost that you can compare reasonably with our total cost in the Manitoba Program. And I'd be the first to admit, Mr. Speaker, that our costs are high and at the present time that they're out of line with the amount of business that we are doing, but they are not out of line, Mr. Speaker, with the job that we are trying to do for the farmers of this province.

We undertook here in Manitoba to try something that no one else in Canada has tried to do, and from the reports I hear we're the only ones in Canada that are having any success. The reports I hear from Saskatchewan are that out there they did things in the usual big CCF way, they sent out 40,000 applications, they didn't do much ground work, much research, they let these applications go out all over the province. I understand they received about 200 replies applying for crop insurance in that province and the deadline is far past. In Manitoba we confined our efforts to four experimental areas and we had 2500 farmers enroll. This is quite a comparison and I think very favourable to Manitoba. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba is the only province in Canada that is seriously and sincerely endeavouring to promote a genuine crop insurance program for the farmers. There's no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that not only the farmers in Manitoba are going to benefit from the work and the expense that we are going to, but the farmers in other provinces are going to benefit from the research that we are doing and the basic and fundamental principles that we are able to establish. It was the result of a good deal of this 140,000 that we were able to, for instance, introduce this discount system for favourable crop yield experience to the farmers in 1961. It was because of this research that we are able to go to the farmers this year with a different basis for establishing coverage in areas and for establishing the level of premiums, and permitted us to develop a flexible program that is adaptable to the needs almost to the individual farmer. This wouldn't have been possible if we hadn't spent this money.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition tries to make something of the relationship of the provincial department of agriculture to that of Ottawa and he seemed to be quite taken back that we might not agree with some of the things that were going on down there. Well I don't think there's anybody in Manitoba that would be surprised if the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba were to disagree with Ottawa on anything. When the occasion arises I will; but if the occasion doesn't arise, I won't.

Now on the question, and he likes to quote me, "there was complete unanimity that Federal agricultural policies to date have been inadequate." In some respects I do believe that they are inadequate. I don't like the idea under some of the programs that the chap who's got incentive and ability and he's got enough money to get started on an economic basis shouldn't be left without any price supports whatsoever. I think to a large extent that this aspect of the deficiency payment program tends to nullify the work that we are trying to do in the Province of Manitoba in encouraging and helping our farmers to establish themselves with economic unity. I do object to that but that doesn't mean to say that I object to everything and that I believe that everything is inadequate. I got a great deal of amusement out of the propositions that were put forward at the National Liberal Convention. It seems that they're going to outbid the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker and his government whereas the acreage payments are only bringing about 40 million into western Canada. They had a program devised that would bring 50 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think they can really be serious about this because of the difference between \$43 million and 50 million. Do you think that they -- I wonder do the Liberal people really think that they can woo the western Canada farmer with \$7 million. It just happens, Mr. Speaker, that I was down in Ottawa a few years ago when

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) their counterparts were holding forth down there and the western farmer got a closed door on every issue. He couldn't have cash advances -- no, it was impossible. Just couldn't have them! But it turned out that he could have them. Now I believe that this has been a very big help to our farmers, especially when they are unable to make deliveries in the fall when the elevators are congested. We told them down there a few years ago that there was need for farm credit. Why they were as deaf down there in Ottawa as they were here in Manitoba. There was no need for farm credit; we had the perfect policy, the perfect farm credit policy and there was no need at all to improve it. We talked about lots of programs; at that time they were all turned down cold. Now, today I must say this on behalf of the Federal Government, in all fairness, that they have introduced most of the recommendations and the requests of the western Canadian farmer of three and four years ago. It is true that they have not been able to raise the price of agricultural products to a level which has eased especially those farmers who have not been in as fortunate a position as others, whose volume of production is not great enough to keep them in contention in this very competitive game. They have failed in this -- not because they haven't tried. Certainly they have tried. I have to admit that they haven't had 100% success. I don't care who goes down there they're not going to have 100% success. Mr. Speaker, I object to the, it seems to me, the inference here that, and I don't know which it is, that either Manitoba doesn't interfere on the part of their farmers or that we do to too great an extent. It's hard to make out. It's hard to follow.

