

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.	Viriden	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
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 12th, 1961

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Conservation.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Agriculture and Conservation beg leave to present the following as their first report: Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Shewman as Chairman; Your Committee recommends that for the remainder of the session the quorum of this Committee shall consist of seven members; Your Committee has considered Bills No. 4, An Act to amend The Water Supply Districts Act; No. 5, An Act to amend The Fruit and Vegetables Sales Act; No. 23, An Act to amend The Watershed Conservation Districts Act; No. 52, An Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act; No. 86, An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act; No. 89, An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Area and has agreed to report the same without amendments. Your Committee has also considered Bills No. 20, An Act to amend The Margarine Act; No. 46, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, all of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River that the report of the Committee be received

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Notice of Motion.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Introduction of Bills, Mr. Speaker?

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act (1).

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Dairy Act.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 109, An Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2).

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Flin Flon) introduced Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution standing in my name on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker presented the question and following a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Teachers' Retirement Allowances Act by providing, among other matters for making payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund to The Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund in respect of persons who resign from positions as teachers and go to foreign countries to teach or serve in the field of education under government programs.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, there is before the House a resolution respecting the matter of educational assistance to other countries. If that proposal receives the approval of the House it is expected that teachers will be employed and sent abroad. This proposed amendment would enable such teachers to continue as members of The Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? The Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews) Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Teachers' Retirement Allowances Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable Leader of the House? Can he tell the House as to how many more bills are expected to be introduced at this session?

MR. ROBLIN: To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, they have now all received first reading or have appeared in Notices of Motion. But my honourable friend does give me the opportunity to make this comment that in Law Amendments Committee this morning we had a pretty important bill before us dealing with amendments to the Metro Act and a number of important suggestions were made as to how that bill should be amended. In considering that fact it seemed to me that it might perhaps be wise if we did not meet tonight, either in the House or in Committee in order that we might have time to review those amendments and be prepared to deal with them when they come again before Law Amendments Committee tomorrow morning. So it would not be the suggestion of the government that we would meet this evening in the House or in Committee but that we should use the time for the purpose that I have mentioned.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, in connection with what the Honourable the Premier has said, is it intended that copies of the amendments will be made available to us so that we may be able to consider them over the evening if we do not meet?

MR. ROBLIN: We haven't got the amendments so we'll just have to rely on the notes that we've taken.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw your attention and the attention of the Members of this Legislature to the gallery to your right. In the gallery you'll notice a group of young ladies and gentlemen; they're accompanied -- these young ladies and gentlemen come from Emerson, from the Emerson High School, and they're accompanied by their principal, Mr. Blewett and also accompanied by two of the School Board, Dr. Goossen and Mr. Peto. These young ladies and gentlemen come from one of the oldest constituencies of Emerson and they come from this wonderful heart of Manitoba that you hear so often mentioned on the broadcasts, our weather forecaster Mr. Ed. Russenholt says "The Red River Valley, the heart of Manitoba"; and I heartily agree with that. Emerson is the gateway to Manitoba. I hope, and I'm sure that these young ladies and gentlemen will find the tour through the Legislative Building quite educative and I'm happy that they have the opportunity to listen to the law makers of Manitoba. They tell me that they are few in numbers today but next year they say that they'll fill the gallery. I thank you.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to file or table an answer or a reply to a question by the Honourable Member for St. John's dated March 3rd, 1961. I should just mention that this was inadvertently overlooked; it would have been tabled long before. It's a reply which will not be of too much assistance in any case because the information isn't available, but it should be tabled.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Utilities. There's a rumour prevalent in the north country, the Gypsumville and Grand Rapids area, that the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board is attempting to close the Grand Rapids road to all traffic. This is causing a lot of concern. Perhaps he could tell us what the true story is?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the member for giving me notice of this last evening. I must confess however that I didn't have an opportunity of investigating to see whether there was any truth in this matter. I would like to say though I did hear this rumour last fall and there has never been any formal representation to either myself or the government or any informal representation for that matter, that I know of. I'm quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that there's no truth in this rumour, but I will undertake to investigate it for my friend.

HON. JOHN THOMPSON, Q.C. (Minister of Public Works) (Virden): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table a Return to an Order of the House No. 16 on the motion of the Honourable the Member from Brokenhead.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Committee of the Whole House.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following bills: No. 43, No. 44, No. 41, No. 45, and No. 58.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews for the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Bills No. 43, 44, 41, 45 and 58 were each read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered certain bills and directed me to report as follows: No. 43, 44, 41, 45 and 58 without amendments and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

Bills No. 43, 44 and 41 were read a third time and passed.

Bills No. 41, 45 and 58 were read a third time and passed.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health & Public Welfare) (Gimli) presented Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Health Services Act for second reading.

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

MR. HUTTON Presented Bill No. 87, An Act respecting The Farmers' Co-op Seed Cleaning Plant Limited for second reading.

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

MR. CARROLL presented Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (1) for second reading.

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

MR. CARROLL presented Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act (2), for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 96. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker before dealing with Bill No. 96, and I wonder if with leave of the House I might make this short statement concerning bills in Municipal Affairs Committee and other committees of the House. I was wondering if it would meet with the approval of honourable members, generally, if we could agree that any bills left outstanding in committees, and I'm thinking in particular of the Municipal Affairs Committee, and any other committee that may have sat to consider bills, be now transferred over to Law Amendments Committee rather than call a separate meeting of the other committee to clean up the work that is before us. I don't think any prejudice would result to any of the bills that may be in those committees. As I say, the only one I can think of is Municipal Affairs. If that could be done I think it would facilitate and expedite our consideration of the matters before those committees.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 96, An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act and to facilitate the establishment of a nuclear research area, for second reading.

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

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 98, An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.
MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Motor Fuel Users Tax Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker,the First Minister will accuse us in the future of having supported these taxes, but I think we are realistic and we know that after having made the expenditures that the expenditures have to be met through taxation. I don't think it would be right to charge us with supporting all those expenditures which have necessitated these bills.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable the First Minister and the amendment proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and a further amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ROBLIN: He doesn't appear to be present, Mr. Speaker. I suggest if anyone else wishes to speak on this sub-amendment they be invited to do so; otherwise we'll allow the matter to stand till the honourable gentleman is here.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other member wish to speak at this time? Order stand? The next order on the paper is adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable the First Minister standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. I might say that this order has been placed in the wrong place on the Order Paper and should appear at the end of the Order Paper as it is a Private Member's resolution, and we will deal with it when we come to the end of the Order Paper.

Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education; that this House doth concur in the first report of the Standing Committee of Public Accounts received by the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba on Monday, the 10th day of April, 1961. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, if I take a little longer than I had expected to do on this motion, I'm afraid that I will have to share the blame between the Honourable the Minister of Education, the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party and his colleague the Honourable Member for Inkster. I did not expect that the moving of the motion would take as long as the Honourable the Minister of Education devoted to it, and his remarks have impelled me to make some reply. The same applies to a lesser extent to the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party and his colleague.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that first of all I would like to thank the Honourable the Minister of Education for his fairness in a couple of regards. First he was kind and courteous enough to say that he recognized the right of myself or any other member of this House to make such charges as those that I made; not only the right but the responsibility if a member of this House felt that they should be made. And I think he's perfectly correct in that. I had rather understood from what some other members of the House had said earlier that they were not so sure on that point but the Minister certainly expressed my view in that regard. Then he was fair enough also to state that as far as my position was concerned regarding the flagmen, the famous flagmen on Highway No. 12, that I had always admitted that this was of lesser importance than the other charges that I made. I appreciate the fact that he did that because that is the fact. I had always mentioned that I thought this to be of much less importance than the other charges, because after all even with what I think about it, it was still just the case, in my opinion, of waste and petty patronage. The other two matters, as I see them, are matters of principle, very important principles, and it was on them that I based the charges that I made. And they are matters of serious principle. One a bribe, namely, the letter from the then Minister of Public Works to the Rural Municipality of Springfield; and the other a threat. The threat of the Honourable Member for Cypress that if the candidate in that constituency was not elected, the government candidate, that the Notre Dame-Manitou road would not be completed. And to me, to get one being established definitely as a bribe — the letter, and the other as a threat in the by-election, they, to me, fully justify the general charge that I made of using the road program for partisan political purposes. I agree with the Honourable the Minister of Education again, that when he talks about the fact that we should be careful to say either improper political

