



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 17 2:30 p.m., Monday, March 5, 1962.

5th Session, 26th Legislature

Printed by R. S. Evans, Queen's Printer for the Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Monday, March 5th, 1962.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I wish to present the petition of Raymond Bernier and others praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate the St. Boniface College Scholarship Fund.

MR. CLERK: The petition of the Winnipeg Better Business Bureau praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Winnipeg Better Business Bureau. The petition of Albert Chamberland and others praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate the Missionary Oblate Fathers of Keewatin.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports for Standing and Special Committees.

Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

The Honourable the Minister of Health.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Hospitals Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions, standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Honourable the Acting Minister of Public Works, and the Honourable the Minister of Health.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member from St. Matthews in the Chair.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been advised of the subject matters of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1 - Resolved it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Public Works Act by providing for the designation of certain highways as provincial roads, the cost of the construction and maintenance of which shall be paid from the Consolidated Fund.

MR. ROBLIN: In the absence of the Minister who is out of the City today on other business, I can advise the House that this is a proposal to replace the present category of 100% provincial roads which haven't a very precise definition and are not provided for in the statute by this kind of a definition, which will cover this type of road with greater precision than heretofore. I don't believe that it indicates any substantial departure in policy although it will enable us to identify these roads by means of road signs and similar identification of that sort.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, is it the intention to add to the list of roads that are presently under that category, or is it simply taking the existing ones and renaming them? One other question as well: Why not bring these into the provincial trunk highway system as part of the over-all road program?

MR. ROBLIN: In a sense, Mr. Chairman, this does bring them into the provincial trunk highway system though as a separate category of their own for the reason that certain standards of traffic and other technical considerations apply, so that they should be in a separate category, but this will bring them effectively within the trunk highway system. Undoubtedly, more roads will be added to this category as time goes by, but as far as I am aware there is no intention to make any spectacular changes at the present time -- simply take in the roads that are now 100% roads, give them this new category; they can then be sign-posted, and our responsibility for them clearly identified, and any new roads taken in under that category will be similarly dealt with, but if there are new ones the Minister can deal with them when his estimates are up.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, does it mean -- may I ask a question --

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . . does it mean that only the roads called "provincial" can be criticized by this House, and the others could be left alone, whether they are broken or not?

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): May I ask a question -- or two questions? Are these roads now mostly in Unorganized Territory or wholly in Unorganized Territory or are there any roads in Unorganized Municipalities? And the second question would be: Will these roads be given numbers as trunk highways are?

MR. ROBLIN: I think there are 100% roads now in both Organized and Unorganized Territory and some form of identification will be developed for them. I'm not sure whether it will be on the numbering basis or the lettering basis, but there will be some form of identification.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Are some of these roads just secondary roads and just by an order-in-council they be proclaimed No. 1 highways?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is general knowledge that the -- what we refer to as the Neepawa-Carberry road has already been designated as a 100% road. I believe it is a fact that the Town of Neepawa, the R. M. of Langford and the R. M. of North Cypress have been advised of that fact and they're quite happy to receive the news. I, too, would be interested to know whether this section of road will now be designated as a highway.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we should, in this House, take note of the words of the First Minister that this particular resolution only deals, or apparently only deals with the naming of roads that are presently, to all intents and purposes, provincial roads. I was somewhat amazed to hear my honourable friend stand up and say that in general -- it indicated to me -- that in general that this was just more or less of a change of names, and if I understood him correctly, that his remarks indicated to me that we were going to stand pat in the construction of roads that are 100% responsibility of the government itself. Just a superficial glance at the estimates for the Department of Public Works for this year indicates that this is so, and my honourable colleague from Elmwood, or rather from Kildonan, raised a very, very valid point I think when he wondered whether or not this was something of the nature of designating highways through name or through order-in-council. We have noted recently, or since we last sat, that a number of the roads that -- contrary to the fact of this government when it first took office, saying that they were going to raise the specification and the general construction of the roads in our province in order to handle ever-increasing vehicle weight and gross tonnage -- that this simply is being done or is being done in many instances simply by the passing of an order-in-council, and if the statement of the Honourable the Premier of the province indicates that merely by this resolution we're simply going to put a letter or a number on our provincial highways, it certainly isn't achieving what is desired for the people of Manitoba.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Will the roads affected by this resolution be made available to the members of the House?

MR. ROBLIN: I am sure, Mr. Chairman, if that question were asked when the estimates are up that the Minister would give that information. In fact if he reads Hansard I hope he will notice that the question is asked and that he will have that information for members of the House.

I don't think I could agree with the proposition put forward by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. It is perfectly true that there is no revolutionary connotation to be attached to this particular measure -- that is, that the first thing that will be done will be to identify by means of signs, etc., those roads which are in this particular category. At the present time that isn't done. We think it should be done; we also think they should be on the map, which they're not identified on the map now as being provincial roads. We think that should be the case because it gives the travelling public more information about the circumstances which they can expect. But I can tell my honourable friend that steadily additions are being made to this 100% road concept. We get numerous requests from municipalities, and others, for this kind of thing and each case is dealt with on its merit and if it seems that we have 100% responsibility, though it's not a provincial trunk highway in the normal sense, then that road is taken into account. So there is the gradual expansion of this kind of thing and I think my honourable friend will see that the quality of the road system is gradually increasing as we have maintained it would do and a great deal of money is being spent. So, while I'm not

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . making any spectacular claims for this piece of legislation, I think that it is reasonable under the circumstances.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, it does indicate to me another proof of the policy of the government that if the work isn't actually done at least through a gimmick of this nature, of placing a number or a letter on a highway and placing it on the map, at least it shows to the public by the media of propaganda that we're expanding our road system in the Province of Manitoba, and as we all know well in this House, the government are notorious for this type of gimmick and propaganda. I would far rather hear the First Minister of this province make an announcement to the effect that, by virtue of this resolution, we will be broadly expanding now our road system 100% provincial responsibility instead of just merely a gimmick to indicate on paper or by designation that these roads are ours.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, if I were making any claim such as the sort my honourable friend alleges, perhaps he might have some point in his gimmick suggestion, but we're just stating the facts of the matter here. We're not trying to take any credit that isn't due and we're not trying to deceive anybody, so I don't see anything wrong with the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 2 - Resolved it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Department of Health Act by providing, among other matters: (a) for the establishment of the Manitoba Hospital Commission and the payment of the remuneration and out-of-pocket expenses of the members, the appointment of staff and payment of their remuneration, and the retention of professional assistance and payment of costs thereby incurred; (b) for the establishment of The Manitoba Health Council and the payment of the out-of-pocket expenses of the members, the appointment of staff and the payment of their remuneration.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, this resolution refers to some of the subject matter in the Department of Health Act which will be before the House shortly. This resolution refers to the changes we are contemplating in the Department Health Act which will set up a hospital commission consisting of the chairman and a total of three to five members. This would provide for the part-time indemnity of the commissioners who would be appointed to serve on this body. The second part of the resolution refers to the Manitoba Health Council. As many members may be aware under The Health Services Act there has been a Health Services Advisory Commission for some years, and with the introduction of The Manitoba Hospital Services Act there was a hospital council set up under that Act. The powers of these two commissions overlap and considerable duplication has resulted in that the Minister is directed at the present time to take any requests for hospital additions or new hospitals to the Health Services Advisory Commission and under The Hospitals Act this body is also asked to be called by the Minister for consultation and deliberation with respect to the Hospital Plan. This has resulted in duplication which has been obvious to members of both bodies now constituted, and it was, therefore, decided in the Department of Health Act proposed to the House this year that we amalgamate these two bodies as now constituted, into a Manitoba Health Council, the membership of which would be similar to the presently constituted body. The members appointed under The Health Services Act are appointed largely from the same organization as are the members under the hospital council under The Hospital Insurance Act. In other words, you have this duplication at the present time and the Minister is required to meet with the two of them at this time. This is, we think, a step forward. This is a Council which will be a part-time body as the present councils are, to which the Minister can refer any matter of concern with respect to The Health Services Act and with respect to the Hospitals Plan. It just pays out-of-pocket expenses and for the times when they do meet.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I missed the Minister's explanation -- which two bodies were going to be amalgamated? Could you tell me that again?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): There's an Act under the Department of Health, Mr. Chairman, called The Health Services Act, and the Health Services Act is an Act set up some years ago and deals with the setting up of local health units, local lab and x-ray units throughout the province; and with also a commission to which, when the Minister was ever asked for additions to hospitals or for a new hospital by a community for example, he would submit this to the Health Services Advisory Commission. The commission was made up of the Advisory Board of the Deputy Minister of Health as a statutory member, certain members of the department, representatives of the medical association, the municipalities, the associated hospitals and so on.

(Mr. Johnson, (Gimli) cont'd.) . . . . Under the Hospital Services Plan, the Manitoba hospital council largely has the same constitution and the same representative body. We have noted considerable duplication in presenting minutes to both these commissions, and with the Hospital Plan as it exists today with the government paying larger and larger sums towards hospital care and so on, we feel the setting up of a commission to deal with the day-to-day problems of such a large utility, plus an amalgamation of the commission under The Health Services Act and the advisory body under The Hospital Act would be very timely.

MR. MOLGAT: So in future then under the Hospital Services Plan the committees as listed here will be changed. We'll still have the officers of the plan obviously who will continue. The next one, the Manitoba Hospital Council, will disappear insofar as MHSP. The Medical Review Committee, of course, will continue, the Dental Review Committee and the Hospital Budget Committee. Fine. Now insofar as the first part of this resolution, Mr. Chairman, the establishment of the Manitoba Hospital Commission, could the Minister tell us whether the members of that commission have been selected as yet, and is it the intention -- they speak here of the payment of remuneration and out-of-pocket expenses -- could he tell us exactly what is the salary they intend to pay to these people; how frequently they intend to have them meet and exactly their function?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, in answer to the questions, we have not picked anyone as yet, of course, in anticipation of the legislation. The concept is becoming only too apparent in talking to a number of people in the hospital field and in the day-to-day operation of this, which is now a very large utility spending a great deal of money, that it would be in the public interest to appoint a commission of which the chairman shall be a full-time civil servant -- say the present commissioner moving into the chairmanship of a commission which shall consist of a total of not less than three or more than five members, who I anticipate at this time would be on a part-time indemnity, which has not been determined, of course, at this time. The main reason for this is this utility and the amount of -- in the day-to-day operation of the plan it is difficult for the leader, to the officials of that organization, to keep up with the changing concepts in hospitalization. I'm thinking of the many activities that should be explored and improved upon where a commission sitting part-time can give more consideration to the changes that are occurring from day to day, and be of an advisory group to the chairman of the commission who is charged with carrying the policy in the day-to-day operation of the plan.

One of the other things, for example, at the present time -- the budget committee of the plan consists of the commissioner, the Deputy Minister of Health and the head of the budget committee. These people set budgets, meet with the hospitals concerned and then the appeal is directly to the Minister. This is a feeling that more consideration can be given possibly to the -- as we're going ahead from here on with, in analyzing budgets and so on, that certain studies very often should be made. I think we're getting to the point it's incumbent upon government to carry out further studies, constantly examining such things as laundry services, group purchasing and that sort of thing. And when you're dealing with a large utility like this and the many hundreds of details that come to the commission's attention during a day, it could be improved, we think, by the formation of such a body.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, . . . . . expected term for which these people will be appointed, and I notice that provision is also made for the appointment of staff and retention of professional assistance pertaining to costs. At the present time is it not anticipated that the staff of the commission itself and the professional advisors that they have will carry on and work with this? Also, while the Minister is making notes of questions to answer, I would assume then that only one of the members of the committee will be a permanent civil servant, and presumably from your statement that would be the present commissioner. All the others will be non-civil service people, call them lay people if you will.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, . . . . . a question in connection with the one asked previously. Will they all be medical men?

