

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, March 13th, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Industrial Relations beg leave to present the following as their first report.

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. Baizley as chairman. Your committee recommends that for the remainder of the session, the quorum of the committee shall consist of seven members. Your committee has considered Bill No. 29, an Act respecting the Wages and Hours of Work of Persons Employed in the Construction Industry and has agreed to report the same, with certain amendments, all of which is respectfully submitted.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota) introduced Bill No. 96, an Act to validate By-law No. 405 of the Village of Shoal Lake and By-Law No. 750 of The Rural Municipality of Shoal Lake.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) introduced Bill No. 94, an Act to amend An Act respecting the Town of Souris.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital) introduced Bill No. 95, an Act respecting business tax within the Rural Municipality of Fort Garry.

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

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

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1: resolved it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Animal Husbandry Act by providing, among other matters, (a) for the payment of grants made in respect of vaccination of calves against Bang's Disease from and out of the Consolidated Fund with moneys appropriated by an Act of the Legislature to be so paid and applied; and (b) that the amount of the grant payable in respect of vaccination of calves against Bang's disease be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Resolution be adopted?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, for some time now the Horned Cattle Fund has not been used for financing this program, the monies have been coming from the Consolidated Fund and it was thought wise when we were amending the Act that we bring the Act into line with the practice long established. The other thing is that we are changing the contribution of the government from \$1.00 per calf vaccinated to 50 cents and we are providing for these changes to be made by an Order-in-Council.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): I gather Mr. Chairman, then what the Minister is concerned with is that this is being done now but even though we appropriate the amounts in the estimates, that the Comptroller-General or the Legislative Counsel or somebody thinks that we should have the authority contained in an act as well. So I would think it is perhaps an advisable procedure and we can talk about the question of whether or not the amount should be reduced when we get to the bill I suppose.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): I have one question. This doesn't mean that you are going to cut down on your vaccination program at all - you will keep on as you have in the past?

MR. F.M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, just one question. Will this cover the total cost involved or is the individual going to be asked to contribute as well?

MR. HUTTON: It doesn't cover the total cost; it's the government's contribution towards the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted. Carried. Resolution No. 2. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Expropriation Act by providing, among other matters (a) that in certain cases interest on compensation be calculated from the date of the deposit of the plan of expropriation; (b) that in certain cases interest on compensation be calculated from the date that the expropriating authority take possession of the expropriated land; (c) that in certain cases the owner of the land entitled to have compensation ascertained with reference to the day on which he received notice of the deposit of the plan of expropriation; and (d) that the costs of arbitration fixing compensation be taxed in the same manner as costs in an action in a County Court are taxed; as a result of which additional expenditures may have to be made from and out of the Consolidated Fund where the Crown expropriates land.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, the amendments being brought forward in relation to the Expropriation Act are here largely on the recommendation of the Land Acquisition Committee. They are all for the benefit of persons whose land may be expropriated. They're complex in the sense of technically complex and we would be happy to have them discussed in detail in committee. I think there is nothing very useful that I could give the committee beyond saying that generally speaking, they will be of benefit to persons whose land may be expropriated by the Crown.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted. Carried. Committee rise and report.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the Minister if the bringing in of this measure has anything to do with the experience that this government derived from the work connected with the floodway over the course of the past three or four years. I'd like to know if there is any direct connection. And secondly, I would like to take this opportunity to point out to the Cabinet, particularly to the Minister of Public Works, that in itself it is inconvenient enough to those who have their property expropriated to have to go through all of this rigamarole, but it is often compounded, the difficulty is often compounded needlessly by lack of co-ordination. To give you a specific example: Public Works engineers have been surveying for three years up on the north perimeter. A man started to build his house, was working on it for 2-1/2 years, meanwhile the engineers knew all along that they would need this particular property and after he completed his house they notified him that they would be expropriating. So in addition to measures like this I hope that in the future there will be just a little more commonsense and co-ordination utilized by the various departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise and report. Call in the speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I did ask -- at least part of my question was rather specific -- I asked whether or not this introduction has anything to do with the experience derived from the floodway.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, a progressive government such as this is always doing things as a result of experience gained. I'm in this position that I cannot say that it is the result of any specific experience. These are some matters which it was considered would improve the Expropriation Act. I do not know that they are related to any particular project or expropriation or any particular experience.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I don't know that I heard all that the Honourable Minister said, because the way he started his speech sort of disconcerted me and I didn't know who was speaking for a moment. But I am interested in knowing what are the nature of the different cases or classifications that are referred to in these sub-paragraphs as to the occasion whereby some are paid interest as of a certain date and others are paid otherwise and just how will they be sorted out and separated. Is it the nature of the expropriation, is it the department that does it or does it have anything to do with the actual taking of possession.

MR. McLEAN: Well, I don't know that I can detail the exact types of cases here in this committee Mr. Chairman, I would think that in most instances it would relate to the date of

(Mr. McLean, cont'd)...taking possession.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, that does not explain the reason that interest is payable on different occasions, depending on some type of classification which can't be too difficult or extensive, because there are only two different categories referred to here. In one case the date of interest will commence on the date of deposit of a plan of expropriation; in the other it would be from the date that possession is taken. I'm wondering why the distinction is being made and if there is some general principle involved which could be clarified.

MR. McLEAN: . . . .principle and the operation I'll be glad to do so when the bill is before the House, and the committee.

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

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

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

MR. HUTTON introduced Bill No. 93, an Act to amend the Animal Husbandry Act.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 92, an Act to amend The Expropriation Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where are some 50 Grade XI students from four schools in the City of Brandon under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Swayze and Miss Dunseith. These schools are situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Brandon. There are some 40 Grade IX to XI students from the Cartwright High School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Beaumont. This school is situated in the constituency of the Minister Without Portfolio. There are some 43 Grade XI and XII students from the St. Norbert Collegiate, under the direction of their teacher, Sister Herauf. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

Nous vous souhaitons la bien ici cette après-midi. Nous espérons que tout ce que vous avez vu et entendu à l'assemblée législative vous sera utile dans vos études. Puisse cette visite vous inspirer et stimuler votre intérêt dans les affaires de la province. Revenez encore nous visiter.

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.

Orders of the Day.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture? In view of the flood situation in some states of United States, which is quite serious, my question is whether directly or indirectly it affects our own region and what is his opinion and the opinion of his forecasting committee?

MR. HUTTON: No.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I wish to place on the table a Return to an Order of the House No. 19, provided on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie made February 25, 1964. In addition, a Return to an Order of the House No. 28, on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood, made March 6, 1964.

And, Madam Speaker, while I'm here I would like to make comment or perhaps it's a retraction. Yesterday when the House was in Committee of Supply, the Honourable the Member for St. George made a statement which he says had been reported in the press and I was quite vehement in my denial. I find now that my vehemence was hardly justified because I thought that he was suggesting that I was saying that magistrates should give severe sentences whereas he was quoting a newspaper article in which I was alleging that he himself took that attitude. I do recall the discussion with the reporter, Mr. Steve Melnyk, and while Mr. Melnyk has not used my exact words that I used to him on that occasion, I must certainly say that his report is substantially correct, so that I was perhaps a little hasty in my denial yesterday. Having said that, Madam Speaker, I would like to assure the Honourable Member for St. George that I don't really think he wants magistrates to be severe and I think perhaps my comment to the reporter was made at a time when I was a little angry over some matters that had developed here.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day. I object very strenuously to

(Mr. Gray, cont'd)...the impolite attitude of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I'm a member of this House; I told him I'm going to ask the question because they asked me outside of the House; I wanted him to give the answer. The way he brushed it aside, I feel insulted and I object to it.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I'd like to apologize to the Honourable Member for Inkster for the tone of my voice, but the answer is still "no." It has no effect on the Red River.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I'd just like to take this opportunity to thank the Attorney-General for his remarks.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, may I address a question to the Provincial Treasurer, the First Minister. This morning in Labour Relations Committee it was suggested by one of the speakers that the Provincial Treasury had money that had been deducted from construction workers during the year for their holiday pay that had not been paid out. I don't know, this is rather a complicated question, but could the First Minister tell us if there is money belonging to construction workers that has not been paid out, that is holiday pay that has been held for them?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, according to the statutes we operate trust fund for holiday pay in connection with the construction industry and workers in that industry who are employed on a part time basis. The purpose of this procedure is to make sure that they are credited with their holiday pay and that when it accumulates to a sufficient fund it's then available to them. This is a trust fund, it is paid out upon application of the workers concerned and I think it operates very smoothly. If there is any other information my honourable friend wants about it I suggest he table an Order for Return.

