

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 22, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STEWART E. MCLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General (Dauphin)): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their sixth report.

Your Committee has considered Bills: No. 58, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1; No. 111, The Commissioner of Northern Manitoba Affairs Act; No. 122, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills: No. 97, An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act; No. 105, An Act to establish a Commission to Recommend the Reorganization of Boundaries of Local Government Units; No. 109, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act; No. 110, An Act to amend Certain Provisions of the Statute Law and to correct Certain Typographical Errors in the Statutes; No. 16, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; No. 75, An Act to amend The Municipal Act; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. MCLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the report of the committee be received.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, is this up to and including -- yes, this is a question before the Orders of the Day and in regard to the question here. Does this report include everything that was dealt with this morning in committee?

MR. MCLEAN: All Bills that the committee decided to recommend to the House.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, if I might ask a subsequent question. What about the Bills that the committee decided not to report to the House? Will there be anything said about them or not?

MR. MCLEAN: They're not reported.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the report of the committee be not received with respect to Bill No. 75, that Bill No. 75 be referred back to the committee for further consideration.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, members of the committee who were present at the time that Section 46 of this Bill No. 75 was discussed this morning will realize why I make this motion. The reason that I do so is because I want to take this opportunity to protest once again about what I believe to be an unfairness to the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie in the provision that is made for paying grants to lands that are taken for provincial waterways.

I think it is unnecessary for me to argue once again the points on which I base my belief that this is unfair because they are generally well known. Let me simply reiterate once again though, that if it is felt that to pay taxes for three years when the land is being taken out of the tax assets of the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie in perpetuity, then surely at least it would be fair to ask them to bear the brunt of only a portion of that loss of taxes inasmuch as other municipalities, including the City of Winnipeg - Greater Winnipeg and other municipalities, receive more benefit from the works involved than the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie does.

So I make this motion, Madam Speaker, in order to once again bring that question before the House.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House - the motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the report of the committee be not received with respect to Bill No. 75, but that Bill No. 75 be referred back to the committee for further

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd)... consideration. A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Paulley, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak and Wright.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 12; Nays, 33.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Attorney-General, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education.....

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the report of the committee be not received with respect to Bill 100, but that the committee be instructed to reconsider Bill 100.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside that the -- (Interjection) -- The Clerk informs me that Bill 100 was not reported.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if I may on a point of order, that was the reason for my question to the Attorney-General. Normally, as I recall it, when Bills are considered in committee and they are not accepted in committee, the report of the committee states that such and such bills were considered but are not reported. Now that was not done, so by inference then, the fact that it is not included in the report of the committee, the fact that it considered in the committee, by inference the report is saying that it was turned down. Now I can't see of any other vehicle for my honourable friend to bring the matter before the House except by moving such a motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Attorney-General, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the report of the committee be received.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, are we not going to have any explanation of this procedure, because surely - surely this House must be informed of what happens to the bill.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I think probably that the member can obtain the consideration that he wants if he re-words his motion. It seems to me if he said something to the effect that the report of the committee be not received but that the committee be instructed to reconsider or to look again at that bill, he would probably be in order. It's the form of the wording that I think is inaccurate.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on a point of order if I may, the original wording was that the report of the committee be not received with respect to Bill 100, but that the committee be instructed to reconsider Bill 100. Well if the only change that is necessary is to remove "with respect to Bill 100," then the motion would read, "that the report of the committee be not received, but that the committee be instructed to reconsider Bill 100." I presume that would be in order.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend doesn't usually apply to me for any advice as to whether a matter is in order or not -- (Interjection) -- Neither does the Speaker. I merely offer my opinion. Madam Speaker will have to rule.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, but you did receive some gratuitous advice a moment ago and I was merely following up on it.

MR. ROBLIN: good advice from my honourable friend too. I think we're all entitled to make our remarks on the rules within the regulations of the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion before the House...

MR. SHOEMAKER: Perhaps it could be dealt with - I'm speaking on a point of order now - in this fashion, that when the Honourable the Attorney-General makes his next report to the House, he could say that certain bills are not to be reported and I could speak on it at that time. I don't insist that I speak on it now.

MR. MCLEAN: Madam Speaker, I think so as not to mislead the Honourable Member for Neepawa-Gladstone, I could not make such a report. The report as it is in your hands is correctly - as I understand it - before you, in terms of the work that was done by the committee.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, Beauchesne does make provision for referral back to the committee for reconsideration

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... of any matter which was within the power of the committee to consider, and if the committee did not consider that matter, then it is within the power of the Assembly to re-instruct, as I understand Beauchesne, to reconsider a matter from the committee. I can't see any difficulty at all. I think that the motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone is perfectly in order, that the committee is giving -- the House is giving instructions for the committee to reconsider some action which it did in effect take, and surely to goodness in a democracy the senior body or the supreme body, which is this Legislature, has the direct right to instruct a sub-committee or a committee of the House to take a second look at some action that they've taken, and Beauchesne, I'm sure, Madam Speaker, makes ample provision for you to accept the motion as proposed by the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, on a point of order, we had exactly the same thing in the dying minutes of the Session a few years ago on a sports bill that was reconsidered - exactly the same thing - and there was no trouble there at all.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, would it be in order then if I asked unanimous consent of the House to withdraw the first motion that I put if it was not in order and put this one that I now propose. I think the Honourable the First Minister has - this is what he has suggested really.

MR. ROBLIN: Would my honourable friend be kind enough to read the new motion that he proposes.

MADAM SPEAKER to the Clerk of the House please.

