

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

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 13th, 1961.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just wondering how many we might have in the committee tonight but I think I can assure you that I'm quite prepared to give the report of the fight right from here so that you can stay inside and not be going

MR. ROBLIN: I much prefer to fight in here. We'd have a better fight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I really think though that the man who could bring the report would be the Leader of the Opposition because he was speaking this afternoon about giving the nod to one and then giving the nod to the other so if he was the referee in Miami tonight I don't know which way it would go. We're on Item (11) - Credit Corporation.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, when you called it 5:30 you will recall I rose to my feet and just shortly prior to that the Honourable Leader of our group, the man that represents Flee Island, was as you suggested earlier comparing the Federal Farm Credit Act with the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Act and he and the Honourable Minister got into a bit of a hassle. I don't know who got the first prize but I will say this that there is no comparison whatever when it comes to granting loans if you're in a hurry to get the money. We are fortunate indeed at Neepawa to have an appraiser for the Farm Credit Corporation, the Federal one, and he is very prompt in attending to the applications. In fact I have seen him make an appraisal within 10 days of an application. Now true, we are fortunate that we have an appraiser right in the immediate district. Comparing that to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Act, about July or August of this year a farmer living just west of Neepawa made application, went over to Brandon, made application for a loan under the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Act; he was told that if he made his application that day, they doubted very much if they could make an appraisal until August, 1961. There were that many ahead of him. Most of the members here, with one exception, will remember the resolution that I had on the order paper last year, charging the government with its slow procedure in granting loans -- and I still say they're slow. In our Votes and Proceedings No. 15, there on page seven, you will find the answer to three questions and the questions asked were: (1) How many farmers applied for loans in 1960? (2) How many of them received loans? (3) What were the amounts received by each? And the answers given to that: 850 applied for loans in 1960; 192 less one were approved. Well, Mr. Chairman that means that something like 660 who made application in 1960 are still waiting -- that is there is a backlog of 660 yet to be dealt with. I suggest to you Mr. Chairman, that that's pretty slow. It looks to me as if it will take them all this summer to get caught up with the 660 some odd that are still left to be dealt with, plus whatever applications come in this winter. It seems to me that something should be done to try and speed up these loans, because often if a man has the opportunity to buy his neighbour's farm next door he must decide now whether he is going to be able to buy it or not otherwise the seller will have many opportunities to sell it for cash to someone else. It's unfair to the applicant, I suggest.

We had an order for return on February 20th in my name, eleven questions concerning the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Act, and I just received the answers to all of them one day last week and I am only going to deal with one or two of the question, because I am interested in the answers given to them. Question No. 2: the actual amount loaned by the Corporation as of December 31st, 1960, \$9,780,751.22, and then they broke that down as to the amount of loans and the number of them at four percent and the number at five and a half percent. The actual amount paid out to the borrowers as of December 31st, 1960 just slightly over \$7,000,000.00, and the number of applications for loans received to December 31st, 1960; 2592, and my guess is that that's the total number received from the time the Act went into force. Now question No. 7: the amount of money, capital and interest that fell due and was payable to the corporation by borrowers in 1960. The answer is that as regards capital there was \$72,536.26 and interest \$164,114.66, for a total of \$236,650.92. Now that seems to me to be a pretty small amount to be due and payable on \$9 million, unless a great majority of the borrowers took advantage of the option to pay the interest only for the first three years. I understand that the Act does provide that if a farmer so wishes, that he can pay the interest only for the first three years and then commence paying the capital. But let us suppose that all of the money that was loaned, was loaned at four percent, on \$9 million there would be a lot more due and payable than

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.)....\$236 thousand. I don't know — I just can't reconcile the figures that I have here; and then I can't reconcile either, Mr. Chairman, the expenses of the corporation. It appears that included in the administration costs, or not included in the administration costs, is interest on the money that's loaned -- apparently that is not there.

I have another little matter here that I hesitate to mention, and certainly when I do mention it I am not criticizing any of the civil servants because I have always paid tribute to them -- and they are not responsible at all for what I am going to refer to now, but I have a letter here from the Secretary-Treasurer of the R. M. of Westbourne in which he says and I quote: "I would like to bring to your attention that we are losing quite a bit of working time in dealing with the provincial representatives of the Agricultural Credit Corporation or whatever name the farm credit bill goes by. This morning we had three different men in from this organization asking information on various lands; the general sales prices in the district; assessment, new and old and generally consuming a great deal of time. I feel that it is completely unnecessary to have three separate men all with cars in the same locality when one man might do the job. How the government go about their distribution of work is possibly none of our concern, but we do object to having to take time -- the whole morning was pretty well lost in going over this information. We are quite willing to supply the information and are anxious to co-operate with the government in this respect, but we do feel that too much time is being lost in going over details more than once. Perhaps you might bring this to the attention of whichever department is concerned." and that's the end of the quote, Mr. Chairman. Now certainly the men are not responsible, it's the government that are administering this and I am wondering if there is duplication here that might be remedied a bit. I was particularly interested too, Mr. Chairman, in the answer given to a question here. The question was: Has a loan been made to a director or directors of the corporation, and the answer is a simple "yes". Now there may be nothing wrong with that, I don't know if there is anything wrong with that. I am wondering if a member of the Legislature could borrow from the corporation or is there -- I guess it's quite above board for a director to borrow from the corporation, but I was interested in both the question and the answer. Apparently there has been a director or several directors borrowing from the corporation.

Now, Mr. Chairman I don't think I want to make any other comment at the present time except I might say that I was rather interested in a little clipping here from the Tribune dated December 7th, 1960, that was when there was a by-election on down in Pembina. I would just like to quote what the Tribune had to say. The Premier was speaking at Somerset and he said there: "In two years agricultural credit to young farmers and expanding farmers has totalled \$9 million at four percent interest". Well that we know isn't right. I guess the Tribune, as usual, have made an error here -- but the public reading this clipping, certainly would think that it was a fact likely and would give the party a bit of a boost during the by-election when they read a statement of that kind. Of course we know that it isn't right but nevertheless and I guess we can't blame this government for what the Tribune reports, because that certainly is an error -- (Interjection). Pardon? Well we would make it an effort to, I don't know whether we could ever get it across to the people or not. Now Mr. Chairman, I know that you have visions and hopes of finishing the agricultural estimates this evening, so I won't take any more of your time tonight. Thank you very much.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the honourable member would mind tabling the letter he quoted from? The only reason I can think of off the top of my head why there might be three men appear in one area was that it happened that they had a number of farm loans and they were trying to push them through. Despite the criticism that the honourable member has registered against the corporation for its tardiness in dealing with the farm loans, I think that once again he has risen in the Legislature to support the contentions of this government by arguing that the federal agency has no trouble whatsoever in dealing with their loans. I think he was pointing out what is very obvious, that they aren't doing the business in Manitoba that the Manitoba corporation is doing. They have, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, twenty field men, we have eight. The actual fact of the matter is that during the past year the credit corporation was able to recover quite a bit of lost ground in catching up with the swarm of applications that we received at the inception of the program. A year ago last fall there were 750 applications on record to be dealt with, and by comparison there were about 450, this immediate fall, so they did again make a very substantial gain, and as I pointed

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)....out earlier in the legislature, we feel that given another year we will be getting close to up to date. I would like to assure the honourable member that if he has any person in his constituency that has a chance to buy a farm and they're going to lose it and there's a real sense of urgency about their case, that he should urge them to bring this to the attention of the credit corporation and I'm sure that they will take this into consideration. They are practical enough to know that the opportunity to buy a farm, an adjoining farm, doesn't come up every day and they're there to help the people.

Before we go any further, I quoted some figures this afternoon on the emergency program and they were incorrect. I was adding actual costs in one year to estimated costs in the next and I would like to put the record straight. This is the total cost of the emergency program. For administration \$23,296.24; for assistance on freight and fodder the total cost is \$310,419.01. Unharvested acreage payments \$813,328.70, and the assistance for freight on feed grain was \$69,898.90.

MR. SCHREYER:Mr. Chairman, on this item of the credit corporation. I know of course that the credit corporation does not make money available by way of loans to those people whose off-the-farm income is greater than 50 percent of their total, but in view of the economic situation and the growing rate of unemployment I question the wisdom of not making the legislation more flexible so that those people who are farmers in almost every sense might avail themselves of borrowed capital in order to make their operations an economic one and possibly then they would be able to withdraw from the labour market. I think that specially at this time this would be worth considering. Then, too, I've heard that the Honourable Minister with a substantial portion of his income being off-the-farm income seems to have deemed it necessary and prudent management to avail himself of a loan from this corporation. I don't see why-- if this is true, then I don't see why we might not look seriously at this approach.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, what is this fantastic statement that I seem to have heard?

MR. SCHREYER: Well Mr. Chairman, it's not a fantastic statement. I merely question -- I ask the Minister if this is true, then certainly it seems that we could expand

MR. HUTTON: What is true?

MR. SCHREYER: That the Minister has deemed it necessary and prudent management to avail himself of a loan through the credit corporation.

MR. HUTTON: This is ridiculous; this is absolutely ridiculous. They're really off into the hemisphere -- stratosphere -- ionosphere. All I can say is that it's hardly worth answering. No member of the Legislature can borrow money from the Agriculture Credit Corporation.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, that withstanding, I still would like to bring to the Minister's attention for his consideration whether at this particular time or situation in our economy, whether it might not be worthwhile to consider making the arrangement more flexible so that those people who must depend upon non-farm sources of income, might not be given an opportunity to avail themselves of capital here. I know a good many who would no doubt withdraw from the labour market, to put it in a broad sense, if they could avail themselves of funds to make their operations more economic. This might not be easy to effect but I think it's something worth considering.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, taking the risk of the Minister calling me ridiculous, I'm going to ask a question related to the one asked by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. What was the purpose originally of creating the credit corporation? I understand it was to help those who cannot get a loan at the bank, who cannot produce A-1 security. If they would have all these assets they wouldn't have to go to the corporation for a loan. This loan is on the same basis as the other loan societies, which there are hundreds in the city, is to help out one that cannot produce A-1 security for the money he is borrowing. Now if you actually intend to help people you've got to help not only those whose security is good but others on moral promise. In other words even if the corporation would take a risk in one, the very fact that they are helping a certain individual to re-establish himself rather than be on the labour market, rather than to suffer. Even if it is a loss I still think it's worthwhile trying. I feel that very few who apply for a loan have the security, otherwise they wouldn't need the provincial government to help him. Now my question is to what extent does the management of the corporation require from the board security for a loan? I know there's a lot of small businesses came in to me, and of course the only thing I can do is send them over to the office of the credit corporation.

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.).... When they go to the bank their risk is no good -- neither is mine -- but this is for the purpose of helping, and I think it was anticipated there might be a loss, but the loss will pay more later on by re-establishing those who are unemployed or those who have lost their small business, or those that cannot, and haven't got the finances to re-establish themselves, so I feel that if the corporation acts strictly in accordance with the rules and regulations of a bank then I think the idea of the credit union is wrong. The ideal, the principle is gone, if everyone is being scrutinized. Now I notice that 275 withdrew their applications. I'm sure that they did not get any money from heaven or from a tree. They must have waited that long; they must have been scrutinized so close that they withdrew the application. We don't know what the 275 are doing now. Are they still on the farm? Are they still in their business? Or are they now parading the streets as unemployed? Then again out of 1,200 applications received, only 300 I think, if my figures are correct, have been approved. What's wrong with the others? Lack of staff or lack of time to investigate? All these questions and all these doubts in the minds of some of us is that they have established a credit corporation with one idea, that irrespective of the expense that we have operating this corporation, the main idea was to see that not a cent is lost. This principle I believe, is not justified to the idea and ideals of such a corporation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 35 passed. Item 12 resolution 36, passed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister earlier in his estimates commented on the Interlake area of what a fine area it is for the production of good cattle and sheep. I would agree with him on this but as far as sheep raising is concerned, unless something is done about the predators that are in the area sheep just can't be raised. Particularly in the unorganized territory there's quite a problem with the coyotes. In the municipalities they're able to use 10-80, but in the unorganized territory until now they're not allowed to use 10-80; and until such time as the farmers in these areas are able to control the predator they just can't raise sheep because they ravage the flock and they suffer serious financial losses. I have copies of letters here from -- written to a constituent of mine from the department -- one is from the crop protection and pest control in Alberta; another one from the Wildlife Branch in Saskatchewan, and they have used this 10-80 program quite extensively. Now I know that the 10-80 program is being used in this province in certain areas where the municipalities have agreed to look after the program -- that's how I understand it anyway -- but in the unorganized farmers aren't allowed to take it at all. I wonder if the Minister wouldn't consider a program whereby the farmers in the unorganized territories could use the 10-80 to try and get rid of the coyotes. I know in Saskatchewan in 1949, I understand they had, they estimate that they had 100,000 coyotes, or more than that, and they estimate that number has been killed by the 10-80 program since it was put into effect.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. George has brought up a point that is very pertinent. I agree with him that a solution has to be found to the problem of predators in unorganized territory. I said that the Interlake had a great potential for cattle and for sheep and that's true; and what he says about getting control of the predators is true. I'm very much in favour of trying to find some means of organizing the people so they can take advantage of that 10-80 program. It has proved to be very effective and as he knows, the Member for St. George knows, under the present legislation there has to be somebody to take responsibility for any losses that might occur through the use of the poison; but at the same time, I think that we've got to find some means of clearing it up in order to give the people protection and the encouragement to go into sheep production -- especially sheep production, but I think it would also extend to some extent to cattle production.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister any plans for the coming year in this respect of predators? People that are primarily concerned in my area ask the question that if the government will let the municipalities take responsibility he wonders why the government won't take responsibility in the unorganized territories.