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I can understand the appointment and payment of staff. This is a big organization spending a lot of money and nobody would want the Commissioner to have another heart attack. I just wonder though about the purpose of the commission. Is the commission to do part of the work which is not now being done by the Commissioner? In other words, will certain of his present responsibilities be delegated to members

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . . of the commission -- and I'm not saying that this would be wrong -- or, is the commission an advisory body to whom the Commissioner will report on major decisions of the operations of the commission so that he can get their consideration before they're made policy decisions. Again I'm not objecting to this, but I think the House should know what the purpose of this hospital commission is.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, possibly we can deal with this a little more in second reading of The Department of Health Act, but for the questions that have been asked: It is anticipated in the legislation that the term of office would be for three years, that other than the chairman it would be part-time appointments of lay people. Certainly we wouldn't -- our feeling is that there shouldn't be any vested interest on the commission, that is, I wouldn't anticipate medical men unless there's some very good reason for that. I'm thinking more of a good businessman as being the ideal type to have on this commission. We're not trying to get away -- this is put forward in a very straightforward manner -- we're not trying to get out of any work or to do something sinister in any way. It's merely a, this utility is now in the neighbourhood of \$40 million, the day-to-day operation of the plan is on the shoulders of one man who is also on the budget committee, who also reviews budgets with the boards of hospitals, the appeals come directly into the Minister. This is very fine and we'll still continue to have the appeal to the Minister and the Minister will have to be responsible for this commission to this House. However, we do need some support at the top in the method by which we're going to carry forward the ever-increasing role of this utility and to give greater day-to-day scrutiny of just where we're going.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think possibly this is a move in the right direction. I have one or two questions I would like to ask of the Minister though in connection with the setting up of this augmented commission. I appreciate the fact that it has been a tremendous burden on the present commissioner of hospitals carrying alone. I'd like to pay a compliment to him at this particular stage as an individual. I think, despite many difficulties, despite the fact that from time to time we might be critical of the over-all plan, but I would say to the commissioner as an individual that he has my support and that of my group.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister has in mind of the personnel of both of the groups that are suggested in this resolution. I believe my colleague from Inkster asked the question as to whether they would be just medical men, or others. I think, myself, that with this huge public utility as it is now in the Province of Manitoba, that we should have representatives of farmer, representatives of labour because, after all, collectively the people of Manitoba are making ever-increasing contributions directly into our hospital's fund. I would like to know from the Minister whether or not the government has given consideration in setting up of these commissions whether or not we're going to get away from the political setting of rates in respect of hospitalization. As you well know, Mr. Chairman, we have the situation of where, by order-in-council, some months ago the rates were increased considerably, and then subsequently we had numerous debates in the House and eventually the rates were reduced.

I raised the question the other day, speaking in the Throne Speech, and I know we're going to have an opportunity -- the First Minister indicated that it would be by resolution -- that we're going to have an opportunity in this House sooner or later -- I hope it's sooner than later -- to consider the presentations made by the government to the Royal Commission on Health in respect to the setting of the rates of MMS. I might say at this particular time, Mr. Chairman, and I'm rather disturbed in that connection, and I think that it is all-inclusive on hospitalization and medical care in the Province of Manitoba -- I'm a little disturbed when I read reports that there apparently might be consultation between the Minister and the MMS in regard to rates. I think that it is well time that we got away from just consultation between Ministers and groups of this nature; as I indicated previously, that it should be on some rate setting board. Now then, I posed the question in respect of the setting up of these two councils or commissions whether or not the setting of rates is going to be within their purview in their operation. I think that is very important that that consideration be taken out of the hands, as I indicated, of government; possibly set up primarily by a commission of this nature subject to the approval of some organization, as I suggested previously, of a public utility board. I think we've got to realize more and more that there has been a change in Medicare; there has been a change in hospitalization wherefore the financial aspects of the payment of fees and funds should divorce

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . Itself from politics, and I would like to hear the comments of the Minister in regard to the points that I raise.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this is just another appointment of a high-paid commission to take the onus off the Minister and his department in future planning of hospitals and medical plans.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I want to make it perfectly clear that such a commission's responsibility is to try and give increased efficiency and a better and possibly an increasingly more public consciousness of the Hospital Services Plan, and I've indicated that there are many activities that I can see discussing with the Commission to assist us in the day-to-day operation of the plan. No government -- I'd love to see all health and medical matters completely out of the hands of politicians, but I've come to realize more and more that government must become involved in setting of rates and so on.

I would visualize the commission, Mr. Chairman, as I see it, assisting the commissioner in the setting of rates; they can look at these rates in a current and capital program for the year and bring this to government, or to the Minister and government; they will have to study this together and go forward from there. With respect to the so-called dealing with the political setting of rates, I think we all want to bring the best possible standard of care, and at the same time preserve public funds to the maximum, make the maximum use of them, and I think this is one of the very reasons for a Commission. Today, frankly, the operation of this plan and the many problems that arise in finance, etcetera, require a great deal of the time, the whole time of the Commissioner, and a great deal of time of the Minister -- I don't care who the Minister is. And this will have to continue to be so; this Commission will always have to answer to the people and I think it will strengthen our commission to have such a body. With respect to the setting up of the Health Council, certainly it is intended, and it will be spelled out in the Act, just what representatives we would expect to appoint. We would ask for three nominations, for instance, from this body, three from the municipalities, or two; and set up this on a representative level. However, this can be dealt with in greater detail as we see the bill before us.

MR. MOLGAT: Before we leave this, on the second part of the resolution, the matter of the Health Council. At the moment the hospital's council as constituted has 12 members. I don't know how many members there are on the group that operates under The Health Act. How large a council is it intended to have under this new scheme, and will all the people who are on both be appointed on this new one?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I don't think we will be able to accommodate everyone, but, for instance, on the Health Council we asked for nominations from the municipalities on the Health Services Commission advisory body, we asked for members from the municipalities. We would hope to consolidate certain numbers and have roughly about a 12-man health council. As I say, there is this very definite duplication at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . resolution be adopted? Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Public Works Act.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Department of Health Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, on a point of privilege, may I take up for one minute the time of the House. We are here celebrating many occasions, and I'd like to call the attention of this House the occasion of this week. This is "Educational Week" or the week for education. The main reason I rise is that I was born in a country where the large majority of the people were illiterate. Not because there were lack of teachers or facilities, but the regime at that time -- the Czarist regime did not want a people with education. It's easier to deal with an ignorant people, and even they have from one time to the other

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.).... revolted, and many people, including myself, came to Canada because we felt that here we have an opportunity to educate our children, knowing by education, by enlightenment, they could build a nicer world to live in -- a world of freedom and a world of peace. I regret exceedingly that I have not taken any advantage of the educational system in this country, but I'm very anxious to have my children and the children of everyone to become enlightened and help to build a better world. I want to compliment those responsible in declaring a week for education or educational week for all of us.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Second reading of Bill No. 16. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. I'm sorry I didn't give him notice, but perhaps he could take this as notice. The question is simply this: "What is the government policy regarding the payment of municipal realty taxes on dwellings used or inhabited by government employees of provincial institutions in any given municipality? Now, for example, in one municipality in this province where there is a fairly large provincial institution, there are over 15 dwellings owned by the province used by provincial employees in which there is a sizeable amount of municipal tax arrears and there seems to be no policy, and I would ask the Minister if there is a policy.

MR. ROBLIN: Perhaps my honourable friend would allow me to say that I expect the Minister of Municipal Affairs will be able to make a statement on this when his estimates are up -- if my honourable friend would be happy with that suggestion.

MR. SCHREYER: ..... First Minister.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): ..... the Honourable Member of Brokenhead who has just spoken, I have had this matter under advisement for some time.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Is it the intention of the government to declare further crop insurance test areas this year?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I expect when I'm asked a question, I better answer. I'm not prepared to make an answer to the honourable member at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable the Attorney-General, I would ask that Bills Nos. 16 and 17 stand over until tomorrow.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Flin Flon) presented Bill No. 30, An Act to amend The Mining Royalties and Tax Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a technical matter. We are just clarifying the definition of a mining claim in order that we may assess the mining tax to a group of claims. Under the original definition we were able to assess on the basis of one claim. Since we made modifications to the regulations we allow now the surveying of a group of claims up to 18, and this allows us to obtain a tax on each one of the 18 claims as we had done previously.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Welfare. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate I want to make it perfectly clear that I'm in complete agreement with what the resolution before us is intended to do for the people of Manitoba and, indeed, all Canadians. It is, therefore, our intention to support it or any other legislation that will improve provisions or benefits for our senior citizens, disabled persons, etcetera, etcetera. I subscribe, too, to the fact that -- to quote the Honourable Mr. Pearson: "It has become the obligation of a responsible society to make possible retirement without worry but I don't believe we can do that on a simple handout basis. We need sound government plans to which the individual contributes. This is Liberal policy." All political parties apparently are in accord with the principle involved in the proposed resolution before us. On checking the Federal Hansards of February 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th, 1962, the days on which this subject matter was being debated in the House of Commons, it is

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . . quite apparent that no member of any opposition group was opposed to the principle of (a) the graduated old age pensions on a contributory basis for those who can afford additional provisions for their old age and who have not undertaken it under private plans contractual or otherwise, and (b) the payments of benefits under certain circumstances to the widows and children of contributors who die and to former contributors who become permanently disabled.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the debates on this subject matter in Ottawa did not involve principle. In addition to discussing the merits of both the proposed Conservative and Liberal schemes for a contributory old age pension plan, the Opposition, and that's all of them, argued that it was not necessary to amend the BNA Act to enable the government to proceed with implementing the program outlined in the resolution that's before us today. This is particularly true of that part of the resolution under Section A. I do not profess to know too much about law nor do I profess to be a constitutional specialist or expert, but as a political partisan it certainly does appear to me that the present Section 94(a) of the BNA Act enacted in 1951, and I would like to quote it: "It is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may from time to time make laws in relation to old age pensions in Canada, but no law made by the Parliament of Canada in relation to old age pensions shall affect the operation of any law, present or future, of a provincial legislature in relation to old age pensions." Now it appears that the Federal Government has the authority to proceed with the plan that is now proposed, particularly Section A of it.

The resolution before us sets out a proposed amendment and I think I should read it, Mr. Speaker; "It is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may from time to time make laws in relation to, (a) old age pensions, and (b) pensions and other benefits incidental to or conducive to the better operation and administration of, a scheme of old age pensions; but no law made by the Parliament of Canada under the authority of this section affects the operation of any law enacted by the legislature of a province in relation to any of the matters specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section." Now if you will look at the present 94(a), that's the one that was enacted in 1951, you will see that the Parliament of Canada, "may from time to time make laws in relation to old age pensions in Canada", etcetera, etcetera. It is a recognized principle of interpretation of statutes that the right to do a thing implies the right to do things that are incidental to it and the things that are necessary to reasonably and properly carry it on. In specific relation to constitutional matters the courts have held over and over again that Canada and the provinces can enact laws in relation to their respective spheres of jurisdiction, but those laws must relate to the relevant subject matter and must not deal with one matter under the guise of something else. For instance, Canada could not deal with old age pensions under the guise of criminal law merely by making certain penalties for the infraction of the law. The court looks to the pith and substance of the legislation. Now with that kind of standard, are not other benefits incidental to or conducive to the better operation of administration of a scheme of old age pensions, part of old age pensions? If I had to argue a case as to whether these incidental matters are included in old age pensions, I would rather be on the side of the Dominion Government than on the side who ever was questioning it. In this connection note that (b) of the new proposed section 94(a) as we have before us, is not nearly as broad as the discussions in the preamble to the resolution before us.

It is quite clear to members on this side of the House that the Prime Minister is using this consultation with the provinces and the requested amendment to the BNA Act as a device to delay action. The Prime Minister has been delaying the implementation of the contributory old age pension scheme ever since he was elected. Oh yes, he's talked about it all right. On checking the Federal Hansards the other day, as recently as yesterday, I find that on January 13th, 1958 -- which is over four years ago now -- the House of Commons Hansard on page 3233 quotes the Prime Minister as this: "We in this government and party intend at the earliest possible date in addition to the present pension systems, to give full consideration to investigating the insurance system in United States to the end that we will bring about in Canada a rounded and effective contributory social security system over and above that which already exists." Mr. Speaker, more than four years after that statement, the Prime Minister has now learned that he must confer with the provinces to provide for Clause (a) and (b) of the resolution that is before us. It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that that much used and abused adage of this

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . . government, "Why didn't you do it when" would be appropriate for us to use at this time.