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) purposes or partisan political purposes or something of that kind, because political purposes by itself should not bear the connotation that it does. I agree with him too with regard to his statement that we're all engaged in politics, we're all engaged in public affairs, and that's the practice of politics, and those words "politics or politicians" should not have the connotation that some people are inclined to ascribe to them. But I say also, Mr. Speaker -- and this was my reason for bringing this charge -- that the reason that that opinion is held by some people, of politicians, is because of the very things that I'm talking about here. It's because politicians do this sort of thing at times, and thank goodness we don't have too much of it in this province, but it's because politicians have been known to do this kind of thing in the past that we do have people feeling as they do about politicians, and my complaint is that that is bad for democracy; that's bad for all of we politicians; that's bad for the country and it's because of that that I bring these matters to the attention of this House. That's my justification for doing it. This is what brings the word into disrepute and if we're going to stop people from doing this kind of thing the only way to do it is by when we hear of it to expose it and bring it to the light of day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that you realize and that other members of the House do, that it is usually difficult to prove charges that we believe to exist; it's usually difficult to get people to come forward and substantiate the charges, because they don't like to do it. I don't like to do it. Regardless of the opinion that some people have expressed of me in the House in the last couple of weeks here, I didn't enjoy bringing these charges before the House, and certainly the witnesses that came here didn't enjoy coming. They don't like to do this sort of thing. That's why it's so hard to make any of these charges stick, but when you get to the position of where you find reputable people that say such statements were made, that this letter was written, then in order to see to it that this type of activity does not gain ground; in order to see to it that it is exposed in the way that it should be exposed, I declare that it's right to bring the charges before this House.

Then having said those things about the points of agreement that the Honourable the Minister of Education -- I can't agree with him very much further because I think that I never saw my honourable friend the Minister of Education make as poor a presentation of his case in the House as he did on this occasion. I'll not apply to him the term that the Honourable the Leader of the CCF did, but I certainly will say that as one who has not always agreed with his principles or his policies that he's been enunciating here -- and I don't mean the principles in the wrong sense -- but with the policies that he's been enunciating here, I have certainly always had a high respect for the capability with which he puts them before the Chamber; but I didn't think that applied yesterday and I must have something to say about some of the matters that he raised.

Now the first thing when he dealt with the question of the flagmen he quoted the Deputy Minister of Public Works, Mr. Collins, as saying that exactly the same type of thing that had been done on No. 12, had been done on Highway No. 1 in 1957. And, Mr. Speaker, although I have tried to do it in the short time since we had Hansard on our desks, I've not been able to check all of these quotations, but I'm trying to quote my honourable friend as accurately as I can, and if there's anything wrong with the quotation he can correct me because I have to depend upon my memory and the notes that I took down at that time. But as I understood him he quoted the Deputy Minister as saying exactly the same type of thing as had been done on Highway No. 12 with regard to these flagmen, had been done on Highway No. 1 in 1957. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not what the Deputy Minister said, and I think in this case that I should actually look at the record because when the Deputy Minister was quoting 1957 he was dealing with the work on No 12 Highway and on No. 1. When he quoted No. 1 Highway I think it directly tied up with No. 4 Highway, and that what he was talking about was last year. Now I shall consult the record in that regard. First as to his first statement re the Highway No. 12, that's page 164, according to my notes here. If the Honourable Minister will look at page 164, he'll notice there was discussion, the Attorney-General was questioning Mr. Collins and he spoke of Mr. Tanchak giving evidence, and Mr. Collins answered that an analysis had been made of the payroll and they found that some of these men had been employed last year, and then the reference is, "No, all the remainder", which was the ten, all but two had worked in 1957, all but two had previously worked for the Government of Manitoba said the Attorney-General, and the answer is as indicated by the payrolls 1957. That was definitely dealing, as the record will show, with Highway 12.

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) But then my honourable friend says that he says that exactly the same type of work was done, but that isn't what he said. Mr. Collins definitely stated that they were not all doing the same type of work -- that's in the very next paragraph on the same page. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains asked a question of Mr. Collins: "Were all these employed by the Department of Public Works in 1957?" "Yes, they appear on our payrolls." Question: "Were they doing the same type of work?" "No, not necessarily. I know some of the payrolls indicated they were labourers, some were gravel checkers." So that instead of saying exactly the same type of work was being done he said exactly the reverse, that they were not all doing the same type of work. Then with regard to where Highway No. 1 was mentioned and it was in connection with the work on No. 4, I believe, we'd have to look at his earlier evidence on page 120. Here is Mr. Collin's evidence on page 120, and I think it's not out of context in any way. Mr. Collins speaking: "Anyone who travelled west on the Trans-Canada last year will recall that while we were paving between Neepawa and Gladstone we had flagmen at the intersection of No. 4 and the Trans-Canada, 6 miles west of Portage, which was 30 miles from the construction job, but the people were getting up in there and they were definitely directional flagmen." Now that was last year.

MR. McLEAN: the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will look at the bottom of page 121 and the first half of page 122.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, the bottom of page 121 -- the answer by Mr. Collins: "I think it is due to circumstances of the job more than anything else." This is page 121, "We get many cases where we are doing work on a road some distance away from where the indications are you should avoid it. We're making provision now to wear a distinctive uniform." Question: "This did not happen before, Mr. Collins? This is more or less recent?" Answer: "I'm just speaking quickly; I'm just speaking very immediately; I don't know whether there have been cases similar to this." And then by Mr. Christianson a little later on. Question: "Wasn't this same policy followed back in '56 and '57 at Portage la Prairie when we were paving the grade west, we detoured them up where the Campbell Soup is now? Answer: "Yes, when we were paving the grade west we detoured them up where the Campbell Soup is now. I think it did; I'm sure it did." But that's a completely different type of operation. That was quite different from the one that my honourable friend was quoting. And then in connection with the flagmen, the members who were listening in or who consulted the record will be aware I'm sure, that Mr. Collins' evidence on the first day -- when in fairness to him we must say he was speaking without the records -- indicated that it was some days after the work started when these flagmen were put on, and they were put on because of complaints, he said, from the engineers and local people, customs officials, that some folks were breaking down the barriers and were getting lost and were still using the road. A question from the Attorney-General indicated that this was during the tourist season, but when Mr. Collins, having consulted his records, came back, he showed that eight of these people had been put on within the first and second day of the work being started. The work being started on May 20th; one or two being put on on May 21st and eight of them on the 22nd. And Mr. Speaker, May 20th would not, I think, be a very heavy tourist season in that area.

But then the Honourable the Minister said after that: "Let's get this Oakbank road into proper perspective. We are considering this in the context that what Mr. Klym did was improper." Now I'm not quarreling with my honourable friend's statement about the Honourable Member for Springfield, but that's not my charge. My charge is that what the Honourable the Minister did was improper. It was worse than improper; it was a bribe. What the Honourable the Member for Springfield did was perhaps indiscreet -- that's the word that some have used -- but it was at least not in the same character at all as what the Minister did. The Minister was the man that really made this into a case. Mr. Speaker, once we succeeded in getting that letter from the then Minister of Public Works to the Rural Municipality of Springfield on the record as far as my case was concerned, that was the substantiation. The Honourable the Minister of Education says, what about the Minister? He goes on to say that the Minister of Education said -- this matter will receive immediate attention. The Minister of Public Works said this matter will receive immediate attention. But there again, Mr. Speaker, that's not what he said, and here, I think, would be the proper place for me to put that letter on the record because I want to have it on the record. It is one of the things that we need to have on the record in order to substantiate the charge that I made. It's on Page 125. Mr. Speaker, might I mention here

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) that there's what I'm sure is an error appears in the transcript because this letter begins - "Dear Mr. Harvey and then Mr. Frank Klym." I have seen the original of this letter. I think it was correct in the original; it was Mr. Fred Klym and this is an error in typing, I'm sure. While I'm speaking of that -- and I will read as Mr. Fred Klym because I'm sure that is correct -- while I'm speaking of that I'd like to turn to Page 169 and look at the evidence of another witness that was called before the Committee, a man named Campbell. I want to make a correction there because I did not say what is reported here. There was a question by the Honourable the Attorney-General, Page 169: "You are telling us then, these people are all Conservatives and not are all Conservatives and not hired in your time?" And my answer as it appears on the record is: "I would expect they are Conservatives now, in having had a couple of years of this government." Those who heard me on that occasion, I'm sure, will support me in saying that I said: "I would expect they are not Conservatives now in having had a couple of years of this government." I wouldn't want this record to go unchallenged. And I stay with that statement.