MR. HUTTON: I haven't any proposal to make; I'm just convinced that you're right.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister to give us the breakdown of that figure. How much for predator control and how much for grasshopper control? I see that in the public accounts for the year ending March 31st, 1960, there was nothing at all spent for grasshoppers. But the situation has changed and I would like to know

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)....how much is estimated to be spent with respect to each of these two items.

MR. HUTTON: I think that we're estimating about \$35,000 for predator bounties and about \$4,000 for grasshopper control. Mind you if we get a major outbreak of grasshoppers in any year, these monies here would hardly cope with it. I think we have to face that. The total for bounties in the calendar year 1960 was \$28,000 paid out by us; and we are estimating \$35,000 for bounties and \$4,000 for grasshopper control. But this shouldn't be taken to indicate the extent of the program that would be put on should we face a major grasshopper outbreak in the coming year -- of course, nobody can tell.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says nobody can tell how serious it might be, but I'm sure that the Minister is aware that there was very many grasshoppers last year. In our area the infestation was very, very heavy and I know that on my own farm it was terrific the grasshoppers. They were eating all the young alfalfa in the late fall and even the old alfalfa. I am sure there is 160 acres of alfalfa on my own farm that is going to be ruined unless something is done in the spring, providing the eggs hatch properly, and we are subjected to that at any time. And I understand the situation is bad nearly all over the province. So I was wondering what information the Minister has with respect to the possibility of a bad year next year with respect to grasshoppers, and what the policy really is with respect to grasshopper control.

MR. HUTTON: I have here a map showing the possible outbreak. Can you see it from there? The purple patches indicate severe infestation, and they cover -- that is, west of the river. No, not in the east. Moderate -- there's some moderate and light infestation west of, or east of the river. But, of course, everyone knows that this depends an awful lot upon the year we have. We've had a forecast of possible outbreaks of hoppers in the past, and we've got three or four inches of rain and a cool May and it just didn't materialize. We must, however, recognize that if we get the proper kind of weather for grasshoppers that we'll have them. Under the grasshopper program the cost is shared by the farmer, the municipality and the government. Outside of the first \$10 the cost is pretty well split 50 and 50 percent shared by the municipality and the provincial government. Or rather, pardon me, outside of the first \$10 the farmer is rebated 60 percent and the difference is shared. This is not a new policy; it was established I think in 1956 and then a change was made in 1958. There has been some pointers raised by some municipalities on the question of greater participation on the part of the Provincial Government and the municipality -- or the municipality with the assistance of the Provincial Government. It has this difficulty, however, that the more responsibility that a municipality accepts the less responsibility the farmer is going to accept. It may be true that some farmers will look after their headlands and so on and the next farmer won't; but what happens when the municipality steps in and says well we'll do it. Then everybody will quit. It's just a question of finding that middle road that enables the farmer to carry out his program, the municipality to live within their costs, and of course, the Provincial Government to live within its financial resources. It's possible that if there were major outbreaks and we were faced with an emergency, that something might have to be done to change this, but I think sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof, and we'll cross those bridges when we come to them.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I noticed that the amount held in trust is holding constant now for a few years. Could the Minister explain the reason for that? This Item (b) 12.

MR. HUTTON: Well each year we vote so much money into the program; there's money held in the reserve fund, and we haven't had to use it up. I think that's the essence of the thing. I'm not an expert on financial affairs but as I understand it there are monies held in trust and these monies are available in case we have a bad outbreak. We haven't had a bad outbreak in the past few years, at least the last two or three years since I've been in the Legislature. I think that pretty well covers it.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I could understand that if the smaller amount had been -- or the larger amount had been allocated to predator control but we see here that only \$4,000 has been allocated for grasshopper control. In my opinion, that's the unknown quantity, so why the holdback of \$19,000?

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I could butt into this business here? A session or two ago there was a great discussion on skunks from the Honourable

(Mr. Corbett, cont'd.) Member from St. George and Fisher. Possibly the skunks didn't breed as well as they should have done last year and we didn't have to use all the monies.

MR. HUTTON: for instance the refunds in 1959 for grasshopper control amounted to \$1,359, and in 1960, although the estimates aren't firmed up it looks like \$3,000.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I want to turn back to the coyotes again. The grasshoppers jump and the coyotes jump too, only the grasshopper jumps on the grain or on the grass and the coyote jumps on the sheep. So I just want to reiterate how important it is for the people to have that control in the Interlake Area. I have a paper clipping here and I know this man very well -- I served with him on the local Agriculture Representative Council at one time and he is a very good sheep man. I believe every word what he says in this paper and I'll just read it fast. I'm not a man to take too much time anyhow. And it says: "Coyotes ravish flock" January 9th, 1961 Free Press. "Interlake men claim forced out of business, Poplarfield, Manitoba". -- Poplarfield is in the constituency of Fisher and this man is dealing in Poplarfield; he's living in St. George constituency, so we are very close related, both constituencies -- "Charges that some of Manitoba's Interlake sheep farmers are being forced out of business through lack of adequate predator control program were made here Friday. Art Devlin, a local farmer, who raises some 250 sheep west of Poplarfield, said that during the past year about ten farmers who normally raise sheep in the area have been forced to get rid of them because coyotes have been ravishing flocks and it was becoming uneconomical to carry on what was a fairly lucrative sideline. Now it is difficult to assess" -- he said "it was difficult to assess the damage caused by coyotes apart from those animals which have been ravished and killed, because there was also a considerable loss caused by the sheep and lambs being in a constant state of agitation which made them late in getting to market. In his own case he put the loss at about \$300. Mr. Devlin who lost 20 sheep and lambs to coyotes least year alone, told the Free Press that that area is a local government area and therefore does not enjoy the same predator control program as that provided the rural municipalities". And he goes on further: "However, during the war, regardless that it was unorganized territory, the government did take the undertaking and they used the 10-80." I believe that the Honourable Minister should take it under good advisement or under good consideration and take action, because as this man states -- "that farm land produces grain up to \$7.00 an acre, but when raising sheep it produces \$15.00 an acre. There is a boost for the farmers if these predators could be controlled, so I personally urge the Minister to take immediate action.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 36 passed?

MR. CAMPBELL: I am afraid that I missed some of the discussion with regard to predators, but I notice that in the report of the department the point is mentioned that the operation of that amendment, fairly recent amendment in the Predator-Control Act that allows municipalities to declare themselves out of the program with regard to foxes and bears, is proving to be of doubtful value or actual danger in some cases. This is the reading from the report itself: "This action of the part of municipalities is likely to permit a building up of these predators to proportions which will result in increased losses of poultry and sheep; further it could increase the danger of rabies infection, the incidence of which from time to time has been recorded in foxes". I was wondering if that being the opinion of the department, if there's any consideration being given to changing that legislation again?

MR. HUTTON: No, I think that we would like to find some more adequate method of dealing with predators than the use of the bounty system. There is 31 municipalities that have voted themselves out of red fox and bear. I think there is ten municipalities that are using 10-80 this year -- I am not an expert on predator control: I'll have to leave this for my honourable colleague to deal with. I think that the general consensus of opinion is that bounties are not the best method. Now it's true that if there is no other program, then of course you would have to stick with the bounty, but insofar as the municipalities are concerned with 10-80 available, they may feel that they -- and after all I think the municipality is sovereign in this matter -- I don't imagine that legislation was brought in without a request and an understanding on the part of the municipalities that they wanted this. We haven't contemplated amending the act again. That's about all I can say in regard to this, but I do feel that these other methods of predator control must be pursued if we are going to do away with bounties.

MR. CAMPBELL: so far as the outlying areas, the ones that are administered by

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.). . . . my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Resources, that other methods, perhaps, are better than the bounty -- I am certainly not an expert on the matter either, and perhaps there are other methods that are better in the settled areas too -- but the use of the guns or the poison or any other method is, I think, much more difficult and dangerous and unsatisfactory in the municipalities generally than it is in the areas where the administration is under the other department. If the Minister wants to say to me that this legislation was put in during our time, then I say quite frankly, that's a fact, but even though the occasions were extremely rare -- I think maybe we made some mistakes at times -- and I have admitted before that I think this one has not worked out well. I had doubts about it when it went in, but other people, who I felt knew more about this matter than I held differing views and so this arrangement was put in, whereby if you were contiguous to an international or provincial boundary or to unorganized territory or to another municipality that had taken this action themselves, you could declare yourself out, or that municipality could declare itself out, and that has an accumulative effect, it keeps reaching along from one to another to another. Quite frankly, I don't think it's working well, I think that it should be reconsidered and I notice that report of the department itself seems to at least raise some doubts. I am quite willing to leave it with my honourable friend the Minister, but I would suggest that he take a look at it because we can't help but notice the build-up of foxes, even in areas where this action has not been taken. I notice that in my own municipality of Portage la Prairie that there are more than twice as many foxes taken as Coyotes and that obtains in some other municipalities as well. However, it's not an easy decision to make and I would recommend that the Honourable the Minister and his experts take a look at it. I don't pretend to be one.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, that if there was any definite indication from the municipalities that they wanted us to revert back to the old, or make a change, even if it wasn't to revert back entirely to the old legislation, if they wanted it amended in some respect, that we would take it. It may have been brought to the attention of others in the department, but there has been no definite indication from the municipalities that they wanted us to do anything about this particular provision in the act.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, in my time in this House we have gone all the way from where for a considerable period we did away with the bounty altogether. That was done for a period, and then it wasn't very long until the municipalities were back pointing out the fact that there was a big build-up and I think -- my honourable friend has been speaking about the sheep industry, a little while back and I agree with him that Manitoba can profitably produce many more sheep -- but in the outlying areas I think that the coyote, and to some extent the timber wolf problem, is the real limiting factor on sheep; and in the settled areas I think that the biggest single limiting factor is dogs, and those two problems I think have to be dealt with. Well as I said we have gone all the way from having no bounty at all at one time up to a comparatively high bounty on all of them and then back to a smaller bounty. We have had it compulsory; we have had it voluntary, and then a while ago we put in this provision about letting municipalities, so far as bears and red foxes were concerned, declare themselves out of the area. I don't suppose there is any perfect way, but I think that it's something that needs to be continually looked at.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I have two suggestions, I don't know whether they are both good or both bad, but since we have two departments, one is looking after the timber wolves and one is looking after the coyotes and the smaller animals. I just wondered if these two departments would co-ordinate together and use the same people probably to destroy the timber wolves and to destroy the coyotes; possibly these same people could eliminate some of those coyotes while they are looking after the timber wolves. I understand to my knowledge that even one of the men that was looking after the timber wolves in a certain area was laid off because due to a shortage of timber wolves. Well maybe we could rehire or hire and carry on destroying these coyotes. However, the other suggestion -- I would venture to say -- we are always practicing something, testing something -- I would venture to say that we go and try the bounty on those coyotes, a bounty that would be more or less payable, because I hear through the area that a lot of people say, "Well, by George, if it would be a bounty, I'd go myself and shoot, but this way I have to buy a gun, I got to buy the shells and everything and it doesn't pay". If I were the Minister I would try these two suggestions whether they would work -- for six months or for a certain period and see what happens. But actually something should be done.

