

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, March 23, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library beg leave to present the following as their first report. Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Cowan as Chairman. Your committee recommend that for the remainder of this Session the quorum of the committee shall consist of six members.

Your committee has considered Bills: No. 5, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited; No. 17, An Act to incorporate Tri-State Mortgage Corporation; No. 25, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate "Winnipeg Bible Institute and College of Theology"; No. 33, An Act to incorporate Canadian Nazarene College; No. 42, An Act respecting United Dominions Investments Limited; No. 43, An Act respecting Traders Mortgage Company; No. 47, An Act to incorporate Mutual Trust Company; No. 49, An Act to incorporate The Red River Exhibition Association; No. 51, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Brandon Golf and Country Club; No. 60, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Investors Syndicate of Canada Limited; No. 61, An Act respecting the Holding of Real Property in Manitoba by The Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Provincial Command of the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada and Units of the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada; No. 62, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Trafalgar Savings Corporation; No. 64, An Act for the Relief of Cyril Alvin Henry, Service Station Operator, Joseph Allen Bryant, Merchant, and Francis Adelaide Bryant, his wife, all of The City of St. James, in Manitoba; No. 65, An Act to incorporate Association d'Education des Canadiens-Francais du Manitoba; No. 77, An Act respecting the City Savings and Trust Company; No. 78, An Act to incorporate Riverview Golf & Country Club; No. 79, An Act respecting York Trust and Savings Corporation; No. 81, An Act respecting Montreal Trust Mortgage Corporation; No. 83, An Act to incorporate Fort Garry Trust Company; No. 84, An Act to incorporate Hamiota Golf Club; No. 87, An Act respecting Wellington Credit Corporation Limited, and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered Bills: No. 41, An Act to incorporate Selkirk Savings and Loan Association; No. 52, An Act to incorporate The Catholic Foundation of Manitoba or La Fondation Catholique du Manitoba; No. 59, An Act to incorporate Investors Syndicate Limited; No. 73, An Act to incorporate Union Centre; No. 75, An Act respecting North West Trust Company; No. 82, An Act to incorporate The Wasagaming Foundation, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, all of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Wellington, that the report be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson) introduced Bill No. 103, An Act respecting The Transcona-Springfield School Division No. 12.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 109, An Act respecting The Town of Morden.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface) introduced Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (2).

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 104, An Act to validate By-law No. 18928 of The City of Winnipeg, and to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (3).

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the resolution standing in my name and in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Welfare.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried

and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1; Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba), 1962, by providing, among other matters, for an alteration in the method of calculating the amount of tax payable by farmers and fishermen which may have the result of reducing the amount of tax payable by them.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee will know that we usually have legislation on income tax to consider each year in order to keep our legislation in step with the legislation of the Federal Government. We are bound under the Tax Collection Agreement to make sure that our legislation is the same as theirs and, while they initiate these moves, we face the responsibility of endorsing them here in this House. The present bill does that. It has two main items in it. First of all it has to do with the method of averaging farmers' and fishermen's incomes over a five-year period, and it's a technical matter as one can judge when the bill is before us; and secondly, we have to approve of the acceleration of the collection of corporation income taxes as has been provided by legislation in Ottawa. Those are the two main items in the bill and we can deal with the rest of it on seconding reading or in committee.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I take it then that every province in Canada is putting in this same legislation. Is this correct? That Ottawa has made up their minds that they're going to make some changes in these two particular categories and they simply informed the provinces who have to pass the enabling legislation? Is that the . . .

MR. ROBLIN: I can't tell what other provinces are going to do. I have no information about that at all. I do know that if we wish to retain our collection agreement we're asked to do it. I presume that applies to other provinces who have collection agreements, but not all of them have. In the Province of, I think, British Columbia with respect to succession duties, Ontario and Quebec with respect to succession duties, Ontario and Quebec with respect to corporation taxes and Quebec in respect to personal income taxes, no collection duties exist, so I presume that it applies to the others but I can only speak for Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Passed, Resolution No. 2: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the vesting and portability of pension benefits under pension plans and respecting the solvency of pension plans, and providing, among other matters, for the appointment of members of a board to administer the Act and for the remuneration of the members of the board and persons employed under the board.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the exact item that is before the committee, of course, is the financial appropriation that will be necessary to pay the salaries of the board that will be established under this legislation, but I think I should also give members at this time a brief idea of what the legislation itself provides.

This is the first step that we are taking in the provision of portability and vesting and funding for private and group pension systems within the province. The bill itself deals with two categories of pension plans: those in existence at the moment and those that will come into existence in the future. With respect to those that exist now, we are not making mandatory at this moment the provisions that may be set down by this bill. It is intended to work into that gradually when we can examine the various pension plans existing and see how they can best be fitted into this scheme without undue burden, either on the employer or the employee. We feel that matter should be left flexible. Nevertheless, the goal will be to bring them all in a reasonable length of time to the same standards.

With respect to new pension plans the Act will provide that they must conform to certain standards right from the beginning so that in that case portability will become available. The aim of the legislation is to arrange for portability as between this province and any other that has similar legislation -- and at the present time the only one is the Province of Ontario -- but to arrange portability within these provinces with respect to private and group pension plans. This is nothing whatsoever to do with the plan, the Canada Pension Plan, which is being discussed in the Federal Parliament at the present time. Nothing whatsoever to do with that. This merely refers to those plans which are above -- if we use that expression -- above the level

(Mr. Roblin cont'd) intended to be provided for in the Canada Pension Plan.

There was one other point in connection with these pensions which I had in mind, if I can just recall it at the moment. Perhaps someone will ask me a question and it will refresh my memory on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just a word on this. I know that there has been quite a controversy going on in the Province of Ontario in respect of a bill suggested. This will be modelled somewhat after that. I would like to know from the Minister whether the portability insofar as pensions of the Civil Service, whether or not that will have to wait till the final adoption of this bill. It does seem to me that here is one area at least that the government could proceed with, without actually being under what I presume to be the proposed bill. I understand from press reports and further from the Minister's announcement a few moments ago, that this is another one of those bills which will be introduced and then allowed to hang fire pending further consideration and representation, and so it would be indicated then by that that it may be a considerable period of time before anything of a concrete nature is enacted in the Province of Manitoba.

I'm sure the First Minister is aware as indeed I expect all of us are, that this will have no bearing whatsoever insofar as portability of pensions of those under federal labour jurisdiction, and there's a considerable number of workers in the Province of Manitoba who are covered under federal jurisdiction. I'm thinking, Mr. Chairman, of railroad pensions, both for the CNR and CPR, also certain inter-provincial transport companies and the likes of that, which won't be covered under this bill.

I again get back to my original point, Mr. Chairman. I think that the government should be in a position to introduce measures for portability of Civil Service pensions without the necessity of the time element involved before, as I can see it at the present time, we arrive at enacting legislation as proposed by the Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I thank my honourable friend because he reminded me of the thing that slipped my mind at the moment, and that was that it is proposed to send this bill to the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders for study during the recess. The reason for that is that this is very complicated legislation indeed. We're bringing forward a statute which we believe is well drafted but we are very sure that we need to get the advice and counsel of people who are in this business, in a very detailed way to make sure that we don't ask for something which is unnecessary or stupid or unduly expensive when all things are considered, and we do want it to receive careful consideration in that way.

Another fact is that as the Ontario bill is not going to come into force until 1965 at the earliest, there is nothing to "port" with, if you'll allow me to use that expression, as far as their Act is concerned, until it comes in, so we feel under no great pressure to finalize this one in view of the fact that we had this job of co-ordinating with the province.

I think the point taken about the portability of federal pensions is a good point. We are hoping to interest all provinces and the federal government in common legislation on this question of portability so that we can be on a national basis in this respect. I see the point that he makes with respect to civil servants and we have considered that, but it seemed advisable that we should do this thing altogether and in view of the fact -- that there is a small time delay, I agree, but we thought it best that we should handle it all in one complete measure rather than in another way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Passed. Resolution No. 3: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting assistance in providing elderly and infirm persons' housing accommodation and to provide, among other matters, (a) for the making of grants to private non-profit corporations, municipalities, and corporations established by municipalities, for the purpose of establishing and operating elderly or infirm persons' housing accommodation; (b) for authority for the government to guarantee repayment of loans made to such corporations by the Government of Canada or any of its corporations or agencies; (c) for the employment and remuneration of personnel necessary for the administration of the measure.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, The Elderly Persons' Housing Act is being extended to include a new kind of facility that we are calling a "personal care home" and this is the provision by which we will be able to provide grants to

(Mr. Carroll cont'd)charitable, non-profit organizations, municipalities or groups of municipalities to take advantage of this kind of housing accommodation. The statute sets up a fairly elaborate procedure as to how municipalities may join together to jointly finance such an undertaking. It also establishes by legislation the kind of guarantee arrangements that the government has been entering into with respect to these various kinds of facilities.

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

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 106, an Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba) 1962.

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 107, an Act respecting the Vesting and Portability of Pension Benefits under Pension Plans and Respecting the Solvency of Pension Plans.

