

I N D E X

Monday Evening, July 27th, 1959

	Page
<u>Report of Committee of Supply</u>	
<u>Resolution 25, Agriculture, Discussion and Divisions</u>	1319
<u>Resolution 26, Agriculture, Discussion and Divisions</u>	1322
<u>Resolution 35, Water Control and Conservation, Divisions</u>	1323
<u>Resolution 45, Health and Public Welfare (Executive Division), Divisions</u>	1323
<u>Resolution 46, Health Division, Discussion and Divisions</u>	1324
<u>Resolution 47, Welfare Division, Divisions</u>	1325
<u>Resolution 48, Mines and Natural Resources, Division</u>	1325
<u>Resolution 81, Highways, Discussion and Divisions</u>	1326
<u>Resolution 86, Labour, Division</u>	1327
<u>Capital Supply, Statement, Mr. Roblin</u>	1327
<u>Discussion and Passing of Items</u>	1329

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, July 27th, 1959.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, before 5:30 I had indicated that I had wanted to say a few words in connection with this amendment. All I actually wish to say is this. That the purpose of the amendment as offered by this group is perhaps misinterpreted either unintentionally or otherwise. Certainly the intention was not to offer, shall we say, intense criticism; it was merely to indicate to the Government that we were not satisfied that they had acted or had considered this problem -- Indian-Metis problem -- as diligently as perhaps they should have, or could have. I think that we all realize that this problem has existed in this province for many years and is a much greater problem than a good many people care to admit. All this amendment is doing is offering a mild rebuke to the Government for not giving us, at least in general terms, some indication of just how they intended to tackle this problem that exists with us.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, while I perhaps agree with the First Minister -- that he is not the only one to blame, -- but fortunately or unfortunately the other Party is not in power now and he must of necessity assume the blame. The tragedy and the hardships of these two classes of people is known to everyone and I'm sure each one appreciates it. I happen to be in the unfortunate position of having an office where they get together quite often and I could see them; I talk to them quite often. A helpless people who needs to be helped. If not, they will become a burden on the community, which they don't want to be. So we have to pinpoint somebody, and we simply have taken you as the goat for it, although realizing that somebody else in this House were at one time also to blame. At the same time, however, it had been in power for a year. It's true that we've had the investigation, but investigations were made long before, which must be on record with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, because the Honourable Minister of Agriculture previously, of the previous Government, handled it. So I agree with the previous speaker -- the reason for the amendment is just to call the attention of the House, the attention of all parties, the importance of doing something and doing it as soon as possible.

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

MR. PAULLEY: The Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is that while concurring in Resolution No. 25, this House regrets the failure of the Government to implement the recommendations of the Indian and Metis Report.

A standing vote recorded and the results were as follows:

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

NAYS: Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Campbell, Carroll, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Miller, Molgat, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Weir, Witney.

MR. CLERK: Yeas -- 9, Nays -- 41.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson that while concurring in Resolution No. 25, this House regrets that the Government has failed to secure from the Federal Government an equitable share of the cost of the proposed Federal-Provincial Crop Insurance Plan.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I'm just wondering if it's in order to move two amendments to the same resolution? I remember in days gone by we used to have arguments about this and I'm trying to recall just how it came out. Whether we decided they were in order or out-of-order.

MR. MILLER: There's no argument on that point at all. You can move any number of motions on the same resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the same resolution deal with crop insurance?

MR. PAULLEY: may I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, it's dealing with the administration of the Department of Agriculture; and once one resolution is defeated,

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) it's been the past practice and I believe it's in order for a second amendment to be

MR. SPEAKER: Put the question.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Federal Crop Insurance Bill as presented in Ottawa and past in the recent session just completed, is of necessity a lengthy and complicated one. But in it are three main points that are of great concern or interest to all of the people connected with the agriculture industry. The three main points are the financial terms where the Federal Government offers to pay to any provincial plan -- crop insurance plan -- 50% of the administration costs, 20% of the premiums and, in addition, are agreeing or offering to loan money to Provincial Crop Insurance Plans wherever they -- through a crop disaster of some kind -- require extra capital to pay the insurance. In all cases they only offer to loan extra money. They do not offer to in any way to underwrite any of the losses occurred by a disastrous crop failure.

Now to my knowledge, the Manitoba Government is the only Provincial Government in Canada which has indicated that this plan is satisfactory and acceptable. Certainly all the other prairie provinces have indicated very strongly, great disappointment in the federal proposal. All farm organizations that I know of have indicated their disappointment with the plan; and they feel that the Federal Government has accepted very little responsibility in the field of crop insurance by their very limited offer of assistance. Now it is apparent I think to all that the Federal Government did not consult farm organizations when they drafted this bill. And I think what is more important to us tonight is the fact that the Manitoba Government did not consult any local agricultural officials or organizations before passing their opinion on this plan -- their opinion that the plan was good. And I suggest, this is a damaging opinion because all farm organizations have indicated their displeasure with the plan whereas the Provincial Government indicates that they are pleased with the plan. Now it's an unfortunate situation because I think that the Provincial Government has placed, has jeopardized the farm situation on this thing, because we are now in an extremely poor bargaining position with Ottawa over this Federal Crop Insurance Bill because our Minister of Agriculture in this House indicated or said in plain English that he was pleased with the federal proposal. And I think we have placed ourselves behind the 'eight ball'; I think we have placed ourselves in an extremely poor bargaining position, and makes it almost impossible for us to go back to Ottawa now and say, "this was not a good plan; we're sorry that we said it was a good plan" -- because I think it is apparent to us all that the federal offer of assistance on the crop insurance plan is an extremely limited one. It is one that places all the -- a large portion of the expense in case of loss on the province. I feel that this Provincial Government of ours, the Manitoba Government, has in effect scuttled both the provincial taxpayers position -- because in the case of a disaster, it will be the Provincial Manitoba taxpayer that's going to take it. And in addition, it has scuttled the position of the Manitoba farmer by being too willing to accept a proposal offered by the Federal Government at Ottawa.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think that when the honourable member sees the legislation the Government is bringing down, he will find that almost everything he has said has been wrong. When he says that we haven't consulted farm organizations, I think he'll find he is incorrect in that too. (Interjection) I don't care what they told my honourable friend. I think that he'll find that when the legislation comes down that the interests of Manitoba have been amply protected.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: The Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House that while concurring in Resolution No. 25, this House regrets that the Government have failed to secure from the Federal Government an equitable share of the costs of the proposed Federal-Provincial Crop Insurance Plan.

A standing vote recorded and the results were as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hryhorczuk, Miller, Mølgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Carroll, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli),

(Nays, cont'd.)... Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Weir, Witney.

MR. CLERK: Yeas -- 19. Nays -- 31.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that while concurring in Resolution No. 25, this House regrets that the Government has failed to support the farmers of Manitoba in their attempt to obtain from the Federal Government their promised fair share of the National Income.

Mr. Speaker presented the question.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be very brief for two or three reasons. No. 1 -- It is hot in here tonight. No. 2 -- The plight of the farmers has been thoroughly aired at not only this session, but at two previous sessions. At this session the Honourable Member for Brokenhead discussed this matter in some detail; the Honourable Member for Roblin discussed it. In fact I think it is still on the Order Paper, if I'm correct, and the funny part of it is that every member regardless of where he sits seems to be in agreement in that the farmer is in a plight. The cost-price squeeze has caught him and it's tightening every day, and everybody admits that.

Now when I spoke on the Throne Speech Debate, I went on record as favouring deficiency payments; I went further than that, I suggested how the money could be raised for the payment of a deficiency payment by a two-price system. The Prime Minister of Canada and indeed this government, during both election campaigns assured the people of Canada and the province that they were champions of the farmer. The Prime Minister of Canada said that he was prepared to offer the farmers 'parity not charity' -- There was no argument about that. And we say on this side of the House, that this government has failed to support the farmers when they made the mass delegation to Ottawa here in March, I believe it was. Every member here this evening that sat through the last session of the Legislature, heard all about the 'wishy-washy' telegram that was sent down there by this government. But in view of the fact that probably 50% of the members that are sitting here tonight don't know the content of that 'wishy-washy' telegram - (interjection) - Yes, I know and there are a lot of members that have heard the term 'wishy-washy' telegram, but I think in view of the shortness of the telegram that it wouldn't do any harm to read the contents of this 'wishy-washy' telegram. Now this is what the Conservative caucus - (interjection) - No, that's right and this is just for the benefit of the new members that would like to hear about this 'wishy-washy' telegram. And here it is fellows: "Manitoba Provincial Conservative caucus much appreciates your reception of mass farm delegation on Tuesday, March 10th. We are glad to remember your special interest and special knowledge in this connection. Although deficiency payments are only part of the whole picture, we feel confident the meetings between yourself and farm leaders will be helpful in reaching a fuller understanding of possible solutions."

A MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SHOEMAKER: That was the Conservative caucus that sent that after a great deal of deliberation, signed by the Whip of the Conservative Party. Now up to now this fence-straddling, 'wishy-washy' telegram hasn't resulted in any action from either government and we will leave it there. We claim that this government has failed to press their federal friends for any assistance whatever.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Motion before the House: That while concurring in Resolution #25, this House regrets that the Government have failed to support the farmers of Manitoba in their attempts to obtain from the Federal Government their promise of a fair share of the National income.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Gray, Harris, Hawryluk, Hryhorczuk, Miller, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Carroll, Corbett, Cowan, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon,

(Nays, continued)... McKellar, McLean, Martin, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wier, Willis, Witney.

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 18, NAYS - 32.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 26 - Resolved to be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,123,160. for Agriculture and Conservation. Agriculture -

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that while concurring in Resolution 26, this House regrets the failure of the government to implement farm security legislation.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Mr. Speaker put the question. A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Campbell, Carroll, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Miller, Molgat, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Weir, Willis, Witney.