Has the honourable member leave of the House to withdraw his first motion? -- Agreed. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the report of the committee be not received, but that the committee be instructed to reconsider Bill No. 100.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I dealt with this particular Bill at some length in committee this morning and I certainly do not intend to re-read the brief that I read to the committee this morning, but inasmuch as I consider the health and the welfare of the people, not only in my constituency but in every constituency, to be the first consideration of the government and the first consideration of the elected representatives, I feel rather strongly about the Bill. Because what the Bill and the brief both say in essence is this, that they believe that this is one way to encourage and attract medical staff, doctors, dentists, nurses, and so on to the area, and we suggest, and the Neepawa Area Development Corporation and the Neepawa Chamber of Commerce and the Town Council, in consultation with the doctors, feel that this is one way that they could attract adequate staff to our area.

Now they have examined other ways of trying to erect a clinic and they have concluded that private enterprise can not really be encouraged to do this, because in order to encourage and keep the doctors in the medical profession in an area, you have to keep their costs at a minimum. Now it is a well established fact that in the northern States in particular, and in certain places in Canada and no doubt certain places in Manitoba, that communities are now offering doctors fringe benefits to come and settle in the areas, and we have lost in Neepawa three or four doctors because of the fringe benefits and attractions that have been made to them by other areas.

Now, as I explained in the committee, even if we do pass this bill - even if we do - first, before anything can be done by the provisions set out in it, the Town Council must agree that this is in the best interests of all of the people in the Town of Neepawa. That must first be done; and then secondly, they must proceed with a by-law for the approval. Then all of the people in the Town of Neepawa would then be given a chance, and in the wisdom of the Town Council, the wisdom of the medical profession, and the ratepayers who have to pay it, if they all say yes, we will proceed to build the clinic; if they say no, we won't. But I think in a democracy, at least we should give the people a chance to decide for themselves whether (a) they want it; and (b) if they want it bad enough to pay for it.

Now as I explained, Madam Speaker, in the committee this morning at great length - and I apologize for taking up so much time in the Committee - the proposal and the briefs made by the Neepawa Area Development Corporation and the Chamber of Commerce suggest that it will not in fact cost the ratepayers any money providing - providing that a grant would be forthcoming from the government for that part of the building that was intended to house the health unit offices.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)..

But I suggest to the Assembly and to you, Madam Speaker, that even if there was a \$5,000 deficit every year, even if it turned out that way, that it would be less than a mill - it would be less than one mill. One mill in Neepawa produces 57 hundred and some odd dollars and surely this isn't too much to ask of the people if it will in fact assure the area that we will have an adequate supply of doctors, dentists, and medical staff in total. There are many towns and villages and municipalities in the province who include one mill for social services.

However, the information that I have before me suggests that there will be a slight profit, and I must say that I was delighted when the vote came before the committee this morning to find that several of the members of the committee on the government side of the House voted with me on this particular bill. I said in committee then, Madam Speaker, and I will say it again now, if the government has any other alternative whereby the people of this province can be assured that they will have adequate doctors, dentists, and medical staff, and if they would get up in the House and say this is what we are going to do to assure you that you will have this staff, then we don't need to proceed with this bill.

As I said in committee this morning too, maybe a municipality or a town corporation have no legal responsibility to assure their populace of an adequate supply of medical profession, but certainly I feel and they feel that they have a moral obligation to do that. And so, Madam Speaker, I hope that those members of the government that voted with me this morning will vote with me again now and that we will allow the people of Neepawa the opportunity to decide for themselves whether or not they want to proceed with the clinic.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I wish to make a few comments in connection with this bill. I sat in the committee this morning where we had a full discussion on it and I am just amazed why the government will turn down a request like this. These people are trying to help themselves and certainly we subscribe to the principle of helping people to help themselves. This is not a request for welfare in any way; they're willing to pay the whole load themselves, as is pointed out in the bill, and certainly we should try to accommodate them in this way in passing this legislation.

It's needless for me to bear on the point that there is a heavy turnover as far as doctors are concerned in the rural area. The rural part of this province is crying out for medical help as well as dental help, and if these people are trying to bring about a situation where they will be able to attract medical people and dental people for their own community, I think it is up to us, as a duty, to accommodate them in the passage of this bill.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wish to lend the support of the New Democratic Party to the contention of the Honourable Member for Gladstone that this bill should be reconsidered by the committee, and may I commend the Council of Neepawa and the citizens of Neepawa in their endeavours to do something that the government of Manitoba has apparently rejected, that is to make adequate provisions for the medical care of the citizens of Manitoba.

During a discussion of another resolution that we still have before us dealing with the question of Medicare and the provision of medical services, the Honourable the Minister of Health said to the House that the government of Manitoba does not agree with compulsory aspects of Medicare. Well I suggest to my honourable friend if he believes this, if indeed he was speaking for the government of Manitoba when he said that, that here he has an opportunity of supporting voluntary contributions to the provision of Medicare, because here is a community that is most anxious to have enabling legislation passed in this House so that they can provide for a medical centre in their community.

So I want to know, what is the attitude of government? Where exactly do they stand? Here we have the Minister of Health telling us that he doesn't believe in the compulsory aspects of Medicare, that he is going to do the best he can on behalf of the government of Manitoba to get the Federal Government to change its plan of a 90 percent acceptance of coverage before we enter into a Medicare Plan - my honourable friend the Minister of Health wants to reduce it at least to 75 percent - and here we have a community that is prepared on a voluntary basis to assess themselves on a mill rate basis to provide for a Medicare Centre, to do something that this government has refused to do. Now, Madam Speaker, I ask, where in the name of all conscience is there any consistency at all in the position the government is taking, or a majority of the members of this House? You might say to me properly, Madam Speaker, why do I say government? I say government, Madam Speaker, because it was a Minister of the Crown at the committee this morning who moved the bill be not reported - the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)...