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk that an humble address be presented to the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that he may cause to be laid before this House a return of  $\infty$  pies of all correspondence and agreements between the Government of Canada, or any Department, Minister, Commission, Board, Agency or official thereof, and the Government of Manitoba or any Department, Minister, Commission, Board, Agency or official thereof, dealing with the so-called Winnipeg Floodway and the so-called Portage Diversion.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Subject to the usual qualification, Madam Speaker, the consent of the Government of Canada; we will be glad to accept the order.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for papers standing in the name of 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 Elmwood, that an humble address be voted His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor for a Return showing: copies of all correspondence and other documents to date between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada, and between the Government of Manitoba and TCA, respecting the transfer of the overhaul base of TCA from Winnipeg to Montreal.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, subject to the reservation that we obtain the consent of the Government of Canada, I'm happy to accept the Order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: 1. The number of gavels inscribed with the names of the Honourable Mr. Roblin and the Honourable Mr. Smellie that were purchased by the province. 2. The total cost of said gavels. 3. Which department of the government paid for said gavels. 4. The names and addresses of persons to whom gavels were distributed. 5. Whether said gavels were purchased by Public Tender, who the bidders were and what amount each bid.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I am happy to accept the question because my honourable

(Mr. Roblin cont'd) . . . . friend did not ask for one for himself

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you very much, but I also wonder about the green badges?

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 the 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. Copies of all reports made by any Department of Government or any private agency on behalf of the Government respecting adverse effects on the economy of Manitoba which would result if TCABase were closed; 2. Date of such reports; 3. By whom such reports were made.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, insofar as any of these are public documents, and I think some may be, we will be happy to accept it. My honourable friend I think will understand that we will make a reservation with respect to internal documents within the department as is our practice.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Madam Speaker, if in this connection if there are any confidential and private reports that the Honourable the Minister whose making the reply might indicate that in addition there were three or four confidential reports which are not public information, in order that I may have some indication that there were confidential investigations made, otherwise I would be in the dark.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think I can undertake to do that. There may have been all kinds of memoranda, papers and other documents exchanged within the department and we simply just don't report to the House on inter-departmental matters as my honourable friend will recall.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Madam Speaker. The return is not asking for inter-departmental correspondence but using the words reports which to me are far different that what we would consider as normal inter-departmental memos and the likes of that.

MR. ROBLIN: Well I don't want to quarrel with my honourable friend but I think my reservation must stand if we're to accept the Order.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll accept it but I may pursue it on receipt of the Order, Madam Speaker.

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 the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I have an arrangement with the Minister to wait further for information.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to let it stand? The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for St. James, and the proposed amendment by the Honourable the Member for Wellington, and the proposed amendment to the amendment of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GÜTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has been called out unexpectedly but if anyone wishes to speak on it he has no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak? Agreed to stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Carillon, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Fisher, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: Well I'm glad, Madam Speaker, to find that after the trials of a week ago that they still want to listen to me. I don't really believe it but -- (Interjection) -- Madam Speaker, this resolution seems to have created, or crystallized the argument in this House as to whether you are for a growth in the sugar industry or against it -- in Manitoba. I think that this is rather unfortunate because I don't think that there's a member of this Legislature that doesn't sincerely and wholeheartedly hope for and applaud every indication and sign of a growing economy and who wouldn't go out of his or her way to encourage an expansion of a sound industry in this province. I don't really think that there for instance is any difference at all between the Honourable Member for Carillon and myself on this question.. We both want to see a growth in the sugar industry in Manitoba because of what we know it means to the people of this province, to the farmers, to those who are afforded an opportunity to work in our beet fields; to those who find employment in the processing of the raw product; and for the very real benefits that accrue out of having a multi-million dollar industry in our economy.

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)...

However, the real question is as to whether the time is ripe at the present time to seek out and encourage the construction of a second industrial plant at this particular time. I think we have to take, as a responsible government, we have to consider the consequences of such action, what it would mean to the potential investors in the new industry and what it would mean to those people who are at the present time relying on the existing industry for their livelihood.

And what are the facts of the situation? I think we can all readily understand too, the reaction of the public at large when the prices of sugar rose so violently during the past year, but already the prices of sugar have dropped in almost as violent a fashion. Where the price last fall was \$15.35 per hundred pounds and was pegged at that price by the local industry, today the price is \$13.80 and -- (Interjection) -- well, it's fluctuating but it has been down to -- my quotation here is, \$13.80. Maybe this is a different basis of quotation but these figures are relative that I'm giving. Why are we subject -- I think first of all we must examine -- why are we subject to these violent fluctuations in the price of sugar? Well the reason in my opinion, on the basis of the information that I have, is that our prices here in Manitoba, in Canada as a matter of fact, are based on prices in the world market. Now not all the sugar goes into the world market. A great deal of the sugar that is produced in the world is disposed of under International agreements of one kind or another. For instance, the British buy much of the sugar under an agreement. The United States bought their sugar from Cuba under an agreement. Now the producing country, albeit Cuba or any other, makes a long-term agreement to supply sugar and in return for this they get a guaranteed price, maybe on a sliding scale but at least there is a guarantee there. This puts them in a position if they have surplus production to dispose of this sugar at a much lower price in the world market. What really happens is this that when you have a surplus production of sugar in the world, all the surplus supplies find their way onto the world market. The world market actually becomes a dumping ground. And if world production of sugar is high you can get a price in Manitoba of \$7.00 a hundred as it was in 1961, which works a real hardship on the industry here and on the growers. But what happens when you have a shortage in world production? Naturally the agreements must be filled first and so the entire impact, almost the entire impact of the reduced production of sugar is felt in the world marketplace. Therefore you have these violent fluctuations which drive the sugar prices extremely high; and on the other hand, when there are surpluses, they find their way onto the same world market and can in an equally violent way drive the price of sugar down.

Now with this background, and recognizing that we are subject, that our prices are determined by world market prices, let's look at sugar production in Manitoba. The Manitoba Sugar Company has been processing sufficient sugar from Manitoba grown sugar beets to supply the share of the market which it has been able to capture. The 1963 Manitoba crop of sugar beets yielded 79 million pounds of sugar from a production of 28,100 acres. This amount of sugar is sufficient to supply 80 percent of the market area requirements. The remaining 20 percent of the market cannot really be considered as a potential market since it consists of specialty sugars and a portion of the consumers who insist on buying cane sugar -- and I am sure many of you have heard good housewives, good cooks, claim that they like cane sugar.

The market area for Manitoba beet sugar due to competition from the east and from the west may be defined as Manitoba, Eastern Saskatchewan and the extreme west part of Ontario, the Kenora area. Western Saskatchewan and Alberta are being adequately supplied by the Alberta production of 45,000 acres of sugar beets. The annual per capita consumption of sugar in Canada has remained fairly constant at about 95 pounds, and it isn't expected to increase. Beet sugar at present represents about 18 percent of the total Canadian consumption. With two sugar beet processing plants in Alberta, one in Manitoba, one in Ontario and one in Quebec, the anticipated population increase in Manitoba by 1975 would necessitate an additional production of about 8,000 to 10,000 acres. The processing capacity of the existing factory is being increased and modernized and by extending the length of the processing time a few weeks it will be able to handle this extra production very adequately. Any substantial increase in the production of sugar in Manitoba, such as would be the case if an additional factory were built, would mean that this sugar would have to find a market in the heavily populated sections of Eastern Canada. Such sugar sales would have to compete with imported sugar cane.

Raw sugar cane can be brought into Canada from Commonwealth countries under the

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)...preferential tariff arrangement with a tariff of 30 cents per hundred-weight and from non-Commonwealth sources at a \$1.30 per hundredweight. Almost all raw cane sugar therefore comes from Commonwealth countries, all refined imported sugar is subject to a tariff of \$1.89 per hundredweight.

The United States sugar price to consumers is substantially lower now than Canada because of subsidized sugar beet production. This protected market prevents Canadian exports to the United States at a time of low world sugar prices. At the same time the United States government is discouraging the export of subsidized beet sugar to Canada at the present time of high prices by export restrictions. Great Britain and other countries are partners to the Commonwealth Sugar agreement -- Canada is not a partner. Sugar prices in Great Britain are stabilized by a system of surcharges and rebates and at present the government in England is paying about \$6.00 per hundredweight in rebates to sugar processing plants. The United States also has a policy of stabilizing both producer and consumer prices. Construction of a modern, economical, sugar beet processing plant would cost about \$15 million. The plant under construction at Drayton, Minnesota is estimated at a minimum of \$18 million. There is no doubt that we could produce the raw product in Manitoba for such a plant. However, a national policy protecting the beet sugar market would be required to make the marketing of the end product feasible. And what would be the situation of the sugar beet growers and this industry if they were established today in Manitoba, where annually the present plant counts on a carry-over of 10 percent of its production, each year, at the present time; and if you were to inject a new modern plant, what sort of circumstances would the plant itself and the growers in Manitoba have to deal with. Well they would be in the position where they would have to dispose of this sugar in Eastern markets.

At the present time the price here is determined by the price at Montreal, plus freight. The present industry here can compete by discounting its sugar prices by 50 cents under the cost plus freight or the eastern price plus freight. But if we started to try and compete the other way we would find ourselves at a distinct disadvantage. Oh, we could do it now -- we could have done it in the last year because we had these high prices. But what would be the case where you had \$7.00 sugar as we had just two short years ago, or a little better than two, in 1961. Our sugar beet producers here in Manitoba would have an industry where the net returns to that industry would be some \$7.00 less the freight cost east and what they would be faced with is a product that they could dispose of net between \$5.00 and \$6.00.