Now I am going to read the letter substituting the proper name Fred for Frank. This is the letter as read on the record by Mr. Harvey, Page 125; April 29th, addressed to W.A. Harvey, Secretary-Treasurer, Rural Municipality of Springfield, Oakbank, Manitoba. "Dear Mr. Harvey: Mr. Fred Klym has been in to see me in regard to the possibility of having this department construct an access road from Highway No. 15 to Oakbank. There is always a limitation in regard to this matter, but apparently the distance is four miles and under our policy we have a four-mile limit for doing this work. I suggest to you that your municipality make application to this department for an access road to Oakbank and stating that it is a distance of four miles, and such application would be almost certain to have approval by us here. It would be advisable to direct your request to me personally in order to secure early approval. Yours truly, Erric F. Willis, Minister of Public Works." And so instead of saying as the Honourable the Minister quoted it, that the Minister of Public Works said this matter will receive immediate attention, what the Minister really said was, "such application would be almost certain to have approval by us here." What he further said was, "It would be advisable to direct your request to me personally in order to secure early approval." That's what was said and that's the letter that I was anxious to get on the record. The Honourable Member for Springfield seemed to feel that the charge was being made against him rather than against the Minister, and he seemed to have the feeling that in some way or other, he was being criticized for going to see the Minister.

In that connection I would just like to look at the report that has been presented to this House. The report, Clause 12: "Mr. Fred Klym, M.L.A. gave evidence that in April, 1959, he had conveyed to the then Minister of Public Works, the desire of the Reeve of the Rural Municipality of Springfield, and some citizens thereof to have the aforesaid road taken over by the province. He agreed that at the time of conveying this information to the Minister of Public Works he was a Progressive Conservative Candidate in the Provincial Election then in progress." Now as I said, my complaint is against what the Minister did rather, than what the member did -- the present member -- but in my honourable friend's evidence I will defy anyone who reads that evidence carefully to determine whether the Honourable the Member for Springfield visited with the Minister or not. If anybody doubts that, I just ask them to read the record, because on at least two or three occasions during his evidence he indicates quite clearly that he did speak to the Minister -- he just saw him and he just asked him for the road. On two or three other occasions he indicates equally clearly that he didn't see the Minister at all; and once or twice he's inbetween and says: "if I saw the Minister, or "if I saw someone else. But, Mr. Speaker, when we come to this report the position of Mr. Klym is clear and above board; there's no doubt about his position at all according to the report. But let me say again to the Honourable the Member, the complaint that I am placing is on the Minister and the letter that the Minister wrote to the municipality, immediately before an election, mentioning the candidate of this party in that constituency, saying: "Send the request to me personally; it will be almost certain to have immediate approval" -- "Send it to me personally so it can be dealt with," -- what's the term? -- "In order to secure early approval." Now, Mr. Speaker, is there anyone in this House who does not believe that that was written for partisan political purposes? Is there anybody that will say that that is not a bribe -- sent out just before the election mentioning the Conservative candidate, saying to an influential body, the municipality, that this road, which a lot of people of course

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) were interested in, will be almost certain to receive approval -- "Send the request to me personally, so it will get early approval?" Now I ask my honourable friends, can they say that they think that there's not improper political implications there? And there was quick action taken, very quick action. I simply can't follow my honourable friend, the Minister of Education when he says that if the Minister was wanting to play politics with it, that he would have said wait till after June 1st. I think if he was wanting to play politics with it, he sent exactly the right kind of a letter. That's the basis of my charge with regard to the Oakbank road.

Then when we come to the Notre Dame-Manitou road, Clause 14 of the report tells about two witnesses, namely, William Berry and Stanley Bird both of the Rural Municipality of Pembina in Manitoba, farmers, appeared before your Committee pursuant to the subpoenas issued at the request of the Leader of the Opposition. Both acknowledged that they had originally been requested to appear before your Committee by Mr. C. Cousins, the defeated Liberal Progressive Candidate in the aforesaid Pembina By-Election. Well I have no objection to that. Then the witness William Berry said that Mrs. Thelma Forbes, M.L.A. had visited the family home on a social and political visit. Those who sat in the Committee on Saturday morning will know that the first draft of the report had left out the word political, it was just a social visit. If there hadn't been a protest made in the Committee that that was rankly unfair and actually untrue, I suppose that's the way the report would have come into the House. Because it was not a social visit; it was social and political according to the witness. During the visit the by-election was discussed. He said although he could not remember Mrs. Forbes' exact words, his interpretation of Mrs. Forbes remarks was that the by-election was a vote of confidence or non-confidence in the government. If it was a non-confidence vote the Notre-Dame-Manitou road would not be built. He admitted that Mrs. Forbes made no threats, promises or bribes. Now, Mr. Speaker, does anyone think that either one of these two men -- and I'll speak of Mr. Bird in a minute -- does anybody think that either one of them would want to suggest that there were threats or bribes made? These men come before this Committee with a good deal of trepidation; they don't like to come. They admitted that they were personal friends of the person being talked about. They're not anxious to come; they come only from a high sense of duty -- combined with a subpoena my honourable friends will say -- that's right. And I was anxious that they should be subpoenaed, because I could appreciate the reluctance that they would have, because they did not want to appear to be taking sides in a question. But they were both gentlemen enough and honourable enough, and public spirited enough that they would tell the truth. I can say to my honourable friends who seem to show some interest in the fact that one of them at least has been asked if he would sign a letter, I can say that I was advised by two lawyers with whom I discussed this matter, I was advised by them that we should endeavour to get letters. I suggested to Mr. Cousins that he should discuss with them if they would prefer to put their statement in a letter. I would guess that my honourable friend the Minister of Education or my honourable friend the Attorney-General with their experience in courts, that if either of them had been summoning them as witnesses in a case of this kind, that they would have asked for their deposition in writing, because I find that a lot of lawyers are very doubtful of witnesses standing up to the cross-examination when they get before a court or a body similar to our Public Accounts Committee. But, Mr. Speaker, I could appreciate, not being a lawyer perhaps, I could appreciate the position of these people, and I certainly did not press in any way that they should put their statements in writing; and I was willing to take the chance knowing how much it meant to me that they didn't stand up to the question. I was willing to take that chance, because I had been the one to whom one of these men had spoken. It was to me who Mr. Bird first made that statement when I visited him on a "political" call, not a social one. He told me this, and I was so impressed with Mr. Bird that I was willing to take that chance that I'm sure lawyers would advise against, of him coming and telling the truth. I ask anybody in this House, Mr. Speaker, to read the evidence of those two men and I'd be glad to read it myself -- in fact I think I shall read some of it. I ask anybody to read the evidence of those two men and won't you be proud of the kind of men that came before that Committee and they didn't want to come. Of course they don't want to come. But would anybody expect -- either of the two things that were suggested to them, or suggested in this report -- would anybody expect: No. 1, that they would remember the exact words that were spoken to them. And here in the report we have a point made of the fact that one or the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....other of them, or both, didn't remember the exact words. This was Berry, according to the report. He said that although he could not remember Mrs. Forbes' exact words, his interpretation was so and so. Who would on oath want to say that they remembered the exact words, and yet this is put into the report as though it was some kind of a qualification of the evidence that these men gave. My honourable friend the Attorney-General in questioning these men or anybody else in questioning them didn't shake their evidence one particle in the main point -- and there was only one main point as far as I was concerned. Was the statement made or wasn't it made? Although my honourable friend the Attorney-General is considered, or was considered in his day to be a very good Crown Prosecutor, he wasn't the least bit successful, not the least bit, in getting either one of these gentlemen to change their story. I'm proud that we've still got people in Manitoba -- and I know we've got lots of them -- who will stand up and say these things, and the Honourable Member for Pembina can be very proud, I think, that the people there have lived up to their high tradition. But, of course, they wouldn't say that it was a threat or a bribe or a promise to them; To one of them he admitted that he had no interest in the road. The other one, why would he call it a threat or a bribe? But I call it a threat, because the evidence also clearly shows that this rumour was going around in the constituency and the one of them says, Berry says, that others had heard it. And Bird says that he wouldn't say how prevalent it was but that there was some discussion of it.