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 105, an Act respecting Assistance in Providing Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Accommodation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 93 Grade 6 students from the Laura Secord School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Jones, Mrs. Hoffman and Miss Krizak. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the First Minister. There are also 23 Grade 3 and 4 students from Sanford School under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Velie. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris. We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table of the House a partial Return for an address on the motion of the Honourable Member from St. George, and also a supplementary Return to an Order of the House No. 36 on the motion of the Honourable Member from St. George.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House Returns to Orders of the House Nos. 10 and 40, both standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I'd like to return six copies of Return to an Address for Papers on the Motion of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to draw the members' attention to the notice in the Votes and Proceedings of a meeting for the Private Bills Committee tomorrow at 11:00 o'clock in the morning. This morning we also had a meeting and we completed all our work excepting for one bill, and there would seem to be no need for another meeting tomorrow especially when there are no other bills ready for the committee, so if the House will agree the meeting tomorrow will be cancelled.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 76. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I regret that I've held this bill for some time now before proceeding with the second reading. I might say that at the time the bill was introduced for second reading by the Minister, I sort of "smelled a rat," to use that phrase, with this piece of legislation, and it was for that reason that I adjourned the debate. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that dealing with the important matter of marketing boards for the livestock industry in particular and also other aspects of the marketing of natural products, that we here in Manitoba should only act in respect of such matters in close co-operation with the other provinces that are concerned with the same subject. I have in mind the provinces of Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta, particularly and especially in regards to hog marketing. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that this is a problem that has been with us and the producers for a considerable period of time in order that they may have a fair return for their

(Mr. Pauley cont'd) products, but in order that it may be a fair return it is most essential, in my opinion, that uniform legislation be enacted if at all possible in co-operation with the other producing provinces. Since the bill was introduced, I have had correspondence with other areas, and it seems to me from information that I have received that this is also a desire on the part of residents and producers in the other jurisdictions.

It seems to me, Madam Speaker, as we look at the bill that is before us, that the government itself takes on too much of the responsibility to the detriment of the producers in the selling of the products from the producer. One looks at the bill, part 1 of the bill, which deals with the setting up of marketing boards. There is no provision as I can read into the bill, at least no direct provision, for producers representation on the marketing board itself. If one peruses the legislation, it seems to me as though the marketing board appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council has almost absolute power over producer boards and also the marketing commissions. While I do recognize that in some areas it is advisable to have someone from government acting as the representative of the public on the boards, on the other hand, however, Madam Speaker, I feel that the producer has not been given sufficient recognition in the bill before us, as sure that if we do set up a marketing board as visualized in this Act, that they should be instructed to give priority to producer boards over marketing commissions, which is not done within the Act that we have before us.

There are many other features within the Act itself that are strenuously objected to by farm union organizations here in the province and without the province. For instance, Madam Speaker, while I realize that I cannot deal with the bill section by section, in the general part of the bill dealing with regulations there is an exemption from the bill or the plan for all of those whose income from the sale of the natural product is under \$500.00. I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that this is prejudicial to the small farmer or the small producer in the Province of Manitoba, and if there is going to be protection through a marketing board for the producer, why not all producers? If the idea of this exemption of \$500.00 from being able to vote for a marketing board is to take care of the little chap that only has the one or two hogs a year, well that's all right, but I do feel that the exemption of the \$500.00 is quite out of line. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, the government takes onto itself the power, under the general section of the bill, to exempt any, from the regulations, any producers of any regulated product of any class, variety or grade thereof. Actually, if the government bill as proposed before us went through, the producer would have little or no say whatsoever in the marketing of his produce.

Now Madam Speaker, we've had a number of bills -- indeed we even had a resolution presented to us today suggesting the introduction of a second reading and then suggesting that the bill be referred to a committee for further study. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that this is another one of the bills that the government has introduced that further study should be given to it. It seems to me that if the government does carry out its program of referral, as it has done on many important bills, that here then is another bill that should be referred to a committee to take a further look at and to act in concert with the other producers in the other provinces.

We have before us also, Madam Speaker, on the Order Paper, we have the question of a report from a livestock committee that was set up here two or three years ago, which deals in general with the same subject. This House is being asked, providing you agree that the amendment is in order, Madam Speaker, that that resolution and action on the resolution, the recommendations, be held back pending further consultation with our farm organizations, and I suggest Madam Speaker, that this is what should be done in respect to the bill that we have before us. So I would say, Madam Speaker, that the Minister would be well advised to not proceed with the second reading of this bill, that he should contact the agricultural departments of the other jurisdictions, particularly those that I mentioned, namely Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta, that he should call together a conference of the farm leaders and livestock producers in the Province of Manitoba in respect particularly of the provisions in Bill 76, and hold back any further action on this bill until this has been done, because I am sure from representations that have been made to me, Madam Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture will find himself in a mess if he proceeds with the bill that we have before us, and I reiterate once again, Madam Speaker, it would be advisable for my honourable friend to withdraw or to hold up Bill

(Mr. Pauley cont'd) 76 pending further investigation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. A. VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Emerson that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) presented Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act, for second-reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: I believe that the explanation on the fly leaf of the bill itself is as good as anything that I can give and probably a great deal briefer. The bill provides for three things. It provides for moneys to be paid out of a consolidated fund; it provides for the establishment of regulations prescribing the method of vaccination and the type of vaccine and the period, the age at which female calves shall be vaccinated; it also provides for the contribution to be paid on behalf of vaccinations -- the level of contribution to be paid by the government toward the cost of vaccinating female calves in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister if the reason for making the decision regarding the age of the calves to be vaccinated being left to regulation, is that because there is some changed thinking now as to the right date of, the right time in the life of the calf for vaccination?

MR. HUTTON: If there are no more questions Madam Speaker, that is the reason. To date they have recommended that calves be vaccinated between the ages of four months and eleven months as a result of recent meetings of the federal and provincial people. The recommendation is that they reduce the maximum age to nine months. This is to avoid the possibility of the results of vaccination showing up in the test.

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

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 98, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): I move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood, that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. R. G. SMELLIE, Q.C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell) presented Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Devolution of Estates Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam, I rather expected that anybody that had read the bill would want some explanation. I did myself. At the last Session of the Legislature, there was an amendment passed to The Devolution of Estates Act which provided that where a person died intestate leaving a spouse and issue, that before there was any division of the estate amongst the issue, the spouse should receive \$10,000 and that after that it would follow the usual division under The Devolution of Estates Act. I think it was clear in that amendment that the intent was that the spouse should have the first \$10,000 of an estate, and if there was no more than that then the spouse should have it all.

Two situations might arise where, by reason of other provisions of The Devolution of Estates Act and certain provisions of The Wills Act, the spouse of a person dying intestate or partially intestate might receive this benefit of \$10,000 twice. The first of these situations is where a person dies partially testate and partially intestate. Section 13 of The Devolution of Estates Act provides that where there is an impartial intestacy, the Act applies to that partial intestacy as though it were the full estate. This would mean that where a person makes a will leaving his spouse a gift of, say, \$10,000 and then died intestate as to another part of his estate, the spouse would receive the first \$10,000 of the intestate part, despite the fact that he had already received a benefit under the will. The intention of this amendment was not to give double benefit and it's thought advisable to propose an amendment to prevent this double benefit of \$10,000 coming up in such a situation.

The second situation occurs because of the provisions of Section 30 of The Wills Act, which would be replaced by Section 33 of the new proposed Wills Act presently before the House. Under the provisions of The Wills Act, where a person leaves property by a will to a child, or

(Mr. Smellie cont'd)other issue, or to a brother or sister, and that beneficiary dies before the testator, then the gift is distributed as though it had been made directly to the persons who would have benefitted from an intestacy of that beneficiary, and in the same proportions as they would have benefitted under those circumstances. This would mean again that a double benefit might occur. The amendments contained in Bill 101 are to remove the chance of a double benefit of \$10,000 occurring either under The Devolution of Estates Act or The Wills Act. It goes a little bit farther, however, and provides that where a person leaves by his will a sum less than \$10,000 to his spouse and there is a partial intestacy, the spouse could claim the balance of the \$10,000 under the amendment passed last year to The Devolution of Estates Act.

I'm sure that the explanation has now made the matter crystal clear to all concerned, and I would suggest that if you have any further questions you ask those questions in committee.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Madam, I wish to compliment the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs for his very clear and explicit explanation. Thank you.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would call the motion on the Committee of Ways and Means.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I adjourned debate the other day on this resolution because of two factors. One was that I wanted to say that I appreciated the fact that the government was ferreted out of its position of non-reply to criticisms from this side of the House until such time as they were prodded into action. If you recall, I had suggested that the First Minister was simply sitting back in the bush waiting until everyone had had their piece so that he could come back in reply before there could be any rebuttal. So one of the reasons that I adjourned the debate because it appeared to me at that particular time that the matter might have come to a vote without me having an opportunity of saying that at long last we did get a bit of a reply from the government insofar as our criticisms were concerned. But my honourable friend in his very fiery reply encompassed all of the criticisms that had been offered by the Official Opposition in this House, and I leave it to them to defend their position now that the First Minister has replied to them.

But, Madam Speaker, there was another reason that I chose to adjourn the debate at this time. If you recall, Madam Speaker, just prior to the First Minister speaking, my colleague from Inkster announced the fact that this House was going to be his last, and that he had made up his mind that when this House is dissolved that he would call it quits insofar as his political contribution to Manitoba and this area was concerned. Now, Madam Speaker --(interjection) -- Pardon? -- Yes, you did. Madam Speaker, I thought that it was only fitting that someone in this House should pay a tribute to the long service that has been rendered by my illustrious colleague, and I thought that possibly I, as the Leader of the New Democratic Party, could do that because of my close association over the years with my comrade from Inkster.

One of the features of we humans, Madam Speaker, is that I think we're often too reticent to give flowers to the living and wait until they have gone over the brink before we say nice things about them, and I feel sure that my colleague, the Member for Inkster, may be embarrassed for a few moments while I try to say "thank you" to you, Morris Gray, for what you have done for this the land of your adoption.

It is said in the Book of Ecclesiastes, Chapter V, Verse 15: "As he came forth of his mother's womb, naked shall he return to go as he came, and shall take nothing of his labour which he may carry away in his hand." And then in the New Testament in Timothy it is recorded in Chapter VI, Verse 7, "We brought nothing into the world and it is certain we can carry nothing out." But, Madam Speaker, I suggest that it is what we do in between the time we are brought into this world and the time we are carried out that really counts. And I would suggest that this is the measuring stick for us all, and I say that using this as a measuring stick my colleague has done more than it is normally required or expected of any individual. This community and this province owes a debt of gratitude to him for the service that he has and is

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) rendering on their behalf. I want to say how much I appreciate the valuable help which he has given to me since becoming a member of this House some eleven years ago. More particularly, when I was first chosen as House Leader of the CCF Party the hand of understanding and friendship was extended to me from my colleague, and then as I became Leader of the New Democratic Party he further offered and gave to me the values of his long experience, and I am grateful to him.

