



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 25 2:30 p.m. Monday, March 12, 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 12, 1962

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Allan Henry and others praying for the passing of an Act to Incorporate Secured Investors Association.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

Mr. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone) introduced Bill No. 19 an Act to amend an Act respecting the Insurance Institute of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. J. INGEBRIGTSON (Churchill) introduced Bill No. 14 an Act to repeal An Act respecting the Town of Gimli.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SCARTH introduced Bill No. 64 an Act to amend The Public Schools (1) Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): I beg to move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name.

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

MR. HUTTON: The Administrator of the Province of Manitoba having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommended to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whereas a Special Committee of the House was appointed at the Third Session of the 26th Legislature on the 14th day of April 1961, to study and enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing system in the Province of Manitoba.

And whereas the said Special Committee of the House was reappointed at the Fourth Session of the 26th Legislature on the 17th day of October, 1961, for the same purposes and with the same powers and the same members, being Mr. Shewman, Chairman, Messrs. Weir, Geo. W. Johnson (Assiniboia), Roberts, and Wagner,

Therefore be it resolved: 1. That the Special Committee of the House appointed at the Third Session of the 26th Legislature to study and enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing system in the Province of Manitoba and reconstituted and reappointed at the Fourth Session of the 26th Legislature be now reappointed and reconstituted for the same purposes and with the same powers as set forth in the resolutions passed at the Third and Fourth Sessions of the 26th Legislature appointing and reappointing the said Special Committee. 2. That the said Special Committee shall consist of the following personnel, namely: Mr. Shewman, Chairman, Messrs. Geo. Wm. Johnson (Assiniboia), Roberts, Wagner and Watt. And be it further resolved that this Special Committee of the House shall have power to sit during the present Session, and in recess, after prorogation, and to report to this House on the matters referred to them at the next Session of the Legislature. And that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, to the members of the said Committee, the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the committee, or expenses incurred by the members in the performance of duties ordered by the committee, in recess, after prorogation, as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General. And that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, the expenses of counsel, secretaries, technical advisers, accountants, clerks, stenographers, and investigators to aid and assist said committee in the enquiry and to print the evidence proceedings and documents

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd.) . . . received by the committee during the session or after prorogation during recess as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General.

Resolution be adopted?

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with the adoption of the resolution I think it might be well if we had a progress report on the operations of the committee. It's now held a number of meetings and I think that the Members of the House would be interested in knowing exactly how much has been accomplished and what the committee proposes to do between now and the next session.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, the statement that we tabled here a while ago pretty well covers the activities of the committee up to date and what the committee intends to do I'm not at liberty to say because we're at a standstill right now, but the committee will further this work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, no, before the committee has adopted the resolution I would also like to ask the Minister proposing this how come on this particular resolution it was preceded by a message from His Honour. Were the expenditures involved not in the estimates?

MR. HUTTON: No they were not.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised that this committee which has been now operating for a year -- a committee which has been in operation, and that there should be no provision in the estimates when the government knows it is something that is going on. How can the Minister explain that he has not put it in the estimates?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier & Acting Provincial Treasurer)(Wolseley): Mr. Chairman, the Speaker not being in the Chair perhaps it would be open for me just to make a comment on the little contretemps that we ran into the other day. I have been thinking that matter over and it seems to me there is room for a genuine difference of opinion on this particular point. The Speaker has ruled on it and I know that it's not in order to debate his rulings and I don't wish to open that up. I think that the ground that was taken at the time among others was the interpretation of the word "sponsor" and matters of that sort. But it is my opinion that should we accept the Speaker's ruling as being correct on that occasion -- and perhaps it might be well if we did -- I think that for the removal of doubts in this matter in the future, that as far as we are concerned we would be prepared either to have the words "give consideration to the advisability of" or have a resolution proposed to the Committee of the Whole, as we are doing today. As I say I think there's room for a genuine difference of opinion on this, and I don't question the Speaker's ruling on it but it's my opinion that in order to prevent any legitimate misgivings that any members might have we would be well-advised to be on the safe side in resolutions of this sort and I think that's what we would like to do.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, my reason for bringing it up is not to question the Speaker's ruling but to find out exactly what the procedure is going to be. If one day it's one method and the next day another method, then obviously the House doesn't know where it's going on these things, and I merely wanted to find out what the procedure in the future was going to be -- what procedure was going to be followed in the future.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask either the Minister or the Chairman of the Committee if the committee has been, or is now, or plans to employ counsel?

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Chairman, we as a committee have acted to the best of our ability and we have sought help outside of the committee to date, and what future help we will need we're not at liberty to say so right now.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the chairman is being very secretive. I wonder what the reasons are for not being at liberty to tell the committee what is proposed? -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- Oh, but they have had something like a dozen or more meetings. There's surely been time to consult the committee and they're taking the authority to employ counsel, secretaries -- I presume they have a secretary. It wouldn't be divulging any untoward secret, I guess, for the chairman to tell us that they have a secretary. Have they technical advisors, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think if the Honourable Member for Lakeside would

(Mr. Shewman, cont'd.) read the report that was tabled here he would have a pretty fair idea of what the committee has done up to date. And I think you will notice in there that we have obtained the services of experts' advice on the questions that were pertaining to the marketing of livestock, and I think you will notice where we've had a Mr. Campbell from Guelph, Ontario. We had a Mr. Gilson with us for some advice and we've had a Professor Wood with us for some advice, and I think that's all in the report that we tabled, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I have read the report, Mr. Chairman, and I was very interested in it. I would consider that Dr. Campbell and Professor Gilson and others who have appeared before the committee would class as technical advisors. Would the Minister or the chairman inform us as to who would be investigators?

MR. SHEWMAN: didn't understand that last part of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Who would be investigators?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. SHEWMAN: For the future?

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't know whether they have investigators at present, but I see they're taking authority to have investigators.

MR. SHEWMAN: We cannot answer that request today, Mr. Chairman, because the committee has not decided on who the investigators will be as to date.

MR. CAMPBELL: I can understand that they wouldn't have decided, Mr. Chairman, who the investigators would be, but have they decided to have investigators. What would be the nature of the work of investigators?

MR. HUTTON: I would like to say a word, Mr. Chairman. I think that the resolution gives this committee powers to do things if they see fit and see the need to do them. However, the nature of their investigation to date has been to call various groups who are interested and who are associated with the problem that they have to deal with, and to request information by way of briefs and through some cross-examination by the committee itself. To date there has been no need to use investigators, if I am putting the right connotation on the term as used by the Member for Lakeside. It may evolve that the committee might have to resort to this sort of thing and for that reason, in that extremity they have powers to do so, but this is a provision in the resolution not necessarily meaning that it will be utilized by the committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: I confess, Mr. Chairman, that it was the two types of assistance that they are asking for -- or that this resolution gives them authority for -- namely, counsel and investigators. This looks like a pretty active kind of a study if they're going to employ both counsel and investigators. I wonder if it's proposed to investigate the question that the Honourable Member for Logan has raised in the House and to which the Honourable the Minister of Health has replied. I would think they would need counsel there because it would appear that that was probably invading the federal field rather than the provincial, but I am just intrigued by the two types of assistance that are authorized in this resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution to be adopted? Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. 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. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Acting Minister for Public Works that whereas a Special Committee of the House was appointed at the Third Session of the 26th Legislature on the 14th day of April, 1961, to study and enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing system in the Province of Manitoba, and whereas the said Special Committee of the House was reappointed at the Fourth Session of the 26th Legislature on the 17th of October, 1961, for the same purposes and with the same powers and the same members, being Mr. Shewman, Chairman, Messrs. Weir, Geo. Wm. Johnson (Assiniboia), Roberts and Wagner; therefore be it resolved: 1. That the Special Committee of the House appointed at the Third Session of the 26th Legislature to study and enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing system in the Province of Manitoba and reconstituted and reappointed at the Fourth Session of the 26th Legislature be now reappointed and reconstituted for the same purposes and with the same powers as set out in the resolutions passed at the Third and Fourth

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) Sessions of the 26th Legislature appointing and reappointing the said Special Committee. 2. That the said Special Committee shall consist of the following personnel, namely: Mr. Shewman, Chairman, Messrs. Geo. Wm. Johnson (Assiniboia), Roberts, Wagner and Watt. And be it further resolved: That this Special Committee of the House shall have power to sit during the present Session, and in recess, after prorogation, and to report to this House on the matters referred to them at the next Session of the Legislature. And that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, to the members of the said Committee, the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the committee, or expenses incurred by the members in the performance of duties ordered by the committee, in recess, after prorogation, as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General. And that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, the expenses of counsel, secretaries, technical advisers, accountants, clerks, stenographers, and investigators to aid and assist said committee in the enquiry and to print the evidence proceedings and documents received by the committee during the session or after prorogation during recess as are deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. SHEWMAN: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, on account of the statements in both morning and daily newspapers re the flood scare on the Red River. Would he care to make a statement on that?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I anticipated that there would be some questions on this matter because of the reports in the local papers about what appears to be danger of flooding on the upper Red River Valley. It appears that there has been a substantial fall of snow in the southern Red River Valley. They experienced quite a snowstorm there just over the past week-end, and with the steady build up of snow it is anticipated now that there can be flooding in the upper reaches of the Red River. Of course each year we have the Flood Forecasting Committee in Manitoba that sit twice -- once in February and once in March -- in order to assess the situation as it will affect Manitoba, and it would appear that at this time we may get a report that is less favourable than the one that was brought in in February because of the heavy snowfall that has occurred in the Red River Valley. However, members of our department are travelling down to the States this week to consult with the United States Weather Bureau and the corps of engineers in order to get a more accurate picture of what we can anticipate in terms of a normal breakup, but also taking into account that we may have abnormal conditions in any spring and if we do get abnormal conditions it would appear that at the present time we might experience flooding on the Red in Manitoba. However, any firm statement as to this occurrence would have to await the findings of the Flood Forecasting Committee. However I do think, Mr. Speaker, that it does point up the fact that the Red River Valley lives in constant danger of flooding, and may I take the opportunity to remind those who would argue that because we may have a period of drought that flooding is no longer of much consequence to the Province of Manitoba, that we may be faced, in spite of the drought in 1961, with the danger of flooding on the Red River in the spring of '62.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for St. John's wish to pursue this question?

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Sir, I want to pursue the same question. Mr. Chairman, in the meantime is anything being done by the department except sending someone to make an investigation south?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker if I may precede the Honourable Member for St. John's? It's on the question of flooding. I would like to ask a supplemental question of the Minister of Agriculture, if that has your permission at the present time. It deals with the possibilities of any flooding in the Seine River Valley and particularly in the Municipality of St. Vital and the Municipality of Ritchot, which from time to time has been flooded as the result of the run-off of the Seine River. My question to the Minister would be, has there been any investigation or forecast made in respect to the possibility of flooding in this particular area and are the facilities of the Seine River diversion now complete enough to prevent any flooding in the St. Vital area? If the Minister, Mr. Speaker,

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) hasn't the answers to these questions or knowledge of it, I must apologize for not forewarning him of this question. He can take it as notice but possibly he's in a position to answer me now.

MR. HUTTON: The Seine River . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I would think it would be better if the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture reserved his answers until the Honourable Member for St. John's has spoken and then he will be more in line with the rules of the Legislature. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): My question is directed to a different Minister. It doesn't matter. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Welfare. Saturday's newspapers carried reports that the Knowles School for Boys, St. Agnes School and St. Joseph's Vocational School, all agencies doing important welfare work, are in serious financial difficulty because of an agreement which they thought they had with the Children's Aid Society not being implemented. I wonder if the Minister can give the House information with regard to this matter.