What's he worried about? Is he worried because the people of Neepawa are going to pioneer in this field and show an example to the rest of the communities of Manitoba that will put the government deservedly to shame? Is this the attitude of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that he's afraid that the Town of Neepawa will be a pioneer, that my honourable friend might be in some predicament insofar as municipal assessments, mill rates, etc. are concerned, for a new departure. I say, Madam Speaker, if the people of Neepawa or any other community in Manitoba want to take up the slack created by the deficiencies of government at the provincial level, then let us give them the right and the opportunity. Community Medicare is nothing new. Community Medicare is in effect in Saskatchewan even though they have a Medicare scheme there. It is in effect in the Province of Ontario, even though they don't have at the present time a widespread coverage, although they are in the process, but it is in effect in Ontario.

So I say, Madam Speaker, that if the people of Neepawa are desirous of making provision to attract medical personnel, dental personnel, by the creation of a building and a medical service, why then should this government, through its Minister of Municipal Affairs, turn around and deprive the people of Neepawa? On the contrary, Madam Speaker, I say that this Assembly should pass a unanimous vote of appreciation to the citizens and the Council of Neepawa, and say to them in effect, "Thank goodness that we have a group of publicly-spirited individuals who collectively - I beg your pardon? --(Interjection)-- So I say, Madam Speaker, that we here in this Assembly, instead of curtailing the desires of the people of Neepawa, should give them accolades and peons of praise for doing something and picking up the slack of the government of the Province of Manitoba, and certainly, Madam Speaker, this matter should be referred back to the committee for reconsideration.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, first of all, let me say I believe I'm as much a free enterpriser as any member of this House, but I do know the problems that some of the smaller rural communities have in keeping and attracting doctors, and I do believe that the House should be indebted to the member and to the Town of Minnedosa for bringing the problem at least to the attention of the Legislature, because I think some solution to this problem must be looked at in the future. Now, I am critical of the bill as it stands, because while there's provision in the bill for raising the monies, there is no provision in the bill which will direct the recovery of the monies to return it to the -- so that the ratepayers eventually are not carrying the total load, because as the bill reads, the building could be used by doctors free of charge; there's nothing to cover the recovery. But I supported the bill in committee this morning, or rather that it be reported ... not reported, and I feel that the problem is pressing enough to support the motion at present before the House where the matter might get a little further attention and discussion by members of this House.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, there's no question that one of the more serious problems in rural Manitoba today is the retention of health personnel. This applies to doctors, dentists and nurses. My honourable friend the member for Gladstone, who presents this bill, represents the constituency immediately adjoining mine, and I know that the Town of Neepawa has the only dentist between there and the Town of Dauphin, and this is about 90 miles, and even then they only have one dentist, I believe, in Neepawa itself, to service a very large area. This is repeated throughout the Province of Manitoba. There is a very serious problem in this regard. It's inconceivable to me that the government would take the position that the Town of Neepawa, who is in good financial condition, decides that it wants to put this matter up to its ratepayers - the Council isn't suggesting that it have the sole authority itself to proceed with this; the Council is simply asking for the authority to submit this to the ratepayers of Neepawa for a decision by them as to whether or not they want to make this expenditure; they are doing this because they are convinced that this method will assist them in obtaining medical staff for their area - now how can the government possibly turn around and oppose that sort of a request? I cannot consider it, Madam Speaker, anything but supreme arrogance on the part of the government to tell the Town of Neepawa, who is merely asking for the authority to ask its ratepayers to do something like this for the benefit of the town, for the benefit of the health of the people, and the government turns it down and says, "No, you can't do it." At the same time, this government is asking this House to pass bills permitting the government to go and invest in a business of its own. They're asking us to pass that sort of legislation, and here is the Town of Neepawa, in good financial condition, realizing the problem that faces it, asking merely to be enabled to ask its ratepayers to vote whether or not they want to proceed to do something of this sort, and the government turns it down. Madam Speaker, it's an inconceivable action of supreme arrogance on the part of this government.

April 22, 1966

MR. MCLEAN: Madam Speaker, while I don't suppose that I can reach the heights of eloquence of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the New Democratic Party, perhaps a few facts wouldn't go amiss in this debate, and form part of the public record. There is no question of our interest as members of the Legislature or as citizens of the Province of Manitoba in the provision of adequate health facilities for all the people of the Province of Manitoba, and the concern that all of us have about the real problem that exists in the attraction of qualified, trained health personnel to all parts of the province. It doesn't follow, of course, as was remarked in committee this morning, that merely because you have a building or facilities that that in itself will attract people, but there is no question of our concern and our interest. And surely, Madam Speaker, it would be really asking too much to follow the line of reasoning of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, who suggests that we are not interested in health services. What in heaven's name have we been doing for the past eight years, with the tremendous expansion and explosion of hospital services in every part of the Province of Manitoba, millions of dollars of money spent for that purpose in the extension of health units which are -- and the argument is that these facilities that are provided to diagnostic units assist doctors and medical people to do their work, and just look at the record.

And in all this, and I need not to repeat it, but I really wanted to make three points for the purpose of the record here, one of which I made this morning in committee, and some one or two others which I'd like to place on the record here at this time. I became very concerned this morning in committee, although I was the chairman of the committee, at the number of times that reference was made by the Honourable Member for Neepawa-Gladstone in his presentation, to a provincial grant being provided for this project, if, as and when it were allowed, and I felt that it was incumbent upon me to say that I, for one, had never heard of any policy under which a grant would be made available for such a project, and I say it now again so that it will be on the record, because it would surely be a disservice to the people of Neepawa to suggest by our proceedings here that all they had to do was to vote for a debenture by-law in order to obtain a grant for the construction of these facilities in the Town of Neepawa, so without saying what policy may be in the future, I think it should be quite clear that that would be perhaps misleading if that impression were to be left with the people of the town.