During his long years in public life Morris Gray has held open the door to the troubled, the needy and the sick. His office on Main Street while he was still in business, Madam Speaker, was a reception room for all -- all creeds, all nations, all strata of humanity -- and no one was ever turned away. I say without hesitation that my colleague is responsible in large measure for bringing about a better understanding between all races and creeds. He is honoured by young and old alike and I would suggest that in the political arena that the Honourable Representative for Inkster could get elected in almost any constituency in the Greater Winnipeg Area.

As a school trustee for four years in Winnipeg he fought for equality of opportunities in education. I note, Madam Speaker, from some of the literature back as far as 1932 that my colleague then was fighting for what he has been fighting for in this Legislature. While he was an alderman in 1932 much of the program and philosophy of his then party the Independent Labour Party was listed insofar as education for those things that we have been fighting for and he has been fighting for in this House ever since. I'm sure that my friend was the author of part of the preamble to the school board platform back in 1932, which was 32 years ago, when he was calling for a free education for all under the jurisdiction of the school board; textbooks and all necessary supplies to be free for pupils in all grades; the establishment of a vocational school; special classes in schools for all children of school-leaving age and upward who have been unable to obtain employment; continuation of present facilities for sub-normal or physically handicapped children. These are but a few of many items, Madam Speaker, that my colleague has fought for throughout the years. Some of them have come into being in recent years. Free school books have only been on the statute books for about six years and yet my colleague was fighting for them back in 1932, and he made his contribution then in respect of education.

As a member of the Winnipeg Council he advocated, among other things, the social ownership of all public utilities. At that time, Madam Speaker, we had the Winnipeg Hydro and the Winnipeg Electric Company. My colleague has seen through his endeavour -- maybe not enacted by any party that he was associated with -- but he has seen come to fruition that the public utilities in the electrical field at least are now publicly-owned. And so it is, Madam Speaker, that many of the contributions that my colleague was fighting for back in the 30's and the 32's have now borne fruit.

Among other things he advocated when he was running for office back in 1934 for the development of a properly organized system of public health services including hospital, medical, optical and dental care available for every citizen. He has not yet seen, but I sincerely trust and hope that before he leaves this Chamber that he will see, a medicare scheme in the Province of Manitoba. But he has been instrumental in bringing into Manitoba a hospitalization scheme. Another of the points that was being advocated by my colleague back in 1934 was the elimination of slum conditions and dwellings and their replacement by habitable dwellings erected under a municipal housing scheme. And we saw today, Madam Speaker, another resolution dealing with housing for our elderly citizens. My honourable friend was fighting for that 32 -- 30 years ago. Is it any wonder, Madam Speaker, that sometimes when my colleague stands he says, "I know that I am just a voice calling in the wilderness." But I want to say to him today that he may have figured that he was a voice calling in the wilderness, but many of the utterances of his voice and many of those things that he has advocated over the years are now facts and legislation in our province. As a member of this House since 1941 he has fought for a better deal for our old age pensioners, and I think he can take some credit for some of the actions that have been taken in this House. Do you recall, Madam Speaker, the fact that after about 18 tries for an increase in pensions in this House, my honourable friend had his resolution unanimously adopted when we had the minority government in the Province of Manitoba?

My colleague fought for years for a dental college in Manitoba. In this he was a voice crying in the wilderness again, but today, Madam Speaker, we have a dental college. My friend

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) has been crying in the wilderness, as he calls it, for a school for deaf children to be located here in Winnipeg, to combat the loss when Tuxedo was taken away as the result of war. It was announced this year that such will be done.

My honourable friend has been fighting constantly and persistently for a better deal for our students in our schools, fighting that the doors of our University should be open to all who have the ability to learn, and I suggest that his pleas will find receptive ears before long.

So I say to you, Madam Speaker, I could not help but take this opportunity as one charged with responsibility in the Province of Manitoba, to say to my colleague: We regret your decision but we appreciate your reasons for doing so and we appreciate the work that you have done for this, the province of your adoption. I cannot help but read a stanza which came to my notice over the weekend, which I think properly applies to my honourable colleague and friend:

I shall not pass through this world but once.
Any good thing therefore that I can do,
Or any kindness that I can show
To any human being or dumb animal,
Let me do it now; let me not defer it or neglect it,
For I shall not pass this way again.

And I would say, Madam Speaker, members of this august Assembly, we do indeed owe a debt of gratitude to this immigrant from across the pond who came here in 1907, two years before my birth date, and has rendered invaluable service to this community, and I say to you, Morris Gray: Thank you. God bless you and keep you long.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House is the proposed motion in amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; Nays, 31.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, it's my turn to ask for yeas and nays, if you please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. ROBLIN: I doubt if we should take a vote on the Ways and Means on the same Division. I look at my friend, the Member for Lakeside, and ask his view. I think we really ought to take the proper voting.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): I think, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable the First Minister is correct. There is always the odd chance that somebody across the House may vote with us.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I'd like it on the same Division because the yeas lost.

MR. ROBLIN: A very trenchant observation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Wright, Patrick.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 31; Nays, 19.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: I believe now, Madam, that this motion is carried that you leave the Chair and that the Chairman of Committees takes up through the committee stage in Ways and Means.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1965, the sum of \$139,940,528 be granted out of the consolidated funds. Resolution be adopted? Committee rise and report.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . you had there is the figure less the 12th . . . or whatever it was that we had voted before, is it?

MR. ROBLIN: No, Mr. Speaker, it's the total of \$151 million minus the statutory applications which are not voted. They are passed by statute. This is the net balance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has adopted a certain resolution, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that the Resolution reported from the Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1965, the sum of \$139,940,528 be granted out of the consolidated funds.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I do not rise to oppose the passing of this resolution, although I do want to point out that this is a departure from our normal procedure, because we are here authorizing the government to levy the total amount of money necessary for expenditures that we have not yet authorized, because we have not completed the study of the estimates. Now I presume that with the present majority that my honourable friend the Leader of the House holds that it is likely that the estimates will pass, but nevertheless it's not quite the procedure that I think the House should be following, so I would suggest that it might be better if the bill, which would normally be coming now, might be held until such time as the estimates are completed so that our procedure might be in, I think, better keeping with what is really going on here and what would be, I think, a better standard all around.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'm not entitled to enter the debate again having moved the motion for concurrence, but if I could treat my honourable friend's enquiry as a point of order I would say that it is not our intention to proceed with the actual supply bill itself at this moment.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think the next motion that I would ask you to be kind enough to call would be the resolution on shared services.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the Conservative Government has adopted as party policy three principles which are set out in Premier Roblin's statement of February 10, 1964, and which are repeated, although with some changes, in the resolution now before us. By its adoption of these principles the government party has come out in opposition to public aid to private schools. At least, I take it that the Premier in his resolution does not mean to depart

(Mr. Mogat cont'd) from the principles enunciated in his February statement. In that statement he said that "private schools are to be supported entirely by private resources." In the resolution he has left out the word "entirely" but I am sure he did not mean by that change to leave open the question whether private schools should be supported entirely or only partly by private funds.

I would like to express regret that Premier Roblin has thus committed his party to a partisan stand on the question of public aid to parochial or private schools. I had thought in 1961 when our Liberal leadership convention declared its opposition to a partisan stand, that the Premier agreed with our point of view, but he appears to have changed his mind. Madam Speaker, I would refer to the Hansard February 26, 1962 pages 194 and 195. The Premier is speaking and he refers to an article in the Winnipeg Free Press of April 20, 1961 entitled "Liberal policy takes no stand. Non partisan on school aid," and he proceeded to read into the record the statement that our party had approved at its leadership convention. The Premier then carried on to make these comments: "Now" -- referring to this party statement of ours, and I quote from Hansard page 195 -- "Now that is a sound statement and I congratulate those who drafted it and those who approved of it, because it is exactly the position that we took when we were dealing with this matter in the Legislature. Former Industry and Commerce Minister, F. L. Jobin, said, 'It is impossible for this or any other party to form a majority opinion.' He personally favoured aid to the private schools but, nevertheless, favoured the resolution and he said 'this is not a case of shirking responsibility'."

The Premier is speaking again: "I agree with him. It's a case of responsibility. To be perfectly fair about it, one of the prominent members of the Liberal Party there, a former president of the Liberal Party had this to say: 'Chide delegates -- Joe O'Sullivan, past president of the Liberal Association, chided delegates for criticizing the Conservative Government. There has been some suggestion that we would do well not to make this a partisan question, but the Conservative Government does wrong to take the same stand,' and he goes on: 'In fairness to the people of Manitoba, we should not seek to gain political advantage from this question, he insisted. This attitude is a sound basis for the government as well as the Liberal Party.' That is the end of Mr. O'Sullivan's quotation. Now I want to pay my" -- this is the Premier speaking again -- "Now I want to pay my respects to Mr. O'Sullivan. I think that he, I'm sure after much inner conflict because I know his private views, and after much weighing of this most difficult of our traditional political problems in this province, I pay my respects to him that he delivered himself of so generous, and if I may say so, statesmanlike sentiment in dealing with this problem. I would like to hope that we can keep it on the same basis, because for all the pain it may cause the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and I do not for one second challenge his sincerity or the sincerity of the Leader of the Opposition or any other gentleman in this House, I respect it, but I say that if we are to do the right thing in Manitoba that we have to keep this on that high plane that the Liberal Convention raised it to with almost unanimous consent. I pay my respects to Mr. O'Sullivan. I pay my respects to that convention because they did the right thing in the Province of Manitoba. I only hope that the members of this House will not fall short of the standards they have set for themselves and for us."