MR. GRAY: question to the same Minister who made the last report, together

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I anticipated the question of the Honourable Member for St. John's would be on the same subject matter, and to clarify the position now if the Honourable Minister of Agriculture chooses to answer the question of the Honourable Member for Inkster he may do so now, then we will proceed with the question of the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. HUTTON: I am going to ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce to answer the question, "What will be done if we are faced with a flood threat?" and I will confine myself to answering the questions of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party on the Seine River diversion. I am not aware of any survey that is carried out specifically on the Seine River watershed, except as it would contribute to the waters on the Red. But the diversion is completed and it will handle now -- that river will handle -- twice the flow that it's handled in the past so that there is a wide margin of safety on it as compared to our experience in the past few years. The channel, the passage of the channel proper is estimated at 2,000 CFS and the passage of the new diversion channel is estimated at 2,000 CFS, so you have double the capacity, and it would appear that for any of the flows that we have on record, the diversion plus the channel proper could handle the flows on it. However, I would point out that sometimes you get flooding on the Seine in St. Vital through a back-up of waters on the Red and it isn't really the Seine that is flooding it's the Red that is flooding back on the Seine, and I expect that this could occur.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, may I ?

MR. SPEAKER: Who asked a supplementary question?

MR. GRAY: I wish to ask the Minister of Health nothing to do with the previous question.

MR. SPEAKER: I think maybe we should take the Member for St. John's first.

HON. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Minister of Public Welfare)(Portage la Prairie):

Mr. Speaker, the agreement of which the member speaks is actually an understanding between the Children's Aid Society and the institutions in question, whereby the Children's Aid Society would pick up any deficit incurred by its wards, on behalf of its wards, in the previous year's operation. Nothing has happened to the agreement but unfortunately the amount of the deficit is considerably larger than had been anticipated and was estimated at the time that the Children's Aid Society of Greater Winnipeg made application to the Welfare Advisory Committee for a rate for 1962. The officials in my department are looking into this matter and I think that they will be able to resolve it satisfactorily in the very near future.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Health? He has no doubt noticed in the press an item today where six babies died in a maternity hospital in Binghamton, New York. Will he as Minister of Health advise the maternity hospitals in the province of the extra care the dispenser should take to avoid such tragic errors. I think his statement may pacify some of the mothers who have infants or newborn babies in the maternity hospitals in the Province of Manitoba.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable member for advising me that he would be asking this question. First of all may I say I just know what I read in the newspapers, in the press, on the radio. I do believe that -- of course, this is a most regrettable incident. This is an instance of human error where -- there are things, no matter probably what we do in the course of events human factors do come into things, but I could tell the House and the honourable member that in the Province of Manitoba we have the Director of Maternal Health and Hygiene, a physician and a public health nurse whose full time duties are -- about half their time is spent in visiting the nurseries throughout the province and raising the standard of maternal health and child hygiene, and great strides have been made in the last years in raising the standards of infant nurseries throughout the province. Again, under the standards division of our hospital plan, our consultant nurses going into the hospitals of course pay particular attention again to the structure of the nursery in trying to eliminate all hazards of ingestible materials within a nursery and of course this has to be a matter of continuing and daily concern, 24 hours a day, in the nurseries of Manitoba. I think incidents as this are most regrettable. Very fortunately, we in Manitoba have had no instances of ingredients getting into the formulas of babies in nurseries which can be injurious to them, and of course this is also a continuing concern of the medical staff, nurses and administration of individual hospitals, and serves to keep us very vigilant in all these matters. I am sure that the officials of our department and the hospitals throughout the province are continuing their concern in this area and really, this is a matter of human error which is a pretty hard thing to cope with.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Welfare. Some ten days ago in Committee of Supply we passed a resolution imploring the Government to investigate the question of need in its Social Allowances Act. I wonder if that survey has started yet?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: As we indicated at the time there had just a short time before that debate arose been some revisions to the regulations under the Social Allowances Act. However, we are carrying forward further studies and the Welfare Advisory Committee is meeting this week and they will be, amongst other subjects, discussing this one.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I want to apologize to him that I didn't give him any more advance notice than speaking to him during the time the Committee of the Whole House was sitting this afternoon. My questions to him, Sir: Was there an inquest into the death of four miners at the Thompson International Nickel Mines? Was there a departmental investigation? Is the report of the departmental investigation available and what recommendations, if any, have been made to prevent the recurrence of this tragic event at Thompson? I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister may not have the information at his fingertips due to the fact that I didn't give him advance notice and I would be agreeable for him to take this as advance notice if he so desires.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'll thank the Leader of the NDP for half of the questions which he served me notice about. However, I didn't get the last two questions which I don't feel I can deal with. However, I can say that there was a coroner's inquest called. It did report and I understand that he wanted to know whether a copy of their report was available. The Attorney-General tells me that copies would be available through the secretary who would have the notes that were taken and would have to type out any copies you might require, for which you would have to pay if you wanted the result of that inquest. The accident was investigated by the Department of Mines who have responsibility for all mining operations, and it was under investigation the day after the accident. I happened to be in Thompson on that day and Mr. Junkers was there at that time. He was underground that day and did conduct a very thorough investigation, and with respect to that report I would refer you to the Minister of Mines who will likely want to give consideration before he answers that question. I would like to say, too, that I did see the scene of the accident myself when one of the bodies was still under the rock, and was very much impressed with the magnitude of the incident. The boulder that dropped from the roof without any advance warning weighed some 400 to 500 tons. It dropped very suddenly and from what I gathered in my inspection, apparently all precautions had been taken by the Mine. It was rock bolted and there was apparently no way

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . of knowing that there was anything wrong in that particular area. However, perhaps the Minister of Mines would like to take it as notice and reply further at a later date.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, most members today received a brochure from the Selkirk Chamber of Commerce regarding the proposal for a Western Inland waterway and I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. My question is, did you receive a copy of this report before we received ours? Or have you received a copy of it yet?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce and Provincial Secretary): As far as I can tell from across the Chamber I have not received a copy yet.

MR. HILLHOUSE: A supplementary question. Would the Honourable Minister after having received his copy, be kind enough to peruse it and report back to the House on whether or no he would consider the proposition feasible.

MR. EVANS: I shall be glad to peruse the document.

MR. PAULLEY: Before we were dealing with the question of the floodway from the Town of Selkirk. If I may, the Minister of Labour mentioned the secretary from whom I might be able to obtain a copy of the report. Might I ask him what secretary he was referring to? Also he indicated that possibly on the question of the investigation I may be able to receive my information from the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and indicated that possibly that honourable gentlemen would reply as to that portion of the question. I wonder if I may have both bits of information.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that probably if my honourable friend would put in an order for a return, that would be a conventional and suitable way of getting the information for him.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't think that should be necessary with just simple questions like this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: We'll take it as an order for return.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if my friend wants to be stubborn, let him take it as a notice of an order for return.

MR. ROBLIN: It's not stubbornness, Mr. Speaker. If my honourable friend cares to read the rules he'll find out that complicated questions of this sort are usually put in the form of return and may be taken in that way, and I think he would be well advised to do so.

MR. PAULLEY: May I say, Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat surprised, possibly it's because of Monday, that my honourable friend the Premier of Manitoba thinks that these are complicated questions. I'll excuse him for it seeing as it is Monday.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of the Members of this House a matter which I believe to be -- I might be wrong -- but I believe this matter to be a breach of the privileges of the Members of this House. Mr. Speaker, last week the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce brought a resolution before the House with respect to a trade mission to be sent overseas. At that time my leader got up and asked the minister under what estimates the money to be spent on this mission should be voted, or will be voted, and he further went on to say that possibly this matter should have been brought before the House in the way of a message from His Honour. At that time the Minister of Industry and Commerce didn't appear to be sure of himself and the First Minister himself did not seem to be fully aware of where and how this money, necessary for the trip, would be paid for, and finally we were told that it would be under the estimates of the Manitoba Development Authority, and the First Minister further stated that there would be some money in the kitty for this purpose. Well I went to the trouble of finding out how much the trip made by the Federal MP's and sent overseas on a similar trade mission in 1960, and this cost the federal government \$152,302.00. I did not know at that time how many persons the present government wanted to send overseas. I thought it would cost money and apparently everyone else here in this House thought it would cost money. But lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, although the Minister to my mind, and as far as anyone in our group can recollect -- and I haven't had a chance to go through all the speeches although I have the speech of the Honourable Minister here, it's not mentioned -- on Saturday morning when I was sitting in my home I heard the radio station inform the people of Manitoba that some 75 or

(Mr. Prefontaine, con'td.) . . . 100 persons would be sent overseas by the government and, --(Interjection) -- I heard it on the radio -- Where was it mentioned? -- and it was in the paper, I believe, on Saturday night. And I thought in my own mind, "This is surprising to me that I have to listen to this bit of news on a Saturday after having been in the House all during the week, except on Thursday night," and I was told that the information was not passed on, but furthermore the news carried this astounding bit of news, that the members on this mission will pay their own expenses and they were practically sure of 75 to a hundred. Now I wonder if they had contacted these men already, whether these men would be willing to pay their expenses. And then comes up the question of representatives of the farm unions or farm organizations. We were informed that they would be invited to go. Now suppose they refuse to pay their own transportation and expenses, will they be barred from making the trip? I don't know. We don't know. We didn't know this in the House but people of Manitoba heard it on the news on Saturday. I think this is a somewhat serious breach of the privileges of this House. Unless my memory serves me very badly -- but I'm quite positive and I discussed it with a few -- this information was not told this House by the Minister. It might have been told by a civil servant on Saturday -- I think I heard the name of one civil servant in connection with this news release -- but Mr. Speaker, I protest against what I feel is contrary to well-established parliamentary procedures.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I'd better reply to the honourable gentleman and say that I, for one, would be very sorry if he felt that the privileges of the House had been breached, but I really don't think they have been, because I think I recall my saying at the time that no decision had yet been reached as to how this particular mission would be financed in respect to the travelling and other expenses of those people such as the ones he mentioned that might go along. Now, I must confess that I, too, read the story in the newspaper but I can only tell my honourable friend that it has not yet been settled by the Executive Council and as such it is certainly not a matter of government policy until that is done. I can give my honourable friend, I'm afraid, no explanation for the story. I haven't made any enquiries but it certainly was not authorized by the Executive Council, and I think we are in the same position now as we were last Friday when we first raised the matter.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question then, if I may. The story that appeared on Saturday then is denied by the government and incorrect?

MR. ROBLIN: What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that that story was not authorized by the Executive Council, or as far as I know by the Minister. I don't think I should go farther than that at the moment because for obvious reasons personalities are involved.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Education)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to table a return to an order of the House No. 9, moved on the 27th of February, 1962, on a motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to table a return to an order of the House No. 9 on a motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Minister of Welfare. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I would like permission of the House to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? Committee of Supply.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, 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 and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 84.

MR. EVANS: Before proceeding I'd like to pay some of my debts of information and try to see that my honourable friend from Lakeside no longer feels neglected or otherwise ignored. I'm sorry that the delay has occurred in answering some of his questions.

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.)