I do not intend at this time, Mr. Speaker, to argue the merits of the proposed Liberal plan of contributory pensions or compare them to what the federal government has in mind, for the simple reason that I don't know what the federal government has in mind in this field. I know something about the Liberal plan but, as I said, I do not intend to argue the merits of them. But surely, Mr. Speaker, this province intends to recommend to the federal government certain definite desirable regulations and provisions that must be inherent in a plan of this kind to insure that the people of this nation has a social security program that is second to none. It is our intention, as I said before, to support this resolution on the simple grounds that we don't want it delayed any further. We say that it has been delayed now for four years which certainly is unnecessary, and I would very much like to hear what this government intends to recommend to the federal government when it's considering a contributory type of plan.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one or two very brief comments on this resolution. I think it is one of those types of resolution that, no matter from what corner of the House it is proposed, should receive our support. I'm not quite sure, and I have no great knowledge of law, but it would appear to me that in order to achieve the desirability of having a pension scheme in which the widows and the children of the contributors are able to partake of any of the benefits of the scheme, that it is necessary for us all across Canada to support this resolution. It's my understanding that at the present time under The British North America Act the question of old age pensions per se is the premise of the federal government, and that they could institute a contributory scheme without the necessity of an amendment; but, however, for the benefits on the decease of the contributor to go to a beneficiary, would require this amendment. It's my understanding at the present that it might be possible for the provinces individually to set up a scheme of the transfer of the benefits to the widows and children on a provincial scheme -- but I don't think anybody would suggest that, Mr. Speaker, for a province such as Manitoba.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a type of a resolution that we must pass here in the Province of Manitoba and it appears that in order to be enacted that all of the provinces in Canada must agree to it before an application can be made to Her Majesty's government. This, of course, raises the very, very important matter of the repatriation of the Constitution in Canada. I understand, however -- as a matter of fact I'm sure -- that later on in the deliberations of this House the questions of the amendments to the British North America Act, and the placing of the Constitution of Canada within Canada itself will be under discussion, and at that time we'll be able to discuss all of the broad aspects of the proposal of the federal government in respect to the resting of the Constitution in Canada, and there's no need for any further comment. But in order to achieve this stepping-stone the House has the support of my group. I might say, Mr. Speaker, in passing comment, I would suggest that we would far rather have had a resolution which dealt with all of the broad aspects of a comprehensive health scheme, and we'll be discussing those points later on in the House, but in the meantime may I assure the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, the resolution introduced by himself has our support.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The other day the matter of the trips taken by the Cabinet to rural parts of the province was raised by members on this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I might inform the Honourable Member for St. George that he has already spoken in this debate.

MR. GUTTORMSON: This is a new motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I think not.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. MOLGAT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that each day when this motion is put it's a new motion? My understanding is that that is the case, in which case the honourable member would have the right to speak. He couldn't speak twice in the same day, we'd all agree to that. But I believe it's a new motion which simply comes back on the Order Paper daily.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, rising to the point made by my honourable friend, I must confess that when I first came into the House I was of the same opinion that he was, and I recall under similar circumstances that I attempted to intervene twice, as the Honourable Member for St. George is doing, under the former Speaker, Mr. Bachynski, and it was ruled at that time that I had exhausted my right to speak and I was out of order. So I give that experience to the House and suggest that probably Mr. Speaker is right in making the same ruling on this occasion.

MR. MOLGAT: Could we have the rule that lays that out then Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Of course, it's covered somewhat by Rule No. 58 - "that only one amendment and one sub-amendment may be made to the motion for Mr. Speaker to leave the Chair and for the House to go into a committee of supply or ways and means." That is similar to the motion on our ways and means and also on the budget debate and on the Throne Speech debate, and it does appear that this motion is substantially the same in import as the motion that is made for Mr. Speaker to leave the Chair to go into the committee of ways and means, committee of supply and also under the budget debate.

I might also recall that I do recall in my tenure as a member of the Legislature that under the Speakership of the Honourable Member for St. George, Mr. Bachynski, that a motion was denied in this House -- a speaker was denied the right to speak twice on this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. MOLGAT: It seems to me that last year when we amended the rules it was agreed that precedent in this House was not to be the case, that if there was a rule in the book then it applies, but if there wasn't a rule in the book then we went to Beauchesne. Now the rule that you read, Sir, No. 58, applies to "amendment to the motion". Unless my honourable friend was making an amendment, which I don't believe he was -- he was making a speech -- then it seems to me that Rule 58 does not apply to this particular case, and I can find no rule that says that this motion is not debatable.

MR. ROBLIN: I know that as far as precedents are concerned, there is nothing in our rule book that says that previous precedents here must necessarily hold. On the other hand it doesn't rule them out altogether. But I can give the House the information that was given to me by the Speaker at that time when he denied my right to speak twice, and it wasn't on the grounds of Section 58 that is mentioned here -- it was on the grounds that this is not a new motion, but that the originating motion was the one that was made the other day on which there was a debate, and that when Mr. Chairman of committees begs leave to sit again, and the committee is not dissolved or suspended or put out of action -- that it is the same committee, it's the same motion, and therefore cannot be debated twice, and it was on that ground that Mr. Bachynski denied me the right to speak on it some time ago and I should imagine that the same ground would hold today.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, however, I should just remind my honourable friend, the Leader of the House, that since that time our rules have been revised and, as my Leader has mentioned, we have taken out of our rules the section that made our usages and customs in the House, and precedents, a very important part of our rules; and instead of that we have decided to cover rules, as far as possible, by stating them specifically in our own rule book, and to provide that where a case is not covered, that the rule of the Federal Parliament shall apply. My remembrance is, that in this case that we actually left out the rule that dealt with the point that my honourable friend has mentioned, so I suggest to you that we are definitely back to the rules of the House of Commons. I would further suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if you check their rules carefully, you would find that in a similar situation to this that there would not be the restriction as to speaking only once, because, as the Honourable Member for St. George has mentioned, it would be under those circumstances, in my opinion, a new motion.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, with respect to precedents of this House, I think that my memory serves me right -- I am quite sure that under the Speakership of the ex-member for Rhineland, I was accorded the privilege of speaking twice on the same motion in 1950, I believe -- if my memory serves me right, and I am quite sure it does. I am quite sure the second time I spoke was with respect to the recording equipment I believe, and I think I spoke twice during the session of 1950 under the Speakership of the late Mr. Miller.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, it might be that you'd like to take the matter under your notice and rule on it tomorrow. On the other hand, you might be prepared to rule today.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, . . . . . take under advisement, I'd just like to point out on the point of order, that this motion does reappear every day and is moved every day by the First Minister himself. The other motions on the order paper which are recurring motions, are not moved daily by the originator of the motion, they are merely read out by the Speaker and the debate is proceeded upon. This one has to be moved each time it comes on the order paper by the original mover, and as such, in my opinion, constitutes a new motion each time.

MR. ROBLIN: On that new point, I would just point out that in many Houses the Speaker merely leaves the Chair without question being put when this item in the order paper is reached. It's just an automatic motion and, in my opinion, I must say for what it's worth, is that's the kind of a motion it is. However, this is something that the Speaker can decide and perhaps we'd be well advised to leave it to him.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that you consider Rule 234 and particularly subsection 2 of that rule when you have this under advisement. I think under this that you may be substantiated.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say that I have given some consideration to 234, subsection 2, which reads as follows: "No member is allowed to speak more than once on the motion. He cannot discuss all the matters which then come up and when he has spoken on one of them he has exhausted his right to speak" - the motion before the House, namely that the Speaker do now leave the Chair.

However, I will take it under advisement. I feel at the moment that possibly I am right in this matter, but I may change my mind.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate. Honourable Member . . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be agreeable to put the motion to go into supply and get on with that portion, and reserving the honourable member's right to speak tomorrow, if your ruling should permit him to do so.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department 2 . . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I believe when we left our work on Friday that we were on item 6, and the First Minister had just given us a report on the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in Ottawa, or rather I should say, in London, and had taken the opportunity to give us mainly a debate on the matter of the European Common Market. I realize that according to the Throne Speech that this is supposed to come up at a later date; however, I have not seen a resolution from the government yet. Due to the fact that the First Minister spent some time on it on Friday, I would like at this point to say something on this subject myself.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . before my honourable friend proceeds further, and point out that I had no wish to precipitate a general debate on this subject because as the Throne Speech indicates, there will be a -- and I can tell my honourable friend -- a very broad resolution which I think will permit discussion of every aspect of the Common Market at that time, and that to do so now would indeed have two debates on the same topic. I would also point out to him that I did not initiate this discussion, but I spoke on request, giving what I hope, was a factual and not a provocative description of what took place which evolved around the Common Market. So I just wonder whether in the interests of proceeding in an orderly fashion, that we could not have our debate on the Common Market at the time which a resolution will be introduced which will give very wide latitude, in my opinion, and any part of the subject can be discussed. Otherwise we will probably have the debate twice, which doesn't really get us much further forward.

MR. MOLGAT: I assure the First Minister, Mr. Chairman, that my comments are going to be very, very factual. He might find them provocative because in this case I think the facts maybe are such. But the fact is that he did, on Friday, proceed to give us an extended discussion on the ECM, in fact it extended over our normal adjournment hour and there was no opportunity at that time for any of us on this side to make our own views known on the subject. I don't propose to repeat in the House on a number of occasions the same speeches, but I think that when my honourable friends across the way come out with a subject, then that we should have certainly the opportunity to discuss it at that time. And on that basis, and not wanting as I say, to make a speech now on the subject, make the same speech again, if he does present a resolution, I really feel that it would not in any way interfere with the work of the House. It's true that his reply the other day was, in a sense, at my request. What I did request, however, was a report on the parliamentary conference and not necessarily a debate at this time on the ECM -- but that's what I got.

MR. ROBLIN: ..... a blow by blow account of what took place there, and that's all.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, then it must have been an ECM meeting that my honourable friend was at because that's the only part that I recall him discussing.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what's happened. I asked my honourable friend to believe me. That was "The" topic of discussion and there were some fringe discussions on the other points that I did mention yesterday, namely technical education and that kind of thing, but for one reason or another that was "The" topic. It wasn't planned that it should be -- the agenda included a great many things, but that's exactly what happened and I'm not trying to mislead my honourable friend when I tell him that what I gave him yesterday, was the substance of what transpired, and I trust I did so in such a manner that it did not prejudice his views or, indeed, mine on the ultimate outcome of these matters or what we might say in the debate that will take place later on. I only gave those remarks in response to my honourable friend's request that he should have the report and I want him to believe that what I gave him was just to the best of my ability, a factual account of what took place rather than something that would challenge him, so to speak, to put his views on record at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to carry on just discussions on points of order here, we have some business to do and it's my interest as well as my honourable friends across the way to see to it that the business of the House does proceed. However, he did start the discussion on ECM on Friday. Now we've been waiting for some time for some of the matters that appeared in the Throne Speech. We were told then that these things would be brought out by resolution and that we would have an opportunity to discuss them. So far, very few of these matters have appeared on the Order Paper, Mr. Chairman, and we certainly don't want to be in a position where these things appear in the dying days of the session and are pushed through without adequate discussion. Once we get into estimates -- as my honourable friends know across the way -- it is a tough job for members of the Opposition to keep up with the amount of work that's required and the sooner we get notice of these things and the sooner we can get discussing them, the better the job that can be done in the interests of Manitoba and of this House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): ..... that just as soon as my estimates are completed, I propose to introduce the resolution. It's now complete, it's been completed only in the last day or so. So within a week, I'm sure, the resolution will be introduced.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, this applies to a number of other resolutions as well, and quite frankly, my reason for wanting to discuss ECM today is that I felt that the government is holding back on some of these things which they said that they would present to us. The Throne Speech covered everything that one might expect to have discussed in the session and if it's simply going to be a cover-up to prevent proper discussion of these items, we are certainly objecting to it. On the assurance from the Minister that we will have a full discussion within a week, I would prefer to forego my statements today on the European Common Market, but I want to make it very clear that we want these resolutions that have been promised to us on the Order Paper. I frankly do not see why it has to wait until the estimates of my honourable friend have been discussed. Why couldn't it appear now? I see no need to connect the two.