This policy no longer seems to endure, Madam Speaker. I regret that change of mind because I do not believe that it is in the best interests of the province that political parties should divide on religious lines. I think that the Premier's action in taking a partisan stand against public aid invites partisan division on this explosive issue. I would like to assure the House, however, that we of the Liberal Party do not intend to accept the challenge which the Premier has laid down. However tempting it may be politically to seek the support of the large bloc by now taking a partisan stand in favour of public aid to parochial schools, the Party intends to stand by its declaration of April 20, 1961, and that declaration stated: "(a) That the Liberal Party be non-partisan in its approach to the question, being neither for, nor against, public support for private and parochial schools, and (b) that in accordance with the best traditions of the Liberal Party, every encouragement be given to the development of objectives and dispassionate attitudes amongst the people of Manitoba in the expectation that greater understanding of the factual aspects of the question will lead to its proper solution."

We intend to adhere to this policy. This policy means that on the question of public aid the Liberal Party declares for an open vote, leaving it to the conscience of each member to

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) decide whether or not to support public aid and in what measure.

My own personal view of the question has been made clear again and again. I announced my personal view on April 19, 1961 on the opening day of the Liberal Leadership Convention prior to being elected Leader of the Liberal Party. My stand, which was reported on the front page of the Winnipeg Free Press, was in favour of some public assistance to private schools. I have repeated my views on many occasions. I would not hesitate to vote for a measure of public aid to parochial schools if I were satisfied that the aid would not be detrimental to the public schools of the province. I have long thought that a non-partisan approach should be made towards implementing the recommendation of the Royal Commission. But I do not think that the Liberal Party should consider the division of the major political parties on this issue. I have said that I could support public aid personally where such aid is not detrimental to the public schools. These are my personal convictions and on this I speak for myself only, in the same way as other speakers in the Liberal Party such as the Member for St. Boniface and the Member for Selkirk were stating their own personal convictions when speaking on this subject.

All Liberals, however, can agree, I think, in saying that the public school system is something that should be preserved and maintained in its integrity in Manitoba. No action should be taken which would harm the existence of public schools open to all in every part of Manitoba. That is why I have grave doubts about the wisdom of Mr. Roblin's shared services plan. Under the Roblin plan, as outlined in the February statement, and again on the introduction of the Resolution, denominational schools are to be allowed on a regular and wide-spread basis to share in the services offered by the public schools. This is not to be only the occasional use of the gymnasium or workshop in a public school by parochial school pupils. I fear that the Roblin plan will introduce segregation into the public schools.

According to Mr. Roblin, the public school services under his plan are to be offered not only to private school pupils on an individual basis, but to the private schools themselves so that the pupils of an affiliated or accredited private school would attend at the public school in a segregated block for their shared services. I am concerned that the introduction of segregation into the public school itself may be harmful to the public school. It has long been the boast of our public schools that, except for religious teaching, there is no discrimination, no divisiveness, no singling out of Catholic or Jew or Mennonite. Secular instruction is entirely non-sectarian.

The Premier has talked of the principles underlying the public school system. He has talked of separation of church and state as if it were a principle that was helpful in deciding on public aid, but I say that he has left out the basic principle of the public school in Manitoba, and that is the principle set out in Section 246 of The Public Schools Act, and I quote: "No separation of pupils by religious denomination shall take place during the secular school work. That is the principle that ensures the integrity of the public schools and serves as a guarantee against discrimination and divisiveness in the public school itself.

In my opinion there is a strong possibility that shared services, if they are to be meaningful and effective, will have to contravene the principle of non-segregation in the public schools. To determine the extent of that nature, to analyze the tremendous administrative problems that shared services pose, this question should not be referred to a committee of politicians, but to administrators. Those who are responsible for the administration of schools are the ones who can say to what extent shared services will harm our unsegregated public schools. Setting up a legislative committee is not, in my opinion, the manner in which this should be handled, and I intend to vote against the resolution.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works, that Madam 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.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XI, Item 1. Administration.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, in once again attempting to present to the members of the committee estimates of the Department of Public Works, I have no particular opening statement to make at the moment except to say that the Highway Program is going to be distributed fairly immediately I believe to the members of the House. While it is being distributed I would hope to have the co-operation of the House to have the estimates of the Department divided into two, with the discussion of the Public Works estimates first and the highways estimates following the completion of those. It will make it considerably easier with the manner in which I have the information set up before me and I would hope in that way that we could deal with these things in the most expeditious manner.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry -- he is a very young looking, handsome and pretty, Mr. Chairman. I was hoping that the Minister would give us advance copies of his road program since actually I'm going to pretty well restrict myself to the highways part of the estimates so that I could deal with them while making a general statement. However, since they're not available I think we'll just have to do the best we can without them and probably refer to them at a later date.

What I want to do, Mr. Chairman, today, is to just take a careful look at the manner in which this Government obtains undeserved publicity from time to time and I think that this particular department is the one that we can see how it works and how this publicity is received. I feel in a sort of a mellow mood today, Mr. Chairman, so if I am not too critical but factual, I hope it will be understood.

I'd like first of all to show how the highways program of this government has received tremendous publicity -- and I hope, Mr. Chairman, before I am through, to prove that the publicity was unwarranted, undeserved, that the government has now reached the stage where it is doing considerably less in highway construction than was done by the former government as far back as 1957 -- and I don't think I'll have any difficulty in proving the statement. In fact I'll use nothing other than the figures and statements that have been given to us by the government itself from time to time.

Now let us first see how they get advance publicity of any plan -- and I'd like to refer you, Mr. Chairman, to the Winnipeg Free Press of Saturday, March 4, 1961 -- and I want to read this advance publicity in total to show you how it could fit in to an overall plan that the government has in obtaining publicity -- and I can say now in doing so, misleading the public.

Now if we look at this particular article we'll notice that it's headed: "Twenty Year Plan \$400 million Road Program" -- and this is March 4, 1961, Mr. Chairman. That was long before any members of the House knew anything about this particular road plan. But the paper evidently did get good advance information and the purposes of this advance information was to prepare the public first, to what was supposed to have been something very unusual in the way of planning for a road system in Manitoba, and also according to the article, condition the public to the possibility of an increase in the gas tax. And if we follow this through we'll see that they were quite successful in obtaining both of these objectives. But here's what this news comment has to say: "The Provincial Government within the next two weeks will lay before the Legislature a report that calls for the complete reconstruction of all Manitoba highways over the next 20 years at an estimated cost of \$400 million." Now, in passing, Mr. Chairman, I would draw your attention to these words: "Complete reconstruction of all Manitoba highways." Now, why that particular phrase? To lead the public to believe that that was necessary; that in the next 20 years all the highways in the Province of Manitoba would have to be reconstructed. And we'll see later why they have tried to leave this impression on the public. And I quote further: "The report was drawn up by the Automotive Safety Foundation of Washington, D. C., and has been two years in the making." The report was drawn up by the Automotive Safety Foundation. I doubt this very much, and when I come to this particular report, I'll tell you why Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether it was these consultants that drafted all of that report.

And I go on and read further: "It will no doubt provide the government with a basis for increasing gasoline taxes, a move that has been speculated upon for at least a year. The current guess is that the tax will go up two cents a gallon. The tax is now 11 cents a gallon." In order to get out from under the responsibility of levying this additional tax, how do they go about that part of it? Now listen to this next paragraph and I quote: "But the most inflammatory part

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd). . . of the report will be the charge that Manitoba roads in the past several decades have been so badly neglected that this proportion of expenditures are now necessary to being them up to safety standards. They immediately lay the blame for the increase in tax on the former government." And I quote further: "This will be taken by the Conservative Government as justification of all its charges that the previous Liberal administration was building cheap roads."

Now, Mr. Chairman, we come to another very fine gimmick that the First Minister likes to use so often and he's a master in the English language, he can slant public opinion in the direction he wants it to go. He doesn't tell them this is it but he'll slant his talk in such a manner that the public is quite free to interpret his saying as they will, but there's always just a little bit of this slanting that the average man will come to the conclusion that the First Minister wants him to come to that particular conclusion whether there is basis for it or not. And again I quote: "The Conservative Government in the past has paid for highways out of the capital account and not out of operating account. The plan in future is reported to call for systematic payments out of government operating account for highway construction." Well, Mr. Chairman, you and I and the members of this committee know that the government has not been building highways out of the operating revenues -- they've been built out of capital revenues. But the average man on the street on reading this account will say, "Here, we're going to be taxed another couple of cents a gallon for gasoline, but that will be all right because it's going to be used to construct highways in the Province of Manitoba." Not knowing the true facts of the case that that money was not intended to be used for highway construction and is not being used for highway construction. And I'll have more to say about the gasoline tax a little later on. That was the first piece of publicity.

Then we come to the second one, and that is that very infamous "Manitoba Highways Planning for Tomorrow." Now in here we notice, the advance notice said 400 million in 20 years, but when we come to this gimmick that was published by the government, it raises the ante to 540 million. Over the next 20 years -- I'm quoting now from this particular report: "Over the next 20 years an average annual expenditure of more than 27 million is required to fulfill provincial trunk highway system needs." Twenty times 27 million is 540 million. Now, Mr. Chairman, I also want to quote the following: "A higher level of yearly expenditure during the next few years above that now prevailing would be warranted in order to catch up with current needs, following which costs could be reduced." Here again they're letting the public believe that because of current needs of a backlog of work, this government is forced to spend tremendous sums of money -- and I will hope that by the time I'm through, Mr. Chairman, I will be able to show the committee that these tremendous sums were not spent in the first instance and furthermore, the amounts that were spent, a very small portion of them were spent because of any backlog of roads that needed reconstruction.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that after the passing of three years since this report made its first appearance -- and I'd also like to point out that it took two years to prepare that study -- and if it was as important as we are led to believe it is, then you would think that the government would follow the recommendations of this report very religiously. Well it has not followed them.