My honourable friend from Lakeside asked a question concerning Appropriation XIV - 3 (c). As I have the record here he said, "Appropriation XIV - 3 (c) was \$45,000 in 1960-61 and \$137,000 in the current year 1961-62. Please explain details of this appropriation and advise how much of the current year's appropriation has been spent to date." The answer: the increase from \$45,000 in 1960-61 to \$137,000 in 1961-62 in Appropriation XIV - 3 (c) was accounted for mainly by the sum of \$100,000 voted for urban renewal studies. This increase was largely offset by the fact that \$80,000 of urban renewal study cost was recoverable from the federal and municipal governments shown in XIV - 3 (d), leaving a net cost for urban renewal of \$20,000.00. The breakdown of expenditures from amounts voted for the current year is as follows: -- Then, taking the \$137,000 and deduct anticipated recoveries of \$80,000 leaves a net of \$57,000.00. Those are the amounts voted for the current year 1961-62. The expected total cost for the year, that is comparing the actual expenditure with the amount voted, the expected expenditure is \$95,000 less expected recoveries of \$42,500, leaving a net of \$52,500. The difference between the amount voted and the amount expected to be spent is largely to do with the Metro study in the amount of \$40,000, of which it's expected that only \$8,000 will be spent this year owing to the fact that the work has just started.

Then my honourable friend noted in the Public Accounts fees equalling about \$340.00 re the Group Life Insurance, and an explanation was requested. This concerned a meeting that was held between the Canada Life Insurance Company, who eventually got the contract, and certain other companies who wanted a technical discussion on the terms of the two tenders as to whether they were indeed comparable and whether one was indeed more favourable than another. I retained Mr. Turnbull, who is the actuary of the Superannuation Fund and a consulting actuary, to advise me and I engaged a public stenographer and had complete transcript of the meeting, subsequently received Mr. Turnbull's report and the contract was eventually awarded. Fees in that connection amounted to \$324.75.

My honourable friend for Gladstone drew attention to the fact that the number of food establishments in Manitoba increased only 2.2% from 1949 to 1959, and this compares with the figure in all Canada which decreased by 5% in the same period. The decrease is accounted for by the consolidation of smaller food plants into larger ones and the same process took place in Manitoba. If there had not been a consolidation in Manitoba our increase would have been larger than 2.2% in the ten-year period.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain -- he isn't in his seat but perhaps he can get it from Hansard -- in speaking of the Workmen's Compensation item under the Provincial Secretary's estimates, said, "the assessment is doubled." Now this is not really an assessment, but are claims for the current fiscal year, or anticipated claims for the current fiscal year, and I should tell him that the amounts required for this fiscal year are very much larger indeed. The amount provided in last year's estimates was \$30,000; there has been a further amount obtained by special warrants already of \$70,000 and it's anticipated that in supplementary estimates yet to be tabled there will be a substantial amount again -- in the present year.

Then on March 8th the Leader of the New Democratic Party asked for information as to the accident ratio or what type of accident we have been experiencing, and I have not been able to get any statistics of that kind -- they are not kept. They could be extracted from all the records of the Workmen's Compensation but it would take a considerable amount of time to do it and I have not been provided with it so far. I have some information now, and I might tell my friend that we are providing now to keep statistics, more by classes of accident, so there will be information that we can use at a later date, but I would like to provide him with the following information which is all I have been able to obtain. One hundred and forty-six civil servants received compensation under the terms of the Workmen's Compensation Act during the year. The greatest number of these -- 60 -- were employed in the institutions in the Department of Health. Many involved back strains from lifting patients, and burns and hand injuries. Regular courses in handling patients and accident prevention are conducted in the hospitals. The second largest group was in the Department of Public Works -- 43 -- and were largely concentrated in the garages and in the Highways Branch. The relatively heavy expenditure this year was the result of three very costly accidents. Herman Toole and Raymond Cayer, casual employees in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, were killed in traffic accidents while on

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) duty. Two casual employees with the Department of Public Works, Michael Prokopchuk and Ronald Cox were cut off by the forest fire in the Duck Mountain area. Mr Prokopchuk died as a result of his burns and Mr. Cox is still very seriously ill, requiring special nurses 24 hours a day. It should be noted that compensation is being paid still to the dependents of employees killed in an aircraft disaster some years ago. It should be noted that casual employees who are not civil servants are covered in the same code. The Department of Mines and Natural Resources reported 90 of this type who received assistance as a result of minor injuries resulting from the fighting of the forest fires. I am afraid that's all the information I have been able to get for my honourable friend. It is not a statistical analysis of the causes, but as far as I have been able to trace them that is the outline of the accidents.

I'd like to tell my honourable friend from Inkster that in reply to a question on some other occasion -- I think before the Orders of the Day one day -- he asked whether we were taking advantage of the establishment in England of a tourist promotion office for Canada, and I am happy to be able to tell my honourable friend that we are. We are in constant contact with Mr. Field of the Canadian Government Travel Bureau and will be supplying literature and editorial support for him from Manitoba as we do in the Canadian Government Travel Bureau offices throughout the United States. There are similar offices throughout the United States and we keep them very fully supplied with Canadian literature. I have been in two of them and have seen very effective displays of our brochures. I might tell him also that we have even anticipated the establishment of this office and have had an article on fishing in Manitoba published in the Fishing Gazette, which is an English publication and covers the outdoor sports, fishing in the United Kingdom. Now I think those are most of the debts that I owe members with regard to information. I would be glad to answer further questions.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Minister for the information, and may I at this time just say a few words. I wasn't here Friday afternoon. I was, in the afternoon, but I left earlier, so I did not hear the Minister speak on 84 and if I happen to repeat something, he would forgive me. At the outset, in my own business, where I make a livelihood, the department is supplying us with the publicity they have available and many tourists, American and Canadian outside of Winnipeg, are calling to the office for different information. This is being displayed and quite a few are being picked up, and some of them are coming over again for more -- and by the way, if you have any more literature send it in; it will be free distribution; I won't charge anything to the government for doing it.

Now with regard to the agent in England. The reason I ask the question is this: he's there solely -- this is being paid by the Manitoba Government -- for developing tourists to Manitoba. I want to tell this House that tourism is one of the greatest businesses in the world today and I am not afraid if any honourable members go into this business, because I am about to get out, but it's one of the greatest businesses. There are more people travelling every day than they have for the last 50 years, the last year or two. They don't know where they are going. Most of them don't know. They go anywhere, anywhere they are sold the idea of going. Many come in and ask where to go, in the winter or in the summer. The same thing may apply anywhere else. Israel had 165,000 tourists last year, a small tiny country. They don't go to Europe very much more now; they want to find new places. How many in England or in Italy or in France or anywhere else in the world has seen Manitoba? The picture that's here on the printed matter is just as nice and just as beautiful and just as attractive as any other country in the world. The spots are here. So I say that that idea of tourism should not be neglected. Leave the agencies alone down there? Give them some help. And the people don't only travel here -- from here, from France and England, they are travelling from Arabian countries now, which they have never been out of the desert before; they're travelling from many of the countries of the near East and many of the European countries who are a little bit tired of the ancient buildings of Egypt and European Countries. Someone came in to me the other day and he says, "Give me a place, somewhere to go, except Copenhagen." I said "Why, Copenhagen is a beautiful city." He says, "Every day I come down there they show me the dilapidated home where Hamlet used to live. This is no more interest to me; I want to see something new. I want to go to Africa, these new countries, I want to go somewhere else." My point is to urge you, Mr. Minister, do not neglect the word, the idea, that slogan "tourism". It's growing every day. If they don't come to Manitoba, they'll go to Quebec. We don't mind if they come to Canada, but I

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . am in the Manitoba Legislature. I am speaking about an agent of Manitoba, and this should be encouraged and encouraged without any limits. So the publicity you have now -- and could be improved for there are nicer fields -- should not now go out to the United States so much, or could go there too, but should go out to the new countries. I can assure you they're travelling. The other day there was a plane wreck with nearly a hundred passengers lost their lives. Where did they come from? Some were from the African countries. Where did they go? To the United States and Canada. I mean, this is something that you should think about and I am not in a mood now to give the Minister in the Department hell for not doing it; I want to give him a compliment what they have done, except improvement, and I am only dealing for the moment with tourism.

Now the next thing I'd like to ask -- either he could reply immediately or reply in general with the other questions -- is the grants to the Manitoba Travel and Convention Association. I am not so sure -- I don't say they are not doing any work. But I am not so sure about it. In other words with \$15,000 they could send somebody to the new countries in Europe, to other countries in Europe, because they are coming here with all these ships and planes, travelling now across the Atlantic and even across the Pacific. You've got to wait weeks for reservations -- you have to wait days for reservations. I am just mentioning it to indicate the importance of it, and if you are going to charter a plane to take over some businessmen and MLA's to Europe, do it now, and if you have a place for 90, you only appoint 89, and I'll be the last one So, Mr. Chairman, I, in this particular section, I am not going to criticize the department, but I'm going to urge them to do more. Every day is a day lost; every day is a day lost; and if you want tourists for Manitoba, oh yes, we've got to prepare for them, number one; we've got to have hotels or motels for them, and I think they are doing it now to a certain extent and there will be more; we have got to have cabins for them; we've got to prepare for them, and I think they could have just as enjoyable and profitable a time in Manitoba as anywhere else.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, speaking on the same theme as the Honourable Member for Inkster. I note that the reports that we have laid on our desk, the annual report of the Department of Industry and Commerce, shows that Manitoba had last year or in 1960 -- when I guess the report is for -- roughly 1.3 million tourists, the value of the tourist industry being set at in the neighbourhood of \$36 million, and as I pointed out the other day, this averages out at around \$29.00 per tourist, and in checking the older reports it seems that they apply this same factor and have done for the last 10 years. I suggest that this must be a very conservative estimate and I suggest that the tourist today must be spending more than he did 10 years ago. Surely \$30.00 won't buy you the same amount of anything, as far as that goes, as it did 10 years ago. If -- and I think it more or less confirms what I said a year ago on this subject, that if one-third of the tourists are spending \$100.00 that means the other two-thirds are not spending anything, and I think I said last year it was apparent from the figures before us that many of the tourists came into this province with one shirt and one 10-dollar bill and went home without changing either one of them. I would like to have an explanation as to how this \$29.00 is arrived at.

Now the report before us suggests that, on the very last page, where 42,552 cars entered Manitoba at the various ports of entry last year and it is down about 10,000 from the year before according to reports, one very significant thing is that out of the 42,000-odd cars, 27,000 of them, or about 65% came in from North Dakota and Minnesota, and perhaps that is understandable but it seems to me that we might be doing more to attract tourists from some of the other states. Now it is true that we have no figures to show the pattern of traffic, that is the number of Manitoba cars that are going down to the States through the Manitoba ports of entry, but the Dominion Bureau of Statistics show a number of Canadian cars entering Manitoba at the various points of entry and they come up with a figure for 1960 of 272,000, or about five Canadian cars going south and coming north for every one American car, which suggests to me that our tourist trade must have a huge deficit. I have before me the Bank of Montreal's Business Review dated February 27th last in which they point up, and I quote, "Canada has recently become such a nation of travellers that Canadians spend more money abroad per capita each year than residents of any other country in the North Atlantic area. As a result, Canada now regularly runs a significant deficit on travel account in contrast to the period prior to 1951 when for decades travel receipts consistently exceeded expenditures," and they go on to point up that the deficit

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . in 1960 was \$200 million, and they explain one of the reasons being that Americans are now going to Europe rather than to Canada. And they suggest a remedy here too, Mr. Chairman, and I just want to read one short paragraph. It says, "In any attempt to assess the Canadian Tourist industry's prospects for the future, account has to be taken of the fact that foreign tourist expenditures in Canada are influenced by much the same consideration as expenditures by Canadian tourists both at home and abroad. Thus the more attractive and well-publicized are Canadian facilities the more likely it is that a higher percentage of the ever-increasing number of Canadians who now have the money and time to spend on travel will explore their own country." If it is a fact that about five Manitobans visit the United States for every American that's visiting Manitoba, I hope that we can find means and ways of correcting this huge deficit, and I for one, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that the estimates for this department are up considerably above what they were last year because it is a fact that the tourist industry is becoming one of great importance and in my opinion will continue to do so in the years to come. Now our problem is, how do we get them to Manitoba and how do we get them to spend more than \$29.00 apiece when they do get here? These are some of the problems that I would like to see overcome.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . before we leave this item, I just wonder if the Minister has any comments on statements that were made. On this I am quoting from a newspaper report subsequent to a meeting of the Manitoba Tourist Association when one of the speakers said that the "Manitoba Government was sitting back" -- I am quoting now -- "and making a nice fat profit from the tourist industry while not investing sufficiently in it." He proceeded to say that the Government made a profit of \$1.25 for an outlay of 28¢, the cost of bringing each tourist to the Province. He added, "There's a constant pressure on every tourist operator to spend money to up-grade his facilities. If the government is willing to tell us to dig into our pockets it should spend a little more money considering the amount that it's making out of the same business." This is the Free Press, November 11th, '61.