Then here's a most remarkable reference here by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition to something which not only I, Mr. Speaker, but almost anyone who is conversant with the problems of agriculture, is hoping against hope will ultimately come to pass, and that is the establishment of a national and independent research organization that will carry out research in the field of agricultural policy and agricultural markets. And it isn't my idea; this idea was floating around when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was the Premier of this province. I can't understand his rather disparaging reference to it. If I remember correctly, I was instructed by this House to take steps to see what could be done in trying to co-operate with our sister provinces to the west in this just last Session. I was instructed by this House to do what I could to try and find some solution to the economic problems that our western farmers face. I feel that this could be a major stepping-stone for the farmers of western Canada, for the farmers of eastern Canada, for the farmers of the Maritimes, for the farmers on the other side of the Rockies. It's something that has long been advocated by various groups, and I am very proud and happy that it was my privilege to invite the various provinces and interested groups to come to Manitoba this coming spring. But there my responsibility ends. The success, the direction of this conference has been turned over to a Steering Committee made up of representatives from the provinces, from the farm organizations and from the Agricultural Institute of Canada. The decisions are theirs from now on; they were as soon as that Steering Committee was convened. I have withdrawn completely from any responsibility for the direction that it takes, from the plans that they lay, and I only hope against hope that for the benefit of the farmers of this country that some real progress can be made in establishing this organization.

Well, then he dealt with feed mills. He seems that he wanted to intimate that there was a great deal of misunderstanding in this. I can't see that there was. It seems to me that I made a statement to one group that I had issued no statement. There's a great deal difference between issuing any statement and the fact that another Minister, a Federal Minister might have heard that I was -- what was the term? -- that I was favourable to this move. But let me assure you that the farmers' organizations know where I stand on this; the Federal Government knows where I stand and where the government stands on this. What other things are in this speech? Not too much more.

MR. CAMPBELL: I wonder Mr. Speaker if I might ask the honourable member a question? Would he tell us where he stands on this?

MR. HUTTON: Yes! We feel that because the decision was made to go ahead with this -- and it was the decision of the -- made after hearings at Ottawa before the Commons Wheat Committee -- because when we looked into it there seemed to be a relatively small amount of grain involved; because we don't believe that it's going to effect the quotas too much, if any, at all; and the biggest reason is because it's only effective until July 31st, 1961. Certainly it

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.).....could do no harm to try it. I think that this is a widely held opinion by some of the people and representatives of the farmers, farm leaders, who hold this opinion generally, that it can do no harm to try it. Our position provincially is this: it should be tried until the 31st of July; before being extended it should be reviewed carefully to see if there are any abuses -- that no abuses have arisen out of it.

I would like to just say this in regard to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's statement on agriculture, that he can't seem to get away from the attitude that there's very little that Manitoba can do to assist the farmers of this province. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker -- I have tried to deal with this question in the House before, I think it's a waste of time -- I would suggest, however, that the most appropriate thing that can be done with this philosophy is to frame it and hang it in the Agricultural Museum at Austin. We have a new building out there at Austin, a courtesy of the Department of Agriculture -- the Government of Manitoba -- to try and preserve the relics of the past which have such a significant value to the people of Manitoba, and especially to our pioneers, and I think surely that we can find room in that building for such a statement and it should be hung there.

Now there were some very interesting statements made, Mr. Speaker, by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Really remarkable statements. I've heard about shooting from the hips and buckshot blasts, and it seems to me that he felt if he hit often enough and hard enough, he might hit home some place. I think one of his hardest attacks was on the program of research in tobacco that is being carried on in Manitoba and he made quite a remarkable statement here on what has taken place: "Well, they discontinued the experimentation at Hadashville or Prawda I presume because they were out of money." Not at all, Mr. Speaker, not because we were out of money, but because we found that the soils at Marchand were much more suitable, much better suited to the production of tobacco. He says: "they're doing a little bit of experimenting down at Marchand and virtually none at the University of Manitoba." Well, it depends on what you would call a little bit of experimenting down at Marchand. All the experimenting that we were doing in both places, we were doing at Marchand. He said that "the one employee which they had for a short time working on the tobacco in particular, no longer is employed by them, and virtually no experimentation, virtually no trials on new varieties, virtually no trials of hybrids or crossbreds is being done, and tobacco farming is at a stallmate in Manitoba." Well, I think he's referring to Mr. Prohdan who is the former agricultural representative in that area and who retired. If he isn't, I don't know who else he is talking about.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): I think the Honourable Minister should have an idea of who is in his employ. He had a tobacco man in his employ all last summer.