Now let's take a look at the 1961-62 Annual Report on Public Works of this government. On Page 55 appears a chart -- I referred to this chart last year but I'm referring to it again, Mr. Chairman, because in this year's report that chart disappears and that is the first time that it is not in the Annual Report. And why is it not there, Mr. Chairman? Simply because it shows so clearly that the government today is spending just probably a little more or even a little less in actual dollars on the construction of highways than the Campbell administration did in 1957. We don't know how much has been spent last summer, because we only have the figures for the '62-63, but I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that last year's expenditures were less than the year before; and the year before the expenditures dollarwise were just about even with what was spent by the Campbell administration in 1957. So I ask you, how accurate were the reports in the Free Press of March 4th, 1961, and how much value can we place on this book that took two years of study; a lot of public funds to produce -- and I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in my humble opinion this press release on this report was nothing but a hoax on the public of the Province of Manitoba. Why has this chart been discontinued, I ask the Honourable

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd). . . Minister? It's a good way of making comparisons for anybody who wants to read the report. It's clear -- probably he'd just as soon that it wasn't -- but it does not appear in this year's report.

Now we're talking about money spent, Mr. Chairman, but that isn't the whole story. The fact is the Campbell administration built more miles of road for a given sum of money than this administration is building. And I would say at a guess -- because I have no way of telling the figures, except by going into something like this, which should give us a fairly good idea of what this government is building for the money it is spending, and what the former government built for the money it spent. If we go back to the 1958 construction year, which was the last year that the Campbell administration was responsible for -- because you will recall that the estimates, the budget, the contracts and everything were let before this government took over on July 1st, 1958 -- I can give you some figures here that are really an eye-opener. In 1958 the Campbell administration constructed -- and I'm going to take each individual type of construction separately to show you a comparison -- in 1958 the Campbell administration did 568.7 miles of grading. What did this government do in the last year that we have a report on? One hundred and fifty-one point one. In other words, the Campbell administration did approximately four times the number of miles of grading construction than this administration did. Graveling: the Campbell administration 869.8 miles; the Roblin administration 344.7 -- a little better than a third. Base Course: the Campbell administration 203 miles; the Roblin administration 160. Now, bituminous matting, prime and seal: the Campbell administration 1,040.8; the Roblin administration 434.5. Concrete: the Campbell administration 16.1 miles; the Roblin administration 16.5. Now if that isn't a clear factual indication of mismanagement-inefficiency on the part of this government, then I don't know what you can find that would prove it better.

In the plans, in the plans that they put before the public they make certain claims, namely, that this government is going to give the people of the Province of Manitoba highways, which the other government did not do; that they had a big construction program before them -- and it is proven, Mr. Chairman, that that was not accurate. I can say in fact it was not true.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is only a very small part of the whole story. How does -- oh, before I come to that point -- we have -- I said that I think that the '63 amount of money spent on highways in Manitoba -- and I'm talking about the highways covered by this report, Mr. Chairman. I don't want any misunderstanding on that point. In 1961 this government spent 13.4 million on highway construction; 1962, 12.1 million. We don't know what it was in 1963. But as I said before, I venture to say it was below the 12.1 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, coming back to this little press article where it said that this government intended to build some of those highways in their program out of current revenue: now let us see what has actually happened. The First Minister was somewhat irked by what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had to say about his budget and the debt situation in this province. Well, Mr. Chairman, in 1957 this government -- or pardon me, the Liberal Government, the Campbell administration, built their roads that year on the pay-as-you-go. In other words, they were built out of current revenues. What has happened -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. CARROLL: What was the size of the program that year?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Between nine and ten million, which is just slightly below in money-wise what we have for 1962. -- (Interjection) -- No, it was 1957. We didn't have an election until 1958. The honourable member is a year out. If you want to see -- (Interjection) -- Oh, just a second, if you want to talk elections that's right up where I want. Because if there's anybody that puts political expediency ahead of anything else in the history of this province, it's the present government. If you want to talk elections, well -- Let's see, when did we have an election? In order to find out when we had an election -- this government isn't in power. All we have to do is look at this graph and there it is -- the biggest election of their whole time was 1959 and by golly the peak of construction -- right on that graph. This is my statement.

MR. ROBLIN: You must remember that was voted after the election, not before.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Oh no, oh no, no.

MR. ROBLIN: Thirty-five million.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Oh no, you're not getting out of it that easy. You were so kind in admitting that you made a mistake when you were a private member over on this side of the House, I believe it's about time you admitted mistakes while you are in the seat that you're in right now.

MR. ROBLIN: I've made plenty of mistakes.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Yes and by the looks of it you're going to continue making them because you will pay no attention, because you'll pay no attention to the good advice you receive from this side.

Now, what about the financing by this government? We now have, according to the figures given to us by the First Minister in his budget speech the other day, we have now capital loans amounting to 142.5 million for roads and bridges. That's the sum total of our borrowings to date. And I ask you, the members of this committee, how can you justify that, when you are building less roads than the Campbell administration did on a pay-as-you-go and you have raised for this same purpose \$132.5 million after giving advance warning to the public that you were going to do some of the construction of highways out of current revenues. Interest at 4 percent on this money is just over \$5 million a year Mr. Chairman, that our taxpayer has to carry in interest alone, which is a half of what it cost the people of this province to build the roads that this government is building today, by the former Campbell administration. Now if that isn't a sign of who was efficient in administration and in management of the public affairs, then I say again, I don't know where you can get better factual material.

Now let's take a look at what happened to that gasoline tax. The gasoline tax went up, as was anticipated, and I guess there's still a lot of people in the Province of Manitoba that figure that the gasoline tax was raised in order to be able to build the roads that the government had in mind. But let's see what actually has happened in the tax field in this regard. In 1957 the revenue from the gas and motor fuel tax was \$12.7 million. What was it last year? -- \$26.3 million -- more than doubled is the revenue from gasoline tax. In motor carriers, auto licenses and so forth it was \$6.2 million in 1957; \$8.7 million in 1964. The revenue from both these sources in 1957 was \$18.9 million; the revenue now exceeds \$35 million. Not one cent of that \$35 million is being used for the construction of highways in the Province of Manitoba today; and the original intent and purpose of that tax was to use it in the construction of highways Mr. Chairman. Today the people of this province are taxed on their automobiles and their gasoline to the tune of \$35 million and yet this government borrows every dollar that is used in the construction of highways. I ask you Mr. Chairman, is that fair? Is that good and efficient management? Is it good administration? I say to you Mr. Chairman that anybody, anybody, brains or no brains, can build roads when the public gives them the money that they need for the building, or if they take it from the public without the public knowing what it is being taken for. It wouldn't be too bad if we were getting value for our dollar; but I want to state again Mr. Chairman that from the facts as I have given them to you today, the value is not there.

Now there's another very interesting thing to look at, if we compare our estimates of 1957 -- and what do we find: we find that in the Public Works that year, the Public Works estimates totalled \$22.8 million. And what are they in today's estimates Mr. Chairman? -- 15.5 -- just a little better than half. What is this government doing with all the money it's collecting from the people of the Province of Manitoba?

On the pay-as-you-go basis with taxes about half of what they are, we were able to give to the Public Works Department \$22 million of the estimates; today they receive only 15. And we carried this without that tremendous load of interest that our taxpayers have to bear today. What about the debt? Well enough has been said here, but I think it will bear repeating, that our dead weight debt is about ten times what it was back in '57; and I don't think that that speaks too well for the government. I would also like to point out that in 1957 we had no difficulty in retiring that debt and we almost allotted as much to retirement of that debt in 1957 as the present administration is allotting to the retirement of ten times that amount of debt. Which in simple arithmetic means that the people of this province are carrying a tremendous load of interest and will be carrying it for years and years. And may I remind the First Minister that the people who come after us will have a load to carry of their own because our road system has a limited time of usefulness and the time will come when the people will have

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)... to build different roads once again, because the lifetime of the road will be up. They'll have their own problems to meet; and on top of that they'll have the load that this government has placed on their shoulders by way of interest.

Now there's only one other matter. I wasn't going to take even this long seeing that I am in a sort of a mellow mood, but I would like to point out something to the Honourable Minister and I hope that he changes some of these things. I haven't seen this -- yes, it's on my desk now, I'll have to take a look at it -- but what I would like to point out Mr. Chairman is in these schedules that we receive and which we have received this time from the Minister, the project is described in places somewhat different than it is described in the annual report and it makes it difficult to follow through. Now I understand that these schedules are approximately what the government wants us to approve in this House. I may be wrong but I think that's the purpose of them, and if we are to be able to know whether this particular type of work that we have been asked to pass upon has actually been done, then the terms used, the definition of the project should be pretty well the same in the annual report, so that we can identify one with the other. I would also like to point out that the government does not follow, actually they don't follow the schedule as far as I can see, in the work that they perform in that year. Now I'll just give you one example Mr. Chairman, and this is taken at random out of the constituency of Dauphin because that happens to be very close to me and I know that area fairly well. In 1961-62 authorized expenditures in the Schedule the way I read it were approximately \$400,000.00. What was spent in the constituency of Dauphin that same year? -- \$660,000.00. About 60 per cent more than was authorized by this legislature. In 1962-63 authorized \$22,000, spent \$85,000.00. Now how did I arrive at these figures, because we are not given dollars and cents in any of this. I arrived at them by taking the miles of work and averaging out the cost as we get it in the annual report, that was the only way I could do it, and I think they are possibly correct. I believe, and I may be wrong Mr. Chairman, that when this Committee or this Legislative Assembly is asked to pass on a certain program of road construction that program will be followed pretty closely, and as I have indicated it has not been so followed.

I think I'll leave this little talk at this point in the hope that the Minister will have the opportunity to go through the figures I have given him and if there are any errors in my calculations I wish he would point them out, because it is an important matter, a very important matter and I for one do not want to leave the wrong figures with the public of Manitoba because I happen to be criticising that type of approach, but I would like to -- if I am wrong I certainly would like the Minister to point it out and I stand to be corrected. I have been very careful in getting this information but I can be subject to mistakes as well as anybody else. I do hope that the time is not too far away when this government will live up to the promises it has made the people of the Province of Manitoba, that it will start building the roads that it promised to build under its highways plan; that it starts spending the money that it said it would have to spend under these highways plans; that it begins to use the tax funds which seem to be earmarked for certain purposes as they were earmarked; that some of the gasoline tax be used toward the construction of highways in the Province of Manitoba instead of being used to pay interest on monies borrowed to build roads in Manitoba.

