

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

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, February 21, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER Presenting Petitions.

MR. J. E. JEANNOTTE (Rupertsland): I beg to present the petition of Roland Couture and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate The Catholic Foundation of Manitoba, or La Fondation Catholique du Manitoba.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Traders Mortgage Company praying for the passing of an Act respecting Traders Mortgage Company.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The petition of Stewart Millet and others, praying for the passing of an Act to Incorporate The Red River Exhibition Association.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I beg to submit the report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs begs leave to present the following as their first report. Your committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Lissaman as Chairman. Your committee recommends that for the remainder of this session the quorum of this committee shall consist of six members. Your committee has considered Bills No. 3, an Act to amend The Soldiers' Taxation Relief Act; No. 6, an Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act; No. 7, an Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act; No. 8, an Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act; No. 15, an Act to remove the City of St. Boniface, the City of Portage la Prairie and the City of St. James from supervision of the Municipal Board; No. 19, an Act to amend the Winter Employment Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered Bills: No. 9, an Act to amend The Municipal Act; No. 10, an Act respecting the provision of planning services to municipalities and agencies of the government and for the preparation of planning schemes for regulating the use and development of lands and buildings; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments; all of which is respectfully submitted.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 44, an Act to amend The Real Property Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 70 Grade 8 students from Beliveau School under the direction of their teacher Mr. Loewen. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

There are some 25 Grade 11 students from the Manitou Collegiate under the direction of their teacher, Mr. McGinn, and this school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Pembina; 26 Grade 8 students from St. Ignatius School under the direction of their teacher, Sister Electa Maria. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. There are ten Grade 7 students from Earl Grey School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Friesen. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day I think I have an announcement that may interest the House. A short time ago I was awaited upon by Dr. Cumming and Mr. Russell Robins and Mr. Sydney Halter, the members of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg Review Commission, and I had the pleasure of receiving their report. There are not as yet sufficient copies for distribution. We are

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)... hoping to be able to make a full distribution to members of the House, to the press and the general public, on Monday and at that time to make available the contents of that report. I have just received it; I have not read it myself, but I will do my best to see that copies are available for the members at the earliest possible date.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the First Minister for his statement. Could he indicate to the House whether he has yet received such a visit from the Honourable Mr. Michener and other members of that Commission?

MR. ROBLIN: I must tell my honourable friend I have not yet been so honoured.

MR. MOLGAT: possible that he might have booked an appointment for these honourable gentlemen, Madam Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: No, Madam Speaker, I must rise in their defence. They have only been working some -- well hardly twelve months -- less than that -- and, while they haven't produced the report, they have given some indication to me that they are well advanced in their work and I would rather compliment them upon their diligence.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I should like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 8 on the motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's dated February 18th of this year.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to make a correction in a report that appeared in one of yesterday's newspapers. I refer to a report in the Free Press of Thursday, February 20th, this year with the heading, "Pay Hike Isn't - Campbell." I don't know that the heading has any particular significance. The sub-heading says, "Molgat hasn't received voted increase" and I shall not read all of the press clipping but part of the fourth paragraph says this: "According to Mr. Campbell, Speaker Mrs. Thelma Forbes also failed to receive a raise voted for her during the last session of the Legislature." I would never have been so ungallant, Madam Speaker, to have left you out of any representations that I was making if I thought that you should be included in them, but I did not make the suggestion that's attributed to me here. I did not couple your name with the ones of those who had not received the increase that was voted for them last year. As a matter of fact it was the Honourable the First Minister who brought your name into the discussion, and I at that time disagreed with him by saying that I was sure that the statutory bar did not exist in your case because of the fact that this legislation had been passed some years ago.

HON. MAITLAND STEINKOPF (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I advise the House that a memorandum explaining the federal-provincial centennial grants program has just been prepared and will be mailed to all municipalities and local government districts over the weekend. I have arranged for a copy to be handed to all of the honourable members here this afternoon.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. A news article last week some time, or before, indicated that the Attorney-General, in replying to a question about one police force for all of the province, replied: "There's a good deal to be said for a central police force." In view of the statement, is the government contemplating establishing a provincial police force on the same basis as the Ontario provincial police?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, the Attorney-General ought really to learn to keep his mouth shut. The answer to the question is no.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question then to the Minister. I had understood that the federal government, some days before this news release, had been in touch with my honourable friend suggesting that they might be prepared to consider some enlargement of RCMP work in the province. I think he was contacted. There was a news release on this from the federal Minister of Justice. Could my honourable friend indicate to me what action he intends to take?

MR. McLEAN: I haven't received any communication, Madam Speaker.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. When a local municipal council is not just too sure of how to operate under a particular statute or regulation, and if they request assistance or enlightenment

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)... from the department, is it usual practice for the department to give them such assistance or enlightenment as to what a particular statute or regulation means?

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Usually the municipality will consult their own solicitor first. If he can't help them, or if they think there is something wrong with the legislation or the regulations, then usually they come to the department and we've always tried to help them.

MR. SCHREYER: That being the case, Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. I would like him to explain why it was that when the Winnipeg School Board asked for some guidance with respect to carrying out the provisions of the law regarding religious instruction, why the Minister dismissed their request so curtly -- the Minister of Education, Madam Speaker.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, could he be more clear with that question? Or maybe I should just take it as notice and determine what he has asked ...

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I will clarify the question. I notice, according to a newspaper report, that the Winnipeg School Board did ask the Minister of Education to give some guidance and clarification as to how best they could carry out the provisions of the statute respecting religious instruction, and according to the report the Minister was not inclined to do so at all, and I'm simply asking, in view of the fact that it is a common practice to give assistance to local authorities from time to time, why the Minister did not do so in this particular case.

MR. JOHNSON: I answered the question put to me by the City of Winnipeg and followed the Act as it is written.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Address for Papers. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster that an humble address be voted his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor for a Return showing copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba respecting the Canada Pension scheme as proposed by the present government of Ottawa.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, we accept the question with the usual reservations about the consent from Ottawa.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I be permitted just one word in connection with this correspondence. I'm referring to the numerous proposals of the government at Ottawa, not just the most recent one.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Chairman, if I may ask a question of my honourable friend. That raises a point. I had assumed here that what he was speaking about was what is known in common parlance as the LaMarsh scheme. If that is correct I have nothing to answer.

MR. PAULLEY: That is precisely it.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for a Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the member for Seven Oaks that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the number of road or highway construction contracts let by the Department of Public Works in the year '63 that were let on an hourly rate basis; the name of the contractors involved in each case, and the nature, extent and area of the work; and (c) the rate of payment or the total sum paid for each work project.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing (a) the name of the successful tenderer for the construction of the Hydro transmission line from Grand Rapids to the Rosser sub-station; (b) and with leave, if I might insert a few words -- a copy of the agreement or agreements exclusive of engineering data, relative to this particular construction entered into between Manitoba Hydro and the successful tenderer.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: There are approximately 50 exhibits appended to the main agreement, and I presume these are what are referred to when you say the engineering data, and it will be okay to accept the order on that basis.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of needy persons disabled for employment for more than 90 days who have made application for Social Allowances either personally or by the municipalities on their behalf; 2. The number of the above who were granted social allowances; 3. The number of unemployed widows under 65 years of age who have received aid; 4. The number who were rejected from receiving disability allowances but who were given social allowances by the Provincial Government. I might say, Madam Speaker, the above questions are related to a letter issued by the Deputy Minister of Welfare about a year ago.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the question seems to be in order by my colleague isn't here and there might be some points he would like to raise before we accept it. Could we allow it to stand until he returns?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I appreciate the position.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would like to have the leave of this House to withdraw the order so that I might submit it three weeks hence.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave? Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for St. James, and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for Wellington, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, the future of the overhaul base at Stevenson Field has never been more in doubt than it is at the present moment. There is only one thing that could remove doubt about the future, and that is to ensure that whatever facilities exist here are adapted as time goes on to take care of modern aircraft as they appear in service. This can be done. The premises either exist for it now or can be adapted with only moderate cost, and the skilled personnel are present in Winnipeg and this neighbourhood who either have the skills required now for modern aircraft, the jet aircraft and those to follow, or can probably be retrained for whatever new responsibilities there might be more reasonably than perhaps any other work force in the country. I say the Federal Government has got to stop either pussyfooting or being pushed around by one of its own employees. There is too much at stake, as far as we are concerned in this part of the world and as far as Canada is concerned, for any other course to be contemplated.

More than 2,000 jobs in this area are affected, 800 of them direct in the overhaul base itself, and when the supporting industries and suppliers and service industries are considered, the total number rises to at least 2,000. Eight thousand people, including some 700 school children are supported out of the earnings of these more than 2,000 people. Twelve million dollars in consuming purchasing power -- that is, the personal disposable income -- is involved. Nine million dollars in retail sales representing the purchase of food and clothing and drugs and the other necessities of life. Two million dollars a year for owner-occupied or rental housing accommodation. This is the measure of the importance of this matter to Winnipeg.

Not only that, but a matter of very much wider import is involved, and that is the whole regional development policy of the country, a policy that the present government at Ottawa has espoused, saying that there must be regional development of this country, and that whole policy is at stake because, in this area particularly, the industrial development of this region will

(Mr. Evans, cont'd)... depend to a very large extent upon the pool of skilled labour that we have here, because we have no resource comparable to it as a base upon which to base the industrial development of this particular region. And we depend to a more than usual extent upon the skills of the aircraft industry of a single industry for a supply of skilled workmen upon which our industrial expansion can take place. Our situation is much like Pittsburgh who built great industries upon the pool of skilled labour that began to cluster about the steel industry and was expanded from there. This labour pool around Winnipeg in the aircraft industry is unique. It has had intense training and years of experience to develop them to a skill, and I might say further, a sense of responsibility well beyond the degree to which these qualities are required in the average workman.

Now I'm deeply sorry that the Liberals have decided to play politics with this matter of the TCA base. Manitoba has presented a united front at Ottawa in its requests for attention to this particular problem, and in every case we have presented a united view. The Leader of the Opposition accompanied the first delegation that we took as did the Leader of the NDP. Then, he didn't -- my honourable friend corrects me on that. He discussed the question of coming without an official invitation, and did not come . . . , but the Leader of the Liberal Opposition did accompany the delegation and appeared with us.

MR. MOLGAT: Could I ask the Minister a question? Is it not true that the government attempted to stop me from going on that delegation?