MR. HUTTON: If I was the Honourable Member for Fisher, I'd suggest to some of those people that it would pay them to buy a gun to shoot a wolf that would destroy a \$200.00 cow — that's one thing I'd suggest. But I'd like to point out to him that the administration of predators in unorganized and disorganized territories doesn't fall under my jurisdiction, it's under the Department of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister comments to buy a gun. That's very well and done. Do you know the coyote is not staying there where the sheep are. Once you kill those fellows that are around the sheep, another group comes in -- another group comes in -- you have to start destroying them 25 miles, 30 miles away from home. Everybody should be interested. The man that's raising the sheep, he cannot leave home and go out 30 miles away from home and kill all the coyotes that they wouldn't migrate to his flock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 36 -- passed.

..... Continued next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 15 - Water Control and Conservation.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, there's been a great deal of discussion regarding the method of expropriation of land for the floodway. Well I'm not only opposed to the way the government handled the expropriation, I'm opposed to the construction of the Red River diversion. I'm opposed for two reasons: one, I don't think it's necessary; and secondly, I think the enormous cost of this program isn't justified for the benefit that Greater Winnipeg would receive. In 1950 when the flood struck Winnipeg and the Greater Winnipeg area, Winnipeg virtually had no protection at all; and yet, in many areas where the damage was the greatest, the people fighting the flood nearly succeeded. I refer to one instance in East Kildonan, on Leighton Avenue, where the people fighting the dikes there one evening, and I happened to be there that night, when they came within an eyelash of holding out the water. Since that time dikes have been built right around the Winnipeg area in East Kildona, in Riverview, Fort Garry, and other places along the Red River, which today could withstand a flood of the magnitude of the 1950 flood. From what information I can get from people that are more qualified than I, these dikes are so constructed now that they could withstand a flood much higher than we experienced in 1950.

We now have the perimeter road encircling Winnipeg which is virtually a dike around Winnipeg. I well remember that in 1950 the McGillivray Boulevard was used as such a dike and saved the whole area of River Heights from flooding. The perimeter road could be used to an even greater advantage because it is higher at the south end. Another advantage, in the spring of the year all the heavy equipment which would be required to fight a flood if it was necessary, is all available. The Red River doesn't flood rapidly. It climbs gradually, and engineers know literally weeks in advance when a flood is to be expected. The Red River flood isn't one which endangers the lives of people like so many flash floods in the southern states. I know it's true we lost a life in the 1950 flood but this could, I think, be attributed not to -- it was a man who took a chance on something in his basement and he slipped.

Regarding the cost, the Royal Commission on Flood Cost Benefit suggests that the floodway can be built at a cost of \$64 million, plus an annual maintenance cost of \$225,000 per year. If, as they suggest, the costs are amortized for a 50-year period and the money was borrowed at 5 percent, the annual payment would be \$3,760,000 or a total of \$188 million. This dike, or this channel, which is estimated to be as large or half the size of the Panama Canal, 30 miles long involving 12,500 acres and perhaps three-quarters of a mile wide, is a tremendous project. And, Mr. Chairman, I think you'll agree that it is a rare occasion when engineers don't underestimate the cost of a public works project. I've been told by people that the cost could well reach \$100 million; and amortized over 50 years at five percent, this project could well cost the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Government, if they decide to come in and I have my doubts, between \$200 and \$300 million. What was the damage in the Greater Winnipeg area -- what was the damage paid as a result of this flood? Well it was under \$10 million. If we can go by the history of the Red River, we can expect the Red River to flood the way it did in 1950 once every 36 or once every 40 years. However, as I said before, even if the water rose again to the level of 1950, I sincerely believe that Greater Winnipeg could successfully fight off the water. What damage would be caused, I think, would be negligible and the government would be far better off paying this damage rather than spending millions of dollars on a project that they aren't even sure will work.

As we know, the river is in dire need of cleaning and dredging. The homes along the river are suffering from the banks caving in. I think this government would be far better off getting in touch with the Federal Government and work on a program of cleaning and dredging the river, and shoring the banks which are rapidly deteriorating along the river. As far as those people are concerned who live south of St. Norbert, this Red River diversion isn't intended to protect them. This diversion is only designed to protect those living in the Greater Winnipeg area. Today, the people of Manitoba are fast becoming tax-poor. To me it looks as if it would be most foolhardy for this government to saddle the province with a deadly debt for the next 50 years, particularly when the project isn't necessary.

Two years ago, just before the last election, the First Minister made a grandiose statement that he would build this channel and, if necessary, go it alone. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most ridiculous statements the First Minister has ever made because, by making

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.)....this statement, he virtually destroyed any bargaining power he has with the Federal Government. We have been trying to get correspondence between the two governments regarding this matter for two years now, and we're still waiting. We've asked the government what share the Federal Government was going to pay in this matter. They're hoping for 75 percent. The Federal Government has not seen fit to declare itself in any way on this matter. It has been said that even if the government did pay for the damages suffered by the people, if there were any, that money can't replace the sentimental values that people attach to their homes. Well, Mr. Chairman, the damage, if there was any, that would be suffered by these people would be only temporary. What about the 1,500 people who are in the path of the Red River diversion whose homes will be destroyed by this channel? Their homes have sentimental values too, and it's permanent in their case.

Now it will be argued that a Royal Commission has recommended this project and, therefore, that we should abide by their recommendations. Well, Mr. Chairman, the previous governments, and this government have had Royal Commission recommendations. They've had recommendations that have been unanimous, and they haven't seen fit to abide by the recommendations. It is generally understood that the Royal Commission on flood cost benefits was unanimous. This is not correct as there was a minority recommendation by one of the commissioners. That person was Mr. Jack MacDowell who spent 14 years in this Legislature as a Conservative MLA, and Mr. MacDowell, who although I don't always agree with him, certainly was a forthright man and never hesitated to let his opinions be known. Unfortunately, when this report was brought down the publicity was all given to the main recommendations and little, if any, importance given to the minority report. For this reason, and because of the tremendous importance of this subject, I think that Mr. MacDowell's recommendations should be read into the record. Mr. MacDowell's report reads: "The Royal Commission on Flood Cost Benefit carried on its inquiry, investigation and surveys for over the past two years. As a member of the commission I have given careful consideration and study to all matters pertaining thereto, including submissions tendered and opinions expressed by experts and others. One of the basic and possibly main considerations in connection with the problems herein and their possible solution is one of economics, not only for the present generation but those of the future generation. In the past we have had recommendations such as those contained in the Red River Basin Investigation Report in connection with the City of Winnipeg, The Red River and The Assiniboine River Valley. The report recommends the following projects: (a) A floodway from St. Norbert via Bird's Hill entering the Red River at Lockport; (b) the Ste. Agathe detention basin; (c) the Russeil Dam; (d) the diversion of the Assiniboine River into Lake Manitoba at Fort la Reine or at High Bluff."

"As a member of this commission it is necessary to consider the due authority and responsibility of our two senior governments in respect of navigable streams. The Dominion Government has authority over and is responsible for the water that flows in such streams, while the Provincial Government has authority over and is responsible for the bed of such streams. Pursuant to provincial legislation, drainage boards have been set up in certain districts in Manitoba; and through the authority of such boards, a vast amount of drainage has gone into both the Red River and the Assiniboine River, resulting in an excessive deposit and accumulation of silt in these rivers. Having regard to the foregoing I do hereby recommend: (1) That there be established, a Navigable Rivers Authority for the carrying out, under the direction and supervision of the Provincial Department of Public Works, of all navigable river projects. (2) That 75 percent of the cost of any and all such subjects be paid for by the Dominion Government; and the remainder, or 25% of said subject costs, be paid for by the Provincial Government. Pursuant to a reference of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council there is on file, in the Department of Public Works and in the Department of the Attorney-General, a legal option as to the respective responsibilities of the Dominion Government and the Provincial Government in connection with navigable rivers. (3) That the Lister Rapids be removed and thus restore main control of the Red River to the dam at Lockport."

"In the engineering studies done by the R.B.I., 22 different designs for channel improvements below Winnipeg were investigated. Of these 22, two of the trials, Trial 12 and Trial "B" showed the smallest cost per foot of stage reduction at Redwood Bridge and provides a practical degree of stage reduction. Trial 12 involves widening of the natural channel

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.)....between mile 40.2 and mile 32.6 from just below the Bergen cut-off to a point two and a half miles upstream from the Old St. Andrew's Church. Trial "B" involved deepening the channel from mile 40.9 to mile 27.3 from the Bergen cut-off to a point near Lockport, with very little widening. The estimated capital cost of these projects, all taking an assumed construction period of five years, was as follows: (1) Trial 12, \$5,674,000, which would take one and a half feet off the flood stage at Redwood Bridge equal to the 1950 flow and have a cost benefit ratio of 4.46. (2) Trial "B", an estimated cost of \$14,925,000, which would take 2.9 feet off the flood stage of Redwood Bridge with a flow comparable to the 1950 flow and have a cost benefit ratio of 4.31. This shows a good cost benefit but I think this work can be done at far less expenditure. I call your attention to how they took the rock out of the Detroit River without using copper dams. The Red River Investigation Report is an authority for the fact that removal of the Lister Rapids would only reduce the level of the Red River at the University in south Fort Garry approximately three inches. (4) That the cross-sections of the Red River be widened, in such manner and to such an extent as qualified authority deems advisable, where such river flows through the municipalities of Fort Garry and St. Vital and other municipalities south of the perimeter road. (5) That the extensive removal of silt and other objects deposited in the river bed be undertaken by dredging. The river's report submitted to this commission shows the depth of the Red River to be, at Bergen's cut-off, 28 feet; at the Redwood Bridge, 26 feet; at the Canadian National bridge at Lombard Street, 12 feet; and at the mouth of the Assiniboine River, 15 feet. To enable the Red River to carry a full load throughout its Greater Winnipeg course, the bed thereof should bear a uniform and proper level in relation to its hydraulic radius. This can be accomplished by removal of silt and other objects. (6) That a dam be erected on the Assiniboine River at Russell, Manitoba. It has been estimated that this dam could be erected at a cost of \$6,500,000 to \$7,000,000 and that it would help to eliminate the flooding of the area adjacent to the flow of the river from Russell to Brandon. The construction of a dam at Russell would greatly benefit the city of Brandon by assuring of its having a better and steadier supply of water. (7) That at Brandon the river be straightened, the present dike widened, and provisions made for the impoundment of a large supply of water. This work could be done by means of a hydraulic dredge and the Brandon flats could be built up by using the same as a depository for the silt removal. This operation, incidentally, would be the benefit of future industrial demand and growth in population. (8) That a dam be erected on the Assiniboine River at Holland, Manitoba. This dam, if adequate footings can be established, be of such magnitude as to utilize the river channel which runs through the adjacent hilly country and build up an impoundment of water to the extent of four million acre feet. Furthermore, if this impoundment could be built up with a high enough head, it would permit of the diverting of water to southeastern Manitoba through the Morris River basis. (9) That if adequate footings can not be established at Holland to build up a head water as aforesaid, then a series of dams should be erected between Holland and Brandon. (10) That consideration be given to a large basin being provided in the Assiniboine River at Portage la Prairie so as not to only maintain that city's present water supply but to assure of adequate supply for future need. In my opinion, what is referred to as High Bluff diversion into Lake Manitoba should be resorted to only after it has been definitely established that all other means of control are exhausted. This diversion would cost \$9 million plus an annual maintenance cost of \$82,400. (11) That the silt and other obstructions such as islands be removed from the Assiniboine River throughout its course from Portage to Headingly. (12) That certain new channels be cut in the course of the Assiniboine River from Portage la Prairie to Headingly and that old channels be not blocked off but kept free to take care of the high water."

Mr. MacDowell goes on to say, "I am unable to approve of or join in my fellow commissioners for the construction of a floodway. It is estimated roughly that the cost of construction of this floodway would be \$64 million plus an annual maintenance cost of \$225,000. If, as proposed, these costs were amortized over a period of 50 years with interest at five percent, it would entail an annual payment of \$3,760,000 or a grand total of \$188 million over the 50-year period. Since the tabling of the Red River Basin Investigation Report, certain public works helped to safeguard Greater Winnipeg from future flooding. These works consist of the perimeter road which, through the foresight, skill and ability of senior officials in the

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.). . . . Department of Public Works, is so constructed as to form a ring dike around Greater Winnipeg. To appreciate the value of the perimeter road as a ring dike, one has only to recall the flood of 1950 and what would have been the result if the lake proportion of accumulated water south of Greater Winnipeg had permeated into the River Heights area. This was prevented by the erection of a dike, the base of which was McGillivray Boulevard. Furthermore, the bridges being erected as part of the perimeter road are being so constructed as to provide for considerable control of the flow of water passing beneath them."