Now I'm going to read some of the evidence because I think it should be put upon the record. I won't read it all, but if anybody suggests it's out of context in any way, let them consult the record and make any corrections that they think are valid. I'll complete the Stanley Bird paragraph first: "Stanley Bird said that Mrs. Forbes called at his home during the by-election on a combined social and political visit, he having been a former pupil of hers. Mr. Bird said that he interpreted Mrs. Forbes' words to mean that this was a vote of confidence in the government and that if the Government Candidate was defeated, the road would not necessarily be completed. He stated categorically that Mrs. Forbes did not say anything which he could treat as a bribe, threat or promise. Of course not; why would he? But I would call the attention of the members of the House as I did to those in the Committee, that Mr. Bird had a particular wording to what he said. And instead of it being as it's put in this report, "The road would not necessarily be completed," what Mr. Bird said in his evidence was that Mrs. Forbes' statement was that "the road necessarily would not be completed." I call your attention to that, Mr. Speaker, because I say that this was a quite outstanding witness this man Bird. If any of this credit for his capabilities goes back to his former teacher then she's entitled to it; because I thought he was quite outstanding; and he was when he talked to me. He was disturbed by this situation and he used this term, I'm sure, in his evidence purposely, because what he said to me indicated that he's been thinking about this and that he had tried to reason out any reason of why this road would not be built, and he was asking if it had something to do -- when that statement was made to him -- he asked me if it had something to do with the fact that appropriations were made only from year to year and would it make a difference. I say they were quite outstanding witnesses and I'm proud of them. The one of them I had seen; I visited him on political matters. The other one I didn't see at all; never saw him. But from what my friends told me of the kind of men they were, I was willing to take the chance on the evidence, and I think they came through wonderfully.

Page 131, I think, is the start of the evidence of Mr. Bird that I would like to mention. And I think it's right to put this on the record. This is Mr. Molgat questioning Mr. Berry. Question: "Was anything said during the course of that visit about the normally known Notre Dame-Manitoba road?" Answer: "Yes". "What was said about that road?" Answer: "Well if the seat wasn't retained by the government that road would not go through." Question: "And if the seat was not retained by the government the road would not be completed?" Answer: "Yes, that is right." Question: "This statement was made to you?" "Yes." Question: "Were there any other statements made about the road?" Answer: "Well just that, the way she put it, that if it wasn't a vote of confidence like, if it was the other way, if there was a vote of non-confidence then these future plans which included this road would not be done. We would not get the road." That's all I intend to read on that page, I would refer the committee to Page 136. I suppose this is the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....Attorney-General questioning Mr. Berry at this point. Question: "You say Mrs. Forbes mentioned to you the fact that something about no confidence in the government -- a vote of confidence in the government?" Answer: "That is the way she put the vote. Just, that is what this election would mean if the government held the seat it would be a vote of confidence. If it did not, it would be a vote of non-confidence." Question: In what the government had been doing?" Answer: "That is right." Question: "That did not sound particularly unusual to you?" Answer: "No." Question: "This was all mixed up I presume, the context of the Notre Dame-Manitou road?" Answer: "She told us then what would happen if it was a non-confidence vote." And then this question: "Can you tell us what her exact words were?" Answer: "No, I don't think so." Question: "You can't remember her exact words?" Answer: "No, I know she said, it is quite awhile ago, I can't recall the exact words but that is certainly what she meant." And who would recall or attempt to recall under oath the exact words in a case of that kind. Then it goes on: "Had you heard anything about the Notre Dame-Manitoba road prior to Mrs. Forbes visit; whether it would be built or not." Answer: "Yes, I did." Question: "What did you hear?" Answer: "Just from a neighbour mentioning to me sometime before. He was asking me if I had heard and I said, no, I had not." Question: "What had you heard about it? It was going to be built or it was not going to be built?" Answer: "It would not be built if the government did not retain the seat." Question: "For what reason?" Answer: "I don't know." Question: "Pardon?" Answer: "I don't know." Question: "Now which portion of this road are you interested in Mr. Berry?" Answer: "None of it." Question: "You're not interested in the Notre Dame-Manitou Road?" Answer: "No, I don't think I have been on it for years." Then on Page 139. Question: "Mr. Berry, what was said to you was something in these terms -- the government in this by-election was seeking a vote of confidence in the people of Manitou or Pembina?" Answer: "Well I don't know actually seeking." Question: "Well looking for?" Answer: "Well yes. I don't think she said that. It was just that, which way the vote would go was the way she termed it as a vote of confidence or a vote of non-confidence." Question: "Isn't it a fact Mrs. Forbes said to you she would not make any promise about the road one way or the other?" Answer: "I don't recall it." Question: "You don't recall that?" Answer: "No, because I mean she couldn't promise me anything anyway. I was miles from the road." Question: "Isn't it a fact that Mrs. Forbes said to you in effect, no promises were being made during the election, that the government was seeking a vote of confidence from the people of Pembina?" Answer: "I don't recall that." Question: "You don't recall that?" Answer: "No, she didn't make any promises or threats actually. She stated what would happen if the government candidate was defeated to that road." Question: "You didn't take anything she said as either a promise or a threat or a bribe?" Answer: "No I just figured that it sounded pretty rough coming from the Government." That is all. She was a member -- a statement like that. Question: "That was your impression?" Answer: "Yes so I didn't say anything." Then Mr. Paulley, the Honourable Leader of the CCF, asked a question. "I would like to ask just one question of Mr. Berry. You mentioned Mr. Berry that this talk with your neighbour insofar as the question of this road was concerned, that road would not be built unless the government was upheld in the constituency. My question would be: "Do you know whether or not this was general talk or the general impression in the neighbourhood?" Answer: "Well I couldn't say how general, but a lot of people knew about it. I heard it from different sources." Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to agree that the main point of Mr. Berry's statement remained absolutely unshaken.

Then we go to page 143 and Mr. Bird's evidence, questioned by Mr. Molgat in this case. Question: "Was anything said to you during that visit about the Notre Dame -Manitou road?" Answer: "Yes." Question: "What was said to you about that road?" Answer: "Well I don't know whether I asked Mrs. Forbes whether that road would be finished or not, but in the course of the conversation it was brought up and I understood Mrs. Forbes to say if the government--" Then the chairman intervened. The chairman said: "I think the witness should say what was said not what he understood. You tell the committee what was said." Mr. Molgat: "I think he is quite right. He is recalling a conversation that went on some months ago -- I think with all due respect, comments that he understood. I think he gave his understanding; I think he is entitled to say that." Then, question: "Go ahead. All we want is the truth." The chairman says we want more than the truth. This witness is called to give evidence about a specific

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....conversation. Now his evidence must be related to that; not what he understood or thought or what somebody else understood or thought. What this witness can tell us about this conversation please. That is pretty elementary. Question: "Proceed, Mr. Bird." Answer: That is we did not give the government a vote of confidence, that road necessarily would not be finished." Then at the bottom of that same page -- well immediately after, by the Leader of the CCF Party. "I would like to ask you a similar question. I don't know whether you heard what I put to Mr. Berry. Was this general talk in the neighbourhood if the government were not retained in the riding that the road would not be completed?" Answer: "I don't think it was general talk to my knowledge." Question: "But there was some, was there?" Answer: "Well I think there was some in a round about way, yes."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say again that I think that these two witnesses were a credit to their community. They were here because they were called, that's true, but they were telling, in my opinion, the truth, and not trying to colour it in any way. The fact that they both said that there was some talk in the neighbourhood indicates that there were other people had heard the same thing. That's about all I have to say with regard to the Honourable Minister of Education's statement, but I would like to comment briefly on what the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party said. Though he labelled the speech of the Minister of Education as bordering on the ridiculous and called the report a whitewashing effort, he still said that the government had nothing of a major consequence to defend. I simply can't understand how my honourable friend arrives at that conclusion -- that the speech was ridiculous or bordering on ridiculous; that the government had nothing of major consequence to defend. Nothing of major consequence to defend, Mr. Speaker, when he knows of the existence of that letter sent right in front of the election, naming the member, the man who is now the member, the Conservative Candidate, saying - "make a request to me personally" -- "the road is almost certain to be approved, make it to me personally so it will have early approval." And nothing of consequence when we have these two reputable, in fact outstanding, witnesses saying that a member of the House campaigning in the constituency said that if the Conservative Candidate failed at election that the road would not be finished. Does my honourable friend really say that that is nothing of consequence, Mr. Speaker? I'm sure that the people of Manitoba don't feel that way about it. I'm sure that the members of this House don't feel that way about it. But then after that my honourable friend changed sides and he said--having said there was nothing of major consequence he changed around and he said, "But there's something to that letter." You bet there is. There's something to that letter. Now, I'm quoting my honourable friend again--I haven't had time to read Hansard in this regard and these are just from my own notes--I hope I'm not misquoting him: "There's something to that letter," he said. And he also said: "It's our understanding that mimeographed copies were made presumably of that letter." I don't know whether he said distributed or not.