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 9, NAYS - 42.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains that while concurring in Resolution No. 26, this House regrets the government has failed to take care of the interests of the basic export industries of this province by failing to make adequate protests against the increasingly restrictive trade policies of the Federal Government, which invite retaliatory action by other countries and seriously threaten our export trade, and in particular our export of livestock to the United States.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution is fairly self-explanatory but I just wish to add this: that this is one of the most serious problems facing western agriculture and unless something is done very soon to correct the present tendencies of the Federal Government, we are going to lose our markets. At the moment the barley market in Japan is seriously threatened, and our livestock market in the United States can be threatened at any time if the government proceeds with its policies as it has in the past few years. This would mean a very serious loss to all farmers in the Province of Manitoba, and for that matter in all of Canada, and this is one of the most serious issues facing agriculture at this time.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Speaker, it is passing strange that we should have this resolution at a time when we have exported more cattle than ever before; when we have exported more dollars worth of cattle than ever before; at a time too, when the experts say it will be good for at least five years more -- which they haven't been able to say in the past. And yet we get this resolution which has no basis in fact.

MR. MOLGAT: A great deal of basis a great deal ...

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture is pretty wide of the mark, when he suggests it is passing strange that this resolution should be proposed under these circumstances. It's just because the livestock market is so vitally important to the stock raisers of Manitoba -- because we have had those good export conditions recently -- that the seriousness of this situation needs to be brought to the attention of the Federal Government, and this Government, in order to exert whatever influence they can upon them. And, Mr. Speaker, the only self-confessed expert that I have heard be so optimistic as to suggest that the situation is safe for five years, is my honourable friend, the Minister of Agriculture. I don't know of one other...

MR. WILLIS: economic expert of the Department of Agriculture whom you hired when you were in there; who said it was good for at least five years. And you'll find it in the Free Press Prairie Farmer, the last issue, in which he made the statement. He's the man whom you hired as an expert.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would be very glad to have my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture produce the article that I hired as an expert while I was there, Mr. Speaker -- if he can produce it. Because the information that I have which comes from the United States itself -- I get one of the trade journals there from the largest Co-op on the St. Paul market -- is that the build-up of cattle in the United States itself is quite likely to change the marketing situation in that country. And if the marketing there continues to outrun the demand situation, and if the trade policies of Canada at the same time become restricted, then certainly our position here is in jeopardy. And I don't think that anything that we could say or do in this House could emphasize that situation too greatly. Export as a good many of the honourable members know, is the life blood of the cattle industry and it's been good in the last couple of years, that's true. What we would like to do is keep it that way.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion before the House is that while concurring in resolution number 26, this House regrets the Government have failed to take care of the interest of the basic export industries of this province, by failing to make adequate protests against the increasingly restrictive trade policies of the Federal Government, which invite retaliatory action by other countries and seriously threaten our whole trade export trade, and in particular our export of livestock to the United States. Those in favour of the motion rise.

A standing vote was recorded and the results were as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Prefontaine, Miller, Gray, Paulley, Hawryluk, Molgat, Hryhorczuk, Guttormson, Orlikow, Wright, Wagner, Tanchak, Roberts, Shoemaker, Desjardins, Harris, Reid, Schreyer.

NAYS: Messrs. Roblin, Thompson, Lyon, Evans, Willis, McLean, Johnson, Boulic, Ridley, Carroll, Shewman, Scarth, Alexander, Martin, Cowan, Groves, Corbett, Cobb, Witney, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Stanes, Smellie, Strickland, McKellar, Weir, Seaborn, Johnson (Assiniboia), Baizley, Bjornson, Klym, Hamilton, Hutton.

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 19, NAYS - 33.

MR. SPEAKER: I Declare the motion lost. Resolutions 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34 were read and concurred in. 35. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1, 500, 000.00 for Agriculture and Immigration -- water control and conservation.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member from Fisher, that while concurring in resolution 35, this House regrets that the Government has failed to provide proper aid for those farmers who have suffered severe flooding and/or extreme excessive moisture conditions.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Motion before the House. That while concurring in resolution No. 35, this House regrets that the Government has failed to provide proper aid for those farmers who have suffered severe flooding and/or extreme excessive moisture conditions.

A standing vote was recorded and the results were as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hryhorczuk, Miller, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

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

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 19, NAYS - 33.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Resolutions 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44 were read and concurred in. 45. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$489,704.00 for Health and Public Welfare, Executive Division.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for St. George, that while concurring in resolution No. 45, this House regrets the failure of the Government to secure from the Federal Government an implementation of its promises to

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) . . include the cost of mental and tuberculosis treatment under the National Hospitalization Plan.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Motion before the House. That while concurring in resolution No. 45, this House regrets the failure of the Government to secure from the Federal Government an implementation of its promises to include the cost of mental and tuberculosis treatment under the National Hospitalization Plan.

A standing vote recorded and the results were as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hryhorczuk, Miller, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

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

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 19, NAYS - 33.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. 46. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,393,675.00 for Health and Public Welfare, Health Division.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Kildonan, that while concurring in resolution 46, this House regrets the failure of the Government to inaugurate free diagnosis and treatment of cancer.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Motion before the House. That while concurring in resolution No. 46, this House regrets the failure of the Government to inaugurate free diagnosis and treatment of cancer.

A standing vote was recorded and the results were as follows:

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Campbell, Carroll, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Guttormson, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Miller, Molgat, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Weir, Willis, Witney.

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 9, NAYS - 41.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that while concurring in resolution 46, this House regrets that the Government has not provided for sufficient trained personnel, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and vocational guidance workers in our mental hospitals.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member a question? Could he explain the difference between a psychiatrist and a psychologist so that we'd all know here.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows that I'm not an expert, but I do know something about this. A psychiatrist happens to be a medical doctor who is trained and qualified to actually treat people who are mentally ill. A psychologist is not a medical doctor, is one whose main purpose is to conduct -- to do testing and various experiments of that nature. The two work together. If the honourable member wants it in detail, I'm sure the Minister of Health can do a much better job than I can.

MR. CORBETT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member a question? I didn't quite catch it. Are there any podiatrists on that (interjection)

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, he ought to ask the Honourable member for -- who introduced the Bill, from St. Vital.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion before the House is, that while concurring in resolution 46, this House regrets that the Government have not provided for sufficient trained personnel, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and vocational guidance workers in our mental hospitals.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Campbell, Carroll, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Miller, Molgat, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Weir, Willis and Witney.

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 9, NAYS - 42.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. 47. That there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,040,000. for Health and Public Welfare, Welfare division.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead that while concurring the resolution 47, this House regrets that the government has failed to take initial steps necessary to increase the basic amounts of pensions to be paid to the Old Age, Blind and Disabled Persons.

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

A MEMBER: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion before the House is that while concurring in Resolution No. 47, this House regrets that the government has failed to take initial steps necessary to increase the basic amount of pension to be paid to the Old Age, Blind and Disabled persons.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Campbell, Carroll, Cobb, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Miller, Molgat, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Weir, Willis and Witney.

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 9, NAYS - 41.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. 48. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty the sum not exceeding \$81,510. for Mines and Natural Resources, Administration —

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that while concurring in Resolution No. 48, this House regrets the failure of the government to secure adequate revenue in royalties and rentals from those corporations who are exploiting our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker put the questions and following a voice vote, declared the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays, please, Mr. Speaker, especially from one who has already said "yea".

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion before the House is, that while concurring in Resolution No. 48, this House regrets the failure of the government to secure adequate revenue in royalties and rentals from those corporations who are exploiting our natural resources.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Campbell, Carroll, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Molgat, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Weir, Willis and Witney.

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 9, NAYS - 42.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Resolutions 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80 read and concurred in. 81.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that while concurring - interjection - Seven Oaks - sorry - that while concurring in the Resolution No. 81, this House regrets that the government has not taken the initiative in establishing a forward-looking policy regarding the construction of a provincial municipal grid system of market and school roads.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Motion before the House is that while concurring in the Resolution No. 81, this House regrets that the government has not taken the initiative in establishing a forward-looking policy regarding the construction of a provincial municipal grid system of market and school roads.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

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

YEAS. Messrs. Campbell, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hryhorczuk, Miller, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Carroll, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, McKellar, Lyon, McLean, Martin, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Weir, Willis and Witney.

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 18, NAYS - 33.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that while concurring in Resolution No. 81, this House is of the opinion that the government by greatly increasing the weight limits on many highways of the province, has confirmed the fact that these highways have been built to a high standard by the previous administration.

MR. PAULLEY: I think this is one of the most interesting concurrent resolutions that has been produced this session. It appears to me somewhat amusing because the Honourable the present Minister of Public Works has told us on numerous occasions -- if not actually, -- certainly by inference -- that the former administration were not on their toes in respect of building high standard highways. Now this resolution is an attempt on the part of the Official Opposition to say to the Honourable the Minister of Public Works and to the government that simply because of the fact that they have increased the weight limits on these roads that it is, in effect, saying that the roads are of high standards. During the discussions on the estimates of the Department of Public Works, this matter was given a considerable amount of consideration. We maintained at that time, and we still maintain, that rather than, as this resolution suggests, that these highways which have now been designated as Class "A" highways are of high standard; We maintain that the weight limit increase has not been justified. The Honourable the Minister of Public Works informed the House at that time on the consideration of the estimates on highways, that a certain amount of testing had been done. He wasn't in a position to tell us the extent of that testing. From observation made in recent days of some of these highways which have been classified as Class "A" highways, merely by the passing of an Order-in-Council; I think that the province and the Treasury of the Province of Manitoba is going to be faced with the necessity of rebuilding completely many of these roads which have now been classified as Class "A" highways. So, Mr. Speaker, while briefly talking to this resolution which we are not going to support, we are not supporting it because it is not a fact that with the reclassification of these highways that they are made to a high standard. We are not supporting this resolution because we believe that merely by Order-in-Council has not produced a high enough standard of roads to warrant a weight lift limit of 72,000 pounds.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and declared the motion lost.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion before the House is that while

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd)... concurring in Resolution No. 81, this House is of the opinion that the Government by greatly increasing the weight limits of many highways of the province has confirmed the fact that these highways have been built to a higher standard by the previous administration.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

A standing vote recorded and the results were as follows:

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Carroll, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Orlikow, P. Reid, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Weir, Willis, Witney and Wright.