MR. EVANS: This is not true, entirely not true, because when my honourable friend appeared at the aircraft I welcomed him. When we arrived in Ottawa I invited him to attend the meeting that we had before the delegation went there; the night before I presented him with a brief at the same time that I presented briefs to the other members of the delegation; I welcomed him on that occasion, and he went with us and helped us to make our presentation.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is it not true that the union representatives who were inviting people to go on the delegation were specifically told not to invite any of the NDP and myself, and on that basis telephoned me and gave me that information that they had obtained from the Minister?

MR. EVANS: That is not correct, because . . .

MR. MOLGAT: It certainly is.

MR. EVANS: My honourable friend was not invited as a leader of an official political party. The delegation was formed and consisted of the membership of the Manitoba Transportation Commission, and other individuals were added in their personal capacities. The second delegation that went -- there was an invitation extended to both parties officially to attend, and both parties accepted.

But now we have speeches in which the Leader of the Opposition attempts to place some responsibility or some blame upon me or upon this government for the situation that exists. He makes reference to the Throne Speech as being critical. I have re-read the reference in the Throne Speech. I can't see anybody that they were critical of, and then my honourable friend from Assiniboia stands up and says that well I may have done something quite lately about this thing that really is four years too late, and why didn't I do some of these things. Well, my honourable friend should have done some of his home work, because this entire delegation and movement to represent this point of view and to try to stop the move of the overhaul base was very largely my own personal creation, and I propose to go ahead and give him some details of the work that I have done and that the government has done. I think it's most unfortunate that my honourable friends across there should be trying to find, in my opinion, a scapegoat, so that they will have somebody to point a finger at when their friends at Ottawa turn down the reasonable demands of this part of the country for the retention of the base here, and to try to find a fall guy, if you like, to blame for what they greatly suspect or perhaps know is going to happen with regard to this particular action.

My honourable friend across the way asks: "Well, what about the government action the last three or four years?" I would ask, what action has been proposed from that quarter of the House that has not been taken? What did the Liberal Party advocate last year that wasn't done? Or the year before, or the year before that? Or indeed, what constructive suggestion have my honourable friends in that quarter of the House made at any time with respect to this? And I would ask my honourable friend from Assiniboia when he appeared in the matter up until the

(Mr. Evans, cont'd)... time he spoke the other day. I don't recall him, as the representative of an area of the city that was deeply concerned with this, paying any attention to the matter. I don't recall seeing him at any of the delegations when we either had meetings or during the crowds when we were seen off, or at any other time appearing in this matter; and now he undertakes to be critical of the role that we are taking.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to tell the Honourable Minister that we did take objections through the St. James Chamber of Commerce in St. James, and I have used this, as a matter of fact during the election campaign a year ago, and at the same time I don't believe that any member of the government did make any mention of it.

MR. EVANS: My honourable friend did not attend my meetings or he would have heard very considerable mention of the whole matter.

Well, I can say this, if my honourable friends will consult the people most closely concerned, the workers themselves living in his own constituency, I think he will find that they have some opinion that perhaps the government has undertaken a very considerable amount of work to try to sustain this base here, and in fact when the Manitoba Federation of Labour called on the government quite recently and presented us with their brief, they were good enough to volunteer. They remarked in their introduction about as follows: "that we wish to commend your government for its interest and good work in its efforts to keep the TCA Maintenance and Overhaul base in Manitoba." And I shall try to stifle my blushes by going on to read the rest of the sentence, which says: And special word of commendation to the Honourable Gurney Evans and his department." And I read that because the department is mentioned and not myself. "And to you, sir" -- he was addressing the Premier -- "for the great interest that you have shown in heading up the last delegation to Ottawa."

Well, I'm going to not rest my case upon that, but I'm going to tell my honourable friends that I was the one who succeeded in breaking through the wall of silence that had been raised by TCA in this matter. They had been silently and, I think, deceitfully extracting workers from the Winnipeg Overhaul base and gradually bleeding it to death, while all the time giving vague assurances that this, in fact, was not happening. This has been repeated so often I think it's generally accepted here. Well, I'm much indebted to my honourable friend from Winnipeg Centre, Mr. Cowan, who from time to time learned of individuals who were being moved east, and he kept coming to me with these, and other members of the Assembly did as well. And so I began to take up the task of finding out whether in fact these moves were taking place despite the assurances, and in March 11, 1960, I made my first representation to the then Minister of Transport in Ottawa, Mr. Hees, and I received a general reply from him giving me the same usual assurances, which undoubtedly came from the TCA management. Well, I couldn't understand that, so I wrote back again on June 10, 1960, and requested an appointment with the Minister, an appointment which I subsequently kept, and after those events, on August 8th I received a further letter from Mr. Hees saying that he would talk to Mr. McGregor again; and then on August 16, 1960, Mr. Hees wrote to me that the base will be moved, and that was the first time that we had a breakthrough and exposed the scheme of Mr. McGregor to move this base secretly and without rousing the proper reaction which indeed did follow. There are other times upon which I called this matter to the attention of the House. I immediately summoned the Manitoba Transportation Commission and laid the matter before them, and it was from that point that the delegations were created and the three delegations were taken to Ottawa.

Well, I might say that at the time this situation was exposed, the first task that had to be accomplished was to arouse people in Winnipeg, first of all to the gravity of the situation, and second, to a belief that something could be done about it. If you had asked the average person in Winnipeg, or almost anyone, whether or not there was any use in taking these delegations East, they would have said, "certainly not," that the thing was an accomplished fact and all we had to do was to wait for it to happen. Nevertheless, the Manitoba Transportation Commission, with the additional membership of the mayors and reeves of the 19 municipalities of Greater Winnipeg, did take up this task, and they took it up very vigorously, with the results that we know about.

The first brief, of course, was made to the Diefenbaker government, and exposed the

(Mr. Evans, cont'd) . . . deliberate deceit and trickery of TCA, and I use those words deliberately. The federal government froze the staff pending the study, and at the time the staff was thought to be frozen -- that we got assurances from the government at that time that it would be frozen -- the staff was 997 in number, and the numbers are now 800, so one can see how effective the freezing was.

The second brief was made to the Pearson government, and the Prime Minister gave assurances in general terms that the numbers of people there would be maintained.

The third brief, on December 12, 1963, at that time the Prime Minister repeated this statement that he made in Parliament on November 22, 1963, that for at least as far ahead as planning extends, that is, for at least ten years, the Winnipeg facilities will continue to be used. The Minister of Transport said that I indicated that I expected the employment level would be maintained or even increased beyond the present low level. He said that during the debates of the House of Commons November 26th, which will be found on Hansard at Page 5104.

At this point, something new entered the picture. Up to this time, TCA had been ignoring the expressed wish of the government, but from now on the TCA management began flatly to contradict the Prime Minister of Canada after the Prime Minister had said that the president and officers of the TCA appeared before the Sessional Committee on the Railways and Airlines, and here are the words that are quoted from the proceedings of that meeting: "There will have to be a certain strength maintained at Winnipeg, which we seem to have established at 600, not the 800, which was the strength at the time that the Prime Minister gave his statement. As long as we are operating 34 Viscounts, this study goes to 1973. As to what happens after that, I would hope that the number of Viscounts beyond 1973 would drop quite sharply. I thought it would happen in 1966, but as long as we have a substantial number of Viscounts, we must keep the base in operation in Winnipeg. But, if in 1974 or 1975 the number of Viscounts in service-- or even before that time -- drop into the 20's, we would certainly have to shut down Winnipeg and offer transfers to other places in the company to experienced personnel. And those who accepted would be transferred, those who decline transfers would be asked to leave. Those were the proceedings in this committee.

The Minister of Transport tried to explain that statement away during a visit to Winnipeg on January 17th last. On the occasion of the opening of the new airport terminal, the Minister of Transport stated that the testimony of the TCA management had been misinterpreted. Well, I've read those proceedings word by word, and there's not the slightest room for misinterpretation of what was said. And now to cap it all, Mr. McGregor says that he has had no directive from the government, in spite of the fact, as my honourable friend has pointed out, that we've received assurances from the Prime Minister of Canada that he would convey to Mr. McGregor the assurances that he had given to the delegation when we met them in Ottawa. But even in spite of that, surely the Minister of Transport is in touch with the head of the TCA, and surely the head of the TCA can read a newspaper. I say this, that C.D. Howe would have known what to do, because he said explicitly what he would do in circumstances of this kind. He said explicitly what he would do in exactly this situation, because concerning the freezing of employment at Winnipeg, he refers -- and I refer to the minutes of the proceedings and evidence of the Sessional Committee on Railways and Shipping of April 5, 6 and 7, 1949: "To allay widespread and justifiable fears of a severe cut-back of TCA, the late Right Honourable C.D. Howe, Federal Minister then responsible for TCA said" -- and these were his words reported in the minutes: "I think if an attempt was made by the directors to move the overhaul department or accounting department after the remarks of the president, I would have good reason to put a veto upon these suggestions. I say that, as an added assurance to those employees who are fearful of having to move, they need have no such fear."

Well, there was no doubt in C.D. Howe's mind who was boss, either the people of Canada, or one of their employees, and I think C.D. Howe was right. There's a clear divergence between the wishes of the federal government and the actions of the TCA management. TCA agrees with the federal government's wishes and directives only when the agreement suits TCA's purposes. The national interest which TCA is expected to serve is almost entirely overlooked. I think this is another major factor in the situation to which we should pay some attention.

Crown corporations, including Trans-Canada Air Lines, are established to fulfill

(Mr. Evans, cont' d) . . . special requirements which are considered to be of benefit to the public at large. Trans-Canada Air Lines was incorporated to provide Canada with a national air system. It was expected to operate at losses in some regions, and today important links in the TCA are maintained at substantial losses, and there's considerable detail in this in the committee's report that I have referred to before. In the interest of national unity and development, these losses were subsidized by the National Treasury. Further, TCA's competitive position is protected as a matter of national policy. Operating under public subsidy and protection, TCA has developed as one of the major airlines of the world. It could not have developed to its present status without the public assistance which it is still receiving. In the course of its development, TCA has become an integral part of many communities in Canada. Its management, however, has lost sight of its original objectives to the extent that it is openly defying the federal government and the public who support and protect it. The Dixon-Speas study, however, important as it may be, and the controversy over its release are only incidents that provide another demonstration of the arrogance which TCA displays to the Canadian public and to the Federal Government.

A full public enquiry into the conduct of the management of Canada's national airline and the entire matter of Winnipeg's base is required. The Prime Minister and the Federal Government have a responsibility to the people of Canada to convene such an enquiry. Meanwhile TCA activities in respect to the phase-out of the Winnipeg base should be halted by the Federal Government without delay and stabilized until such time as a public enquiry into the TCA management is completed.