It was not also, Madam Speaker, I think, adequately explained in committee what examination, if any, had been made for the purpose of providing clinical facilities for the doctors in the hospital which is at Neepawa. Now I speak of this without knowing the detailed arrangements, but I'm well aware that in many hospitals in parts of the province that facilities of this nature are provided. What attempt has been made to avail themselves of that possibility?

Then again, Madam Speaker, it is known, and I would suggest that it would be quite possible for the Town of Neepawa to provide a civic building by borrowing the money with approval of its ratepayers for the purpose of the town, and if they wish to include space that can be rented to the doctors, that, I would think, might be quite in order. It's certainly a possibility that could be examined and we heard nothing of it this morning. I give as an illustration a situation with which I am well acquainted, in which the Town of Dauphin raised money by debenture, purchased a building, a civic building, in which are located the civic offices of the town, and in which space is rented out to two other tenants, one of whom is the Province of Manitoba for the purpose of the Department of Highways, and I'm convinced - in fact, absolutely convinced - that we acted completely within the law under those circumstances. And finally, Madam Speaker, I think that it has not been adequately explained why the Community Development Organization - I'm not just certain of the correct name - which is established and which we understand has authority to borrow money for the purposes of community development and so on, it would not . . . that their corporation that they have in Neepawa would not interest itself in this project and could not adequately provide the facilities which are required through the medium of that corporation, and with the assistance, financial assistance, by way of loans which is available to such a corporation through the provisions that have been by the Province of Manitoba.

So, Madam Speaker, what I want to raise here, and particularly to have on the record, are the important points that I believe have not been sufficiently explored, and indeed all of which may well offer the opportunity for the community, or the Town of Neepawa to provide full facilities with which we all agree. There's no difference of opinion - we agree that if this will be of assistance that none of us would deny them, I'm sure, that right. But we do not believe - I, for one, am a little concerned that these avenues of solution to the problem have

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) not been fully explored.

MR. P. J. McDONALD (Turtle Mountain): Madam Speaker, I do not have the privilege of sitting in on this committee but I can't help but feel that we are kind of forgetting the speeches that have been made in this House for the last three months about the poor people, and the poor widow, and the poor pensioner, and now we are going to pass bills that will put more expense on these people.

I come from a constituency that has three medical centres and every one of these have been financed within the town by the people in the town, and have no problem at all, and in my opinion, while I can't help but compliment the Member for Gladstone for trying to do what he can for his community, I do feel that this is not the right answer because I'm quite sure that it's an insult to the Town of Neepawa that we have to have money from outside interests, or from the municipalities, to bring in doctors, the very men that make more money probably than anybody else. I know that the Town of Deloraine has got new doctors; Boissevain has a new clinic and so has Killarney; and I feel quite sure that if they looked around Neepawa they would still get this support and there's many ways the money could be raised without going to the poor old taxpayer and the old widow.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I am willing to admit the validity of all the arguments raised by the Honourable the Attorney-General, but I think that they do not have relevancy in respect of this particular bill. These arguments that he is using would be valid arguments for the ratepayers to use in either opposing or supporting any by-law, but all we're called upon to do here is to determine whether or no the people of Neepawa have sufficient good sense upon which to determine their own destiny. That's all we're asked to do. All the arguments we do raise, just as I say, they're valid, but they're valid in respect of the discussion which would take place in Neepawa as to the pros and cons of the by-law to be submitted, but as far as we're concerned here, all we're asked to do is to give the people of Neepawa an opportunity to vote on this by-law, and I think that if you look at it from that light we are very foolish to deny them that right.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I don't want to get into this debate at length, but as one who ventured into rural Manitoba with a black bag and three kids, I think I know something of the -- (Interjection) -- I've been in relative retirement since then. That's all right. Well, six little Tories to worry the Grits.

Madam Speaker, I do believe that the -- and if I give some thought to this today for what it's worth, the thing I think when you look at legislation like this you want to think of the entire province and its effect, because what is proper by legislation through legislature in the House, surely it should apply across the province, but we have so many situations. I can see, for example, nothing wrong as the Attorney-General has said, in the Town of Neepawa building a civic centre - a public building - for doctors' offices, and if it is the desire - and I defer to my colleague - for example, of the Department of Health that they have no room in the hospital for them, they have in the past developed Health Unit facilities downtown. Health Unit offices in Portage are rented on the main street. It depends on the local situation.

But what concerns me in a growing, thriving town as Neepawa, there's nothing to assure us that if this building is built that doctors will in effect care to work together in the one building. -- (Interjection) -- No, they're a good bunch of fellows. They all get along well together, but experience across the province is that in general physicians like to be away from the hospital during the day to receive their patients, and not congregate everything in the hospital area, and it would appear to me that the Town of Neepawa has the authority now to develop this very kind of concept that they have in mind.

MR. SHOEMAKER: going to close the debate or

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, before that happens I would like to just say a word in reply to some of the points that were mentioned by the Honourable the Attorney-General. He referred to the provincial grant and I certainly would accept his assurance that so far as he knows, no one has committed the government to making a grant, and that quite probably applies to the other Ministers as well, but yet the fact remains that the folks who were considering this matter very carefully - and they were people who were knowledgeable on the subject - and members of the Town Council, members of the Chamber of Commerce, and others, made it a point to show in the estimated revenues of both plans that they submitted that they were expecting a government grant. Now, they evidently feel themselves that they have a basic proposition here that would appeal to the government, and I have no doubt that if they were given the opportunity to proceed with it that they likely would be able to persuade the

(MR. CAMPBELL con't.) government that they had something here that is worthy of support and that could be assisted.