"More engineering studies should be made in the upper regions of the Red River from Winnipeg to Emerson. This is essential and some joint effort with the United States is necessary to remedy what has become a chronic situation. In the flood year of 1950 water reached an estimated maximum discharge at Redwood Bridge of 103,600 c.f.s. With the present set-up of the perimeter road forming a ring dike around Winnipeg, the volume of water entering would appear to be unnecessary and uneconomical to provide for anything higher than the 1950 flood as we now can take care of 110,000 c.f.s. with this ring dike control."

"Conditions have changed since the 1826, 1852 and 1861 flood. With roads now built well above prairie level it is easier to impound water by blocking off the eveners or culverts. A review of what has happened on the Assiniboine River during the 1956 flood will show that by using the Trans-Canada highway, as a dike to contain the water between the highway and the river, resulted in most of the water being held and returned to the river and bed flow. If this had not been done a very large area beyond the highway would have been inundated causing much more devastation over a larger area. If we clean out the Red River and the Assiniboine River by dredging and removal of obstacles therein, as well as remove the Lister Rapids and raise our permanent dike, we could take care of a flood as high or higher than the one which occurred in 1950."

"Finally, I must stress the importance of reasonable financing costs to carry out these works. I would recommend that a survey and study be made of the system adopted by the Federal Government of the United States for the financing of public works. Under the United States system the cost of any and all projects in the public interest, which are undertaken by any state of the union, can be paid for by the issuance of interest tax-free bonds. These projects include such works as canals, docks, schools and roads. If a similar system were in existence in Canada, it would enable the provinces and municipalities to more readily and satisfactorily fulfill their obligations. Prior to The Dominion Income Tax Act the provinces had available to them what is referred to as cheap money. Surely it is only reasonable that lenders have a fair return on their money over and above the income tax they are required to pay on income from money loaned. This could be accomplished by the issuance of tax-free interest coupon bonds and result in benefits to people at the municipal level. Respectfully submitted, J. MacDowell, Commissioner."

Mr. Chairman, because of the tremendous importance of this matter I think this government should set up a Special Committee of the Whole House and invite Mr. MacDowell before us and question him and discuss this matter. I don't know whether Mr. MacDowell would come, but if his interest is the same today as it was in the days he sat in this Legislature, I am sure that he will appear and I am sure that this House could certainly benefit by hearing his views because, Mr. Chairman, this is a tremendous expenditure. We have no assurance that it's going to be successful and, as I said before, I don't think it's necessary.

MR. SCARTH: Would the honourable gentleman permit a question, Sir?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I sure will.

MR. SCARTH: Did I understand you to suggest that the perimeter road would, in any way, impede the flow of the Red River into the City of Winnipeg?

MR. GUTTORMSON: No, I did not say that. I said it formed a dike and I said if there was a lake of water south of the perimeter road, it would act as a dike, just as the McGillivray Boulevard did in 1950 which protected your home.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, if the oldtimers had built Winnipeg where Selkirk is, we wouldn't have this debate tonight.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, again I rise to object to the way this matter is presented to this House. After two years we still do not know what part of the cost of the floodway will be paid for by Ottawa and we're asked to approve our expenditures, to go ahead

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)....with the project. The First Minister hasn't yet answered the Honourable Member for St. George with respect to the correspondence. An Order for Return has been adopted by this House two years ago; no answer was forthcoming during the short session of 1959. Last year the member for St. George again asked for the correspondence and the First Minister answered him that he was not able to produce the correspondence at that time. I brought this matter up and I suggested that maybe the First Minister should be called to the bar for refusing -- and I quoted from Beauschene -- for refusing or failing to give the return that has been approved by the House. The First Minister, in answer to my remark, made this statement -- (Interjection)-- well that's in Hansard on page 1672 - "Well I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to point out that the orders have to be dealt with in a certain way, reservations are made on those which involve correspondence with other governments and we made the reservations. The first time this was brought up the matter was not completed because we didn't get reply from Ottawa as far as I know" -- as far as he knew--it was a surprising statement -- carrying on the quotation -- "at the time of our previous session, which was a rather short one. The order lapses. My honourable friend introduced it again this session. We are doing our best to get the information and I am confident that he is going to get it."

I asked the Honourable Member for St. George and he never got it; and this House never got it. This House was never told whether the Federal Government agreed with the recommendations of the majority report of the Royal Commission. We don't know whether they approve of this floodway in Ottawa. They might have passed a small sum of money recently but that's no indication that they are going to pay 75 percent of the cost; and I say, Mr. Chairman, that we should not proceed until and unless we have a firm undertaking from Ottawa that it will pay 75 percent of the cost. We should have had that two years ago. The statement that was made at the time by the First Minister, two years ago, to me was the greatest blunder ever made by any First Minister of this province. I say this statement was most ill-advised, was unwise, was childish, unstatesmanlike, unbusiness-like. I wrote them down to be sure that I wouldn't miss any.

MR. ROBLIN: Think up a few more adjectives.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I say that it was done for political reasons, and I say that it was done just a few days before the First Minister declared that he had been defeated in this House and called an election. The First Minister was putting all his cards on the table and was willing to deal with Ottawa, with all his cards on the table. Now I ask you and I ask this House what would have happened, if the previous government led by the Leader of the Opposition now, in 1950, if the First Minister at that time had rushed into promising everyone down the valley that they would be fully compensated. He was pressed to do so, to announce publicly that every cattle would be paid for; that every bushel of grain would be paid for by the government. He was pressed by the member for Morris to make an announcement --national emergency -- but this was a prudent administrator to my left and he waited, and he waited and rightly so, and the First Minister at Ottawa was called here. If he had made the statement that the present First Minister made the other day, "We'll go it alone; Okay we'll guarantee everyone." What share would have been paid by Ottawa, I ask you? Is there a member of this House who will say that Mr. Campbell had said at that time, "Okay, we'll go it alone; we'll guarantee everyone that we will pay for every bushel of grain that is destroyed, every cattle, every chicken destroyed." We would not have received 75 percent and we all know it. Mr. St. Laurent was called and he inspected the damage, and a firm arrangement was made between the two governments before a statement was made. We were paid by the Federal Government, but if the Honourable the First Minister at the time had not had the courage to stand to the pressure for a reasonable length of time, this would never have been done.

But we have now a new situation, whereby the First Minister of today says, "Okay." He was pressed by this side of the House to say how this would be financed when he made his famous statement on the 16th of March, 1959, just before the election, "Well if necessary, we'll go it alone." Mr. Chairman, I believe this was a terrific mistake and, since then, two years have passed. We were inclined to believe that the First Minister, being so friendly with his teacher in Ottawa, that he would get the 75 percent. Well on a basis of 75 percent paid by Ottawa I was not too strenuously opposed, but two years have passed and we haven't

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)....got yet a firm undertaking; and I think this is going a little too far. It seems that money is not important with the present First Minister.

Last year, in answer to a question put to him by the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party and the question was this: "Mr. Chairman, before we go into the Holland Dam, could we get any information from either the Premier or the Minister of Agriculture insofar as how negotiations are proceeding with Ottawa in respect of federal contributions to this floodway?" And the answer by the First Minister, "Mr. Chairman, I think that we will get a satisfactory result. I have had a number of discussions with those concerned on some points that required clarification on this matter. They have not all yet been resolved and I expect it will take a little while yet before they are. However, what has been decided, as the House already knows, is it will be a shared proposition and that what we have done is to take those steps that are necessary to ensure that our rather prolonged negotiations" -- and were they prolonged, Mr. Chairman -- "prolonged negotiations on the financial end of it don't hold up the actual work"-- and mind you, this sentence -- "I think that's the important thing, that the work should go ahead, not the financial part of it." I say that we have reached a point where the financial end of it is important. It is the most important and I say that we should withhold any expense until this is settled. This is matter of major importance for the Province of Manitoba, and I say that Manitoba should not rush along with Ottawa paying only 50 percent or paying only 60 percent. We should have 75 percent or stop; and it's time that we should do it. We shouldn't spend any more money at all on the project until we get that firm assurance. This is an important question. Our people are taxed so heavily at the present time. We have more services to give to our people. Let us not put all our money on a project of that kind with a dead weight that will be terrific.

The ex-Premier of this province has been accused of being slow, but suppose he had built that in 1951 and 1952. What would have happened? It would have been useless completely until now. We would have spent every year, in interest rate on the project, some \$3-1/2 million, as has been pointed out by the member for St. George. By not doing it we have already saved \$35 million. Certainly there is no use laughing about that -- \$35 million is in the kitty now to take care of damages that might be done if we have another flood. But as has been stated, I believe that the protection we have and the machinery around this district in the springtime is enough to protect Winnipeg against another 1950 flood; and the danger is not so great, except for a deluge or something that we cannot cope against. We are protected as far as normal prudence goes, and I say that it is foolish to rush into things. I have a quotation here, I don't know how it goes, "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread at times," but I say --(Interjection) well what are you then? The other side of the quotation. Take it as you want --(Interjection) I wasn't hinting that you were fools, but I was stating that you were rushing into this matter. You had rushed two years ago too darned fast.

MR. ROBLIN: You are entitled to your opinion. I don't object to it.

MR. PREFONTAINE: And you are putting this province into a position where no other government could back out. There might be another government pretty soon as things are going on in this province now, with Metro and with this floodway and with taxes on land and many other things. They are straws in the wind now. We can see that the day might not be too far away that there might be a change of government; and the new government will be saddled with this responsibility over and above other services that they will have to provide to take care of the debt and the capital on this thing and, of course, we have nothing yet for the upper valley -- no protection. I asked the Honourable the First Minister what would be done with respect to the towns and villages in the upper valley. "Well," he said, "There might be dikes around them. We have no programs for that at all; we have no insurance fund; no protection for them at all." We are going to spend a sum of money here, possibly all alone -- oh, I don't doubt that there will be 40 percent possibly from Ottawa, maybe 50 percent, but I doubt if we will get more and I say that if we don't get 75 percent that we shouldn't proceed. This is no laughing matter -- it's the most important matter that is coming before this House at this session; and I would like to see the members take it very seriously.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, this is rather amusing. Mr. Kuch did such a beautiful cartoon of me as a tortoise, now I seem to have turned into a hare. It seems to me that the tortoise won the race so I'd prefer that designation. It's rather amusing to be bombarded

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)....with accusations that we weren't doing anything, that two years had gone by and what has been accomplished -- absolutely nothing. Now we have had an impassioned speech that we're rushing headlong into a floodway and we haven't taken any precautions whatsoever. It's just amazing -- just amazing, but so typical -- so typical of what's been going on in the opposition. They can't make up their minds which is the best platform, which is the best plank to stand on -- (Interjection) -- Well I have to say that even the Honourable Leader of the CCF had signs of a little rebellion in his backbenchers when one of them indicated to us, I believe it was the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that he had his reservations about this floodway. Of course, mind you, the issue is becoming clearer all the time. It's becoming apparent now that the reason that the floodway wasn't embarked upon by the Official Opposition, when they were on this side, was that they were opposed in principle to it. Now we have had a pretty fair indication at this session that they are, in fact, opposed to it. Now I pointed out the other day that there's some pretty expensive water control projects needed in other parts of the province and you know there are about half, a little better than half the people in Manitoba live in Greater Winnipeg, and it seems to me that if we, who represent rural Manitoba, want to see those developments take place in rural Manitoba that's going to make it strong and virile in the years ahead, then I think we should think twice about condemning a project which is going to safeguard the property, and not only the property but the future prosperity of Greater Winnipeg. We're going to need some help on these other projects and we want that help a great deal. You go back to some of those earlier floods and I'm told, and I think on pretty good authority, about the only thing that was sticking out of this country was Stony Mountain. I'm afraid that I have to disagree with some of the statements that were read into the record tonight, when they say that times have changed.