MR. EVANS: . . . there are no further questions on this item, Mr. Chairman. My honourable friend from Inkster assumed, I think, that the agent in London was there largely for tourist business. I thought I would draw his attention to the fact that his main responsibilities there are in promotion of industry and that we have not seen it possible financially to equip an office which would be fully staffed and prepared to go after the tourist business, although that matter is kept under review. The agent's general main duties are in connection with industrial promotion rather than tourist.

My honourable friend's figure is quite accurate about the \$29.00 for the expenditures of the average tourist; the figure I have here is \$28.85. This figure is reviewed in general each year, not as a precise mathematical calculation but we do send out questionnaires to the people who leave their names and addresses in Manitoba as having visited here, either by registering at one of the tourist offices or the Legislative Building or elsewhere where we can get the lists, then we send a questionnaire to them, and a fair number respond. We ask them if they will tell us where they went, what they saw, what their comments are. We ask them also how much they spent; and these are reviewed each year to see whether it's advisable to raise or lower the average expenditure per person, and perhaps it would be logical to assume that the expenditures per tourist have gone up, but on the other hand it isn't necessarily so because I don't think the average accommodation in the recent period of three, four or five years has been going up in price per day; nor the meals in cost per day; nor has the length of stay really extended. People tend, I think, to come for either the whole of their vacation period or some portion of it, and in recent years the length of stay hasn't increased. However, it's a point to keep in mind, but my honourable friend should know that we do review actual questionnaires from visitors each year to see whether some change should be made in the average revenue figure.

The number of cars being reduced in number coming across the Manitoba border may show some variation as the years go on because of a changing pattern now on account of the Trans-Canada highway. There may be more American visitors come up east of the Lake of the Woods or indeed across the popular Lake Superior, and enter Manitoba by the inter-provincial boundary, rather than enter Manitoba by the international boundary, and these matters will have to be kept under review.

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.)

There is and has been a tourist trade deficit as far as Canada is concerned. We have spent more in the United States than Americans have spent here. This illustrates the rather severe competitive position we're in. We are in competition now with the whole world; we're in competition with some areas of the United States with tourist promotion budgets much larger than we could possibly afford, because of their larger populations. We must, within our means, make every effort to capture an increasing share of this trade.

My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition drew attention to a comment on the part of the Tourist Association, asking whether we are not indeed making too fat a profit. Well the tourist trade is profitable for the province. We want to attract as much of it as possible, and each dollar that is available to the government to spend is the subject of the most severe competition between departments and even indeed within my own department for different purposes. We have thought that the very sharp increase in tourist promotion that we put in in 1958 and the increase since was a considerable step in this direction. We'll be prepared as conditions warrant to make further investments.

Some attention has been drawn to the Manitoba Travel and Convention Association and I would like to review with the honourable members the program that they have undertaken and the extremely valuable work they do. The Association has made great forward strides and they're undertaking and accomplishing positive results in promoting conventions, attractions and special events in the province. The chief accomplishments of the Association in the past year were:

Conventions. A convention department has assisted in the securing or staging of 154 conventions during 1961 with an estimated delegate expenditure of \$2,584,560.00. Those are expenditures by the delegates quite apart from the organization or the arrangements of the convention and the convention hall itself.

Convention brochures. Presently preparing a top quality colour brochure which will greatly assist in attracting additional conventions to our province. The approximate cost of this new brochure will be \$11,000 of which \$7,000 will be raised by commercial support. I would like to draw this to the honourable members' attention because this organization, while it receives a grant from us, does go out and raise its own money and helps to promote the tourist industry with its own resources.

Attractions and events. The Association is continually planning and assisting small and large events and activities throughout the province. These include the Pine-to-Palm tour, the Grey Cup Parade float, the RCMP Band performance, hosting U.S. school bands and numerous other events.

Efforts aimed at selling specific Manitoba events have been undertaken south of the border. Sixteen billboards were erected at strategic locations in Minnesota and North Dakota for a three-month period. A one-minute film on Manitoba attractions was shown on various television stations in the adjoining states of Minnesota and North Dakota. Billboard advertising was also used in Winnipeg, publicizing historic circle tours in order to stimulate interest among local residents. The General Manager of the Association has made numerous public appearances and addresses to various groups and organizations. That is, I think, the main outline of their activities and I would draw particular attention to the progress that has been made in attracting conventions to Winnipeg and to other parts of Manitoba because here is a way in which we can take what might be called the rifle approach, and the great value of this association and its separate department on conventions is that they can learn when the next open convention of an organization is likely to take place. It may be as long as three or four years ahead, and they ask to be considered and then continue to keep in touch with the organization, and eventually issue an invitation. It is no good trying to secure conventions for next year because most of them are booked and this organization is taking the long range view of this. It's had success so far and I would anticipate a rising curve of success.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make my statement clear, that I happen to be a member of the board of this organization, but there is a little bit of criticism and I thought perhaps by your explanation they probably would know what they are doing.

MR. CAMPBELL: Would the Minister tell us how the funds for this organization work out as between the government grant and the amount raised locally, or by their own efforts,

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . and while I'm asking that question, I notice that in the Public Accounts grants under this item were listed as something in the neighbourhood of \$22,000.00. Could the Minister give us a list of the grants in total, or do they all go to this one organization?

MR. EVANS: Dealing first of all with the proportion that the government provides of the funds for this organization. The approved budget for the coming year ending in March 31st, 1963, for this organization, is \$91,000; the amount to be provided by these estimates is \$15,000.00. My honourable friends will remember that this grant started at \$20,000 and in two stages has been reduced to \$15,000 on the understanding from the beginning that we would support it very substantially in the beginning, and as they were able to secure their own financial resources, that they would begin to take up that slack.

MR. CAMPBELL: Are they actually getting the other \$76,000 or thereabouts from other sources?

MR. EVANS: As my honourable friend knows this is the budget for the next year starting a month from now, and I don't think I could report on progress for a year that hasn't even started.

MR. CAMPBELL: No.

MR. EVANS: But with a grant of, I think, \$17,500 last year they did achieve all the rest of their funds themselves.

Now with respect to the \$22,000 grants, this refers to the previous year and I'll see if I can find that reconciliation here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, . . . year, or the year that we're in, or the projected year, I suppose they'd run at least along the same lines. Anyone of the three would be . . .

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the item that I see here under Travel and Publicity Branch Grants, (d), there is only the one grant listed at \$15,000.00. The comparison with the previous year for the same item was \$17,500, which is accounted for by the reduction in the amount proposed for that same organization.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 84 passed. 85, Item 7, Civil Defence -- passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, might I get a statement from the Minister in respect of this item.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to give an outline of the activities of the Civil Defence Branch during the year. I would like to precede it with one general remark. I think this field of Civil Defence is no more certain and well-defined today than it was at any time in the past, because we've had so many changes of what might be called concept or plan in civil defence ever since it was begun. Honourable members will remember the first plan involved -- evacuation. It was assumed there would be a comparatively long build-up period in which war threatened and even after war struck there would be the normal warning time of a considerable number of hours during which the approach of hostile aircraft could be tracked, a warning given to citizens, and evacuation undertaken on two plans, one strategic, in which people who could be spared would leave the larger centres, and the other technical in which people would evacuate quickly at the last minute. Well that was very much fore-shortened by the arrival of the ICPM which cut down warning time to twenty minutes, and then even more so by the almost horrifying increase and geometric increase in the power and destructive capacity of the weapons themselves.

Nevertheless, difficult as it might seem to try to make a plan which would be fully effective, there was no alternative in our view to preparing as well as we could to provide some protection for people and to provide a means of organization, or a plan of organization, on which a government could begin to put the pieces together and to carry on as well as might humanly be possible in conditions which almost stagger the imagination to think of. And so our efforts have been bent in the last year to organizing a plan of emergency operation.

Let's consider a moment whether there aren't two cases to face: one, in which one or more atomic devices might explode in Manitoba, presumably on Winnipeg and perhaps elsewhere as well, and such destruction as we envisage takes place, and might very well cause much paralysis and disorganization that one would doubt whether it would be possible to put the pieces together, at least quickly. Nevertheless there is another distinct and I think much more likely alternative, and that is, that an atomic device, at least in the first instance, would fall

(Mr. Evans, cont'd)elsewhere, perhaps on the SAC bases -- the Strategic Air Command bases in the United States some hundreds of miles away, but that the fall-out cloud might be blown by the prevailing winds, which do come in this direction, and that this radioactive fall-out dust might settle on people and either kill them or injure them severely. There is the opportunity to protect ourselves from the second alternative and one of which we must take full advantage. The plan for encouraging people to provide shelter for themselves has been available for some considerable time, and only very recently a new plan of shelters has been put forward which are less in cost but still adequate to shelter people from a considerable degree of radiation.

I think it might be acceptable, Mr. Chairman, if I ran over the main steps that have been taken by the government to organize in both these fields to assist in the continued administration of public affairs and also to assist, or provide a plan, take our part in providing a plan, for the protection of the public itself. The greatly increased interest in civil defence matters over the past year has resulted in the need for an expanded program of organization and training throughout the province. With the formation of Metropolitan Winnipeg and its assumption of civil defence responsibilities in 1961, a year of activity was required to reorganize and to plan for the future. This plan has now been prepared and has resulted in a greatly expanded program to commence in 1962-63. Further extension to the emergency communications system will see a start made in the radio link between the Metropolitan area and Portage la Prairie, which is the location of the target area headquarters. The term "target area headquarters" is taken to mean Metropolitan Winnipeg. The target in that event would be the target at which an enemy would aim in Manitoba if an attack were to be made on us.

Additional funds have been provided for the training of volunteers. Second, organization throughout the rural area has developed during 1961-62 and a total of 25 municipalities have submitted requests for financial assistance programs for the first time. This number, together with the 10 municipalities with continuing projects, makes a total number of 35 financial projects now required throughout the province. The term "financial project" here is drawn from the Ottawa Civil Defence Organization where the project is submitted by the municipality to the province, and the province then forwards it to the federal organization who provides the largest proportion of the funds. Organization is developing in local government districts and funds are provided to assist in this program. Funds are provided for the anticipated National Civil Defence exercises during the year. These exercises will involve all government departments and municipalities and areas having a financial project. Funds are provided to maintain the existing inter-zone teletype circuits and the maintenance of existing radio equipment. All civil defence cars and station wagons were equipped with mobile two-way radios. One light trailer for the transportation of medical advance treatment centre is planned. This will enable a civil defence car or station-wagon to move the equipment for an emergency medical unit to any desired location, either for training or for emergency purposes.