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . . One is of a federal nature of great importance to us which is the main reason that I want to get into a discussion of it, because this affects the future of Manitoba and we have to get our views, and certainly any pressure that we can put on Ottawa, going on this; we can't wait any longer. Every day puts us in a more difficult position.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the contention of the Leader of the Official Opposition in this, and I want to ensure my honourable friend opposite that had the Leader of the Liberal Party started a general debate on ECM, I was also prepared, and I'm sure that we wouldn't have got very far today with the items dealing with the estimates of this department. I join with him in saying to the government that we should have these major resolutions as contained in the Throne Speech before us with all due dispatch. I would also like to say this, that it is very, very hard, as the First Minister and the Minister of Industry and Commerce are well aware from past experience, very hard for us to contend with a number of resolutions at the same time dealing with very major problems. I don't know, I'm sure, whether I have the full support of my honourable friend, the Leader of the Liberal Party, in this or not, that one's mind -- at least my mind -- isn't of such a nature that I can do justice to half a dozen major subjects at the same time, so I join with him in a plea to the members of the government to bring forward these resolutions as suggested that they will be doing, as quickly as possible; not as we've had the experience in the past of having to deal with so many major items just prior to the time of the adjournment of the House. In this, at least, Mr. Chairman, there is a complete coalition between the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party of Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say that I'm in sympathy with what the honourable gentlemen are saying, and I can give you the program that we're trying to follow with respect to these resolutions. I think there are four of them yet to come. One is on the Order Paper now, and it would be my hope that the one on the ECM would be down probably by the end of this week, and that we would try and do them about one a week, something in that neighborhood, so that we'd get one major topic before us at a time and allow members to concentrate on that without having the whole lot of them dumped on our desks at one time. But I think I can assure my honourable friends that a program of that nature is what we have in mind and we hope it will turn out to be satisfactory.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, first, referring to the comments of my honourable friend, the Leader of the NDP, I would like to agree only that at times we have the same views but to disagree completely that we are ever in coalition. Insofar as what the First Minister said, this would be agreeable to us if this procedure is going to be followed and they will be coming along promptly. I would only like to add one more thing -- I realize that we are away from the discussion, Mr. Chairman, when we do this, but I think it's useful for us to have this discussion to clearly understand where we're heading to in our work -- and that is, that if there is information, factual information going along with these resolutions, if there are papers going along with them, that they should be made available to us as early as possible so that we can study them and have the full information. If we get them just at the same time as we receive the resolution, it's very difficult for us to make a proper analysis. So for this particular case, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to forego my own speech today on the ECM. I'd just like to point out to the First Minister, however, that if he had wanted to he could have said on Friday, himself, that this covered mainly ECM and that the resolution was coming down and he was referring till then. However, I have no desire to hold up the House; I'm prepared to go along on this basis. I don't guarantee that that will be the case all the time when my honourable friend brings in extraneous subjects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 6 - passed. Resolution 7 - item 5.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, on Resolution 6, the Honourable First Minister gave a list of the cultural grants in connection with that. Would it be possible to get the other grants?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Sir, I'll be glad to give them to the committee. Under Health and Welfare grants the following: Manitoba League for the Blind, \$100.00; Canadian Welfare Council, \$3,000; Last Post Fund, \$250; Welfare Council of Greater Winnipeg, \$2,000; Heart Foundation -- that's included in the Department of Health -- Indian and Metis Friendship Centre, \$4,000; Boy Scouts, \$2,500; Girl Guides, \$2,000; Commonwealth Parliamentary

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . Association, \$2,300; Canadian Highway Safety Conference, \$1,200; Royal Canadian Humane Association \$100.00; Unallocated, about \$10,000.00.

We usually have, we have had a certain sum unallocated because we get requests that we feel we should meet during the year that are not thought of at the present time. That gives us a total of \$90,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 6 - passed; Resolution 7, Appropriation 5.

MR. REID: Resolution 7, No. 5 -- I notice the libraries' item for the year is -- \$171,905 spent on libraries, but then all the grants for public libraries for the province is only \$72,000.00. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it's \$99,905 spent on provincial and departmental libraries. I think myself this is out of proportion in comparison to the number of people using the same in comparison to public libraries, and I think that the amount should be reversed for the people of Manitoba.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to send my annual bouquet to Miss Morley and her staff for the wonderful service they give, not only to the members of the Legislature, but to others. My beef, however, is for years very, very little extra money has been spent on books and periodicals. The budget is about the same for years. We have a \$10,000 increase this year, but that goes to historical research, which is very valuable. I was just wondering whether the library, with its thousands of books -- some of them perhaps are still very valuable, they are perhaps 40, 50 or 70 years old, but those books are not used, very seldom, but current books -- the world is growing; there's a lot of new books on new ideas; the development of the African countries; the establishment of many countries, which in my opinion should be at the disposal of the public and particularly for the education of the honourable members, if they have it, for the education of myself personally. And we see that year after year, year after year the budget for new books and periodicals are the same. They can't be used and even if they have one copy -- I'm trying to get a copy of something now because it's out and I couldn't get it -- should be enlarged. In other words, if the library is built for the benefit of the members and the benefit of those who seek more knowledge, I think we should provide them with the facilities to have it. So while I'm very, very satisfied with the service of the library, I cannot see why they have not raised one cent almost, if you look over the last budgets for books and new books and periodicals.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the matter of the provincial library I certainly would want to make my comments about the value of the library to we members here in the House. We've certainly found them to be most co-operative at all times in getting for us on very short notice, on occasions here in the House while we are sitting as well as between sessions, any of the material that the members need, and I would not want this occasion to pass by without those in our group -- I'm sure I can say without any question of contradiction for every member of the House how very helpful the staff in our library here is and how much they make the work of the members both more practical and much more rapid in execution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) passed; (b) passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: On (b), Mr. Chairman, Departmental Libraries, how many are there of these?

MR. McLEAN: It's the library that formerly served the Department of Health and Welfare, continues as one library serving both of the departments that are now separate departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) passed.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, can I just have a word or two from the Minister who . . . . very quietly and ask him about the . . . . . education, what it is. Can he give us a comment why the project has not been increased for years for books and periodicals which are coming out daily.

MR. DOW: Mr. Chairman, on the question of regional library grants, I notice that this year is the same as last year which would indicate that the acceptance throughout the province has not increased. And personally I would like to see some form of promotion made throughout the province so that possibly more information was given to the public and the schemes that were enforced by this government to achieve them. Down in my constituency we have two regional libraries which are serving a very useful purpose and I would say, second

(Mr. Dow, cont'd.) . . . to schools, they are used by all people including the very small youngsters to the very elderly people, and this particular phase of the educational system in Manitoba has much to commend itself and I feel that a great deal more promotion should be given to it with the idea of trying to get more of these regional libraries throughout the rural areas.

Last week, Mr. Chairman, we were more or less, on this side of the House, given a lecture by the Honourable the First Minister assisted by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture in regards to simple arithmetic. He pointed out that certain factors and phrases that had been used by members on this side that if we had taken a look at the yellow book, as he called it at that time, we could arrive at certain conclusions by a system of simple arithmetic. But, Sir, over the weekend I had occasion to take a look on the annual report of the library for the Province of Manitoba for 1961 and, Sir, if you will take a look on page 21, it amazes me that the Department of Education or the Minister in charge who's the Minister of Education would allow just a report of figures to be put out under the authority of the Government of Manitoba for a permanent record. If you will take the first two items which are straight addition -- \$2,175 and \$1,450, I can't see how you can get \$4,625. The other item of mills are reversed and then, Sir, if you continue that along, to get an annual per capita cost in this particular library, you divide the population into the amount of money and instead of having \$3.11 it should be \$2.78. Now this particular library is in my own town and I have been interested on many occasions in trying to sell the library to other communities and I have made the mention that the annual per capita cost runs under \$3.00. Now, Sir, if I had to refer to the 1961 report and sell it, it stares me in the face that I am kind of prefabricating a certain amount of government knowledge that is put out. If you will take the second line -- the Glenwood-Souris library, and you add \$1,500 and \$900 I can't see how you can get \$1,590. It should be \$2,400 in my way of figuring. The same thing prevails when you go through and you divide the population into the total amount of contributions by municipalities in grants; instead of \$2.04, my figuring is \$2.37. Now, Sir, if you go down to the Virden one and add the population figure, you find a discrepancy of 3,000 people. I contend, Sir, that this report is absolutely useless in view of the fact that the figures -- if you want to use the method of simple arithmetic -- and they're useless to me because I know they're incorrect and I suggest I don't know procedure but, Sir, I think that this particular page of this report should be withdrawn from the return and brought up-to-date properly. I don't know whether it's in order -- I feel it isn't in order for me to move that it should be done so but I think the Minister will realize for an individual in public life to go out and refer to public government documents and reports that are as incorrect as this particular page is, I feel that we should have no hesitation in making our own figures up because if this is an example, then how can we follow it?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I didn't catch the page that my honourable friend was speaking of.

MR. DOW: Page 21, Sir.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I want to register my disappointment at the fact that the government is refusing to face up to what I think is its responsibility in encouraging the people of this province to read more. There's a conference going on at the present time in Montreal -- Canadian Conference on Education -- and the reports which were prepared for that conference and reports which are coming from that conference all speak of the fact -- and I know that we'll deal with this in much greater detail when we get to the Education estimates -- but all deal with the fact and make the one point that the Canadian people are not doing enough in the field of education. Now, Mr. Chairman, education doesn't stop when a person finishes high school nor does it stop when a person finishes university. Education is a continuing matter. And if the people of this province are going to keep up-to-date with world events, if they're going to keep up-to-date with the matters in which they are interested, it's essential that we have modern well-equipped and well-stocked libraries. Now surely we have learned the lesson -- this province is in various fields in welfare, in health and I suppose even in education, we're in the fields because the Federal Government set up a cost sharing program. They said, "We will pay money towards these programs if the province will meet our grants." Now surely, Mr. Chairman, if we're going to advance as we ought to in the field of libraries, in the field of reading, the province ought to show the lead. Now I haven't the breakdown with

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . me. I know that the amount of money which comes to a city like Winnipeg, like a metropolitan area, is a disgrace both in the actual amount and in the percentages which are spent, but I'm not making a particular plea for the City of Winnipeg or the metropolitan area. It seems to me that there ought to be -- we ought to aim for the establishment of a well-organized, well-stocked library in every city and in every town in this province. And I don't mean in the year 2000; I don't mean 50 years from now; I don't mean 25 years from now; I mean in the next two or three years, Mr. Chairman. Now I'm not surprised at local municipal councils. I hesitate to start something which they haven't had in the past. They're facing great difficulties in holding the tax line at the present level, just to keep existing services going, and so they're not rushing in many cases to get into this field, and it seems to me that if we want them in this field -- and I for one thing think it's an absolute necessity that the Province of Manitoba has got to take the zipper off the financial purse and invest some money in this. I think libraries are just as important as roads, and we're borrowing lots of money for roads and I want to suggest to the members of this committee, Mr. Chairman, that we can afford to spend a good deal more than \$62,000 in grants to help the local areas get started, and where they are started, in helping them to expand libraries. Now it seems to me that this is something which the government ought to give early consideration to, Mr. Chairman.

. . . . . Continued on next page

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a few questions from the Minister on the mobile library. How often do they visit the towns, and how far they go and how long they stay, and what more or less is the impression the Minister gets -- whether it's beneficial and whether the people borrow these books and study. What is the attitude of the rural area on the library situation?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the questions that have been raised, the Honourable the Member for Kildonan said that the proportion of money in the total estimates should be reversed, and that would certainly be quite satisfactory. He will understand, of course, that a municipal or regional library does not become established until the people in the territory concerned have voted to have one, so that, of course, the amount that is spent for grants depend upon, in that sense, upon the wishes of the people concerned. If they were to vote in favour of the establishment of libraries, then the grant, the amount of money would increase and the proportion would be changed.