Now there is always more than one point of view on engineering and water control. Down in the United States, as I understand it, they have at least four different bodies who are concerned with water control. They have the Corps of Engineers and they have the Reclamation Bureau and they have the Conservation People, and there is another one that slips my mind; and through my association with the engineers in my department, meeting on occasion, I've had occasion to meet members of some of these different groups I've named from the United States, and it's my understanding that there's a different point of view depending upon the group you belong to. There are several different persuasions. Some of them believe that you should have big multi-purpose dams, control it all in one place, and another group believes that this isn't the way to do it at all that you should have a lot of upstream reservoirs. Others believe that you can control the whole thing by planting more trees. I think we could stay here until -- well I think somebody forecast Christmas -- I don't think we would have any trouble making it, if we were going to engage on a debate as to which point of view we're going to take. The government has subscribed to the recommendations of the flood cost benefit study, and we've embarked upon the floodway, that part of it is not an issue any longer. We're going to build a Greater Winnipeg floodway, and we're going to protect not only those people who were subject to flooding in 1950 but we're going to protect the community of Greater Winnipeg, and all that means. Now a lot was said by the Honourable Member for St. George about the 1950 floodway, if we did this and having done this and having built dikes and having the perimeter highway around us we don't need to fear the flood of 1950. Well that's true. I can agree with him, but I don't think he'd want to stake very much that the next flood that comes along is going to be of the proportions of 1950. We had floods of far greater magnitudes in the past and there are a great many people who are considered to be authority on floods and water controls and they will tell you that the very fact that the country's been opened up, that the cover's been taken off, that all these roads -- and the Honourable Leader of the CCF feels that some of the trouble out here on the Seine was due to the fact that the farmers went out in their municipalities and dug big ditches and increased the runoff and they increased the hazard of a major flood. Now I think that it's reasonable to say that because all this drainage has taken place down through the years -- look at the major floodways that we're putting in here through the drainage maintenance district south of Winnipeg. Look at them. Small rivers. All this land that has come under cultivation. Every highway, every road that's built speeds up the runoff. This is true. There's hardly any evidence to substantiate the claim that things have changed during the intervening years since those terrible floods of the 19th century, that we couldn't

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) have a flood of those proportions. Now if we had said we're going to protect ourselves against the flood of the proportions of 1950, it wouldn't pay to build the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. We could do it, but there isn't a smidge of evidence to back up the statement or the assumption that we aren't going to have one of far greater proportions. And the Greater Winnipeg Floodway is designed to protect Winnipeg from a flow of 169,000 cubic feet per second. Correct me if I'm wrong. I haven't looked at the report for a long time. We're too busy trying to get the floodway built, to go back and study the report. The flood as the honourable member said of 1950 was in the nature of 103 cubic feet per second. Now we feel that it is reasonable to try and protect ourselves against a flood of the neighbourhood of 160, 170,000 cubic feet per second. Well if we establish that, if we establish the fact that we can't bank on having a flood of 103,000 cubic feet per second or less, then if you're going to do anything at all you might as well protect yourself against any reasonable flood that you might expect. I think it should be clear that it's possible that we could still have a fantastic flood and even having put the floodway in, there could still be damage -- if you had one of the proportion of say 200. The chances of having that kind of a flood are remote; but the chances of having a flood of 106 feet or less are not so remote. The statistics bear out that it pays. This isn't somebody's pipe dream. They sat down and they tried with the information that was available to them to determine what was a reasonable protection to undertake, and on the basis of that information they determined and made their recommendations.

Now, I'm not going to go into the question, again I say I'm not going to go into this question of what could be done as an alternative. The decision has been made. The decision has been made. And I'm going to tell you how far we've gone. Tell you how we, give you an up-to-date report. I want to read into the record, but I'm not going to read into the record something that is old and that everybody knows. I want to read into the records something that will give some indication of the work that has been done. I hope I haven't lost my record. Forgive me for reading. If I began to talk we'd be here forever. "Construction of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway will rate highly amongst the major construction projects undertaken to date in Canada. In earth excavation alone it will be almost twice the size of the South Saskatchewan Dam and larger than the Garrison Dam on the Missouri River in North Dacotah. It will involve excavation quantities about 50 percent larger than the St. Lawrence Seaway Channel excavation, and in fact will be almost half of the excavation required for the Panama Canal." That you know. "Recognizing the magnitude of this project it is important that a sound policy and administrative procedure be established upon which construction will proceed. For this reason a great deal of effort has been put into organizing and establishing such machinery during the past several months. The economic report of the Royal Commission on Flood Cost Benefit which recommended construction of a floodway, was received by the government on February 9th, 1959. On February 27th, 1959, Manitoba presented the Federal Government an outline of its flood control policy, particularly in respect to the Greater Winnipeg floodway, and requested financial assistance towards the cost of undertaking such a major program. In September of 1959 our further engineering studies as recommended by the Royal Commission had progressed to the point where it was deemed advisable to receive approval of Canada for the work already completed. Accordingly Manitoba requested the Federal Government to appoint its technical representative to review and approve the revised location as determined by our engineers and thus permit further field investigation to be carried on by our staff. On January 27th, 1960, the Federal Government appointed Mr. G. L. MacKenzie, Director of Prairie Farm Rehabilitation, Regina, for this purpose. On February 3rd, 1960, Mr. MacKenzie met with officials of our water control branch for the purpose of being acquainted with the engineering studies pertaining to the revised route of the floodway, particularly for the purpose of moving the point of diversion south of St. Norbert to include that village in the protected area. Immediately thereafter Mr. MacKenzie and Mr. R. H. Clarke, who had been subsequently appointed by the Federal Government to represent the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, reviewed the reports of our engineers and again met with our officials on May 3rd and 4th, 1960, at which time a field investigation trip of the revised route was included. At the conclusion of this meeting Mr. MacKenzie expressed favourable approval of the location proposed by our engineers, except that part from the Trans-Canada Highway to St. Norbert which was reserved for further study. By letter of July 21st, 1960, the Federal

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)....Government advised that they approved the whole route proposed by our department." That was just last July 21st. "In order to permit further technical investigations and arrangements to proceed in a manner satisfactory to the Government of Canada, it was proposed that a Floodway Advisory Board be established, and by letter of July 12th, 1960, the Federal Government was so advised. The purpose of this board is to act as an administrative liaison between the two governments on all administrative and policy matters respecting the floodway project, including the most satisfactory engineering authority for furthering the designs and construction of the project, selection of engineers' consultants, review of construction plans, forms of tender, scheduling of construction, budgeting, etc. On October 14th, 1960, the Federal Government agreed to our proposal to mutually establish such an advisory board but subject to certain revisions in the constitution of the board and its suggested duties. After clarifying these matters the Floodway Advisory Board was formally established by the two governments on December 7th, of 1960. This board consists of for Manitoba: Mr. Griffiths, Chairman and Member, Mr. T. Webber, Member, and Mr. W. D. Hurst of the City of Winnipeg, Alternate Member. For Canada: Mr. G. L. MacKenzie of the P.F.R.A., Mr. R. H. Clarke of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, and Mr. R. D. May, as Alternate Member, of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources. The Board held its first meeting on December 14th and 15th, 1960, at which time it considered and reported to the government on the engineering organization best suited and qualified to undertake the further design and construction engineering required for the floodway project. The government concurred in the recommendations of the Board and on December 19th, 1960, instructed the Director of Water Control and Conservation to establish a floodway division of the branch, with the responsibility of generally co-ordinating and directing all details of design and construction of the floodway. It was given authority to employ staff only for the duration of the project and to retain consulting engineering services for specialized aspects of the work as considered necessary and recommended by the Advisory Board. The floodway division was established as of January 1st, 1961, headed by Mr. A. G. Mensforth, a senior engineer of the branch experienced in construction of flood control works. The division will operate under the direction of the Chief Engineer and the Director."

"The report of the Royal Commission on Flood Cost Benefit received on February 9th, 1959, recommended that the floodway intake be moved upstream of St. Norbert so as to include that village in the protected area, providing engineering studies proved that such a revision was possible. During the spring and summer of 1959 the Water Control and Conservation Branch undertook engineering investigations to determine if this revised route of the floodway would be feasible. This entailed engineering surveys along several proposed routes between the Red River south of St. Norbert and a crossing of the Trans-Canada highway immediately to the intersection of that highway and the perimeter highway, together with an extension northerly immediately east of and adjacent to the perimeter highway up to the vicinity of the Springfield road, at which point the route joined to the route previously proposed by the original engineering report of 1953. Detailed surveys were also undertaken to ensure that we had the best crossing of the Bird's Hill ridge and the most satisfactory location for the re-entry of the floodway into the Red River north of Lockport for both the hydraulic and economic aspects. Included in this study was a preliminary sub-surface investigation which entailed drilling to bedrock in the bed of the Red River at about five possible sites for the control structure south of St. Norbert as well as sample drilling throughout the whole length of the most probable floodway route. All soil samples thus obtained were analyzed in either the University of Manitoba's soils lab or the Department of Public Works soils lab as facilities were available. This sub-surface investigation extended through the winter and into the spring of 1960 following approval of the route by the Federal Government as previously referred. During the spring and summer of 1960 an engineering survey of sub-surface investigation was completed for the retaining dike running westerly from the control structure south of St. Norbert. During the summer of 1960 a preliminary design of the whole floodway channel was completed from which was determined the location and width of right-of-way required for the project, and engineering plans of this were prepared and made available for the land surveyors for the survey and preparation of expropriation plans," which will be referred to in greater detail and which I have already put on the record." On the advice of the Advisory Board, Dr. Arthur

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)....Cassagrande, Consulting Engineer and Professor of the Division of Engineering and Applied Physics, Harvard University has been retained as of January 18, 1961 as consultant advisor in soil mechanic matters. Dr. Cassagrande is recognized throughout the world as one of the top authorities in this specialized field of engineering. Our engineers consider that the soils mechanics aspect of the floodway design is a most vital and critical factor in ensuring the future stability and therefore the successful completion and operation of this project. Likewise it is also a significant factor in the cost of the work since a relatively minor flattening of the side slopes to insure greater stability and freedom from erosion could increase the total excavation costs by as much as three million dollars. We therefore consider ourselves fortunate in obtaining the advice of such a world recognized expert in this vital matter and consider it necessary that he be allowed sufficient time to properly and thoroughly complete his studies and provide us with the best advice obtainable. Dr. Cassagrande will be assisted in this work by Mr. R. Peterson of the P.F.R.A. soils lab in Saskatoon, also a recognized specialist in the field of soils mechanics. As of February 24, 1961, a detailed report of all soils mechanics data obtained by our own staff has been forwarded to Mr. Peterson for review prior to his meeting with our engineers and Dr. Cassagrande later this month."

"On February 7, 1961, our engineers met with the chief engineers of both the CNR and CPR for the purpose of preliminary discussions in respect to the effects on the railways of the floodway construction. It appears that at least three bridges will be required on the lines on each of the two companies together with possibly some relocation of existing track. Proposals were made by our engineers as to the administrative and technical manner by which this work could be most efficiently undertaken, and certain plans and design information was subsequently provided to the companies. The officials of both companies are now reviewing this information following which indefinite arrangements will be made for putting railway bridge construction underway at an early date possibly near the end of this year. In this connection it is the present proposal of our engineers that all railway and highway bridges be constructed prior to excavation of the floodway channels. It is their opinion that such a scheduling will considerably reduce the construction costs of the structure, and also the cost of detouring traffic during the period of construction. In respect to highway bridges, arrangements have already been made for the Department of Public Works to undertake the design and construction of these structures according to a construction plan and schedule being drawn up by the floodway division. These structures might also be put under construction near the end of 1961."

"The Water Control and Conservation Branch is presently giving consideration to the problem of the method of tendering and contracting the major excavation required for the floodway channel. Many contractors with widely different types of equipment are interested in this project and each type of equipment is best suited to certain specifications and time schedule; therefore it is of the utmost concern to the government that the specifications and methods of tendering be such as to result in the most economical methods of undertaking this work. Other matters receiving attention at this time are the complete rearrangement of the land drainage system in the vicinity of the floodway since the floodway will intercept all drainage from the east and require facilities to bring this flow into the floodway channel. A rearrangement of the municipal road system will also be required to divert traffic to the main floodway crossings. An extensive drilling program is now underway in the bed of the river at the site finally chosen for the control structure south of St. Norbert. This program has been underway for some three weeks and will continue throughout most of March. The objective is to determine in detail the elevation and sub-surface rock and hardpan together with the formation of the underlying material, all of which will determine whether or not this is a physically and economically acceptable site for the structure. If this is so this data will serve as a basis for the design of the structure foundation. The significance of this design is indicated when it is realized that this control structure will be required to hold back the whole force of floodwater bearing down the river and divert such water along the floodway channel. At the present time as many as four drills are working on a 24-hour basis on this investigation to complete the work before breakup of ice."