Now, having said those things, I must turn to the amendment that was moved by my honourable friend from Assiniboia, and I find myself in a difficult position here because I agree with almost all that was said in the amendment. There are one or two items in it, however, which I find impossible to support and I'll give you my reasons for it; but this is an amendment to an amendment, and it's not possible for me to further amend this particular motion and so I must vote against it, and I would like to discuss the one or two items that I find I cannot support. For example, item No. 2 speaks of "immediately accept the copy of the Dixon-Speas Report offered to it by the Federal Government some months ago, for further analysis and study." We have received no offer of a copy of the Dixon-Speas Report. There was a reference in the press, I believe, to a possible offer of a copy to be sent to us in confidence, to be allowed to be read and returned. The offer was not made officially and if it had been I would have been forced to decline an offer which would thereupon have gagged me so far as referring to the matters contained in that report were concerned.

MR. MOLGAT: permit a question?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Did he not receive personally an offer of this report? Did he not make that statement himself at a meeting of the delegation prior to going to Ottawa in December?

MR. EVANS: I don't recall what statement my honourable friend may be talking about but whether or not -- there was no official offer, there was certainly nothing in writing, and when this reference came up in this resolution I tried to recall whether I had seen it in the press or how it came to me, but it doesn't matter I think, because I would have to say this, that if a copy of the report were offered to me in confidence it would not be possible for me to accept because that would gag me on the subject. I would not be able to refer to the report without violating a confidence, and so it was not possible for us to accept it. So I cannot accept the resolution in that particular.

Item No. 4 of the resolution calls for a provincial enquiry such as was mentioned by the Prime Minister in Ottawa. This would not be suitable because it would not be within the competence of a provincial enquiry to compel the attendance of the officials of TCA or those who had compiled the Dixon-Speas Report or any of the papers in the possession of either TCA or naturally of the Federal Government, and so a provincial enquiry would not be effective for the purpose and could be defied just as readily by TCA as the TCA is defying the Federal Government today.

Item No. 5, is to give consideration to the advisability of establishing a commission or committee made up, if possible, of representatives of the Government of Manitoba, the Government of Canada, the municipalities concerned and other interested bodies, and to list the objectives below. Well we already have this body because -- I don't know that my honourable

(Mr. Evans, cont'd)... friend is aware of this, that the delegations that went to Ottawa were delegations of the Manitoba Transportation Commission to which were added for the purpose the mayors and reeves of the municipalities affected and others, and onto this body we could add any additional personnel. They already have studied the matter. There are already a large body of papers in that connection and the staff are acquainted with the matter, and consequently it would be far better to adapt that particular organization, the Manitoba Transportation Commission, than to create a new body. So for these reasons -- not that I differ with the object of the resolution itself, because it does nothing more than perhaps amplify the previous one. It contains material that is all to be found within the briefs, with the exception of the items that I have noted. I have no option but to vote against the amendment to the resolution for the reasons that I have mentioned.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Minister. Does he deny that he was offered a copy of the Dixon-Speas Report?

MR. EVANS: There was no offer to the Manitoba Government by the Government of Canada of a full copy of the Dixon-Speas Report.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is the Minister telling me that he didn't get an offer from Ottawa personally that he would get this Dixon-Speas Report if he was willing to accept it?

MR. EVANS: Perhaps my honourable friend will tell me who made the offer and on what occasion.

MR. MOLGAT: You answer the question.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. STAN PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, when I adjourned this debate I adjourned it for my colleague the Member for Seven Oaks, but if he speaks now he would be closing the debate so if anybody else wishes to speak they are privileged to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does any member wish to speak before the Honourable Member closes the debate? The Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, one of the reasons that I introduced this resolution was because of the many complaints or suggestions from my constituents, and I must admit that the Honourable Member for Wellington certainly did a good job in the preparation of his speech, and I thank him for that, but it took me quite a while to find out whether he was for me or against me because he did mention on several occasions, and he quoted experts to prove, that it might be possible that certain harm was being done to our children, and although I have a high respect for higher education, I still believe that when it comes to knowing what's good for children I think that perhaps the mothers and fathers do have a little knowledge here too. For instance, I might say I spent a couple of winters out at the University in workers' educational classes studying child psychology when my children were small and I did learn much there. I did learn, too, that there is great disagreement among the psychologists.

You know, Madam Speaker, we have the experts telling us on TV that when you hear the commercials they're not any louder. They offer all sorts of scientific argument to prove this, but after all, we were given the blessing of hearing and it's pretty hard to convince many of us who listen to TV that it isn't louder. It's certainly objectionable, no matter what they say with their scientific approach to the matter. The honourable member said that he felt that the TV industry was being persecuted today, and this was certainly not my intention in bringing in this resolution. The intention was to throw some light and have some discussion on a subject that I think is of paramount importance to parents today. I have a great respect for the television industry and I am particularly proud of our CBC because, from the standpoint of educational advantage, I think it's second to none; and it is because of this top place in the home and its ability to do good or evil that I think we should be discussing it. The honourable member quoted Walter Lippman as saying -- and it might not hurt to refer to that

(Mr. Wright, cont'd)... again. He said that Walter Lippman stated: "There can be no real doubt that the movie and television, and the comic book, are purveying violence and lust to a vicious and intolerable degree." I think that's right, but he said that psychiatrists maintain that not much harm is done to the child if the child is well adjusted, if the child comes from a home where harmony prevails; and I'm inclined to agree with him. I think that this is true but I don't think we should be making the job of parents more difficult by having to sort of counter-act the various types of violence shown on TV. I think that, as I said before, we must respect the wisdom of parents in deciding what's good for children and, as the honourable member has agreed with me very, very much of what is shown on TV, especially during the supper hour, is certainly not considered good for children. In fact, I think that in the last week or so a program called "Outer Limits" has been switched from the supper hour to a later hour. So it wasn't with the idea, in submitting this resolution, that I wanted to give it any undue publicity, especially adverse publicity for the TV industry, because as I said before I have quite a respect for the ability of TV to be a teaching medium; but I think that in the everyday common sense of people who are trying to raise children much could be done to time programs. I wasn't advocating censorship but I think there is a lot of senseless timing, and as I said in my original speech in opening this debate, one of Walt Disney's finest nature films was shown at 11 o'clock at night, and this is the sort of thing, despite all the opinions of the psychiatrists who claim that children are not being impressed adversely by television, I think that we have to respect the opinion of parents. It was with this idea that I submitted this resolution and I solicit the support of the House in just merely asking the Board of Broadcast Governors to consider the problem of timing.

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

MR. PAULLEY: The ayes and nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, Whereas children today spend many hours per week watching television and whereas this medium of entertainment is constantly subjecting the plastic mind of youth

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Campbell, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, Martin, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Steinkopf, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Wright, and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Johnson, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Roblin, Seaborn, Stanes, Strickland, Weir.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 38; Nays, 11.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the Leader of the House has been defeated in the House. Is it his intention to resign.

MR. ROBLIN: democrats. I do what the majority say and the majority insist on my keeping my present office.

MR. MOLGAT: On the contrary, the majority of this House has just voted against my honourable friend.

MR. ROBLIN: Ah, but I listen to the voice of the people.

MR. PAULLEY: In keeping with the tenor of the remarks of the Honourable the First Minister that he believes in democracy, then the sponsor of this resolution can expect to receive a copy of a communication to the Board of Broadcast Governors very shortly, carrying out the intent of this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, the Honourable the Member for Hamiota.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Carillon. The Honourable the Member for Fisher.

MR. EML MOELLER (Fisher): Madam Speaker, for the last year and a half we have heard so much about sugar. Sugar -- a known thing for sweetening, but how bitter can it be at

(Mr. Moeller, cont'd)... times to one group or the other. One time it's the producer, the next time it's the consumer. Since beet growing has started in Manitoba and sugar refining in the year 1940, the Manitoba beet growers have lived a rough life. When fathers contracted more acres and sons and daughters had to do the work, and hard work, and the wives of these beet growers got so far then said, "Well, we're going to divorce our husbands. There's just no end. Trying to produce something sweet but we always get the bitter end. There wasn't enough money in growing beets, but things change, and for the last year and a half the price has risen, not due to Manitoba beet growers. It's the world market that controls these things. For a good number of years the Canadian Beet Growers Association has tried to get a national sugar policy for this country, to stabilize the price so it wouldn't be any hardship on beet grower nor consumer. We only produce about 14 percent of the sugar consumed in Canada. Eight-six percent are imported. Most nations have a sugar agreement with other countries, but not all sugar is under an agreement, and that sugar that's loose is on the world market and it's usually called homeless sugar, and this small percentage makes the price just like the 15% of hogs that come to our public market makes the price for the balance. So after all this time, the beet growers didn't receive anything from the Federal Government. The only thing that was that we came under the price stabilization with all sugar beet growers. This isn't too bad. It's not too good either. It fluctuates. But when the prices rise there is no stabilization and the consumer has to pick the bitter end. Why can't we produce all the sugar in Canada we need? Or, we'll say about 50 percent to be modest. In the western part of our nation, in B. C. the cane refinery gives B. C. enough sugar. Alberta has two big factories which supply Alberta with their sugar, about 33 percent of what is there is exported from Alberta to the sister province of Saskatchewan, but about 8 percent has been coming to Manitoba. Manitoba didn't produce enough sugar before, not until this last year, and our sugar came from the east. Our sugar came in at a preferred freight rate and at times when we had a little extra here in this province and tried to export it to Ontario we have to pay double the freight for our sugar going east, than sugar coming from the east. Are we measured in this country with two different kinds of sticks? What is wrong with our Federal Government? Can't we get anything what is good to us all? Then the Member for Carillon, he made a very good speech and I agree to most of it, but not quite. He said, "I have been convinced that there would be many advantages to the people of this province if a second sugar factory could be established in Manitoba." What would that do to the existing beet grower, to the existing factory? This year we have an over-production in Manitoba, and maybe 100,000 bags of sugar have to be carried over to next year. If we try to put our sugar into Ontario today and the prices should become lower again, what will the cane refinement do to us? They might choke us, and it's the first time in the history of Manitoba beet growers that sugar is cheaper in Manitoba than in the east, but people usually don't realize these things. So there we go on and on. I fully agree, if it was possible that we have another factory in Manitoba; there is something in it; more industry, more work for our labour; like last year 1,300 of our Manitoba Indians were employed in thinning and hoeing sugar beets. Their take home pay was \$191,000. Then they were employed during the sugar campaign at the factory and those are not the only ones. It's all the others it's the line, it's the bags, and anything that's connected with it that's used in Manitoba. It's a good industry, but with the freight rates against Manitoba it's just not possible if sugar prices should come lower, that we can afford another sugar factory. Therefore, if the sugar stays high we build another factory, maybe one factory would be strangled and the other one, the new one would commit suicide before she gets going. I'd like to make one correction in my honourable friend's remarks there when he said the sugar content went as low as 11 percent. I state that the sugar percentage was 16.9 average so that's not very far off from the 17 that was estimated. And I'd like to make an amendment to the motion -- I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that the resolution be amended by adding after the word 'Manitoba' in the last line thereof, the following words -- "as soon as accessible markets make such a factory economically feasible."

