



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 75 2:30 p.m. Monday, April 23, 1962.

5th Session, 26th Legislature

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, MONDAY, April 23rd, 1962.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.
Reading and Receiving Petitions.
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.
Notices of Motion.
Introduction of Bills.

Before I call the Orders of the Day I should like to introduce to the members of the Legislative Assembly 26 members of the 4-H group under the title of McIvor Nimble Thimbles. We invite them to the session of the House this afternoon and we hope that their visit with us is pleasant and instructive. I would just pass the word along to the members of the Legislature if they wish a demonstration from the Nimble Thimble group, and would suggest if there is a button or two loose possibly they would receive a little accommodation from the skilled group in the Gallery.

Orders of the Day.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I rise on a matter of privilege affecting myself as a member of this House and affecting me as a Minister of the Crown, a member of the Executive Council of the Province of Manitoba.

On Thursday last grave charges of preferential treatment, of favouritism by the Crown, in the matter of charges laid in the Brandon Packers strike investigation were levelled in this House by the Honourable Member for St. George supported by his Liberal deskmates and particularly by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I do not believe there is any misunderstanding as to what the charges were. The charges were that there had been preferential treatment shown by the Attorney-General with respect to J. C. Donaldson as a result of the evidence arising out of the Brandon Packers Strike Enquiry Commission. Not only that, the charge went further and said that favouritism had been shown to him. The implication or innuendo was, I presume, that it was shown because of his former past political background or for other reasons that were not specified. The further allegation or charge was made that I should resign as a result of this alleged preferential treatment or favouritism that had been shown.

Mr. Speaker, in the whole realm of governmental responsibility perhaps no aspect is more fundamental or more important to the functioning of a democratic society than the fair and impartial administration of justice. The public are entitled to expect this as of right from any government in office. Until Thursday last I was under the impression that the Liberal Opposition, while certainly not agreeing to all or any of the government programs in other fields, at least accorded to this government the courtesy of belief in what we all know to be the fact, namely, that justice is administered as thoroughly and impartially in Manitoba as humans may administer it anywhere. That is not to say that it is perfect because any institution that is administered by humans is subject to the very frailties and errors which make up human character anywhere. But now quite a different position has been taken by the honourable member and by his Leader, among others. Their allegation of favouritism strikes at the vitals of democratic parliamentary government. Their charges have received wide publicity, not only throughout our province but across the nation. It is regrettable, Sir --

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I don't want to interrupt the honourable gentleman; I'd just like to point out that he has raised the point of privilege. I don't believe that there is one. This matter was debated last week and he had then the occasion to make his reply. I'm not going to prevent him from making his statement now, but naturally, then we will expect that the same courtesies will be accorded to all members of the House.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that any member who wishes to speak on this point of privilege will be allowed the courtesy of doing so.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I think that that isn't the whole point

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) of order though. The point of order is that a matter that has already been debated, on which the spokesman for the government already had the opportunity to reply and did reply, is now being raised again as a matter of privilege and that would mean that if at any time any of the rest of us feel that we have a question of privilege to raise even though it's raised once at the time and debated then, that we would be able to raise it again before the Orders of the Day.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, it is regrettable; indeed I suggest, Sir, that it is tragic --

MR. MOLGAT: That is the understanding then is it? That we will have the same privileges on this and other occasions?

MR. LYON: I have no objection to any of my honourable friends replying on this matter.

MR. ROBLIN: I would suggest that this is a matter for Mr. Speaker to decide.

MR. MOLGAT: Well then, Mr. Speaker, would you make a ruling in that regard, whether it will be the accepted practise that we can do this in the future?

MR. SPEAKER: I will make the ruling when the incident occurs.

MR. LYON: I say again, it is --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, you do rule this one in order?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I don't think my point of privilege has been thoroughly dealt with so my honourable friend is asking you to rule upon something that really is not before you yet. But to continue, I say that it is regrettable, indeed it's tragic -- and I use that word advisedly -- that deliberate smears of the kind we heard last Thursday should impede this House and the citizens of Manitoba in their consideration of the public issues of the day. I further suggest to you, Sir, that no government worthy of its name may disregard such charges no matter from what source or agency they come. The proposition advanced by the Honourable Member for St. George is that the Crown, through the Attorney-General, was derelict in its duty and in fact gave preferential treatment to J. C. Donaldson with respect to his part in the whole Brandon Packers affair. Some alleged points of evidence were called which were said to present "an overwhelming case" for prosecution.

I desire, Mr. Speaker, to point out first of all that the case of The Queen versus Paton and Cox, which is presently before the Court of Appeal, was and is one of the longest, most complex and intricate criminal trials which this province has seen for some time. The pre-investigation period involved a Royal Commissioner -- a learned trial Judge -- and his counsel in approximately four months of enquiry and investigation before a recommendation was forthcoming that the Crown intercede to investigate for any possible breaches of the criminal law, and that recommendation came on the 17th of November, 1960. I pause here to point out, Mr. Speaker, that at no stage in the course of that letter or in the course of the report that appeared subsequently will honourable members find the present Chief Justice of Manitoba, the Royal Commissioner in that instance, in any way condemning the person of J. C. Donaldson with respect to the transactions that took place, and I invite honourable members to read his report and to see if this fact is corroborated.

The special Crown Prosecutor, A. S. Dewar, was appointed by the government and began at once his detailed examination of all of the exhibits of the proceedings of the Royal Commission bearing upon the issue. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police and a firm of chartered accountants were placed at his disposal and interviewed scores of witnesses whose statements had to be reviewed and weighed in the light of known facts before he could arrive at any conclusions. His instructions from me, as I advised the House the other day, were to investigate the whole matter thoroughly and to make recommendations as to what persons and what charges, if any, should be preferred. His terms of reference, Mr. Speaker, were not circumscribed in any way whatsoever. His investigation involved several weeks of intensive work, with many trips to Brandon and to Toronto; the RCMP accumulated a vast file of evidence on this matter; and finally on the 5th of January of 1961, he reported to me the recommendations arising from his investigation which were as follows: (a) that Paton and Cox should be charged with certain stated offences, which they were subsequently charged with. (b) that Donaldson be not charged.

His recommendations were considered by the Deputy Attorney-General and myself on or about January 10th, 1961, and he was instructed, Mr. Speaker, to proceed in accordance with

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) his own recommendations. I pause here, Mr. Speaker, again, to point out the following. The procedure followed in this case was quite normal and in accordance with long-standing practise in the Department of the Attorney-General, namely, that the Attorney-General appoints Crown Attorneys as agents to act on his behalf and to carry out the law. Today as I stand here, Crown Attorneys all over the province are making decisions on my behalf and as my agent in the administration of justice in Manitoba. And let there be no mistake on this point. I accept responsibility for their decisions as I do for the recommendation of Mr. Dewar, which I adopted in respect of Donaldson. The minute I adopted his recommendation it became mine and I stand by it right or wrong, and it's an opinion, a matter of valued judgment; but I stand by it having adopted it. But that is quite a different matter from what my honourable friend alleges. He charges deliberate and calculated favouritism, a dereliction of duty and a disregard for the evidence. I respond by giving you the truth, Mr. Speaker, as to how this decision came about.

After the recommendations of Mr. Dewar were reviewed in the department he was instructed to proceed according to what he had advised us and recommended to us. The charges were laid, and without detailing or going into the vast history of what took place subsequently, I can merely remind honourable members of what happened. The preliminary enquiry was held over a period of some four to five weeks with respect to the two accused. A vast amount of evidence was accumulated at this preliminary enquiry. The Crown was represented by Mr. Dewar and by his assistant, Mr. Houston. The defence were represented by two counsel of their own choice. Mr. Donaldson appeared as a witness at the preliminary enquiry as indeed he had at the Brandon Packers Strike Enquiry Commission. Following committal for trial, the trial was held last fall, that is in October, November of 1961. This trial involved 40 days, 40 days of evidence; nine volumes of evidence were accumulated during the course of this trial encompassing some 5,000 pages in all, that is, exclusive of the addresses made to the jury by the Crown, by the Defence and the charge to the jury made by the judge. It's a matter of record that the accused were convicted of the offences of which they were charged, and the sentence was handed down by the Court, which is presently under appeal before the Manitoba Court of Appeal.

On April 19th, last Thursday, the transcription of evidence of the trial was for the first time made available to the Court, the Crown and the Defence. I was not at the trial itself at any time. I was not at the preliminary enquiry at any time, nor for that matter did I attend the Brandon Packers strike enquiry commission at any time. I personally can say quite honestly to this House that I have heard no evidence in this case at all. It is only sensible, I suggest to honourable members, that I take the advice of the Crown Prosecutor who was appointed to act as the agent for the Crown, but having taken it, I accept responsibility for it, but I suggest that they consider that that is the only reasonable course that any attorney-general can follow in such circumstances. I can only presume that my honourable friend did not read the 5,000 pages of evidence that were made available on Thursday morning before he made his speech on Thursday afternoon, in order to enable him to arrive at the so-called conclusions that he did. Indeed he says his advice came from legal sources -- sources, I can only presume, who were present at the enquiry or the trial, or were at least completely privy with all of the evidence that was heard and transcribed. And I invite him, Mr. Speaker, to inform us further in detail as to the names of his legal advisors as I have been able to tell the House mine. More simply, if his evidence is not from such sources then let him tell us that he has read all of the evidence and is basing his opinion as a layman upon his own knowledge.

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to deal with this question of favouritism. I desire to read into the record and to table the following communication which I have received from the special prosecutor A.S. Dewar relevant to this matter. The letter is dated April 23rd, 1962; it's addressed to myself: "Re Brandon Packers Criminal Investigation. Dear Sir: At your request I am setting forth my understanding of the instructions received from you in connection with the Brandon Packers criminal investigation. In November 1960 I was instructed to review the Brandon Packers Strike Commission evidence, to obtain through the RCM Police such further investigation as might appear necessary, and to report to your department thereon with my recommendations as to whether or not criminal proceedings should be taken against anyone. After considering all of the information and evidence available at that time, and the

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) participation of all persons and corporations involved in the various transactions under review, I reported to the Deputy Attorney-General on January 5th, 1961, summarizing the facts as ascertained, outlining the further investigation required, recommending that Messrs. Hugh Paton and D. Hubert Cox be charged with certain criminal offences, and requesting instructions to proceed. I also directed attention to the conduct of Mr. J. C. Donaldson and recommended against charges. Subsequent instructions received from the Deputy Attorney-General were to proceed in accordance with my recommendations. This was done. After that time, as the investigation proceeded I had occasion to reconsider the participation of all persons and corporations involved in the various transactions. Nothing came to my attention causing me to alter the recommendations as to the persons to be charged. My opinion remains the same today." Signed, "Yours very truly, A.S. Dewar." I table that -- (Interjection) -- dated April 23rd, this date. I table that for the record, Mr. Speaker.