"A further meeting of the Floodway Advisory Board was held on March 8th and at this

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) time consideration was given to the employment of consultants for designs of major hydraulic structures including the control structure at St. Norbert and the outlet structure at Lockport. Both of these structures require specialized services for their proper hydraulic and structural design. Consideration was also going to be given to a construction schedule and the most probable and satisfactory time at which each phase of the construction program can be put under way."

That is what has been going on in the floodway. I think it outlines the many, many aspects that have to be examined; the necessary organization that has to take place; the provision for all the problems that arise in the construction of a program of this size. I think that in giving this report when I mentioned the fact that the floodway will intercept all the waters east of Winnipeg that we are forgetting the benefits of the floodway to an area that has had a water problem in the past, and before sitting down I must say how heartily I must disagree with the statements that were made by the Honourable Member for St. George and endorsed by other members of his party that this is a foolhardy venture. They're arguing in the face of facts; in the face of a cost-benefit ratio of \$2.90 for every dollar invested. A project of this kind in the United States for instance would have the highest priority, and I say again that if the people of Manitoba, or rural Manitoba, expect to get the kind of money spent on the Assiniboine, on the Pembina, in bringing water to rural towns then they've got to expect to offer to participate through their government in making protection available to the City of Winnipeg. We all live in one province, we're all citizens of the same province, some of us at times like to think that we're more important than the other fellows -- that our role is more important, but actually we're all pretty dependent upon one another. There's no one that's more enthusiastic than I am for water conservation, but I think it's been proved beyond any shadow of a doubt that the only solution to the continued hazard and threats of flooding to Winnipeg is in the construction of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway.

.Continued next page.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I think I must strongly object to the insinuations contained in the last few remarks of the Honourable the Minister. He seems to think that, myself I suppose, and the Member for St. George, have made certain statements because we were representing rural Manitoba and did not have at heart the interests of all the people of Manitoba. Well if that is what he means he is wholly mistaken, Mr. Chairman. I'm acting here as a representative of the whole of the Province of Manitoba and it's because the government has pledged this province to an expenditure of \$85 million or a possible \$85 million that I rose up to speak, and I hate the situation. It is the honourable member now that is putting up the rural members against the city members and trying to insinuate that we are interested only in rural Manitoba. Well I think this is going a little too far, I think it is unfair. But I would like to say to the Minister that he is very clever if he is able to get laughs from the members of this House when he insinuates that I said that I was telling the House that the government is not going fast enough with the development of the floodway in these two years, that you were rushing into it. Well Mr. Chairman, I said you were rushing into an announcement of policy that you should not have made at that time without getting a formal agreement with Ottawa, that was the rush. Oh no, we didn't rush in these two years, you are not going very fast. I agree with my friends on this side that you haven't done as much as you intimated you would do. I agree with them wholly. But the rush was in making this pledge, this announcement, in binding this treasury to an expenditure of 85 millions without full consideration, without making a formal agreement with Ottawa. That's the rush; not the other in these two years. Mr. Chairman, I want to make that very clear.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I didn't oppose this Red River diversion because -- (Interjection) -- just a minute -- I didn't oppose it because it's for Winnipeg. I oppose it because I don't think it's practical, because I don't think it serves a useful purpose. If I thought it was going to help the City of Winnipeg I would agree to it, but I am sincere in my belief, I don't think it's going to help Winnipeg and therefore I am opposed to it. And my friend from Carillon says, 85 million -- this project is going to cost in excess of 200 million and maybe 300 million, and I say that it's a useless project and that's why I am opposed to it. I can't agree with the Minister that this is going to help the City of Winnipeg. He says he agrees with me that Winnipeg is now geared to fight a flood of the size of 1950. He says he wants to help it for a flood, maybe that's beyond that -- but to what point? He laughs and says, I'm told, he said that Stony Mountain was the only place sticking out in Manitoba at one time. Is he trying to suggest that the Red River diversion is going to save the province from a flood if it came that high? I suggest it won't. We had a flood here in 1950 that cost the province under \$10 million and you're trying to involve the province into an expenditure which will exceed 200 million, and I say it's wrong. And another thing -- you don't even know that this Red River diversion will work. Any private enterprise before they'll spend an amount of money like that will set up a pilot plan to see if such a project will work. This province doesn't intend to do that. You might spend \$200 million on this project and it mightn't even work the way you hope it will.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word about this flood we're having here this evening -- a very good flood of oratory. It's not my purpose to attempt to defend the government at all, but I would suggest this, Mr. Chairman, that we have had this flood of oratory now every year since there was a change of government. Prior to that of course, the flood was still on this side because they did not do anything about it at the time of the flood itself and only after being prodded to set up a commission to investigate the matter was that done. Now I was rather amused

MR. CAMPBELL: against that statement; that is untrue.

MR. PAULLEY: I was rather amused, Mr. Chairman -- (Interjection), I was rather amused again, Mr. Chairman, to hear some of the remarks from the Honourable Member from Carillon. There was inference -- to use a word that's been batted around this Chamber on numerous occasions -- when he was mentioning the fact of the 75 percent of the cost -- the tab having to be picked up by Ottawa. It seems to me that his remarks contained a proposition such as this: that unless the Government at Ottawa were prepared to pick up 75 percent of the tab, that we shouldn't go along with the deal here in Manitoba at all. The inference, being to me, Mr. Chairman, that if the money came out of the public treasury at Ottawa, it would be all right. Now we (Interjection) pardon, a proper share. In other words what I am getting at -- apparently my

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....contention in this is correct, Mr. Chairman, that it doesn't matter whether it comes out of the public treasury or not, as long as it doesn't all come out of the public treasury of the Province of Manitoba. It would justify it if 75 percent came from Ottawa and 25 from here, but if we were to have a 50-50 proposition, then that wouldn't justify the flood, which I don't think is very proper.

The Honourable the Minister, when he was speaking a few moments ago mentioned the fact that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead had reservations on this floodway. I think he is entitled to his reservations -- I think we all have some reservations. I have some in the manner in which the expropriations in connection with the floodway are going along, but I'm not going to get into that hassle again tonight. I was pleased to hear the Minister mention the fact that I had drawn to his attention the effect of run-offs in some of the portions east of my constituency and its effect on the Seine River, and he used this as an illustration as to why it was necessary for the floodway. I was glad to hear him indicate that here this evening, because he didn't indicate that to me when he was replying to my contention that that was one of the problems that we were having on the Seine River last year. Now it does seem to me that the government has committed itself, with the exception of one member, on the Royal Commission which investigated the floodway, that the floodway is necessary. My criticism is simply this, that it may be that we are running out of time. Now I note that my honourable friend, the Member for St. George kept repeating, when was the last flood -- when was the last flood? Is this an indication that providence is on his side, because of the fact that it gives him lots of room for argument. Again I am not trying to pull the government from out of its troubles, but I wonder what the attitude of the Honourable Member for St. George and others would be in this Legislature had we have had a repeat of the 1950 flood. I am sure that the arguments then would have been -- you should have done it -- and now that you haven't.

I say to the government, there are many misgivings that I have in respect of this floodway, but I do think that having the report of the experts before us we should proceed with its construction. One thing that appeals to me and one thing that I do not like about the whole situation in respect of this floodway is unless there is some change in the financing and the rates of interest in Canada, we are going to eventually pay more than what was visualized at the time of the recommendations of the Royal Commission. They mention in the report as read out by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the amortization was at five percent over a period of years. If the Provincial Treasurer is fortunate enough to have his saving bonds of Manitoba at five percent over subscribed we might be able to keep within that limitation, but at the interest rates which we are having to pay these days, for school construction and the likes of that, it will be far more costly than it would have been had some arrangements been made. I regret very much that Ottawa has not seen fit to make a firm declaration in respect of their contribution to this floodway, and I suggest that we're all of the same regrets in respect of that is concerned. But I do say it appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that my friends to my right are repeatedly trying to run over the last election and with the floods that we are having annually in respect of this, we are really not achieving anything at all. Maybe it's good for them to keep on repeating about the declaration that the Honourable the First Minister made, "We'll go it alone, if necessary". I suggest this, that if it is necessary, and it has been established that it's necessary, the answer my honourable friend from Carillon, isn't the answer, that if we get 75 percent of public money from Ottawa justifies it; if we don't get 75 percent of money from Ottawa it doesn't justify it." I think the floodway should be justified on the question as whether it should be built or whether it should not be built.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have two announcements for the benefit of the members: that Floyd Paterson won the fight in the sixth round. The other announcement that we have is that all pool winnings by members are supposed to be paid into the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party seems to deplore the fact that he has what he calls a flood of oratory from this side of the House, but he certainly encourages it when he makes such ridiculous statements as he did just a minute ago. They are not only ridiculous as I said, they're untrue, because the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party said that the government of the day did nothing while the flood was on and nothing after. Now that's too stupid for words, Mr. Chairman, and my honourable friend can have no other object in the world in making a stupid statement like that -- (Interjection) -- you didn't

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . stop when I got up to correct you so just sit down -- he can have no object in the world in making a silly statement like that but to continue the debate. He knows better than that. Why does he make a statement of that kind, Mr. Chairman? -- (Interjection) -- I am still on the floor, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend can talk when I get finished and he's quite capable of talking ad infinitum.

Mr. Chairman the thing that I would like to ask out of all this, and I have never been the one that brought up the question of either the last election or the flood itself, but when anybody wants to get up here and make statements that are ridiculous and stupid, then I am prepared to discuss the matter on that basis. But to get back to something not quite as silly as what the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party is talking about I think we have a right to know where stands the financial negotiations at the moment? It's practically two years ago that we were told in this House by the Honourable the First Minister, that he expected that the Federal Government would come through with an agreement on the basis that they had suggested. He said that they had asked for 75 percent; he said that he expected the answer soon. This is two years less a week, I think, and I think that it's time that we know "where do the financial negotiations stand". That is important -- not important to my honourable friend perhaps -- but it's important to us, and I am sure it's important to the Treasury and the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba. I would like, Mr. Chairman, that either the Minister or the First Minister would answer that question. What is the situation with regard to Federal participation in the financing?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to assure my honourable friend that when I was speaking of doing nothing, I was speaking only in regard to the prevention of a recurrence of the 1950 flood. I did not mean to infer, and if I did to him, I apologize to him if that is what my remarks inferred. I know that the government of the day did do something in respect of the flood itself, but my reference was to the construction of something in the nature of a floodway to prevent a re-occurrence, and I want to apologize to my friend if I annoyed him by that, without clarifying myself at the time.

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend should have, Mr. Chairman, gone further and mentioned as well that the system of dikes were built in the interval, because that is prevention. The Minister has admitted tonight that he agrees with some of us that the provision already made, combined with what can be superimposed upon them would look after a flood of the volume of the 1950. I think that's correct, and that was done immediately after the other flood. In fact it was done very, very quickly and it was a big project at that; the Federal Government did pay 75 percent. I'm never interested in people apologizing to me. I don't want any apologies. I don't mind a bit if they say something like that. All I insist on is my right of free speech to answer them.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into a debate with my honourable friend. I accord him the right of free speech. If he rejects my apology, that's quite all right with me. I give it to him in sincerity. If he will not accept it, well then that's quite all right with me. It's the first time, incidentally, this session I've seen my honourable friend so riled. He mentioned the fact of the building by the former government of the dikes. In my opinion it was insufficient and it took a long period of time before even they were built.