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. P. J. McDONALD (Turtle Mountain): Madam Speaker, I rise at this time to speak to the resolution placed before us from the Honourable Member from Emerson. I certainly was very, I might say happy, to hear him get up and say that once upon a time we had discrimination probably in roads and what have you, but this is no longer the case, because we have this Minister out at least three different times to spend some time in that community, and I think I'll have to have a little heart-to-heart talk with my Honourable Member the Minister of Public Works, to see if I can't get him to spend a little bit of that time in that south-western part of the province that I represent. Madam Speaker, the resolution that has been presented to us refers to secondary highways, and I couldn't help but feel that probably the member was anticipating or hoping what might come out of the Michener report; and we all know that this report will be coming up reasonably soon and look forward to what it has to offer. In referring to the secondary highways being taken over by the government, while the province has taken over each year we have taken over some additional roads that it has been felt was too heavy for the municipalities. Actually the miles have declined that are now secondary highways, because the government has taken over more than they have added, so I think that they have realized and recognized the responsibility that they have to take a look at this time. I would like to point out to the honourable member, that on secondary highways, he was mentioning that local government only have one source of income. Well, I believe that there is more than one source of income because, taking secondary highways for instance, the government pays 75 percent of the construction and also 75 percent of the upkeep, and I'm sure that we have to consider that this is an income. When it comes to market road systems, any municipality can enter into an agreement on a 40-60 basis and get up to \$10,500. In addition to this, there's grants for education, there's grants for special projects and welfare, and I think that there isn't any doubt that we can be looking forward to a complete report coming from the Michener report on government and financial taxation for the municipalities.

I was certainly pleased when I heard the member refer to the secondary highways, but I don't think it's broad enough for us to accept just the secondary highways. Take for the municipality that I represent, this would be of no help to us at all, because there's no secondary highways in the province; and based on these few reasons, I feel that I couldn't support this resolution.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson):question. One of the reasons given by the member was he can't support the resolution because he has no secondary highways in his area. What about considering the rest of the province?

MR. McDONALD: Well, Madam Speaker, I think that this is something that I suggested that wasn't broad enough. I think that we should be recommending to the government something on a much broader scale, something that would help all the municipalities.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Madam Speaker, before speaking to this resolution, may I suggest that this is the first time I've taken part in debates in this session in your presence. I would therefore extend to you my good wishes for your continued good health and success in your heavy, and sometimes tedious responsibilities.

Madam Speaker, in speaking to this resolution, it is with a feeling of respect toward the Honourable Member for Inkster. While he refrained from going into detail, I remember his eloquent appeal of last year. His continued interest in the well being of the senior citizens is understood. Madam Speaker, I want to assure him that many others, both inside and outside this House, have a burning interest in doing their best toward bettering the lot of those unfortunate enough to find themselves in need in their declining years and unable to provide for themselves. Madam Speaker, no one questions that the rising cost of living is dealing a heavy blow to our senior citizens, as it is with most everyone else. I do, however, make no apology

(Mr. Bilton, cont'd) for the efforts of this government during its term of office in helping in this sphere of endeavour. Added to this there's the effort made by people in Manitoba toward providing a means of substance and a life of dignity, to which my honourable friend refers. My honourable friend stated that the cost of living has increased 34 percent since 1949. I note that he overlooked the fact that pensions in that time have increased 150 percent. He will no doubt recall that the pension in 1949, a year he mentions in his resolution, was only \$30.00 a month, not \$55.00 as intimated. He will also recall that in 1952, the pension was increased to \$40.00. Furthermore, it was that year -- 1952 that the Old Age Assistance Plan was extended for those in the age group 65 to 70. Demands, Madam Speaker, for assistance continue to be high, but through the steady progressive action by the government, and community-minded organizations, a large majority of those requiring attention are being accommodated. Over the past fiscal year, some \$830,894 has been allocated for hostels and housing units as an assistance to local organizations, with an increased forecast for this year. I said earlier, my friend opposite did not go into any length in the support of his resolution, nor, Madam Speaker, do I intend to 'whip the horse' today. All have listened, read and seen for themselves problems facing our elderly people. No comments of mine, insofar as statistics are concerned, will serve any purpose at this particular time. I have no doubt during the estimates on welfare, facts will be brought forward for the interest of all. I would, however, like at this time to extend to you Madam, and members of this House, a few personal experiences which leads me to mention the Senior Citizens' Lodge in Swan River, which was opened only a couple of years ago and is presently housing 50 people in surroundings of comfort undreamed of five years ago. This Home, Madam Speaker, provides all-inclusive -- and I repeat that -- all-inclusive accommodation with private, beautifully furnished suites in a price range of \$65 to \$75 per month. Not excessive, I'm sure you will agree, at this particular time. The department assists individuals in this Home financially where necessary, and the local taxpayers, the taxpayers of the Swan River Valley, have picked up the tab for the initial construction and furnishing costs, which I can assure you, Madam Speaker, is no small item. Similar homes, Madam Speaker, have been and are being developed all over the province. So I say, while there is yet much to be done, progress -- substantial progress is being made and I reiterate that these people are not being forgotten. In fact I defy anyone to say so, and really mean it. I do say however, Madam Speaker, that from experience, I find there is a tendency these days for some to abandon their parents -- parents who have reached their twilight years. Too often, parents are forgotten and cast aside as a charge to an interested organization, or the state, if you like. This, I submit, is wrong and such people should pause awhile and remember that the day will probably come when the same fate may befall them. This condition, Madam Speaker, without question aggravates the situation and I suggest a little more human approach toward this problem within family life is long overdue. In passing Madam Speaker, the resolution put forward by my honourable friend will require in the neighbourhood of \$50 million to meet the needs of approximately 50,000 people over the age of seventy years, and some 28,000 in the age group of 65 to 69 years -- all this in Manitoba.

It is not hard to realize that hundreds of millions of dollars will be required Dominion-wise to meet the suggestion put forward. While this is for the most part a federal problem, let there be no mistake. Manitobans will have to bear their fair share of the taxation to underwrite any given situation. We are all aware, Madam Speaker, that the subject of universal pensions is a matter presently being considered by the federal parliament, out of which all of us would hope and pray that the needs of the senior citizens, the pioneers of this vast land of ours, will be given the consideration they rightfully deserve. After all, we in this House and thousands beyond its borders recognize this basic problem. We -- or at least I -- have no quarrel that the need does exist. It is on the manner we resolve the problem that we would perhaps disagree. Our society, Madam Speaker for generations have accepted this responsibility, much more today than every before. In recent years great strides have been made. All must admit this. In all honesty, Madam Speaker, I just wonder how long we can continue to keep using the power of the state to constantly demand increases toward our ever mounting tax load. In other words, are we not taking from one part of our society -- the toilers -- an increased levy of the citizens' earned dollar and handing it to another part of our society more and more,

(Mr. Bilton, cont'd)... and in saying this, Madam Speaker, I would want you to understand that I am excluding the aged, the sick and the maimed.

With these few remarks, Madam Speaker, I am sure you could probably presume that I cannot support the resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, when the Honourable Member for Inkster was proposing this resolution to the House he used the words describing the conditions around which divorce may be obtained as cruel and brutal laws. I think that we should never for one moment forget that basically what is at stake are the regulations surrounding the marriage ceremony, and I would much rather members remember that this is a firm and binding but very just contract. Now, as to cruel and brutal laws I would ask each member to question himself in his own mind. Certainly there is no doubt about it, that people can be very cruel and brutal to each other but I think the Honourable Member for Inkster would be well-advised to reconsider his description of legislation in this manner.

Now, having said that, I would still like to say that I am not so far apart as I may have seemed to by saying these words, from the honourable member. I think any common, decent person, realizing what tragedies can develop from ill-mated marriages is, in some degree at least, of agreement with the expressions aimed at in the honourable member's resolution. However, I cannot find myself in agreement with many of the reasons he suggests should be given as considerations for divorce, particularly those in which the reasons are defined as being considerations for divorce, particularly those in which the reasons are defined as being time periods. Now I know any honourable member could reasonably and rightly say, "Well, for goodness sakes, if the marriage is a sad affair, if people are incompatible, if they are cruel to each other, if there is desertion, well then certainly no one should be condemned to going on the rest of their lives bound by such a contract." And I think all thinking people today would agree that there must be some reasonable term at least, even in years of how long they must abide by a bad contract. Now, in addition to coupling this with a period of years, I think members would agree that in singling out insanity, continuous and recurrent, as being a reason, what about many other ailments that a person may develop which would make life very miserable for a pair living together. So I think it's not wise to single out a single illness such as insanity.

As a sixth reason, the Honourable Member for Inkster suggests legal separation for more than two years. Well now, I wonder what the Member for Inkster means when he says "legal separation" because if two people agree mutually to separate I can see nothing illegal in this. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Inkster had in mind a separation such as under our Wife and Child Maintenance Act. Now, legal grounds for separation under this Act are given as -- conviction for assault on the wife; failure to provide reasonable maintenance for the wife or children; third, habitual drunkenness; fourth, desertion without lawful excuse, and fifth, persistent cruelty. Now I propose, Madam Speaker, to amend this resolution and while I will be in some degree, I suppose, discussing my amendment, I would like to propose the idea to the House that rather than define these particular reasons, as the honourable member has set forward, with their rather short term of two years in at least three instances -- and I wonder if this is a reasonable period to place as a reason for divorce, because there's the very real danger of people who might otherwise get together and make a reasonable go of things if the period were not too short and I think we should make every effort to make the marriage contract one which is not too easily to be broken, for the good of the nation, for the good of moral standards; and I suggest, rather, that if we were to delete all the reasons given after reason one, and substitute something in the nature of a legal separation which has been in existence for at least four or more years as a reason in addition to the first reason given in the resolution, if this might not be quite a reasonable approach at least for the federal authorities to consider as a further grounds for divorce.