I further desire to read into the record and to table another communication from the Deputy Attorney-General of this province, Brigadier Orville M. M. Kay, Q. C., and this is dated April 23rd, today, addressed from the Deputy Attorney-General to myself. "Subject: Brandon Packers, Paton and Cox, J. Campbell Donaldson. Pursuant to the interim report of the commissioner appointed to investigate the Brandon Packers labour dispute, it was decided to have the police make a complete investigation to ascertain whether or not the financial situation of the company was due to fraudulent acts of any person or persons. As such an investigation would require the full time of at least one, and possible two counsellors in the department, and as the volume of work in the department was such that we could not undertake the investigation, it was decided to employ A.S. Dewar, Esquire, as counsel and place him in charge of the enquiry. Mr. Dewar was agreeable to accepting the appointment and he was advised that he was in full charge of the enquiry. His instructions were to carry out a full and complete investigation, and to assist him a firm of chartered accountants were employed to examine the financial records of the company and Sergeant Stavenjord of the RCMP Criminal Investigation Branch was also assigned to work with him. There was no qualification or restriction of any kind or nature made or suggested in regard to the scope or extent of the investigation. Mr. Dewar at all times had a free hand in deciding the channels of the investigation and the extent of the enquiry. On or about the 9th of January, 1961, the investigation being complete, Mr. Dewar called into the office to see you. I was present. At that time Mr. Dewar recommended that charges of conspiracy, theft, obtaining by false pretenses and issuing a false prospectus be laid against H. Paton and D. Hubert Cox. He stated that he did not recommend any charges being laid against J. C. Donaldson, advising that in his opinion the evidence did not justify charges being laid against him. You instructed Mr. Dewar to have informations laid, setting out the charges the evidence would substantiate and to prefer charges against whomever he felt the investigation warranted charges. The question of whom was to be charged was left to counsel who had carried out the investigation. There was no limitation or restriction of any kind or nature stated, implied or suggested. Informations were laid against H. Paton and D. Hubert Cox; the preliminary was held, and the two men committed. Subsequently, Mr. Dewar drew the indictment charging Paton and Cox, which I signed as Deputy Attorney-General. The case came on for hearing before Mr. Justice Monnin and a jury of the Brandon Assizes in September 1961. Both men were convicted. Since the issue was raised in the House by E. Guttormson, Esquire, MLA, I have spoken to Mr. Dewar and he states that after hearing all the evidence given at the trial of Paton and Cox, which included the Crown's case and the defence of both accused, he is still of the opinion that his original recommendation that no charge be laid against J. C. Donaldson is correct." And that's signed "Orville M. M. Kay, Deputy Attorney-General," and I table that document, Mr. Speaker, for the records of the House.

I may further advise the House, Mr. Speaker, that since last Thursday I have consulted the trial Judge, Mr. Justice A. M. Monnin, who heard all of the evidence in Regina versus Paton and Cox. I should pause here to advise the House that it is not an uncommon practice for a trial judge hearing a matter, either civil or criminal, to advise the department at the conclusion, or even during the course of the proceedings, if he feels the evidence before him discloses a criminal offence by a person not before the court as an accused. This is a well-established practice and it's of great benefit, may I say, to the Crown and the administration of justice in any jurisdiction. The trial judge in question, on at least two occasions since I have been Attorney-

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) General, has reported to me on such matters which were then considered by the Crown. I use as an example a recent one that I had wherein on the 14th of February of this year the same trial judge, Mr. Justice A. M. Monnin, in the course of delivering a judgment in a civil matter, said in his final paragraph: "I am forwarding a copy of these reasons to the Attorney-General and to Mr. C. H. Flintoff, Trustee of the Estate of Subway Garage Limited, for such action as they may consider advisable." And so I point out to the House that this is not an uncommon practice.

I am expressly authorized by the trial judge, Mr. Justice A. M. Monnin, to advise the House: (a) That he has made no report to me recommending the prosecution of J. C. Donaldson as a result of the evidence before him in Regina versus Paton and Cox. (b) That since this matter arose in the House he was again asked if such a report would be forthcoming recommending prosecution and he assured me it would not. Again I report that the foregoing evidence as to whether or not Mr. Donaldson should have been charged is only a matter of opinion; the opinion of the special prosecutor who was appointed; an opinion of the Deputy Attorney-General; and it becomes my opinion when I adopt it. It's my opinion, because I have adopted it, right or wrong, and there may be legitimate room for argument, if one wants to look at all of the evidence, but that is the advice I accepted, and I adopt responsibility for it. Donaldson may well have been tainted to some extent by this whole transaction -- I'm not here to argue that point; I'm not here to argue it at all. That's a matter of legal opinion as to whether there is sufficient evidence to justify a charge. You have heard the advice I received upon that point, and remember that the Court of Appeal must still deal with this whole question in the appeal that is presently before them. The question of evidence and of law is a separate question by itself and I'm not here to argue or to defend Donaldson -- not at all. I am here to point out how the Crown reached its decision, the very circumstances under which it reached its decision, in order to prove conclusively, I trust, that no suggestion, or implication, or innuendo of favouritism, or partiality, or dereliction of duty lies in this case. What is in question is not the legal argument as to who is being charged, because as I say that is a valued judgment that we have made based on the evidence that I have shown you, but the morality of the decision is questioned and I submit the inference drawn is a gross untruth -- a gross untruth, Mr. Speaker.

My honourable friend from St. George has never had the temerity to suggest that Mr. Dewar showed favouritism. My honourable friend from St. George has never had the temerity to suggest that the Deputy Attorney-General was guilty of showing favouritism. And yet when the Attorney-General accepts the advice and adopts it as his own, he charges the Attorney-General with showing favouritism. And that, Mr. Speaker, is why I say that it is a gross untruth -- a gross untruth, and I repeat it several times, for his ears and for the ears of all the people of Manitoba.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is more -- there is more than what I have already spoken about. I draw to the attention of the House the points of so-called evidence upon which he attempted to found his case. Members will appreciate that it is not possible to discuss these matters either intelligently or with understanding unless one has either heard or read all of the evidence -- all 5,000 pages of it -- and then are equipped to weigh the facts and apply the law to the situations enumerated. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that it is obvious that my honourable friend has selected, as might be expected, only those portions of the evidence which best advanced his own argument. I have taken some advice on the question of this evidence from those most closely connected with it on behalf of the Crown, and I find that each of his main points, each of his main points reflects the line of defence advanced by, or on behalf of the accused, Paton and Cox, during their trial. In other words, he adopts the viewpoint of the two accused as to the truth of statements with respect to Mr. Donaldson. Undoubtedly he must be impressed by their defence but this hardly calls for the statement that he has made charging favouritism, maladministration of justice and dereliction of duty. My viewpoint is that rather of more impartial sources, which I have enumerated to you, and I stand by that viewpoint until new evidence or a change of mind is registered or indicated by those who were responsible for advising me in this matter.

Again, concerning the prospectus. One must accept the line of defence again of the two accused, that Mr. Donaldson knew all about their plans if he is to be held guilty of a criminal act in signing it. And if my honourable friend feels that Mr. Donaldson is guilty, why does he not suggest that all the other directors, Miss Peary, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Lidster and Mr. Kerr

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) who signed the prospectus with Mr. Donaldson, be not charged as well? I ask him that question. He must remember that the law requires a guilty mind to accompany the act. He must remember that the law also recognizes that a crime may be committed by a person through the office of an innocent agent, or agents. Why does he single out Donaldson? He says that he was not motivated politically in this matter. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest we are left to draw our own conclusions in that regard. Why does he not mention all of the other persons who might have been involved directly or indirectly in this matter? Because that is what the Crown Prosecutor had to do. He had to consider the part played by every person, and by every corporation, whether it be the Imperial Bank of Canada, whether it be the General Manager, Mr. Waddell, whether it be any of these other persons, whose evidence came before the Tritschler Enquiry or who were mentioned in the course of the general evidence surrounding the transaction which took place in 1956 when Brandon Packers controlled it. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the picture becomes much clearer. My honourable friend gets legal advice from sources he declines to identify and builds up his case, if it may be called that, largely on the line of defence taken by or on behalf of the two accused in the trial which is now in the Court of Appeal. I ask him today, Mr. Speaker, as I did last Thursday, if he is interested in justice or in politics. I think the answer is clear. It is clear, I submit, that justice has not miscarried in the Crown's handling to date. No one can say what the outcome of the appeal will be. We will continue to keep an alert and an open mind to all evidence and developments in this case as we have heretofore. For our part we have acted on the best advice available to us and will continue to do so in the public interest. Unlike my honourable friend we serve no cause in this matter but justice. Our consciences are clear; our actions are explained and I submit, proper, in the circumstance. We propose to carry on in this manner.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, we've heard a very interesting and very well-documented statement by the Minister of the Crown. It's most interesting to note that he did a wonderful job of skating -- skating around the subject matter. He belabours the word "favouritism". I used the word "favouritism" once in my remarks when I said that it was his oath of office. Of course he takes it out of context. That's all right. He talks about the evidence that I cited in my remarks. He says this is the word of Paton and Cox. Mr. Speaker, this is not the evidence of Paton and Cox. It was the admission under oath by Mr. Donaldson, not by Paton and Cox. It was admissions made by the man himself. I also stated several times in the course of my remarks that this was the evidence -- not my evidence -- this was the evidence in a court of law. I said -- I asked him why charges weren't laid in the face of it. I said, "Let's not us decide who is guilty." I said, "Let the courts decide on the face of the evidence." At no time has he disputed the evidence that I have submitted, except towards the end of his remarks where he said "I put forth the arguments of Paton and Cox and I was prepared to take their word." This wasn't Paton and Cox's evidence; this was the evidence given by Mr. Donaldson under oath.

The First Minister during his remarks made a very interesting observation, which he later denied, I admit, because I think he realized what he had said. The Attorney-General today is telling us that he assumes the responsibility, but when the remarks were made in the first instance, it was the responsibility of the Crown Prosecutor, Mr. Dewar; he gave him the advice; he followed that. As the debate concluded the First Minister said, "We assume responsibility for any decisions of this government," a direct contradiction of his earlier remarks. I'll quote what the First Minister said: "I know this, that when this whole matter came up in the first instance it was considered by the Cabinet and we came to the quite obvious, perfectly normal decision at that time when we started to investigate this thing, that we would proceed, let the chips fall where they may, and that I have, from time to time, enquired of the Attorney-General whether the advice tendered to him or any of the details that came up from time to time, would justify the prosecution of any other persons in connection with this matter." This doesn't quite ring with what the Attorney-General has just said. It seems strange to me that it took so long for the Attorney-General to come out with this statement which was made. The debate took place on Thursday; this is the following Monday. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the facts that I have submitted in this case were true, they are evidence; they were given by Mr. Donaldson under oath. I said we should not judge him. I said the courts should have that opportunity. I said the Attorney-

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) General should have allowed -- should have charged him in view of the heavy evidence that was made by the man himself in a court of law. He says why did I not mention other people. Well, it didn't come out in evidence that other people signed the false prospectus. It didn't come out in evidence that they got the \$200,000.00.

MR. LYON: If my honourable friend will consult the Brandon Packers Strike Enquiry Commission report prepared by Mr. Justice Tritschler he will find that evidence which came out before the trial.

MR. GUTTORMSON: We're dealing with the trial -- the trial of Paton and Cox, and you know it. Who admitted in court that the minute books had been -- that directors' meetings which never took place were signed by Donaldson? He admitted this himself. Why was this done? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney-General can skate all he likes about the issue, but the facts still stand. When I have an opportunity to read his statement in Hansard I trust we'll have the same opportunity to bring this matter up before the House again, just like he did today.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, as a Minister of the Crown and a member of the Cabinet I feel that I have reason to speak at this time. The Member for St. George has brought the most serious charges possible against a Minister of the Crown and against the Government of Manitoba. He has charged a deliberate miscarriage of justice for partisan purposes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: On a point of privilege. I never said at any time on a partisan basis. It was the Premier who said this. I never mentioned the political background of the man in question at any time. -- (Interjection) -- I retract what? I said I never mentioned the man's political background at any time. It was you that did it.

MR. ROBLIN: You're pretty transparent.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Just a minute, Mr. Speaker. I said I never mentioned the background of this man -- of his political background at any time.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend did charge favouritism and dereliction of duty and

MR. GUTTORMSON:

MR. ROBLIN: When I used those words I said "Well, if he doesn't mean it in that way, we'll be pleased to hear from him," and he never replied.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Oh yes, he did.