MR. PAULLEY: No.

MR. CAMPBELL: No. And then he said "One could take a far different interpretation from that of the Minister of Education." I think you certainly could, Mr. Speaker, and you could take a far different interpretation from the report of this committee as well. Then we had a short speech from the Honourable the Member for Inkster. He thought that this hearing had done a tremendous amount of good, and he thought, as I gathered his remarks, I think the place he figured it had done the most good was that it would discourage me from ever making this kind of a charge again, and he seemed to say in his remarks, and I haven't had the chance of rereading them, but he seemed to me to be saying that he thought it was a terrible thing that these charges had been made; they shouldn't be made; that the allegations were not substantiated, but then if I caught his amendment correctly, he ended up by trying to move an amendment saying that the charges were proved.

MR. PAULLEY: No, no, not at all.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well then I didn't catch his amendment correctly and we'll have to try and see what it was.

MR. PAULLEY: Not to the degree that you charged....

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh yes. But they were still substantial. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I'll never have to do this kind of thing again. --(Interjection)-- I hope so. I hope there'll never be an occasion where I have to do it again. My honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation said during the debate in the committee a while ago that he

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) thought that I was nearing the end of the road and it was too bad that in my latter days that I should do this kind of a thing. Well I may not be as near to the end of the road as my honourable friend suggests; I may be on the road for quite a while yet. I may be around for quite a little time and I hope that I never have to bring charges like this into the House again. Does anybody think that, whether I'm nearing the end of the road or just at the peak of my career, does anybody think that I enjoy bringing up this kind of thing? Does anybody think that I figured that I would gain any marks either in this House or with the press by bringing this kind of thing up? No, nobody, nobody in their senses would think that I would be so misled. But I hope there are some people, and I'm sure that there are people in the country that will say that when these matters come to your attention from reliable sources that it's right to bring them up, and I'm sure, perfectly sure, that the intention of that letter that went out to the municipality was for the partisan political purposes that I have stated. No doubt about it in my opinion. What I wanted was to get that letter on the record so that it's not a case of anybody giving one version of it and somebody else giving another of what was done. We'll let the public judge as to whether that's an improper action or not. As far as the other case is concerned I'm even more sorry because it happens to be a sitting member of the House. But if my honourable friend from Inkster wants to suggest that there's some good coming out of this, then I think the good that's coming out of it is the good that comes from ventilating cases of this kind when they come to your attention. We all may have suspicions at times, Mr. Speaker, of things being wrong, but it is difficult to get the proof; and when you get the proof -- and I maintain that in these cases I had the proof, and the proof has been laid before the Public Accounts Committee in the form of the letter and in the form of the statements by these reliable, reputable, public-spirited citizens -- and to suggest that because these citizens preferred to be subpoenaed and that I preferred to subpoena them, that for that reason their evidence is any less reliable, or to suggest that because they say that they didn't remember the exact words, that that is in any way a qualification of their main statements, is in my opinion worse than begging the question. So I say to this House, Mr. Speaker, that the good that I think a thing like this will do is that it will make all of us, all politicians, and that's what we are, it will make all of us more careful to see that we maintain the good name of politicians. And that's what I want to see happen, regardless of where I am on the road in my public life. I still believe that the public life of this province in general is of a pretty high order. We've not had many scandals and I never tried to pretend that this one was a scandal in the sense of some that have happened elsewhere or in olden times; but I do maintain that it's improper, very improper and when that kind of thing comes to my attention, I believe in bringing it up.

Mr. Speaker, I've been 40 years in public life in this House -- not in this House, it's 39 now in this House, 40 years in public life -- and I'm not trying to pretend that I have by any means a perfect record because I've made lots of mistakes. I don't very often moralize in this House; I don't try to preach to the members or the younger ones or the older ones or any others, that isn't my job here. I'm not trying to do so now; I'm certainly not trying to hold myself up as an example because I've made my share of mistakes. In that time also I've changed my opinions some. Some I've stayed with pretty closely, some I have changed, and I've made lots of mistakes. But one thing I have tried to do is keep the conduct of public affairs on a high level at all times, and I believe that that should be done. And when I see this kind of thing being done, and I consider that the letter is using the roads for a partisan, political advantage, which in my opinion constitutes a bribe, or the case of the Pembina By-Election using the road program as a threat, then I say that kind of thing is wrong, that we should not defend it; that we should be prepared, even though it makes us personally unpopular, to stand up and tell these facts about it and place the facts on the record and then it's for this House and the public to do what they want to about it. Now as far as the House is concerned, I know enough about the restraints of parties in this Legislature to know that the House will not deal differently with this report. It's been prepared and it will go through. But at the same time, I shall certainly not support it, and I shall take the case to the public and ask the public what they think about this sort of thing because that's the court of last resort. My honourable friend, the Minister of Education said that he thought that if my case had gone to the courts that it would have been dismissed there. And then I guess thinking that he really would strike terror into my heart, he said it would be dismissed with costs; which, of course, would have been a frightful calamity. But, Mr. Speaker, whether this House dismisses it or not, the charge still stands as far as I'm concerned, and the proof has been furnished by the letter that's on file now, and the statements of these reliable

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) witnesses from Pembina constituency.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, may I say a few words? Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to these charges on one other occasion, and tempers were a little bit hot in the House as I recall at that session that particular evening. I sincerely regretted at that stage of these proceedings the level to which political life in the province seemed to have dropped, and there's nobody in this House that's probably quicker to anger and quicker to get over it than I am, and I still don't like the atmosphere that pervades. I'm a little bit concerned, or a great deal concerned, about the fact that whenever an occasion like this arises, freedom has a tendency to die a little bit, if you like to put it that way. It's only because we enjoy certain freedoms in this House that we as members can, with immunity, bring charges against other individuals in the House. And I think that it is a truth that freedom is a privilege and not a licence, and those of us who enjoy that freedom must cherish it because of the extent of freedom that we do enjoy. And we must guard it, and we must be very careful of the way in which we use it. I said freedom to the individual member in this House is a privilege and it is not a licence, and I cannot help but feel that on the basis of the evidence that has been brought, as has been pointed out by the Leader of the CCF and the Member for Inkster, that freedom in this case was used as a licence because there wasn't, in fact, the kind of evidence to justify the serious charges that were levelled at a member of this House by a former Minister of the Crown.

Now maybe I'm wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I was always of the impression that where bribery was concerned, there were two parties to the act; that is, if the bribe were accepted. In the case of the letter that is held up as evidence by the Leader of the Opposition, as evidence of political bribery, he cannot charge the former Minister and the government unless he is prepared to accept those who accepted the offer, if it indeed was bribery. So we find ourselves, then, bringing charges not just against a member of the government but against innocent people, who are above, I hope, any charges of this kind; responsible people in municipal positions. There was nothing underhanded about this thing. These people accepted the government at face value at that time, and were happy for the policies that were in effect at that time, and it seems to me that if the charge is true on the one hand, it must be true on the other. And I don't think the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to charge the Municipal Council of Springfield with accepting bribery from a member of the government.

In the case of the charges with regard to the by-election in Pembina, here again there is no foundation for the enormity of the charges that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has brought. I said it was disturbing when you see people using the freedom of the House as a licence and not as a privilege; it's more disturbing when you see a man who enjoys a reputation in this province use his position to tear down others. I know that a man who has served this province can take some credit with the reputation that he has and the position that he holds in the community, but also, Mr. Speaker, he holds that position as a gift of the people. And as a gift of the people there's a tremendous responsibility goes with that position. And I can't help but feel sincerely that this gift in this case has been misused. I can't look at it in any other light, because when you weigh the evidence against the serious charges that he has made against an honourable member of this House, there seems little justification for bringing it in the first place on the basis of the evidence that he was able to muster; and secondly, that he brought it at all without investigating and making sure that he had, in fact, a case against the honourable member. I object to the inference that he has made this afternoon in the Chamber when he talks about the evidence from reliable reputable citizens. I'm not going to argue that these witnesses were not reliable, reputable men, but I am going to object to the inference that the honourable member against whom he brought these witnesses is not an equally reliable and reputable person. And if we accept his statements of this afternoon, we cannot hold that the charming Member for Cypress is a reliable, reputable person. And so I must reject out of hand these inferences and indirect charges that he is bringing against the honourable member.