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd)

I might suggest to the honourable member proposing the resolution that really, in effect, it does take into consideration many of the items which he has suggested as reasons but puts it on a more general basis, and probably more acceptable basis, for authorities to consider. Therefore, Madam Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the reasons No. 2 to 6 inclusive in the resolution be deleted, and that the words, "where there has been a separation sanctioned by the court which has existed for four years or more" be substituted.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that there's another resolution on sugar, I shall have the permission of the House to let it stand until the other motion is disposed of.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. EVANS: the point of order that my honourable friend will ask for the item to stand on each occasion on which it appears on the Order Paper, we agree to the Order standing today.

..... Continued on Next Page.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, whereas there is a rapid increase in the number of vehicles using Trans Canada Highway No. 1 between Winnipeg and the junction of No. 4 west of Portage la Prairie, and whereas there is a continuing high accident rate and death toll on this section of highway, therefore be it resolved that this government consider the advisability of proceeding at once to construct two additional traffic lanes to provide a four lane divided highway from Winnipeg west to the junction of No. 1 and 4 west of Portage la Prairie.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I shall be brief. Madam Speaker, it was just about a year ago today that this resolution was put forward by myself and the government, when they spoke to the resolution, made two points I believe. One of the points was that this action would be taken when it was needed, and during the debate the people who spoke in favour took the view that the need was then -- that is, one year ago, and I'm still labouring this point that the need is here now. It's not some time in the future. Also there appeared to be some inconsistency I thought when the Honourable Member from Roblin spoke, and he suggested to us in his speech that the corrective measures that had been taken were stop-gap enough to hold this position -- hold down accidents, and satisfy the need of the time, for some time to come, although he didn't elaborate on the time that we could wait for this suggested action. Now I have here, Madam Speaker, a few newspaper clippings that have to do with this stretch of road in the past year, and I would like to read parts of them into the record. One is from the Daily Graphic, October 24, 1963, and the headline reads - "Brandon Man Dies after Collision. One man was killed and three other persons escaped serious injuries as a result of a two car collision on the Trans Canada Highway 3 miles east of Portage la Prairie about 1:00 P.M. Tuesday afternoon." The other -- and I won't complete the reading of that -- the other clipping I'd like to refer to in the same newspaper November 26, 1963. "Death Strip Claims Two More Portagers." The opening paragraph says "Two Portage la Prairie residents have been killed in accidents along the infamous death strip of the Trans Canada Highway between Headingley and Elie." Without going into the whole article, Madam Speaker, this particular item refers to two different accidents at different times. The other accident occurred near Headingley. I would like now to refer to an announcement that was made by government officials shortly after the debate that took place last year, and in this particular announcement it says here, "The Provincial Government soon will begin negotiations to acquire enough property for a four lane super-highway between Headingley and Portage. Deputy Minister George Collins said Thursday the necessary rights-of-way will be gradually acquired." Madam Speaker, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the phrasing here -- "gradually acquired." While it does say later in the article that some of the money will be appropriated this year, it suggests I believe that the land is going to be acquired over a number of years, and if we can take this for the face value, it wouldn't be too much to assume that the construction is going to take place over a number of years, and Madam Speaker, I contend that this particular construction project is needed and needed desperately, and by waiting two, three, four, five, whatever number of years before the completion, is not in the best interests of the people of this province. It is of such importance I believe that it should be started. The acquisition of the land should be rushed through, the whole construction program should be carried out in the nature of a crash program, to have this desperate need fulfilled. Now, I know that when we come to talk about the cost of such a project -- to add another two lanes, 50 some odd miles -- that my honourable friends on the other side of the House are going to say that we are always advocating the spending of money but the money needs to be raised also. Well, I have a suggestion that may be of some help there and this suggestion comes from our friends across the line who are acknowledged the best road builders in the world, I believe, and that is to consider the advisability of the use of toll roads. We know it's an expensive proposition. We know that the money has got to be found. In this particular case there is a highway -- the old No. 1 now called No. 4, that runs from Portage to Winnipeg, and the people who didn't wish to pay the toll, they have an alternative, but for those who want modern highspeed travel, which is what four lane highway provides with safety, then this alternative could be considered. Madam Speaker, I am urging upon the

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd) government the need for immediate action, not some action sometime in the unnamed future.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Dufferin, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, whereas on April 2, 1957, March 26, 1960, and February 21, 1961, Mr. Speaker ruled that a report from a special committee could not be referred back to that committee, and whereas by letters dated February 23 and February 24, 1961, the opinion of Honourable Roland Michener then Speaker of the House of Commons, Ottawa, was sought; and whereas Honourable Mr. Michener requested Mr. Leon Raymond, Clerk of the House of Commons to advise on the matter; and whereas the opinion of Mr. Raymond, concurred in by Honourable Mr. Michener, was that, following the practice of either the Canadian Parliament or the United Kingdom Parliament, a report of a special committee may be referred back to be amended. Now therefore be it resolved that the rulings of Mr. Speaker of April 2, 1957, March 26, 1960, and February 21, 1961, as reported on Pages 283, 282 and 30 of the Journals of the House, 1957, 1960, and 1961 respectively, shall not be considered as precedents by this Legislative Assembly.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the honourable members will notice that, to a large extent, the subject matter of this resolution is similar to a motion that I made in the House last year. It covers the three Speaker's rulings on this occasion, rather than one, because the Honourable the Attorney-General of that day pointed out there were two other cases where somewhat or exactly similar rulings had been given; so I thought it wise to include it in the resolution at the present time. I would not want it to be thought that I was trying to be technical about this matter, because I don't believe greatly in the technicalities, and I repeat what I have said on other occasions that I hold firmly to the view that the rules are intended to be the servants of the House, and not their masters, and I hold also to the view that while the rules are often quoted as being for the protection of the minorities, and certainly that's an important function of the rules, yet they are also, and I think quite properly, for the conduct of the business of government which is above all important in the House too. So my submission is that it's important to all of us that the rules be correctly interpreted, and, having been correctly interpreted, that we do our level best to live up to them. I do not intend to take the time to develop this matter that I did on the last occasion. The honourable members had the opportunity to read those portions of the correspondence with the Honourable Mr. Michener at their leisure because I placed them on Hansard for that purpose. If they have read them I'm sure they will have arrived at the conclusion that Mr. Michener has said that the Canadian practice and the United Kingdom practice both permit of this being done. I have the conviction, Madam Speaker, that it was only because of the lateness of the hour, both in the day and the session, at which this matter came up for debate last year, that the decision of the House was to not support it. I think if we had not been rushed at that time that we would have given more careful consideration to it and that an agreement could have been reached. This is one reason that I have made it a point to get it on reasonably early in this session. So I leave it to the judgment of the House, once again, to consider this matter carefully -- consider the information that Mr. Michener has given which I think is completely authoritative, but equally important to read once again our own rule on the matter. It's said, Madam Speaker, that the old Roman statesman, Cato, used to end every speech that he made during a certain period, with the statement that Carthage must be destroyed. Well, I don't want to become famous for one single statement of 'read the rules', or 'read our own rule book', or 'go by our own rules', but I do feel constrained to say time and time again, to newer members of the House, that, though I do not pose as an expert, I feel sure that if we just acquaint ourselves with our own rule book, that we can get along very well in the vast majority of cases. And, while I'm not one that believes that the rules should be too severely applied, I certainly am one that believes that these rules have

(Mr. Campbell cont'd) arisen from a long, long history of parliament, that they have simmered down through discussion and debate and precedent through the years, and that they have been developed as something that will best achieve those two main objectives of protecting the rights of the minority, no matter how small they are in the House, to be heard and to get their point of view before the legislature, and at the same time facilitate the business of the government, which also is important, both from the point of view of principle and of practice; and in this connection, I want to mention once again that, just as the provincial government in the sphere of responsibility that is assigned to it is equally authoritative in its own sphere as the federal government is in its large sphere, so our own rules here, where they apply are the final resort and not any others. If you look at the general rules at the first of our rule book, you will find that it is only when our own rule is held not to apply, that we go to the Parliament of Canada for their custom or rule. And so to me it is abundantly clear in our rules that such an amendment is permissible, and now we have that point of view reinforced by the argument of Mr. Michener and Mr. Raymond that the same is the case in both the Canadian Parliament and the United Kingdom Parliament, which is a good indication that it is from both sources that our own rule has come, that I would think that on this occasion, we could all agree that these rulings should not be considered as precedent, and that during the course of the debate that we can resolve to once again take a close look at the procedure dealing with committees which is covered quite fully on Page 28, 29 and 30 of our rule book, following a procedure through the various committees, the setting up, the conduct of the committees, the reports by the chairman, and then coming to -- and incidentally dealing with both spending and special committees, and then coming to Rule 73, which says in what seems to me to be the clearest of language, "a report from a committee shall not be amended by the House, but it may be referred back to the committee." So I recommend a consideration of those particular sections to any member of the House that is interested, and I hope that we can on this occasion set the matter straight, not by blaming anybody for what's gone on in the past, and I have no intention of doing this -- I'm sure that any rules, any of these decisions that are referred to, were made with the very best of intentions by the speakers concerned, but because I think they do not agree with the strictest interpretation of our own rule and the opinion that Mr. Raymond and Mr. Michener have given to us that we should now make this change. If the honourable members are anxious to hear me at any greater length, which I sincerely doubt, I shall be prepared to say something more at the conclusion of the debate.