The Honourable the Attorney-General says that it was not adequately explained why the Neepawa Area Development Corporation failed to carry out this project. I thought it was very completely explained in a very few words, because what the Honourable Member for Gladstone said in that connection was "they haven't got the money," and that's just as good an explanation as you can get, I'm sure, and perhaps they find it difficult to arrange to raise the money, but whether they should do it or whether they shouldn't do it, the fact is that the people who are most concerned and who are in a position to act in the matter, have held committee meetings and discussed this question for a long time and come up with a plan that to them seems to be sensible.

Now, if there are things to be explored recently, like more adequate provisions in connection with the hospital, or some other solution -- the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain says that he is sure that this isn't the right solution, but who's in the better position to know, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain or the people who were there on the ground? Members of the City Council, members of the Chamber of Commerce, members of the Development Corporation, they've looked at this question, Madam Speaker; they've studied it. They didn't just do this thing out of a clear sky. This is a problem to the area, not only to the Town of Neepawa but to a huge area surrounding there, and they've looked at it carefully and they think that this is something that's worthwhile, and they're prepared to put it before the people, the ratepayers of Neepawa, for a vote. Now what is fairer than that? And why in the world, Madam Speaker, should we here, who are not in possession of the facts that they are, who are not conversant with the local situation in the way that they are, why should we say them nay?

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, can I or can I not close the debate?

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. SHOEMAKER: The Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the motion of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone, that the Report of the Committee be not received, but that the Committee be instructed to reconsider Bill 100.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Lissaman, Molgat, Paultey, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Wright.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 15; Nays, 29.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Moved by the Honourable the Attorney-General, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motions

Introduction of Bills

Orders of the Day

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are read, I would like to have the opportunity of making a statement with respect to the negotiations which have been taking place between the government of the province and the government of Canada, respecting sharing of flood-fighting and associated costs as between the two governments, and I suppose members would not think it out of order for me to say that we have a distinguished visitor in our Gallery today, the Honourable Roger Teillet, who is a Minister of the Federal Cabinet, and in whose name it appears at the moment I am making a joint press statement on behalf of the government here and the government at Ottawa in respect to this matter. I should also say that I believe a similar statement has been, or is shortly to be in Ottawa.

Now the joint press statement reads as follows: "The Honourable Duff Roblin and the Honourable Roger Teillet today announced in Winnipeg that Mr. Roblin and the Honourable Mitchell Sharpe had discussed the sharing by Canada of the costs being incurred by Manitoba in fighting the current flood on the Red River, in constructing additional permanent dikes that

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) now appear to be required, and in the restoration of damaged property. The costs of these various necessary measures cannot be properly assessed until the waters recede, but it is evident that they will amount to some millions of dollars and be on a scale large enough to constitute a major emergency requiring federal assistance.

"An agreement was reached that Canada would, in accordance with past practice in such major emergencies, bear three-quarters of the various public costs associated with fighting the flood. Such costs would include, amongst others, those incurred in building and removing temporary dikes; in auxiliary pumping, barging and boats; establishing and operating the flood headquarters and evacuation centres; and special sanitation and health measures. It would also include the cost necessarily incurred by public authorities in moving persons and livestock to safety, and to supporting persons away from their homes who are unable to arrange or pay for their own support.

"The Government of Canada will also, in accordance with past practice, bear three-quarters of the cost of constructing permanent dikes to protect a number of the communities in the Red River Valley which will not be safeguarded by the Red River Floodway, and which it may now be agreed warrant permanent protection of this nature. Federal officials will consult with provincial authorities on the specific requirements of this kind before decisions are reached on the location and scale of such work.

"Agreement in principle has been reached that Canada will also contribute to the meeting the costs of restoration of public works and installations that have been damaged by the flood. This will also be in accordance with past practice in major emergencies requiring federal assistance. Detailed surveys and discussions by federal and provincial engineers will be needed after the waters recede before the scale of the damage and the cost of making it good can be assessed. Manitoba has requested that these costs be shared in the same proportion as those for flood-fighting, and the Federal Government has agreed to consider this request.

"The Premier stated that it was the intention of the Government of Manitoba to provide assistance to the owners of flood-damaged homes, farm buildings and other small business properties, to assist them in meeting the cost of repairing and restoring these buildings, subject to defined scales and limits.

"Manitoba also intends to offer grants to farmers in the portion of the Red River Valley that was flooded in or since 1950, to assist them in providing dikes or other flood protection for their farm buildings. Mr. Roblin proposed that the Federal Government would share in these costs. Mr. Sharpe said that the Federal Government would give further consideration to this in the light of the situation as a whole, when it can be more fully assessed."

Madam Speaker, that is the end of the statement, and I think it fairly well outlines the state of the negotiations between the two governments in respect of this matter, that there is a firm federal commitment as to percentage with respect to flood-fighting and with respect to permanent protective measures. There is federal agreement to share in the cost of rehabilitation, but the exact extent of the federal participation in that respect is still to be settled.

And then there is the request of the Government of Manitoba that the Federal Government should share in the costs of aiding private individuals whose buildings have been caught in the flood waters, and in the costs of the protective measures we are proposing for individual farmsteads in the Red River Valley, and while there is no agreement on this at the present time, the Federal Government has undertaken to consider the situation later. I think it would be proper for me to say that I am grateful for the prompt way in which the federal authorities have dealt with the proposals of the Province of Manitoba. We haven't as yet got everything that we have been asking for, but it would be unbecoming, I feel, if I did not acknowledge in this Chamber the helpful and sympathetic spirit and the prompt manner in which our province were considered by the federal authorities, and I am happy to make that statement.