MR. HUTTON: He has received unqualified support from his Leader and from the Member for St. Boniface. There can be no doubt in the minds of anyone in the Legislature that his action was premeditated and planned with the assistance of legal advisors. He told us so. There can be no doubt that his Leader was privy to the charges he intended to bring and was possessed of the information on which he based his case. After all, the Member for St. George is his right-hand man and party whip. It is unbelievable that he would have lent such strong support to his demands for the resignation of the Attorney-General had he not been full cognizant of all the aspects of the member's charges. As a matter of fact he went even further and called for the resignation of the Premier. I would expect that the Member for St. Boniface had been taken into the confidence of the Member for St. George, since he, too, gave vociferous support to his plot. I must, at the outset, question the zeal and the enthusiasm of the Honourable Member for St. George in pursuing this matter. It is difficult to believe that he is anxious to see justice meted out to Mr. Donaldson. It makes one wonder if his zeal was not directed to discrediting a Minister of the Crown and bringing the integrity of the government into question, rather than crucifying Mr. Donaldson in a court of public opinion. Unhappily for Mr. Donaldson he was an expendable pawn in the game of politics. What possible motive could there be for the member's action in turning this Assembly into a public inquisition and playing the role of the public inquisitor? What reason for his Leader and the Member for St. Boniface to support him in this doubtful and repugnant action? This is not a court of law. There was no defence for the individual named. This was not justice. This was an inquisition; a kangaroo court. Trial in the court of public opinion was no defence for the accused. The Member for St. George couldn't possibly be looking for justice. Was it then for ulterior motives? In his anxiety to discredit the government, to destroy a Minister of the Crown, to gain power by a quick trick, I fear that he may have snared himself. His Leader, I fear, may have stooped to conquer.

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)

I base this statement on the following evidence. It is not direct evidence but coincidence is significant. A set of circumstances difficult to explain. It is a matter of record that the Member for St. George raised the question of the innocence or guilt of one Mr. Donaldson with respect to his complicity with certain persons convicted of stealing from Brandon Packers. In doing so he established a court of public opinion. He presented one-sided evidence, maintaining that it incriminated Mr. Donaldson. He stated that a great deal of this evidence was brought out by the lawyer for the defence through cross-examination at the trial. He stated that he had not done this lightly; that he had consulted some of the best legal brains in the province; that they agreed. He said that he had help in preparing his case. He had the benefit of legal advice. He stated that many persons had approached him; that legal persons, lawyers had come to him, and implied that they had encouraged him to raise this matter in the Legislature. The evidence he presented to the Legislature was incomplete and distorted. He studiously omitted any evidence which tended to exonerate Mr. Donaldson. There was a deliberate attempt to present the evidence in such a way to create the worst possible impression and he said that he had legal assistance in preparing this evidence and his Leader stated that the evidence was documented chapter and verse. He refuses to name his legal advisors. He nor his advisors nor any of the shareholders or bondholders of Brandon Packers, nor any interested person need resort to the method followed by the honourable member to get justice in this matter. If any bondholder or shareholder of Brandon Packers or a lawyer or the member himself would lay an information before a Magistrate, the Attorney-General will prosecute in the case of an indictable offence. His legal advisors must have known this. The argument that damages could be sought for malicious prosecution can't hold here because the honourable member and his legal advisors, whoever they are, are of the opinion that this man is guilty beyond doubt. This evidence is based on the statements made by the Honourable Member for St. George.

One could probably deduce a great deal more by reading between the lines, but the facts and statements as outlined are sufficient to raise a number of very serious questions. Why did the honourable member raise this matter in the House in the manner in which he did? For the purpose of seeing justice done or for some ulterior motive? Why did his legal advisors not advise him to use another means of seeing justice done, if they are so sure that the evidence against Mr. Donaldson is overwhelming? If the evidence is overwhelmingly against this man, why did not one of the aggrieved persons take action against him by laying an information before a Magistrate? Who brought out the evidence by cross-examination at the trial? The honourable member has told us. Evidence presented to the House by the Member for St. George. Why was this evidence brought out by cross-examination at the trial? For what purpose? Is it being brought out for the same purpose in this Legislature? Who are the legal advisors who have helped the member document this case? And again I remind you that the Leader of the Opposition said it was documented chapter and verse. Why did his legal advisors allow the Member for St. George to present a one-sided case which presented all the incriminating evidence in a manner well calculated to convict Mr. Donaldson in a court of public opinion, but studiously ignored or omitted that evidence which tended to exonerate him? Is this the work of one, or the approach to be taken by a legal advisor who wishes justice to be done, or could it indicate ulterior motives? Who was the legal person or persons who came to the Honourable Member for St. George and encouraged the member to raise this matter in the House? Who could be so concerned to see Mr. Donaldson charged to encourage him to raise this matter in the House and in the manner in which he did it? Who would stand to gain by such a circumstance? Who would benefit the most by it? What lawyers -- who are after all officers of the Court -- would put pressure on private members, rather than go to the Attorney-General or a Magistrate or the Courts? Who are these legal advisors? We know who advised the Attorney-General against prosecuting. Who are the people who say that the evidence justifies a charge being laid? Unless the member produces conclusive evidence to the contrary and gives some pretty satisfactory answers to the questions that he has raised in our minds, we have little alternative but to suppose that he may, in his great anxiety to overthrow the government and to discredit the Attorney-General and his colleagues, have become the willing dupe of a clever ruse to discredit the government and to force the government to seek the prosecution against the advice of qualified government advisors. If this is so -- and the circumstances as outlined by the

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) Honourable Member for St. George could indicate such a state -- it would constitute an unholy alliance within the Liberal Party. I'm referring, of course, to the possibility that in the light of the statements made by the Member for St. George that there has been direct or indirect contact between the Member for St. George, his Leader, the Member for St. Boniface and eminent legal counsel with whom they are in intimate political relationship and who may be presumed to have a personal interest in the Brandon Packers affair.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I am not as well prepared -- I haven't any prepared statement such as the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture had before him, but my name is being used here and I think that I should say a few words on this subject.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture has talked about "stooping" and I think this is exactly what he has been doing himself. The members on the opposite side, led by their Leader and the Attorney-General on most occasions, do not hesitate a minute to give us lectures on democracy when we don't like the way things are done; we don't like the way they seem to hit below the belt or talk about the past. They tell us, "Well you don't understand; this is democracy in action; this is the way that the free people are protected." Well, Sir, when the shoe's on the other foot, it's a little different. The Attorney-General tells us on one hand that he will accept all responsibility, but he'll take valuable time of this House to explain and to try to lay the blame on somebody else. I wish that he could make up his own mind. Now, again he has tried to show that there was an accusation of favouritism. This was denied last Thursday. The Honourable the Leader of this House today tells us that this isn't true, but I think that we can find this once and for all. This is exactly what the Member from St. George said: "I have discussed this case with some of the best legal minds in the province and they have assured me that the evidence certainly warrants a charge being laid. In the face of this, Mr. Chairman, I have no alternative, and I regret having to do this, but to demand the resignation of this Minister for his dereliction of duty." It is very plain, Sir; it is very plain. If the shoe fits, if they feel that there has been favouritism, they can answer their conscience, not to try to get all insulted and tell us that we're wrong in implying this; we can't imply; we can't read in their minds. The accusation was made and then the Honourable the Leader of this House tried to change this. He challenged the Member from St. George. The Member from St. George again told him that this wasn't what he had said at all. He mentioned that today again, he's trying to say this. Now another thing, the Honourable Attorney-General and the Minister of Agriculture feel that the Member from St. George should tell him who he has been talking to; where did he get his information. This, Sir, is ridiculous for anybody that's been running in party politics and so on. You know that if you were to give the information when you're asking somebody "What is your opinion; this is just an opinion," that you should come in and use his name, you know that it's ridiculous. The members opposite us do not do that themselves. It is assinine to even suggest it here and it won't be done, that is for sure.

Now, we were asked by the last speaker, why -- the Member from St. George, I would say, was asked why he chose the way that he did to bring this to this House. Why? Well, as I said before, this is supposed to be the way, the place to see democracy in action. Well this -- I might give an answer to the Minister of Agriculture that this has been discussed before; he's right. This has been discussed before. We've mentioned that before. We'd be crazy not to. There was opinion asked and the Member from St. George himself told the House on Thursday that he hesitated to bring this into the House and why did he? This is why, Sir. On Wednesday, this is what the Leader of this House said, -- on Wednesday -- and this is on page 2006; Mr. Roblin, "That is, some evidence comes to light which indicates that a wrong doing has taken place whether it's in companies, directors, thieves, whatever it may be. And when one finds evidence of wrong doing then it is the duty of those in charge of maintaining law and order to see that that is tracked down to its source; and that's what we did. We try with prevention all we can but honourable gentlemen opposite know as well as I do that if a man wishes to break the law nothing can stop him. The question is, can you catch him and do your best to put him where he belongs? Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, that in the course of the labour dispute that was before us at that time we received evidence to the effect that there was something here that should be looked into."

Now a little further, this is what Mr. Roblin has to say: "Just the same, when we found evidence of wrong-doing we carried out our obvious duty and we had a full investigation

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) of it. I confess, frankly, that I didn't know other birds were going to be flushed from the bushes beside Paton and Cox." He's the first one to mention Paton and Cox. This is still before the court -- there is an appeal. But he was the first one -- the Leader of this House. Now perhaps it's wrong to mention anything like that. For them it's absolutely correct. "I didn't know that. I had no idea of that. But we were not going to be deterred from our obvious duty." There's no question of Mr. Dewar having told him to do this. No, not at all. "But we were not going to be deterred from our obvious duty in spite of the pressure brought on us by the honourable gentlemen opposite that we should call the case closed and not continue our investigation." The CCF were all wrong in trying to put pressure, but they weren't going to be told; they were going to study this case. And Mr. Roblin also added, "He says ridiculous, but I want to tell the committee, Mr. Chairman," -- he's talking about Mr. Paulley when he says "ridiculous", "but I want to tell the committee, Mr. Chairman, that if -- (Interjection) -- 5:30 and I'm through, I want to tell the committee, Mr. Chairman, that if we had not carried on this investigation, over the protests of honourable gentlemen opposite, we wouldn't have put them in gaol. But we have convicted them and we have upheld the law and we will do the same any time; and we reject the charges made by honourable gentlemen opposite that we're not doing our job." Now, Sir, I think that this is fair. This is why the next day this was brought in by the Member from St. George.

Now the Attorney-General tells us every day there are some people working, doing something, "representing me, and I accept this responsibility" -- that might be true. It is true. We know that. We know that he can't do everything, but there are certain cases that they knew about. Now on that same famous day, Thursday, on Page 2023 the Leader of the House again said; -- and oh, yes, we were told that we had -- that the Member from St. George had brought this into the House because Mr. Donaldson was a member of the Conservative Party. This was never mentioned this side of the House, Sir. It is not true; it's a lie -- and they know it -- because here on Page 2023, the Leader of the House said himself: "I think that one reason," -- it's all right for them to think; everything's fine -- "I think that one reason why he may have made it is because perhaps of the fact that the person spoke of is known to have sat in this House under certain political colours and it would be in my mind one of the most unsatisfactory things one could think of it anyone who reads the story in the newspapers, as they're going to read it, feel that this is the situation that exists." That, Sir, comes from the other side of this House. Now we could say, "We think also this has bothered you. You seem to be worried about this. You're bringing it up." We could say that. Especially if we read a little further, Sir, and if we read what the Leader of the House again says: "I think the Attorney-General has given a perfectly straightforward account of what transpired. I know this, that when this whole matter came up in the first instance," -- it came up before, Sir. I don't know how it came up, but it came up before. Here are the words: "that when this whole matter came up in the first instance it was considered by the Cabinet and we came to the quite obvious, perfectly normal decision at that time when we started to investigate this thing" -- we started to investigate this thing -- "that we would proceed let the chips fall where they may; and that I have from time to time enquired of the Attorney-General whether the advice tendered to him, or any of the details that came up from time to time, would justify the prosecution of any other persons in connection with this matter."