Now I think that it's good business whenever you are planning a big investment not to count your chickens before they hatch. I think the Honourable Member for Lakeside would agree with this. And what you can't base the future of an industry on the sunny days, you have got to take some of the cloudy days into consideration. There is no doubt at all under the conditions that have prevailed in the past year or year and a half, we could support a second sugar industry in this province -- sugar beet factory -- and it could compete economically with the industry in the east. But under the conditions that we have known just two short years ago it would be economically unfeasible, impractical, and likely lead to nothing but a big disappointment for everybody involved. It doesn't seem to me to be a wise thing for the government now, when we have seen this violent fluctuation, when we have seen it go sky-high, when we have seen it drop and dropping, when we know that two short years ago it was completely out of the question to build such a plant -- that we should today turn around and say that in spite of marketing conditions, in spite of the adverse economic situation that we undoubtedly would face without a national sugar policy, to go ahead and try and get such a plant established.

I suggest to the members of the legislature that we would do industry in this province a great disservice; we would cast a shadow on the judgment of this government to lead people into an investment of this nature when the circumstances did not and the environment did not justify it. So I would urge you to vote against the sub-amendment and support the amendment which calls for the establishment of such a plant as soon as it is feasibly and economically wise to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I'd like to speak in favor of the proposed motion. I am amazed at the lack of imagination on the part of such an "aggressive government" as the Honourable Minister the Attorney-General mentioned earlier in the session this afternoon.

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd)...

I believe that there is room for another sugar plant in this province that can be established by the process of free enterprise and I think that the responsibility of this government, is to provide a proper background for the establishment of any such industry. I don't think that it is in the interests of any government to take an active part in such a plant. I think that a feasibility report has been prepared on the sugar industry in this province and I believe that the feasibility report shows that there is room for another sugar plant in this province. I think that with proper planning you can well look forward to the proper crystallization, not only of the sugar itself, but to the plant.

We are seeing the construction of new plants in the Red River Valley south of us. Now if this is going to be such a very heavily subsidized industry, I don't think the people to the south of us would be undertaking the construction of a plant that may not pay its way in the competitive field of sugar marketing. I appreciate what has been said about the matter of world sugar markets but there are a few things we are overlooking and that's this: that for every \$1.00 spent in Canada, statistically it has been worked out that there is anywhere from 25 or 30 percent of this dollar that will recur back either to the provincial or federal government in terms of taxes being returned to these governments. Consequently, this is something that should be looked into very closely.

Secondly, I would repudiate completely the statement that we would be unable to sell the sugar. I want to go along on record, in terms of free enterprise again, and tell you that aggressive salesmanship can and will sell the surplus sugar. And I would like to say that this type of aggressive salesmanship coupled with the feasibility studies and also supported by proper research, you are going to find that there is room for a lot of secondary developments that can be developed in this country based on sugar as a primary source of raw material -- and I specifically refer to the matter of the development of glucose, the development of the secondary higher alcohol derivatives of sucrose from sugar. There is an unlimited number of derivatives that can be derived from sugar, so that it should not be looked at strictly on the standpoint of being an absolute commodity which you must compete with in the form of sugar itself; because if we have secondary uses derived for the sugar during the terms or years of surplus, this can be channelled into the secondary uses of sugar; and then if you have a higher price then possibly the secondary industry for the use of sugar might have to pay a little bit more for the use of its raw material, but then the average price of sugar would have a more stabilizing effect as far as our province is concerned. I would like to take the other approach. I would like to take the approach that -- let this government create, or any other government create a favourable background, undertake the research and feasibility studies. I know that free enterprise will come in and develop this industry --no question about it.

I am very much disappointed in the Honourable Minister of Agriculture taking the attitude that -- drawing to our attention in such great detail the many pitfalls. I tell you that there are no pitfalls -- if you want progress, if you want to proceed and to get things done you cannot do it in a halfway measure. You have to roll up your sleeves and get on with the work. I again say to you Madam Speaker, that I am very much flabbergasted at the attitude of such an aggressive and forward-looking government by making a statement of this nature. It was almost a statement of doom.

I also appreciate what was said about the competitive price of sugar in eastern Canada, on railroad transportation, on the matter of handling. There are such things as commodity rates; there are such things as agreed negotiated charges on railroad transportation and I think that if you want to sell something into the eastern market that there are agencies, there are ways and means that have been set up by the provincial government and by the federal government, that these can be worked on to help any industry that wishes to establish in this province.

I wonder if the last speaker took time out to find out actually how many different materials can be derived from sugar, such as the matter of alcohols, and how many of these commodities we're importing into the province today. And as we build up on the basis of industry in Manitoba, whether it be the inorganic or organic fields, sugar is one of the many basic raw chemicals required for a good percentage of these industries. Consequently, if there's some doubt in the minds of having the sugar plant established as a primary source of

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd)... income and profit-making, then I again say look at the secondary uses of sugar and you can establish the organic processing of this material which we in the province are importing at the present time, such as molasses and these glucose derivatives -- we are importing them into the province in very large quantities and which represent a large amount in terms of dollars and cents.

And I, Madam Speaker, would like to leave this thinking with this House. Irrespective of what the national sugar policy might be if one has to be established, I think that this is a matter of plain dollars and cents -- spend a dollar and make yourself five or six cents on it. If you're able to create work, you create a new industry and you encourage and have more source of taxes for the province. I think that this is the direction in which we should be progressing and looking forward to, instead of saying that because we have one sugar plant another one will not work. I do not understand that type of language. I cannot accept it, especially from such an aggressive government. And I myself, of course, simply say that there are more than one, there are more than two ways in which you can establish another sugar beet plant and make it profitable. I want you also to know that our farmers in the Red River valley and in the southern part of Manitoba at the present time although they are only growing 28,000 acres of sugar beets are prepared and are willing to grow a lot more. As a matter of fact I think that if the expression of desire was analyzed by these interested farmers you would find that there is almost an additional 28,000 acres of sugar beet that is potentially capable of supporting another sugar plant in Manitoba.

The thing is that this is the type of work we should be doing; this is what ARDA should be doing, which I mentioned last year, and which I got rather a remark that it didn't matter, this was something that was a study going on. Madam Speaker, if we are making studies in this province it is the responsibility of all of us in this House to further the industry of Manitoba. This is one problem that should be taken up and studied to its final conclusion and a proper feasibility report prepared; proper recommendations made, and then let free enterprise take its own gamble; take its own chance whether it does want to develop another sugar plant industry in Manitoba. But I, Madam Speaker, cannot accept, cannot accept, a recommendation from the Minister of Agriculture, who should know better, to tell us that it's absolutely dark and there is no possible chance of another industry being able to make a success in the refining of sugar. I thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I'll only be a couple of minutes. There is no intention on my part and the groups part to withdraw the resolution which follows of creating a co-operative, or make a study of a co-operative sugar industry. In the meantime, I'm going to support this one because, first of all, it is something constructive; secondly, it creates employment, which we are paying out millions of dollars for Unemployment Insurance these days; and thirdly, it's necessary, absolutely necessary. Imagine such foolishness. The price of sugar on the world's market is based f. o. b. New York, so if an industry producing a necessary commodity, a most necessary commodity right here in Winnipeg is adding to its cost, the freight from New York to Winnipeg -- I cannot understand it and I don't think anyone else would. Based on what? Why base it on New York, why not base it on Manitoba? Why not base it on the million people we have right here in this province and the other province in the west. This is ridiculous. Cost of living is as high as it could go and sugar is a main commodity. Therefore, I'm going to support this resolution but will not withdraw the others if this resolution is carried or not carried.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I'm glad that the Honourable Member for Inkster spoke right after the Member for Burrows because I was rather hesitant to enter the debate right after the Booming Baron from Burrows spoke -- the fertilizer baron, or shall I call him simply an energetic entrepreneur.

This group is obviously of the same opinion as to the desirability of having a second sugar plant in this province as is the group which the Member for Burrows spoke for. However, I couldn't help but wonder about some of his strange reasoning. Here he is going to support a resolution which asks what? It asks that this House request the government to give active leadership in the establishment of a second sugar beet factory in this province. To listen to the Honourable Member for Burrows explain the matter it would seem that free enterprise was in itself completely, but completely adequate to the task of setting up such a second plant.

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)... And so I say to him that if free enterprise is as aggressive and as competent in this regard as he makes out, then why support a resolution which requires government intercession and government help. But I suppose there isn't much point in belabouring this, Madam Speaker, since we really have the same goal in mind, namely, the establishment of a second sugar plant here in this province.

And from this point on I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Burrows. We have in this province undertaken in the course of the past few years an economic survey as to the long-range economic developmental needs in this province. We have a Minister of Industry and Commerce who has taken this kind of economic survey work very much to heart; he has given us the impression, and the public generally, the impression that we must simply stimulate the creation of more labour intensive secondary industry in this province. Well, Madam Speaker, when the first concrete opportunity comes to do just that, what happens? This government pulls in its horns and instead of looking in an active manner at the possibility of establishing a second plant, it all of a sudden puts its tail between its legs and slinks away -- that's in effect what they are doing here. Because I suggest that when the domestic demand for sugar exceeds the domestic supply of beet sugar to the extent that it does in this country, then it would seem obvious that there is room for more sugar refining capacity right here in this province.