MR. WEIR: Well Mr. Chairman, we have again been treated to the annual oration or discourse from the Honourable Member for Ethelbert. I thank him for the time that he has put in in preparing for it. A good deal of it probably could have been found in last year's Hansard. I have got so that I look forward to this discourse in the same manner that I look forward to the discourse that we have annually from the Honourable Member for Lakeside on his Bang's policy and it certainly would be missed if they weren't forthcoming.

The Honourable Member says he is in a mellow mood this afternoon. Well one of the terms that has been used for mellow is over-ripe. I'm inclined to think in that line he may be quite right. He talks about publicity Mr. Chairman. He talks about publicity. Publicity may concern the Honourable Member for Ethelbert but I've got news for him, because it doesn't concern me in the least. Because it doesn't matter how much publicity you get, it doesn't matter how many headlines the Honourable Member from Ethelbert gets that says the roads in Manitoba are not good and they are costing too much money, because you can't make a good road out of a bad one and you can't make a bad one out of a good one; and as long as the people in Manitoba are driving the roads of Manitoba in the manner in which they are, I haven't got

(Mr. Weir, cont'd)...the least concern.

He asked about roads. Without going into any particular detail, he and the people of Manitoba need only look at Highway No. 1, Highway No. 2, Highway No. 3, Highway No. 4, Highway No. 5, Highway No. 6, Highway No. 7, Highway No. 8, Highway No. 9, Highway No. 10, Highway No. 11 -- and I could go on and on and on. I ask him to have a look at those roads. To have a look at the changes in the roadmap over the years, and it's true, it's true all of the roads in Manitoba aren't in the shape that we'd like to have them but they are getting that way and they are getting that way fast. He talks in terms of dollars. He uses for instance the years '56-57 and '57-58. I don't blame him for using those years, I don't blame him and I don't criticize him for it, but I would just point out that in the capital division in 1955-56 which was the largest to date at that time, '55-56, \$10,300,965.09 was the amount. In the '56-57 year it jumped to \$18.3 million. It stayed the same -- no it jumped to \$20 million in the '57-58 years, which was the year that he was talking about that the government changed. And he talks about miles of road. Well, it took until about 1959-60 before the standard changed: Changes in width, changes in gradient, a good many changes took place about that period of time and certainly changes in the standard of the surfacing that was put on the roads. They are definitely built to a different standard today; we're definitely not getting as many miles of road built for the same price today, but there's a different type of traffic going over them today. I'm not saying it particularly critically of the former administration because no doubt they spent the money the way they thought was best, but with the traffic that we're experiencing today we have to, the people require a better standard of roads and this they are getting.

I don't think that I particular mentioned no graph in the annual report. Well, this is the other proof that I've had this afternoon is that for the Honourable Member for Ethelbert to understand it you have to put it in picture form. It seems to be the manner that he can get it best. The main reason for taking it out is that we are assuming that the changes in highway spending will not deviate too greatly. They may go up and down a little depending on the type of contracts that are being done that particular year but we don't anticipate vast changes in the up and down of these contracts. It just so happens that in this year's there will be a little greater increase because of some of the jobs that are being done.

He talks about value for the dollar. Again I go back -- there's no argument, there's no argument, there's no sense using any argument at all with the honourable gentleman because the roads themselves are the answer. If you drive over the roads in Manitoba and see the impression that has been made -- they are there.

He asks to have the same terms used in the Annual Report as are used here. It's something that had escaped me; I'll look into it and see what can be done. There's possibly something we can do to make it easier for the honourable member.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been my hope that we could have proceeded in a different manner. I would suggest that I take my seat now and that we proceed again from the front of my book which would be much the easiest, and to discuss the Public Works appropriation with the exception of highways. I have absolutely no reservations, if you'd like a second free-for-all so to speak, at the beginning of the No. 3 appropriation so that we can discuss highways in its entirety, I'd be quite happy to let that take place, but it would be much easier from this side in providing information if we could proceed with them as they are in the book.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry if the announcement could have been made in the beginning perhaps, I wouldn't take the trouble of having a couple of notes, but as usual, I shall be very brief.

I have no road problems at all because my constituency don't require it. They have good roads, nice paved streets, but I'm very much interested in those who need roads and need them badly, but I am not in a position to suggest whether you build a road first class, or second class, in one constituency or the other. My point is, build them all over, and build them where you think it is most necessary, so I cannot complain that in one section you have built a road, and in another section you have not. My suggestion is go ahead. Roads are very very necessary now, and I for one in this House cannot tell you where it is more important, so I must of necessity leave it to the Minister who is in charge of this. I don't think that the Minister would purposely, or any Minister purposely build a road where he thinks it's political expediency. I don't believe in this accusation on any government because I don't believe in political expediency

(Mr. Gray, cont'd)... myself, and I have no right to charge anyone else. After all, Public Works Department is dealing with dead material, so to speak, rock, stone, oil, sand, there is no human interest in it. I cannot argue with the Minister of Public Works as I do with the Minister of Health and the Minister of Public Welfare because down there they are dealing with human beings. They deal with sickness, they deal with death, they deal with T.B., they deal with all diseases which no human being should have, and should be prevented. But in this particular case I cannot conscientiously and honestly blame anyone. I could blame you for not having roads, I could blame the present Minister, I could blame the future Minister or the past Minister. It's impossible. What I'm interested in only is this, that the buildings under the Minister's charge, like the Mental Hospitals, the Home for the Boys, and all the other buildings, although it's buildings--we are not dealing with superintendants, we are not dealing with the medical, we are not dealing with the training, but the buildings in itself. It would do a lot of good if we could see that there are no fire hazards, to see that they are clean, they are decorated, they are safe, and they give the environment particularly to the Boys' Homes, the environment of a home life. This I'm very much interested in. I have no direct claim but I'm just asking the Minister to explain for our satisfaction whether those buildings are in the shape they should be and if there is any money to be spent on this because there we are not dealing with sand and rock and gravel. We are dealing with human beings and with the future of human beings. This, I think perhaps is extremely important in your Department, because as I said we are dealing with human beings there.

Now to add a little bit of gaiety and romance and so on. For years and years I've urged all the Ministers of Public Works to have more benches and more facilities on the government grounds around the Parliament Buildings. There's no parks around here. There's no accommodation even to the new beautiful fountain across Broadway and there's no parks around here. It's too hard--there are many many people who cannot afford even the carfare living around this district as yet, someday it'll probably be eliminated, to accommodate them here in the summer months. They have nowhere to go. It won't hurt our grounds. It won't hurt the grass. We have men that are looking after it. When they come here they haven't got a bench to sit on; they haven't got a place to enjoy themselves in the hot evenings, and every time I suggested that it was just as my leader said today, a voice in the wilderness. I think this is just as important, everything is important, but not one item less or not an item more; and particularly this suggestion does not cost any money or very, very little.

I'd like to suggest not for now, probably in a hundred years from now, because many of the members will likely get old, I hope you do get old in this House, and this is to find a way of getting into the building without climbing those steps in the front of the building. It's beautiful, it's decorative, it's historical, everything is right, but there are many people have to come here and have to come here when they cannot walk those steps and I say, you can't do it now when the roads are necessary, you can't do it now when many other things are necessary but I think you should be planning and thinking to have a main ground approach to this building. That is about all the criticism I have and the reason I did not criticize more is because I know I'll get an answer. In this particular case I'll only get a very kindly, gentle explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1. (a). Passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we pass Administration, I am going to do what the Minister suggested in general and ask questions on various items instead of on his salary, but if he turns to page 13 of the Annual Report of Department of Public Works, he will note that there's an item here "Emergency Measures Organization" which deals with setting up various facilities in connection with the Provincial Co-ordinator for Civil Defence. Now I don't see any appropriation in the estimates of the Minister of Public Works for the expenditure of money at all. I was under the impression that the Civil Defence Co-ordinator and the whole of the Department of Civil Defence came under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Secretary. Now, is the Provincial Secretary reimbursing the Department of Public Works, for the expenditure of man hours that the Public Works Department uses in connection with this civil defence business that's going on in the province or is there duplication between the departments? If there are expenditures that are not being recovered from the estimates dealing with civil defence, then I suggest, Mr. Chairman, they should be in the estimates of the department whose operation is under inspection at the present time. Of course, if the Minister says certainly we have

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd). . . a return from the Provincial Secretary's Department that's well and good. If that is the case I'd like the Provincial Secretary to show me where it comes out of his appropriation back to Public Works. I think this is necessary for us to scrutinize the estimates properly.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, if I might answer the Honourable Leader of the NDP. With the Emergency Measures Organization I don't think--and I stand to be corrected--I don't think that there is any recovery from them. This is a service that the Department of Public Works does for the group, and really the reason for it is that these things are distributed around the country in areas where we have offices, the trucks and so on and so forth, and they're checked by our district people to make sure that they're being looked after and being kept up and so on and so forth, and it saves quite a bit of running around for the people in the Provincial Secretary's department. I really don't believe that there is any recovery on it and the amount of time that it takes in conjunction with the other services that these people are rendering in the area anyway, is rather minute.

While I'm on my feet I better say a word or two I think to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Inkster. With the maintenance of the buildings in the country as we are dealing with old buildings in some instances, I think that it is probably difficult to say that they are always in first-class shape. With old buildings it's always difficult to keep them in first-class shape. There is money annually that is voted and we make every effort to keep them that way. There are sections of each of the institutions that are usually renovated and remodelled and brought up-to-date, and some buildings with the floor taken off and so on and so forth, and we attempt in every way that we can to keep them up-to-date. There's the never-ending job, of course, of tightening windows and so on and so forth in some of these buildings and in the expansion of them. I think for the most part they can be said to be satisfactory, although continual improvement is necessary.