Now, we have known, Mr. Speaker, for a long time that women were the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's particular forte but we always thought of him as a Sir Galahad, a Sir Walter Raleigh, a man who was quick to drop his cloak and help the lady over a rough place. But on this occasion he is something far different from a Sir Walter Raleigh or a Sir Galahad. It seems to me that chivalry is at a low ebb in this House; chivalry is at a low ebb in this House when, of all the members in the Legislature, he chose on such flimsy grounds to discredit the charming and Honourable Member for Cypress. I think that we have a good deal to have regrets

April 12th, 1961

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) about in this session of 1961. And I say, first of all, I think that freedom has died a little bit in the Legislature and in the province as a result of this. I think that men will have to walk overcast and with care for fear anything they might say or do will be misrepresented, or that any misinterpretation of word or action will be blown up into a crime and brought against them. I think we should have learned something from this session. I agree with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I think we should have learned a great deal, and that is that we should consider, go out of our way to make sure that we don't bring false witness against our neighbour, because we can do it, not purposely, but inadvertently by not making sure of what we are saying; not making sure of our ground before we make these charges. You know, it's very important to the political life of this province that we are able to attract the very best, most capable, most honourable people into this work -- and here I exclude myself. I don't know just how I happened to get here. But this is important, and if the honourable members of this House, no matter what their party or their politics are, are not from unfair charges, it's going to have a very detrimental effect upon political life in this province. And no one can deny that. The people of this province aren't able to attract men to these offices because of the monetary returns. I think you'll all agree to that. The people of the Province of Manitoba attract men to serve them for the privilege and the honour of doing so, and their sense of responsibility to the general public. But if they are going to be exposed to the type of unsubstantiated charges and the attacks that have been brought here against members of this side of the House, I think they are going to think twice, and wisely, Mr. Speaker, about offering to serve the Province of Manitoba. None of us are perfect. And it's so easy, it's so easy for misunderstandings to arise about something about that someone is supposed to have said some months ago.

In connection with the Honourable Member for Cypress and what she was supposed to have said, it seems to me a very simple thing for two men to have misinterpreted her argument. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has talked about the rumour that went around about the road. And there was another rumour going around about the road that was started by his own Party. That was that the road would be built in any case. And isn't it the most logical thing in the world, Mr. Speaker, that a politician out on the hustings should try to upset the arguments of the Opposition -- the most logical thing in the world. And in so doing, apparently two people, two people misinterpreted what she had to say. On the basis of this, the integrity, the honesty and the honour of a very charming lady, a member of this Assembly, has been brought into question. And I still say that this has been done most unfairly and without any adequate justification.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know that any answer is required to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture who has just spoken, because I believe that the case that has been made by my Leader still stands -- stands possibly stronger than before the previous speaker spoke. I'm sure that my Leader knew when he made those charges that even though they would be substantiated in the presence of the Public Accounts Committee that the report of the Committee would not agree with him. He has had experience in this House, and many of us have. When the newspapers come out with a story, "Government not guilty", although there are small quotation marks, I think the title should have been "Government says it's not guilty". The government was sitting as judges in their own case. It's natural that they would come out with this whitewash. We all expected that. I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition expected that. He knew. And he told us so now. But the question is, what about the people of Manitoba? I have, in the past, moved in this House for three inquiries. I knew that I could not prove my points to the satisfaction of the committees that were sitting on this because they were loaded in favour of the government of the time. But I was able to satisfy the people who were in the full knowledge of the circumstances that my accusations had been proper and right. And this is one of the reasons why I'm still in this House. I asked for an inquiry into a defalcation in the Department of Public Works. It was interesting. I didn't win my point before the Committee but immediately actions were taken by the Department of Public Works to see to it that such a thing would not happen again. And I'm sure that although the report of the Committee, the majority report, will state that the accusations were not proven, I'm sure that many people in Manitoba -- and I've heard the echoes of this in these last few days -- that the people can read between the lines, and they praised my Leader for bringing this matter to the attention of the

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) people of Manitoba, because there are a lot of people who have thought in the last two elections that politics were being played with the road program in the Province of Manitoba.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I say that it was improper for the Minister of Public Works to use his influence as Minister of Public Works to help in the election of a candidate of the Conservative Party at that time. And this letter definitely proves that the influence of the Minister of Public Works was being used in order to help in the election of the candidate in Springfield constituency. And it seems to me that this was improper, and I think the charge has been proven.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, resent the charge made by the previous speaker with respect to the fact that the Member for Cypress happens to be a lady. I'm sure that the Member from Cypress is not pleading here for special privileges because of her sex. And I think that the attack was improper that he made on those grounds. The member was making a social and also a political call, and she has admitted it. And I say that this matter should not have entered into the speech that was made just previously. The Honourable the Minister of Education says that we are all politicians. Maybe there are different kinds of politicians. It has been stated that some politicians think that they belong to the state and that other politicians think that the state belongs to them. And by that I mean that certain politicians would like to use their powers when they are in certain positions to help in the election of their friends, their partisans. And there are degrees, I suppose, as to the fact that some politicians would do that, but we had reached the degree, it seems to me recently, that we had never reached possibly in the history of this province at least for a long, long time, and I say that what has been done -- the charges -- and in spite of the report that the government would bring to whitewash itself, in spite of that report, I think that the reputation of my Leader has been enhanced that he has rendered this province a great service, and that this matter will come before the people of Manitoba, and that it will have some effect in keeping Manitoba clear of certain things that have been happening at election times in other provinces. And I certainly will vote against the motion.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't want to prolong the debate or discussion on this motion before us. I just want to put on the record that while I will be opposing the vote, nevertheless I want to have it understood that I'm not opposing the whole report; it's just certain sections in the report that I'm opposed to.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, insofar as we're concerned, I think our views are pretty well known inasmuch as we attempted to move an amendment last time this was up before us and it was not allowed. Insofar as we're concerned there's a conundrum here in the action that we're asked to take in voting on the question of the acceptance of this report. We could not in fairness support the contention that specific charges of bribery and threats have in fact been proved. On the other hand, to vote in the negative might very well leave the impression that we do support these charges, so that leaves us with the alternative of voting for the report, but we certainly can't do that, Mr. Speaker, because we cannot vote for concurrence here because this report gives a blanket refuting of these in the general charge that the road program has been used in a political way and for political purposes. I don't see how we can support such a blanket denial of the facts as we see them. Read the transcript. I ask all members to read the transcript in detail, and no matter how much you would want to vote for the complete denial of the charges I think you would have to conclude that there is just a little bit too much uncertainty; there's just a little bit too much doubt on the part of some of the witnesses. There seems to be just a little bit too much indication of political manipulation to allow us to think other than that there was a good deal of manoeuvring in a fairly blatant political way. Now it could well be that -- and I feel personally that this manoeuvring isn't great enough to disgust us but it's certainly there in sufficient degree to concern us, and we therefore feel in a complete absence of malice to anyone, that in a sense of conscience we must -- the only sensible alternative -- abstain completely from the vote.

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

MR. ROBLIN: The Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable Minister of Education that this House doth concur in the first report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts received by the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, on Monday the 10th day of April, 1961.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roberts, Shoemaker and Tanchak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas - 33. Nays - 12.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Second reading of Bill No. 54. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River) presented Bill No. 54, An Act to validate By-law No. 109 of the Village of Bowsman, for second reading.

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

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) presented Bill No. 71, An Act respecting The Municipal Enquiry Commission in Manitoba, for second reading.

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

MR. WM. H. HAMILTON (Dufferin) presented Bill No. 77, An Act to amend An Act respecting the Rural Municipality of Dufferin and the Rural Municipality of Grey, for second reading.

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

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights) presented Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Law Society Act, for second reading.

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

MR. SCARTH presented Bill No. 94, An Act for the Relief of the Estate of Charlie Young, Deceased, for second reading.

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

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington) presented Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (3), for second reading.

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

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, for second reading.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be agreeable to revert to the budget debate at this time, which we stood over a few minutes ago in favour of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, so that we can now invite him to make his contribution to this debate.