I challenge the Minister of Industry and Commerce to show us in any concrete way just why it is that it wouldn't be feasible now, or very soon, to think realistically and in an imminent way about the establishment of a second sugar refinery in this province.

I simply cannot understand the Minister of Industry and Commerce and his associates telling us last year, and the year before, that when it comes to industrial development it has to be go, go, go, and then when the first chance comes for them to prove the sincerity of that remark, they pull in their horns; they recede from the picture. I think it's about time they proved their intentions.

In addition to all of what I have said up to now, Madam Speaker, I wish to make the point that it wouldn't hurt to have a little more competition in the sugar refining business because up to now despite all of the plethora of statistics quoted to indicate a world shortage and so on, those who are in control of the sugar refining industry in this country have been acting like common shysters over the course of the past two years -- (Interjection) -- Well I believe that this is the fact of the matter, Madam Speaker, and it should have been said before. -- (Interjection) -- A common shyster is a self-evident term, Madam Speaker.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): I don't understand it. I wonder if my honourable friend would tell me.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, a common shyster is one who operates in such a way as to maximize profits beyond the limits of what is in the public interest and what is necessary for the operation of the firm. That's what I define as a common shyster. -- (Interjection) -- No, I didn't say that. The Minister can misrepresent me if he likes. The fact of the matter is that dividends paid out, special bonuses paid out by certain sugar refining companies have been completely excessive, and it's time that we either inject some competition into the industry, or failing that to bring about the establishment of a co-operatively-owned sugar refining company in this province.

Madam Speaker, I make no apologies for the temper of my remarks because I think that the public has suffered enough and even though now we seem to have a respite from what has been going on for the past few months, nevertheless it could very easily reoccur again unless one of two things happen -- and that is, the injection of some competition, or a co-operatively-owned sugar refining enterprise. So I feel that I can support the resolution proposed by the Member for Steinbach and as it has been sub-amended by my Leader. I'm glad to see that the Member for Burrows has certainly put the case as pungently as he has. The only objection I had or question that I had was as to his statement that a free enterprise could do this all by itself, and I simply ask him if it can, and it probably can, then why call on government to take any sort of prime role at all. I believe on the other hand that it seems to have reached the point where free enterprise or private enterprise very often does need some sort of help or assistance in market surveys and so on in order to allow a firm or an entrepreneur to get launched. So there is nothing wrong with this resolution. In fact it is in keeping with the kind

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)... of economy we are moving into these days, namely, a mixed enterprise type of economy. I don't know if the Member for Burrows would approve of that concept but it has been approved by the national leadership in his party, they refer to this kind of economic system and they seem to refer to it in an approving way. So Madam Speaker, I would ask that members think very carefully before they turn "thumbs down" on this sub-amendment because it is only giving this government an opportunity to put its actions and its money where its mouth was in regards to economic development in this province.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker might I just correct a remark. The thing is that the speaker who just sat down really put words in my mouth which was not the case. In other words, the reason I support this resolution is because it says "to give active leadership in the establishment of a second sugar beet factory." And I interpret that to mean feasibility studies, create a favourable climate and background but leave it to free enterprise to do the job and if the co-operative wants to go along with free enterprise, as they have done in the past in the province, then leave it for the decision of the co-operative movement and the free enterprise movement. I don't think that any government wishes or desires to dictate to anybody. Thank you.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, perhaps you would allow me to clarify a remark also. I simply want to make the point that I am not suggesting that the government dictate to any private firm. All I am doing, I ask the honourable member to clarify for me why it is that if free enterprise is so aggressive and so viable, why it is that it requires governments to do feasibility studies for it? It seems to me they could do it for themselves.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Churchill, 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 Member for Inkster, the Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I indicated the other day that I had adjourned it for another honourable member and I would like to have it stand if I could.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to have it stand? The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster, the Honourable the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Madam Speaker, I think we have had enough sweetness in this House today. I wonder if I could have this stand for the time being.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage. The Honourable the Member for Morris.

MR. ROBLIN: In view of the honourable member's present absence as he is hospitalized, Madam Speaker, perhaps that matter should stand as well.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, as amended. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand until Tuesday.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. I think one speech from me is enough.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Just make it unanimous, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage. The Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. MCKELLAR: Madam Speaker, I'll try to be different. I'll try to say about three words.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is similar to one we have had in other years, saying that there is six months' delay in the payment of grants to school divisions and this delay causes the

(Mr. McKellar, cont'd). . . school divisions to borrow money at the rate of six percent causing additional expense to their requirements. I would like to say to the Honourable Member for Portage that while he spoke in his resolution on school divisions, during his speech he mentioned strictly Kirkfield Park School District which is an entirely different situation. As we all know Kirkfield Park is expanding at a terrific pace and needs additional schools to meet their requirements.

I would like to say to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that he is wrong when he states "six months;" that it is really three months that it takes to receive the half-yearly return. They approve them in the Department of Education and the money is forwarded to the division and the money is then transferred to the school districts.

I also would like to suggest to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that the government aren't the only ones that pay money to the school divisions. The municipalities pay, as you should know, being an alderman in the City of Portage la Prairie. This money is contributed on about an equal basis, I would imagine, and if as you suggest, this money being paid in advance or a lot sooner than as already -- instead of the school division borrowing the money it would mean that the municipalities and the government would have to borrow the money to pay to the school division. In my own school division, in the 27 school districts in Souris Valley School Division, the total amount of interest paid in 1962 was \$158.15, which is nil in my estimation.

Regarding the school divisions, it is a different situation, they were just set up four years ago and up till now most of them are trying to build up reserves to meet their needs in order that they can save the costs of interest. I don't think there is any great problem here as far as I can see. What I would suggest if I was the Member for Portage la Prairie, if he is so greatly interested in this, I would ask that the percentage of the administration costs be increased from 50 to 75 percent -- If he is interested in seeing that the school divisions get back some of the interest that they pay out to borrow this money.

I would also like to suggest to the member from Portage that they do recover part of this interest cost through this administration grant and that not too many of the school divisions from what I can gather are hurt too greatly by this interest cost. Most of them in 10 years' time from now will have sufficient surpluses built up to take care of their needs. I would suggest to all the members of the legislature that they vote against this resolution.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, the last speaker made mention of the fact that this resolution has been discussed in the last, I think he said, several years. I've only had the benefit of hearing it discussed last year and I am sorry to say that I am forced to the conclusion that the honourable member who just spoke didn't listen to what was said last year. The reason I suggest that, is that he seems to lack appreciation of just what the problem is. And that's why I felt it incumbent on me to express my point of view.

In the first place, Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the last speaker doesn't know just where school division taxes "really" come from. He seems to speak of school divisions as school districts as being some form of entity which gets money in some way, which is corporate in some sense, because he says after all school divisions are not hurt too greatly. Who are these corporate entities that aren't hurt? A school division itself can't hurt, it can't feel, it can't have pain, but the persons or the people or the corporations who provide the money for the school divisions, they do have some reaction to pain, whether it is mental or physical. And then, however, he says, well where do they get their money from? They get it from municipalities. What are municipalities? They too, seem to him to be things which don't feel and don't pain and therefore it don't hurt.

I was under the impression, Madam Speaker, that most of us present here knew that the monies that are provided through municipalities to school divisions in the main come from a real property tax and I am pretty sure that people somehow pay the real property tax. It is true that there are some companies that own property and that way pay tax, but in the main it is people, it is residents, it is people who have jobs, earn livings, support children and have to provide the taxes for the schools out of their incomes. They are people and they can feel pain. They are not school divisions which "are not hurt too greatly" and I'm using the words that the honourable the last speaker used.

Now if the monies which are provided by the municipalities and which come from real

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)... property tax are not a burden then of course we are wasting our time. But if they are at all a burden which is felt by the ratepayer, then we must consider that the monies that come from grants from the province also come from people. But they come in a different way and they are paid from a different form of calculation -- and that I think is the point that the honourable member doesn't recognize. The province gets its monies from various sources, none of which to my recollection are the real property tax; and the sources where the government gets its money are such which I believe, are much less painful than that of the ratepayer, the real property ratepayer. Therefore it seems to me that it does make a difference whether certain dollars for payment of interest charges that this resolution deals with, whether they come from the real property tax or whether they come from the sources of revenue of the province. I think that difference is important enough for us to deal with and vote on and I think that we ought to consider it.

Now the honourable member said that it wasn't a six month delay, but a three month delay. I am sorry that there too, he is not aware of the true situation. As I understand the situation, the school attendance records for the first six months of the year are filed at the end of the six months of the year -- let us say after July 1st -- and it takes about three months for those reports to be processed and for the grants to be calculated and distributed, so that in some sense in relation to the monies spent in January of the year, the government is nine months late in sending in the money because the money wouldn't come in until about September. The money that actually is spent by the school district in June is three months late because it comes three months later; so that the average is six months and the average is as mentioned in this resolution. The honourable the last speaker felt that this was much ado about little because it doesn't really affect one particular school district very much. I remember making a calculation last year which was never challenged. It was one which I made with a great deal of hesitency because I didn't feel that sure of myself that I would throw figures around without having checked them properly, but I checked them about three times and then I gave them and they were never challenged. I'm going to do it again.