Now from time to time the Leader of this House discussed this with the Attorney-General. From time to time. Why? Because he was a little worried, or because this was important enough? Now it was said this afternoon, and Thursday, that the Member from St. George supported by the Leader of his party and the Member from St. Boniface, supported this charge and left no doubt that they felt that Mr. Donaldson was guilty. That again, Sir, is wrong. This again is hogwash. It's not true at all. The only thing that was said, and I said it myself, that as far as I was concerned, if the evidence read by the Member from St. George -- I don't know where he got it; I don't know at all -- but if that is true, then I felt that there was enough evidence for the government to lay a charge. Not to say that Donaldson was guilty -- that is not true -- but to lay a charge. There is question -- if there is any doubt at all, and if that evidence was true -- and it's never been denied. It hasn't been denied on Thursday; it hasn't been denied today. If this is wrong, then I might agree that they had no business laying a charge, but that if it is true, and I mentioned then again that I wasn't as intelligent as my

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) honourable friend; that I was more in the category that he had mentioned, the Member from St. John's, but there were a few in Manitoba like us and we deserved an answer. We wanted to know if there was protection or if there was a law for one and another law for somebody else? It's quite a grave sin to steal a loaf of bread sometimes. And you read in the paper that somebody has stolen a loaf of bread or a few packages of cigarettes and they have three months in gaol. Now we are not, or certainly I'm not -- I'll speak for myself -- I'm not saying that there's no doubt that this man is guilty. I didn't look into this case. I'm just saying this after hearing the Member from St. George lay his charge -- I'm saying that if this evidence is true, I'm saying that the government should take the responsibility -- maybe I should read again what the Leader of this House says that they do -- bragged about doing -- and I felt that there was enough evidence on this to lay a charge. And I'd like to inform the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that I certainly am not sorry that I said that. I feel exactly the same. I feel that I would like to hear from the government and if this evidence is wrong, that's a different matter; and if it's right, I think that it is the duty -- at one time a lot of people were trying to tell him, "No it's not right." Now the Attorney-General is blaming Mr. Dewar. He's blaming Mr. Dewar for not doing his duty, and I feel that if this evidence is true, then in my mind -- and I certainly repeat again that I'm not a lawyer -- but I feel that there's enough, not maybe to convict a man, that we have no right convicting a man in this House who has no chance to defend himself -- it would be pretty low to do it -- and there was no accusation, no statement this man was guilty -- not from this side of the House -- and if politics are being played, Sir, I think that it is obvious that politics were played from the other side of the House. The Leader of this House is the one that started all this. He used the name of Cox and Paton -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes. All right, we'll read it again. We'll read it again, because those members are too good at that, at changing everything. "I want to tell the committee, Mr. Chairman, that if we had not carried on this investigation, over the protests of honourable gentlemen opposite, we wouldn't have put them in gaol. But we have convicted them and we have upheld the law and we will do the same any time," and so on. This is obvious. And this, Sir, when he was not following the rules of this House; when he was speaking after 5:30, after being challenged, but he wanted to make his point. He didn't like what had been said by the Member from St. John's and by the Leader of the NDP Party, and he sure put his foot in it.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour) (The Pas): Our honourable friend from St. Boniface is always great at being fair in everything he does, talking about being a good sport and not hitting below the belt, but I'd just like to have the members opposite reflect on the smear campaign that's been coming from that side of the House during this session. One could go back and recite a good many incidents in which they have been hitting below the belt, and if somebody stands up on this side to protect their position, then, of course, we're automatically guilty of something which is completely wrong. -- (Interjection) -- You hit below the belt on Churchill the other day -- sure you did. You charged this side of the House --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker --

MR. CARROLL: You charged this side of the House with giving out information that wasn't available across there.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. In what way can the honourable member accuse me of hitting below the belt, because I brought in some information from Churchill which I obtained? I resent that statement and I ask a withdrawal of that statement.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I can say that my honourable friend did charge the government with distributing information that was not available to the House to people outside the House. We denied it. But he didn't believe us. And for his information he may be interested to know that I've asked the Attorney-General to put the Royal Canadian Mounted Police on that trail to see what they can find out.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I demand a withdrawal of the statement that I was hitting below the belt. I resent that statement; it's incorrect; and what I said in this House -- I didn't get a chance to check it all -- I merely said that I rose on a matter touching the privileges of this House -- the withholding of information from the House by the Government.

MR. CARROLL: It isn't true. It is not true -- (Interjection) -- Another thing that was raised the other day -- I think members of the House will agree -- we were charged with somehow or other falsifying, changing records of the House. What a smear. What a smear, coming from members opposite. And now the Member from St. Boniface says it's true. We did instruct them to change the -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that they've been hitting below the belt ever since this House came into session, and somebody stands up to place the record straight, and boy, how they run for cover. -- (Interjection) -- unfair -- (Interjection) -- oh yes. I think that charges like this do reflect on not only the members who make them, but they reflect on the integrity of every member of this House, and I think we should all be offended by such charges. I agree with the Minister of Agriculture when he suggested this matter was not raised in the House to get justice. I think that he was more interested in casting the government in an unfavourable light in charging the Attorney-General with neglect of duty, or something like that.

But these are matters that I didn't rise to speak on. I did want to refresh your memory, though, about some of the events that took place during the Brandon Packers investigation and subsequently. It is true that the government from time to time did sit to consider conditions in Brandon, and we considered first of all whether we should have an enquiry to bring to light those things which we suspected at that time, and we did discuss prior to the adjournment, at the request of both the union involved and the spokesman for the company, we did consider their request as to whether we should withdraw the commission, which we naturally had to do when the formal request came to us. But there were also a great many other times at which this matter was discussed. I would like to suggest that those great Liberals, Paton and Cox, did threaten members of the government -- (Interjection) -- They admitted themselves; they were the ones that said to us that they were Liberals -- (Interjection) -- they 'phoned us, they threatened members of the government -- (Interjection) -- threatened the government itself; threatened reprisals against the government, if we were to proceed with the investigation which led to the charges which were being laid, and frankly it makes one wonder whether this isn't somehow or other the way in which they hope to impale the government. --(Interjections) -- I'm wondering whether -- (Interjection) -- and I'm just wondering whether the legal counsel for these two gentlemen isn't very much behind the individual who laid these charges before the House. Well what happened? What did the government decide when these threats were made against the government? -- (Interjection) -- What did they decide when we were charged, when members of the government were blackmailed to call off this investigation --

MR. GUTTORMSON: By who?

MR. CARROLL: By Mr. Paton. He said he'd get this government if we proceeded with our action.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What did he say?

MR. CARROLL: What did he say? All right now, this is the thing.

MR. GUTTORMSON: tell the truth.

MR. CARROLL: the only suggestion --

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order.

MR. CARROLL: I'm afraid I'm not responsible for what your Leader said, but I'm just saying that we were advised -- we were advised to call off the investigation which led to the charges that were being made and we said, "Let the chips fall where they may; we're proceeding with this investigation; we're proceeding with the charges if they have to be laid," and this is possibly an explanation for some of the remarks that were made, but I would like to say that we, on this side of the House, are only standing up to defend ourselves when these other low charges are brought by members opposite. Mr. Chairman, that's all I want to say at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: I trust, Mr. Speaker, that under the new rules of the House that we'll be in a position to bring up this further matter under privileges when we have a chance to peruse Hansard and prepare our statements like the honourable members across.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to bring to the attention of the government and the Members of this House the severe flooding that took place at Horndean early Friday morning. Horndean is situated some 70 miles

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) southwest of Winnipeg. It's right next to Highway 14, has a population of between two and three hundred people, and heavy losses were suffered by individuals as a result of the flooding that took place. It took place very early in the morning. People were unprepared, and this probably added to the losses which normally probably would have been more limited. Losses occurred on household goods, clothing, furniture, supplies -- supplies that probably were stored in the basements -- electrical goods, and furnace motors were burned out; even the stores in the community suffered some loss, and when I was in to see them they told me they weren't sure whether they would be covered by insurance at that time or not. Farmers in the area suffered heavy loss, especially one farmer just west of town; he lost about 19 hogs which were ready for shipment. He lost seed grain, 350 bushels of wheat that he had cleaned up for his own seed; about 150 bushels of oats and 90 bushels of flax. Flax is naturally a total loss because once flax gets wet it's useless. In addition to that he suffered feed losses, alfalfa and clover and so on. The people in Plum Coulee that lived south of the CPR tracks also suffered losses and a number of houses were flooded in that area as well. I am unable to make any assessment at this time but I might say that the losses could probably amount to as high as \$100,000.00. Since Highway 14 was rerouted when it was constructed in 1953 they've had previous occurrences of flooding, because when the water gets into Plum Coulee the bridge just east of town is unable to take the water especially when you have ice floating on top. The bridge then blocks and as a result you'll have flooding further to the south, and the highway and the CPR tracks act as a funnel, channelling the water right into Horndean, so that these people are unable to avoid flooding because of this. This definitely needs correction. There should be some ways and means by which the flood waters can be re-diverted into the double dike which is just north of the tracks. It should receive the attention of the Minister in charge and something should be done about it so that this would not have to recur every so often. Assistance is badly needed to help these people in this community. First they had suffered because of a crop loss -- they had a very small crop -- and now in addition to that they have this severe flooding. To the people involved it's actually a disaster, and having personally viewed some of the premises, some of the houses and buildings, I'm sure that quite a few will have damages running into several thousand dollars, and I feel that this government should do something about it. Can the people of Horndean expect any help in this hour of need? I would appeal to the First Minister to give assistance to these people involved in flooding at Horndean. There will have to be made a further assessment before this can be done but I'm sure that assistance is warranted in this case and it should be forthcoming. It should be provided for. Now I know that in 1950 when we had a flood in Greater Winnipeg assistance was provided and after all the appeals had been met there was still a surplus left at that time. I don't know whether this surplus is still available, or whether it has been dealt with, but I feel that assistance was given to the people at that time in Manitoba and I feel these people deserve it just as much, or probably more so, because of the situation they're in. They've already suffered crop loss; their means are not there, and therefore help is needed badly. I appeal to the Minister that he find ways and means of providing some help to the people involved.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): May I direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer? About 1951 some wise, influential man in Winnipeg with the consent of the government decided to take away a million and a half dollars from Manitoba of money contributed by the people the world over. I wonder whether there is any chance to bring this money back home and use it for any emergency that we may have now? A question now to the Minister of Agriculture. I was listening over the week closely as to the situation. I also visited the banks close to my home -- which I have suffered in 1951 -- and I was just wondering whether he could tell the House the latest situation, not only where the previous speaker mentioned, but right in the City of Winnipeg. I understand that the water rises almost from hour to hour.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I think the first thing I will do is to give the forecast of the Flood Forecasting Committee. Due to the continuing high temperatures and warm strong winds on Friday, April 20th, there has been a very rapid run-off and resulting concentration of water in the tributaries on the west side of the Red River. After reviewing the high flows in the west side tributaries and the flows in the main stem of the Red River in the United States, the Flood Forecasting Committee revises its forecast of April 19th as follows:

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) Winnipeg at James Avenue, 21 feet, instead of 19 1/2, 65,000 c. f. s. The crest expected by Friday, April 27th. Morris -- an elevation of 773, 50,000 c. f. s., Thursday April 26th; Emerson, 785, 40,000 c. f. s., Thursday April 26th. On the Assiniboine River -- Although ice jams have caused local flooding during the past few days between Portage and Headingley the water will drop well below the dikes as soon as the ice clears out of the river, and the committee sees no reason to change the previous forecast for the first half of May.

Now, going back to the flooding that has been occurring in southern Manitoba. I would like to say this, that it hasn't been confined to southern Manitoba; there has been flooding in the area east of the Red River as well. Some of the creeks and streams there were unable to carry off the water from this very quick melt that we got of the snow. What happened in many cases, the snow melted off the fields where it was maybe laying from six to eight inches deep, and the creeks and floodways and so forth hadn't cleared, and even where there was movement of water there were still large chunks of ice and snow, and these tended to jam against the bridges, and so this type of flooding has occurred, as I say, east of the Red River in southern Manitoba, west of the Red River, and on the Assiniboine. On Saturday last there were a number of men in the fields, both east of the Red River and in southern Manitoba, doing what they could, but with this very fast run-off there was little that could be done to stem these waters. Some work was done on the Assiniboine, but here again the nature of the flooding was such that even with the emergency steps taken to obviate the situation some damage and flooding took place.