MR. FROESE: I haven't got my notes with me at the moment so I couldn't do it at the present time. I will have to ask that the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreeable that the order stand? Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and the proposed amendment thereto submitted by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, this resolution was on the Order Paper last year and again this, and to me it is notable that these resolutions deal only with physical fitness and they say nothing about physical education. Certainly I think everybody here recognizes that we as individuals must retain a degree of physical fitness. We need this physical fitness so as to perform our normal daily tasks without using our last ounce of energy in doing so, and using all one's energy in performing these everyday duties we create the mental and emotional problems which reduce our effectiveness, not only in our work, but as citizens. Our bodies are somewhat like a car; if it's travelling at 100 miles an hour it uses a considerable amount of gas, but by reducing that speed then we reduce the consumption of fuel and thereby increase the efficiency of the machine. So do we humans work more efficiently the greater our physical fitness than that required to perform our daily tasks.

Now certainly I recognize, and I think everybody in the House does, that a government has certain responsibilities in regard to the physical fitness in our schools, but surely, Mr. Speaker, the government is not responsible for the physical fitness of the citizens of the province or the adults. I think we can say that physical fitness is a very personal problem, and no

(Mr. Strickland, cont'd.) one, and certainly not the government, can make us fit; it's something we must do for ourselves. In agreeing that we require a physical fitness program within our schools because I believe that it dovetails in with our mental and emotional fitness, and while the province is today providing a course of physical fitness in our schools, I think that it could be said that it may be somewhat outdated and that it should possibly be revised or altered to fit the modern day thinking on what we require for physical fitness. But surely physical fitness in itself, Mr. Speaker, doesn't require any great gymnasium or large amounts of equipment. Surely the government, as has been suggested by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, is not responsible for the Olympic or professional sports enthusiasts. Physical fitness in itself is really quite simple and it's quite easy, as long as we have the proper mental outlook as to why we need to be physically fit.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, a Royal Canadian Air Force publication which they refer to as the 5BX plan, and I'd like to read the last paragraph of the Forward by the Chief of the Air Staff, and I'm quoting, and he's speaking to the members of the RCAF - "It is your duty and responsibility as a member of the RCAF to maintain a high level of physical fitness and be ready for any emergency which may require the extended use of your physical resources. Positive physical well-being is also closely allied with mental and emotional fitness, all of which are essential in the discharge of normal daily tasks." Now the Air Force, Mr. Speaker, is spread out across not only the Dominion of Canada but throughout the world, and they don't have on all of these stations proper facilities for what we consider to be gymnasium acrobats and so on, so they evolved this plan for the use of the membership. It requires absolutely no equipment whatsoever and it guarantees from the best information that they have, to keep their personnel physically fit. This publication can be had by enquiring through the Queen's Printer at Ottawa for 35 cents, and I would advocate that any member who is a little bit worried about his own physical fitness condition that he so write the Queen's Printer.

The Government of Manitoba in this session, Mr. Speaker, announced a program for the training of leaders for community groups. The province has also in the last few years increased considerably the recreational grounds for the citizens of the province, and I believe that this program will assist communities to organize their local activities in promoting individual well-being as well as a zestful living for all, and I think that it is a program that we all are quite willing to support. I think inasmuch as the resolution refers to physical fitness and is limited to that, Mr. Speaker, that the province is acting in this way, and I am pleased to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, that the motion of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface in amendment to the motion of the Honourable the Member from Brokenhead be further amended by deleting all the words after the word "recreation" in the second paragraph thereof and substituting the following: "THEREFORE be it resolved that the Government continue its announced policy of promoting the physical fitness of Manitoba school students and citizens generally by (a) the provision of school gymnasium facilities for physical education in the schools; (b) the revision of the program of studies for physical education in the schools; (c) the provision of training of teachers of physical education and (d) the provision for leadership training through recognized community groups."

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I thought I would speak on it now, but in view of the length of the amendment, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, could I let this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Matter stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion, the Honourable Member for Logan and proposed amendment by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. R. G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. James was just called out. Could we let this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and the proposed amendment by the Honourable Member for Roblin, and a

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.) further amendment to the amendment by the Honourable Member for Carillon. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that in rising to speak to the two amendment to my resolution I should, first of all, accept with thanks, the thanks given me by the Honourable Member for Roblin for bringing this resolution to the floor of the House so that we might be able to discuss matters affecting general farm policy and the general agricultural economy. Beyond that point I am afraid that there isn't too much in what I have to say that will be as complimentary to the honourable member, because after reading his fairly lengthy speech which he made here last week, I found several inconsistencies and several outright errors in approach. Among other things, the honourable member said that we approach this problem on a very narrow track; we never make mention of the rise in price, the rise in costs to the farmers. I would merely point out to him that I have mentioned it on so many occasions in this House I thought he'd have perhaps become quite sick of it. It's right in the resolution for one thing. It's right in the second paragraph of my resolution, and when I do mention it that way, apparently he doesn't seem to appreciate it too much because he proceeds to delete it. If he believes so much in the importance, relative importance of rising costs to the farmer, he could well have left that paragraph in its entirety remain.

He goes on to say, "Why do we want western grains included under the terms of the Agricultural Stabilization Act when various farm organizations have expressed their opposition to this?" I would ask him if all farm organizations have expressed opposition to this possibility. He mentions the fact that western grains can't be marketed under the Price Stabilization Act and be marketed under the Canadian Wheat Board. I really fail to understand that. There is no necessary conflict; the Wheat Board is a marketing system, that's true, but the Stabilization Act is not a marketing system; therefore what's the necessary conflict? If the government wished to bring western grain under the Stabilization Act they could do so by legislation and there would be no impossible task there. The Honourable Member from Roblin gave me some advice as to my need for changing my agricultural advisor. Now I don't know whether he thinks that I can afford an advisor on an official basis; I suppose he's referring to something just a little more personal than that, and if he's referring to whom I think he is referring, then I would tell him that he is only an occasional advisor, and only in the last few months at that. -- (Interjection) -- and a good one of course, Mr. Speaker. I have no reason to question his judgment up to now -- tell him that. I would give the honourable member -- I would pay him a compliment and give him credit for his very frank admission that the Agricultural Stabilization Act is not operating in the way in which he would like to see it operate. To me, this is a very important admission; it almost touches at the very nub of the matter of my resolution, and if the honourable member really feels that the Stabilization Act is not operating in the way he would like to see it operate, then I invite him to take steps, whatever steps he may have the power to take, to do something about it, and one of the steps that was certainly open to him would be for him to have supported the contents of this resolution which I moved, so it seems to me that he's really a little confused as to how best to make improvements in this Act which he openly admits is not operating too well. -- (Interjection) -- Then he really takes after -- like a hound in the chase -- he takes after the Honourable Member for Inkster, and there he might have us in what he thinks is a very vulnerable spot, because I recall well the occasion last year when the Honourable Member for Inkster made this statement referring to large grain manufacturers, as he put it. It was a statement made off the cuff and incidentally made in relation to the honourable member's personal knowledge of two individuals -- (Interjection) -- of two individuals -- ask him some time in the hallway -- two individuals who do operate in this way. Now if the honourable member wants to take this as an indication of our group's thinking as to the general mode of operation of Manitoba farmers, then I can't stop him, but it's certainly a very silly way for him to behave. Now he knows better than that so there's no point in me pursuing that any further. He mentions Stanley Knowles and Hugh Garner. Now that's a strange combination if I've even seen one. I don't think this is really important here and so I shall go on further.

He accuses us in the CCF of always talking about price; never anything else but price, and while we admit that there are many problems for the Department of Agriculture, both federally and provincially, to work on, almost every problem that any department of agriculture

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) in this country wishes to tackle, is almost, by elimination an ancillary problem. The main problem is price. I say it now; I've no compunctions about saying that at all. Price is the main problem, and while we can attack many of the other problems, they are not -- no matter how much success we have with them -- they are not going to help solve the general situation that exists in agriculture today, undesirable situation. And what is it? The honourable member is well aware because he mentioned it himself -- rising costs of production. He mentioned it. He said we didn't mention it enough. So he mentioned it. Rising costs of production and deteriorating prices or, at best, level prices. And if you pursue this to its logical conclusion, what other conclusion can you come to but that the main problem is price? -- (Interjection) -- Well, I just don't see why you take after us. You and the Honourable Minister in this Chamber both -- the Minister of Agriculture -- you accuse us of speaking of nothing else but price.