I do recall that the grants totalled somewhere around \$25 million. It is my impression that the interest paid generally is 6 percent per annum. To the extent that the average delay in payment from the time the school district spends the money until it receives it, the average is 6 months. I calculate that the interest cost is half of 6 percent and that is 3 percent; and 3 percent of \$25 million I calculate to be \$750,000; and when I reach the figure of three quarters of a million dollars in interest I reacted because that was a very large sum of money. I found it difficult to believe and I went back and I counted the noughts in all my calculations to make sure I wasn't talking about \$75,000.00. I still come out with a figure of three quarters of a million dollars. If I'm wrong I hope I'll be corrected, because I have a feeling having listened to what was said before that we'll be discussing this again next year and voting on it again next year and I want next year to be able to use corrected figures. So that if three quarters of a million dollars is spent in interest rates to the bank, then it really is a question of who pays it. The honourable the member who last spoke, either thinks it's paid by a school district or by the Province of Manitoba. I think it is paid by either the real property ratepayers, who reside in a school district and pay the municipal taxes, or it is paid through the other sources of revenue of the province which is collected through liquor, through gasoline tax, through income tax in the main, and I think that that makes an important distinction and one which I think that the honourable members present should consider as worthy of consideration. In other words, the suggestion is that the people who are late in paying the money and who as a result compel the charges of interest, should pay the interest on it.

Now the Honourable the Provincial-Treasurer, might say well we get our money late from the federal government. All right, if that's the case, then let the provincial government have a talk with the federal government. Or he made some allusion I don't remember the exact quotation so I won't deal with it, but I will say that if the government is late in getting it's money, that it has its own problems which it ought not to pass on to the extent of three quarters of a million dollars to the real property ratepayers of this province who are heavily burdened as it is.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I haven't much to contribute to the substance of the argument that is going on in this House at the present time as to whether or not it is

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)... a sound policy to ask the school boards to handle their own financial affairs and to pay the cost of doing the same. This, of course, has been a factor which has been in this whole equation of municipal taxation for some time. Some school divisions for circumstances which are peculiar to themselves perhaps, have evolved a system of financing and have secured sufficient working capital to deal with this problem without an extra charge on their ratepayers. Others have not. And it is true to say that for those who have not, it constitutes to that extent a cost with respect to the running of schools. So I'm going to leave that part of the argument quite alone. I don't want to get into that discussion because to my mind that really is not material to the point that I wish to make.

The point that I wish to make and I think it probably will be widely shared is that we are all concerned in this House at the present time with respect to the level of taxation on local government, taxation on property with respect to schools. And it doesn't really make very much difference whether it's interest on school working capital, whether it's the cost of paying the teachers salaries or any other of the expenses that are incurred in the school system of Manitoba. This has been a concern of ours for the last little while. At the present time the division of costs between the provincial taxpayer and the local taxpayer who are related to one another, one might say, is in the ratio of about 45 percent for the province and 55 percent for the local government; so that one can see that a very substantial portion of the school tax burden is borne by local governments. Now our concern in this matter has led us to appoint the Royal Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance, which is going to report I hope soon. I have been reporting "I hope soon" for some time, I must admit that -- it's sort of like the man that's staggering across the desert to that pool of water and he finds the closer he gets to it, it becomes a little bit of a mirage and the date recedes into the future as to when this commission is going to report. But I am confident that it will report within a very reasonable period of time. It seems to me therefore that we should suspend any judgment on the merits of this resolution until we have that report before us, because I am as certain as I stand here that it's main effect -- the main recommendations of that report will have to do with this very problem of local taxation and this question of school costs in particular, and I do not think it would be sensible for us to pass this resolution which would in effect be an instruction to the government to handle this particular, relatively minor -- in spite of the three quarters of a million dollars which I don't really quite believe -- I would like to look into that a little more before I accepted it at its face value. But the point is that it would not be wise for us to deal with this rather tangential -- is there such a word? Something like that -- anyway -- on the periphery of things; to make myself clearer, on the edge -- to deal with this matter when we are going to have to face the whole problem in all its, perhaps I should say, all its majesty, all its complexity and all its difficulty -- all its ramifications my colleague says -- it's a wonderful word, before long.

So my advice to the chamber would be to vote against the resolution. We won't have to deal with it on that basis on a matter of principle as to whether we're opposed to this particular idea or not. We'll vote against it simply because we think it is inappropriate to deal with it at this moment when we are on the edge of a complete overhaul of municipal finance and local government in general. So for what it's worth, my recommendation to the House would be to reject the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable First Minister would permit a question.

MR. ROBLIN: I'll try ...

MR. PAULLEY: Was that the reason that you voted against the same resolution last year; or what was your reason for voting against it in the absence of a Royal Commission such as the Michener Commission last year?

MR. ROBLIN: I didn't think it was a very good idea last year in any event with respect to that particular way of relieving local taxation. But my honourable friend will recall that in spite of that opinion the fact that we were going to have a Royal Commission had been announced.

MR. PAULLEY: I thought not until this resolution had been disposed of.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, 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 Assiniboia as amended. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg leave of the House to stand this.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: I beg the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: We've got back into that standing rut, Madam Speaker, and I wish to continue. May it stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Member for Wellington.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Member for St. Matthews.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

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

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. P. J. McDONALD (Turtle Mountain): Madam Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable the Member for Dufferin.

MR. WILLIAM H. HAMILTON (Dufferin): Madam Speaker, I don't want to be different from anyone else. May I have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: May we have this matter stand please?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to take advantage of this opportunity, when you call my name, to make a short statement on this subject, because in view of the fact that I had the privilege of sitting in this House as a backbencher, as the Leader of my own party of one for awhile, as Leader of the Opposition and now as Leader of the Government, I have seen this question raised by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead from all its various aspects.

I don't know whether I can say that I approached the problem from an entirely unprejudiced point of view, but I can say that I have not changed my opinion about this matter from the time that I sat as the leader of a single party of one, namely myself, a member of the Opposition and in the backbench, and it has been this, that one departs from accepted constitutional doctrines with the greatest care and that we should in all cases where this is suggested, make sure that we are absolutely satisfied that under the circumstances that we should depart from the accepted constitutional doctrine that has been developed and built up over many years.

Now I hope that that won't sound unkind, because I am really saying that I don't think I want to vote for this resolution which would provide certain additional payments to leaders of other parties apart from that of the government and the official opposition of the Legislature. It may seem that this is a bit uncharitable or a bit flinty-hearted and perhaps it might have been, but I can recall when I had to make this decision on the first occasion that it could very

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) . . . well have applied to me at that time and I would have been the fellow who didn't get the extra pay, and yet in spite of that situation I felt that the doctrine of the constitution as we understand it with respect to leaders of the opposition should be upheld rather than that I should be the beneficiary of some extra emolument of this sort.

Now I want to make it clear that I don't regard the constitutional doctrine with respect to opposition parties as being fixed for all times and forever, I think it has to be admitted that we have more than two parties in this House and that we are quite likely to have more than two parties in this House for some time, and this position is not peculiar to us alone. I think we have to admit that views about the status of those parties changes and indeed it may continue to change, and I agree that all that is possible and that it may happen, I want to make it clear that the constitution is a living thing. It grows and it develops. There may come a time when the position taken by the member for Brokenhead is generally accepted, but I do not think that time has come at the present.

I looked over the record and I find that we have faced this question before in the Legislature of Manitoba, and I rather think that if he chooses to do so the Honourable Member for Lakeside may enlighten us and perhaps cast more of the fact of this as he knew it in his experience, because in 1939 an amendment was made to The Legislative Assembly Act which did provide for an allowance to be paid to the leader of any group of four or more members in the opposition. The amount voted for the opposition leaders was to be divided among the leaders of the groups who qualified on the basis of the percentage of the opposition members in their groups. This amendment recognized that the opposition may be made up of more than one party and gave some recognition to the leader of each party in the opposition.

As I understand it at that time, what happened was that the sum of \$6,000 which we now show as Leader of the Opposition, instead of being given to one was divided among the two or three or how many there were in the opposition at that time. I'm glad to see my honourable friend, who recalls these events better than I, signify that that was what happened. But it didn't really seem to be acceptable in the long run because in 1945 this provision -- which in a sense is roughly similar to the one that my honourable friend suggests -- this provision was deleted from The Legislative Assembly Act of the Province of Manitoba. In other words, we had it; we tried it; we didn't like it; we went back to the old system that we had before, the system that we have today. Now I mention that because the House is entitled to know the background of this problem in our own legislature, that it is not new; that we did do it at one time for six years. We decided not to do it at the end of that six year period and we abandoned the practice.