Excellent progress was made in emergency health planning during the past year, and for 1962-63 our plans include:

1. Staffing of all Emergency Civil Defence Health Units. These units depend on the compilation of the medical man-power resources of the province. Surveys are at the moment in the process of compilation and distribution. From results obtained, it is hoped that the professional associations will allocate the required numbers of their profession to the proposed numbers of emergency medical units. Liaison required between the professional groups, as well as volunteer organizations such as the Red Cross, St. John's Ambulance, Hospital Boards, etcetera, will be assisted by the department.

2. Completion of Emergency Hospital Disaster Plans. Continued effort is being expended in the endeavour to obtain a written disaster plan from each medical installation within our province. The information obtained from these plans, as well as the exercise of the plan, should prove a very useful function in the daily lives of our citizens. By the creation of plans as suggested, we are exercising the community resources for possible disasters and bringing new meaning to the fire drills that exist now.

3. Exercise of the Training Advance Treatment centre. We are obtaining a trailer suitable to transport this unit behind the normal motor vehicle, thus eliminating costly transfer charges. As emergency areas become organized, it is the intention to transport this unit to

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) rural areas to teach the local medical personnel its organization and function.

4. A provincial civil service college has been started at the provincial Agriculture College in Brandon, and two orientation courses were conducted in 1961-62. For the coming year it is proposed to hold a minimum of ten courses, covering such subjects as orientation, radiation monitoring, emergency lodging, emergency feeding, registration and enquiries, and emergency clothing. In addition to the above, a total of 14 fire schools are planned for the coming summer and fall. These will be conducted jointly by Civil Defence and the Provincial Fire Commissioner. Operational radiac instruments are being made available during the coming year, and \$10,000 has been provided for the purchase of this equipment which will be located in each town having a financial project and with certain other provincial government personnel. Many hundreds of persons will have to be trained in the use and handling of this equipment.

Well that is a fair outline of the steps that have been taken and some of the plans for the coming year.

MR. MOLGAT: I want to thank the Minister for his report on the Civil Defence Expenditure. This is one item where certainly we all have to be very concerned. I realize it's difficult to get people very excited about this matter until the emergency does occur. This of course is the constant problem. My great concern here, Mr. Chairman, is that I wonder if we are getting value for the money that is being expended in this field at this time. I was hoping that the Minister would give us a report on the exercise that was held last summer, the tocsin exercise. I understand that he was in Ottawa in the fall, after the exercise, to discuss its results. I have the feeling, Mr. Chairman, that these exercises have not proved out the value of our present civil defence structure. It seems to me, for example, in the case of the general public, that they have in many cases not been aware that the exercise was going on. I certainly can speak for my own self in this case. In my own area I could not hear the sirens that were being sounded, and I think this applies for a good number of the people. The news reports at the time of the exercise indicated that, in Brandon, even the civil defence officials couldn't hear the sirens and, according to the news reports, didn't know where they were. This seems to indicate to me, Mr. Chairman, a great confusion in this whole field of civil defence at this time.

The Minister of National Defence was quoted as saying--it was very recently, in February, that he was not--and I am quoting now from a news report, 24th of February: "He said he was not happy with the work being done by the Emergency Measures Organization to inform the public of procedures to follow in case of nuclear attack. I think--and I'm quoting now--"I think there can be a good deal more information given", he said, "but with three levels of government involved, it is necessary to attempt a greater uniformity of thinking and there is still a considerable distance to go. Sirens are not the final answer as a warning system and the idea of installing an electronic warning device in each home was being investigated." So it seems, Mr. Chairman, that in this field the Minister himself in Ottawa is not satisfied with the way it's going, and says that with three levels of government that the co-ordination is not possible. The indications here locally are, if the Brandon case is an example, again an indication that something is amiss here. When we turn to the other programs, the basement fall-out shelter program, apparently this has not been successful either. The annual report of my honourable friend says so. The news reports would indicate that only the Leader of the House and one other individual in the City of Winnipeg have proceeded with the development of fall-out shelters and--(interjection)--I beg your pardon? Possibly the Leader of the House would be prepared to give us a report on this particular item too, Mr. Chairman, but it just doesn't seem to get off the ground. Now we can't measure the success of these programs by the amount of money that we spend on them. We can only measure them by the degree of preparedness that we see in the public, and from my observations of the last exercise, Mr. Chairman, we are not getting value for the money we are presently investing in this field. I would be happy to hear from the Minister what his own observations were after the Tocsin exercise and the meeting in Ottawa which was called to discuss its effectiveness.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, this item in our provincial estimates raises many questions. I was interested and thank the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce for his outline. I was particularly interested when I heard him say: "that in the field of civil

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) defence, we are having to meet constant changes in the approach to this very vital matter." The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition mentioned a moment ago the operation Tocsin and suggested that this operation indicated a lack of preparedness, a lack of uniformity in respect of survival as the result of a nuclear war. I would suggest to him that there was another and far more important revelation as the result of Tocsin, and that was the absolute and sheer terrible fact that we haven't any defence against nuclear warfare. That to me, Mr. Chairman, is the lesson to be learned from Tocsin.

When we were speaking here a year ago and considering the matter of civil defence, we were talking in the terms of ten and twenty megaton bombs falling in the area. At that time the Honourable Provincial Premier extended to the then Leader of the Opposition and myself an opportunity to join with him in the building of a fall-out shelter, based on a near-hit of a relatively small megaton bomb. We were informed that on All Hallows Eve that the Soviet Union exploded a 50 megaton bomb, the equivalent of 50 million tons of TNT. We are now informed that it is possible, and apparently some powers have, a bomb of the size of 100 megatons. We are informed that the dropping of a bomb of this magnitude would be sufficient to eradicate the whole of the Province of Manitoba and everybody that was in it, so vast and so destructive is the power of these types of weapons. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we are laying too much emphasis on possible methods of survival, as far as we're concerned here in the Province of Manitoba, and that we are not doing all that we should be doing, as a responsible government, to impress upon our federal authorities and to impress upon all of the peoples of the world, the sheer nonsense of continuing to permit the ever-increasing accumulation of weapons of destruction of this nature.

I noted some months or so ago, with great regret, that apparently our sister nation to the south of us are building, I believe in North Dakota, a base for inter-continental ballistic missiles. It is my understanding that this is just a mere few miles from the borders of our country and of our province. This to me, Sir, can change the whole outlook of our situation in the Province of Manitoba. If you recall, Sir, when we were considering civil defence a year ago, the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, who is in charge of this department, suggested to us that there was little likelihood of us being a prime target. If I recall correctly at that time, I pointed out to him that because of the advancement of destructive science, it would be possible for us to be a secondary target. I suggest that that situation has now changed due to occurrences to the south of us. I suggest because of this, that we've got to allow our voices to be heard and heard ever more emphatically.

We regret very much, Mr. Chairman, the fact that for a considerable period of time that the Soviet Union were exploding nuclear devices in the atmosphere. We abhor their action and certainly do not support them in any way, shape or form. But equally, Sir, we abhor the recent announcement that has been made by that great democracy to the south of us, that they too are going to start a program of explosions of nuclear weapons into the atmosphere. If I recall correctly, while in opposition I believe, my honourable friend the Leader of the House raised the question of the strontium 90 contents in the milk for our children here in the Province of Manitoba. This to me, Sir, is an ever-increasing danger and indicates to me that we must redirect our efforts. When we watched over TV, Operation Tocsin and saw the devastation, and acted as it was, it can happen in our country as the result of this stupidity of mankind, I became more and more convinced that we must change our approach. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that while within the appropriation of the Civil Department estimates for this year there is gain in training civilian personnel to take care of local or national disaster, such things as fire-fighting, such things as floods, wind storms and hail, these things are all to the well; but I suggest let's be honest with ourselves, let's come to the firm conclusion of necessity, that I think we must come to, that expenditures of a provincial and a municipal level will be to naught in the event of a nuclear war.

I read the other day where 50 professors of the McGill University, and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that these are men of high intellect, men who have given serious consideration to all aspects of this question, suggested that we are simply throwing money down the drain the way we are conducting our campaign. It is suggested in a news report of the press of November 20th, and this was from the genesis at the John Hopkins University, that 80% of the United States population, 75% of the citizens of the Soviet Union would die as a result of a

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) nuclear war between the two nations; and we, Sir, here in Canada, come between the two of them.

I think we should take a firm stand insofar as Canada is concerned, and while you might say to me that this is a federal matter, we are already dealing with some federal matters here in this House. I think we should make firm representations to our government at Ottawa, and I care not what it's political stripe is, that we should make firm representations to Ottawa that we will not permit on our soil nuclear weapons or permit our soldiers to have them. I think this is a must. Some may accuse me that this is a coward's way of approach to the situation. I reject that completely. I say in this world of destruction, in this idiotic manner in which we're conducting ourselves, and when I say we, I am talking of all of the nations of the world, that there is room for sanity and we have our part. I would like to pay a great tribute to such organizations as the Voice of Women of Canada, who are constantly carrying on a campaign, pleading and cajoling all of those who are in public life, all of those who are in the scientific field, pleading with them to stop this method of retaliation, of the threats of retaliation, pleading with all and sundry to revise their approach and ban the use of any nuclear weapons anywhere in the world.

This organization, Mr. Chairman, is an organization not of any political party. It is an organization of women, who has in its membership all shades of political opinion. Not only that, Sir, as the result of its start here in Canada, it is now becoming international and universal. As a matter of fact, they even sent a communication awhile back to the wife of the Premier of the Soviet Union. I think that this is the type of an approach that we want to make. I think we have an onus and a responsibility in this Legislature to face realities and to face facts.

What the Honourable the Minister of Industry & Commerce has said to us this afternoon of how they have set aside certain amounts of money for this plan, for that plan; what we did here in the Legislature last year--gave to the municipalities permissive legislation to exclude from municipal assessments, bomb shelters; and now the program that the Minister has outlined to us. I would suggest to him and I would suggest to this House that there is an organization at the present time that is appealing for funds, an organization which has some of the best scientific minds in our country, namely, the National Peace Research Council, who are pleading for funds to endeavour to bring sanity back into the world. I would suggest that part of this expenditure could well be used towards that. I suggest that, as the Minister had to tell us today that the constant changing plans, the constant changing outlook, what was good last year or seemed good last year is no good this year in respect of defence in nuclear war. I suggest that this is going to continue, and as I said at the offset, I suggest that there is only one defence--there is only one defence--the return to sanity of all nations in the world; the abolition of all of these weapons of destruction. It is up to us to do our full part as a government of the Province of Manitoba, and for members of this Legislature to realize this fact and so direct our energies that this will be an accomplishment.