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 10 NAYS - 42.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Resolutions Nos. 82, 83, 84 and 85 read and passed. Resolution No. 86 - Resolved that it be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$73,270.00 for Labour Administration.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher that while concurring in Resolution No. 86, this House regrets the Government has failed to extend the provisions of the Fair Wage Act regarding hourly rates of pay and payment for overtime to the whole province.

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

A MEMBER: The ayes and nays Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion before the House is that while concurring in Resolution No. 86, this House regrets the Government has failed to extend the provision of the Fair Wage Act regarding hourly rates of pay and payment for overtime to the whole province.

A standing vote recorded and the results were as follows:

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

NAYS: Alexander, Bjornson, Boulic, Campbell, Carroll, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Miller, Molgat, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Roberts, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Weir, Willis, Witney.

MR. CLERK: YEAS - 9 NAYS - 40.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Resolutions Nos. 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, and 98 read and passed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable J. S. McDiarmid, Lieutenant-Governor. The Lieutenant Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates of sums which are required for the services of the province for the capital expenditures and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor together with the capital estimates accompanying the same be referred to the Committee of Supply.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the capital supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with the study of this list of capital supply that is before you now, I'd like to make a brief statement explaining some of the salient features before the Committee begins its work. As the government has repeatedly indicated, we intend to proceed with a vigorous program of capital expansion of facilities and services much needed by the people of Manitoba. We are asking the Legislature to provide authorization

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)... for expenditure of some \$58,953,560 of which \$22,500,000. will be required by our self-sustaining utilities; \$28,726,800 for direct expenditure by the Provincial Government to expand its own facilities, and \$7,726,760 for support of organizations that depend to a large extent on the Government of Manitoba for financial assistance on capital projects.

You will notice, Sir, that the estimates for capital supply are segregated into three schedules - A, B and C - and I would like to explain the purpose for making this division. Schedule A lists the requirements of our three public utilities - the Manitoba Telephone System, the Manitoba Power Commission and the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board. These utilities are, of course, self-sustaining and supply their own funds to pay interest and amortization. Because of the fact that these are publicly owned utilities, their programs for expansion must be approved by the Legislature as a means of Public control. Schedule B of the estimates lists the Government's own requirements for capital expenditure. Included in this section is an amount of some \$19,000,000 for highways and roads. The major portion of this new authorization is required to enable the Department of Public Works to plan its highway expenditures for the coming winter and the 1960-61 fiscal year. In previous years the lack of advance authorization has caused uncertainty and delay in highway construction, but by voting these funds now, we will enable the Department of Public Works to get their highway program underway much earlier than they otherwise could. Earlier tenders for road construction means an earlier start each spring and will help to meet the problem of seasonal unemployment. Schedule C of the estimates lists the capital requirements of the University, affiliated colleges, hospitals and such other organizations that are partially supported by the province. You will note, Sir, that this section is headed, "Grants, Loans, Advances or Guarantee of Securities issued." I would like to explain that the Government is asking for the approval of the legislature to either grant, lend or advance moneys to these organizations, or in lieu of making grants or loans, to guarantee the securities of such organizations. It is the opinion of the Government that this type of flexibility is necessary in order that we may meet the requirements of these organizations and still maintain our advantageous position in the securities market.

Without going into detail, I would draw the attention of the House to some of the major expenditure items provided for in these estimates. The details of the various programs will be explained later by the Ministers having charge of the particular services. 1. Manitoba Telephone System - \$4,000,000.00. I might explain here that the estimated capital expenditure for the Telephone System during the current fiscal year is approximately twelve and a half million dollars, of which three and a half million will be provided by Replacement Reserve Fund; \$5,000,000 will be provided by a carry-over of unused authorization provided by the legislature in previous years; and the balance of \$4,000,000 is provided by this Bill. 2. The Manitoba Power Commission - \$1,500,000.00. The program for the Power Commission during the current fiscal year will amount to approximately \$7,300,000. Of this amount approximately \$6,100,000.00 will be provided by unused authorization from previous years. Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board - \$17,000,000. The expenditure program for Hydro development is approximately \$32,000,000 for the current fiscal year, to be financed as follows: half a million from depreciation replacement fund; fourteen and a half million from the unused portion of prior year's authorization; and seventeen millions by this Bill.

The Government is requiring authorizations for capital expenditure for its own purposes of some \$28,700,000 of which the following are the most important items: \$19,390,000 for the Department of Public Works; \$1,760,000 for increased patient accommodation and additional facilities in our mental hospitals and institutions; \$4,400,000 further authorization for the Winnipeg Provincial Administration building and the Provincial building at The Pas; \$500,000 as a start on our flood protection program; \$1,000,000 for soil erosion, water control and drainage projects; \$671,000 for development of natural resources and recreational projects; \$350,000 for the purchase of property for future sites of provincial buildings; \$330,000 for the acquisition of land and land settlement projects to permit the establishment of more forest preserve and game preserve, and to provide for the reclamation of land for agricultural purposes.

Now we are asking the province for authorization to make funds available to organizations that depend on the province to a large extent for their financing. These include the University of Manitoba, requiring some \$3,800,000 to provide increased authorization for the new Science Building, the Architectural Building, the School of Dentistry and to provide funds for an art

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)... annex and other projects. \$750,000 to be made available to the affiliated colleges, and \$500,000 has been specifically designated for Brandon College. Some \$900,000 is to be made available as an initial contribution to a five-year program for development and expansion of the Agricultural Department and School of Home Economics at the University of Manitoba. \$1,235,000 is to be provided as the provincial share to hospitals and homes for the aged throughout the province. \$218,000 is an initial authorization for a rehabilitation hospital, and \$250,000 for the supply of water in the lower Red River Valley. This Sir, is a resume of our capital expenditure programs contained in the estimates that are now before the Committee and as we proceed with the estimates the Ministers will do their best to explain the program that I have just briefly indicated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule A - Utilities Requirements (1).

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, Would the Minister just go over the figures again which the Honourable the First Minister has already given us. I don't think I got them completely. Twelve and a half million is the total expenditure for the Telephone System as I understood it. Would he just go over those figures once again, please?

HON. J. B. CARROLL: (Minister of Public Utilities): (The Pas): I can run over the various items under this - that make up this amount - \$12,416,000 -- they are as follows: underground conduit for Winnipeg - \$578,000; underground cable, Winnipeg - \$774,000; aerial cable, exchange lines, Winnipeg - \$836,000; Central office equipment, Winnipeg - \$1,205,000. central office equipment - province - \$1,345,000.;

radio relay equipment - \$245,000.; long distance toll equipment - \$838,000; radio-telephone - \$242,000; buildings and land, - Winnipeg \$667,000; buildings and land, province - \$365,000.; toll lines, province - \$396,000; exchange plant, province - \$683,000; rural lines - \$1,227,000; subscribers station equipment - \$1,788,000; autos, trucks and tools - \$900,000; furniture - \$77,000; contingencies - \$250,000. A total of \$12,416,000, of which \$3,416,000 come out of replacement fund, the balance - \$5,000,000 from previous unused authorization. We're asking for an appropriation this year of \$4,000,000.

Would you like the same detail on the Manitoba Power Commission? Outside suburban Winnipeg area - farms, farm land, domestic commercial service and oil fields - \$425,000, towns including purchase and new distribution system, rebuilding and converting of old distribution systems, system improvements and new customers and street lighting - \$1,271,000; Transmission, including high voltage lines and associated circuit changes, rural lines, rebuilding and conversion and relocating for highways - \$1,992,000; substations - \$345,000; regulation - \$103,000; terminals - \$803,000, making a total for outside of Winnipeg - \$4,939,000. Suburban Winnipeg Area: - distribution including four K. V. Feeder Systems, improvements, new customers, street lighting - \$1,281,000; transmission including high voltage, subtransmission lines, associated circuit changes, rebuilding - \$180,000. Stations including general substations, customers' substations, buildings and miscellaneous - \$697,000; Land and buildings - \$275,000; a total in the suburban area - \$2,361,000 or a grand total of \$7,300,000 of which there was \$6,100,000 previously authorized but unused.

Now the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board: - power generating plants, a total of \$26,525,000. Made up as follows: Brandon - \$410,000; Selkirk - \$9,375,000; Grand Rapids - \$300,000; Kelsey - \$16,000,000; sundry items - \$440,000. Transmission - a grand total of \$3,650,000 made up as follows: Southern System - \$500,000; Saskatchewan interconnection - \$2,000,000; Kelsey and Thompson - \$1,150,000. Terminal stations - a total of \$700,000. Made up as follows: St. Vital - \$350,000; Kirkfield, land only - \$2,000; Rosser, land only - \$7,000.; additions to existing stations - \$341,000. Miscellaneous -- which includes communications, remote control, relay and other work - \$1,500,000. Total projects - \$32,375,000, less from depreciation reserve \$475,000, and carry-over from the 1958-59 authorization \$14,900,000, making total required - \$17,000,000 we're asking for in this authorization.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, did I get the figure correctly, Kelsey - \$16,000,000?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Kelsey - \$16,000,000.

MR. CAMPBELL: That means that the Hydro Board is expecting to get \$16,000,000 worth of work done this year at Kelsey?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, that's right.

MR. CAMPBELL: And Brandon, was it only four hundred and ten?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Brandon is practically completed. There's just a little clean up work left.

MR. CAMPBELL: And Selkirk, I didn't get that figure.

MR. CARROLL: Selkirk, \$9,375,000. Selkirk is about 40 to 50% completed I believe -- at year end.