HON. ABRAM W. HARRISON (Minister without Portfolio) (Rock Lake): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PETERS: In the absence of the Honourable Member, may we have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Second reading of Bill No. 20. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 20, an Act to amend The Transcona Charter, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: The purpose of this bill, Madam Speaker, is to permit an amendment to the City Charter of Transcona, so that the elected mayor and aldermen of the City will be enabled to take office at the end of the month following in which the municipal elections take place. As I'm sure honourable members are aware that at the present time, under the provision to The Municipal Act, members who are elected to new positions on Council, or re-elected, that they do not take their positions on the Council until the January following, albeit the election is in October. It is felt that this is a practice which while prevalent over the years has been established, that might be changed so that there isn't a 'lame duck' period between the time of the election and the time of the incumbent taking his seat on the council. Now, this provision has already been made in the wisdom of this legislative body, and I suggest, Madam Speaker --

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) good wisdom -- insofar as the City of Kildonan is concerned. The forward looking community of Transcona requests the same for them and I sincerely trust and hope that this will have the support of the Assembly. I might say that the matter was discussed at the Urban Convention -- the Manitoba Urban Association at Swan River this year. It was given a considerable amount of debate. The general consensus of opinion at that particular time by the majority was that, while we have no objections in principle, we thought -- this was the tenor of the convention -- that they would not apply to the government for holus-bolus change of the Act at this time; but they agree in principle, I am sure, Madam Speaker, that with a charter of an individual city this is quite within their rights and quite proper for them to obtain these privileges.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, at this point, I would propose to call the adjourned debate on the motion to go into Ways and Means, and I have just asked the Whip on the other side if he would find out whether the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to proceed at this point. I would be glad to delay proceedings of the House until I have that answer, if I have unanimous consent to do so. I think it's a courtesy to him which we would like to extend. And now, I just wonder whether I should -- to occupy the space quite sure I can spare the House any speech of mine just to fill in the interval, and if it's acceptable to you, Madam Speaker, perhaps you would allow a minute to see whether I can have an answer to my inquiry.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I'd like to have the matter stand until next week.

MR. EVANS: That's agreed?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Provincial Secretary. Resolution No. 23 -- Emergency measures Item 10.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed on that, there were a few questions that were asked of me last evening and I had the courtesy extended to me of giving me the time to reply to them, but I see that the honourable gentlemen are not in their seats, so I guess I'll give them the answers if they come in a little later on, or do I give them the answers now.

MR. ROBLIN: probably be in after.

MR. STEINKOPF: The question by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside referring to a chart in the annual report of the Civil Service Commission, chart on page 15, asking an explanation why the number of employees in one column total 6,035, and in another column, 5,382. I'm replying to the question that was asked of me last evening.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you very much.

MR. STEINKOPF: The figures in column one which would be under December, 1963, are all of the employees as of December, 1963, which would include the employees covering off establishments, all the full-time civil servants, the term employees and the casuals as of that time. And in the column immediately beside it -- for example, coming off 337 of the establishments under Agriculture and Conservation, you'll see an Item of 302. This shows the number of civil servants in established positions. The total number of positions that were set up in the estimates for that department were some 337, so you only had 302 of them covering off 337 of the establishments, and then the balance would be made up of casual help and term employees. I hope that that is reasonably clear.

MR. CAMPBELL: I always find it a little -- I thank the Minister for his explanation.

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) I do find it a little bit confusing to try and follow the figures. I don't have my list here now but as I remember the figures last evening there was something just over 6,000 employees shown in that third column on the page.

MR. STEINKOPF: 5,082 in the other column.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. STEINKOPF: If the member would like, I could go into this with him after we're sitting here and discuss this in detail.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. I think perhaps that's the better way, because I would like to check that at the Minister's convenience and I don't want to hold up the other matters that are here at the time and I will check the figures on Hansard in the explanation and can ask some other questions later.

MR. STEINKOPF: There was a question posed to me by the Honourable Member for Selkirk in connection with the Purchasing Department, requesting information as to the policy of that department insofar as revealing information as to the successful bidder, his name, and the price that the successful contract was let at. I've ascertained the policy of the department is not to reveal these figures and this has been a long time well-established policy of the department and has been considered in the best interest of the department and of the taxpayer in that there is a feeling that if the prices were revealed to others that probably it would cost the department and the taxpayer considerably more, because there is a benefit in purchasing without revealing the price that was paid. Now this is a practice that has not been adopted lightly -- I presume that it has been in force for a number of years -- but it certainly isn't one that has to be fixed and I think it is one of these things that we're looking into and I think that it could be modified to a degree and in the report that we're working on we'll have a little further to say on this particular point.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Minister for the information that he has given me and naturally I urge that the Minister do try and introduce the system which the federal purchasing agent uses, that of revealing particulars of the successful tender. I believe that it would result in better public relations. I believe that there is a feeling today through the non-disclosure of these facts that there might be something to hide. Now, I'm not saying for one moment there is anything to hide, but there is the possibility of that feeling arising, and I think in the interest of good public relations that it would be well to frankly disclose to the unsuccessful tenderers particulars of the successful tenderer's bid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 10, Emergency Measures, Resolution 23 --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister going to make a statement on the matters of civil defence, which I believe come under this Item, although the name has been changed?

MR. STEINKOPF: I prefer to answer questions if I could, rather than make a general statement. I could if you prefer.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, we had quite an extended debate on the matter of civil defence last year, and my suggestion to the government then was to either get value for the money we were spending in this, or to cease completely the experiments, and we had made some specific recommendations at that time -- my honourable friends across the way are always asking for us to be positive, and we had been positive in a number of matters -- but I've seen no action on the part of the government on this. For example, we have proposed that the Manitoba Telephone books, both the city and the rural one, should have a much better civil defence section in it than what they have at present. I believe that there's been no change since last year. Only one page is devoted to civil defense information, whereas there are several pages devoted to advertising the Telephone System and so on. Now here is a book that is in virtually every home. I think it's fair to say that every homeowner knows exactly where it is because they have to consult it with fair regularity. It seems to me an ideal means of getting the basic information that we require to get to people on the civil defence. I'm sorry that there's been no action and I would recommend to the new Minister that he have a look at this, and due to the fact that he's also Minister of Public Utilities he should have no trouble whatsoever in co-ordinating these activities.

I'd also suggested last year that we should look at the American system of marking the evacuation routes. When you go into American cities the evacuation routes are clearly

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) marked; there's no difficulty insofar as the residents in the various areas knowing what course to follow. Well, here we haven't done so. It's in the telephone book and if people go to the trouble of getting in touch with Metro they can get the information in booklets, but once again I think if we're serious about civil defence that we should take some further steps and set this up.

We had some questions last year on the matters of sirens, for example, the fact that at that time there was no siren, I'm told, at the University of Manitoba. I wonder if this is so. I also would like to know from the Minister whether the siren system has been expanded or whether it is the same as last year. There had been some difficulties on the last test that I know of in that the sirens were not effective because they could not be heard in all sections of the city.

Now in spite of my criticisms in the past I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the organization, that last summer I had the opportunity of working quite closely with the civil defence group during an army exercise at Camp Shilo, and in fairness to my honourable friend's group, we had to make use of his vehicles and his setup for communications which turned out to be most efficient. The station wagons equipped with the radio system were really the only relays that we could depend on and they obviously had a very efficient radio set-up which I believe extends throughout the province, so in that regard I would like to compliment him on this development. I would appreciate if he could give me an answer to my questions and let me know whether we can expect action to be taken on these measures.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is the item which gives us an opportunity in this House to make some comment on the question of the world situation, particularly in regards to civil defence and other adjectives of weapons of destruction and preservation.

It seems to me that we should take advantage of this opportunity to make a few comments each year. You may recall last year, Mr. Chairman, that we had a considerable discussion in this House on the question as to whether or not Canada should permit the domiciling of nuclear weapons on our soils. And I think if I recall correctly, that from the tenor of the debate at that time the majority opinion in this House was that we should not. I think members of this House are fully cognizant of the fact that it appears, or possibly that history will reveal, that a political party lost an election because of divisions within its party on this very vital point of nuclear weapons. I think also history will recall that insofar as the federal situation at the present time, that the government of the day, despite its original opposition to the domiciling of nuclear weapons in Canada, despite the fact that it was only prior to an election that they changed their mind, but more important, despite the fact that the majority of the people of the Dominion of Canada rejected the domiciling of nuclear weapons on Canadian soil, that this majority government of Canada has permitted these weapons to be domiciled in Canada against the overwhelming majority of the people of Canada.

Now I want to make a protest in this Legislative Assembly of Manitoba of the actions of the government at Ottawa in this regard. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that even in the minor amount contained in the estimates for Civil Defence in the budget of my honourable friend the Secretary-Treasurer that we're going against the tide even here in the Province of Manitoba, for while we have noted recently in the Dominion House that the appropriations in the Department of National Defence have been reduced in many areas -- there have been curtailments in naval forces and naval equipment; there have been reductions in air staffs; there have been reductions in military staffs -- that it seems to me, however, that insofar as our local appropriation is concerned there's an increase. Now I'm sure that my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary will be able to explain and fully justify why it is that here on this item of emergency measures which has always been considered is in general lack of civil defence, we are asking for about \$60,000 more in total expenditures this year. Even the Federal Government, despite its rejection of the majority opinion of the people of Canada in respect of nuclear weapons, has seen fit to reduce the burden -- the monetary burden -- on the taxpayer of Canada by reduction, here we have an increase.

It seems to me that we're in a better atmosphere, Mr. Chairman, today, insofar as the world situation is concerned than we have been in for many years. And I say this in full cognizance of the fact that in many areas throughout the globe there are tensions -- need I mention Cyprus and Vietnam and many others -- there are still grave tensions and spots of

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) disturbance, but I think on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, it is only proper to be able to say here today that the main area of contention seems to be a little more eased than it has been for a good long time. It seems that Canada and the Soviet Union have been able as the result of our trade negotiations at least to be able to talk to each other, and indeed it even seems that maybe more miraculous, Mr. Chairman, even than this, that the nation to the south of us, who have always been more vigorous in their denunciation of communism than anyone else, have come along the road to at least recognize to some degree of the necessity of trade with the Soviet Union.