With respect to the Honourable the Member for Inkster, he is referring to the legislative library as distinct from the public libraries that are available, and he says that very little is spent on books and periodicals. He is overlooking, I'm afraid, the fact that large numbers of books and periodicals come to the legislative library without charge because it is a depository library and receives many of its books without any cost. I just might indicate that these are received from the Government of Canada, from the departments of the Government of Canada, a large number of them, part of the provinces of Canada, the United States federal government, the United Nations and the International Labour office, to mention only a few of those that supply these books and periodicals without charge. So that it is perhaps not entirely accurate to gauge the amount of material coming into the library by the amount of money that is spent on them. The books that should be available to the general public, I think, are available in the various public libraries as distinct from the legislative library, which is a rather technical and special sort of library where it's not intended to have perhaps the type of books that the general public would like to have. The Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain has referred to the need for promotion and of the establishment of libraries and I think that's a good point. There is, I think, a fair amount of promotion going on -- a great deal more than perhaps is generally known. We try our best. I think we must be quite frank and say we don't particularly receive a very warm reception and it hasn't anything to do with money; it's just perhaps a lack of interest in the formation of libraries, but I think that it is true that we must continue as we have been doing, the best we can to promote the establishment of libraries.

Not being either a mathematician or knowing very much about money, I agree that page 21 of the annual report looks a bit odd. I can only say that I'll see what I can find out about it to determine whether there is an answer. On the face of it it doesn't appear to be correct.

With respect to the comment of the Honourable the Member for St. John's, I wouldn't say if the municipal people or the people in our towns, municipalities, vote for the establishment of libraries, but no one would be happier than we to provide them with the monies that are available, but we can't compel people to read, and we must face the fact that there are relatively small numbers of people who are really interested in the reading of books and, of course, your best example of that is the City of Winnipeg where you have excellent library facilities and all kinds of books available without charge to those citizens of the city, and you have what is after all a very low rate of use. In other words, there is an inner motivation that must come which I suggest cannot be promoted with money. The mobile libraries -- the only ones that are operated in Manitoba are the libraries that are operated by the City of Winnipeg library. It moves about only in the city and I believe that they are used extensively in the territories in which they are used, and in that sense they are effective. We do not have in this province any mobile libraries that operate in any rural part of the province. I, myself, would like to see one of the regional libraries establish a mobile library, because I think it would be useful to determine to what extent it would be accepted and how it would be used. I would be inclined to think that it would likely be used fairly well, but we have no experience in which to base any specific answer to that. I'm hopeful that sometime before too long we will have one of our regional libraries that will undertake the use of one of the mobile libraries. Of course, in order to do that, you'd have to have a fairly large region, and I must say that our regions so far formed are not really large, and perhaps in some cases would not warrant the mobile

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . library to serve it.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I want to disagree completely with the Minister because the experience is precisely the reverse of what he says. The number of people reading books in this city of Winnipeg and in the suburbs around Winnipeg was small and was declining as long as we were limited to three buildings in the city of Winnipeg, but as of the time that the city of Winnipeg built a new branch, built a branch on Osborne Street, built a branch on Corydon, opened the travelling libraries and particularly -- I don't know how the Minister could have missed the report which appeared, I think, last week with pictures as to the reactions to the downtown branch where the picture showed empty shelves -- the experience is that, and we have the same experience, Mr. Chairman, in the suburbs of St. James, West Kildonan, St. Vital, St. Boniface; there may be several others -- I think Fort Garry -- which have opened branches. Where you open branches and where you give people the opportunity to get books without them having to travel for an hour on the bus, they will read and they will read in large quantities. That's precisely the experience we have, and I would like the Minister to give some consideration, some thought to the experience which we have. This is not theory, this is the actual practice. Where we have moved to open up libraries, people have been more than willing, they've been happy to read the books. The problem now is to have enough books in the library to meet the needs of the people and all I'm suggesting to the Minister is that he learn a lesson from the experience and to help. There are many towns -- Beausejour, or Stonewall -- I'm sure there's towns all through the province that, if they could see a grant from the province towards the purchase of books or towards the beginning of opening a library I'm sure that they would meet the challenge, the urging of the provincial government, and put up some of their own money, and I can't think of anywhere where the money could be better spent.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue a little bit on this rural mobile region which the Minister was speaking. I felt that maybe at times the mobile unit did go out from the city, but now he tells me that it didn't go out of the city and it's a far cry that it should be established now, not sometime. It should take immediate steps in 1962 -- this coming summer -- and see what can be done, because it seems to me as if the rural people are second class citizens as far as the library is concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) passed . . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the -- oh we passed (d) -- I'd like to ask the Minister, are there any changes or any proposed changes in the establishment of regional libraries? At the moment, two municipalities -- is it, say a rural and a village -- can join together and create a district? Are there any proposed changes in that?

MR. McLEAN: No change.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on the same subject of regional libraries, I'd just like to acquaint the House with one regional library established actually in 1961 which will be opened in 1962 which I think is a departure in rural Manitoba. I'm referring to the library which will be established in my own constituency in the village of Ste. Rose. It will be the first bilingual library in rural Manitoba. The rural municipality there and the village got together and started that in the past year, and the books will be split evenly between French and English books, and there'll also be a section of German books for the German population in the area. This was done by agreement of the local board, and as I say, so far we cannot report on the success of it because it hasn't actually opened, but I think it's interesting that this is the first one to be developed in the province. I think it's an interesting development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) passed. Resolution 7 passed . . . . .

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make on (d). I'm sure that the Minister will not be astonished that I have a few remarks to make in connection with (d) because I see that he has been paying some attention to the metropolis of Flee Island and (Interjection) -- F l e e Island -- and I suppose that in spite of the interesting subject that it is that we can't expect the Honourable the Minister to be conversant with all of the details. I wonder if he could tell me, though, the difference in the Order-in-Council that has been passed and the one that was rescinded dealing with these historic sites and perhaps that one in turn. In other words, could we get the history of what has happened here?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, I think it might be rather more my subject -- (Interjection) -- Yes it is; I can answer my

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . . honourable friend, that there was no change made by the Order-in-Council but merely listed down in one place and gave the legal description of the land respecting the historic sites that do exist now. Then we are reviewing the list to see what, if any, further steps are required to preserve them and to make sure that people are warned that any desecration of the ground or any alteration of the ground is certainly to be avoided and might even be punishable in certain circumstances.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think that the latter part that the Honourable the Minister mentioned is included in the Act itself, and is it not a fact that these had previously been declared historic sites? I well remember that they were mapped and certainly my own remembrance is that they were declared historic sites for the purpose of protecting them just as the Minister has mentioned. One point that I wanted to mention, though, is that this list, too, in the general area-- there is a third one -- this one, Manitoba Gazette regulation 9/62 lists the Flee Island Indian entrenchment, then it lists the St. Ambroise Indian entrenchment. There is a third one in between the two in the St. Marks area. My guess would be that it was included in the original order along with the others, although I'm not certain of that. I would think that it's approximately in the same stage of preservation as the others, though I've not seen the St. Marks or St. Ambroise entrenchment for several years. I see the Flee Island one quite frequently because I make it a point to go in there to be sure that I don't miss the location. It hasn't been well taken care of; it has been mapped, as the Honourable Minister may know. It has been mapped. I believe that applies to the others as well. The description that's given, the legal description so far as the Flee Island entrenchment is given, is a very long and intricate description and it concludes by saying that it contains 2.06 acres. I was wondering if this Order-in-Council also provides a roadway in to the site because people can't get there without a great deal of difficulty. If there was going to be any use made of it as a historical site I would think it would need a means of ingress and egress, if those are the proper terms, and 2.06 acres wouldn't seem to give very much.

In the case of the St. Ambroise Indian entrenchment, there seems to be 5 acres appropriated. My remembrance is that they're very similar in size. It's quite odd that they should be. They're roughly circular; they're approximately 100 yards in diameter. I have stepped them -- that's a method that we farmers use in measuring -- and I would say they're approximately 100 yards in diameter. I notice that the one with regard to the Flee Island entrenchment mentions all that portion of north-east quarter section 13, Township 13, Range 6 West. Not all of it is on that quarter section. This description is so involved that I can't be sure just what it covers but if it covers only the part on the north-east of 13-13-6, it hasn't got it all, unless the line fence is in the wrong place, because the line fence at the half mile line at the south side of that quarter section goes across a small portion of that entrenchment.

Now, I'm going to cross my honourable friends up who have been expecting me to deliver my usual oration on the history of Flee Island, and not tell them about it at all. I'm really going to disappoint everyone. But I would mention something that I have perhaps not told the House before. That is, our friend Al Hockbaum, who is in charge of the Delta Research Station, has developed into a very qualified historian of that area as well as a specialist on game birds in particular and wild life in general. And among the objects of historical interest has been this old entrenchment, and the others that I have mentioned, and some other items of considerable historic interest, the position of the old original graveyard of the local Indians in that area. And in his checking on this location of the Flee Island battlefield he discovered that it is very, very close to a place that he considers tremendously important, because he tells me that it is the traditional mating ground of the ruffed grouse, that they come every year to the same place, that for those who have observed the ceremonies in that connection, the fights and the sounds that take place, that it's to ornithologists and to nature lovers in general and particularly to those who are interested in the ruffed grouse, that it's a matter of considerable importance. And that famous ground where, Al tells me, the ruffed grouse have come for centuries on end, happens to be within a stone's throw, or thereabouts, of this old entrenchment. So it might be well if a marker is going to be put up any time there, it might be well to contact Al Hockbaum, who is a top-flight historian of the area now, and get him to make some comments on interesting points that might be raised in that connection.

Now even if you coax me that's all I'm going to tell you about Flee Island today, and I'm not going to tell you any more about St. Marks either. But it lies halfway between Flee Island March 5th, 1962

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . and St. Ambroise. There is an entrenchment in that area. I'm not certain of the place -- I would guess it's on Section 11 of the next Township, next both north and east, but that's only a guess, but when we're doing it we might as well protect that one too. And the St. Ambroise one -- the last time that I saw it, it was in the best state of preservation of the three of them. I would suggest that they should be protected by fencing soon, and in the case of the Flee Island one particularly, there will have to be some compensation made to the owner because he is farming close to the place, even though it's quite stony, but whether there needs to be any great amount of compensation made in either of these cases, the one in the St. Marks area lies close to the centre of a section. It wouldn't be easy to get to, but they need to be protected, particularly the St. Marks and St. Ambroise ones, because livestock running over will tramp them out pretty soon. And if they aren't protected fairly soon, nobody's going to believe me that they actually existed there and I want something beside my own reiteration in this House to mark the site. So I suggest to the Minister that he prepare to get some actual protection in the form of fencing put up -- and the owners no doubt would need to be contacted in that regard. And then at least for two of them, perhaps all three, that some arrangements be made for markers, because this is part of the history of the province and I'm suggesting that at least two, maybe three, should be preserved and by all means the Flee Island one.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think among the historic things that must be preserved are the speeches that come year by year from the Honourable Member for Lakeside on the subject of Flee Island, and I would think that that would be incentive enough for us to undertake the preservation of these sites.

I'm not able to tell him whether St. Marks was included in the original orders or not. If there are in fact entrenchments of this kind that have not come to our notice, they should be looked at. I'll undertake to see that that is done.

There was nothing provided in the Order-in-Council respecting access roads. That matter is under separate jurisdiction -- as a matter of fact the Department of Mines and Natural Resources have that responsibility and these sites will be in their plans. Whatever degree of priority is given to it I do not know. The question of the difference in size of sites is something that I had not heard discussed before. However, I'll refer this matter to the Historic Sites Advisory Board and get their views.