MR. CAMPBELL: Selkirk, \$9,000,000.00?

MR. CARROLL: \$9,375,000.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: I might ask, Mr. Chairman, when is the completion date on Selkirk?

MR. CARROLL: Selkirk completion date, should be in service sometime during the summer of 1960.

MR. CAMPBELL: A year from this fall. That'll be the first units?

MR. CARROLL: About one year now.

MR. CAMPBELL: For the first units?

MR. CARROLL: No, I expect the first units will be ready before that time -- but it should be completed summer of 1960.

MR. CAMPBELL: Completely?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, I understand it will (interjection) - Kelsey, first power, I understand about a year now.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have the figures as to what is invested in Kelsey up to now? And the same with Selkirk. So we get a picture of the over-all cost of the two.

MR. CARROLL: Expenditures up to May, 1959 on Kelsey, did you say?

MR. CAMPBELL: If you have them. I'd like to have each one of them.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, that's listed here, I believe, under Northern Power System. Expenditures to date - \$23,119,950.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: At Kelsey?

MR. CARROLL: Yes. You wanted Selkirk as well?

MR. CAMPBELL: If it's handy.

MR. CARROLL: \$13,893,930.00. Brandon - \$22,429,884.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, just so we have them on the record, because I find them hard to remember, would the Minister put on the record the power potential of each of those three plants when they're brought to full capacity? I think it is correct to say that arrangements have been made to increase the size of the Kelsey plant. Is that correct?

MR. CARROLL: Yes Kelsey, when complete, will be 210,000 horsepower. Brandon is 120,000 kilowatts. I should actually put those in the same -- Brandon would be 176,000 horsepower. Selkirk 176,000 horsepower. And that would be then Kelsey at 210,000 horsepower.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sorry, I didn't get those, Mr. Chairman. Kelsey 210,000 horsepower?

MR. CARROLL: Brandon and Selkirk both at 176,000 horsepower.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1.

MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry, that's 176,000 horsepower for Brandon, and 176,000 horsepower for Selkirk.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, they are the same size approximately, are they? Mr. Chairman my recollection was that Selkirk was going to be considerably bigger.

MR. CARROLL: I think the size of the units are quite different. Brandon with 4 units produces 176,000 horsepower. Selkirk with 2 units produces the same -- the equivalent amount. Of course, Selkirk it is planned could be expanded eventually to a million horsepower.

MR. CAMPBELL: then this Capital Supply that we're voting for those different plants now will completely finish Brandon I take it -- outside of the odd little cleaning up? It will practically finish Selkirk -- is that right, Mr. Chairman? It would take Selkirk through to next spring, and I understand that the Minister thinks that it would be finished perhaps a year from now. Would that be correct? and Kelsey, how close would it be to completion? Did the Minister say next year also?

MR. CARROLL: I'm assuming, Mr. Chairman, that with this authorization that we're passing today will see the completion, or should see the completion of Selkirk. It was planned originally that it would be in operation by next winter. There has however, been some delays

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd)... in certain of the equipment that is essential to the completion of Selkirk. The first unit I believe, is delayed by a period of three months; and the second unit, of course, will be a month or so after that. Therefore, the first unit will be ready by spring, the second one coming in by summer. It appears to me that this money should see the completion of Selkirk site.

MR. HAWRYLUK: About what would be the total cost in each case after completion of Brandon, Selkirk and Kelsey, in round figures. The total cost.

MR. CARROLL: Now there's just some doubt in my mind as to whether this is the total cost. But the figures I have here would seem to indicate that the total cost of Brandon is \$22,635,873 and Selkirk \$25,329,300.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1. Passed.

MR. PAULLEY: What about Kelsey?

MR. CARROLL: Kelsey \$46,044,640.00

MR. PAULLEY: Is there an arrangement in respect of Kelsey where -- this seventeen million does come under the terms, I believe, of the 2% borrowing insofar as International Nickel is concerned? Is this the item that deals with that?

MR. CARROLL: No, I think the original agreement -- there was a loan of some \$20,000,000, at a low rate of interest. This, of course, is not part of that, no.

MR. PAULLEY: This will be -- the interest rate we'll have to pay on this is just what the government can get on the market. Is that correct?

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: The other's all been used up? I believe, Mr. Chairman, it was at 2%, and that this amount is going to have to be borrowed on the open market, is that correct?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, that's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 - passed. Item 2 - passed. Item 3 - passed. Total Schedule A \$22,500,000.00 passed. Schedule B 1 - Provincial buildings, etc. Item 1.

MR. CAMPBELL: Could we have the breakdown on this one again, Mr. Chairman? I realize the Honourable the First Minister gave us some detail on it. Could we have the definite breakdown?

MR. WILLIS: Taking the item of \$6,460,000.00 first; Provincial Buildings; Brandon Hospital - \$91,500.00; Selkirk Hospital - \$880,500.00; Manitoba School for Mentally Defective Persons Portage la Prairie - \$780,000.00; (Interjection) \$780,000.00; making a total there of \$1,760,000.00. Then Home for Girls - \$300,000.00; Administration Building, Winnipeg, Public Works - \$4,290,000.00; Provincial Building at the Pas - \$110,000.00. That's the breakdown in regard to the \$6,460,000.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Could I get the Pas item again, Mr. Chairman?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, it is \$110,000.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister goes on to the other item, will this \$4,290,000 provide sufficient monies for the completion of the new administration building? And what will be the total cost of that building?

MR. WILLIS: This will complete it, as I understand it, and the total cost will be just under six million we figured.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, might I ask what is the building or buildings at Brandon that make up the 91,000? I presume it's not a very big building. Selkirk...

MR. WILLIS: We'll leave that to the Minister of Health. He'll give you the details.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): For Brandon, the items are broken down of \$91,500, into a \$9,000 item for the reception unit alterations, to close in balconies. There are certain balconies at the Brandon institution it was thought advisable to turn into a bed and storage space, and in going through the home we decided on a -- I'll come to that -- that's \$9,000; \$6,000 is a new milk house. The old one is dilapidated and is down by the barn that one, and it was considered quite inadequate now. There's \$25,000 for a new pasteurization plant and equipment. The present one is now in the basement of the reception building, and the psychiatric institute is rather small with inadequate equipment, and they also -- this space is needed for laboratory facilities. There's a \$50,000 item here. It was recommended after we went through the institution, -- it's a very large institution, -- and it was thought advisable that \$50,000 be set

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd)... aside for a continuing program for at least three years to replace some antiquated plumbing, toilet partitions and recovering of floors. At present there was some criticism of our open bathroom facilities there, and this will provide more privacy in providing partitions here; also to provide linoleum on the floors; locks on some of the doors. Then the final unit was \$1,500, for a stainless shelving and bins in the kitchen of the psychiatric unit. Some shelving had been put in last year and was so far superior to the other shelving in the hospital in the kitchen that it was felt that the other equipment becoming quite obsolete that it should be replaced this year. That accounts for the \$91,500 under Brandon hospital.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, are the items under Selkirk somewhat similar, just miscellaneous repairs and renovations?

MR. JOHNSON: The Selkirk Hospital, the items here are \$888,000 approximately. That is the new recreation building. There was \$100,000 voted last year and that is being revoked. Last fall the provincial architect found with the tremendous volume of work he had, that he could not get our plans in readiness, and this building was planned some time ago, as I understand it. The old rec. hall at Selkirk was built in 1886 and holds about 100 and some odd people. I got permission from the Board to have -- the Treasury Board, to approach an outside architect in order to expediate this building, and on drawing up the plans, with the increased capacity of Selkirk Hospital the superintendent felt there should be at least accommodation for 500 people in an auditorium, that such a building would be in continuous use with occupational therapy, weaving and sewing in the afternoons and so on; and the provincial architect advised me that the price had now risen to \$250,000 for this larger 500 bed unit. We are in readiness now to proceed, and I might say that this unit would also be used by the share people -- that large voluntary organization which comes to the home -- to provide kitchen facilities for them to entertain the patients; and as I say, it would be an activity centre for the whole institution. We estimate that this year in getting our start on this that we should re-vote this \$100,000. The next item here is a vocational trades building. \$40,000 was voted in 1951 and is still in abeyance for construction of a vocational training building. It is now, with rising costs, estimated at \$50,000, and we have appropriated \$10,000 here. This building was designed five years ago to provide occupational therapy and vocational training to 110 male patients. It is of simple masonry construction designed to be built onto the powerhouse where all mechanical services are readily available. And this building is now in progress; it has been started this past month.

The other item here is the new patient accommodation of 500 beds. There are 250 beds in the present Selkirk institution which have been condemned by the fire commissioner and I feel -- we feel it is more urgent that this 500 bed unit be proceeded with at Portage immediately to -- the hospital is overcrowded -- and there is this older portion of the building which will have to be renovated. This year we're....

MR. CAMPBELL: This one is at Portage la Prairie, is it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. JOHNSON: Selkirk, we're talking about.

MR. CAMPBELL: This is still Selkirk?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I was just bringing that whole total up of this year putting aside \$775,000 for that building. The Selkirk building is estimated to cost 1.9 million and federal grants would take care of \$630,000 and of the balance, we appropriated half this year. And then there's another small item of \$3,500 for water pumps and that was transferred from, of course that's Public Works, that has been transferred into this item. That takes care of Selkirk.

MR. CAMPBELL: I take it, the next item, Mr. Chairman, is a new building, is it? Portage la Prairie?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I could bring you up-to-date on that. The Portage la Prairie, there's an \$80,000 item here for boiler replacement powerhouse equipment. This is to provide heat and steam for the new additions at Portage. The 180 beds that was completed last year on the female infirmary, contained all the central supply and kitchen and lab and so on facilities, and this year in adding the other 180 beds, we don't have any more of the kitchen and lab facilities to build, so that item comes to \$490,000. Construction grants would be \$160,000 and leave us with \$330,000, and \$200,000 of that is voted for this year. With the present 1,015 beds, the addition will provide, this will bring our capacity there up to 1,195. Then again we are

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd)... planning the -- proceeding with the original plan for the new unit for boys of 400 beds and the total estimated cost there is 1.2 million -- it'll be a similar building to the female -- and the construction grants come to \$400,000 and of that balance we're providing approximately half this year, \$427,000. This is the institution where we have approximately 119 female, 156 male patients on the waiting list.