My honourable colleague from Inkster, speaking in debate the other day, suggested that we should sponsor or join in a petition for the recognition of Red China in order to further the easing of tensions in the world. So I say, Mr. Chairman, it is I think a happier note that we can meet on and discuss the question of civil defence than we have been able to meet under for the last few years. So I want to know from the Honourable the Provincial Secretary a full explanation as to why it is that here in the Province of Manitoba, notwithstanding the easing of tensions that I have mentioned, notwithstanding the reductions in expenditures at the federal level, we have increases here. Now my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, just talking a moment ago, seemed to indicate at least to me, he wants more. I want less. I think this is one area of human endeavour where I cannot see eye to eye at all with my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, who is clamoring for more and more gadgets and gimmicks in the area of civil defence. His government at Ottawa, despite my complaint of their rejection of the will of the people of Canada, have gone along the line of saying less I suggest to my honourable friend that he should do likewise here in the Province of Manitoba. Instead of saying, "Well now last year we suggested this, that, and the other, you haven't done it, so therefore you should increase your recommended amount of expenditure," I say to you, Mr. Provincial Secretary, you should have a substantial reduction in the amount of monies that are required for civil defence. I was happy last night to hear from my friend the First Minister that he recognizes pretty well the validity of what I am saying today, when he said last night, Mr. Chairman, that he has abandoned his ideas of building a bomb shelter. Now, I'm sure that he remembers the day when he stood up when the Honourable Member for Lakeside was the Leader of the Opposition, he invited the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and myself to come over to his house to help him build his bomb shelter -- I forget exactly the words of the Honourable Member for Lakeside who was then the Leader of the Opposition; I think it was something to the effect: "Well if one hits me I won't be around so it doesn't matter whether I've got one or not" -- I rejected it completely at that time. My honourable friend has come along -- I don't know what's happened to the Honourable Member for Lakeside in the meantime, but -- Oh, he's still here, and there's still been no bombs and I'm suggesting that a lot of the expenditures and the worries and apprehensions that persisted before in this matter of civil defence have been dissipated because of a real, true, considered approach to this subject, and I'm suggesting that that is not reflected in the budget of my honourable friend respecting civil defence and I certainly would like to hear from him.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I wish it were within my power to answer both my learned friends with one statement but I'm afraid that it'll take a little longer than that. That's not quite possible, but almost. I entered the field of civil defence with a great deal of trepidation and uncertainty in my own mind as to what approach should one take in a matter as ethereal as civil defence, and I must admit that I've come out of it with a rather definite opinion as to what our approach on the matter should be. The Government of Manitoba accepts responsibility in an emergency, as you know, for the preservation of law and order, control of traffic, reception services, medical and public health services, maintenance and repair of highways, organization of municipal and other services for the maintenance and repair of water and sewage systems, organization and control of municipal and other fire fighting services, except in severely damaged or heavy fall-out areas, maintenance and repair of electrical utilities, training of civilians as civil defence workers. This responsibility exists and is there and will always be there. The stress in the early days of civil defence was on a nuclear attack and what would happen if we were subjected to one. The term "civil defence" soon became almost a bad or nasty word, and the title of the organization was changed to "Emergency Measures Organization," and when one looks into that they will realize that it was done for a very good reason.

(Mr. Steinkopf cont'd) Not only is our government involved in man-made destruction, but also in the event of any natural disaster of any kind, and it is more in that field that our Emergency Measures Organization is now operating, and if one has had the opportunity of looking into it, as I presume that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has last summer, he comes away a little bit more satisfied that it is performing a very useful function in much the same manner as I have done. The increase in the estimates is some thirteen-odd thousand dollars and not \$60,000.00. The figure last year was \$53,200 and this year it's \$65,625.00. This represents 25 percent of the actual cost, the other 75 percent being borne by the federal government. It is a field that I was sort of amazed that the federal government did not use the axe rather early. I thought this would be one of the first economies that they would try to effect, but they didn't, and that also gave me more reason to wonder why they didn't and confirm my own opinion. We are establishing, in the Province of Manitoba, a first-class organization for looking after any disaster that may happen here, and I believe at a cost of a fraction of what would be required if we did it on our own, because not only are we just being asked to pay 25 percent of it, but we are also getting the advantage of excellently trained men and the use of the armed services in training our own personnel and working very closely with us.

Some of the things that have been done, in reply to the more specific questions -- I, too, looked at this escape route that was in the telephone book and it certainly isn't very much. It's there and that's about all you can say for it, and this I came about on my own, not realizing it was then an issue in the House last year, and only this morning was working with the head of the telephone system on a new kind of a draft plan -- a map -- that would be a little easier to read and a little bit more dramatic. So I believe that we will be able to have something better in the next telephone book than what we had before, and there's still probably room for improvements but we've given it the best that we can so far.

The organization, I think, has done an excellent job in connection with the emergency communication system. This was referred to by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and I do not want to go into detail on this -- I have it all here -- but they have base and mobile stations all over the province, and this system is based on the existing telephones and the Department of Mines and Natural Resources radio system. They have established a series of mobile feeding units. These at the moment are located at Portage la Prairie, Brandon and Dauphin, and these units are capable of serving 200 simple meals per hour. Now this may not seem like very much but keeping mind a local disaster such as an airplane tragedy that happened in Montreal recently, there the services of the Emergency Organization were called into play, and within a very short time they had a very well-organized effort operating. I also have felt right along that although the public think that we're playing at soldiers when we work on civil defence, if, God forbid, anything did ever happen, they would point a finger at us, and probably rightly so, for not having provided the kind of service that they expect the people in government circles to provide for them.

We have a very large stockpile of emergency medical supplies located at a central location in the province, and plans are now under way to disperse many of these supplies, and a pharmacist is being added to our staff in this '64 and this is part of the increase that we're asking for, to carry out this task. Three trailers to carry this equipment -- that is the pharmaceuticals -- are located at Portage la Prairie, Shilo, and again at Dauphin. Fire or rescue trucks are located at Winnipeg, Brandon, Dauphin, Selkirk, Birtle, Swan River and Minnedosa. A trailer suitable as a base of operations for natural disasters is now located in Winnipeg, and it will be equipped with two-way radio and emergency power supplies. There is a long list here of minor other items that I do not want to take the time up unless you'd like to hear anything specific, but my feeling is that the training that is being given to the professionals in the field of emergency measures or civil defence or disasters alone is worthwhile the cost of the operation, the \$65,000.00. The firemen, the policemen, the heads of the municipalities, the mayors, the Reeves, and the members of the council are all being trained in what role they should play in the event of a disaster. The emphasis has been taken away from the civilian. The need -- I must concur in the remarks of the Honourable Member for Radisson that the worry of a nuclear attack is probably diminishing, but one never knows if a plane should get off course, or if one of these things -- somebody turns a clock just a little bit wrong it might land in Manitoba, and it may never have been planned that way. So that the cost that we have here, I think

(Mr. Steinkopf, cont'd) it's probably one of the best bargains that the province is getting, and certainly it's the last item on the Provincial Secretary's budget, and probably the best dollar one by comparison, say, to a thing like we were talking to the Honourable Member for Lakeside last night on Hansard, and I would strongly recommend that we approve this item.

MR. MOLGAT: I want to thank the Minister for his answers. I would like him to as well give me an answer on the sirens, whether or not they have been tested, because, as I mentioned I think, on the last test they had proved to be ineffective. I believe that last year the Minister had indicated to us that there was some talk about going into a home alarm system connected either with the electric system or with the telephone, I wasn't sure which, but some type of system which has been used in the United States, and I wonder if any progress has been made on this or whether he intends to go into it further. I would like to correct my friend, the Leader of the NDP, as well, that I was not seeking an increase in the expenditure, rather I am seeking to make sure that we get good value for the money that we spend in this. And I think this has not always been the case because I don't think there was a real sense of direction and no clear-cut idea as to what it was that we wanted to accomplish in civil defence. Insofar as the use of the phone book, I visualized no added expenditures there as the book is in use in any case.

I wonder, too, if the Minister could tell us, how the recoveries are shared -- the \$268 thousand shared between Canada and the municipalities. What is the basis of the sharing there? In other words, what load are municipalities carrying in this?

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman -- I have one or two points along the line of the last remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. May I first of all say to the Provincial Secretary, I appreciate the fact that if you subtract \$65 thousand from \$52 thousand you have a net gain of about \$12 thousand but I direct the attention of my honourable friend to another figure, namely, the total expenditure of \$330,674 for this purpose, so we're not actually when we're talking of an expenditure for the overall question of -- what do they call it now, emergency measures -- we're not dealing with an insignificant figure of \$65 thousands of dollars, actually we're dealing with a third of a million dollars for this purpose in the Province of Manitoba. And I too, would like to hear from the Provincial Secretary as to a breakdown of the recoveries from the Dominion of Canada and also the municipalities -- I presume it's Manitoba municipalities. While the Minister is doing this, I wonder whether or not he might be able to enlighten us as to other costs, because it's my understanding the people of -- the taxpayer of Metropolitan Winnipeg -- are paying out a considerable sum of money for the purpose of emergency measures in civil defence. It's my understanding that, subject to correction, that within Metropolitan Winnipeg orbit or council, there is another division for civil defence emergency measures. Is this a duplication of what my honourable friend has in his estimates? How much is this? If I recall correctly it was only a few days ago I saw an advertisement, Mr. Chairman, where on application, I believe it was to Metro, you just drop us a line or a card and we'll send you back a whole sheaf of leaflets telling you how to build your bomb shelter or reinforce your basement, or make provisions for larder down your basement and how you can have all your -- pardon -- (interjection) -- Even a liquor cabinet. I'm not sure of that, but how you can have your thermos flasks and the likes of that fully protected in the event of this. Well, now this is the thing that my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary was saying, "we've got over this to a considerable degree now," but this is the same balderdash that they gave us fifteen years ago of the necessity of this, and they're still appealing to us to send them a card and they'll send us back the same blinking information that they're prepared to do at that time. Now I suggest, Mr. Chairman that there has been a change. If it is just attempting to get rid of old literature that's been taking up space in basements and the likes of that, I'd say that well there's some useful purpose. But the last, the last bunch of informational bulletins that I saw was the same old tripe, and I want to know whether or not part of this expenditure is not for printings -- more of the guff that we've had in the past.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to add a few words in regard to this matter -- I'm sure the honourable minister does not need my assistance in speaking on behalf of this, but I couldn't resist, but wonder if it might not be a good idea if the honourable member, the Leader of the NDP, and I think he has taken his course some time or other, I think he should go back and take it all over again, because I had the opportunity

(Mr. Barkman cont'd) of attending last September, I believe it was, and as he says, "the concepts and ideas have changed so much today, from possibly three or five years ago" and fortunately there's also some literature available -- it happens to be federal literature, but it is coming out and it's really up-to-date. I have some at home and it's good. On the other hand, I think this is one place where regardless of what political stripe, this is a place where we cannot spend too much too quick, especially with the new dangers possibly coming up; things they're building today right across the line, I think this could become very serious much sooner than we realize. I think we all know that you can't build up a civil defence just in that kind of a hurry and I believe we should keep at it until we have it as perfect as we can.

MR. STEINKOPF: Thank you for the help. (Interjection) -- Yes, well that helps Mr. Chairman, answering the money question first, the total amount expended by all is the \$333,674 that's made up of \$155,732 for just general head office and all the things that they do; and Metro Winnipeg, \$92,500; and all the other municipalities bulked together, \$85,442; a total of \$333,674.00. Now, the municipal share of that when you work it out backwards is \$17,795; the federal share \$254,000; provincial share \$65,625; making a total of \$333,674.00. So the Government of Canada and municipalities, the way it is there, is \$268,049 leaving a balance of \$65,625.00. Is that okay?