I'm very interested in the idea that this ground is close to or might be added to by the mating ground of the ruffed grouse, because not only for ornithologists but for others as well this is a combination surely of education and experience of nature, as well as being a tourist attraction. -- (Interjection) -- Indeed it has, and whether these creatures are of a shy nature and might tend to limit their activities if gazed upon by too many tourists, I don't know, but that's part of the responsibility we have in looking into it. I think I can assure my honourable friend that we are very much interested in this subject; that it's being studied at the present time, and he has put his finger, I think, on one of the things that must be looked into and that is the rights of the people who own the land now. There is one case -- no need to name it -- where the gentleman on whose property -- at least I'm not right in saying that; I think the property is actually owned by the Department of Veterans Affairs, but it is being farmed by a farmer in that area, and really I'm sorry to have to report that a part of the entrenchments have already been affected by the agricultural operations there. Nevertheless we intend to proceed as quickly as we can to see that no more is damaged.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, it hasn't been affected seriously. I visited this place last summer and I think there's no damage done as yet, but any time that an area is grazed -- and that one isn't as frequently as the other two -- any time that they're grazed and with the stock going down and out it adds to the disfigurement of it very quickly.

I intended to mention when I was on my feet before, Mr. Chairman, that there is another historical site close by the Flee Island Indian entrenchment because it's exactly a half a mile south of that line fence that I was speaking of -- it runs right through the entrenchment -- it's exactly a half a mile south of there on the very corner where four sections meet, that the original road of the Canadian Pacific Railway ran. It crossed exactly at that corner running a little bit north of east you can still see -- and in the Muir section you can still see a little bit of that old right-of-way. And that was the original line, and it started to bend fairly sharply. That

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . old original line had followed roughly along the gravel ridge that goes pretty well straight west of Warren, Manitoba, and having followed along that gravel ridge, which of course was one of the shores of receding Lake Agassiz, when it got to that area it started and bent in towards Portage La Prairie. And I imagine that perhaps the Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie may have seen some of those old areas of the original railway. It may be well to suggest to the people when they are out looking it over that they can still see some of the old original right-of-way and part of it is right at the corner south of this entrenchment. So just another thing for which Flee Island is quite famous.

MR. DOW: Mr. Chairman, it would appear today that most of the historical sites in Manitoba are centred around the Lakeside constituency and Portage La Prairie. But I would like to draw the attention of the House to one particular trail, that was so very important to southern Manitoba that is gradually becoming obliterated. The Speaker of the House is so well acquainted with it that what I may say he may have some degree of variance with it, but it is what was known as the Old Commission Trail which started at a point originating at the Red River near what is now Emerson. And the people that homesteaded in the southwestern part of Manitoba travelled by oxen through what they called a commission trail, for they had to travel from that particular point to the first land registry office which was situated in the foothills of the Turtle Mountain at a point about six miles southeast of Deloraine. Now that particular trail wandered through various properties as they are so cultivated now, but I would suggest, Sir, that some type of markage, some type of drawings or markings should be established, because at this point the people that have some knowledge of it are fast disappearing and it has been referred to in many historical writings in the province but to my knowledge there's no marking or any indication showing the start, the end and the territory of which it travelled through.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, under this section item (d) Archives and Historical Research, I notice the only increase here is for salaries and that is \$5,000. Now I asked the First Minister the question the other night about the appropriation for historical sites, and he led me to believe that somewhere in the budget would be an increased amount for historical research. Now in view of all the development that's going on at Grand Rapids and in this day and age when modern construction goes on at such a pace, I'm just hoping that this \$5,000 is not the only amount that we have for this most vital work of Grand Rapids.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on Thursday or Friday last, I quizzed the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce on the two historic sites that have been declared at Arden and I understood him to say that he would elaborate on the program that he has outlined for these areas under his estimates. I suppose that would be on Industry and Commerce. Will we discuss them now or shall we wait until we do reach the Minister's estimates?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm very glad -- I see the honourable member has left his chair but I'll be very glad to give consideration to the matter of the Old Commission Trail and I refer it to the Historic Sites Advisory Board for their consideration as to its historic importance.

My honourable friend from Seven Oaks raised the question as to whether the \$5,000 that's in the estimates constitute all the funds that are available for historic preservation work and so on at Grand Rapids. That has not been the case and I think the Honourable the Treasurer the other day indicated that other funds have been applied to this work, and indeed if my understanding is correct, a good deal of the funds comes from the Hydro-Electric Board up there who have provided an amount for various purposes up there, apart from building the power plant itself, which is available for matters of this kind and they have indeed provided funds for it.

Now as to my honourable friend for Gladstone, I'm not aware that I indicated that I had further information to give with respect to -- was it the development at Arden?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Yes

MR. EVANS: Did I say so?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Now, Mr. Chairman, I understood the Minister to say when I quizzed him as to what was planned at the Arden Ridge site that he would discuss it further on his estimates and I thought that he meant the estimates under the Department of Industry and Commerce. The Neepawa Press, the last one, carries quite a little story on it: "Two historic

(Mr. Shoemaker, con't.) . . . sites proclaimed at Arden," and gives a little account of it, and I just wonder if the Minister can tell us now what is planned for that area. For instance, Mr. Chairman, the site would be about two miles north of the Arden Ridge filling station. I wonder if the Minister intends to put a marker up on the highway to indicate where this site is because it could develop into quite a tourist attraction. And then you will recall, Mr. Chairman, too, that at the last session I started to give members of the House quite a historical background on one of Manitoba's sodbusters, namely Adam McKenzie, and they stopped me at that time because they said that I was discussing it under the wrong item. Now, perhaps a marker or a monument of some kind could be erected in that vicinity to show that this is the spot where Adam McKenzie lived so many years because I think that this site, or one of them that has been declared is on ground that Adam McKenzie owned and it would be suitable, I suggest, to probably work the two in together.

And then too, Mr. Chairman, I think at the last session of the Legislature -- not the fall one, I meant the one a year ago -- there was some mention made of the fact that some time during 1961 there would be five markers go up to mark Pelly Trail, wasn't it, or Perry Trail. I think one of the markers was to be in the vicinity of Neepawa. Now it hasn't been erected to my knowledge and I wonder what went awry with the plans for that?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions I shall be glad to refer this recommendation about the Arden Ridge to the Board. We depend on them for advice.

In respect to the Perry Trail, I'm not able to answer whether or not last year we indicated that this trail would be marked. My understanding would have been, or my memory is this, that it was certainly on the list for consideration and I'm not sure that I intended to say, if I did say, that it would be marked in the year between. However, again I will ask the Board to review this item and place it in their list of priorities.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is taking recommendations for markings I would like to give him one as well. This is one that has been discussed as far as I know for a long time, and it's the Manitoba House settlement, the original Hudson's Bay Post on the shores of Lake Manitoba in the vicinity of Kinosota -- I'm sure this one the Historical Society is well aware of -- and requests have gone in at various times to have this site marked. There's still some indications of the original post and it was for a long period of time, as I know it, the headquarters for the fur trade in that whole area, points from which some of the northern expeditions started, so if he would make note of that one.

I wonder too if, while we're on the subject of historical sites, the Minister could report to us at this time on the Grand Rapids situation. Has everything been done there to preserve the sites that existed and the material there? I know that they had some people from the United States, I believe, last year to do some work. Are there still works going on and what is the situation now?

MR. EVANS: I wonder if my honourable friend would allow me to get together the latest information on that? I must confess that I didn't recognize that this was going to be in the estimates today and I'll be glad to answer on my own estimates, say the Provincial Secretary, when we come to them, perhaps later on this evening.

MR. MOLGAT: That will be agreeable to myself. I would like to know exactly the situation on Grand Rapids because I think a fair amount of work was done there.

The question was asked about the increase in this department for appropriation. Does this indicate an increase in the staff in that department?

MR. McLEAN: . . . . . one person.

MR. MOLGAT: Who will be doing historical research?

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: At what point does the First Minister intend to discuss the question of the 1967 celebrations and also the 1970 celebrations which I think we should start anticipating now? We will have, in a sense, two birthdays for Manitoba -- the '67 being the overall Canadian one, but then our own provincial centenary is following right along behind that and I think we should start making plans for that now.

MR. ROBLIN: It is not our intention to initiate a discussion on this matter at this session. We have some time ahead of us, as members will realize, and we were expecting that we would have our own plans brought forward next year and we would be glad to have any

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . suggestions at that time as to how they could be improved and generally debate the matter in the House, but we are not prepared, we have not reached the stage yet where our ideas are sufficiently firm that we would present them to the Chamber. We think that probably we will be able to do that next year.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it the intention of the government to combine the two or will there be two separate activities involved?

MR. ROBLIN: It's not firmly settled yet, Mr. Chairman. It will largely depend, I think, on what kind of a way in which we will mark the occasions. It may be that there will be in effect really two official celebrations -- three years apart -- but some of the main projects may be a one-for-two proposition because of their size and nature, but that matter I must admit has not yet been finally settled because until we have our own ideas a little more firmly sketched out we wouldn't be in a position to make any recommendation to the Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 7, passed. Department III - Treasury, Resolution 8. Appropriation 1 . . . .

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I want to direct a question under the Minister's salary. Before doing it however, I would appreciate if the House would permit me to say a few words leading to this question. During the depression years in Winnipeg, particularly in 1933 when there were almost half of the population partly or wholly on relief, the relief system at that time was conducted by the powers-that-be in the city council at that time who had no knowledge of any kind how to handle relief in an emergency and how to handle the relief in general. The system was to give them . . . first of all a man has to wait for hours in the cold sheds somewhere on Ellice Avenue there and wait for an interview; they were considered as beggars although there were quite a few intelligent people on relief -- professionals, storekeepers and others -- and they were compelled at the time to work for the miserable relief they got. In other words, work all day for the 60¢ or 70¢ a day allowance they received. At that time they had applications from barbers, small storekeepers, bank clerks who wanted just a month's rent or two months' rent which would help them to get through and make subsistence on their own. But the wise men at that time refused. They say you have to close up your barber shop, close up the small storekeeper, the small store, or close up your small business and go on relief. A few dollars rent, two or three months' rent would have helped them but it was refused on the old style charitable system they had at that time. In 1930, in that year I suggested in Council -- and here's an article from the Free Press verifying it, and you could trace the records of the city council -- to establish a municipal bank to enable, first of all, have a bank that would consider applications for loans on the basis of need and the basis of character and honesty and not on the basis of security. And that proposition passed council; it came into the Legislature; it passed first reading, second reading; it was referred to the Committee of Law Amendments. That was in 1933. At that time there was an MLA here -- a very high class scholar, educationally, and also a man who was sincere in public life. He was one of the greatest Conservatives I have known at that time and this is the late -- may God bless his soul -- the late Mr. Evans, the father of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and he made this statement: "You are perfectly right but we are not yet ready for private ownership." And he moved that the bill be not reported. Later when I came into this House there was a shortage of money and the Provincial Treasurers had to wear out the knees of their pants to go down to the United States and kneel before the almighty American dollar to borrow money and pay high interest. If I'm not mistaken, they paid as high as 6%, and at the time that I came into this House I understand they still had bonds which bear the interest of 7 percent. I don't know what they have today; we'll hear about it later. And then I suggested, sell bonds over the counter. There's a lot of people here that would trust -- the 800,000 people of this province, they will trust a million of cultivated land; they will trust all the natural resources we have; the rail-ways, the lakes, the fish, everything, and they would buy money from you at a reasonable interest, not much more than you have to go and beg on the American market, which was not accepted to the . . . . ., to Conservatives. Finally, a couple of years ago the present Treasurer made a trial. He didn't expect to get much money; he limited a certain amount, but he succeeded many, many millions of dollars more than he anticipated and expected. I bought bonds here for the few dollars I had from my insurance, and I was asking the Minister to sell me more and whether I had a right to sell. So now I'm coming back to the very same point and

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . it's not too late to ask for forgiveness of the wrong decision in the years gone by -- the decision in the hungry years which the wise men at that time didn't want to do it and didn't want to save thousands of dollars -- not only this, save the morale and save the dignity of the people. No. They're giving them a little slip for six loaves of bread or a half an onion. That is cheaper than helping them to get re-established.