MR. ORLIKOW: At the third Session we had this year, the Minister announced the proposed building of 500 additional beds at Selkirk. I asked him earlier this session whether in the light of modern practices, this was considered wise, and as I remember it he told me that the provincial psychiatrist was studying this question. Now today he announces that they are going ahead with it. I took the opportunity during interval, Mr. Chairman, to write some letters and I wrote to the medical director, Dr. J. D. Griffin of the Canadian Mental Health Association. I have a letter from him which I can give the Minister, dated July 15th of this year. I'll just read two paragraphs. He says, "I have your letter of July 13th in which you ask concerning the position of CMHA relative to size of mental hospitals." Here's what he says, Mr. Chairman, "I can state quite definitely that it is the opinion of our National Scientific Planning Council, that public mental hospitals should be provided on a regional and even community basis rather than according to the present system. These regional mental hospitals should certainly not be larger than 500 beds. Many of the group feel they should be not larger than 300 beds in order to insure the very best possible treatment on a personalized basis for every individual patient." He says, "It is interesting that the Minister of Health in the Province of Ontario in a recent public statement has adopted the recommendation of our National Scientific Planning Council." And he encloses the speech which the Minister made, and I'll just read two very small paragraphs. This is from the speech the Minister made in the Ontario House on February 11th of this year. The Minister, the Honourable M. B. Dymond says, and I quote, "We want to try now to completely reverse the old order; to begin treatment where it should begin, at the home level, and direct that treatment towards keeping the patient in or at least near his home community." And later he says, "Large construction grants have been made available for building psychiatric units in general hospitals. Ten of these are now in operation, Ottawa, Sudbury, Toronto, St. Catherines, London, Windsor." It's worthy of note, he says, "that one-third of all first admissions to psychiatric facilities are to these units." Mr. Chairman, I have others, but I don't want to burden the Committee. I don't pretend to be an expert but it would seem to me that in going ahead at this stage with the further extension at Selkirk, we are in fact continuing the pattern which other provinces and states in the United States have discontinued and are recommending very strongly against.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm quite aware of the honourable member's concern -- from St. John. I know he is giving me constructive criticism and I accept it as such. And I'm quite aware of the modern trend towards psychiatric units and read with great interest the very extensive statement made by the Minister of Health in Ontario in the last session of their legislature, which I thought was most forward-looking and very excellent. However, Ontario has a little different set-up than we have. They have many cities throughout the province where they can set up smaller psychiatric units. We in Manitoba have followed a pattern as we know for many years of our three large institutions. I feel, despite what the honourable member has said, that in view of my recent conversation with the superintendent of the Selkirk Hospital, and in view of the fact that we have these beds there, 250 beds, which definitely require replacement; and also in view of the fact that we are providing care in these institutions at the very low rate that the honourable member is aware of -- \$2.98 or something a day -- and also we have a 25% over-capacity in Selkirk right now. So we must measure up to the facts of the case. I say, yes, our future planning should be towards a critical look at the idea of psychiatric units, psychiatric centres in our large city here, but then again we have this very urgent need in Selkirk at the present time. And this is the advice of the men I've spoken to, who have been in this field all their lives in the Province of Manitoba. Quite properly, the Canadian Mental Health Association have been of tremendous help to the -- leading the way in bringing the community to the hospital; and certainly the trend is more and more to bringing the communities to the hospitals and bringing more social psychiatric workers into the field and trying to rehabilitate people in their homes. But at the same time we have this case load in a population this size that we simply have to look after; and with that explanation in mind, I feel that we are

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd).. certainly justified in proceeding with the program at Selkirk as laid down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 - passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Before we leave the question of the Provincial Building. Did I understand correctly the Minister to say that the cost would be approximately six million or less than six million?

MR. WILLIS:

MR. MOLGAT: Well, then we couldn't have said some of the money was appropriated last year, could we? Because last year the estimate was two million seven that was passed, and now we're passing four million two, and that comes to very close to seven million. Now, are we...

MR. WILLIS: That would include the furnishings.

MR. MOLGAT: And so -- what will be the total cost - furnished and ready to get going?

MR. WILLIS: I don't have the complete breakdown in regard to it, but it will be over seven when you get the furnishing in.

MR. MOLGAT: Now, earlier, under another item, I think under estimates, replying to a question whether the building was air-conditioned or not, the Minister indicated that the building was not air-conditioned. Now after having sat here in the Legislature today, I'm sure all of the honourable members will sympathize with the members of the Civil Service who will be working in that building. Is it too late to do anything about air-conditioning it?

MR. WILLIS: It will be air-conditioned.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, was not the reply that you gave two weeks ago that it was not air-conditioned?

MR. WILLIS: That's true, and that was my opinion at that time, but it is air-conditioned. I was in error.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 2, - passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Item 1, Mr. Chairman...

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've passed item 1. We are calling item 2.

MR. CAMPBELL: We are on item 1, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean 2 of item 1, the Provincial Buildings.

MR. ROBLIN: Item 1, subsection (2).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Subsection (2).

MR. CAMPBELL: Now, have we a breakdown of what this is, Mr. Chairman?

MR. WILLIS: Are you speaking now of Schedule B No. 2?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, that's right.

MR. WILLIS: Yes, item 2, yes.

MR. WILLIS: That item is one which we put in for various acquisitions which we make. It's not tied down as far as the exact amount is concerned, nor the items. But, well, for example we have been picking up recently properties in this area for the future of the provincial... We have in mind another one which I won't mention lest some of these real estate people be around, which would cost quite a bit more.

MR. CAMPBELL: That is a general vote then, is it?

MR. WILLIS: General vote, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 3. - passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: What about 3.1's that the \$330,000?

MR. WILLIS: It's Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, acquisition of land \$110,000; land settlement projects - \$220,000 making the \$330,000.

MR. CAMPBELL: What are the land settlement projects, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: To complete the Pasquia land development project except the western portion thereof; with \$1,000 for the Catfish Creek and \$10,000 for Washow Bay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 3, - passed. Section 4

MR. CAMPBELL: What about could we have a breakdown of that one?

MR. EVANS: No. 4? There is a total expenditure of \$768,000.00, less recoveries from the Government of Canada, \$154,000.00 leaving a net on that score of \$614,000.00. And there are numerous projects here, including Falcon Beach Development and the Trans-Canada Highway Picnic Area developments in connection with the Government of Canada. Those are the two big items, Falcon Beach..... Beg your pardon? \$240,000.00. Trans-Canada Highway--\$250,000.00. Not forgetting however, a recovery from the Government of Canada of \$154,000.00. And the others are in smaller amounts here including the Whiteshell, etc.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, what remains to be done at Falcon Beach? I'm not familiar with the.....

MR. EVANS: The completion of the shopping centre, the second unit of the shopping centre was put in this year; the completion of the golf house and those are the main items.

MR. CAMPBELL: And the other one that the Honourable the Minister mentioned, the Trans-Canada Highway--what are those expenditures?

MR. EVANS: The cost of the land and the development of the first of all the three major centres--one at Falcon Beach, one was to have been near Headingley and another near Brandon, for the major campsites. Then intermediate between those would be smaller turn-out areas with toilet facilities, picnic tables, garbage cans and so forth, the grand total to be \$250,000.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Those are these sort of road-side developments?

MR. EVANS: The major ones will have running water toilets and quite substantial facilities, and the smaller ones are mostly outdoor toilets and picnic tables. One of the major ones will be near Headingley, one near Brandon and one at Falcon Beach.

MR. CAMPBELL:part of the Falcon Beach?

MR. EVANS: Part of the Falcon Beach development--yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Four passed; Section 5.....

MR. CAMPBELL: Now here's the big.....

MR. WILLIS: This one is Soil Erosion, Water Control and Drainage Projects. It's drainage construction in or adjacent to drainage maintenance districts, \$734,300.00. That takes in all the old drainage districts. Then the next item is Soil Erosion and Water Control--\$600,000.00, less recovery from the Government of Canada of \$300,000.00. That makes up your grand total of \$1,034,300.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm pretty reasonably familiar with the work in and adjacent to the drainage districts, but could we have some more information on the second item--just what the soil erosion or water control means there?

MR. WILLIS: Well, those are the various bills which we've had before the legislature, and those are the monies which we set aside for that sort of thing, including the watershed development, the conservation development as well--chiefly in those two. They will be spending this amount of money, and it's under the general board--with Mr. Griffith as Chairman, and the other two men whom we have mentioned here before.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, what I have been trying to get a little bit acquainted with is just what this work will consist of. Now as far as--I recognize the fact that we've set up this organization, with a very good man in the person of Mr. Griffith to head it, and good engineering assistants taken from the department, a good staff I would say, collected altogether. But as far as their salaries are concerned, those we've already passed in the estimates, the salaries and the expenses. Now what I would like to know is just exactly what the projects--what kinds of projects they're going to do that will result in the expenditure of money. Is one of these the Whitemund Watershed Project, is that one of them?

MR. WILLIS: That might easily be--some--particularly the smaller ones would come under this, and there will be many of them arise, because in the overall picture, we'll be covering the whole of the Province of Manitoba. We'll be subject to requests from people in municipalities from all over the province; we'll be carrying on the regular watershed works which have been outlined in the House here before. There will be more conservation with the PFRA as well, and co-operation with them to spend what we consider to be about this amount. It's a blanket amount of course.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that the Provincial Treasurer doesn't allow different boards, no matter how competent they are, to set up estimates for \$600,000.00 without having a pretty good idea of some exact work that they are going to do. Now I find it diffi-

(Mr. Campbell cont'd)...cult to understand just what the projects are that are envisaged up-to-date. For instance, if the Honourable the Minister would tell us that there's going to be so much money expended in the Whitemund Watershed area to help with drainage there. If he'd tell us that there's going to be so much to dam a stream in another location or something of that kind, I can understand that. But I would think, as far as co-operation with the PFRA is concerned, that's just a matter of the staff that's already provided for, carrying on the ordinary course of their work. Are there some actual projects that are going to be instituted under this \$600,000.00?