MR. HUTTON: Well, I'm very happy for this information. I know where he is but the honourable member didn't apparently. He happens to be Mr. Lipsett and he is out at the University. The Government of Manitoba, through the bursary program, is assisting him to complete his university course in agriculture. He is the son of a farmer, a tobacco farmer in Ontario, and he is doing good work for us and I expect he will continue to do good work for us in this field. This year we produced 2,300 pounds of tobacco on the plots down there. It sold for an average price of 52 cents a pound. We will continue to carry on this program, and it costs, for your information, about \$10,000 per year to carry on this program of experimentation. Now the honourable member for La Verendrye doesn't think this is a drop in the bucket. I suggested to him that 100,000 -- I asked him, I believe, if he had 100,000 to put into it. "Mm, 100,000 he questioned, that's good investment, cheap investment. If there's ever a possibility of growing tobacco in Manitoba and bringing millions and millions of dollars of resources to this province, it's cheap." Well, it seems to me that this statement shows a little immaturity, jumping from \$10,000 a year investment...

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order if the Minister would read a little further there he would note that I was quoting from your predecessor, the Minister of Agriculture before you, who said that in this House, that it would be cheap to invest \$100,000 for this type of thing -- only two years ago.

MR. HUTTON: Well! He seems to be looking for an out on this question of his judgment in spending \$100,000. (Interjection) He's in favour of spending \$100,000. I'm glad that you will go on record. Tobacco is one crop, one special crop that has a possibility of being

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)...produced in Manitoba; but I think that we should not forget, Mr. Speaker, that there is an area in Canada which is admirably suited without question to the production of tobacco. Due to the question of markets and prices there is a restriction on the production of tobacco in Ontario. It would seem to me very poor business for Manitoba to spend a \$100,000 a year, which would add up in not too long a time to a million dollars, in the production of a product of which we are not sure yet that we can produce within the restricted frost-free season that we have. It seems to me pretty poor judgment to spend this kind of money at this time on the production of a special crop before we know where we're going with it. Now there are all kinds of other products that can be grown.

It seems to me that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye hasn't heard about some of the things that are going on in his area. Recently I was out to Hadashville -- and by the way, I might say it was the first time in history, they told me, where a Minister of Agriculture had ever visited their community -- and it seems to me that the Opposition sat in this House for a great many years as the government of this province, and it seemed to me an odd thing that the people of this area who had a problem of long standing should never have been visited before.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I do not challenge my honourable friend's statement because if he says that he was told that I accept his word that he was told that, but I certainly challenge the information because I was at Hadashville on more than one occasion when I was Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker. I'm only quoting the information that was given to me. But it seems to me unusual that the honourable member who is representing these people is not aware of the fact that there has been quite a bit of interest in the Hadashville area of late in the possibility of getting into a small fruits production in the area. Members of my department have done a great deal of work, research work, both from the standpoint of the feasibility of producing in that area, from the standpoint of available markets and we feel quite assured that there is a real good possibility of getting into small fruits production in Manitoba. Each year in this province we bring in, import about 400 carloads of strawberries alone. Not only is there an opportunity in the fresh fruits market but there's an opportunity to establish complimentary industries. Fresh frozen foods, jams and so on. It seems to me that it would be a terrible pity to spend \$100,000 on tobacco which we aren't too sure we can produce profitably and in competition with areas like Ontario, when it is a certainty that we can produce small fruits. Because we believe that we can produce small fruits, and to prove that my honourable friend from La Verendrye is 10 miles off base when he makes his charges against the ag reps and the work they are doing and the value of the work they are doing in the province, we have switched Mr. P. J. Peters -- who is better known to everybody, I think, in the province as "Potato Peters" -- we've switched him off potatoes and put him on to small fruits and told him to go ahead and promote the production of this product. The ag reps in the area is working with him and we've done a great deal. But governments can only do so much. I feel sure that something will materialize in this respect in this community and in other communities.

He made other charges about there being no research going on in the fields of edible oils. It seems to me the best thing for the honourable member for La Verendrye to do is to go out to his old alma mater and find out what's going on.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I didn't say that there was no research going on in edible oils. I'm very familiar -- I said there was not enough research going on.