Now you made some mention, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member made some mention about cost of production and he said, "Well, where can we get adequate figures? Where can we get information as to what the cost of production is?" Well, the Department of Agriculture certainly has statistical information at its disposal. The Federal Department of Agriculture publishes statistical bulletins quarterly. There's a publication put out by The Dominion Bureau of Statistics called the Economic Analyst, and they've made very detailed studies of the costs of production in certain regions of Canada and in certain regions of certain provinces in Canada, and they give cost of production figures, but this is not the problem, the insolvable problem that should be keeping us back from taking proper steps. I would, Mr. Speaker, like, if not here then in personal conversation with the honourable member, like to find out from him where he gets the impression that we, in this group, don't refer in sufficient emphasis to cost of production. I see he mentioned it three or four times. He mentions labour as a very major cause in the rise of production costs to the farmer. At the bottom of Page 1603 he points out the weekly wage increases in manufacturing in Canada, conveniently forgetting to also point out the rise in productivity per worker which therefore gives a rather distorted concept of the relative importance in the cause of farm cost of production price increases -- too large a proportion that can be attributed to cost of labour. This is not as great a cause as the honourable member leaves with us on Page 1603, because I don't have any very recent figures in my head right now, but I remember a 1958 study on farm machinery manufacturing and costs, etcetera, and the proportion -- and I make this a definite statement; the member can challenge me on that if he wishes -- but the cost of the manufacturing of farm machinery attributable to the labour element had actually not increased, because with the increase in hourly wage rates there was a concomitant rise in productivity per worker. Now of course in other segments, this productivity might not have kept up with wage increases but in farm machinery it has; at least it did until '58; it might have changed since then, I don't know.

Now he mentioned, and I quite agree with him here, on page 1604, the Honourable Member for Roblin said that we must quit passing the buck. -- (Interjection) -- Will you hold your tongue -- he's chastising somebody over here -- but we must quit passing the buck and get down to business. It's time that labour and management get together and find a different way of sharing profits and so on, so as to prevent the continual rise in increased costs and so on. Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is looking for support he couldn't have a better supporter on that point than myself.

MR. SPEAKER: I might just point out to the Honourable Member for Brokenhead that the motion we're discussing is the amendment to the amendment by the Honourable Member for Carillon. He appears to be directing most of his remarks to the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in order to deal with that I must go through the amendment which led up to the sub-amendment. I really won't be too long. I will get to it presently. So how do we attempt, then, to put a stop to rising costs as it affects the farmer? Well, we could have some measure of price regulations, voluntary by tripartite boards, of labour, management and public representatives. This might help. We could do it by legislation which would bring about price control, but it was the action of the Federal Government in the post-war years which took off price regulation. I don't think any of the Conservative members of parliament at the time opposed it, so if I were the Honourable Member for Roblin, I wouldn't get too excited about price regulation at this time. It doesn't seem consistent with their

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) philosophy. The honourable member says that surpluses aren't problems; is not a major problem. I would tend to agree with him, but that's certainly not the way the former Federal Minister of Agriculture spoke. I recall so vividly the words of the Honourable Douglas Harkness when he was speaking to an F. A. O. meeting in Rome just a couple of years ago. And what was his reason for having farm prices at a non-incentive level? Because of fear of over-production; because of fear of mounting surpluses. How do you reconcile that with this view of the former Minister? Alvin Hamilton just the other day gave advice to farmers not to expand too much -- not to expand.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member is taking things a little bit out of context. I said surpluses are not a problem if we have the markets. Marketing is the problem.

MR. SCHREYER: Well you think then, Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: is almost out of order I would think. They have been very patient with him. I thought that possibly he would discuss in some manner the amendment to the amendment by the Honourable Member for Carillon. He has still failed to do that.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if necessary then, I shall confine myself to the

MR. ROBLIN: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend doesn't want to talk about the sub-amendment he can sit down, and then when the sub-amendment is disposed of, he can make his speech dealing with the speech of the Honourable Member for Roblin on the amendment. It's quite simple.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think to expedite matters I shall deal with the sub-amendment right now. As I see it, the sub-amendment is the same as was before us last year. It has its merits. I don't think that it really should be included with the same resolution that I proposed. However there was an amendment to my resolution and now this sub-amendment, and quite frankly it has its merits although what results it can bring is really open to question, and in view of that, we shall support the sub-amendment, pointing out in saying that, Mr. Speaker, that the sub-amendment, like the amendment of the Honourable Member for Roblin, is quite a far cry from the original problem and original intent in the proposed resolution, the original resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party and the amendment proposed by the Honourable the First Minister and the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to let the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the reason I adjourned this resolution was, I believe my colleague from Inkster was not here at the time and he had wanted an opportunity to say a few words. I see he's not here again. I would ask it to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party. Just under the wire.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder -- Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, and I have a reputation of not being too brief, if I may allow this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member from Morris. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I am not thinking of standing this over. I have very little to say on it, and I don't want the fellows to get out of here ahead of time. I would like to have seen this resolution brought in by the Minister of Agriculture instead of one of the front back-benchers. There has been a lot of talk about the over-production of chickens and all the rest of it, and what I was concerned about, Mr. Speaker, the other day when the

(Mr. Peters, cont'd.) Honourable Member from Assinibola was speaking about -- we listened and heard of all the new industry that we're bringing into this province, and one of the industries that is being brought to the fore is the chicken industry, and as I pointed out one time I was disturbed by the amount of American chickens that are being -- not whole chickens because you can't import a whole chicken into Canada, but cut-up chickens -- that are finding their way into Canada and I think there's a source of revenue for our farmers here.

There is one other thing that I want to bring to the attention of this House. Not too long ago we had a great surplus of pork in this country, in Canada. That surplus has now disappeared. There isn't one pound of pork in storage in Canada anywhere. Pork is so scarce in this country that this summer, not only this summer but for the past six months we have been importing pork from the United States and this summer, to meet the demands of the public here in the Province of Manitoba, we are going to have to import anywhere from a million to two million pounds of American pork. That's why, Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of this resolution, but the only thing, I am very sorry that it wasn't the Minister of Agriculture that brought it in instead of, as I said, one of the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HUTTON: I would just like to say a very few words. I think that the fact that the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, didn't bring in this resolution -- this indicates what everybody knows, that we've got a great deal of talent on this side of the House and they don't have to rely on one of the Ministers to come up with a good idea, and I think it most appropriate that the Honourable Member for Morris brought this resolution in here. He's a man who has had a very close association with the livestock industry in the Province of Manitoba. I had to take off my hat any day of the week to the Honourable Member for Morris when it came to spotting a good animal. He looked at 'em in the ring for many, many a day; he knows what the buyers like and he knows how, as an auctioneer, to squeeze the last quarter of a cent or part of a cent out -- (Interjection) -- I am talking about the resolution. The Honourable Member for Morris introduced this resolution because he has a keen interest in it, and I'm in agreement with him. I think that as members of the Legislature we should be apprised of the various aspects of marketing livestock in this province. We hear rumblings from time to time on the farm level about the marketing of our livestock products, and I think it's very timely that a Committee of this House should be set up to look into this matter so that we are informed generally in this House, on the conditions as they exist in the livestock industry in this province and I heartily endorse the resolution of the Honourable Member for Morris and in no way am I envious of the fact that he brought it in, because I think he's a pretty fair authority in the field of livestock in Manitoba.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, I think I can still get in my time. I'm not known to talk long but only I want to observe this, if we're going to have a committee and such a committee to study as we had Dean Walnes studying margarine, then afterwards we battled in the House here, back and forth, and I would like to see that committee study all phases of marketing. I would like to see that committee even study the Marketing Boards and if that study comes in, that it would be implemented in this House as soon as possible, as soon as that study is, and not shelved, because sometimes I feel we have studies about agriculture and what not, and the next thing you know it's shelved -- on the shelf -- and it stays there, so therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to make that brief comment that I hope that that committee is going to work and it's going to work in the interest of the agricultural economy here in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like just to say a few words on this resolution of the Honourable Member for Morris. I too have been approached a number of times on this very problem, the marketing of livestock and everything concerned with it, and I think it will be in the best interests of the farmers in Manitoba if we set up a committee to investigate all aspects of marketing in Manitoba here.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, it's pretty nearly close to our usual time of adjournment so I will move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

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