On the Assiniboine, I have a report that on Friday, April 20th, 1962, an inspection was completed along the Assiniboine River, between Portage la Prairie and Baie St. Paul bridge. At the airport bridge south of the City of Portage la Prairie, the river was running clear. There was evidence that ice jamming has occurred but river stages had receded approximately four feet and were well within the natural banks. At both the Trans-Canada Highway and Poplar Point bridges the river was running free. However, at many points large areas of original ice existed extending completely across the river. By Saturday morning, April 21st, severe ice jams were developing at many points, particularly in that reach between Curtis and the Trans-Canada bridge. Some water escaped over the confining dikes on the south side, but the major portion of the flood water passed over a short section of dike on the west side of the river between the CNR Railroad and the Trans-Canada Highway. This followed the south road ditch for nearly one mile, crossing the highway through a large concrete culvert and into the low which parallels the river and flows northeast into Long Lake drain. The reeve and council from Cartier were busy during Saturday blowing minor jams in the reach between Poplar Point and Baie St. Paul but the flows were confined to the channel. During Saturday evening the large jam at the Trans-Canada Highway bridge moved downstream into the Baie St. Paul area and water levels upstream dropped eight to ten feet. Reeve Hamlin reported that a large ice jam was developing in that section from the Lachance loop at about river lot 43, Municipality of Cartier, to river lot 157 in the rural municipality of St. Francois near the Jubilee Road. Some water was escaping over the north dike near the western end of this jam.

From the inspection early Sunday morning it was evident that this large ice jam described above was well developed and would not move without the aid of dynamite. Water had overtopped and partially breached a large section of the dike near the Jubilee Road. Some farmlands between PTH No. 4 and the river were flooded both east and west of this break. In addition, water was moving over the dikes on the south side of the river at two places, namely river lots 62 and 72. This water escaped over the south river road into Mill Creek to the south. The ice was first cleared from above the Baie St. Paul bridge to prevent damage to the structure. This dynamite work was completed under the supervision of the municipalities of Cartier and St. Francois. With the assistance of a provincial crew, over a mile of ice was moved from the lower end of the jam. Water was still moving over the dikes at these places during Sunday evening, April 22nd. This morning a visual inspection of the area indicates that water levels have dropped substantially, approximately three to four feet through the Baie St. Paul area, possibly as a result of the dynamite work. Water is still moving north to the breach dike near the Jubilee Road and is just skimming over PTH No. 4. All overflow has ceased on the south side of the river. It should be pointed out that flows in the Assiniboine River during the past

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) three days have been in the order of 9,000 c.f.s. This diking system is designed to pass 20,000. It is quite obvious that this flooding resulted from the severe ice jams, and stages will drop well below dike levels when the river clears. There is still a three-mile ice jam located in the Baie St. Paul area. This is not causing any flooding at the present, and will probably move downstream within hours. A complete inspection of the dikes will be made within the next two or three days to determine the extent of repair work required to provide protection against the crest.

I have an extra note here. I expect the ice will generally clear out of the river by Tuesday morning and then flows will be well within the channel capacity, in fact will be running only about half full.

That covers the situation on the Assiniboine, but nevertheless damage has taken place, and as the member has pointed out, people have been hurt. Now I can't at this time indicate what action will be taken by the government except to say this, that we will certainly investigate the damages that have occurred in the different areas and consider this problem, the loss to these people, at the earliest opportunity. This flood was something -- flooding has taken place and it's really a matter that is beyond the resources and ability of men to cope with, because the onslaught of sun and wind and the very heavy runoff that occurred in those two or three days, I doubt if drainage systems could be designed -- practical drainage systems could be designed to handle these waters.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture? He has stated something that I think needs to be emphasized, that in the Assiniboine the difficulties and the flooding have occurred because of ice jams. If I caught his figures correctly, did he say that the flow was only 9,000 cubic feet per second in channels that are capable of carrying 20,000, which certainly indicates what the ice jams can do? Is it not a fact -- this is the question I want to ask the Honourable the Minister -- is it not a fact that downstream from the Baie St. Paul bridge that a further jamming of the ice took place, apparently caused by the islands in the river there, and might I also ask him, inasmuch as the ice jams are the cause of the floods a great majority of the time, is there any thought being given to the removal of those two particular islands?

MR. HUTTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Lakeside knows that the work that is done on the river itself is carried out by the PFRA, the diking and river improvements, and each year they improve certain sections of the dikes and at times clear the channel or straighten it or make a cut where it is considered to be necessary in the interests of flood protection. I don't know what their plans are in respect to these two islands. It may be that these two islands were the cause in this case, but I can't say that for sure. I haven't got that information, that specific information. It could have been. Whatever caused the ice jam it was the ice jam that caused the flooding.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 33 agreed to on April 13th on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask a subsequent question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the new levels that he announced to the House today in Winnipeg, what action is being taken to protect those areas that are outside of the diking system? Is the government proposing to do anything in this regard? Has it contacted the municipalities so that they can take action?

MR. HUTTON: My understanding is, Mr. Speaker, that as these flood forecasts come in on the Assiniboine and the Red Rivers, while in the case of the Assiniboine it is a matter of formal procedure some time established that -- in fact established in the spring of 1960 -- that the Assiniboine Flood Fighting Committee receives these forecasts almost immediately. In the case of the Red River, arrangements have been made to have the details of these forecasts forwarded to the communities upstream which are concerned so that they can take appropriate action and the other information that is pertinent to whatever plans that they have is made available to them.

MR. MOLGAT: Is the government going to assist the municipalities in any temporary works that have to be constructed?

MR. HUTTON: Well, if it's a matter of emergency we have stand-by supplies. In respect to other flood fighting it has been our policy in the past to give assistance. However, it's a percentage of the total cost of the program. I think it becomes obvious why this should be, that if the province were to carry the whole cost, it wouldn't cost people anything to take precautions whether they were required or not. We would certainly have and will certainly share in flood-fighting costs.

MR. MOLGAT: Could the Minister indicate what the formula will be? I think this is very important at this stage because there is an emergency facing a number of municipalities and they should know here and now exactly the action that they can take within their budgets and how much they can expect from the government.

MR. HUTTON: It'll likely be based on precedent, Mr. Speaker. I forget what the exact terms of the assistance that was given in 1960, but I would expect it would be something similar to that.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, we've heard a lot in the Chamber this afternoon of democracy and justice. May I have this opportunity, as the son of an Englishman, of drawing to the attention of the House that today that cradle of democracy is celebrating the birth date of its patron saint, St. George.

MR. ROBLIN: And unless memory fails me, Mr. Speaker, this is also a very important date in one of its greatest sons whose language we use here daily, William Shakespeare.

..... Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I propose we go directly to the Committee of Supply so I will move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XI, Section 2, Highways, Resolution 67, 3 (a). 3 (a) Administration.

HON. W. WEIR (Acting Minister of Public Works)(Minnedosa): Before we start on the general program, Mr. Chairman, I think that I might indicate to the committee that the pages will be distributing copies of the Highway Program immediately and before doing that, the Honourable Member for Lakeside asked a couple of questions on Thursday which I believe I have answers for him here now. With regard to cars, the figures that I gave him on Thursday were for March 31st, 1961, I believe, of 734 cars, 181 light trucks and 5 jeeps. The increase in the fleet is 38 cars and 5 light trucks. He also enquired with regard to people that have cars assigned to them, Mr. Chairman, and the only figures that we can come up with is the general fleet -- I presume this is what he means, not the departmental cars -- and in the general fleet there are 76 cars. Many of these cars are driven by more than one individual but all except four of them are assigned to one individual person for its maintenance and care.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, Minister, are those 76 included in the 700-odd that he gave?

MR. WEIR: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: They are included in

MR. WEIR: They're included.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, in presenting the '62-'63 highway program, I think that I might say that it goes some little distance to attempt to reflect the extensive study into high-way planning that was presented by the former minister last year. I don't know whether it has been customary or not but I'm going to give you the rough capital figures that we expect to use -- they'll be debated, I presume, probably a little fuller in Capital -- but I thought that for interest you might like to have them this afternoon. The total gross capital expenditures for the province, next year are expected to be \$23,731,900. This is made up of contracts that were actually let and work was in progress late last year owing to the poor harvest season that we had or poor grain season but good road construction season, and there were \$6,308,000 being carried forward from last years program and a total current new program of \$17,423,900. The total expenditures for the department, as you will note it's up just a little from last year; in the neighbourhood of one million eight for the total expenses of the department. The total current and capital this year are \$35,553,130. as compared to our estimates last year of \$33,763,295. As you will already have noticed that there isn't a great deal of difference in the current estimates; the main difference is in the capital.

I might say that before recommending this program full consideration was given to the relative priorities of all of the highways in the Province of Manitoba. I would like to say now to the members of the committee, although I know that there will be some disagreement which I expect and am prepared to accept, I want to say that full consideration was given to the high-ways that I know right now that they're going to bring up. I know that Number Six will be mentioned by the Honourable Member for St. George; I know that Number Nine, I'm sure, by the Honourable Member for Selkirk; I know that Number 59 south by the Honourable Member for Emerson; No. 19 from the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and if I don't miss my guess that in place of the Fisher Branch-Hodgson Road the Honourable Member for Fisher will probably talk about the No. 68 or some other road which will come up. I want to say right now that consideration was given to these roads and out of the roads the priorities that you have before you now are the ones that have been established as being the most necessary for this year.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk I know is probably interested in the river road that has been talked about for some time. Following comments as I recall that were made last

(Mr. Weir, cont'd.) . . . year by the then Minister of Public Works, it was anticipated that some work would be done last year; but I might say that plans have had to be changed that the original plan of complete or almost complete re-location of the road has had to be not proceeded with, but that he will be interested to know that the present road while it's not in the program, will be up-graded this year and work will be starting, I think, in the not too distant future. And Mr. Chairman there has in some instances been quite a great deal of interest in the re-location of No. 10 highway, from Rapid City Junction north. I might say that this highway is being projected north from the junction of the Rapid City Junction -- junction of 24 and 10 -- and while priority cannot be established at the moment for another crossing across the Minnedosa River, the road is going north approximately seven miles, then east to the junction south of Minnedosa and this particular location will facilitate another crossing when priority can be established.

I think that I'll leave the capital and maybe say a word or two on the current. I think that members will note that we do have two new subsections under Item IV in the form of (h) and (i). Subsection (h) represents the maintenance of 644.6 miles of road; 421.9 of which was formerly maintained under appropriation XI, 4(b) or "other roads". The other 222.7 miles was maintained previously under Capital Account under the Natural Resources and Development Roads Account. The construction of all of these roads was under the Natural Resources and Development Roads Account and it has been deemed desirable to provide the funds from current estimates rather than from capital and to separate them in the estimates so that they can be seen as such; and that has been done. So subsection (i) of Section IV -- this is not a new program either -- it has been set up to a little more properly differentiate between departmental programs. The service was normally provided previously under 3 (f), "District Offices" and this new appropriation will permit better record keeping and show more specifically the extent of engineering services which the province provides to the various municipal governments in the province. Provision is again being made for aid to municipalities to continue the up-grading that they have been doing in the main market roads system over the years and the decrease that will be noted under Section IV (d) results from the fact that revisions are being made. It isn't quite as bad as it looks. The fact is that it has been over-estimated in the last year or two and this \$3,790,000 reflects what we anticipate the requests from the municipalities will be for the coming year, and it's somewhat -- I believe, offhand, of an increase over what has been spent in recent years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before I go any further, I haven't got separate sheets -- would it be the wish of the members I presume for me to read to them the list of access roads that we are preparing to do some work on this year? On highway 1, Alexander base and bituminous pavement; Sydney, grade improvements, base and bituminous pavement. On highway No. 2, Fannystelle, base and bituminous pavement; Elm Creek, base and bituminous pavement and Wawanesa, base and bituminous pavement. Three A, Crystal City, grade base and bituminous pavement; Newdale, base and bituminous pavement; Basswood, grade improvements, base and bituminous pavement. Mackinac, double prime; Grandview, base and bituminous pavement -- (Interjection)-- beg your pardon?

MR. MOLGAT: Those are other numbers though aren't they -- the highways?