I can remember very well a similar debate to this taking place. I think it was on the estimates, in 1950 was it -- 1951 -- sometimes around then when the coalition that existed in those days was dissolved and there were two parties in opposition again and the question arose as to whether there should be two payments to the two party leaders. I said then what I say now, namely, that I think there should not; that the constitution recognized the peculiar position of the Leader of the Opposition, the Official Opposition, the head of the possible alternative government at that time, and that any party that had members but not enough to be the official opposition as recognized by the Speaker had to accept the consequences of that numerical inferiority and that the payment to the Leader of the Opposition should be made to the one person who was the leader of the Official Opposition in the Chamber.

Now I took that stand in 1950 when it was not at all apparent that the party that I happened to be associated with -- I rejoined them at that time as I recall or perhaps I like to think they joined me, I'm not quite sure what happened, there's room for argument there -- but anyway before it was at all clear who the opposition was going to be, and it was a diesis thing at that time, I made up my mind what I thought about it and was willing to take my chances. So I mention that to show that I have faced the consequences of this for a party in opposition which is not the official opposition party and made my decision on the basis of what I think the best constitutional practice to be.

I give that little history because otherwise it would seem that I'm rather hard-hearted or perhaps inconsiderate of the position of the Honourable Member for Radisson, who in my opinion performs a very valuable public service in his present duties. I would say that anywhere and to men like him, and I wouldn't like him to think that I was being in a sense inconsiderate of the contribution that he makes.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, at this stage may I just interject. The proposition is not dealing with the Honourable Member for Radisson at all but the leader of a political party. I want this clearly understood.

MR. ROBLIN: I recognize that but I like to hand my honourable friend a bouquet when he deserves it.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, I don't mind a bouquet.

MR. ROBLIN: He doesn't always deserve it you know, but he does on this occasion and I couldn't resist the opportunity of giving him one. I say that because I want to make it clear to the House that I'm trying to approach this matter from a position previously established in my own mind, one which I hope is not entirely a selfish one and that it is based on what I think the constitutional proprieties to be, and we have the record of this same matter in our own House to which I have made a brief reference.

I have examined the procedure in other provinces of Canada and I find that if the information I have is correct -- and it's taken from the latest Canadian Almanac and from the provincial statutes concerned and therefore I do believe it to be accurate -- I find that in the Province of Newfoundland, the only factor that is recognized is the Official Leader of the Opposition who receives a remuneration of \$3,000.00. There's no particular mention in the Province of Prince Edward Island. I don't think there's any remuneration for the Leader of the Opposition. In Nova Scotia again, only the Leader of the Opposition, \$6,000.00. In New Brunswick, the Leader of the Opposition again, \$6,000.00. In Quebec, the Leader of the Opposition, but there he gets the sum of \$12,000 which when added to the sessional indemnity of \$10,000 represents quite a substantial recognition indeed. In fact it would pay me to move down there as Leader of the Opposition. -- (Interjection) -- Well, that's the only reason -- that's one reason why I think I had better stay here. In the Province of Ontario we find that the Leader of the Opposition only is recognized, the Leader of the Official Opposition, where he receives \$12,000 more. We know our own situation. In the Province of Saskatchewan the Leader of the Official Opposition, where he receives an indemnity of \$10,000 extra. Now in the Province of Alberta, I have a big question mark because we can't find an opposition in the Province of Alberta. It's very vexing indeed. There are two or three gentlemen swanning around on the opposition benches but I think the Premier there must have a very hard time deciding who should be recognized. I'm sure the Speaker would have a hard time deciding who is to be recognized. I put them down as the exception that proves the rule and we'll just have to pass them over in a discreet silence, because neither the NDP or the Liberal Party nor the Conservative Party can really claim to cut much ice in that province. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland of course may be able to take an optimistic view of the situation but none of the rest of us can. Now we come to the Province of British Columbia and we find that the Leader of the Opposition there is recognized only, the Official Opposition -- when I use that expression I'm referring to the Leader of the Official Opposition in these remarks -- and there he receives a \$5,000 payment which is exclusive to him alone.

Now in the Federal Parliament, up until quite recently that was the same situation, but as members will know that in addition to the \$15,000 plus that the Leader of the Opposition gets as a special indemnity in Ottawa, a party which has a recognized membership of 12 or more members in that Legislature, a party of that sort is entitled to claim a sessional indemnity of \$4,000 extra for its leader. So there we do have a form of special recognition to other opposition parties.

In the Mother of Parliaments I find that the position of the Leader of the Opposition is recognized under the Ministers of the Crown Act of 1937 and he is defined as the person who for the time being has the support of the largest single group in the opposition, and he alone is recognized and he receives a sessional indemnity of 3,000 Pounds in addition to his sessional indemnity, but other leaders of opposition parties, and there is at least one, are not recognized in this way.

So we find that if we try to examine the actual position that exists in this country and in the Mother of Parliament, that the weight of evidence comes down on the side that I think is the correct one, at least for this day and age, of recognizing the Leader of the Official Opposition alone in respect of this matter of salaries and indemnities. So I must frankly say that I don't intend to support the proposition that is put before us.

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . .

Now whether we will always take that point of view is a matter which I leave open. We fortunately are able to exercise the arts of persuasion in this Chamber and elsewhere on the various issues that are before us and I'm not one of those people who feel that I must always be consistent with a decision made in a previous occasion. Consistency is said to be the virtue of small minds. Mine may be small in this case. I hope that members will not think so, but I certainly recognize that there's no particular virtue in consistency itself.

But re-examining the problem now from another point of view as Leader of the Government compared with the examination I gave it previously, I do not see any reason to change my view on this occasion. It may be that the eloquence of the members will persuade us one day or another to take another view of this thing, but at the present time I think that we would be wiser to stick to the accepted constitutional doctrine that there is but one Leader of the Opposition, namely, the Leader of the Official Opposition, and that is the man to whom these payments should be made. So I have come to that conclusion and I feel it only right that I should tell the House these views on the subject.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

. . . . . Continued on next page.

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

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I beg leave of the House to withdraw this resolution for rewording.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave of the House? Agreed.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina) presented Bill No. 47, an Act to incorporate Mutual Trust Company, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MRS. MORRISON: Madam Speaker, the sponsors of the petition to incorporate the Mutual Trust Company are doing so in the knowledge that a need for the services of such a trust company exist in Manitoba. The need is apparent in those areas of the province that are now centres of settlement and commerce for the Mennonite people of Manitoba. The various and several Mennonite Conferences, churches and denominations have in the past provided the services of an executor, administrator and trustee of deceased persons' estates through a person or committee of persons known as the Waisanamt. These are persons who are delegated and entrusted with the authority to look after the temporal affairs of those persons who cannot manage their affairs in business and commerce without the benefit of experienced counselling. Such counselling and assistance have been provided by concerned persons and community leaders ever since the Mennonites first settled in Canada in 1874.

One of the main purposes of this trust company is to relieve leading members of each community and church from the responsibility for administering the estates of others in that community and church. In addition, the services of this trust company would be available for all those who see fit to utilize any or all of the services to be provided and rendered by it within this province and elsewhere in Canada. The effectiveness and usefulness of the Waisanamt was materially altered. The Waisanamts were neither in law, nor in fact trust companies or banks, and thus were not subjected to government control or regulation in their investment policies and the securities obtained in their lending practices. There has been no service made available to replace the continuing and growing need for such counselling and assistance. Respected and responsible business men of the Mennonite communities in Manitoba are now endeavouring to fulfil the need that now exists and continues to grow.

The sponsors of this bill, and others who are supporting them, now place themselves in a position to be subject to the existing legislation respecting administration of estates and reinvestment of funds in the management of a trust company. It is to this need that the sponsors and their supporters are prepared to venture capital for the purpose of developing the services required in these areas of the province. This is being done under the terms of existing and protective legislation for those persons who deal with trust companies that are registered and licensed to do business in the Province of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) presented Bill No. 62, an Act to amend An Act to incorporate Trafalgar Savings Corporation, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend by one year the company's agreement. They have apparently run into some unforeseen problems in their underwriting agreement and have asked by this bill for a one-year extension.

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

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 77, an Act respecting the City Savings and Trust Company, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this bill will enable this company, which is incorporated in Alberta and having its head office in Edmonton, to carry on a trust business in Manitoba.

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 79, an Act respecting York Trust and Savings Corporation, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this bill will allow this company to carry on business in Manitoba, the Chairman of the Board of this company is a very well known man in this country, Mr. James E. Coyne, and it will be one of the companies that will be associated with the Bank of Western Canada. It was before the Senate yesterday -- or the day before yesterday -- and it is hoped that this bank will open in Winnipeg with its head office in Winnipeg this summer. Unfortunately, the Senate held it up the day before yesterday but perhaps it won't be too long before they set up their business in Winnipeg.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . if the honourable member could answer me. If the charter for the bank is not approved by the Government of Canada and the Senate of Canada, will that mean that this bill we have from the company that we have before us will not proceed if they are not granted a charter to operate?

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I am not sure of the answer to that question, but I think it is the intention that this company would be setting up its business in Manitoba if and when the charter is granted for the Bank of Western Canada. By this bill being passed, they will be able to carry on business in Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, they are wanting us to pass a bill that is postulated on wishful thinking that a bank might be granted a charter?