So I come back direct to my question now. I'm not suggesting a provincial bank because the banks now getting less and less are too powerful to allow us to do it, although it would have been a good idea and I think in years to come they will probably think about it. But right now, instead of deciding having another campaign and paying interest to the brokers and spend thousands of dollars for advertising, why not open up a simple office downtown, or even in this building, and tell the public, "If you have \$10.00 to save, if you have \$100.00 to save, come to the most secure, most secure place and put in your money, and you will soon accumulate in the millions, in the hundreds of millions, because the banks have it and we are stronger than the banks, and then we won't have to worry every day. Where are we going to get our money tomorrow?" Which lender will accept us, and if, God forbid, there is a failure of crop, immediately they'll say, "Well the province is not secure." Mr. Speaker, the province is the best security, by the people that live in the province, by the land that we have cultivated in the province, by the natural resources and by our tradition that in the last 70 years the province of Manitoba has not failed to pay its debts even at a high interest. So I direct a question now to the Treasurer, whether you'll be thinking about it; whether it's possible; and if so, when will it be done?

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I've looked through the estimates and only see one classification in this department again but a substantial raise in salary estimates. Now I was wondering if this is due to general increase for all staff concerned, but when I looked through the records further I see a new position has been established and I imagine it's in this department. It's called the Assistant Finance Officer, but I wouldn't imagine that \$21,045 would be remuneration for this position.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Honourable Member for Inkster, I have to acknowledge that ever since I took this position that I have now, he's been one of those who encouraged me to go ahead with the Manitoba Savings bond idea, and as everyone knows we did last year, and it turned out very successfully, and as stated in the Throne Speech we intend to do so again this year before very long and I'll be making an announcement in the House about it one of these days. Although it's by no means exclusive information, it's the kind of thing that is made as a matter of routine by the Treasury Department, rather than through the instrumentality of the House. But I think that's about as far as we're going to go at the present time. It's interesting to note that last year, apart from our utilities, we found that practically all of requirements, indeed, were taken care of in this way.

In reply to the Honourable Member for Kildonan, I can tell him that the salary expenses are general increases; that there's no particular post that is responsible for them. The finance officer that he refers to, I think, is one under the jurisdiction of the municipal board and handles municipalities, their financial problems, rather than the ones here.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, while we're still on the general subject, is the First Minister going to make a general report on the department at this stage?

MR. ROBLIN: I'll try to answer any questions as best I can, Sir.

MR. MOLGAT: There'll be no minister's statement then I take it. This opens up, when we enter the Treasury Department, a very wide field, of course, Mr. Chairman. I don't intend at this stage to go into a discussion of the tax rental agreements and so on. That will be coming up later on, and there's no need to have a duplicate discussion. There are some matters though that I would like to discuss.

Last week we had a brief discussion on the matter of the treasury bills put out by the province, and at that time I was discussing with the Minister the matter of putting them out on bid. Since then I have checked further into this subject and I find that subsequent to the treasury bills being put out by the Province of Manitoba here, the City of Winnipeg issued treasury bills of its own, round about the end of February, or the second or third week in February. And these were put out, Mr. Chairman, on a straight bid basis. I understand that they simply got on the phone and contacted a few dealers, six or seven, and told them that they had a million

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . and a half dollars which they wanted on a 60-day basis and proceeded to get bids immediately from all of them. The bids were very close but there was some variation. They ran from 99.882, which was the successful bidder, down to 99.886. I haven't got the percentages worked out but these were the buying prices. All of them with the exception of one were bid without commission. One bid at a somewhat higher price but then put in a \$600.00 commission. And this was done here in the City of Winnipeg with these firms. There were no difficulties apparently; it was a straight bid basis, and I can't understand why the province cannot follow the same procedure. I'm told that this is done in other areas as well. While it's true that the Province of Manitoba is probably the first province to go into this type of financing, the City of Vancouver has done this previously; apparently the City of Kingston has on various occasions and certainly the experience here with our own City of Winnipeg with a somewhat larger amount than what the government itself was doing, admittedly on somewhat shorter term -- 60 days instead of 91 -- but it was still done on a bid basis, and I wonder whether the Minister would care to comment on that.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will comment and say that we do exactly the same thing. When we get relatively small amounts, and I know it seems rather peculiar to talk about a couple of million dollars as relatively small amounts because they're enormous amounts, but in terms of the kind of operations that governments, municipal, provincial and federal do, these are not large sums, nor are they large sums in terms of the market. So that when we get what we call a roll over of a short term funding requirement, either for 60 days, or perhaps for as long as a couple of years, we very frequently do exactly what the City of Winnipeg do; namely, we get in touch with the dealers who might be interested and get a series of bids on that particular operation, which we then give to the lowest bidder. So that kind of an operation is one with which we are familiar.

Now I know that members may have trouble in distinguishing a real difference between that kind of operation and the sort of treasury bill one, but in terms of the market there is, and that is, that we hope to establish the kind of thing we are doing under treasury bills, not as a one-time proposition, or as an infrequent proposition, depending on the circumstances -- which is the case with these things that my honourable friend is talking about -- but as a permanent part of our financing system that we regularly float once a week.

Now, I come back to my point that I'm not at odds with him and I think that quite soon we will be able to go over to the bid basis on this and, frankly, if we do, and when we do, I'll much prefer it. I can only say that one has to be guided, in the beginning at any rate, until some experience is developed when one is trying to establish something that is basically new to the . . . , as this one is, one has to be guided to a considerable extent by the kind of advice that's given, and by those who ought to know. And I must confess that while I hold the office of Treasurer, no one would ever accuse me, I think, of being an expert in the mechanism of the financial market. So, as other treasurers have done, it's necessary to pay considerable attention to the advice we get. And I repeat again, that our advice was that in trying to establish this as a regular operation in the market that we would be well advised to operate on what is sort of a semi-bid basis, namely, we have two firms and we deal through them. But I agree with my honourable friend the desirable thing on this thing is to have it on a straight bid basis, and just as soon -- and it may not be very long -- that we feel that we can embark on that, well, we'll be glad to do so.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabour this point. The net cost to the government, I don't think will vary greatly in all probability, but I just don't see the reasoning for having gone in the first place, on not having gone in the first place, on a bid basis. My honourable friend says that it's new. Well it's only new so far as the Province of Manitoba is concerned. It's certainly been used in Ottawa for a long time, and the facts are that other cities have used it and it's a common method in the financial market. So it's well-known. It may be new in the sense that the Province of Manitoba has not used it before. He says he consulted and got the advice that it should be done through two firms. Did he consult other firms apart from those two? The two firms involved I would imagine would tell him that it should be done that way. Other firms, had they been consulted, I think would probably tell him otherwise. Certainly any investigations I have made lead me to think that the majority of the public, or the firms involved, would think that it should be done on the bid basis. So why simply take

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . . the advice of these two firms and not the advice of the other people in the market?

MR. ROBLIN: I agree, Mr. Chairman, that one shouldn't, nor did we. When we were considering putting this up, the Deputy Treasurer made an extended visit to Toronto, Montreal and to Ottawa, where he spoke with all the leading figures in the financial world, as far as I understand from his report to me, a pretty widespread discussion. And he also reviewed it thoroughly with the Bank of Canada because it was very important to find out what their reaction to this was. And then I may say, just so we won't be accused of looking at it through one pair of eyes only, that the Provincial Treasurer in the Province of Saskatchewan went down himself with his own Deputy Treasurer and made the same series of discussions and investigations with the Bank of Canada and with a wide variety of people in the financial world, and when he came back through Winnipeg he and I, and our respective deputies, discussed the whole matter, and the report that was given was that when all things were considered this was the consensus of opinion of those with whom we had spoken. Now I don't think I'm going to convince my honourable friend that what we did was the right thing, and I don't want to repeat the previous explanation given, but I do want to assure him that pretty serious and careful consideration was given to it before we adopted the method we took. But I come back to my point, which I think is his point, that at the earliest possible moment we should move into the tender system on this and I sincerely hope that can be done.

MR. MOLGAT: Were the firms who are involved in this type of financing in Winnipeg consulted?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not in a position to give the names of all the people who have been consulted, because -- and I'm not saying this because I wish to avoid answering my honourable friend. Personally, I can't tell him the list of the firms because they were considerable. But I know this that it would not be advisable for me to give those names because then we would be imputing the action that we took to their advice. And I think that while we do rely on their advice nevertheless we are responsible for the action taken and not them, so I don't think it would be right for me to give names.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm not really asking for names in this case. I just want the assurance that other people apart from just the two firms were consulted.

MR. ROBLIN: I can give that assurance.

MR. MOLGAT: You can?

MR. ROBLIN: I can.

MR. MOLGAT: At the moment then, how many of these treasury bill issues have been made?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, once a week they're made. I had the list with me the other day when the Treasury Bill Act was before the House and I gave the information at that time, I believe, and since that time there has been one new issue, so that I would guess, I think that four or five, probably five of these bids have been received, but they come in regularly once a week.

MR. MOLGAT: Then since the start, which was some time in the early part of February, every week we have actually borrowed a million dollars on this basis?

MR. ROBLIN: That's right, and over the course of the year we will borrow \$13 million because the bills are only good for 90 days, therefore we pay back once a quarter, therefore the sum total at the end of the year is 13 million, and this system saves us, around, I think the figure I gave the House the other day was about a quarter of a million dollars in interest.

MR. MOLGAT: Well I would strongly recommend a change in the policy of selling on the open market as soon as possible. The experience, by the way, of the City of Winnipeg was that they did obtain a somewhat better rate than what the province obtained on its own borrowing.

MR. ROBLIN: Well one must remember the differences in terms.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, from 60 to 90.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: But on the other hand it's a larger amount so . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Each deal stands on its own feet.

MR. MOLGAT: Each deal stands on its own feet, that may be, but this was done on

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . the open market and I would recommend the other as quickly as possible. I wonder if the Minister could tell us the situation of the treasury, or rather, the savings bonds which were issued last year, and where we stand now in that financing?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think, as members will recall, the savings bond issue was outstandingly successful and some \$40,800,000 worth of bonds were sold at that time. Now as members are aware, this is cash money; this is cash on demand, and, of course, one of the important things is: how are the encashments coming along? In other words, if there was a very large run on this kind of savings, then obviously it would be some cause for comment, and I'm very glad to be able to report to the House that the encashments under the savings bonds have been substantially less than we had estimated when the bonds were first put out. Up to the beginning of February, which is the latest figure that I have, the encashments, I think, were 1.9 millions -- let's call it 2 millions for the sake of argument -- the encashments were 2 million, running around a quarter of a million dollars a month, and we regard that as satisfactory indeed. Figures on this kind of thing, experience with other provinces is very hard to get. We've been trying to find out the experience of British Columbia but we've been unable to get that information and we don't know just how they're going, but we do know that our rate of encashment is -- it compared quite favourably indeed with the rate of encashment in Saskatchewan, so that the Treasury officials are well pleased with the results of this issue and think that the monthly encashments are well within the limits that were anticipated when the bond issue was put up.

I would like to tell my honourable friend -- I think, I'm not sure that he was in his seat when I gave this information previously that we expect to make another issue quite soon and when we do, terms will be announced to the trade and to the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Pursuing this same question, Mr. Chairman, we can assume then that there are still something in the order of 40 million. It seems to me the total sale last year was over 40, around 42, was it not?

MR. ROBLIN: \$40,800,000.00

MR. MOLGAT: So we have something near 40 million on hand. Now these are demand bonds. When the government received this money, this 40 million, what did the government proceed to do with the money? Presumably they did not have need immediately of \$40 million of short term capital. How was it handled?