MR. WEIR: Oh yes, they're under V, pardon me. And on No. 8, Camp Morton, Arnes, Hnausa and Riverton all base and double prime. On 10, Bellsite grade gravel and calcium. On Sprague, No. 12, grade, gravel and calcium; 14A, Altona, grade, gravel, base and bituminous pavement. On Highway 15, Oakbank, additional gravel and calcium. Highway 21, Goodlands, additional gravel and double prime. On 23, Swan Lake, gravel and double prime; St. Alphonse, additional gravel and calcium; Mariapolis, additional gravel and double prime; Greenway, additional gravel and double prime; Belmont, additional gravel and double prime. On 24, Oak River, additional gravel and calcium. On Highway 45, Angusville, additional gravel and calcium; Sandy Lake, grade and gravel; Rosburn, grade and gravel. On 59, Libau, additional gravel and calcium; on 75, St. Jean Baptiste, grade, base and bituminous pavement; 83 Inglis, additional gravel and double prime and off of No. 100, the perimeter, La Salle, grade, gravel and structures.

Mr. Chairman, before taking my seat at this time I think I would like to renew my desire to provide the Committee with any other additional information that I can, and what I'm not

(Mr. Weir, cont'd.) in a position to give you why I hope that we will have means of getting it for you. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a). Administration.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable the Minister could give us the number of miles of access roads completed in '61? I have before me a sheet put out by the Manitoba Motor League, entitled "The Manitoba Motorist" and they say under a heading "1961, Provincial Highway Program" -- and this is the December issue, so I question the figures that are here -- but it says there was 13.6 miles of grading, this is under access roads, 13.4 miles of gravelling, 9.8 miles of base course, 7.2 miles of bituminous surfacing. Now surely that isn't all of the access road work that was done in '61. Surely there was a lot more than that done. I wonder if the Minister could bring us up-to-date on last year's --

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, the figures that I have for the access road program per miles completed in the '61-'62 season are: grading 19.70, gravelling 28.10, stabilized base 9.8, bituminous mat 10.9, prime 6.6 and seal coat 2 miles.

MR. SHOEMAKER: another question. Very early in this session of the Legislature we were told about the 100% roads -- that is the roads that were going to be taken over 100% by the province -- and I in particular mentioned the Neepawa-Carberry road, and, in fact, the town council and the municipalities concerned have received letters, I believe, to the effect that as of a certain date the Neepawa-Carberry road would be taken over and the maintenance would be borne 100% by the province. In looking quickly over the yellow sheets that we have before us I don't see where there's any work planned for the Neepawa-Carberry Road. I wonder if it is the intention of the government to do any work on it in 1962?

MR. WEIR: no intention of doing any work on that road in the '62 season.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): I notice on Page III of the outline that from No. 4 to Libau on Highway 59, work will be done laying down base and bituminous pavement. I suppose that when the other section of 59 from Libau to Gull Lake has this same work done, the access road into Libau will receive a base coat and bituminous mat. But my question has to do with East Selkirk. I see that paving will be done on 59 from No. 4 past East Selkirk to Libau and this would be the time to do the one mile of access road into East Selkirk. I don't know what information the Minister can give me, but I can tell him that last fall a meeting of the local councillors and some people from his department pretty well established that the one mile access road into East Selkirk would be paved at the time when 59 would be paved. And this seems to be the year. So what about this one mile into East Selkirk, off 59. Do you have any information on that?

MR. MOLGAT: Is the Minister going to answer --

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I think that the assumption with regard to Libau might be correct, although I'm not in a position to give him any definite assurance. With regard to the East Selkirk access, there are some doubts still with regard to location with regard to some other road work that will be done in the area -- we presume in the maybe not too distant future that might coincide with the East Selkirk access. I'm not in a position to indicate what they are at the moment but it was for reasons such as this that it isn't being done this year.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't think there's much point in arguing it here but I think the Minister's referring to another road there that is not exactly connected with this matter of the access road. There has been some survey work, some negotiation going on with regard to a connecting link between West Selkirk, across the bridge, and 59, and there's an engineering difficulty there with regard to half a mile, referred to as "the flats". So this I realize cannot be settled, but the one mile access road into East Selkirk, that is another matter. It involves an access road coming in from Highway 59 which is on the east of the village and there's no engineering difficulty there -- it's just a matter of policy. I realize the Minister might not have any concrete information, but I would be interested in receiving from him, if not today, then tomorrow, some indication as to just why they're leaving East Selkirk out.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm concerned I gave the honourable member the reasons.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, some three or four years ago now, I suppose it was my colleague, the ex-Minister of Agriculture, then Minister for Rhineland, who on receiving

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . these sheets was quoted as saying, and correctly: "Millions for everyone and not a cent for Rhineland." As the Leader of the Opposition, I certainly feel the same way on receiving the yellow sheets from the Minister today.

I note in particular, Mr. Chairman, that one of the highways that he mentioned, No. 19, is not on the list. But I note even more that there is not a single stretch of highway in Ste. Rose constituency included in the list anywhere. This isn't a personal request on my part when I say this, but the two which I hoped the Minister would give consideration to, and which I thought -- in fact, had some assurance from previous ministers, were No. 19, which he mentioned. Now as the Minister knows that's a three mile stretch of highway. It goes from an excellent provincial trunk highway that was reconstructed in the past two years, No. 5, to the east gate of the Riding Mountain National Park. This isn't by any means the most trafficked entrance to the Park, that's true, but nevertheless, during the summer season it does carry a heavy load of traffic; and there's a particular problem on that piece of highway, with which I imagine the Minister is probably aware now, with shale movement and with water. The result is that for long stretches, even during the course of the summer, the cars have to be pulled out of mud holes on the highway and it's a very unfortunate situation. Now for as important a piece of road, and for as short a piece of road, I would have thought the Minister would have had it included in the estimates this year. It was in the estimates some three or four years ago, I believe, and was removed at that time, but the Minister assured me then that this was temporary until they could get the information on the particular problem in the area and that they would include it the next year. Yes -- in the estimates submitted to us in the June-July session of 1959, Mr. Chairman, we find No. 19 Highway listed there -- additional gravel and prime. Now this was removed towards the hard-surfacing of it. Since then it's disappeared from the estimates and here we are April, 1962, some almost three years later, and it's not in the estimates yet, and I wonder how the Minister can possibly explain the situation. This, again, as I mentioned, is a tourist highway as well. It's one that is heavily trafficked in the summertime.

The other one, Mr. Chairman, which I'm surprised to see no work on is No. 50 highway. This is one that starts from No. 4 in the vicinity of Gladstone and goes north, then swings west again to the town of McCreary. The southern section of that is now hard-surfaced and is good highway. But the stretch where it turns west between McCreary and Alonsa no work has been done on this for -- well, there was a little finished last year -- there's no major work and certainly the hard-surfacing which was expected by all the residents in the area to continue at the pace that had been set previously of some ten or 12 miles a year, starting preferably, I think insofar as the majority of the people from the McCreary end -- it was hoped that this would continue, but I see nothing at all in the estimates and I would appreciate if the Minister could give us some explanation. I know we can't very well go over every highway in the province and do this, but these are two which were in process previously and suddenly they disappear.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I was very glad to hear the Minister announce the fact that they were going to start work on the River Road through St. Andrews because that was actually promised in the 1957 and the 1958 election. What I would like to obtain from the Minister though would be, that is, a copy of the plan showing the location of the road. I have made enquiries from his department on several occasions; I've written several letters, and so far I haven't heard where the road's to be. There's quite a number of people down there who have small holdings and who feel that perhaps the road is going to go at the back or the rear of their property and cut their property in half, and the people down there are really interested in knowing the location of this road.

Now regarding the omissions from the list of capital expenditures in my own constituency, I'm glad to see that you're going to do that two miles from Parkdale Corner to PTH No. 8-- that'll help a little bit. But sometimes I wish that I were representing the Constituency of Gimli because it seems my friend's doing quite well up there. From Selkirk north to the Whytewold Road the road is in a deplorable condition and has been in a deplorable condition for some years. Perhaps I'm a simple type of an individual but when I was handed this handbook "Manitoba Highways Planning for Tomorrow" I was inclined to believe what that handbook contained, and I find on Page 43, "Urgent Needs, as of January 1st, 1960" and it gives the location of the roads to which top priority should be given; and I find that top priority should have been given as of January 1st, 1960, to the highway north from Selkirk to Whytewold so that we can connect up with

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) . . . the good road that my good friend from Gimli has from Whytefold north. Now I don't think it's right that my people should have to go to the expense of buying a helicopter to travel from Selkirk north to Whytefold. I think that road should be built, and if on the basis of priority factors, which should be taken into consideration in planning roads, I submit that that road is entitled to top priority. It was entitled to top priority at January 1st, 1960, and the case for top priority today is much stronger now than it was then. I would like to know when that work is going to be done. As I say, I thought that when this brochure was issued by the government it meant that we were going to have our highways planned in advance for several years so that we would know, we would be able to tell our constituents when a certain road was going to be done and when it wasn't going to be done. Now it seems to me that this sheet that we have been handed today, bears no relationship to this planning program which was circulated in this House two years ago.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out from the Minister just what the nature of the problem is. That is the problem that seems to be preventing any consideration being given to the paving of the one mile access road into the Village of East Selkirk. It could be the Minister has answered me on that, he said there's some problem there. I would like to know just what the nature of that problem is that is preventing this work from being done this year? Because if it isn't done this year it's going to have to wait several years; when the paving equipment leaves 59 in the proximity of East Selkirk, I don't think they're going to bring it back for one mile of road. What is the nature of this problem that's holding it up?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think it's needless for me to say that I'm more than disappointed in not seeing anything for Rhineland at all. I suppose that is becoming a custom. I have expressed the need for black bituminous mat for Highway 32 for a number of years; the highway is going out of condition completely. I think it was still built by the former government and nothing is being done to it. I travelled on it just last night to find out, to assure myself of the condition, and it's just breaking up completely. If nothing is done this year, I don't know, it'll have to be rebuilt completely before they can ever do something on it after that. I would appeal to the Minister to reconsider doing something to Highway 32 because it's a must. It just cannot continue going on like this. I'm also disappointed that none of the access roads requested by Rhineland and Stanly municipalities have been agreed to. I feel that they were quite justified; they were all of a short distance nature and I'm disappointed that nothing is coming out of it. I appeal to the Minister though that he reconsider Highway 32 because something has to be done on that road.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned -- not my name -- but mentioned my constituency before and I hate to disappoint him so therefore I'll have to say a few words, and whatever I say here I hope the Minister doesn't think I'm very critical of him because I realize that he hasn't had time to acquaint himself with all the roads yet, being a fresh Minister, and whatever I say I hope he doesn't take it as personally criticizing him or objecting to these here. I'm sure that once he has the grasp -- he travels extensively throughout the Province of Manitoba -- I'm sure that next year he will agree with me on points that I bring up here. I don't have to say that I'm disappointed because the Minister knows it himself. We had several delegations this -- even two since he is acting minister and we had delegations previously, and I notice that no action has been taken on any of them. In fact, in the constituency of Emerson there is no major project to be undertaken this coming year. On No. 12 we asked for the completion of No. 12 hard surfacing, on 59 we asked for the hard surfacing of 59 from St. Malo to the American border; nothing is mentioned about that. And the Morden-Sprague, we asked for the completion of Morden-Sprague; nothing has been done regarding this highway.