MR. PAULLEY: your figures jibe.

MR. STEINKOPF: On the question of the sirens which the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked me. This is not within the scope of the Emergency Measures Organization, it is in the hands of the army; there is rather an elaborate system, a telephone fan-out attack warning system tied in with our telephone system and it's four pages of how it works here, but it seems that it is working and it has been tested regularly by the army, but this is a matter for them. I don't have a detailed report here on it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister or possibly the First Minister, could give us some information on the very large and expensive headquarters that were established at Shilo for my honourable friends across the way. I think the previous Federal Government are the ones who built this structure which we affectionately call "the mushroom factory", being a very large underground establishment and I would like to know from my honourable friend, whether the province has contributed anything to the cost of this structure; anything to the furnishings of this structure; and whether the Provincial Government has tried it out as yet; and what their reactions have been?

MR. STEINKOPF: This has all been paid for by the Federal Government and does not show or come into the estimates we have here. As far as trying it out is concerned, I've been there and seen it. If that constitutes trying it out, why then it has been tried out, but it looks to me as if it would be quite operative and very comfortable, too, in the event that an emergency arose.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if my honourable friend could indicate to me, which accommodation is supplied there? Which ones of the Cabinet Ministers are considered to be those who would have to go to that headquarters, and what exactly is the breakdown on this structure? I think this is important to the people of Manitoba as well, because should my honourable friends evacuate to that area and some of us want to get in touch with them, well we would want to know which minister is where. So, I wonder if he could indicate to us the system exactly of priorities.

MR. STEINKOPF: definite part of the detailed civil defence plan. I think that they will have the say, rather than the Leader of the Opposition as to which Ministers are dispensable and which ones aren't. But those that aren't provided for out there, and most of them will be, the balance are located in another place which is at the moment still on the secret list as I understand it, and it may be a good thing for a lot of people not to know where certain Ministers are for quite a long period of time.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I presume I will not be able to get the information, Mr. Chairman, on the secret group. Could the Minister indicate to me which group are scheduled for the "mushroom factory" at Shilo?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I suppose it's amusing to hear these comments that we've just heard. I don't know whether the Honourable Member from Carillon finds it amusing because he seems to take this seriously enough to say that "you cannot spend too much

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) too quickly on this matter" and I'm inclined to feel that most of us feel that there is a limit to what you can spend and I'm inclined to think that the Leader of the Official Opposition too, would have some hesitation about the amount one can spend and how quickly.

I've waited because what I want to ask about in this connection is comparatively minor and yet it is something in which I am interested. But, before doing so, I want to restate what I understood the Honourable Minister to say and that is, that the amount shown in the estimate of some \$333 thousand is the total of expenditures made in the Province of Manitoba by the province, by the federal government and the municipality. My understanding was that Metro Winnipeg for example is charged with the responsibility of civil defence within Metropolitan Winnipeg; that it submits a budget of which the federal government pays 75 percent, the provincial government 15 percent, and Metropolitan Winnipeg 10 percent, but that the expenditure after the budget is approved is in the hands of the Metropolitan Corporation. I'm sure that I'm right in what I say. What I'm not sure of is whether that amount which the Metropolitan Corporation spends is included in the \$333 thousand.

Now the matter which did interest me in particular, was related to emergency measures, not necessarily the measure of catastrophe that we speak of in terms of atomic attack, but rather the type that has been referred to by the Honourable Minister. I am wondering about the availability of ambulance services in such catastrophes where emergency needs arise. The police and the fire which are under the control of the municipal authorities, the army which, of course, is under the control of the army itself, would of course be dedicated to serve in terms of emergency. But I'm not aware of any organized method by which ambulance services become available in terms of emergency need, and I'm concerned about the fact that there has been question raised from time to time publicly as to whether or not ambulances should wait or have to wait to make sure that they will be paid for the work that they are required to do, because they are all, or nearly all, private enterprise concerns.

The other thing that I think about in terms of ambulance services is the fact that many times when an accident occurs outside of the, let us say a well populated region like a town or a city, there is sometimes some delay for the ambulance to arrive at the scene, and sometimes one can see two Mounted Police cars sitting by the roadside waiting for an ambulance to arrive. And I would like to suggest that consideration could be given to suggesting to the Mounted Police, and indeed to municipal police, that instead of the normal type of cruiser cars which they now operate, they should consider the purchase of station wagons which could be quickly adapted to ambulance needs in case of such emergencies, so they don't have to wait to locate and find that ambulance. And then the next step is, the place to which the ambulance takes the patient. Is there any effort made to classify the hospitals in terms of the nature of casualty that they are able to handle, because hospitals have different facilities related to size, number of internes, size and number of emergency operating rooms and equipment. It would be interesting to know whether there are any classifications of the type where either the police in charge, or whoever's in charge of the emergency measure at the time, or the ambulances have direction as to which way and to what locations to take patients who are in need of immediate medical attention. I doubt if the detail I've asked for is so readily available in the hands of the Minister at this time, and, of course, I'm quite prepared to wait for whatever time is necessary to bring these answers.

MR. STEINKOPF: The detail is not readily available, but there have been hospital disaster exercises held in St. Boniface at the St. Boniface Hospital, and one at Portage la Prairie last fall in detail, under the auspices of the Emergency Measures Organization. In the course of doing that, they tabulated all of the hospitals in the province and classified them as to what they were able to do, and what they weren't able to do. The detail of it, of course, would not be as refined as you would like it, because this is designed for an emergency of larger than ordinary circumstances, just not a one or two car accident on the highway, or four or five. And if that happens, probably every hospital in the area or in the province will be called upon to go into action, and there will not be much choice as to deciding whether to send the people to one hospital or to the other.

On the matter of ambulances, this is a matter of detail, that I think I can't go into because I haven't the information, and it is something that the federal government is entirely

(Mr. Steinkopf cont'd) responsible for.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I notice in the schedule that we received from the Minister regarding the staff that is being provided, is shown as 17 under Civil Defence. In addition to this, does the federal government provide any permanent staff under this project? I would also like to know from the Minister how do the other provinces to the west of us compare in this connection? Are we getting our share from the Federal Government under this item of emergency measures?

MR. STEINKOPF: We are getting our share, and there are no other employees other than those listed, except that may be involved in connection with work by the army or any federal agency in which we're not directly interested.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I've spoken about this previously here in the House. In fact, I think it was last year. There is a mine in the Province of Manitoba in my own constituency in the town called Amaranth. This is a very clean gypsum mine. Unfortunately, the area has been threatened by closure of the mine for some time now. In fact, for a period of time, it ceased operation while the company was thinking of operating or preparing to operate in another part of the province. I wonder if the government has given any consideration at all to the alternate use of this mine for any of its storage requirements, because it is a fully underground operation -- it's a clean dry mine -- and whether this has been investigated at all? I know that my honourable friends store, as the Minister indicated, medical goods across the province, and they have to have secure storage, and this would be in the event of an atomic catastrophe, the type of storage which I would think would be required. The hole is there now; the mine is dug; there's ample space; there would be no expenditures involved insofar as digging additional, or, for that matter, protecting it with concrete and so on, and I wonder if the Minister has had his people investigate this possibility.

MR. STEINKOPF: May I refer that to them. I don't think that they have investigated it yet, but there's no reason why they shouldn't.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's easily accessible to Winnipeg; there's rail line to it; it's only some 150 miles, not even that, so it's completely accessible and in the populated area of the province. It's not as we expect of underground mines, isolated in the northern section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 23 ---

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, there are a few questions that I would like to ask of the Minister. First and foremost, did the Minister answer the question of the Honourable Member for St. John's with regard to this being the total vote and including the metropolitan area? Was the answer given to that question because it's one that I would be interested in; and secondly, is the personnel that was mentioned by the Honourable Member for Rhineland as shown on the sheet that is furnished us, is that the provincial personnel only, and is the metropolitan personnel completely additional to that.

Then, I would like to ask the Minister how much money was spent under this vote in the year that we are now in? I see that the year that ended on March last, March 31st last, a trifle over \$230,000 was spent. This year there's authority being taken for \$103,000 more than that amount, and I just wanted to check on what had been spent in the interval. I realize that this year is not completed yet, we've more than a month to go, but the Minister will likely have some estimates on it.

Then, the main question of all that I wanted to check on, Mr. Chairman, has already been referred to, and that's the one dealing, and the Minister mentioned it too, the one dealing with the regular army taking over a good bit of the work that was previously done by civil defence. It seems to me that this could be co-ordinated still more closely, regardless of the opinions that different ones may have on whether the service as such is still necessary; regardless of what we might think of the likelihood of what will happen in the world situation; regardless of a lot of considerations, no one of us, no group of us knows the answer as to what is going to happen. But one thing we do know is that, at the present time at least, we have the regular army. It seems to me as I see them moving about, that they have a great deal of high-priced equipment of one kind and another, and I cannot escape the feeling that the excellent equipment that my leader referred to a little while ago, would probably be better duplicated and consolidated with the Defence Department equipment rather than operated as a separate line of

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) endeavour. Some years ago, when I was in the position of having to answer in the House for civil defence and I can assure my honourable friend that I never found it an easy job, because I, too, thought it was pretty difficult to try and forecast what would be likely to happen, and it was a kind of an intangible, impractical, undesirable situation that you had to be thinking about all the time. But I one time worried about this situation, took the responsibility of having a heart-to-heart talk with the then officer commanding Military District No. 10, and I said to the General: "Why shouldn't this civil defence business that we're working at here, why shouldn't it be tied up with you folks?" And we had quite a discussion, and he was most helpful, but he certainly didn't give me any support on that proposal at all. He said; "No, I don't think it's practical at all" -- and I can't quote his many arguments -- there were several of them -- but his main conclusion was that at the time that the Civil Defence Organization, as such, and this is speaking of civil defence, rather than the civil emergencies that might be talked about, the civil disasters, this was the war scare. He said at that time, "When there is a job really needs to be done, the army would be very busy doing something else." Well now, I couldn't -- he was an expert in this matter and I wasn't. I took his word for this, and I didn't press the matter for a long time, but it wasn't very long after that when the government of the day in Ottawa decided that there should be a certain amount of collaboration and co-operation between the two. And it seems to me that that could be carried on more effectively than has been done up to this time. Now, if the Minister would comment on that. He might want to give some consideration to some further suggestions along that line.

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