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I -- oh, was the debate closed? I thought there was just a question being answered.

MR. ROBLIN: I think we should hear the honourable gentleman, I am sure that no one intended to close the debate at this stage.

MR. CHERNIACK: I only had a question to ask, and if I'm permitted I'll do it.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: It, too, is in the form of a question to the proposer of the bill. I did not quite understand the reasoning behind the announcement as to who the president of this company was. I am wondering whether that is indicated as being a reason to gather the support of this Assembly to the passing of this bill, and if that is the case, whether we ought in all other cases when bills such as these are presented, to enquire as to who are the respective presidents, secretaries, directors and otherwise. Would the honourable member who appears to be the one who is most prolific in producing bills of this type give guidance, to me for one, as to just what it is that we ought to be looking for and whether he has been remiss in other cases in not indicating to us just who are the officers involved in the other companies which he has and is proposing to present for us.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, it might have been a reason had the bill been introduced by us, but I hardly think it is a reason for a bill being introduced by the other side of the House.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I simply gave the name of the Chairman of the Board because he is well-known and because he is associated with the proposed bank of Western Canada which will have its head office in Winnipeg, and in which I am sure we are all interested. I gave the name simply because I thought it would be of interest to the members of this House.

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 41, an Act to incorporate Selkirk Savings and Loan Association, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this is a company being sponsored by a group of Winnipeg business men which have the power to carry on the business of selling investment contracts and issuing savings certificates, and also conducting a savings business.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I am not being facetious when I raise this point, but I wonder if the petitioners of this bill have cleared with the town of Selkirk for permission to use the name of Selkirk? I think people might confuse that name Selkirk Saving and Loan Association with something associated with the town of Selkirk and do I believe that the mover for the second reading of this bill should request that the bill be held until such permission is obtained.

MR. CHERNIACK: We will wait until the bill is presented for the Roblin Trust and Loan and then we will have to ask the town of Roblin whether they have any objection. --(Interjection) -- The town didn't? They were a little late in doing so.

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) . . . .

Madam Speaker, last year I had occasion to question the need for the continual bringing forward of bills of this type with which to burden this House and I made a plea then that something be done in relation to The Companies' Act which would take away from this Assembly the responsibility of dealing with trust and loan companies, and mortgage companies and savings and loan associations, this being one of the few, maybe the only province that requires this to be done. I'm glad the Provincial Secretary is here, I believe he may be able to clarify this problem for me in view of the fact that we already know that there will be a proposed new uniform Companies' Act presented to us. But it does appear to me to be an imposition on this House to be presented with a 14-page bill setting out all the various details involving the incorporation of this company and which does not come as a government measure or indeed sponsored by other than as a private bill.

It seems to me that if we all take our task seriously, as I am sure we do, then we must very carefully measure each and every sentence as it appears throughout these 14 pages. If it were a bill sponsored by a public body or by the government, then the responsibility rests with whoever brings it forth, but certainly I don't think anybody is prepared to put the responsibility on to the mover of this bill, who has probably only done it as a matter of courtesy, to vouch for the validity and propriety of all these various sections making up these 14 pages. I do, Madam Speaker, feel that it is an imposition and I for one resent the fact that I feel I ought to read this carefully and consider the entire bill from the standpoint of its propriety.

I note that very soon the same proposer will be presenting Bill 83, which is the incorporating of a Manitoba company and which will be a very brief bill to present to us, and I'm wondering whether it couldn't have been possible for this Bill No. 41 to have been presented in such a way that the onus of checking all the various provisions could not have been left with the office of the Provincial Secretary or with the Securities Commission or with some other responsible agency of the government to review the extent of detail set out in this bill.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, the new Companies' Act has already had its first reading and I have just been informed it will be on the Order Paper for Monday. It will speak for itself when it is presented and it is something that we have given a lot of consideration to. I don't think we ought to go into it at this time. The law is pretty well laid out now that there's no other way of going through it at this time, and we might just as well get going and study every paragraph in every one of these companies that come up until the law is changed.

MR. PAULLEY: If this is the case, as the Honourable the Provincial Secretary has outlined to me, that we are going to deal with a bill setting up a new -- it appears to me without trying to pre-judge the bill -- a new setup for handling such companies and trust and loan bills that we have before us at the present time and have passed. We haven't dealt with them as yet, as you are aware, Madam Speaker, in the private bills committee. I would suggest that the proper course of action then for us to take in this House and for the sponsor of this and any other bills in view of the announcement of the Provincial Secretary, is that the bills be allowed to stand until such time as consideration is given to the bill as being proposed by the government to amend The Companies' Act.

MR. STEINKOPF: This seems to be going all around a circle in order to get at something. The bill that is coming up on Monday really has nothing to do with these bills that are before us. They have already had first reading and I think that this should go through in the ordinary course of events.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 52. The Honourable the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. DONALD M. MCGREGOR (Virden): Madam Speaker, I beg, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that this bill be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. GROVES presented Bill No. 73, an Act Respecting Union Centre, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GROVES: This bill makes it clear that the Union Centre is a club within the meaning of that word in The Liquor Control Act. There was some doubt about that in view of the fact that the Union Centre is owned by a number of Unions and has not got members as such. It also makes provision that on and after the first day of October, 1964, that it shall be deemed for the purposes of The Liquor Control Act to have been in continuous operation for one year. This, Madam Speaker, is a concession I believe of only a few months, and I might say in closing my remarks on this bill that the concessions that are being given in this case to the Union Centre are practically the same as were given three years ago, I think, to the Chamber of Commerce Club when they opened their new clubrooms on Lombard.

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

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 83, an Act to Incorporate Fort Garry Trust Company, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this is a Winnipeg-based company. It will have its head office in Winnipeg and it will also be associated with the Bank of Western Canada. The people that are sponsoring this bill have gone to the trouble of course of all the work in connection with preparing for the bill, and as this is the way that bills must be passed now in order that they can carry on business in Manitoba, I hope that the members of the House will see fit to pass this bill.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 64, an Act for the Relief of Cyril Alvin Henry, Service Station Operator, Joseph Allen Bryant, Merchant, and Frances Adelaide Bryant, his wife, all of the City of St. James, in Manitoba, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to suspend the time limitations in order that there can be a satisfactory settlement for this property. Briefly, the history is that in 1956, Ness Avenue had been widened in the western end -- or part of the western end and it was decided to continue some time in the future with widening the east end. Therefore, properties were expropriated with the intention that agreements could be made with these people over a period of time.

In all fairness to the City of St. James, they did make several attempts to relocate these people and so on but never found a satisfactory solution. This proceeded, Madam Speaker, until 1961 when Metro decided -- it had just come in -- Metro decided then it was necessary to widen Ness Avenue at that point and proceeded immediately on the expropriation done by St. James. These people were forced to move at this time and relocate. Metro then approached them and offered a settlement. The settlement was not agreeable to these people; the matter went to court; the judge considered that this came under the expropriation by St. James. The Limitation Act came into effect and, therefore, without this suspension there cannot be settlement.

I have discussed this matter with the legal departments both in Metro and St. James and they are fully agreed that this is the correct way to do this, and they and myself suggest that this bill be given second reading.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I just want to make a brief point. This involves the important matter of limitations, and while I do not oppose this going to committee, I just draw to the members' attention that fact and say that there may be those who could wish to reserve the right in committee to make some observations.

On the other comment, the bill respecting The Expropriation Act I believe will have provisions that would deal with situations such as I understand have developed in this case. I just rise only to make this point clear at this stage.

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

MR. DESJARDINS presented Bill No. 65, an Act to incorporate L'Association d'Education

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) . . . Canadiens-Français du Manitoba, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madame l'Orateur voici un Acte qui permettrait l'incorporation de l'Association d'Éducation des Canadiens-français du Manitoba, une Association fondée pour promouvoir et encourager l'éducation ainsi que la belle culture française.

Madam Speaker this is an Act which would allow the incorporation of the Association d'Éducation des Canadiens-français du Manitoba, an Association formed to promote and encourage education as well as the beautiful French culture.

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

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 80, an Act for the Relief of Helen Radclyffe and Edward Frank Radclyffe, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, again the purpose of this bill is to request the suspension of limitations. To explain that, perhaps I should give a brief history of the circumstances leading up to the event of this bill.

Mrs. Radclyffe had an operation in 1944 -- as a matter of fact for a stone in the kidney -- and after that period recovered completely and I personally knew them at that period. In November, 1959, she had another operation -- having enjoyed perfect health during this period, and I am fully aware of that myself -- she had an operation on the same kidney. After that operation she never fully recovered. Then there was a series of several operations of an enquiry nature to investigate the cause of the trouble and finally, I think it was in 1961, another major operation in this area discovered a sponge which had been left there at some previous time. After that operation and the removal, she completely recovered except of course that having had this kidney exposed several times during recent years, apparently she will never regain complete health.

Action was taken by the Radclyffe against the two doctors at the time of this operation. I have read most of the information on this case, but not being a lawyer I am not prepared to argue either way on this thing, but it would appear to me that it is impossible to absolutely know when that sponge was left there -- or that tissue was left there. Therefore, The Limitation Act prevented the first operation from being brought in to the case. The object of this bill is that the total medical history of this lady can be considered, not just part of it. In other words, Madam Speaker, the principle involved in this bill is that justice may be done.