Now as far as the Morden-Sprague is concerned, we had several delegations asking the Minister or the government -- I'll use the word government -- to consider designating Morden-Sprague as a highway. There is no highway, east and west highway, east of the Red River connecting say 59, 75 and No. 12, none of it south of No. 23, and I'm sure that the Minister will realize the importance of this Morden-Sprague once he travels through the area. There's one serious omission on this highway for tomorrow -- "Manitoba Highways Planning for Tomorrow" -- there's one serious omission that I haven't drawn the attention of the Acting

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . Minister, but I did to the previous minister. And if you turn to Page 19 of this book you notice Emerson below there, and Morden-Sprague is just along the boundary there -- there's just a little green line. From Piney it extends west as far as Dominion City, then at Dominion City, the Morden-Sprague terminates; according to this map it goes south to Emerson instead of going straight across to Letellier where there is a half a million dollar bridge, there isn't even a line there. At the delegations we had this summer I asked why. Nobody could explain it to me. In fact one of the members, I presume of this highway planning, said there is no traffic there. I disagreed. I said there is traffic there -- our traffic counters do not lie. I had to point out at the time that there is a half a million dollar bridge and you notice that this Morden-Sprague, there's no extension to Letellier and I think it is a serious omission and a serious oversight. I'm not going to go as far as to say that this highway planning commission, whatever it was, didn't know that Morden-Sprague does connect with 75 at Letellier, but I would simply say that it was an oversight. I think that road is very important and it should be designated. Maybe the Minister is planning to number it this year I do not know; and if he has not considered it yet I would ask him to consider that part of it. And this again draws attention to the extension of this Morden-Sprague to Letellier because I think it's a very, very serious omission. The 59, the Minister knows just last week there was a delegation, he knows the importance of that road, and I really and truly think that the government should have undertaken to lay a mat on that road. Now the access roads, I think there is one the Minister mentioned, the one at Sprague; it's just a short distance about 3/4 of a mile. I wish to thank the Minister for that consideration.

Something bothers me and has bothered me last year. I know that once the present government took over three years, oh pretty near four years ago, they seemed to disagree with the former government. They asked us to permit them to borrow \$30 million so that they could tender the different larger projects during the winter months or very early in the spring. I don't think that the government did adhere to this. Last year there was one project that was announced on a sheet similar to this, early in the spring, the Caliento road. I would like to know why if there was enough money, there was money appropriated for it, why did the government not live up to its promise and tender this road early? This particular section was not tendered until October, sometime around the middle of October, although it was on the program early in the spring. I do not think that the government adhered to its former promise that we'll do a better job, we'll be able to tender these roads early enough so as soon as the snow is gone and weather permits we'll be able to start construction. That was not the fact last year, especially on this Caliento road. I know that the First Minister, the Premier of Manitoba, in my constituency quite often bemoaned at many meetings, the state of affairs in Emerson constituency, the "pioneers of Manitoba", as he liked to call them at the time. He said, "it isn't fair for you to bump over roads like the Morden-Sprague" and so on. But it's four years. True there was some improvement and I give credit, there was some improvement, the road to Morden-Sprague was started before this government took office and there was some improvement since the present government did take over. But I wonder what happened to this \$30 million? I understand there's somewhere around in the neighbourhood of \$25 million left of this \$30 million. I wonder why the government does not proceed with building better roads for the people of Manitoba if this money was borrowed. To me it seems that next year might be an election year and I wonder if this \$25 million will not be used as a slush fund next year, just before the election. There's a lot of money involved. Why not spread it over the last four years and really give the improvement that the people of Manitoba expect.

I would like the Minister to answer why no access roads that were asked for are being built in Emerson constituency? There will be other questions that I'll ask later on, but now I'll have to say on behalf of the people of Emerson constituency that I am disappointed in the program for Emerson constituency for this year.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about a delegation that met with the Minister this year, in February to be precise, in regard to the north perimeter bridge, the proposed bridge in the north-end. This delegation consisted of representatives of six municipalities in north Winnipeg and the Minister told them that there was no set schedule for completing the Perimeter Road; the bridge question was a matter of priorities and the government has already committed to building three bridges elsewhere in

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) . . . Metro Winnipeg, starting with the St. James Bridge. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will not quarrel with the government over priorities because I trust the judgment of the experts in arriving at what is the most needed bridge; but I just wish to point out a few things.

This year there will be a half a million yards of gravel coming from Birds Hill to the St. James Airport. There is now 120,000 gallons of highly explosive material from the East St. Paul Oil Refinery coming through our busy city streets. I suggest that this matter of the north perimeter bridge should be given careful consideration, because after all in St. James they had a bridge, and while it's true that they may need another one, this matter of public safety is of paramount, or should be of paramount concern to this government. Now industry is going that way and into North Kildonan, East St. Paul; and not only that the people of East Kildonan have been very concerned about the amount of heavy traffic from that area through their streets. I would submit that in considering this the government should -- in my opinion it's going to be five years before we see a bridge on the north perimeter road connecting No. 59 with the No. 4 -- and if this is the case, I think the government should give serious consideration; because if they have bitten off more than they can chew let us say, in this perimeter route financially, then I think they should give serious consideration to asking the CPR to lease the Bergen cut-off bridge. This is a railway bridge; a very, very substantial bridge. It is not being used at the time. If it's going to be five years before the government is going to show any signs of starting a bridge linking East and West Kildonan and East and West St. Paul, I don't see anything wrong in asking the CPR to rent this bridge. It's structurally sound, it only needs redecking; the approaches wouldn't be too difficult, because I think this problem of this 120,000 gallons -- and much of it is of a very explosive nature -- the government should look at it and perhaps ask the CPR why this bridge cannot be put to use for the people of Greater Winnipeg. I think the Metro area is suffering considerably by a lack of bridge in the north end of this city.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, several of the previous speakers has referred to the "Manitoba Highway Planning for Tomorrow" booklet that we received a year ago and I think the then Minister of Public Works said that the government has not accepted officially the program as laid down in the booklet. I wonder if that is a fact. I would like to know has the government officially recognized this as a program, and do they intend to carry out any of the recommendations made in it? I would like to refer too to Page 43 of that report, as the Honourable Member for Selkirk has done, and it says, and I quote: "This map shows the existing and proposed PTH system in white lines, and in green the location of backlog needs where existing conditions are intolerably poor for today's traffic." Now I take by that that what is marked in green suggests the highway condition is intolerably poor, and, Mr. Chairman, I know that that is so in at least two locations in the Gladstone constituency, and I think the Honourable Minister is quite familiar with them.

Now No. 5 Highway from Neepawa to Dauphin is in pretty good shape outside of the first ten miles -- that is, from the Junction of 4 and 5 ten miles north, and it is in intolerably poor condition. I drive up there quite often and I'm surprised, and I would be surprised I think at the number of dollars that is spent annually on maintaining that ten mile strip -- it must be terrific because you can go up there pretty near any day in the summertime and you'll find the maintenance crew patching up on that strip between Neepawa and Eden. It would seem to me that they've spent enough maintaining that to put a new top on it.

And then the other section of road, I've mentioned that, Mr. Chairman, shown in green on this map, is the stretch from Neepawa to Carberry -- and I'm already told there'll be nothing done on that in 1962. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, what has happened to this, what we refer to, as a "proposed 28" Highway from Neepawa to Cartwright? There was a lot said about that a year or so ago. I wonder if it is the intention of the government to proceed in stages with the proposed 28 Highway from Cartwright to Neepawa to link up with the Neepawa-Carberry road there.

Now referring for a moment to the access road program. I listened with interest to the program read out by the Honourable Minister. I wonder if it is not too late even at this stage for a municipality to come in and request that a certain access road program be placed on the order. I notice with interest Resolution No. 31 passed at the Union of Municipalities Convention

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . last November, they say, and I quote: "Whereas dust in towns and villages has caused considerable hardship and many towns in the province have benefited greatly by having their main streets hard-surfaced; and, whereas in the past the Highway Department has only done this work at the time when highway improvements are undertaken; therefore, be it resolved that we approach the Department of Highways and request the all-weather surfacing of access roads and main thoroughfares where a municipality is prepared to have such work done, and where it is necessary that consideration be given before an over-all highway program is undertaken." That's the end of the quote and the end of the resolution. It was carried unanimously. I do believe that it was the program in the past to do the access roads when the government was building a highway adjacent to it, or near to it. I wonder if that is still the program of the government.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the R. M. of Rosedale has recently requested an access road through Eden. It's only half a mile stretch -- probably not that. I wonder is there any hope at all of having that small piece of village road done in 1962, if they make a request now? I believe the R.M. of Rosedale, too, has requested an access road from PTH No. 5 into the village, only a mile. I think they've also requested it into the village of Franklin, which the Honourable Minister is quite familiar with. Is it too late at this date to have the requests of the rural municipal men considered?

Another matter that does not concern the Gladstone constituency in a way -- and yet the people in my constituency are certainly interested in it -- I understand that tenders were called for a development at the McKinnon Hill, that is, for a program at the new ski development at the McKinnon Hill. I understand that there were only about two or three tenders received -- or being considered -- and I think both of them request that a road be built from a point on No. 19 -- that's the Norgate Clear Lake Road -- from a point on that that is closest to McKinnon Ski Hill so that it will be more accessible. And then they envisage too, that if that road was put in -- true, it's in the National Park and I don't know, this may be a national problem --but they envisage that if a road -- and I don't think it would be more than five or six miles in length from a point on No. 19 Highway over to McKinnon Hill -- if that was put in, then the McKinnon facilities would be used 12 months of the year rather than just in the summer months. I wonder if the Honourable Minister has given consideration to that request?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this is a fair question to ask in this Committee, but I would like more particulars on Work Order No. 2342 on Page 68 of Public Accounts. There's a figure there of \$205,928.31 and my guess is -- and this is only a guess -- that that is about the amount of money that was required to stabilize the ditch on the south side of the highway from Gladstone to the Arden Ridge, as a result of the flooding there two years ago this spring. The Honourable Minister, or anyone else that has travelled that road any time in the last year or so would see the huge pile of steel culverts that was piled up on the south side of the road two or three miles west of Gladstone. And without discrediting the engineers in any way, shape or form, some of the oldtimers in Gladstone are saying: "I told you so" and kind of smiling at the same time that they're saying that, because all the way along that road prior to rebuilding it, at every approach from the south they had wooden bridges, or huge wooden culverts, and then of course the Highway Department put in the steel culverts, much smaller, very, very much smaller and, of course, they were all washed out. I had a fellow from Neepawa telling me some time ago that he didn't think the department realized the difference in altitude between Gladstone and Neepawa. He said, "Do you know that the fall between Gladstone and Neepawa is greater than the fall between Lake Ontario and Lake Erie?" And I said, "Well that can't be so" and he -- including Niagara Falls. So I said, "Would you mind putting that down in writing because I just can't believe that one." So he wrote me and he says, and I quote: "The fall between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario is 326 feet and has been described in a recent Readers Digest as precipitous. The distance is 27 miles for a fall of 12.7 feet per mile, according to the Encyclopaedia Canadianna." The fall between Neepawa and Gladstone is 385 feet; a distance of 22 miles or 17.5 feet per mile, and most of that takes place between Arden Ridge and Gladstone, so there's a fall of about 300 feet in about 12 miles there. So I was just hoping, and I notice today in driving in this morning that one of the approaches are out again. I know they did replace a lot of those steel culverts with wooden bridges, similar to what was there 10 or 20 years ago, but it seems to me a very costly error if this Work Order 2342 was the actual

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . cost of correcting that mistake that was made at that time. I just wonder if the Honourable Minister could check up on that one.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, as another constituent that didn't get a shovel full of work in the highway estimates, I just wish to draw the attention to the Minister that if his department wishes to spend the type of money that it has been in the last two years maintaining a portion of No. 3 that is not hardtopped between No. 10 and 21, why that's their business; but I would like the Minister to give us the figures that were spent between 10 and 21 on maintenance. In his annual report he divides the maintenance on the 200-odd miles and has it out at so many dollars per mile, and I am sure that if he hasn't already seen those figures it would surprise him, because I think I could safely say that with what he will have to spend on maintenance this year and has the last two years spent in maintenance to keep this road up rather than hardtop it, that well over half the highway could have been hardtopped.