I'd like to just for a moment refer to the report of the department when they're dealing with the question. As laid down in their annual report, it mentions that during the year the Provincial Flood Fighting Plan was completed. I say this is a proper function of the department. It says that members of the civil defence staff maintained regular contact with the United States Civil Defence authorities in the bordering states. I suggest that insofar as the bordering states, as I have already mentioned, they're creating problems for Manitoba by their actions across the line. I suggest that when the report tells us that the St. John's Ambulance have trained 769 persons, this is good. I think this should be our endeavour. Mention is made of Tocsin and I have referred to that already. Tocsin only showed--and I want to repeat this--some say that Tocsin showed the inadequacy of our civil defence. I say that Tocsin showed us the absolute fact, that the only defence in respect of nuclear warfare is that none should ever take place and that these weapons be destroyed and never brought back. The report mentions the question of fall-out shelters. On page 37, it suggests that the public response to the shelter program has not been encouraging. In this, Mr. Chairman, may I give to the average person in Manitoba the Orchid Order of Merit for using their intelligence. I regret to say that even here in the Greater Winnipeg area that some are trying to use the hysteria of people, and I have no reference to my honourable friend whom I see smiling, in order to get them to build a shelter in their basement on the basis of pay-as-you-go plan. Good Lord love a duck, Mr. Chairman, aren't we in enough

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) pay-as-you-go plans now, without using the hysteria of people to build bomb shelters down our basements, that our scientists tell us won't be of any value to us if we're in a general area in any case? While it may be true on fringe areas or in fringe areas they may give us some protection, but protection can be obtained in other fields. Let us not lose sight of the fact that it is not the fringe areas that require the protection, it's protection of all of the areas against the effects of nuclear fall-out.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that our scientists know the answer. I suggest to this government of Manitoba, to the Government of Canada, that they pay more attention to what is being said by these professionals; pay more attention to what is being said by organizations such as The Voice of Women. I don't think that it is necessary for us in the Province of Manitoba, in all due respect to the personnel, I don't think that it is necessary for us in the Province of Manitoba to make expenditures for such literature as this--and I have in my hand a booklet called "Eleven Steps to Survival." I repeat there is only one step to survival--that these weapons never ever be used--and suggest again that is the course to which we should be directing our efforts.

It has been said by many "the time is running out". I think maybe those that are saying that are not so far out. We have--and by we I mean all nations in the world, particularly those that have stock piles of nuclear weapons--have sufficient TNT stored up in these weapons that once one was let loose it would mean the whole end of civilization in every corner of the globe. The challenge is ours, Mr. Chairman. The answer to the challenge is not in such provisions as \$67,000 in cost to the Province of Manitoba. The answer to the challenge is a return to sanity. And this again, Sir, I say is the course to which we should be directing our efforts.

Now as to the appropriation itself I note that the total expenditures here in the Province of Manitoba were estimated at \$350,000 costs, of which recoveries from the Government of Canada and the municipalities will be \$283,000, with the net cost being to us in the estimates of \$67,000. So let us look, Sir, let us look, Sir, at the figure of a total expenditure for this purpose here in the Province of Manitoba of over a third of a million dollars. I would like to hear from my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce if he could possibly give us a breakdown in respect of this third of a million dollars that we're spending here in the Province of Manitoba. How much of the expenditure are we doing for the survival of life in ordinary disasters, and how much we are expending, to use his own words, in plans that we're having to change every year due to our scientific advancement, and also due to the fact that we're constantly having to change our method of approach in so-called defence against the indefensible?

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I had somebody suggest it to me the other day that there may be a golden opportunity for the Minister of Agriculture here in the Province of Manitoba to make a hero out of himself in respect of civil defence. It has now come to the stage where it appears as though individual shelters are not much avail and the community shelters now will be the thing. So the suggestion was made to me that possibly the Minister of Agriculture when he's building the floodway to the east of Winnipeg may spend an extra few hundred million dollars, or whatever the cost may be, to put a complete roof over the whole of the floodway in the Greater Winnipeg area so that we would have a communal shelter there and in that way serve two purposes at the same time. Of course, they didn't go on to suggest what would happen if either end got blocked off as the result of a nuclear weapon attack; but this is the type of thing that people are thinking of. And again, and I want to reiterate this, it may be tedious repetition, Mr. Chairman, but it is the only approach--the only approach to the survival of mankind is not in the provision, as we are doing it; it is not in the approach we are making, either in Canada or anywhere--the only chance of survival is to make sure that these weapons of destruction are never used. And we here again I say, in the Province of Manitoba can play our part by insisting on our federal authorities first of all, that they have no part at all with having nuclear weapons stored here in the Dominion of Canada or in the hands of our services.

.....Continued on next page.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the NDP has been speaking and repeating how important disarmament is. Well I think he has impressed that on us. I don't think it was needed; I think everybody in the free world believes that this is important. But there is one point that he hasn't explained too much, that he has forgotten, that is the point of complete disarmament. It's all right for the young fellow on the street to say, "Well, I don't believe in fighting" but if his neighbour comes in and punches him on the nose, he can take a lot of beatings because he doesn't believe in fighting. I think that again we're getting away, a little bit away, I don't know if the last speaker meant to insinuate that the Government of Manitoba was responsible for that. He did say that everybody should play their part. I think that it is very plain that the people of the free world want disarmament -- but a practical disarmament. It was all right to have disarmament, but we didn't start it in Pearl Harbor and neither did the people of the United States. Now this is more of a federal matter. I think that it's not quite right to say that everything that is done on civil defence, the way he was speaking I would say that he gives me the impression that we should forget all this program of civil defence. Now I agree with my leader that we have to be careful trying to get as much of our money's worth -- I agree with that. I also feel that in a field like this where people are, we're so uncertain -- it's a rather new field, that we might spend some money without getting exactly what some people would call a true value -- we will experiment a little more in this field. But I don't think that this has anything to do with disarmament here, this civil defence. We have to be ready to protect ourselves. Just because we don't want to fight, we don't believe in wars, it doesn't mean we won't get them. Let's be practical on this. We can go to our death saying, "Well, yes, have disarmament." That is not right, and the government of this province has a certain responsibility towards the people of this province. I think that this is what they are trying to do. No doubt their program leaves a lot to be desired, and I think they know that, and I hope they do -- to make a study and see if we can improve on that.

Now the Leader of the NDP's has also stated that we should do more to protect in ordinary disasters. Well I think that if we have a program of civil defence that is functioning, that this program, these people will help us in ordinary such as floods, large fires, I think that they will be set. Once the, if we ever have a system where everybody can be advised, could be told in a hurry that something like that is happening, that will help. And if you have different people in different blocks and different organizations to help the people. We listened a while back to the health, the condition of the doctors being told or helped in the way of looking after those people. I think that this is not only for war -- this will really help.

But going back to the provincial field, one thing that I would like to see, I don't think it's quite right to say that they're using this business of shelter to scare the people -- you can say that about the whole field of civil defence. You're using that, it's just if you need it and you have to be ready, and it's too late if you don't let the people know about it. Now what I think we should do -- I don't know if the government has done that -- have they studied this question of shelter? Is it good, or isn't it? The Leader of this House, a while back, presumably to encourage the people to do this, to give leadership, decided to build a shelter. I think we should hear a little more by his experience. Is it practical, or isn't it? And I would feel that, of course I suppose there'll always be debate on this, but have we had any engineers and architects looking into this? And one thing that I would like to recommend to the government, at least let them look into this. Is it feasible to have shelters if we don't think it's practicable to have a shelter for every family, I'm inclined to think that would, I don't know if I could stay at the door of my shelter and say, "You don't come in." I think they'd push me aside very fast if there was a war. I don't think that that will work too well. But I would like to see this. We're building a lot of schools now and it seems to me that that is something we should look into. The schools are not too far from the people in a metropolitan area we might say, and I think that there might be something in this, in studying the possibility of having a shelter in the schools. Now this shelter might be used as an emergency hospital; it might be used for everything, and the people of that community would go. I think that if those shelters have any value at all, we should think of having the shelter around the school and maybe the churches, or community clubs, that they place this at the centre of different localities. I think that the government should look into that because we're building new schools now and this would be the time to do it. Now if those shelters are proven inadequate, well then we can forget about it, but I would

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) like the people that know something about it -- I don't know if the government has made any study on this, if they've had engineers or architects looking into it -- but I would like to hear some more about it because that is something that the people should have, a directive that the people should have.

I think, and I certainly don't say this sarcastically, I think that we should hear from the Leader of this House on this matter and if he feels that it's not practical we should at least profit by what he has tried to do. I think he was trying to give leadership at the time and it should keep on, and if it's a good thing, well let the people of Manitoba know. But I do think that the government is justified in keeping the civil defence program. I think that when we talk about disarmament right now it's something wishful, wishful thinking more than anything else. I don't think we have to wake up the free world to this. The people of the free world want disarmament, but complete practical disarmament, and that's the only way we can have it. We've got to be ready to defend ourselves. Now that has been -- if the Leader of the NDP can maybe impress this disarmament -- complete disarmament to some of the countries behind the iron curtain, well then it might be a little easier, but I know, no doubt, that he's very sincere, but let us remember that to have disarmament everybody has to disarm. That is the only thing, so let's go back to Manitoba and I think the government is definitely justified in keeping this program of civil defence. In a new program like this, I think if we want to be fair we have to realize that they will make mistakes, but as long as they don't make the same mistake too often, it's the important thing. As I say, it's only a thought that I would like to leave with the government, but I think they should look into this field of the erection of shelters; they should try to see what they can do with these new schools going in. I think that that would have some value; it might not be able to prove a shelter that will resist everything, but I think it would be -- it could be used for classrooms or auditoriums or something else, be below ground, and I think it certainly would be the ideal place, because usually you're trying to bring the schools to the people, and maybe then spend a few extra dollars and it might be a good point. I am not an expert on that; I didn't make a survey, but I think the idea itself has enough merit for the government to look into it.

MR. PAULLEY: if I might just on one point that the honourable member spoke of, that was when he made reference to the Leader of the NDP speaking to those behind the iron curtain. I'd love to be able to speak to the people behind the iron curtain, Mr. Chairman. I would like to point out to him that I did point out that one organization here in Canada, namely the Voice of Women, attempted to do that. They did get a reply from Madame Khrushchev as I understand it; that she was vitally concerned with this problem as well. I think that our efforts should be endeavoured to having all of the peoples of the world, whether they be behind an iron curtain, because they're going to be affected the same as we on this side. This won't be a one-nation affair once it starts, or if it starts. That's the point that I'm trying to make, and I'm sure my honourable friends, if I could talk to those -- and I have no associations, may I repeat, I have no associations whatsoever. Possibly my honourable friend could direct me as to whom I should talk to behind the iron curtain but at the present time I don't know.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is a little touchy today. If he has a voice out there, not only with Mrs. Khrushchev, but with the boss out there, the one that makes the decisions, so much the better. But that is exactly my point -- that it's all right -- I think that this work is done, I think that the people of the free world, the government of the free world, let's be honest, they believe, I think that Kennedy and Macmillan and I think that Diefenbaker and all those people believe in disarmament. I don't think that -- what I'm trying to say is now, we're mixing this up with just local civil defence and I am not saying until all those people, not only -- I wish sometimes Mrs. Khrushchev did run the country out there, but unfortunately she doesn't from what we are told, so I think that in the meantime this government has to worry about a civil defence plan, and my interpretation of the words of the Leader of the NDP is that we should forget the civil defence, and the only thing is disarmament. It is actually the best thing and it might be the only thing to a point, but we can't decide that. He has just stated that he hasn't a private phone to Khrushchev and I'm sure that I haven't got much more power than he has with Khrushchev, maybe a little less, so it doesn't matter how much talking we do here, we're not going to change that, unless -- this is a federal field and those people are vitally interested in those matters. But in the meantime coming back to civil defence, I

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) don't think it's right to say, "Well all this civil defence, it's too much money spent" and so on. I think that there is vital necessity for civil defence, if nothing else to find out what is right and what is wrong, and this is what I am suggesting. Now let's keep on this level now, to worry about this, and disarmament that is wishful thinking. I hope that one of these days Mr. Khrushchev will listen to Mrs. Khrushchev and we'll have it, but in the meantime let's worry about civil defence here.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, this topic certainly opens up one of the most profound and difficult fields in the whole realm of public discussion. It's really not a subject which we usually debate here in this House, as it certainly is beyond our particular sphere of responsibility, and I wish I could be optimistic that anything that I have to say would add to this debate. I am afraid that that probably is not the case, but in view of the certain fundamental matters that have been raised, perhaps I should try and state some point of view on it. I think the first thing we have to recognize in dealing with these matters is that we do not live in a vacuum; that we do not live in isolation and that whatever our policies might be in this or any field, they have to bear some relation to the world in which we live, and it seems to me that in this field of international politics and defence and all that goes with it, it's difficult to find a stopping place between two points of view.