MR. WILLIS: There will be various projects, and there will be a number of projects which deal with our so-called mountains--Riding Mountain control--and those would come under this as well. But for the amount of work which is to be done and which should be done, for the amount of work which has been already surveyed and we know of, under the PFRA, from the number of dams which are being turned over to the province by the PFRA to become the responsibility of the province, we think this amount is a reasonable amount, and that it will be necessary to do it. I haven't got a complete breakdown in regard to it here and I think it's fair to say we haven't got a complete breakdown of it anyplace as to the exact detail of the amount. But this is the estimate by Mr. Griffith and his board in regard to what's necessary--I think they know better than anyone else as to what is likely to happen; what is likely to be necessary; and they came forward with this amount which we accept and go forward with.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'd be very glad to hear, Mr. Chairman, that there was some work being started for instance in those mountains--the Riding Mountain area, or any others that are giving difficulty because that has been an un-resolved problem, I know. But I would like to know exactly what some of the projects are. The same with the dams that are being turned over by the PFRA people. I can recognize that there may be expenditures required there some of these times; but at least I would think that Mr. Griffiths would furnish more detail than this as to what those projects are. Quite frankly, I'd like to know something that they are going to start, and I'd be delighted to hear--

MR. WILLIS: I can get that information for you.

MR. CAMPBELL: O. K.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister at the same time get the information on the amount that will be spend on the Riding Mountain project?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, I'll get the breakdown as far as it goes at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 5 passed; Section 6....

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Section 6. I notice it takes in the Seine River, Lake Manitoba, Red River Valley flood protection. I would like to know how this amount of money is allocated? Will there be sufficient money--will this see the completion of the Sein River flood diversion and what will the total cost be when it is completed; and how much is going to be expended in respect of the Red River Valley flood protection, and what is entailed in the expenditure?

MR. WILLIS: This is just a general item, but it is broken down in this manner. On the Seine Project we have set aside an estimated amount of \$350,000.00.

MR. PAULLEY: Will that complete it?

MR. WILLIS: We're not sure--I can't assure you of that, but it's approximate completion. Then on Lake Manitoba and the Red River Valley projects, \$150,000.00 for this year.

MR. PAULLEY: What will that entail? What will be done for that amount of money.

MR. WILLIS: Mostly engineering as far as that is concerned.

MR. PAULLEY: How much to each?

MR. WILLIS: There's no breakdown here. They're bulked together--Lake Manitoba and the Red River Valley projects at \$150,000.00. Mostly engineering and staff in regard to both of those.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the last time that we discussed this matter of Lake Manitoba, we asked some questions regarding the cost-benefit survey on Lake Manitoba. Quite frankly, I didn't get the information at that time that I was seeking. I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether the cost-benefit survey is completed on Lake Manitoba, because the understanding that we were left with last fall, by the Honourable the First Minister in a speech he made here in the House, was that this would be done very, very soon. In fact at that time he

(Mr. Molgat cont'd)... told us, and this is in Hansard on the 7th day of November, one of the first documents, and I quote from what the First Minister said, "One of the first documents placed on my desk when I assumed office was the report of the Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba Board." Then he goes on and I skip, later on he said--he explained that he too felt that there was a cost-benefit survey involved in that report, but Ottawa was not prepared to accept that. So he said "So without delay", and I quote again, "in the same month, in fact about a week after the report hit my desk, and after I had a chance to read it, we set up our own cost-benefit study on that matter, with the concurrence of the Federal authorities. We expect that cost-benefit study to be ready very soon indeed." I skip again, and I quote a little further and he said, "I want to say that from the information available at the present, we consider that dam to be a splendid thing and it is our intention to proceed with it one way or another. So I serve notice on this House, Sir, that they will, some time in the near future, be called upon to provide funds for the Fairford Dam." Now, I see no funds here and as I say, when we asked questions about the cost-benefit survey, we got no information.

MR. WILLIS: The cost-benefit study has been completed, and if the Honourable Member would like a copy of it, he can have one. Also included in these items here are the work on the Fairford.

MR. MOLGAT: Well Mr. Chairman, the Minister told us that there was an amount of \$150,000.00 to be spread between Lake Manitoba and the Red River. Now that will not even make a start on the Lake Manitoba--and that does not do the work....

MR. WILLIS: That's a lot of engineering and it's chiefly engineering.

MR. MOLGAT: But that's not exactly the committment that we got from the First Minister at that time--that the work would be started immediately. Now the engineering had been done previously when this was examined. Surely--well, could we get a breakdown as to what will be spent on Lake Manitoba itself and what will be spent on the Red River Valley--separately--because those are two completely distinct projects.

MR. WILLIS: The engineering work was not then done and that's why we have to do it at this time. That's chiefly what this is for now.

MR. ROBLIN: To locate the damsite?

MR. WILLIS: To locate the damsite and do the engineering work so we can proceed with the actual construction.

MR. MOLGAT: Well the Lake Manitoba Board report though did suggest where the dam-site should be and they made some engineering studies. There's been a great deal of work done on this in the past. Now in order to arrive at a cost-benefit study, you have to have your costs--that's one aspect of it. Now how can you get your costs and complete a cost-benefit study without having done your engineering to achieve those costs?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is under a misapprehension. The report on the Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba did not include the engineering information that is necessary in order to start building a dam. Many people think that it did, but it did not. Similarly, the work on the Red River problem here did not include the engineering data required in order to build a dam. They do sufficient engineering work in order to develop a cost-benefit study, which one must recognize is in rather rough and ready terms as far as actual technical data is concerned. And it is absolutely necessary to do initial engineering work to know where to site the dam; exactly what kind of a dam is going to be built and all the actual features of construction. Those were not included in the report. That's what this money is for.

MR. MOLGAT: Then I would like to get, if possible, that breakdown between the Lake Manitoba expenditures and the Red River expenditures, and also a copy of the cost-benefit report.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, in the meantime, could the Minister or the First Minister, could they tell us approximately what the conclusions are of the cost-benefit study?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, gladly, Mr. Chairman. Working from memory, it's in the order of one and a half or two to one in favour of building the project. It's quite a favourable cost benefit study as far as the Fairford Dam is concerned. That's why it's included in our program to proceed with.

MR. CAMPBELL: The fact that it has been found favourable means that the government is by this vote committing itself to proceed?

MR. ROBLIN: That's right.

MR. CAMPBELL: And all that it would expect to do though in this year will be to follow up the engineering work. Is that correct?

MR. ROBLIN: That's all that can be done at this particular stage. We're appropriating as much money as we think we can efficiently spend at this stage in the proceedings.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I would doubt that that's all that could be done because even though I realize that the detailed engineering study.....

MR. ROBLIN: Try and get your engineers—that's problem No. 1.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, but,....

MR. ROBLIN: You didn't leave us very many.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, but you've been making, Mr. Chairman—the Honourable the First Minister and the Minister of this department have been making a lot of statements about what a fine job they've done in securing engineers. By raising salaries, they've got the engineers. But even if they hadn't, there are other firms that they could get to do the engineering; and my point is this, that for a great many years there have been engineering studies. Now I know those are not the detailed studies on which a dam is built, but there have been engineering studies carried on in connection with these various projects that have been recommended for the control of the waters in Lake Manitoba; and surely there has been enough of that done, that the engineering now could proceed with the detail of the dam in time to get some of the construction started during this current year. Now if the Honourable the Minister says that they can't do that—what we have I take it, got a commitment for now, is that the cost-benefit study has found the project to be feasible; the government is committing itself to proceed with the engineering on the grounds of a favourable report, which means that they are going to carry through and build the dam. Is there an estimate in connection with the cost-benefit study, an estimate of approximately the cost of that dam—dam and the control works?

MR. ROBLIN: It will cost between one and a half and two million dollars.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's the estimate on which we're proceeding? Thank you.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate what the Federal contribution will be on this? I know he was seeking Federal contribution on it. Has it been obtained and what is the amount of the contribution?

MR. WILLIS: It is now under negotiation. We'll let you know as soon as we've.....

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the same answer I suppose applies to the Red River diversion.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Sir.

MR. CAMPBELL: The engineering in that case, will have to deal with the off-take at the south and the location of the ditch itself, and the structures that will be necessary—all such matters as that?

MR. ROBLIN: The first thing that has to be done, Mr. Chairman, is to decide the exact location of this particular undertaking, because many of the factors that my honourable friend mentioned follow from that. A rough indication of where it should be has been given by the Committee that investigated this in 1953, and that was accepted in general terms by the Manning Report, but it's necessary to decide on its exact location with reference to the Perimeter Road, the Symington Yards, so that the number of bridges and other structures of that sort which cross it will be at a minimum. That's the first step and that's the step that is under way at the present time.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think the Manning Commission Report suggested some alterations in the original location of that.....

MR. ROBLIN: A relatively minor one, that it would be extended south of St. Norbert.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 6—passed; Item 2—Highways, etc.