MR. HUTTON: Well, I don't know what enough is, Mr. Speaker. When we came into office the university of Manitoba, the faculty of agriculture was receiving about \$220,000 for grants for research programs in agriculture, and last year this House voted for \$434,000. In two short years we almost doubled it, and I'm afraid that when I bring in my estimates I'm going to have to ask for more money again. I don't know what the honourable member for La Verendrye would do if he were leader of the Liberal Party in this province; how much money he would spend. About the only thing that we can go by is what they spent when his Party was in office. If he intends to spend more for this program and the many others that he likely will promote, then he will have difficulty in voting in favour of the amendment moved by his Leader.

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)....In fact I should say that if he does vote in favour of that amendment, he might as well stay home because how can you believe a story like this when a man will get up and vote against the very means of bringing it to pass.

Mr. Speaker, so many things have been said and I think I probably talked a good deal longer than I should have. I can't sit down, however, without saying something about this floodway. I'm glad to know that certain members of the Liberal Party are opposed to it. It's nice to know where they stand, Sir. It's a big program because it just doesn't involve the City of Winnipeg and the floodway. We have a comprehensive water control program for Manitoba to control the flood waters of the Red River and the Assiniboine River and it's going to cost a lot of money. But you know, it seems to me that it's pretty difficult to argue against a program which will cost the province something like three to four million dollars a year, and will bring benefits of twelve millions per year. I just can't follow the reasoning or the logic of those who would argue that the Province of Manitoba can afford to stand these losses over a long period of years, and that's what it would mean if we fail to carry out this program. I must admit that to those who aren't aware of the magnitude of the task, and to those who would try to minimize the magnitude of the task, it might appear that we're not making such good progress, but we had to acquire a piece of land 30 miles long and up to three-quarters of a mile wide. It necessitated a great deal of organization -- a great deal more organization than has ever been necessary for any other public works projects in the Province of Manitoba, to my knowledge at least. We are going to excavate one-third as much earth as they did in constructing the Panama Canal. This is a big project. It's going to cut municipalities; it's going to cut school districts; it's going to cut roads; it's going to cut railways. This all takes planning. We're going to dig a ditch 500 feet wide in the base, over 1,000 feet wide at the top. We have to know what we're doing when you go to spend \$65,000,000 of the peoples' money. I don't think that the people of Winnipeg or the taxpayers of Manitoba will blame me as Minister or my government if we make sure that everything we do in this is right and that we're getting a dollar's worth of value for the people of Winnipeg and for the people of Manitoba when this thing is completed. I'm not going to talk about the flush toilet program tonight. I'll deal with that at other session -- at other time, if the honourable members opposite will allow me because the story I have to tell on that would take too long.

I would like to say a word in reply to the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain about the Deloraine water supply. He held it up as an unfulfilled promise and he seemed to feel that the Province of Manitoba was not giving leadership in this matter. He seemed to feel that it turned into a political football. I'm as anxious I believe as the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that we can arrive at the solution to this problem. Members of his constituency from Deloraine have visited me on several occasions and certainly they have corresponded with me on many occasions, and I am doing as much as I possibly can to resolve this difficulty that we have. It is true that the Federal Government made an offer to Manitoba to pay 50% of the cost of this dam on Turtlehead Creek. My difficulty is this: that all the dams that have been built in Manitoba under the 1942 agreement have been done so, have been built at 100% cost to the Federal Government, and therefore it must be obvious to the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that I cannot depart from this program or procedure that has been followed down through these years. It is true that I can, that we here in this Department can undertake to build this dam and we can charge part of it to the people of Deloraine. We don't want to do that unless we have to, unless it is the last thing that we can do. I think they want water in Deloraine but I think they want water as cheaply as they can get it. I think this is very important to them. During the intervening time we have been investigating ground water supplies; we haven't been sitting still and we do intend this year to be in a position to make an offer for water and I hope that we can make an attractive offer to the people of Deloraine and one that won't just satisfy their needs today, but will give them satisfaction and a satisfactory deal for years to come.

I was rather amused by the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa referring to the watershed areas. He said they were too large. Well I don't know how you would cut down a watershed. A watershed is set out by God I guess, the Creator, and how a man, unless we, by artificial means cut off the flow of water -- but it's pretty hard to make water run uphill unless you've got a pump. You've got a lot of water up in that country and I wouldn't want to

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) buy the pumps to try and pump it the other way.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Minister will permit a question? Will he agree that in United States they are limited in size? The watersheds are limited in size to 300,000 acres?

MR. HUTTON: I can't tell you that. I'm not aware of that, but then they are not watershed areas.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well they're described as such.