MR. CAMPBELL: It did not. My honourable friend is just wrong on his facts again. It did not take a long time. It was put in hand very expeditiously and completed in remarkably short time.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if an honest broker can participate in this interchange between my honourable friends opposite. You know there have been some significant contributions to "mugwumpery" in the debate here tonight. I don't know whether my Honourable Friend from St. George is the "mug" and my Honourable Friend from Carillon is the wump, or the other way around. But I do know that we've heard some of the most astonishing arguments advanced in connection with this debate that we've heard in this House for some time. The irresistible thought that comes to me, Sir, is, where have they been? Where have they been, when they voted twice in a row now for very substantial capital sums to be appropriated for this particular project? It may be that some protests were made. I wouldn't say that my memory's infallible, that we did not hear objections from some members of the House. But I can never recall having the whole proposition attacked as it has been attacked tonight, and as it has been attacked by inference on past occasions in this session of the Legislature, as we have

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)... listened to in these recent comments. Where were these honourable gentlemen? If they had doubts; if they had fears; if they thought the whole thing was a waste of time and effort, why did we not hear from them? I would also like to suggest this, that any member of the opposition, the official opposition, the opposition Party itself was in a position to take a stand on this in the election of 1959. After all the policy of the government in respect of this matter was announced in 1959. I believe that some exception was taken to my view that we should go it alone in that election. I wouldn't say that was not the case. But I must say that apart from the Honourable Member for Emerson, who I think did object to what he called the ditch around Winnipeg -- and let's give him credit, he objected to that in 1959 -- but I cannot recall, Sir, that it was the policy of the Liberal Party to oppose this project as a project at that time. I see there's another gentleman who deserves honourable mention in this connection. The Honourable Member for Carillon. Well I think I was right in calling him the wump after all. But there you are, Mr. Chairman, the party in opposition had an opportunity to declare themselves on this when it was before the public, as indeed it was in the general election, and they allowed that opportunity to go by. And now these months later we have this bearing of the soul by some of them in respect of their views on this important matter. I couldn't help but wonder; I couldn't help but wonder if they had any idea of the history of this project. I couldn't help but wonder if any of them had taken the trouble to acquaint themselves with the sequence of events that led up to the decision that was announced in this House in March, 1959, and to the policy which was debated at least by the government side in the election of 1959. Where have they been? Do they not know that the engineering aspect of this matter was thoroughly, and I think authoritatively, laid down by the investigation of the Red River Basin Committee that swung into action about 1954. I think it was about then that they started; maybe it was a few years earlier. Perhaps I'm drawing a long bow when I say they swung into action, but anyway they were in action, and they did produce a report. And they investigated from an engineering standpoint the various methods that were open for the protection of this Greater Winnipeg area. And they did examine the possibilities that have been mentioned in this particular debate tonight, and the various factors that were raised at that time. And they did attempt, and I think authoritatively, to assess the degree of protection that would be offered by the various proposals that had been put forward for many years, and certainly at that time, for the protection of Greater Winnipeg. That's all in the record. There's a pile of studies that at least must be 12 inches high if they were stacked one on top of another that were made by the Red River Investigation.

After receiving that authoritative engineering report the then government of the day, in which my Honourable Friend from Carillon was represented -- very thoroughly represented in the cabinet at that time -- decided to find out which of these methods of protecting the Greater Winnipeg area would be the most desirable in the public interest that should be acceptable. And they set up another Royal Commission, or perhaps I should say a Royal Commission because maybe the first one was not, it was an engineering study conducted by the officers of the Federal Government by and large. They set up a Royal Commission and that Royal Commission consisted of the best men that they could find for this job, and I'll have to agree that they made a good selection, regardless of majority or minority reports. They made an honest effort, and I think a successful one, to appoint a Royal Commission that would have the standing and the experience and the breadth of view to examine this thing in a proper way. They had on that Royal Commission, Sir, gentlemen who not only had some qualifications to consider the matter from the engineering point of view in the light of their experience in the province, but also men who were I think supremely competent to examine the financial aspects of this matter; supremely competent to weigh up the various proposals that were presented by the Red River Investigation people and by anyone else -- and there were lots of other people had ideas. Supremely competent to weigh these up and decide which of them, or which combination of them, would be in the best interests of the Province of Manitoba. And Sir, they made a report, and it's all here in this red book, and you can take any one of the objects that the Honourable Member for St. George was so free with tonight -- you can take any one of them that he mentioned -- and you will find that they have been considered by this body. You will find that they have examined the possibility of excavating the Lister Rapids; you will find that they have examined the possibility of clearing out the river; they have examined the possibility of using the perimeter highway as a dike. They have examined all those points that have been put forward tonight as possible alternatives to the one that has been

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)...adopted. And what did they do? They rejected them. After weighing them all up, they rejected them. And why did they reject them? They rejected them because they could not find that the facts sustained the view that money spent in this way, that money spent in the way that the Honourable Member for St. George has been suggesting tonight, would do the job -- they did not find that the money spent in that way would give the maximum benefit for the dollar spent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think you have to take the observation and the findings of that Royal Commission pretty seriously. I'll agree it was not unanimous; I will agree that there was a difference of opinion. But I think that the majority of that Commission did bring down what to my mind seemed to be unanswerable arguments in favour of what they recommended to us. They examined the possibilities of flood in this area; they examined very carefully. They examined the cost of doing the alternative measures that were suggested. They examined the cost of building the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. They assessed the benefits that would accrue by way of the insurance policy, and surely that's what it is. They examined the magnitude or the size of the project that should be undertaken to produce the maximum benefit and they recommended to us that we pursue the policy that we're pursuing today. Now let's get that clear. People talk about wasted money. People talk about dead-weight debt. People talk about the cost of this thing and the burden that it means to the people of Manitoba. Well, Mr. Chairman, that would all be true, and no one would be doing this thing, or suggesting this thing, if they had not also told us what the benefits were. If they had not also told us that by and large for every dollar that we're spending in this, we're getting an insurance policy that's worth three. Those were the calculations they made when they brought in the report, and every day that passes, and every day that sees the enlargement of this area at the junction of the two rivers, every day that sees a new industry come into Greater Winnipeg -- and some have been inhibited because of our experience in the past -- every day that sees changes in property values here, increases, increases, the benefits that this particular measure of insurance will bring to us. Does anyone opposite suggest that they wait till their house burns down before they rush out and buy the insurance policy? And yet it seems to me it's come pretty close to that in some of the proposals that were made on the opposite side of the House. It seems to me that's what they say: "Never mind about this thing; we'll rush out and buy our insurance policy just at the same time as we call the fire brigade." Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that's good at all. I think that it is our job to get on with providing this insurance as fast as we can. We've been criticized in some quarters because we don't move faster. We believe that we're moving with all proper speed in view of the magnitude and complexity of the problem. But that we should wait; but that we should sit on our hands; but that we should express the pious hope that Providence will save us from what we know from history is likely to happen, would I think be a wrong policy for responsible members of this House, or indeed responsible citizens of the Province of Manitoba to espound. Mr. Chairman, it's not a question of country versus city. It's not a question of providing some frill, some fancy thing that these people in the Greater Winnipeg area don't need. It's not a question of us out of the generosity of our hearts proposing a public work. It's none of those things. This is a policy which has been recommended to us by the best authorities we can find -- and I want to stress that -- who consulted not only the Red River Investigation people but all the people in the United States that my honourable friend spoke of. They were here; they had part of that. They had something to say. They looked it over. They gave it their blessing. This is something that the circumstances require. This is something which the future development of this Greater Winnipeg area require. Just as it is important for the people along the shores of Lake Manitoba, that as part of this over-all scheme, and my Honourable Friend from St. George ought to remember this, as part of our over-all scheme we are trying to do our best to protect the people on the shores of Lake Manitoba from their flood problems. Not as an act of charity; not as an act of grace; but because we think it is something that the economy of that district requires. We have plenty of good competent expert advice and opinion that that is the case. It is precisely the same with the Greater Winnipeg Floodway -- precisely the same. We're making an investment. It's a hard idea to get across. People see the size of the public debt. People see the interest charges. People see the enormous amount of money -- and heaven knows it's enormous -- that we will be committing, that we have committed. Let's get that clear -- that we have committed to this project -- and they think it's

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)... nothing but dead-weight debt. It's nothing but a cost and expense; a burden on our taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, if that were the case, then no sensible person would proceed with it. We're proceeding with it because we believe, and the facts support us all the way down the line, that the money we spend is well worth the spending, and that will mean advantages far in excess of the cost that we're being asked to undertake. Now those, I think, are facts which insofar as human reason can establish, insofar as the very best advice that we can get can confirm, these are the facts of the case. There's no room for argument in my view as to the necessity and the need to carry on with this project. Mr. Chairman, that is why, that is why I did not think it irresponsible that I should say in my view that this matter should be undertaken no matter what. Because even if we were to pay the whole cost ourselves, the information and the facts here would justify such an expenditure in returns to our people -- in dollars and cents returns to our people. And those who advance the exotic argument, the exotic argument, so well underlined by the Leader of the CCF Party that it's all right if Ottawa comes in for 25 percent, but all wrong if they'll only come in for 40 -- or at least let me correct that -- all right if they come in at 75 percent, but all wrong if they come in at 40.

I say to this House, Sir and I say to you, that this project must stand or fall on its merit as a project, on its merit as a financial proposition -- it must stand or fall on that, because if it's no good if Ottawa will only come in with 40 percent, believe me it's no good if they come in for 75 percent, because after all the taxpayer is one and indivisible, although we try and spread the burden a little across the nation by getting Ottawa to share this cost with us. So I say, Sir, that one must examine this project on its merits as a project, on the advice we have been given, on the reports of the best engineers and the best financial advice we can get and make up our minds whether it's good or bad. When we've done that, then we decide on how the costs are to be shared, and I don't make any apology for the attitude that the government has taken. Some people say that that undercuts our bargaining position. Well I think that takes -- I wouldn't say a pretty low -- but I would say it's a rather shallow assessment of the feelings of responsibility, a rather shallow assessment of the policies which we expect national or provincial governments to follow, Sir -- a very shallow assessment indeed. I do not think that the position of the Province of Manitoba is hindered in that respect because of what has taken place, because I believe the matter is going to be settled not by what I said in this House -- the matter is going to be settled as to the cost division between the two governments on the basis of some argument and some logic and some reasoning. Now Mr. Chairman, we may disagree with the government at Ottawa as to what a fair share of the division of these costs are, but I know that they have to establish their point of view by the use of reason, not by the use of prejudice and not by the use of any of these intangible things that the Honourable Member for St. George is so free with, when he says that we destroyed our bargaining position. I don't think that at all. I have a much higher regard for the statesmanship of the people at Ottawa, regardless of what political party may be in office there, than to think that. I believe that they are going to approach this from a point of view of doing what they think is fair in the national interest. Whether that coincides with our view is another matter, but I think that it will be argued on that kind of a basis. Now fortunately we do not have to contemplate, we do not have to contemplate the prospect of going it alone, we do not have to contemplate the possibilities that we will be asked to pay for this thing entirely from the resources of the Province of Manitoba. Far from it. The negotiations which are proceeding have made it quite clear that very substantial assistance will be available from the Government at Ottawa. I will join those who say: "it's a pity that we couldn't get this thing settled a little quicker than we have". I agree with that, but when you are negotiating Mr. Chairman, you don't take the first offer that is made -- when you are negotiating on a project like this, there is room for discussion, there is room for argument, there is room for the advancing of argument and of ideas and of points of fact in connection with policies of this sort. There is room for comparison with the development of federal policies of assistance in other great works of national importance. There is room for considering the international aspects of these matters. There is plenty of room for good honest disagreement, and I do not believe that you would think any the better of me, Sir, if I brought back the first deal I could make and plunked it on the table of this House, Sir and said, "that is it". I think that you would think a little more of me if I were a little more tenacious in my negotiations

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)... on this matter in an endeavour to get the best agreement I can with the federal authorities in respect to this matter. And that's precisely what's happening. We have stated our position, counter-offers have been made -- the two have not yet met. We are going to continue negotiations, Sir, just as long as we think that there is any fruitful purpose to be served by such negotiations and we think we are justified in doing so, just so long as we do not let that fact itself interfere with the paramount responsibility of getting this work underway and getting this work commenced. We have taken that view and we have gone ahead and we have done the things that the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation has outlined to this committee tonight, and at the same time, at the same time negotiations are proceeding.

I just hardly could believe my ears when some members opposite asked me whether there had been any indication that the Government at Ottawa was going to help us with this. Surely it's been public news long enough that they have given a commitment to help; there's even been some talk in the press of how much they were prepared to help with -- and that is a fact -- these offers have been made, negotiations are proceeding and we have an undertaking that we will be sharing this project with the Government of Canada. But I'll state to you quite frankly that negotiations have not reached the stage where I would be willing to come to this House, Sir and say, "this is the best I can do, we've reached a point where no purpose in bargaining can continue or no purpose in negotiation can be served, and we'd better bring the matter to a conclusion". Because we haven't reached that point, not in my opinion, and we're going to continue to negotiate until we have reached a point where I feel that the maximum arrangements have been made under all the circumstances. Because we feel in the negotiations so far that certain factors that are advantageous to our point of view have not yet been fully considered by the authorities in Ottawa, and how silly it would be of me to attempt to bring the matter to a conclusion for the sake of satisfying honourable friends opposite, when I feel that the best interest of the province would be served by continuing the negotiations to see whether we can improve the arrangements that will be finalized between the two of us.