MR. WILLIS: I'll give you the breakdown of it. The total amount is for highways, roads and related projects—\$19,381,500.00. Provincial trunk highways amount to \$16,600,000.00 less recovery from the Government of Canada of \$1,600,000.00, leaves a total expenditure for the Provincial Government of \$15,000,000.00. That's the figure we mentioned before. That was all covered in detail on the regular estimates. Then roads to resources agreement \$4,780,000.00, less recovery from the Government of Canada of \$2,390,000.00 leaves the expenditure of the Provincial Government of \$2,390,000.00. Then mining roads and tourist roads

(Mr. Willis cont'd)...and other natural resources roads--\$895,000.00, less recovery from the Government of Canada of \$53,500.00, leaves a balance of \$841,500.00. Access roads to highways--\$500,000.00. Right-of-way development and traffic control devices of \$350,000.00 and aids to bridges--\$300,000.00, the breakdown of which is Disraeli Bridge--\$200,000.00; St. Agathe Bridge--\$100,000.00. That's the breakdown of the total.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, you appropriated additional monies previously for Capital for roads. Now another 19 million. Is there any monies left in the former appropriation for the purposes of roads left unspent.

MR. WILLIS: From day to day we're spending more. I announced when we had the estimates here before that out of the 33 million, we had appropriated 23 million. It's something more than that because there have been appropriations since that time.

MR. PAULLEY: There's no other appropriation other than the 33 that we passed at the first Session.

MR. WILLIS: First Session, that is right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 2 passed.....

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, there'll be quite a considerable discussion I think on this item, because we had an undertaking from the Minister that inasmuch as we did not discuss the individual roads in detail in the main estimates, that he would be prepared to go into it in the Capital Supply vote. There was one question I wanted to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the perimeter roads. I understood the Minister to say, in fact I think I have the Hansard statement here, if I can find it. The Minister was giving the situation with regard to the perimeter roads--he gave it starting on the west side and going south--Maplegrove to Ste. Anne, Ste. Anne to the eastern boundary. From Highway No. 1 north to Highway 59 there is no construction as yet--I gather that's correct?

MR. WILLIS: If my memory serves me right, that's right. I was quoting--I had a large map in front of me at that time from which I was giving those details.

MR. CAMPBELL: And from Highway 59 west to Highway No. 7 the grading is complete. I think that's correct.

MR. WILLIS: It's probably correct.

MR. CAMPBELL: The grading is complete. And from No. 7 to the western boundary, of the perimeter highway the pavement is now in place. I presume when the Honourable Minister mentions that the pavement is in place, he means that it is in that part just running on the present No. 6 Highway. Is that correct?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, that's right.

MR. CAMPBELL: But the part from No. 7 to the western boundary of the perimeter highway--no--from Highway 59 west to Highway No. 7, the grading is complete?

MR. WILLIS: I'll be glad to give the member a map covering every detail of it, if that's agreeable.

MR. CAMPBELL: The question that I was going to ask--and I'd be glad to have that map as well--is that I think he mentioned as well, that the grading being complete, that this would be finished next year--would be paved next year, that portion.

MR. WILLIS: It's probably right.

MR. CAMPBELL: And then in connection with the same matter--I can't find the quotation here at the moment--but if my memory serves me properly he said that the bridges would be completed at the same time as the road. I wouldn't think that would be possible on that Red River bridge in that area.

MR. WILLIS: We might not make that, it's quite true. That is problematical.

MR. CAMPBELL: I realize that the Minister doesn't want to give--I think I used the term estimate--I realize Mr. Chairman, that the Minister doesn't want to give estimates on costs of roads or bridges, because they don't want to tell the people who might be tendering what their estimate may be, but if that bridge has not been, so far as the department is concerned, even estimated yet, it's certain it couldn't be built next year I would think.

MR. WILLIS: That is my information from the memo which I had at that time.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, during the estimates I asked the Minister whether the section of No. 6 Highway, between the CNR railway tracks and No. 7 Highway would be part of the new perimeter road. And at that time he said he didn't have the information. Has he got

(Mr. Guttormson cont'd)... it now?

MR. WILLIS: No, I haven't got it now. I overlooked it. I can get it for you. These are much easier when you have a map in front of you.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, from what the Minister told us there would appear to be something in the order of \$10 million left from the vote that was taken last fall for road construction. Now, we are now proceeding with another close to \$20 million. How much does he anticipate of this will be built during the construction season this year, and how much of it will carry over until next spring?

MR. WILLIS: There will be very little of it built this year. This year it'll be practically completed with the other amounts which we had available before, but will permit us, even before we have a session, to call for tenders in regard to the construction of a reasonably large program so that we can start construction early in April. We think that is a big advantage--that's one of the main reasons why we're voting these monies at this time. We have practically enough and we may even have enough to complete this season as far as money is concerned. This is almost entirely for next season.

MR. MOLGAT: In other words then, this is largely the appropriation for next year.

A MEMBER: Not necessarily. You'll have to wait for next year's estimates.

MR. WILLIS: When we meet in--whenever the meeting is, January, February or March, we'll be in a much better position to decide at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 2, pass. Schedule B. Total \$28,726,800.00. Pass. Schedule C. Grants, Loans, etc., 1. passed.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Chairman, what buildings are actually being built?

A MEMBER: Somebody asked that before.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, these are the items in this particular estimate. New science building. This is a three year project. 1958 - 1959 was the first year, and the initial authorization was provided by the previous government, and the cash requirement in this current year, current fiscal year will be \$2,000,000.00. (Interjection). Total cost? Will be \$6,000,000.00. (Interjection). I think not, I think that that is for the building only. The second item is.....

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on the first item, in the year ending March 31st, '59, there was an item of one million two--new science building, construction, furnishings and equipment. And did I understand him to say that this was a three year project, in three equal portions?

MR. McLEAN: I didn't say in three equal portions, I said a three-year project.

MR. MILLER: Well, in the first year there was voted one million two.

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. MILLER: And this year?

MR. McLEAN: Two million.

MR. MILLER: Two million? And next year? The balance?

MR. McLEAN: Well, not necessarily, because last year only a small portion of the amount that was voted was actually spent. My information is that some \$15,000.00 was all that was required for the work that was done.

MR. MILLER: Out of the one million two?

MR. McLEAN: Yes. The second item is architecture building--\$200,000.00. This is the final authorization required to complete the building. The previous authorization amounted to \$300,000.00.

MR. MILLER: This is their recovery from Ottawa under the Canada Council?

MR. McLEAN: I am not aware of any.

MR. MILLER: I'm quite sure there is because they can claim under architecture.

MR. McLEAN: Well, there may be. So far as the Province of Manitoba is concerned, the previous authorizations have been \$300,000.00. This \$200,000.00 now being asked is the final amount required from the Province of Manitoba. Now I do not have the figures on the total cost of the building, and it may be that the differences between what is being provided for by the Province of Manitoba and the total cost of the building, is coming from Canada Council grants. I have no information on that.....

MR. MILLER: I think it's 50% from Canada Council and 50% from the Province.

MR. McLEAN: That may very well be.

MR. MILLER: That is the \$200,000.00 item.

MR. McLEAN: The arts building annex--\$450,000.00. This is the first of two instalments from the Province of Manitoba. The total estimated cost is \$900,000.00 and there will be a portion of this received by way of grant from the Canada Council, the amount of which is not known at the moment, but presumably the balance, the next payment from the Province of Manitoba will be the \$900,000.00 less what is authorized in this grant and less what is recovered by way of Canada Council grant. School of dentistry building--\$800,000.00. This is the final requirement under this--for this particular building. It is up \$200,000.00 above what was normally expected. The original arrangement was for three payments of \$600,000.00 each but the costs of construction have increased substantially since the project was undertaken, requiring an additional \$200,000.00 in this final payment to complete the project.

MR. MILLER: Is there any change in the plans?

MR. McLEAN: No change in the plans as far as I'm aware. The only explanation we have from the University authorities is that the costs of the building have risen about 6% and the cost of the equipment has also risen substantially. And there was an omission in the original estimate of some \$50,000.00 which was to cover duty and sales tax on equipment. That had evidently been omitted in the original calculations of the amount required.

MR. HAWRYLUK: In other words the cost of the building would be about two million, is that right?

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. MILLER: Six--six and eight.

MR. McLEAN: Then a number of smaller projects. A surplus stores building \$20,000.00. This is a once only item. It is to provide storage place for surplus stores of the University, that are now stored in an old barn, which is unsafe and which has to be torn down. A new water line from the Greater Winnipeg Water District Meter House to the University to replace the line which has become corroded. This is a once only requirement--\$50,000.00. An elevator in the arts building. This is to provide for the installation of an elevator in the old five story arts building, \$35,000.00. This is an once only item. The air-conditioning of the library building which seems like a very plausible project, \$100,000.00. This again is once only an item in this year's estimates. Certain items which come under the general heading of 'Non-Recurring Capital Expenditures'--although I fail to see any distinction between what are called 'non-recurring' and what we have just been speaking about--include these items: sheep barn -- \$15,000.00; grain elevator--\$10,000.00; alterations to the animal science building--\$5,000.00; temporary pharmacy labs--\$15,000.00; alterations to the pharmacology building--\$1,000.00; alterations to the libraries--\$5,000.00; certain building equipment, for buildings and equipment for the physical education department--\$30,000.00; renewal of the power line--\$15,000.00; rehabilitation of the residence--that's the student residence--\$35,000.00; telephone--\$2,500.00; parking grounds and roads--\$20,000.00; and certain miscellaneous projects including a steam line, painting buildings and office alterations in the order of \$27,300.00. Those are the items with respect to the University of Manitoba, making a total there as indicated of \$3,835,800.00.

Perhaps while I'm speaking, I may as well cover the next items on the schedule. Grants to the St. Boniface College, St. John's College, United College and St. Paul's College, these are provision for grants to the affiliated colleges named on the basis of 25% of the cost of approved construction including dormitory accommodation, subject to the college concerned, providing the additional 75% required. This 75% may come from any source open to the college including grants from Canada Council. Now these grants are made applicable to--in the case of the United College beginning with the time of the beginning of Canada Council grants for the support of the United College building program; and in the case of St. Paul's College and St. John's College, applicable to construction since the date each of these institutions located on the campus of the University of Manitoba. In the case of St. Boniface College they're applicable to construction since--completed since September 1st, 1955, and they are not applicable on proportionate construction which pertains to instruction in Grade IX to XII inclusive, or to instruction given to students registered in a faculty of theology. The amounts of money already paid to these colleges under the old matching grant formula are deducted from the amounts that are payable under this formula of 25%, which is somewhat more generous than the other formula. In

(Mr. McLean cont'd)...the case of Brandon College the grant is.....