While I am on my feet, it would perhaps be appropriate also to say that in the course of the past few weeks there have been a number of rather difficult decisions to make, and a good many people have done a lot of hard work. And in the relation which the government has enjoyed with the municipal authorities, with the federal authorities - and I must especially mention the Army and EMO - with private citizens, we have nothing but grateful hearts for the splendid co-operation we received from everybody in every aspect of this matter, and I particularly want to give honourable mention to the civil servants of the Province of Manitoba who have worked unbelievable hours, and when my colleagues and I were able to make a decision on the certain measures to be carried out, were able to carry them through in a most expeditious,

April 22, 1966

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) efficient and effective manner. I must express my real gratitude to members of the public service of the province, and I feel the members of this House would be more than proud of the way in which they measured up to what was a nasty situation.

We have had no rain to speak of in the Red River Valley since March 4th. I call that "miracle weather" and I doubt it's an exaggeration. It is miracle weather. No rain in the Red River Valley to speak of, since March 4th. If we had had the rain which we had every right to expect, and of course which was taken into account by the forecast prepared by the American authorities and by our own, I probably wouldn't be standing here now making statements about a flood which we believe has had and reached its peak. I would probably be out on the dikes with the rest of the population dealing with the question at hand. It has been a remarkable combination of events that has kept the whole situation within the proportions that we have seen. And so when I make this statement, I just wanted to refer very briefly to these points, and to say that in all aspects of the matter, the people who are responsible for keeping the public informed - the press; the television; the radio people, and others, I think have handled their part of this - and the question of public information and public relations is extremely important - with discretion and tact and with accuracy, and I do wish to express the sincere thanks of the government to them as well.

Now I should say, Madam Speaker, that I hope to meet tomorrow afternoon at 3:00 p.m. in one of the rooms in this buildings, hopefully the one where the Law Amendments Committee meets, on the perhaps optimistic assumption it might be vacant by that time, but if not, somewhere else. I hope to meet at 3:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon in the Law Amendments room, with representatives of the municipalities, in order to translate the meaning of this press statement in terms of municipal responsibilities and also in terms of the assistance that we propose for individuals. And the invitation has been extended to those with whom we have been fighting the flood, to come to the meeting at 3:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, and to hear this statement represented in terms that affect the municipalities and private citizens, and of course as well, to solicit any assistance or advice we can from them as to the way in which we can in the most expeditious and prompt manner, dispose of this flood; remove the signs that have to be taken care of, and to put all parts of the province back on a regular footing.

It must be recognized that while these measures may start now in the Metropolitan area, they cannot yet start in the Red River Valley, because in the towns down in the Valley, particularly at St. Jean and Morris, we still have a difficult and taxing situation. Just because there is no water on the grounds of the Legislative Building is no reason to think that it's all hunky-dory (to use a common expression) in the rest of the Valley at the present, because it's not. We had a problem that might have become very serious at Morris just last night, in respect of dike failure. So while we are looking on the bright side and we will be talking about immediate action in the Metropolitan area, action with respect to those other towns must be delayed until the circumstances are a little more promising. However, we have settled dates, which have been agreed with the municipalities, for people to move back into their homes, and the regular life and conduct of the district to be resumed.

And so, Madam Speaker, although there may be questions that members might like to ask, and I hope they will have the opportunity to do so at this time, I have delivered the joint statement that has been agreed upon by the two governments, and I hope we can now get on with the business of restoring normal existence in the province.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I am sure that all of the people of Manitoba will be pleased and relieved to hear the statement that was made today. I think that it is only fitting that we should thank the Honourable the Minister of Veterans' Affairs who is with us today, and ask him to convey to the Federal Government the appreciation of the people of the province. The members of this House on occasion are inclined to take other position with regard to the Federal Government, and to be critical of some of their actions, but I think that when they do come to our assistance, as they have in this case, that it is only proper and fitting that we should express the thanks of the people of Manitoba, because undoubtedly a contribution of 75 percent is, in fact, a very worthwhile contribution to the province itself.

I would like to know from the First Minister some of the details of the proposals, and possibly we can have a question period, I hope, Madam Speaker. I would like to add my own words to those of the Premier with regard to the work that has been done by so many during the course of this flood. I have seen, in particular, the work that has been done by the Army and the Air Force because of the particular location in which I live, and I think that we cannot

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) be too highly complimentary of the way in which they have discharged their duty and I know this extends to all of the groups about which the First Minister spoke. The specific questions that I would like to hear, if I may, Madam Speaker, would be with regard to the assistance that will now be given to the municipalities: what will be the cost-sharing set-up insofar as the municipal governments are concerned; what will be the cost-sharing set-up insofar as individuals are concerned; and if the First Minister can tell us at this stage, how that will proceed.

I am pleased to see that there will be assistance insofar as permanent diking for some of the towns upstream from Winnipeg for whom the Floodway does not provide any protection, and I would hope that the work on this can start very soon. I gathered from the First Minister's statement that the assistance here is 75 percent as well, which I think was the assistance given after the 1950 Flood, if I remember correctly the terms of that agreement.