One point of view, and one which I respect profoundly, is the point of view that is adopted by those who believe in pacifism. I mean complete pacifism; I mean pacifism of the type espoused by Mahatma Gandhi. One cannot help but stand in awe of the moral grandeur of a position taken by a man like him, and one has to ask oneself in dealing with all these matters the fundamental question as to whether you are a pacifist in that sense or whether you are not, and it seems to me that that decision governs everything else that follows. I do not take the position that I am a pacifist in the sense that Mahatma Gandhi was and other great leaders of men have been, for the reason that I am more persuaded that our situation in the world, living in context with other people who do not share that view of life, makes that view of life a difficult one for us to espouse. Mind you there's nothing impossible about it, provided you are willing to take the consequences on it. Gandhi was. I do not think the people of this country at the present time are. All right then, if you examine the argument in that way, you then put yourself in the position where you are not a pacifist in the sense of Mahatma Gandhi and then you have to face the realities of the world around you; and it seems to me from the moral point of view, it's rather difficult to find anything but a difference of degree in the type of weapons that are used in the world. Of course that argument might be open to attack by those who maintain, and I hesitate to contradict, those who maintain that the difference of degree in the matter of atomic weapons is so great as to amount to a difference in kind and I must admit that that is an argument which must give all of us pause. So then we find ourselves -- we've followed this line in reasoning -- in a world in which we are taking some steps to defend ourselves and to be in a position to deal with attacks that might be made upon us. That brings us to the general question of civil defence.

I could, Sir, state my views on the international situation; to give you my opinion that the American power holds what is, in effect, a nuclear umbrella over the rest of the western world, and under that umbrella or within the nuclear ring -- they hold the ring, if I might say so, with that vast demonstration of power -- we are allowed some little elbow room, not much, but some little elbow room to work out our own destiny and to make what contribution we, as a nation, can make to world peace. I do not believe it to be negligible. I think that there is a role for Canada in the field of foreign affairs, particularly working through the Commonwealth and United Nations, to bring a particular point of view to world peace which within the ring that is held by the nuclear powers, we can hope to make some progress. If I did not feel that I would be very pessimistic indeed, about the future of life on the planet. I want to come to my reasons for optimism in a minute or two, but within that general concept of our position in the world at large we come down to this little local question which is within our jurisdiction to some extent, the question of civil defence. I think that one must ask oneself, is civil defence, can it be looked upon in any way as a contribution, not only to self-defence, but perhaps to peace. Well maybe it can. You might find the reasoning a little far-fetched, but I present it to you in this light, that the fact that we are engaged in civil defence is surely a passive form of activity. Civil defence doesn't threaten anybody else in any direct way. It might, it just

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) might, if we had a sound civil defence system or any civil defence at all, it just might convince anyone who wished to attack us that we're doing something at least to render ourselves less vulnerable than we would otherwise be to that form of attack; and in that rather far-fetched sense, perhaps, it might have some bearing or some contribution to restrain those whom we fear might attack us.

The question as to the effectiveness of our civil defence which is the basic -- or the first question that was raised here this afternoon, is such a difficult one to answer. I wish I could give any assurance to the House that I felt that we had a solution to an effective civil defence. I don't believe that I have. I don't know anyone who has got it either, as far as that goes. We were asked sometime ago to build shelters and I got busy and had a shelter, of a sort, built in my own house. Now the opinion seems to be that perhaps there's not that same urgency as was thought in those times, because the atomic bomb is clean -- if you want to use that peculiar adjective to apply to such a terrible weapon -- but in the language of the times I can do no better I'm afraid. In the language of the times, I have to say that the threat of fall-out may be somewhat less than it was, if so-called clean bombs are used, if that's any consolation to anybody. It's no consolation to me, I must admit, but it does alter your view with respect to shelters because everyone recognizes they're only to be considered in connection with fall-out, that they've got no relation whatsoever to protecting you from atomic attack as such. I must say that I do not think that we have had sufficiently clear directives on the question of shelters from the federal authorities on whom we must rely for that kind of advice, to make me enthusiastic about building any more, or to make me enthusiastic about putting them in some of the public buildings to which reference has been made. It seems to me that if we had a clear directive of that kind from those in authority who know, we'd have to consider it, but so far we've not had it and it seems that there is such an area of uncertainty in connection with this matter that they're not prepared to recommend it to us and I think therefore, we have little grounds, if any, for recommending it to the public at the present time.

But while this seems to be a most sombre topic, and indeed it is, I want to confess to the House that I feel better, and maybe I'm not justified in doing it, but I feel better about the prospects of surviving this threat of atomic warfare now than I've felt for some time in the past. I feel that there is spreading among the nations of the earth a much greater recognition of the real meaning, the terrible meaning of atomic warfare, nuclear warfare, not only on this side of the iron curtain, but I think, on the other side of the iron curtain, and it seems to me that the events of the recent times have indicated that those who have that weapon are exercising a degree of restraint over even brandishing it, that some of them didn't do before and it indicates to my -- I admit my unconstructive opinion on the matter, that there is a spreading realization of the fact that no one can win under this set up, and a much greater hope in my mind for some kind of disarmament, and a much greater hope for emerging from this crisis of humanity, and I think you have to describe it in those terms, that atomic warfare, nuclear warfare presents to all of us.

Now I hope that's not a vain wish; I would like to think that mankind is capable of redeeming itself from the absurdities, from the idiocy of the situation that has been described, and I think that the events that have taken place in the last 20 years give us reason to think that we may still be able to get along in this world without having recourse to the dreadful, and I suppose final of nuclear attack from one side to the other. I feel -- and I know this has no part in the debate in this House, but I'd like to say it -- I feel that the Canadian governments have been sensible and reasonable insofar as lay within their power in connection with these terrible matters. I pay my tribute to the former Secretary of State for External Affairs who is now the Leader of the National Liberal Party. But I think that what he tried to do is, at least in spirit, in spite of some criticism to the contrary, being carried on by Mr. Green who is the present Secretary of State for External Affairs. I don't think there is anybody in any recent government in Canada who has been more seized of this matter than he is, or has done more to limit the spread of nuclear arms and of that sort of thing. And although I know that the policy of the present Government of Canada is held up to ridicule in practically every newspaper cartoonist in the country with respect to its attitude on nuclear weapons, I for my part find it eminently sane -- eminently sane and their policy is, to coin a famous phrase as far as I can understand it, to paraphrase a famous phrase: "nuclear arms is necessary, but not necessarily nuclear

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) arms." What they are saying to my mind is that in the present state of international affairs we don't want nuclear arms, and I think that's the right thing to say; but they must, I think, leave themselves an option in case the situation should become much different from what it is today. So I think that, without trying to force my opinions on this subject down anybody's throat, I do think that there is something to be said for their much ridiculed stand on nuclear arms. I think probably that as things stand today it's the most sensible compromise that can be arranged under the circumstances.

Now, I suppose that it was foolish of me to entertain the committee, if I have, with my opinions on Canadian foreign policy or the policy of the present administration because I'm probably just inviting the expression of other opinions, but when one speaks extemporaneously on these matters sometimes you go a little further afield than you intended to. I really doubt that we can do much good debating the matter here, and if members don't share my opinion on all of these points, I am quite willing to understand that. But I do feel that it is incumbent upon us to take the best advice we can get on this matter of civil defence. We can offer no guarantee that the advice we get is good. All we can say is that it is the best advice we can get at the present time, and we can offer no assurance to the people of our country that the measures that we are taking are going to be anything like adequate in the event; all we can do is to say that these are the measures recommended to us by those who know as much as anybody knows, which may be little enough, in respect of these matters and that we are loyally trying to carry out our part. I think that that was the most that I would like to claim for the civil defence policy of this government, or indeed of any other of the authorities in Canada as far as that goes; that I think that under the circumstances, things being what they are, that perhaps what we're doing is the best that can be done under the present circumstances.

Now it seems to me that to retain any sense of proportion in this thing we have to realize that we are so far from the seats of power; we have to recognize that we are so far from the area of decision, of responsibility in these matters; and so far indeed from the field of knowledge in these matters, that it is extremely hard for us to hold well-informed views because of the extreme complexity, indeed the secrecy of so many of the facts that we would need to know if we were to be experts on this topic. We're here in our little corner; we can't be sure that what we're doing is right; all we know is that to the best of the advice that we can get, this is what we ought to do under the circumstances. And I think that is probably the most that I would like to claim for what we are recommending to our people in respect of this matter of civil defence.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the NDP certainly opened a very broad field of discussion this afternoon. It's not my intention to follow down the path that he opened up, but I feel it necessary to say very briefly certain views on this subject.

Our responsibility here is in fact taking the situation which exists in our country and doing the best that we can under those circumstances. We cannot change the circumstances that exist by ourselves. That doesn't mean that we can't have views on them and I suppose there's no harm in having these views discussed here in the House. I for one, if I understood my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP correctly, would disagree completely with his view that we can approach disarmament from a one-sided direction. This is most definitely a bilateral or, in fact, a multilateral question. I am sure there are no Canadians, for that matter no humans, on certainly our side of the fence, who want to continue the great armament expenditures and the great race that's going on. But we have to face the facts, that until such time as there is proper means of inspection, proper means of control, then we must remain strong. The costs that our nations went into during the Second World War and the position that we were in in 1939 I think is proof enough that by remaining strong is our best chances of remaining peaceful. Our strength is not a type of hostile strength, but rather a defensive strength. I for one would stand strongly in favour at all times of every effort towards disarmament; but only provided there is adequate control and that this is a multilateral type. We cannot afford to be weak in our own position.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a very brief, as I say, statement on the general over-all position. If I don't make it longer, I want my honourable friend to be sure that it is no indication of any less interest in peace or in disarmament, but simply that this is not really the item that we're discussing here this afternoon. There is one more item in the field of disarmament that I want to cover, and that is the tremendous cost to our nation, and for that matter to

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) all the nations of the world today. When one looks, Mr. Chairman, at the things that need to be done within our own country here, advanced as we are and having as high a standard of living as we have, that when we look at the many things that need to be done in the field of welfare; in the field of health; in the field of education; in the field of public works; works of all types that need to be done, surely if we can get away from these tremendous expenditures, and a purely selfish personal standpoint, we want to do so; and we look beyond our own borders at the many nations of the world that live far below our standards and the help that we can give them, then obviously again from the cost standpoint we're interested in disarmament. But this cannot be done by ourselves alone.