MR. ROBLIN: When the money comes in. Mr. Chairman, we endeavour to find out places to put it. Now, I think I may say -- and here I am speaking from memory and I am subject to correction later on -- but I think I am safe in saying that demands by utilities were the people who took up the majority of this money while it was not required for other purposes. The way in which we operate is that we try to make all our cash money on hand work for us all the time. In other words, we don't want any hanging around in the treasury not being employed, and we do run substantial cash surpluses over current requirements from time to time. Members will understand that one of the most interesting parts of the Treasury Department is this management of our cash reserves or our cash resources, and we do not allow other governmental bodies to accumulate sums of cash and leave it lying around unused, but if there is any of that money available it comes into the hands of the treasury and appears in our trust accounts and we manage that money while it is in trust account. Some of it is invested, depending on the nature of the account. Some of it's invested in other municipal bonds or all kinds of things of that sort, but the bulk of this money, and particularly the money that comes in from the savings bonds, is used pretty quickly in the normal operations of the government. Then we send this out by internal treasury bill to the Hydro and to the Telephones, who are very large consumers of capital, and then what happens is, that when we've been drained dry and got nothing left and it's all lent out to these utilities, they usually will float another bond issue and when they get the returns from that they pay us back and the money comes back into circulation, and perhaps it then goes out to pay for the road system or whatever. But there is a pretty close watch, there's a daily watch on all the cash money that we have on our hands, so that it is placed out to some use before it is actually needed.

Now, if we can't find anybody to use it, then we are in the market for these 90-day bills that we sell to others. That, of course, is the whole purpose of this short term money market, that people who have funds temporarily on hand will invest it in the short term money

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . market because they know they're going to need it in 90 days and they get some interest on it while it's out and then they have it brought back in. The same problem that I am describing here occurs with any borrower. It occurs with most borrowers, that if a corporation goes out and floats a new stock issue, or they go out and float a new bond issue, or before the savings bonds came in, if we float a new issue for any of our utilities or for ourselves, one will recognize that there's always a period between the time the money is received and the time the money is used. Now in some circumstances while we're waiting for money to come in we may go to the bank and borrow some, or from any lender that there is around, so that we have the use of that money. Then when the bond money comes in, we pay off our borrowings and if we have any surplus left over we will lend it out to our utilities or other bodies that need funds in that way. So it's quite a business managing the money supply here, to see that it's always put to some use somewhere, but there always is that period on the issue of any set of bonds which we experience and other large borrowers experience, that naturally the money is not used the very day it comes in, that it always has to be re-invested, either in our utilities or in some other way, until such time as we need it for our own purposes.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . . the very purpose of my question, Mr. Chairman, because \$40 million appearing suddenly in the hands of the government, un-anticipated, because this was not anticipated because as I recall it -- and this operation went on last year while the House was in session -- when this was launched, and I am speaking now from memory, it seems to me the First Minister told us that he expected to get something in the order of \$12 million to \$14 million. Now presumably then he had made plans, as he should, for the employment of \$12 million or \$14 million of what might be termed working capital, because I suggest that short term money should be considered as working capital and not as long term investment on his part, so I assume as Provincial Treasurer that he had that expectation. He found himself in receipt of \$42 million, or \$40 million eight, having only presumably prepared or wanted substantially less than that. Now what exactly did he proceed to do with that \$40 million?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, it's perfectly true that when the savings bond issue was announced I didn't expect \$40,800,000. I must confess that the figure I gave in a public statement as to what we expected was on the very low side. I had seen the results of the campaign in Saskatchewan and thought, that we might do about double, which would bring us up to about \$30 million, yet on the other hand I was a little bit reluctant to go out on a limb and prophesy we were going to get that much. I think it would be fair to say that we had expected the \$25 million perhaps 30, but \$25 million would be about the most we would get, and that there was another \$10 or \$15 million which was money for jam, you might say. But the problem that we had in temporarily making use of that other \$10 million is no different from the problem that we have all the time, when bond money comes in, because it always comes in in a considerable flood, and as I've tried to explain to the House, what you do is that you use all your short term lines of credit that you may require in the interval between one bond issue and another, so that when the bond issue materializes and comes in, some of the money goes to pay off the short term lines of credit and other parts of the money is put in some sort of short term investment until you need it. Now my honourable friend says "What did you do with it?" Well, I can't give him a breakdown of these investments but it is available and I suggest that when we come to the Public Accounts Committee if he wishes to ask his question again there, I'll have the Deputy Treasurer there and we can give him any breakdown or information that he requires on that point.

MR. MOLGAT: Sir, I would prefer to get it here -- we're discussing Treasury. All the members of the House are here and this is a matter of interest to all of us, rather than public accounts where only certain members are present. Also, it's been my experience that public accounts usually happens the day after the budget is presented here. Presumably at that stage the Leader of the Opposition is a very busy individual because he has to reply to the budget that afternoon. Maybe my honourable friend intends to have a different procedure, but if not, I think this would be a better time to discuss it. This matter of management of money by the Treasury is a very important one, once you're dealing in the size of issues that my honourable friend is. To have idle money sitting around for a short time or to be borrowing at a certain rate and lending to someone else at a substantially lower rate can be a costly operation for the province. Now, I gather from what my honourable friend says that he has the figures avail-

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . able, and I would like him to supply them to the House. We're almost at the time of our normal adjournment and possibly he could undertake to give us those figures this evening, because I am sure they would be readily available. Presumably from the answer my honourable friend made some of this money was used for the purchase of treasury bills from other sources. The interest that he would receive presumably on these treasury bills would be something on the order of the interest that he receives at present on the treasury bills that he has issued himself. Let us say something in the order of 3 1/2? Yet the money that he had borrowed and that he was paying interest on was borrowed at something in the order of five? He has the figures; I haven't. Maybe he can tell us about that. How long were we in the position where we were holding treasury bills of other people, and so on? How much of it was involved in this, and what was the net cost?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to do this in Public Accounts because I want my officials there. This is a very tricky and complicated matter, and I would certainly want them there in order to make sure that I gave the correct and accurate information. I think I can generally answer my friend by saying that there was some of this \$40 million invested in other short term accounts, possibly for a matter of three or four months. By no means all, but before it had all been absorbed into the usual uses to which this money is authorized by the legislature there would be a period of that order, I should think, but then again I'd like to get this information with the experts at hand who can answer the questions in full that my honourable friends have, but the point that I think should not go unnoticed is that in any form of bond issue the same problem arises whether it's treasury bills, or whether it's regular bond issues or whatever. The advantage to the treasury bill system, of course, is that the interest rate was about 1/2 to 3/4 of a percent below the market at that time and still is 1/2 a percent below the market and thus gives us a substantial margin of interest savings on which we can work, and that kind of thing should be borne in mind when discussions of this sort take place, but if my honourable friend will allow me, I think the Public Accounts is a better place. We needn't deal with it first thing in Public Accounts. If it's going to interfere with his budget speech let him make his budget speech and we'll come back to public accounts and deal with this -- I wouldn't want to rush him. But I would like to have my staff at hand so that we can make sure the information given is completely accurate.

MR. MOLGAT: I can appreciate that the Minister won't be in a position to answer the details of my question at this particular time, Mr. Chairman, but I think that between 5:30 and 8:00 o'clock tonight that the officials of his department could supply this information. This is quite important to the House. One must remember that \$40 million at 5% which is less than what my honourable friend was paying, represents interest of \$2 million a year. That represents over \$5,000 a day, if my arithmetic is correct, and this is a cost to the province. Now if the money is needed, fine. As my honourable friend says, this is the same as any large bond issue, that's true, but in the large bond issue you know how much your going for; you know if you're going for \$20 million or if you're going for \$15 million or for \$10 million, and you would presumably make your plans in advance to absorb this. In this particular case, my honourable friend now tells me that when he gave us the figures of whatever it was, let's say \$15 million, that really wasn't the truth; he was expecting 25. -- (Interjection) -- Well is that not what you said? So presumably he'd made plans for that. The fact is that he got something almost double to what he'd expected. Now, presumably he had not made plans for that. The fact seems to me to bear out that he should have either put a limit on the amount that he was going to borrow in that way, had a closing-off period of some kind or other, stated from the outset that he was only going to accept so much or that it was going to be so much per day for so many days or find some means. The fact is he didn't do that -- he went out with no top-limit. Now what I want to know is, was this a wise financial operation on that basis or did it end up by costing the Province of Manitoba more money than it should have for that particular operation?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I am afraid my honourable friend is not going to get me to apologize for the fact that we got such a vote of confidence from the people of Manitoba as \$40,800,000. We were very pleased to get that money and it has all been employed in the uses of the province. I don't know what I have to tell my honourable friend about planning. Does he not understand what the mechanism of the money market is for? People at all times want

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . to borrow money and want to lend money, so there is always a place to dispose of any amounts of money that might be available.

MR. MOLGAT: But at what rate?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . certainly we can find out the rate. If my honourable friend thinks he is going to, that he's on to something here he's going to have to think again, because we'll give him the rates and we'll show the amounts of money, and we'll answer all his questions as best we can, and he'll get the full information from us, and I haven't any doubt that even he will be convinced that it was a wise move when we get through.

MR. MOLGAT: All I'm asking for, Mr. Chairman, is for the information. So far my honourable friend seems to want to run around a circle and tell me that I'll get it when we get to Public Accounts. I submit that the right and proper time to do it is now. It's quite conceivable that his figures are all correct. I'm not suggesting they may not be. All I'm saying is that it's our responsibility to see to it that they are, and that's what I want to ascertain on behalf of the people of Manitoba. That's the long and the short of it. It seems to me that this would be a good time for the committee to rise and report, or rather call it 5:30, and then he can give us the information this evening.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Before we close at 5:30 could the First Minister tell us in round figures what it is costing and will cost this government as far as interest is concerned on this \$40 million that is loaned to us?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the net cost of interest to the province is shown in the estimates and is some 3 million odd dollars. That includes everything that we borrow and that really is the net cost of interest to the consolidated fund.

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

#### FRENCH SPEECHES

Following is a speech in French and English translation - See page 340 of Hansard, March 2nd, 1962:

MR. W. O. BAIZLEY (Osborne): Monsieur le President, je tenterai maintenant de dire quelques mots en francais. L'affiliation canadienne de l'association parlementaire du Commonwealth a tenu sa reunion annuelle dans la ville de Quebec l'ete dernier. Le gouvernement de Monsieur Lesage agissait comme hote. Je crois pouvoir parler au nom de la delegation manitobaine en disant que nous ne pourrions pas avoir ete mieux recus. Notre sejour fut des plus plaisant. Nous — les Canadiens de l'ouest — sommes tres fiers de notre renommee hospitaliere. Apres mon voyage de l'annee passee je puis vous assurer que l'hospitalite de la "belle province de Quebec" ne cede sa place a personne. Merci Jacques Bertrand et Joe Jeannotte.

#### ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF ABOVE:

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to try and say a few words in the French language. The Canadian branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association held its annual convention in the province of Quebec with the Quebec government as host. I think I can speak for the Manitoba delegation when I say that our reception could not have been better nor our stay more pleasant. We in the West sometimes pride ourselves on our reputation for hospitality but after my visit this summer I can say that the hospitality in "la belle province de Quebec" is second to none. Thank you Jacques Bertrand and Joe Jeannotte.

Following is a speech in French and English translation - See page 341 of Hansard, March 2nd, 1962:

MR. MOLGAT: Monsieur le President, je tiens a feliciter chaleureusement le depute d'Osborne pour sa contribution cette apresmidi. C'est certainement un exemple tout-a-fait louable du desir et du developpement du bilinguisme dans notre pays. En effet, ce serait une experience interessante de continuer le debat sur ce sujet en francais. J'ai l'impression que peut-etre le debat serait un peu plus court, en particulier l'impression que probablement j'aurais raison plus souvent que quand se sont des debats anglais. Cependant

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . . j'estime enormement les commentaires qu'a fait l'honorable depute d'Osborne et je l'en felicite.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF ABOVE:

Mr. Chairman, I insist on warmly congratulating the member for Osborne on his contribution this afternoon. It is certainly a laudable example of the desire to develop the bilinguism of our country. Indeed, it would be an interesting experience to continue the debate on this item in French. I have the impression that the debate would probably be shorter. In particular, I have the impression that I would probably be right more often than during the English debates. However, I highly appreciate the remarks made by the honourable member from Osborne and I congratulate him.