MR. HUTTON: They may be described but they might more likely compare with our drainage maintenance districts, and the reason that we in Manitoba or the Manitoba department has decided to promote the watershed principle is that you get control of all the waters that contribute to your troubles especially in the lower reaches of the stream. The Honourable member mentioned the fact that the soil conservation program was not included in the legislation, that particular legislation, but we have quite an extensive program within the department in soils and crops which deals with soil conservation and I see no reason why the people in the Whitemud Watershed area should not make use of the programs that we have. If it's tree planting that the people in that area were interested in, there's no reason why they couldn't make use of it. If it's assistance in the control of gully erosion there is no reason why the people who live in that area as in any other area in Manitoba shouldn't make use of it. So I think that we have not fallen down on the job because we didn't include soil erosion in that particular legislation because we have quite extensive programs dealing with soil erosion within the department.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been here for a long time, too long, and it's just like every time I (Interjection) -- I mean on my feet too long. It's just that when I get up to talk about agriculture the other fellow might as well go to sleep because I'm going to be here for a long time, but I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition, the official opposition, is not justified whatsoever in complaining about the present government's policies in respect of agriculture. They cannot say insofar as our agricultural programs are concerned that we have not done what we said we would do. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have done far more than we ever promised to do. We didn't promise the people when we ran for office that there would be any sewer and water programs, we didn't promise them that at all; we never mentioned it. I was responsible for putting a modest little paragraph, a very modest -- I said we're introducing what we considered was a useful program and they blew it up last year and it got so much publicity that we're run off our feet this winter. We have introduced programs that we never mentioned to the people of Manitoba. We don't need an election to think up things to do for the farmers of Manitoba. There is no justification for their charges. Well, whoever wants to win the leadership race had better not vote for that amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the motion in amendment to the Speech from the Throne, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition reads as follows: "But this House regrets that Your Honour's Government, with many of its pre-election promises unfulfilled, has added greatly to the burden of Manitoba taxpayers, both Provincially and Municipally, and at the same time has drastically increased the Provincial Debt."

A standing vote was taken, the result being:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Guttormson, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roberts, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

NAYS: Mrs. Forbes, Mrs. Morrison and Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 11, Nays 36.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Minister of Utilities or Labour. Had I voted, not being in the leadership race, I would have voted for the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion by the Honourable Member for Arthur for an address to his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the opening of the session.

MR. GRAY: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I assume that if anyone wished to speak tonight the honourable member would allow it. Is it understood? Does any other honourable member wish to speak tonight? If not I certainly have no objection to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Does anyone wish to speak on the debate now?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that this House doth concur in the report of the Special Committee on the 23rd day of March, 1960 to consider the Election Act received by the Legislative Assembly in Manitoba on Tuesday, the 16th day of February, 1961. I believe that this order is to stand, is it?

MR. CAMPBELL: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this order needs to await the appearance of another motion on the Order Paper.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if it's your wish, we would like to see the Order stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, that this House request the Government to petition the Federal Government for an increase for Old Age and Blind Pensioners in the Province from \$55 to \$75 per month.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Portage, I'd like to ask that this matter be allowed to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution, standing in the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Matter stand. This brings us to the end of the Order Paper.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker put the question and following a voice vote, declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Friday afternoon.

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Man.
ASSINIBOIA	Geo. Wm. Johnson	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Robert Gordon Smellie	Russell, Man.
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	Beausejour, Man.
BURROWS	J. M. Hawryluk	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
CARILLON	Edmond Prefontaine	St. Pierre, Man.
CHURCHILL	J. E. Ingebrigtsen	Churchill, Man.
CYPRESS	Mrs. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean Q.C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q.C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Peter Wagner	Fisher Branch, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q.C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
KILDONAN	A. J. Reid	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Stan Roberts	Niverville, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Walter Weir	Minnedosa, Man.
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Obie Baizley	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolynne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	John Aaron Christianson	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. 1a Prairie, Man.
RADISSON	Russell Paultley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	W. B. Scarth, Q.C.	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Holmfield, Man.
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
ST. JOHN'S	David Orlikow	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Wpg. 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q.C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	4 Lord Glenn Apts., 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	A. H. Corbett	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	E. I. Dow	Boissevain, Man.
VIRDEN	Hon. John Thompson, Q.C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan Q.C.	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1