Mr. Chairman, our responsibility here today is to examine these expenditures in this department and determine whether we are getting value for the dollars that we are spending and whether the policies that this government is proposing to us are the ones which we should pursue. The First Minister indicated one particular item that makes it difficult to discuss this, and that's the field of the certain secrecy surrounding certain of these things. Nevertheless, there are certain fields that can be explored. I mentioned some earlier and he commented, for example, the matter of the shelters. Now this is something in which we should make a decision. Are we going to encourage people to build shelters or are we not? I think this decision must be taken; it's not an easy one necessarily, but surely it doesn't make sense to continue to be encouraging them to do so, if we don't think that it's desirable. Now there's a field where we must make a decision. We must make a decision in the field of warnings. Are we going to continue to establish sirens, or are we not? If we're going to have them then we have to have them much more widespread than we have them now. What are we going to do in the field of communications? What are we going to do in the field of alternate headquarters in case of trouble? These are the things that face us and these are the things on which we must make decisions. I hope that the Minister can give us some specific information on a number of these items.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, just a few words. First of all I would like to know whether this is a national program and that we are just subsidizing or assisting it. After all we're recovering 80% from the federal government and from the municipalities of the amount that is going to be spent. Is the federal government directing it or whose program is it? Then, I would also prefer to have a breakdown. I think it was requested by some of the other members already. Then, personally I feel that we should not go into it in a very big way because I think it's ably demonstrated that a year or two ago shelters were the thing and that was the thing that was promoted. Well today we find that in another year or two it might be outmoded and it might not be necessary at all; therefore, I feel that we should go easy on this department. Could we have a breakdown of the figures?

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, Civil Defence and we all know that thousands of people throughout Canada took a course at Arnprior as civilians, but I understand the unfortunate part, after they took a course, say a week or two, after went home and they were forgotten about, nobody either contacts them, there's no active civil defence work going out through Manitoba or in fact through Canada. That's why I'm very happy that the federal government finally realizes it's not civil defence but national defence, and all army now, army personnel, are trained in survival and also reserve army units. In fact, I got a little clipping here, the third course started on, it's from the Tribune February 26th, 1962: "1,162 start Civil Defence course. Training started today at 12 Manitoba centres for 1,162 recruits to the Army Third Special Militia Survival Course." This means, Mr. Chairman, in a matter of three classes, over 5,000 men and more are trained in civil defence where they should be trained, in the army, and the army's resuming its responsibility as it should, and the federal government. I was just wondering all this civil defence talk that we're talking about as far as the civilians are concerned if it's not a big hoax, because we're trying to impress in the minds of people by the civil defence courses and building fallout shelters, and doing this and doing that, that they will be possibly safe in case of an attack. But I think, Sir, it's not so, that's why they're realizing it's a job for the army, and even the army all they're training for is a matter of survival in these cases and case of attack. So I think, Sir, that as far as Manitoba, true, the money may be well spent, but it should be coming all from the coffers of the federal government. If they're spending in the vicinity of \$1 billion, 700 million in national

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.) defence then the small amount here that's being spent for civil defence should really come under the responsibility of the federal government and the federal government should pay the whole bill of it; and not let's confuse the people with this civil defence and trying to prevail on them just because of these civil defence courses they're going to be safe. Because, Mr. Chairman, by sticking your head in the ground or climbing down the basement, you're not going to be safe, and I'm sure this civil defence as far as the civilian population is concerned, and the courses they had for the civilian population, was just a big hoax.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief because I realize that the where's and why for's of civil defence may not strictly be a matter for this House, that is as to our policy in regard to the atomic protection.

I've listened with great interest to the Honourable the Leader of the NDP, and I for one wish to thank him for his sincerity. On the other hand, Sir, the First Minister has very modestly stated that we here are a long way from the front line in civil defence and perhaps not in too advantageous a position to judge just what should be done, and I wish that I were one who knew. But I would like to point out perhaps two fallacies in the thinking of the Leader of the NDP -- and I say this with every respect to the honourable gentleman. To go back to 1914, the regular British army consisted of 87,000 men -- they did have a strong navy. However, Kaiser Wilhelm the Second thought it was safe to walk into Belgium and start a war because I think he thought, and that was the consensus of opinion, that England was too weak to intervene. England did intervene but it took us four years to get the matter settled. Again in 1939 whilst England had a strong navy, its airforce and army was still in somewhat of a pitiful state. We were not prepared, and Hitler walked into Belgium. So, Sir, I noticed one thing over and above all this, and I've got the greatest respect in the world for the foreign policy that emanates from Downing Street in London. They, to my way of thinking, are perhaps as up-to-date as any nation in the world in their foreign affairs. They are not passing out of the atomic missile business at all, and if we interpret their thinking, it is that they wish to have as a matter of protection deterrent weapons.

Now, Sir, I do think in all sincerity, and who knows who is right today, but I do think that it's dangerous for anyone -- and with due deference to the Leader of the NDP -- to suggest well, here we'll all get together and form a little club abolishing nuclear arms, because I don't think it can be done. I say, Sir, that consideration might be given to at least having deterrent weapons on this continent and enough to stop anybody else from jumping us.

MR. PAULLEY: I just want to make one or two brief remarks, and I don't want to pursue this as far as I'm concerned. I appreciate the fact the Honourable Member for River Heights and his attributing to me the question of sincerity. I know that he meant that; I know that he feels that I am sincere when I speak on this matter in this Legislature.

I want to point out to him, Sir, that there is a considerable difference in the situation now than that that prevailed in 1914; and also a considerable difference to that that prevailed in 1939; that there has been a whole change in the type of missiles, in the types of bombs. There's no such a thing now as there was in 1914 and 1939 in the opinion of most people that it is possible any longer to actually win a war if nuclear weapons are used. I think that concept has changed. Nobody will win in the event of a nuclear war.

I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that the reason I brought this up under the question of civil defence because this is the only opportunity in the debates in this House, that this matter can be considered. I don't agree, I don't agree with the remarks of some that we should just concern ourselves with local affairs; that we should only be concerning ourselves with the expenditures that we are making here in the Province of Manitoba in respect of civil defence. I think when I made my remarks I did say that much of the training that is going on is to the well of the people of Manitoba in the event of some catastrophe. But I want to point out and re-emphasize this, that I raised this question because I don't think that we're a little parochial group. I think that we here in the Province of Manitoba are concerned with what's happening all over the world, and that when we meet here as a legislative body, this is the only opportunity that we can draw this to the attention of the peoples of Manitoba, it's the only opportunity that we have of considering these matters. So, I make no apologies, Mr. Chairman. I don't like a parochial approach in any subject, but this is the only opportunity that presents itself to draw

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) to the attention of all and sundry that despite the fact that it may be a relatively minor expenditure in the Province of Manitoba, that this is a matter of grave concern to us all. For that reason, Sir, I make no apologies for bringing the subject up here today.

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Chairman, this civil defence is no more certain now than it was in the beginning. The arms race has diverted us from our most essential task -- the improvement of mankind. We've heard people here talk today all over the globe, but they forget one thing -- all these monies could be spent in a good purpose to serve mankind all over the world. But are we doing it? No! We bicker around and say we're spending money here and spending money there, but what do we do? We spend it needlessly. I'm not saying that I'm standing up for Russia, or I'm standing up for some other people. But I say, let's get down to facts, and let's face facts and say this: the world in its over-all arms race spends \$14 million an hour on armaments. Devoted to the purpose of peace that amount would feed all the hungry and care for all the sick among the world's population -- three billion people. And here we bicker today on a sum for civil defence. So we say, "Oh! We're big fellows." We dicker around; we talk about parity prices; we talk about this and that and everything else and we have the answer right in our hand if we'd all be sane enough to follow suit. But no, you go to these people and you talk to them; "Oh yeah! I believe in what you're going to say, but" -- that one little word "but" that's it. You can talk all you want to these people but this word "but" comes in and that's it. I believe in this way and he believes in that way. We don't get no place. But if we get down to facts and we start to look into this thing, we'll find out, the world itself, three billion people can be housed, two hundred and forty million families in the undeveloped nations and more than double the cash income of one billion, two hundred million people, an absolute end to arms race, and would release 50 million people from the armies and navies of the world to peaceful purpose. Over 80% of our people live under substandard food supply. We have people who say if you talk of civil defence that it is of no use, we have no protection against nuclear warfare. If you talk of living at peace, the only way is for the world powers to have some sanity. We can change our views if the great powers conceive peace. So ladies and gentlemen, I'll leave you with this thought in mind. Thank you very much.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): I'd like to say a few words on this, but it's agreeable with me if you want to call it 5:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5:30.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, Mr. Chairman, this question of civil defence as my Leader has pointed out is important and that this is the only time in the estimates that we are going to have any time to devote to it.

Now it's a very complex subject. For a person like myself to try to find out just what is the truth is very difficult indeed. I have been saving articles on this important subject along the way and I find like the First Minister that we have to be governed by people who have the ability to look into these profound problems more intensely than we. I remember an article in the Star Weekly some time ago where Bob Neilson went to Wales and spent two hours with Sir Bertrand Russell, and after two hours there left with the feeling that he was deeply impressed with this man of 89 years should be so concerned about whether or not we survived. This man who was world renowned as a mathematician and philosopher and writer is, as Mr. Neilson said: "up to his snowy white hair now in another great cause."

Coming back home, Mr. Chairman, I noted a clipping in "The Voice of the Farmer" of November 5th, 1961, and the article, the writing has to do with a meeting that was held in Arborg. This meeting was addressed at Arborg by no less a person than Mr. Justice Thorson, 72 year old Jurist; and without hesitation, Mr. Chairman, I would say that Mr. Justice Thorson is one of the great living Canadians today. I would just like to take a minute to say what he had to say there. He said -- in a well-prepared address, the 72 year old Jurist maintained that nuclear arms were of no importance to Canada from a defensive standpoint.

Now I've read a lot about civil defence and nuclear warfare and I'm like the First Minister, I'm not a pessimist at heart, but we must be governed by what these men of wisdom have to say about this. Mr. Justice Thorson goes on to say that the cold hard fact was that Canada could not defend itself against a nuclear attack and could not give any effective assistance to

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) the United States if that country were attacked. Mr. Justice Thorson contended there was no known defence against the kind of nuclear attack that the Soviet Union could make against North America, nor could the Soviet Union possibly defend itself against the kind of attack that the United States could launch. I have had occasion to listen to some of the physicists of the University of Manitoba, and I think, without exception, they're quite convinced that this is true; that there is no known defence, that both the United States and Russia have at the present time power, more power than they need. I think the United States has enough atomic power, 25 times over, to destroy the Soviet Union and that the Soviet Union has already built up 17 times the power that she needs to destroy the United States; so the position of the Northern Hemisphere is certainly very precarious. Mr. Justice Thorson goes on to say that he thought that Canada would render far greater service to humanity by embarking on a policy of peace measures aimed at control and ultimate rejection of nuclear weapons throughout the world, rather than use of them, thereby functioning in a political climate far more relevant to her status in a democracy, embracing freedom in all its aspects for all people. Canada's prospects in that regard would be enhanced by the respect and prestige she enjoys in the United Nations built through her years of active participation there, the Judge concluded.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I know it's nearly 5:30, I just want you to give me permission to wind up by saying that this made a profound impression on me, to think that a man of the stature of Justice Thorson would attend a meeting at Arborg, attended by 300 people and would take such, or to give to that meeting his impressions of this important subject, and I think that it's a very complex thing. People of Canada do not know what is the right and the wrong of civil defence because as the editorial here says: "If we do need a program of adequate protection in civil defence then it's primarily a responsibility of the federal government."

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