So far as benches in the areas concerned, I have some good news for him because I think some additional benches are planned for the park across the street, and this, we hope, will mean quite a number of pleasant hours for many of the particularly older people who live in this part of the city. My information is from those that have the opportunity to watch the comings and goings of these people that the majority of the people that use them come from the direction of Portage Avenue, north of Portage Avenue. By developing the area in the park we feel that we save them walking across Broadway and one more opportunity of getting hurt.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my honourable friend the Minister that I cannot accept his reply to my questions in respect of the civil defence because I don't believe that any department can do anything without creating an expenditure within the department that should be shown from one department to the other, as the case may be. The Minister might think that it's just a trivial matter, or a relatively small amount. He may be true, but if the same thing holds true, Mr. Speaker, in respect of other departments as well, one can see that our scrutiny into departmental expenditures can go awry because of the fact that we're not sure of what's going on. I would suggest to the Minister that if the expenditures that have been made in respect of Emergency Measures Organization if they're not warranted to be spelled out insofar as expenditures are concerned, then surely to goodness they're not worthy of being spelled out as to what is happening in the report of the Department of Public Works. Why is this not in the report of the Honourable Provincial Secretary if it doesn't mean anything to the Department of Public Works? We're dealing with Public Works. We have a full page, almost a page and a half of a report dealing with activities within the Department of Public Works in respect of this and yet the Minister tells me he doesn't know anything about the expenditure, it's only a small amount. Well if it's a small amount, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Minister it's not worthy of taking up a page and a half in his report; and if it is worthy of being reported, it should be reported in the Department of the Honourable Provincial Secretary on civil defence, because in either or both departments we're being fooled insofar as the expenditure and the activity is concerned, because we didn't receive any report as I can recall it from the Provincial Secretary in this regard as to activity and we haven't any from the Minister of Public Works insofar as expenditure of money is concerned.

Now I'll accept it; I'll accept his explanation for this year, but I do say to my honourable friend either show us what your actual expenditure is next year, or get the Provincial Secretary

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... when dealing with the Department of Civil Defence to tell us what services are being rendered by the Department of Public Works.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) passed....

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works would like us to proceed in the fashion and order that he has outlined but would that prohibit us from discussing his own salary and the administration if we did, or where do we discuss the administration if we follow the pattern as outlined and stick closely to the pages of the report?

MR. CHAIRMAN:might come up, could be dealt with under the particular item as you approach it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I did have a -- so if you want to speak on the Minister's salary we had better do it now, I judge then. Otherwise he will be paid and we're not certain whether he should be or not.

I would like Mr. Chairman to know the length of holidays my honourable friend takes for instance, or whether he just took an exceptionally long one last year, because I wrote to his office on July 20th and got a very nice reply back that states that -- (Interjection) -- It won't take very long to read this one. "In the absence of Mr. Weir from this office" -- he's taken the liberty of acknowledging receipt my letter of July 20th -- he says, "Your letter will be drawn to Mr. Weir's attention when he returns from his holidays" -- I don't know how long he was on them then -- and then I wrote to him on August the 9th and he was still on his holidays; and then I wrote to him on August the 29th and hoped that he had a very pleasant holiday, if he was back, and hoped to hear from him shortly. Now you might take it from these letters that he was away about two months but I know that he wouldn't be away that long but it would be kind of interesting for me to know just how long his holiday was last year, and if he intends to take the same length of one in the future? Because maybe if he does we should cut down his salary a little bit if he's going to take a couple of months off.

And then there's another couple of matters, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to ask of my honourable friend, and that is in regard to access roads. I note that on the blue sheet that is before us, that has just been laid on our desk, that so far as the Gladstone constituency is concerned it appears that we are to have a couple of access roads in Gladstone -- (Interjection) -- Page 7, Mr. Chairman -- 1.4 miles into Franklin -- that concerns both my honourable friend and myself because that's the dividing line between our two constituencies -- and I'm glad to see that one in there. And then skip one and the next one down 1.5 miles into Birnie. Now I notice under the heading "Nature of Work" it shows that it will be grade and gravel, and I want to ask my honourable friend if that is just the work that is to be done in '64, or whether they will be hard-surfacing the road this year, because, Mr. Chairman, you will recall this that when the former Minister of Public Works, Mr. Willis, introduced this new access road program into the House -- and that was back in July, 1959, five years ago, or nearly that -- he states, and I'm quoting from Page 1099 of Hansard No. 29, July 20th, 1959, -- if I can find it here, he has a 9 or 15 point program that was introduced, but anyway he says -- oh yes, here we are. It's on page 1100. He says: "We are now building" we quote: "We are now building into literally hundreds of towns and villages in Manitoba access roads from the highways up to a total mileage of our miles free of cost so that they may have proper access to their towns and villages in general on the same basis as the highway which they left. It's not always possible but that is the general rule. If it is a gravel highway then the access road is gravel; if it is an asphalt highway then again the access road is asphalt.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the policy has changed from that of five years ago on access roads, because both of the access roads that I referred to, that is, the one leading from PTH No. 4 into Franklin, from PTH No. 5 into Birnie, they're both good asphalt roads, and it would appear from what I have just read that the access road then should be asphalt. And then, as well, Mr. Chairman, I think we should know how many miles of access road that this government has built because five years ago it was reported to us that they had built roads into, quote again: "literally hundreds of towns and villages in the province," so that in the last five years we must have built roads now into thousands of towns and villages in the province, if we have that many. And then, I'm wondering what is the limit that the province will go into this regard? I'm referring Mr. Chairman to the distance that a village or town has to be to a PTH to qualify

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)...for an access road. I understand -- well from the report I have read the figure of 4 miles is given. I believe that has now been amended to 5 miles or 5-1/2 miles.

The Throne Speech of 1962 Mr. Chairman -- I haven't got it before me, but I recall that a statement was made therein in regard to 100 percent roads and the inference was that this government intended to take over a number of secondary highways in the province and be 100 percent responsible for their upkeep and maintenance. I said at that time that the Neepawa-Carberry road I believe was the first such road declared under that program. The Neepawa town council received a letter notifying them that as of April 1st the Neepawa-Carberry road -- that is April 1, 1962 -- the Neepawa-Carberry road would be taken over by the province. I would like to know how many other roads have qualified for what is, for the want of a better term, 100 percent road.

Then again Mr. Chairman, last year quite a healthy discussion took place on the estimates in regard to a bridge south of Rossendale that nobody could seem to pinpoint and in fact I think that the report showed that it had been paid for twice or something of that nature. Now I have not paid a visit to the bridge, to the site of the bridge. I have discussed the bridge with certain farmers who live in the area but, so far as I can gather, there seems to be a bridge across the Assiniboine River south of Rossendale and no road leading to it and used very very little by anyone. I think that this should be cleared and I think too that if it is not, then is this the new policy of the government, that is, to build a bridge first and then build the road into it afterwards? I'm tempted to say this in light of a meeting that took place in Glenboro about July, I believe, in which my honourable friend was on his holidays at the time I think and could not attend the meeting but there were no less than four members of the House present. Madam Speaker was there and the Honourable Minister without Portfolio was there and the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne was there at the head table and I was there at the back bench as usual, listening to what they had to say, but this bridge -- this famous bridge was discussed. Perhaps Mr. Chairman I should tell you the purpose of the meeting first. It was in regard to what is known as the proposed Highway 28 Association. There is an association known as such and the object of that association is to build a highway from U. S. 281 south of Cartwright through to Neepawa, and it would connect up with No. 5 Highway, and naturally this association, which has been in existence for some ten or fifteen years or more, wanted to know how we were getting along with this road from Carberry over to Cartwright and someone at that meeting -- not someone, some several persons at that meeting raised this subject of the unknown bridge down south of Rossendale and said that maybe the best way to get this Highway 28 underway would be to build a bridge down there and then we would find the road into it sooner or later, or either move the bridge from Rossendale and put it south of Carberry somewhere but anyway, let's get on with this highway 28; but Mr. Chairman I don't know whether it was the result of what was said at that meeting or before or since, I notice that it is the intention of the government to do some work on this proposed highway this year. I believe it is limited to work. It's on Page 5 halfway down, Cartwright-Carberry -- Carberry south to Assiniboine River Valley and then nature of work -- Assiniboine River bridge and approaches, so I guess they are going to put in a bridge there, I take it by this. It won't be necessary for them to move the other bridge, and I'm glad to see that.

I am disappointed though, Mr. Chairman, in light of the headlines in the Neepawa Press that my honourable friend was not in the position to answer the question that I put to him before the Orders of the Day on Friday because as I said then, and repeat it again, that the Neepawa Press of Friday March 13th -- my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works hit the headlines in the Neepawa Press and it says, "The Minister is to reveal the route of the Carberry road next week." That was last week and I didn't catch what he said when I asked this question on Friday, but I thought he said that he didn't know what I was talking about, or I didn't know what I was talking about or something of that kind -- (Interjection) -- We are both right on both counts. Well maybe now he is in a position to reveal the route of the Carberry road.

On the blue sheet, the program that is before us, I notice that there is -- the government intends to -- Page 5 again, Carberry-Neepawa, miles 9.0 miles, Wellwood corner north. Now Mr. Chairman, I don't think for a minute that the government intends to build a road north from the Wellwood corner, not straight north from what we call the Wellwood corner surely,

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)...because that would take you straight -- that would come out about 5 miles east of Neepawa and take you all through the community pasture but I guess what they mean, what I would like to know, I guess what they mean is that they are going to go about 4 or 5 miles west of the Wellwood corner. Now if we could just pin the Wellwood corner down as being that corner where the Carberry road now goes west and then if my honourable friend would tell me how many miles west that he intends to go, then I can figure out where the Carberry road is going to go -- (Interjection) -- That's right, now I want to know whether -- will it be four or five miles west, and then I can tell; then I'll know. I'd like to know whether it is four or five -- (Interjection) -- It might be an idea.