One other matter that I'm sure the Minister will not be surprised if I bring up in this committee -- and I do so at the insistence of two municipalities. I don't want to be accused of hitting below the belt in this particular instance but back in October 16th, 1959, which was at the outset of a by-election in Turtle Mountain constituency, the then Minister of Public Works wrote letters to two municipalities in which he pointed out, and I don't want to take the time of the committee of reading all these various letters, but they were documented on a return that I asked for, but in effect the first letter that was written to these two municipalities, and I'll read one paragraph in regards to a road to bring it to a secondary highway from No. 10 highway to No. 21, called the Croll Dam road. The letter starts out that this estimate is set out -- the estimates of the engineer are set out -- it's not in great detail and is only approximate, but the cost of the road would be borne 75% by the province and 25% by the municipality. "It would be satisfactory to this government if the work were done within the years 1960, '61 and '62. This would permit you to spread out your expenditures in a reasonable way and permit you to plan the road's construction in the best way to suit your municipality." Now Sir, that requires as you know, resolutions to be submitted by council, and December 5th, according to one of the letters written by one of the departmental engineers, December 5th, 1960, both municipalities had fulfilled their obligation and sent in their resolutions asking the government to do this. It was also pointed out that the budget of '61-62 had not been approved until the next session and he said "that I'm not able to advise the construction will be definitely undertaken in '61; however I can assure you that it will be considered."

Now Sir, I maintain that from that point the municipalities were walked down the garden path to the place of no return. In June of 1961 having had no assurance that this road would be completed, I with the two reeves and several councillors met with the then Minister of Public Works as a delegation -- and I wish you to just remember these dates. June 26th, '61. At that time in the presence of the reeves and councillors of these two municipalities the Minister and one of his engineers assured these people that everything was in order to go ahead, barring one thing, was the passing and confirmation of Treasury. In view of the fact that the Minister had said that the road could be built by this government in '60, '61 and '62 he put a reservation on that everything was in order, but the passing of Treasury; and that was going to happen in the next day or two. In November of 1961 the reeve and two of his councillors from one of the municipalities interviewed the Minister. He was told then that in two weeks time he would be officially advised -- 1961. My claim Mr. Chairman, is this, the Treasury turned this job down early in May of '61. Why did they not tell these councillors that this road would not be built? Why lead them on? Lead them on to a point that as late as January -- and this I have no quarrel with the present Acting Minister -- in reply to a letter of the reeve of one of the municipalities, he replies in his last paragraph: "Having since checked the files I find that this road has not up to this time been accepted as a secondary highway by the Cabinet." This was in 1962, Mr. Chairman. This was asked by a Minister of this government, in December, in October of 1959; asked the municipalities to apply; received the proper resolutions, and then this comes out in '62 that it has never been accepted as a secondary highway by the Cabinet of this government. And then goes on to say that it will not be possible to reconstruct this road in 1962 as a secondary highway; even in view of the fact that this former Minister and other Ministers said it could be built in '60, '61 and '62, he says it can't be built in '62. But, he says if it is still the wish of the rural municipalities of Morden and the Rural Municipality of

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.) . . . Winchester to have this road accepted as a secondary highway, I would be pleased to submit your request to Cabinet again."

Now I ask you, Mr. Chairman, is this a fair way to treat municipalities? Three years, and they're no further ahead now than they were three years ago? Council have approved of it. They were led to believe by the various conferences with the ministers of the cabinet that everything was in order, and now they're being told: "well apply again and we'll see what we can do." I think this is a very unfair situation. I don't know the answer to it, why? I know that all surveys have been made. I know that the cost estimates have been prepared and given to the municipalities. I know that the telephone company and hydro were instructed to lay the poles and get ready to move them and I know that that was all rescinded and taken away. I believe this is a very unfair situation for any municipal government to be asked to administer their own property and have a government take this type of action.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): The Department of Public Works and the provincial government went to a great deal of expense and trouble last session of publicizing this booklet on their future highways and planning of such for Manitoba. In fact they're still getting publicity from it and mileage. April 17th, Tribune, "Big Road Program Ahead." But the piece that got me here Mr. Chairman, that I can't understand, and I hope the Minister will explain it after, it says: "altogether gross highway expenditures, including both capital, and current spending estimates, are expected to be more than last years total of \$33 million. Much of the spending on '62 and '63 road building apparently will be for highways and access roads linked with the comprehensive road planning report tabled in the Legislature last session." This calls for half a billion dollars spending in roads over the next 20 years. Well the part I can't understand Mr. Chairman, is what super highways are they linking together? It's still the same road; what are they going to link? That's what I can't understand. They're just going to put an access road and they're going to call that a super highway just by a link or two. I certainly can't understand that Sir. But what we're actually concerned I think at the present time Sir, is what are they actually doing right now; because right now Sir, we're paying for these so-called super highways. Immediately this booklet came out last year and they were announced, we were presented with two bills, Bills 98 and 99. Bill 98 increased gasoline tax from eleven to fourteen cents -- three cents extra to pay for these super highways. Bill 99 increased diesel fuel from eleven to seventeen cents -- six cents difference to pay for these super highways, so they say. Thus Sir we've been paying for these highways already for one year, going on the second year, and we haven't any start on these so-called highways. Also money, I understand, is being used from the Consolidated Fund and money from sales of bonds last year and bonds this year -- used for highways. But actually Sir, when you look in the estimates the appropriation for highways this year is lower than it was last year, so I can't understand all this fanfare about highways and all the money that is collected for them and earmarked for highways; we should have a super highway construction started immediately Sir. But as far as I'm concerned, it looks to me that all this money that is actually supposed to be used on highways is not actually used on highways, or they surely would be in better condition than they are now. All a person has to do is just travel on our highways in Manitoba to realize this. Last session we received another one of the so-called projects of the Public Works and Highways. What did we have in the last year one? When you look through it and I total the mileage we have about 24 miles pavement for the whole last session; 139 miles of blacktop and 900 miles of gravelling. I didn't have very much time to look through one this year, but the first item is the same as last year, 17.2 miles on that No. 1 Highway from here to St. Annes and the balance of the highway paving for this coming year 16 miles, some blacktopping and the balance is gravel.

Thus it looks to me, Sir, the majority of our highways are gravel highways in Manitoba and when you travel over these highways, you wonder whether they're under construction or destruction. -- (Interjection) -- Well on the majority of highways. -- (Interjection) -- No, no provincial highways. And speaking of construction Mr. Chairman, I notice in the annual report Public Works last year on page 15, and I quote: "By the end of the fiscal year the reorganization of the Highways Branch had been completed. The position of construction engineer had been filled and the activities of the branch co-ordinated by the establishment of a position of Assistant Deputy Minister of Highways on a full-time basis." Well Sir, the reason I bring this up is for years I've travelled over a section of Highway 52 and exactly 2.8 miles from 59 this

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.) . . . piece there has been under constant construction and destruction by the Department of Public Works. Not only under the present provincial government but also under the former provincial government, and enormous sums of money have been spent on this particular section of Highway 52. Through . . . this highway was bisected by a creek and I have here orders for return which I requested from the department to show how much that diversion cost -- this order of return dated March 2nd, 1962. The year '58- 59 \$94,498. The year '59- 60 \$11,576. The year '60- 61 \$9,128, making a total of \$115,203.87. Why I'm bringing this point up Sir, the Department of Public Works spent so much money diverting that creek, and I have it on file. Now previously when I mentioned about construction they told me they didn't have a construction engineer; they told me they didn't have a full-time deputy minister. Now we have the appointment of these gentlemen Sir, and I suggest that these gentlemen get together and stop spending any more money on this particular section of the road, especially as far as temporary repairs are concerned, because I'm sure they must have the qualification and knowledge as to road construction building to make permanent repairs to a section of a road in Manitoba highways. True, I can't make any recommendations myself because I'm not an engineer, but surely as I've said before Mr. Chairman, these men should be capable of doing this job once and for all.

That's why when Bill 39 came before us, I was wondering the purpose of it. In this Bill 39 most members are aware there's abandonment of provincial roads and change in trunk highways back to provincial roads. Well, Sir, now I can understand why this Bill was brought in, because when I reviewed the construction of highways in Manitoba, I'm sure in the near future this Bill will be used to convert our highways back to provincial roads. I haven't the Press release with me, Sir, but just to show you how the department goes about it, as I recall this Press release "Trunk Highway No. 6 secondary highway is to be declared by Order-in-Council a No. 1 highway to permit of hauling heavy supplies and so forth to Grand Rapids and northern areas." Well, Sir, this is one method and scheme to make secondary highways, first-class highways, but it certainly doesn't improve our highway system. This road particularly Sir, is of very light construction and by the end of this summer it will be in a state of destruction -- unfortunately for the sportsmen who use this road for their familiar and favourite sport -- because up until last summer Sir, and up to the present time, this road has always been badly in need of repairs and not of more abuse as it will be now by being declared a No. 1 highway and heavier loads put on it.

Another section of the highway which I'm not too particularly satisfied with, and which my colleague from Seven Oaks brought up, is that of the construction of the perimeter highway, and how the department jump from section to section all over the area instead of completing a section so you can use it. They'll do a section here and they jump over to a section here and if you try to get anywhere you can't get across any particular place on it. I suggest to the Minister that they start and complete a section, not one section here and one section here and eventually you get it done, but the way they're doing it now, well I don't know when they're going to get it done. And as my colleague has also mentioned, I've been asked to bring this press release up before this House also that when these municipalities, Kildonan, West Kildonan and many more, interviewed the Minister this year about the perimeter highway in the northern section of the area, the Minister says no bridge this year, and the local governments submitting this brief, Mr. Chairman, were the City of East Kildonan, West Kildonan, Municipality of North, Old Kildonan, West St. Paul and East St. Paul. The Minister says no bridge. Well Sir, this is one of the most important connecting links in the northern part of Metro Winnipeg and it certainly would relieve the city streets of a tremendous amount of heavy truck traffic which travel over the street from the gravel pits. So in my estimation, Sir, this should have been one of the most important bridges to have been considered and planned for by the Public Works Department for this session; because last session when we questioned it they told us definitely it would be promised for the estimates this year. And Mr. Chairman, we're still waiting. I'm not blaming the Minister because he just took the job over, but his department, the government, no bridge this year; highways complete one side, complete the other side. How are they supposed to get over it -- jump over it? So I seriously appeal to the Minister to reconsider this and make every effort to try and get estimates in for that bridge and especially start next winter if he can't start this summer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? Administration 1.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I presume the Minister's going to make a reply to some of the --

MR. WEIR: . . . I might as well --

MR. MOLGAT: Oh I think he's got a good handful there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can reply to some of them. As far as a good many of them are concerned, I'm sure that it wouldn't matter what I said. There is a distinct difference of opinion between us as to what are the highways that need the work worst, which are of the most benefit to the people of Manitoba. I don't say this is wrong, I just say that this difference of opinion exists and that nothing that I can say will do anything to correct the situation.

So I think with regard to the majority of these highways that have been mentioned I think that's all that needs to be said, I understand their differences of opinion. These are the way we see it. I may come to see it differently after I've had another year in it, I'm not saying that I'm perfect; I'm not saying that I haven't made errors; but this is the way it is.

With regard to East Selkirk and its access I reply again that I'm still not personally satisfied that the location that has been suggested is correct in the light of other roads that have to go around it and I want to have a good look at it before I go ahead with an access road.

With regard to the location of the river road, if somebody will pass the information on to the Honourable Member for Selkirk, I mentioned earlier, he must have missed it, that there is going to be no change in location, it's going to be up-graded in the present location.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland and many other members that spoke about not a thin dime, or as the member for Turtle Mountain put it "not a shovel full." Please don't feel bad, I know what it's like. I've had some of these years too, and I know it's not nice, but it just isn't possible to build all of the roads that Manitoba needs at one particular time. As a matter of fact it's only a little better than a year ago now, I think that the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain drove out to Minnedosa to address a distinguished gathering and another gentleman whom I respect very much introduced him at that meeting and introduced him as being one of the members of the legislature that knew how to get things done. He informed that gathering in Minnedosa, if I recall the press clipping correctly, that there had been 40 some odd miles of road constructed in Turtle Mountain constituency and not a mile in Minnedosa. Well, I think that was true; I'm not saying the statement was wrong; but these things average out and there are some of those things being corrected slightly.

The Honourable Member for Emerson speaks about page 19 and the fact that the line goes down to Emerson and not across to No. 75. My suggestion would be, as his was, that it was a misprint. I think that somebody drew a line in the wrong place or forgot to draw in a line -- it would be the only explanation that I could have. I don't think that anybody would conscientiously say that it didn't merit mention on the map.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.