. continued on next page

April 22, 1966

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I would like to join with the Honourable the Premier and the Leader of the Official Opposition. I must say that I do agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it is all too rare that we can agree with the joint actions of the Province of Manitoba and the Dominion of Canada, and being one of those constituents of the Honourable Minister of Veterans' Affairs, even though in that great City of Transcona we were not subject to suffering as a result of the flood, may I say I appreciate the endeavours of all in respect of fighting the flood, and the contribution which is now going to be made jointly in order that the costs locally will be shared and will not be too heavy on any segment of the community as a whole. I, too, want to join in the tribute paid to the people who undertook to work on the dikes both here in Greater Winnipeg and throughout the Valley. It seems to me that we really ought to pay them supreme tribute. This year, of course, I was a little older than I was back in 1950 and wasn't able to go out and heave sandbags myself, but I appreciate the fact that many of succeeding generations went out and did a remarkable job, and I think, as was illustrated on a couple of occasions, while we sometimes may be critical of our younger people, in this, Madam Speaker, they really excelled and proved to the community that youth is not delinquent; when the occasion arises they will go and do their job.

Now the Honourable the Premier mentioned the fact that there will be joint action insofar as the erection of permanent dikes are concerned, and we welcome this too. The other day - I believe Saturday, Madam Speaker - you will recall that a resolution was passed unanimously here in the Assembly, a resolution sponsored by the Honourable Member for Morris, asking for an investigation on an international basis as to whether or not some steps could be taken to offset recurring floods, and I suggest, of course, that this will be proceeded with. But the thought arises in my mind, Madam Speaker, and a question I would like to direct to the Minister is, in the arrangement between Canada and Manitoba in the provision of building dikes, will consideration of the contents of the resolution that I refer to that was passed, be given consideration? That is, again, the question of the international aspect as to causes of recurring floods and whether or not -- I'm not suggesting any delay in a study of this proposition, but what cooperation, and will there be cooperation between the Federal Authority and the Provincial Authority and the authorities of the nation to the south of us, in order to offset recurrence if possible, and also what recommendations may be obtained insofar as the building of permanent dikes are concerned. So I'm happy to join the First Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, in saying "thank you" to Manitobans who were concerned with the flood, thank you to Canada for joining with Manitobans in absorbing the costs we Manitobans had to face as a result of this Red River of ours, which we love so much when it's tranquil and when it's just flowing through the City of Winnipeg and down through the Valley.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I too wish to take this opportunity of extending gratitude to the people of Manitoba and especially those that have been involved in doing this hard work in fighting the flood and keeping everything in shape. Certainly this has been a concern to us all and, to say the least, to the members of this Assembly. While I am also very grateful for the arrangements that have been made so far and that have progressed to the extent where we now know the percentage of assistance that we will be getting from the Federal Government, I do hope that the Provincial Government is successful in its future negotiations with the balance of the arrangements that are still pending, because a good number of the people in the affected area and a large number of the farmers in that area have disposed of their flocks, of their hogs and cattle, and had to dispose of them because of the flood situation, and they will have to acquire new stocks in order to get into business again, and they will need assistance, and I do hope that we can in some way give compensation so that they can again be set up in business for the future.

No doubt, with the flooding that is still going on, this means that a number of the farmers will be very late on their fields, that there will be a lot of late crops again for this particular area, and in so many cases where it happens the land gets sour and the prospects naturally for a good crop are not nearly as good. So this, I think, has to be borne in mind, that the people regardless, even if they get the compensation, there will be certain losses taken outside of the compensation.

I was also interested to hear the Honourable Premier mention that they're proposing permanent dikes, and I do hope that this will be of real value to the people in southern Manitoba. Have any plans been made so far? If the plans are advanced that far, I'd certainly be interested to see just what is intended in this connection in constructing permanent dikes.

Once more, I wish to thank all those that have been involved in fighting the flood, and I would, with the other members who have already spoken, thank the Federal Government for

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... coming to the rescue and giving us assistance in this matter.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I am sure that the people of Manitoba are going to be very very happy with the joint announcement made by the Premier of Manitoba and the Honourable Minister of Veterans' Affairs from Ottawa. I am sure that this announcement is a very very welcome one. I myself feel very very happy that my eight-year-old fight for permanent dike protection for towns and villages south of Winnipeg has crystallized successfully, and I'm sure that the people who have also fought for this, different levels of government south of Winnipeg, are also going to be very very happy.

We're indeed very happy that the Federal Government, our senior government, is picking up the greater part of the cost, that's three-quarters, and Manitoba will only pay 25 percent . . . , and I hope that when some protection is being considered for the people south of Winnipeg that our farmers are not forgotten, because they need the protection too. And a special thanks, I would say, should go to the Honourable Minister of Veterans' Affairs who is with us, because as we know this is not the first time that he has visited Manitoba since the flood threatened us, and I am sure that he is very happy also that his efforts, his concern, also crystallized successfully.

There is just one question that I would like to pose to the First Minister. Could the residents east of the Red River, that is, out of the Red River Valley, expect any financial relief in respect to the flood damages in their area, because there was considerable flood damage out of the Red River Valley in my constituency east of the Red River?

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I too want to add to the announcement in that it is most fitting that this aid is forthcoming, and I'd simply like to leave one other suggestion to the First Minister in that a good percentage of this land is going to be waterlogged for a long time, and when seeding time comes around a large percentage of these farmers will be unable to go on the land. Now we have army helicopters, and, as I understand it, they have to be given a certain amount of practice in flying, and I think it would be an excellent proposition if the helicopters were used for an experimental basis to seed those areas where the farmers cannot go on the land with the regular equipment. Now this may seem rather farfetched, Madam Speaker, but the army does have to carry out manoeuvres and practice, and this may well be an area that would assist those farmers that cannot possibly get their land into crop, and this would be one way of at least making some attempt to give them some return on that land that has been flooded for an unusually long period of time.