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I may object here. Last year there was voted an item of \$990,000.00 chargeable to Capital for construction grants to affiliated colleges. Is this \$750,000.00 an additional amount?

MR. McLEAN: No, there were certain amounts spent out of that appropriation, but it being, as I understand it, a Capital grant, it lapsed at the end of the—the portion that wasn't used lapsed at the end of the year and..... (Interjection) .is it current.

MR. MILLER: This amount of \$990,000.00 was voted as a Capital item. And my understanding is, unless I'm mistaken, that Capital votes don't lapse.

MR. McLEAN: I see. Well, I'm quite a novice in the financial field. In any event it disappeared and this \$750,000.00 is an entirely new item.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think if the Minister can't give the explanation I think the Treasury would be able to; because—certainly, my understanding is that a Capital amount voted for a specific purpose does not lapse, and that amount of \$990,000.00 is sitting somewhere. And under this item you're voting another \$750,000.00. And it's not good enough to say it just disappeared or something..... Page 6 in the old estimates.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, except this is for Capital Expenditure but it's shown under current account. Therefore anything that is not spent in this year, does lapse. A substantial amount of that, I am not sure how much, was spent—given to these colleges for this purposes, but not all of it; and the balance that was not spent does lapse because it's not a Capital Grant in the regular sense. It's a grant under current account for capital purposes, but the fact that it's under current account makes it one of those that does lapse.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have another item here. In science building, one million two, and the Minister informed me now that that amount wasn't spent. Did that lapse as well?

MR. ROBLIN: It may have, I couldn't.....

MR. MILLER: Well, I think we'd better look into that, and get some more information on that.

MR. McLEAN: Are you referring to the new science building?

MR. MILLER: Yes.

MR. McLEAN: Yes, that item—the actual story is this. \$15,000.00 was used, \$200-000.00 was converted into Capital and remains available for that particular purpose and the balance lapsed.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I remember quite distinctly that we used to vote items for Capital and they did not lapse, and in some cases they weren't used and the vote was still there. But to my knowledge, we never re-voted.

MR. McLEAN: This was shown in the current estimates last year, not a Capital item.

MR. MILLER: Chargeable to Capital. (Interjection). And why weren't they used? Surely, some payments must have been made out of the then \$990,000.00. Under the old sharing grant system.

MR. McLEAN: There were. There were payments made to the United College, St. John's College and St. Paul's College in accordance with the matching grant principle that was laid out at that time. And the.....

MR. MILLER: And what did they amount to? And were they paid out of the \$990,000.00?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not giving—I don't believe I'm giving an explanation of the public accounts. I'm only undertaking to explain what we have in the estimates at this stage.

MR. MILLER: Well, I'm quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that we can ask for that information. What has been spent out of a last year's vote? And a breakdown. What's wrong about that? Sure. What's wrong about that? Has the Minister the information? Or, if he hasn't got it, I'll wait.

MR. McLEAN: I haven't it here. I—for rather obvious reasons didn't bring it, because as I say, I didn't understand that I was to give an accounting of what had been spent, but rather say what we were providing for in the estimates. If it's important, I'll be glad to—it's quite an easy matter to get the information.

MR. MILLER: I can assure the Minister that it's quite important.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, there are two matters which I'd like to raise. First one: it's rather disturbing and rather mysterious that the Minister did not make any mention as to whether or not there would be any money made available for the building of a faculty building—faculty of education building out on the campus. Could he explain why it has not been seen fit to construct this building, or does the Minister regard this as part of the internal policy of the University Administration?

MR. McLEAN: There's nothing disturbing or mysterious about it at all, Mr. Chairman. I don't make up the budget for the University. They make up their own budget and they didn't ask for any money for the purpose of the faculty of education; and I presume that when they do, we'll be glad to give it every consideration. It is true, I understand, that the building that is used by the faculty of education is not perhaps as modern and as nice as one would like to have it. On the other hand, I think it would be rather unfortunate to build a new building on the basis of the enrolments that we've been having so far. I hope that the enrolment will be tripled or quadrupled and that when we come to build a building, we'll build it for that size of class or classes. In the meantime, we haven't been asked for any money for that purpose.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, wouldn't it be a good suggestion that the First Minister would consider rising and reporting because we have several items to deal here with yet, and some of them are ones that I'm sure we'll want some discussion on. The lower Red River pipe line; rehabilitations hospitals for the aged; agricultural research, I presume that's a building, is it? And the Minister of Agriculture has promised to bring us some information with regard to the soil erosion, water control and drainage projects. And I would like to suggest as well to the Minister of Education that it is important to us to know what has happened to the votes of last year when we're considering the amounts that might be necessary this year. So, all in all, wouldn't it be well worth while to leave these items, the remainder stand and call it a day?

MR. ROBLIN: I've been rather hoping, Mr. Chairman, to prepare the way to bring down the budget tomorrow. And I would appreciate it if the Committee would sit a little longer. We've done the most, we've broken the back of this, there's only some of the smaller items left, and I had some hope that we might finish it up tonight and let us get on with the budget.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly as far as we're concerned we'd be glad to make some arrangement to facilitate the bringing down of the budget. Would it be the intention of the Honourable the First Minister to bring it down at the evening session tomorrow?

MR. ROBLIN: Well it would be my intention to bring it down as soon as private member's business had been disposed of; whether that was in the afternoon or evening.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a word to this. On occasions past I've requested that we call it a day. I join with the Leader of the Opposition—and I think it's very important. While we haven't taken too much part in connection with the appropriations for the University up until now, we're quite intrigued with the debate that is going on as to the Capital Expenditures. Because it's my understanding too, reflecting on the budget of last year, that we did appropriate monies for Capital Expenditure to the over-all picture as I see it here, of some \$3,400,000.00. And it seems to me that some of these items are repeated, and I'd like a full explanation. It doesn't seem that the Minister of Education, in all deference to his ability, has been able to give the answers, specifically, in connection with these revotes.

And insofar as facilitating the bringing down of the budget, I'm sure that my group would be particularly quite willing to facilitate the First Minister in bringing that down and as has been suggested, we haven't normally taken too long on private member's resolutions thus far in the session, and I'm sure that the Honourable the First Minister would have ample time tomorrow to bring it down. I know that he had hoped to bring it down today, but such was not the case. It's now 11:30 and there are quite a number of very important items still to be considered, and I'm sure that some of my colleagues too, particularly on some of those things which have been more or less akin to our group for a considerable period of time, will be understood explanations of the various ministers. So, I would suggest that the First Minister agree to call it a day.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I just happened to hear on the radio this morning that the United Kingdom Parliament is to adjourn on Thursday. They have set the adjourning day, as I understand—adjourn for such and such a recess. Now surely if the United Kingdom Par-

(Mr. Campbell cont'd)...liament, with all the business that they have to transact, can set a day and reach it and keep to their arrangement, surely we could make some arrangement here for one day that we could keep to. As far as I'm concerned, if the Honourable the First Minister would prefer to bring down the budget tomorrow evening, usually I think it's brought down in the evening, not necessarily so, if he would like to bring it down in the evening, I would be prepared to say that as far as our group is concerned, we would be quite willing to make that arrangement, that we would let other business stand during the private member's time so that we would reach the Capital Supply, let us say by 4:30 or something of that kind, so that we could wind it up and have everything clear for the budget to come down in the evening. I'm quite willing to make some arrangement of that....

MR. ROBLIN:I think we've got the makings of a deal here. If the House of the Committee would agree to arrange the business tomorrow so that we will finish concurrence on Capital Supply in time to have the budget tomorrow evening, let us say at 8:00 o'clock, then I think we would agree to rise now.

Apropos of the United Kingdom, if my honourable friend is as familiar with their rules as I have a hunch that he ought to be, and I really think he is, he knows that they have very limited arrangements for debate on all these matters. It's not just the question of adjourning on a certain day. There are only so many days to debate Supply, so many days for budget and all that kind of thing, and a much more restricted basis than we have here. I don't think that argument really applies. (Interjection) However, we're not going to argue about that tonight. We'll agree to rise now, to clean up Capital by tomorrow afternoon at 5:30, and have the budget at 8:00. Now is that clearly--is that the correct understanding?

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, we'll have the necessary information from the various Ministers, I take it?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, they'll do their best. I can't guarantee that they'll be able to answer all the questions that the honourable gentleman can ask, but they'll do their best to get the information.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before the Committee rises and in order that we have more or less a gentlemen's understanding, would....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we just have some order. Would the members be seated, except the member who is speaking?

MR. PAULLEY: Would, say, the hour between 4:30 and 5:30 be sufficient a period of time to finish Capital Supply and have the concurrency. The reason that I'm asking the question--I think as far as our group it would be--but it may be necessary to arrange in respect of the discussion on the private members' resolutions to have our group--and I'm sure also the group of the Leader of the Opposition--agree that the cut-off was at 4:30 if 4:30 would give us sufficient time.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm inclined to think it would.

MR. PAULLEY: Rather than leave it if I may, just to complete, Mr. Chairman, before the First Minister speaks, rather than leave it as it apparently was on an understanding that we would finish by 5:30, I'd rather have it more or less understood that from 4:30 until 5:30, or at the hour of 4:30, we undertake or agree that we will stop--or if it happens previous to that, well and good. But if it doesn't happen, then at the hour of 4:30 private members' resolutions come to a halt.

MR. ROBLIN: What I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, is that we proceed with private member's day in the regular way. And when we come to 4:30, simply stop private business and then resume in Committee of Supply, and if that sounds agreeable, that's what we'll do. Very good. Agreed. In that Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.