Mr. Chairman, I too would like to have a little more information on the proposed work for the Town of Neepawa. I know my honourable friend had several delegations in to see him in regard to certain excavation and blacktopping within the town limits of Neepawa. There is an item here somewhere. I can't find it at the moment. Number 5, I suppose. No, I can't find it but I would like a little more explanation on that. Then too, Mr. Chairman, I thought my honourable friend said last year, a year ago now, that I would have to wait one more year to get that section of PTH No. 5 from Neepawa to Eden re-surfaced. I thought he said I'd have to wait one more year, last year. And looking on the sheet that is before us I'm disappointed that it isn't on here although I must say that I'm thankful for what is on here. I'm always thankful for small mercies and last year I think I said that I was like the late Honourable Member for Rhineland, there didn't seem to be a dime for Gladstone; this year there is several dimes for Gladstone and I'm very happy about that. Now perhaps my honourable friend could give me the answers to some of these questions before we decide whether he should be paid or not.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I might as well get them out of the way, seeing as how the Honourable Member for Gladstone thinks they affect my salary drastically. First of all, I might say that, for his information, I took two weeks holidays last summer and I probably accomplished more work in the two weeks that I had holidays than some people do working for some considerable period, but that's beside the point. When I did get back there was some days I had more to do than write letters and maybe I was a while catching up on my correspondence.

He asked about access roads. The limit is five miles which I think if he looks back on Hansard, I think I told him last year. He enquired as to the work being done on Franklin and Birnie access, grade and gravel is correct for this year. They will receive a surface at some future date. He talks about provincial roads and as of recently, all of the old 100 percent roads are now provincial roads; the ones which the province had built and maintained are now provincial roads. It has taken us from the time that the legislation was introduced, I guess it's two years ago, allowing for the classification 'provincial roads,' it's taken us approximately that period of time to prepare the legal description so that the necessary Orders-in-Council could be passed to proclaim those roads as provincial roads and whether or not the Carberry-Neepawa was the first one, I'm not aware.

He talks about the Lavenham Bridge and there certainly has been some discussions on it. I've talked to some people down there that think it's a pretty important bridge. I've talked to quite a number of people who say they use it. I've talked to quite a number of people who feel that the accusation that it's not needed is somewhat less than the truth. However, I'm not saying that. The bridge is there. There is a road to it. It's true there are better roads in the Province of Manitoba, and if the honourable member keeps on talking the way he is it might well be that there will be a better road to it by the time we're finished, but the road is there. It's a market road. He speaks about the meeting in July and which I was on holidays. I think that if he was at the meeting I sent my regrets that I couldn't be there because I had a son who was going through surgery in the hospital. I have family obligations. They may not mean too much to the Honourable Member for Gladstone, but they certainly mean quite a bit to me.

The Neepawa Press headline which he knows so well -- I had never seen of it nor heard of it until he mentioned it. I don't recall ever having told anybody that I would announce this week that the location of the road was in any one particular spot and I'm still not in a position to release the location. I can tell the honourable member that as far as I know the road will go from Wellwood Corner either four or five miles west and north from one location or the other.

The Neepawa access he inquired about -- the work that's contemplated is the-excavation of

(Mr. Weir, cont'd)... the area that has concerned the people of Neepawa for some considerable period of time and it will be prepared for surfacing probably next year as he has indicated and I think there's a pretty fair possibility that there will be a major blacktop project in the Neepawa area next year. I think that, Mr. Chairman, sums up the majority of the comments that the Honourable Member for Gladstone asked. Oh, he also asked for the number of miles of access highways, Mr. Chairman. I looked. I thought I had it with me but I can't find it. My guess would be that it's 233 miles serving 243 communities or something that. I'll attempt to get accurate information.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, there was one question that -- perhaps I didn't ask it clearly, but in regard to a town that would qualify as an access town, that is a town or village or city that -- you have said that it must be within five miles, but is there not another consideration in regard to the size that it must be? That is, if there's two or three elevators and a buyers' station there I don't suppose it would qualify. And then, (2) would the government not consider a town, say, that was six or seven miles from a PTH highway provided the municipality paid the last two or three miles? Let the province pay the first five miles and the municipality pay the remainder if necessary.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, the answer -- and I think I did say five miles -- and the answer to would we go the first five the answer is, no, not at the present time. We're attempting to get the access roads all developed to the five-mile limit and they're coming along fairly well. The question of the size of the community, the size does make a difference when it comes to the standard because with the type of travel that's on it the standard of asphalt is sometimes in the -- in recent years been in the asphalt surface treatment or the stage construction which I spoke about I believe last year of the heavy gravel base and the asphalt treatment on top. I think that covers his questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I just hurriedly looked over the schedule that we have for this coming year, and you will recall that I said that the amount of highway construction that is being done by the government is falling from year to year, that I expected that last year's below '62. Well, I just made a hurried calculation here, and here is what I come up with for this coming year, and you will note that it's away below what we did in '62. In grading in '62 there's 151.1 miles; '64-65 there's 159. Graveling has dropped from 344 to 260; base course from 160 to 87.7; bituminous mat 434.5 in '62 is dropping to 182. And that's the expensive part. Dropped by more than 50 percent. So I was right when I said the amount of construction that's going on in this province is gradually going down and it won't be long before we'll be about at the level of about 1953.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would just check the standards he would find out that there's quite a difference in the kind of work that is being done.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Ah, but Mr. Chairman, surely the Honourable Minister doesn't expect us to take that too seriously, because any construction, on any continuous construction -- take on No. 5, for example, where the former government had done a piece of No. 5 and then this government carried it on to its completion. The road may be a little wider on the shoulders; your centre strip of blacktop is uniform right throughout. Now, if the Minister wants to tell the committee that it's better construction, higher standard, I disagree with him because the old portions of No. 5 are standing up better than the new portions are and I think the way the road stands up is an indication of how it has been constructed. I would refer him to No. 10 up around Erikson. We know what standard of construction there was on that piece by this government. It looks good but it goes to pieces, and we've got other parts of road built by this government that are beginning to heave, and very badly too, and he may give us a reason for it but he can't tell me anything about the standards. I'll give him credit for only one difference in the standards, that the road is wider on the shoulders and looks a little better, but insofar as standing up to traffic is concerned it is not better.

MR. WEIR: I challenge that, Mr. Chairman, and as an example of some of the standards, if he would have a look at the portion of No. 5 from Neepawa north that the Honourable Member for Gladstone has been asking to have rebuilt for the last three years to my knowledge.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: miles I'll have to give him credit for, but I'd also like to tell him that that road has been there longer than the piece between Neepawa and Gladstone, and that piece which is only a couple of years old is already beginning to heave and drop very very

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)...seriously. It wouldn't surprise me at all, Mr. Chairman, if within the next two years he'll have to reconstruct more than three miles of this particular road.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, since the honourable members have seen fit to range far and wide under the Minister's salary, I feel that there are a few matters which I may as well put before the Minister at this time.

I get the distinct impression that insofar as this government's access road program is concerned, it has ground to a halt virtually. That is to say that the present policy of the government with regard to access roads seems to be that they are going to take it slowly now and wait perhaps three or four or five years until the floodway is completed. Now, there may be reasons for them taking this attitude. Perhaps they don't really have that attitude; I don't know; but if they do, I can see perhaps one or two reasons but I also want to say that those towns, villages and hamlets that have been led to expect that an access road would be provided or constructed within a short time have good cause to be disappointed. If you compare the access roads program for last year, this year, I don't -- it's really difficult to find anything substantial. The Member for Gladstone seems to be happy because one or two villages in his area have had an access road or are scheduled to have an access road built. Good luck to him, but I do know of one village, the village of Cook's Creek, has been after this Minister and his predecessor in that office for some considerable time to have an access road built. I see there's nothing in the estimates for it. I would presume that they're being thought about at least by the Minister. Of course in that particular case he would put forward the argument, I suppose, that they are more than five miles from a provincial trunk highway, but since the Village of Oakbank is going to have, according to these estimates, their access road to Highway 15, with bituminous mat and asphalt, I believe -- yes -- then from Cook's Creek to Oakbank the connection could be made and it would be a convenient connection and it would be under the five-mile limit.

And while we're talking about the five-mile limit, I want to say to the Minister that there's no good reason why it should be kept arbitrarily at that figure. It seems to me that six miles, being the distance of one township, is the more logical figure to strike -- six miles -- and then of course when a village does have some very good attraction for tourists -- and we're trying to attract more and more tourists to this province -- even if it's seven or eight miles, we should think seriously about the construction of an access road. In the case of Cook's Creek I think I pointed out to the Minister on many occasions that it has the largest Byzantine style architected church in Canada and it certainly is a tourist attraction for a stranger coming to the area. It's really high time that an all-weather road, a good all-weather road were constructed in there, and I suggest that he think seriously about making the connection up with the Village of Oakbank which will have now a high standard access road of its own.

And then I think what is a very important point to draw to his attention is that Highway 59 in the estimates for this year, or the road program, we see that there is going to be 9.8 miles of four-lane highway constructed from the north perimeter north. This will be the new 59 four-lane -- 9.8 miles. Then we also notice that there will be 1.3 miles widened to four lanes from Marion Street to Nairn Avenue, which will really improve the traffic carrying quality of Highway 59 in that particular area.

But here's the point, Mr. Chairman. If this government, or this department is going to construct 11 miles of four-lane highway on PTH 59, why not get with it and do the rest so that Highway 59 will become a safe arterial highway? At the present time it is a monstrous safety hazard and I would think that if you are going to improve it so greatly -- as is obvious your four-lane is a tremendous improvement -- if you're going to do it in patches, why not do the little bit extra and convert the whole road into the most safe kind of arterial highway? I have had many people tell me that that road during weekdays, and especially in the winter, is the most monstrous road to drive on because of the heavy truck traffic on that road and the constant high volume of traffic using that highway.

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