MR. ROBLIN: If those are all the members that wish to offer comment, Madam Speaker, may I be permitted the indulgence of the House in making a few remarks in reply to what we've heard. I guess the Honourable Minister for Veterans' Affairs heard the suggestion about helicopters, and seeing they all belong to the Federal Government maybe he'd like to take that particular point under consideration. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, doesn't look to me as if he really thought this was a very good way of seeding the land. I think he rather holds the view that it's all too likely that this water will be off in time for normal agricultural methods, and I'm quite sure that will be the case.

I want to make it clear that the question of government aid for private losses at the moment is limited to the damage to capital installations like buildings and farmsteads - farm homes and farmsteads and the like - and we do not at the present envisage public aid going beyond that particular aspect of assistance to private persons. We hope that the whole of the Red River Valley, in which I include not only the main stem of the river but its tributaries, will be considered in connection with this shared cost proposal. It is my understanding - although I must say that it has not been said; this point has not been sufficiently covered by any written document - it is my understanding that view is also the Federal view, that it is the Red River Valley and its tributaries. Although this is something that may be questioned at a later date, Manitoba will take the position that the area should be the Valley and its tributaries in connection with this matter.

I can assure my honourable friend the Member for Radisson that we intend to follow the decision of the House in respect to the resolution previously referred to, and that while I have no means of speaking for anyone else, I can say that the Government of Manitoba will certainly give its full cooperation in respect of that matter.

I'd say to the Honourable Member for Emerson that he must not think that he alone was concerned in connection with what protection could be offered to localities in the Red River Valley. The Royal Commission that investigated this whole question was unable to recommend any type of protection at all for the Red River Valley. They examined ring dikes, and they

April 22, 1966

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd)... raised grave and serious objections, and it is largely on the basis of that finding, that we have been hesitant as to whether or not ring dikes should be suggested. Not only us, because I am well aware that a number of the localities, or certainly persons in them, had the gravest reservations about ring dikes themselves. In fact, this very year, in one of those localities, they didn't want a dike when it was first suggested as being a possibility, and I can quite understand their feelings about it, and I want to say this about these so-called permanent protective measures such as ring dikes. No one should believe that this offers a final and lasting solution to this problem, because the dike can only be built sensibly so high. If the river get higher than the dike, the town is going to get wet, and the whole reservation of the Royal Commission on Cost Benefits that looked into this matter was, I think, centered on that point with respect to ring dikes. But in spite of what the Royal Commission said, the government has taken the responsibility of proposing to the Federal authorities that we should build ring dikes provided we're all fully aware of their limitations, and provided as well that the localities concerned think they're a good idea; and when we have an opportunity, the engineers of the Federal and Provincial governments will be consulting with the localities that are selected as being suitable for this kind of work, to see what their views are, and our recommendation will be that we do give this measure of protection, limited though it is.

Now, with respect to the financial arrangements between the province and the municipalities, and with respect to damage to private property, I must say that those policies are now in the process of being worked out and when we have them available we'll make them known to the public at large.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, we've had a great deal of latitude in this debate and I do not want to extend it at all. I just wanted to say my personal thanks to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs for having come to Manitoba during the course of the flood on two occasions at least, and I'm sure all the members will be wanting him to extend our thanks to Ottawa for their assistance. I'd like to make one apology to him regarding the earlier debate in the House. He must have thought that he was back in the days when he sat here along with ourselves. He was very patient to stay during the course of that debate, and while it was very useful insofar as the Province of Manitoba, I'm sure it did not deal with federal problems.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I would like to think that the standard of debate has improved since our visitor was here, but I'm really afraid I cannot pass that verdict.

MR. PAULLEY: I won't make any comment in that regard because my honourable representative is at Ottawa.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the Table a Return to an Order of the House No. 59 on a motion of the Honourable Member for St. George dated March 30.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. It's concerned with the water levels in the Assiniboine and the Red Rivers. I would like to ask my honourable friend, in the light of the present knowledge, does my honourable friend still agree with the experts that those dumps of snow and other material in and on the river did not raise the level of the water?

MR. HUTTON: I haven't, Madam Speaker, any evidence to take the contrary point of view. By measurement, the engineers indicate that no head was created upstream of these dumps, and the very fact that the Red River appears to have had a greater capacity this spring than it had 16 years ago, there seems to be no evidence to substantiate the fear that these kind of snow blocks might impede the flow, but I wouldn't want to take a dogmatic position on it because I don't know enough about it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, if I might ask a supplementary question of my honourable friend. Was it reported to my honourable friend that upstream of the big snow dump on the Assiniboia River - that is the one just north of the east side of the Assiniboia Park - that upstream from there the ice stayed and piled up for some time while it was completely clear below; and was he informed of a block of material that came down to the bridge here on the Assiniboia River, the one going over to St. Boniface, and plugged one space there for some time; and does he not think that holds up the flow of the water?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, again I say I am not competent to argue with the facts and the evidence that is brought to my attention. I may have certain reservations, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside has some reservations, but I don't have enough evidence that I feel that I could challenge the statements that these dumps have not contributed to any

(MR. HUTTON cont'd)... higher levels of water upstream and downstream.

MADAM SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I think now, in view of the fact that our proceedings to this point have taken us so long, as soon as we enter on the Orders of the Day, Madam Speaker, I would propose that we adjourn to meet again as a Committee of Law Amendments, for this reason partly, that we can if we wish run on a little past 5:30 and get in a little additional time in that way. And so, Madam Speaker, when you call the Orders of the Day, it will be my purpose to move that we adjourn and meet immediately in the Law Amendments Committee, and I would adjourn until 8:00 o'clock tonight.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. JOHNSON: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 41 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. EVANS: If there are no further proceedings before the Orders of the Day, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 8:00 o'clock tonight.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Friday evening.