I think that Sir, is about all that I want to say on this matter. I think that there has been plenty of time, and heaven knows how much missed opportunity for gentlemen opposite who didn't think that the policy itself was right to say so -- to put their views on the table -- to let the House have the benefit of their opinion. I cannot understand how they find it possible, particularly the Honourable Member for St. George, to blithely ignore all the things that are said here, to skip over the fact that everyone of the points that he raised tonight are dealt with in this volume and are disposed of as being less advantageous to us than the policy we follow. I am at a loss to understand that. I suppose he's read it -- it's all here. However, that's his right, and if he wants to take that stand, well certainly I can't object to his voicing his opinion in this House. But I think, Sir, that on the technical grounds as to what is right and proper to be done, that the advice that has been tendered to the government of this province, to this House, to the people of our province, is sound, and that it was right and proper for us to proceed with the minimum of delay in implementing those proposals. I also think it is right for us to have done that before we had a final settlement with the Government at Ottawa, because as has been said: "no one knows what the future may bring". And if we had sat here waiting for all negotiations to be completed and the i's dotted and the t's crossed and caught with a flood, what would the reaction of the honourable gentleman opposite have been? I can just hear the welcome ring at this very moment. I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, and as sincerely as I can, that we are not out of the woods. Let no member of this House or member of the general public think that we are out of the woods, because we're not. It's going to take us how many years' three, four, five -- listen to the engineers and they'll tell you -- to get this thing done, and the good Lord alone knows whether we are going to be vouchsafed that grace of time to complete this protective measure before the next great flood comes upon us. I say that instead of being criticized for not waiting for the completion of those final agreements that we would have been open to the most serious charges if we had waited and taken that risk, because that risk still exists, and I won't know a quiet moment or an easy one, until this floodway is built and I can face the people of this community knowing that we have done all that we could to protect them according to the best advice and ability we could get. I have no apologies, Sir, for the policy of the government. I think it's right; I think it's sound and I am willing to face people of the Province on it any day.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, when is the First Minister going to let us see the papers regarding the correspondence between the two governments that we have been waiting for two years?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I don't know what papers my friend is talking about, but if he is talking about any exchange of papers between us in the last little while, I should think he will have to wait until the negotiations are completed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'm not talking about those papers, I'm talking about those that I requested two years ago and he kept promising that he would deliver them.

MR. ROBLIN: Well Sir, I made a note of that point here tonight, but to the best of my recollection the Government at Ottawa are not willing to release papers that have to deal with the current negotiations until they are finished. The papers that my honourable friend refers to are the basic documents that we sent to them sometime ago and they are readily available.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of the Honourable the First Minister, and I must confess that as far as the answer to my question about, "where stands the financing negotiations at the moment" that his answer was almost a verbatim report of what he said two years ago. I remember that at that time he mentioned the fact of the other great works that were underway in Canada. He mentioned the fact that because of those works and because of the inter-provincial and international aspects of flood control in this province, that there was reason for expecting a large contribution from the Federal Government. He mentioned a lot of those things, and said that on that basis he expected that the Federal Government would soon give an answer -- they were pressing for 75 percent. And then a day or two later, he made another statement dealing particularly with the question of water control and dealt also in some detail with the floodway, and when he had finished that statement I said that I realized that that statement was not open for debate but that I would like to ask him one question on it. I understood him to say that it should be a co-operative venture with the Federal Government, that assistance had been asked of them, a formula had been recommended to them. The question I would like to ask is: "has the government any assurance that they will receive that assistance?" The answer of the Honourable, the First Minister was, "we have not yet received any counterproposal you might say, or any official comment from the Federal Government" -- This is two years ago -- "on the proposals that we have given them. I have no authority at the present time, to state what the federal attitude will be. We think we have a good case and we intend to do our best to promote that case with them. I am expecting that within a reasonably short time we will be able to come to grips on this particular matter and so on. Now Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Honourable the First Minister and the government is not to blame, but either the Honourable the First Minister and this government is to blame or the Federal Government is to blame because there should be no need for the financial negotiation to take this long particularly when the Honourable the First Minister has asked this Legislature for the money to make a start on it, and a start has been made. Under those circumstances it just should be brought to conclusion, and my honourable friend when he is suggesting that he isn't going to tell the House where the matter stands at the moment just to satisfy our curiosity, or whatever the term was that he used. Mr. Chairman, this is more than curiosity -- this is the public funds that we're dealing with and a tremendous amount of the public funds are already committed as the Honourable the First Minister has mentioned -- and I think that we are entitled to know where the situation stands. What is the delay between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government? We have a right to know, and just to say now the same thing that was said two years ago in my opinion is not sufficient.

MR. ROBLIN: Why doesn't my honourable friend get up-to-date. That's one of his big troubles you know, he is always just a little bit behind in the game. He knows perfectly well that the Prime Minister of Canada has said very important matters on this subject since I spoke two years ago. Why does he refer to that two years ago when he knows very well that the Government of Ottawa has given a public undertaking that they are going to share in the cost of this matter. And he says that I stand up here and make the same statement that I made two years ago. Well it simply isn't the case, and he knows it isn't the case, and then he says I won't divulge the state of negotiations because I don't want to satisfy his curiosity. That's not what I said at all. What I said was that I don't intend to bring in a premature negotiation into this House merely to be able to say "well we have a deal and this is it". What I said was that

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)...we are going to continue to negotiate until such time as we have reached the end of the proper negotiations on this matter and that there are no other favorable aspects of this matter that advance the cause of the Province of Manitoba that I feel I can present to the Federal Government. Now that's the situation as it exists at this time, and he knows very well that there has been a very hopeful change in this matter since I spoke two years ago, and that a firm undertaking has been given publicly by the Government of Ottawa that they will share. Now we're debating on the exact degree of that sharing. The public knows what we've asked for; the public also knows what a Minister of the Federal Government is proposing, so you can conclude that we are arguing about the difference between those two points of view.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well Mr. Chairman, of course I knew that the Prime Minister has made a statement on this. I knew that a couple of other Ministers of the Federal Government had made statements on it. But what did they say? They said that something would be given. I have never seen a figure, even a bargaining figure announced. I've seen the figure announced as far as the First Minister of this province is concerned; I've never seen one announced from the Federal Government. But just an undertaking that something is going to be given is no stipulation of an amount or a percentage at all and that's all I have seen up to date. -- (Interjection) -- Well no doubt, what is it? What is it?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the Honourable Leader of the CCF that there has been a flood of eloquence here tonight, but the flood that originated on this side was of the 1950 proportion and the one that came from the other side is of the 1826 proportion. Quite a flood. Mr. Chairman, I wish that I had the eloquence and the command of the language to be able to answer the First Minister about what he said. I have always thought that he was a little bit of a dreamer and an idealist and I think tonight that he exactly proved to me that he was an idealist. He came and told us that the decision about the sharing of costs would be made on a basis of straight principles and on a basis of figures and facts, technical knowledge, and that there was no disadvantage in him setting out his position from the start -- we'll do it alone if necessary. And then he comes and tells us that he is not going to accept the Prime Minister's offer or the second offer. Well why does the offer come in if it's going to be decided on a basis of facts and principle? And he says that he's bargaining with Ottawa. Is he bargaining on the basis of facts and figures or principles, or is it the bargainings between politicians? Is he leading this House to believe that this is going to be decided by experts or engineers? It's going to be decided by politicians, and politicians like to have their cards some place where his opponent on the bargaining table doesn't know where, and he doesn't show all his cards. And I am sure that in bargaining with Mr. Diefenbaker that our First Minister should have some hidden cards a little bit, should not open up as he has, Mr. Chairman. I think that he just argued against himself when he states on the one hand it's going to be decided on facts and principles, and then we're not going to accept the first offer, no we'll get a better deal, a better deal. We'll wait two years, three years, four years if necessary, I don't know how long until he finally gets the best possible deal. He's a bargainer and I think that's what it should be. He should have thought of that two years ago before telling what he was ready to do. He should have kept his piece until he had completed the bargain and then announced to the people of Manitoba that on this basis, with the proper sharing of cost between Ottawa and Manitoba, he would do what four commissioners recommended that should be done.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend exhibits all the aspects of a disappointed man. He and some of his friends opposite -- and I think I'll include the Member from St. George in this observation although maybe it's a bit unfair, and on consideration I may excuse him on this occasion -- but he's so disappointed, he's so disappointed that they didn't say: "okay if he wants to go it by himself let him go ahead and do it". That's what the trouble is with him, and when he sees that it's not being dealt with in that way; when he sees that they have not taken that statement as an excuse to do nothing, why he's just a little bit disappointed because he thought we'd be caught. And he's such a wily old gentleman over there, I sort of wish on some occasions that I had him helping me to conduct some of these negotiations because he might be able to think up some dodges that I would never never dream of. He's been dodging all over the Province of Manitoba for the last 20 or 30 years in the political field, and doing an excellent job of it. If you really want to hear him when he's in full flight you ought to go to the meeting just before election night. Particularly if the election is on a Monday, you ought

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . to go to a meeting with him on Sunday, particularly when he's talking perhaps in one of his own localities and hear what he has to say, and hear what accusations he sometimes makes against some honourable people who run for office in this province -- and not all in the provincial field either I might add. I remember very well -- he's wily. But I want to tell him that his attitude and mine need not necessarily prevail. I want to tell him that everybody doesn't approach the problem with the same -- well I don't know just how to describe it -- the same background of experience -- let's put it that way, as he does. He's disappointed that we're not left holding the bag to do the whole thing by ourselves, and everytime the federal people and myself meet, he's afraid that we're going to get a little money from Ottawa out of this; that he won't be able to go home and raise Cain about the whole thing and as the prospects get a little brighter, that negotiations are really going to come to a successful conclusion, he changes his standpoint, he gets off into another point of view, his base of argument shifts and he gives it to us all over again from another direction. Well it's a masterful performance. The only trouble is it just won't wash.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman the First Minister has said that the people of Manitoba have received a commitment from the Prime Minister of Canada. Well Mr. Chairman, the people of Canada have received a lot of commitments from the Prime Minister of Canada and he has failed to fulfill them, so we have every reason to believe that he may not fulfill this one too.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman I can tell my honourable friend one thing. He can thank the Prime Minister of Canada for sharing in the dam that is going to relieve his people of the disabilities of flood that was never done before. He can thank the Prime Minister of Canada, and he can thank the present Government of Manitoba that we have gone ahead on a project which he stalled on, his people stalled on, since the beginning of time -- and heaven knows they were in office from the beginning of time -- and yet he has the consummate effrontery to accuse the good faith of people in this House and outside it in such an unbecoming way. Well Sir, I merely want to say that the people of St. George have reason to be grateful for the flood protection policies of the present government. They have reason to be grateful for the co-operation that we have received from the authorities in Ottawa on this matter. We have reason to be grateful that at long last after he diddled and dawdled for heaven knows how long something was actually done about the flood problem on the shores of Lake Manitoba. So when he goes home tonight to console himself with his visions of perfidy; when he goes home tonight to console himself with the duplicity and the two-facedness of myself and any other honourable gentleman he wants to think about, he can conclude with a little prayer of thanksgiving that somebody at last did something for his people.

MR. GUTTORMSON: That's all well and good. The project on Lake Manitoba was practical and that's why this government did it, and I endorsed it. But the one on the Red River is not practical and whether the Federal Government pays 75 percent or 100 percent it still isn't practical.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, it just depends on whose ox is being gored. My honourable friend qualifies for that description.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . not at all to change the subject, because I'm delighted with the discussion that's going on, but just as a point of interest, would the honourable the First Minister tell us what is the proportion that is being shared by the Federal Government on the Fairford Dam project?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes Sir. That's being shared on a 50-50 basis.

MR. CAMPBELL: 50-50? And does the Honourable the First Minister think that maybe sets a precedent for other works?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I think my honourable friend in office set a good many precedents on a 50-50 basis, but I hope it's not going to bind us.

MR. CAMPBELL: We set one that's very closely allied on a 75-25 basis too, the honourable gentleman will remember.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) passed?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, we have a few questions to ask with regard to individual items. For instance I would like to mention for the Honourable Minister's information that we will be asking about the present status of the Holland Dam investigation; the Russell Dam; the progress report on the Fairford Dam, and some other items of interest under the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....general heading of Water Control and Conservation.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if -- I don't know whether you're proposing to call it 11 o'clock -- I wonder if before we close if I could give the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition the figures for which he asked in the proceedings of March 9, 1961, Page 657. The Civil Service Commission staff count figures for June of 1959 were 4,835; and June of 1960, 5,169.

MR. ROBLIN:committee rise Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights 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.