MR. HILLHOUSE: 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.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 81, an Act respecting Montreal Trust Mortgage Corporation, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this is a bill to permit this Corporation to carry on its business in Manitoba. It is a Quebec corporation and this is the only way in which it can carry on business, by having this Act passed by this House at the present time.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm not rising to speak on behalf of the City of Montreal which may or may not have been consulted before this bill was presented, but I do wonder to what extent the Montreal Trust Company has something to do with this. I presume that it would not have been brought here, presented so that a company would be established in competition with one of the major financial institutions in this city, but the honourable the member who presented this bill did not clarify this for us and I think one should protect the commercial enterprises which have entered into this province and are contributing to the maintenance of this province.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I'm not going to answer the question posed by the honourable member that has just spoken. I did want to say something about the provisions of The Companies Act relating to the incorporation of companies of this type that have been in existence for a great number of years. Many trust and loan companies have taken advantage of these provisions and have been incorporated and this, of course, has made an important contribution to the business and economic life of the province. I see no reason why there should be so much consideration today as to the procedure. Just because we are discussing a new Companies Act which is not yet law, and these companies have been either in business in another

(Mr. Steinkopf cont'd) . . . form in this province, such as I believe that you will find the answer to the question on the Montreal Trust Company, and any delays that are now put forward in the corporation of these companies seems to be inconsistent with the method that has been used and is in operation in this House, I would guess for at least fifty years.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin) presented Bill No. 82, an Act to incorporate The Wasagaming Foundation, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ALEXANDER: Madam Speaker, for some years in the past now the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture have operated facilities at Clear Lake which provided among other things for camps for young people in the rural areas and the city areas, accommodations for seminars, study groups, and other matters of this kind. It is felt now that these facilities can be expanded and be of increased benefit to the province if they are operated by a non-profit organization which will be composed of representatives from Manitoba Pool Elevators, United Grain Growers, Federated Co-operatives Limited and the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture. The object of this company will be to maintain, operate and develop land, buildings and other facilities to be used for meetings, lectures, seminars and other programs dedicated to the advancement of education and the betterment of the rural community.

I would just like at this time to commend the MFA for having provided these facilities in the past and also to commend these organizations for the facilities that they hope to provide in the future in this area.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I would like to say a word on this. I believe the main reason I was asked to second this bill was the fact that I have sent two daughters to this camp and it may be that there is a couple more to go. I would like to add my word to the Honourable Member from Roblin to congratulate the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture on their fine work and this meeting ground they provide for children from all parts of the province where they receive good instruction and good training. I would like to give my support to this.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I, too, would like to add my support to the bill. I've been to the camp on a number of occasions and find it everything that the previous speakers have said, but as a property owner in the area, I was wondering who gave them the permission to use the name?

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 48, an Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this bill provides that cheques may be executed by any one of the trustees and the secretary-treasurer, or in the absence of the secretary, by the assistant secretary-treasurer.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the mover of the bill would indicate to the House why it is necessary in this particular case that there be so many signing officers. It seems to me that in a normal situation there are usually, oh say three signing officers and any two of which will do, and here -- I don't know how many trustees there are as the bill doesn't indicate, but I wonder if he could tell us because this seems to me to leave the situation where anyone who is on the Board, or any two, can sign cheques at any time.

MR. COWAN: Evidently not. It's any one of the trustees and the secretary. If the secretary should be absent then the cheques can't be signed, but now if the secretary is absent the assistant secretary-treasurer may sign in place of the secretary.

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

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 68, an Act to validate By-Law No. 3783/64 of the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia and By-Law No. 9859 of The City of St. James and an Agreement between The Rural Municipality of Assiniboia and The City of St. James executed pursuant to those By-Laws, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to validate the by-laws passed

(Mr. Stanes cont'd) . . . . . by the City of St. James and the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia. For some years now it has been a problem in St. James to find a suitable spot for the trench and fill garbage disposal method. It has been a great problem because there hasn't been land which is far enough away from the residential area and can't be more valuable for other purposes, and in recent years the problem has become an important one in Assiniboia. These two factors have brought the two of them together and it's really a combination of Assiniboia's land and St. James' money and a working agreement between the two.

MR. WRIGHT: I don't rise to oppose the bill, but I would like to put a few thoughts on record in regard to this, because after all this is a co-operative effort between two municipalities who have a serious problem and I suggest that this problem is the problem that most municipalities are facing. What disappoints me, Madam Speaker, is the fact that these two municipalities have found it necessary to have to enter into this co-operative venture in order to solve a very vexing problem. Now we are going to have this problem with the other municipalities, and when I think that both of these areas are in the Metro area, I'm a little disappointed. I don't know whether I should be disappointed with Metro, because after all this is one of the big problems. This compares with the water district and similar things that we do on a Metropolitan basis. I'm not too sure either whether the provincial government shouldn't have entered into a problem as big as this one because this is one of the major problems of the Greater Winnipeg area, and here we find now where two municipalities in this area have to enter into a co-operative effort in order to solve this very very big problem.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wish to move, Madam Speaker, 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.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) presented Bill No. 66, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, in the main, this bill arranges to take over for operation by the Council--and requiring the expenditures of certain monies -- of the Municipal Golf Course -- at least -- Park, swimming pool and the Municipal Golf Course. Now these have been under the operation of the Parks Board. I have checked with the Parks Board and they are quite agreeable to this change. You might note that the sum is a fairly large one -- the capital expenditure for the pool -- but the greater part of this has already been arranged for under a winter works program I am informed. There may be some members who feel that proper reference to the ratepayers' rights has not been provided, and, in checking on this because this is one of my own concerns usually, I am informed by the City Clerk that there would be no objection to an amendment of this sort. So all in all, Madam Speaker, I urge that this bill go to committee for its consideration.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I do not wish to oppose the bill at this time but I would say that the bill introduces some principles that are not general in the municipal law of this province at the present time, and that we would reserve the right to review the matter in committee and to object to the bill at that time if a satisfactory explanation is not forthcoming.

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

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 67, an Act to amend The St. James Charter, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, there are really three principles involved in the amendments to the St. James City Charter which are included in this bill.

The first, which is several sections, which are self-imposed rules and regulations on themselves since they have now been released from control of the Municipal Board after 35 years.

The second is a request for one mill for recreation. The Parks Board who look after recreation are responsible for the community clubs; they have just recently taken over a very fine track and changing-room which was built and donated by the Royal Canadian Legion No. 4 Branch. They are finding that their responsibilities and costs are getting heavier and they have asked for that one mill.

The last item is that member may recall we had the tragic death quite suddenly of one

(Mr. Stanes cont'd) . . . . .our members of council in St. James last year, and I think it was in June -- end of June or early July -- and this forced the council to have a by-election, I think it was six weeks before the normal election. It was felt generally this was a waste of time and a waste of money and they have asked for the right to make that decision. Now it is felt of course that if one does, circumstances will vary. In St. James there are no divisions or wards and and therefore every person on council is elected to do his best for the total group in St. James. It is also felt of course that if there were wards then it would be necessary to have a by-election, and in this amendment they have asked for the decision to be made by the St. James Council.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, would you be good enough to call the Resolution on Ways and Means please.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, but if my friend the Honourable House Leader -- the First Minister wishes to proceed, I'd be more than happy to hear him.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, 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: Item 1 (a) --

HON. CHARLES E. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, there were some questions that were asked in the House last night that I feel I ought to answer at this time before we proceed any further with the estimates.

One of the matters that was brought to the attention of the committee by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was the question of the shortage of beds, and I thought that the committee might be interested in some statistics that have been prepared going back to 1958. In 1958 in active treatment beds we had 5,079; in extended treatment beds, 438; and beds per thousand population, 6.4. In 1959, active treatment beds, 5,190; extended treatment beds, 590; for a bed per thousand population of 6.6. In 1960, active treatment beds, 5,303; extended treatment beds, 662; and beds per thousand population, 6.7. In 1961, active treatment beds, 5,369; extended treatment beds, 869; and beds per thousand population, 6.8. In 1962, active treatment beds, 5,607; extended treatment beds, 869; beds per thousand population of 7. In 1963, active treatment beds, 5,662; extended treatment beds, 904; for beds per thousand population of 7. In 1964, the projected figure will be 5,916 active treatment beds; extended treatment beds, 904; with beds per thousand patients of 7.1. This figure of 7.1 per thousand of population compares favourably with the rest of Canada in respect of the number of beds per thousand of population according to the latest figures which have been published.

It will be apparent to the committee on the basis of the above data that beds have been increased on a regular basis to an extent exceeding the rate of growth of the population of the province. The committee will be aware from recent newspaper reports that a construction project of a new addition to the Winnipeg General Hospital to provide an additional 174 beds will commence immediately, and construction of the Salvation Army St. James Hospital with 250 beds will commence this fall. In relation to that, the committee may be interested to note that during the year of 1963 a total of 90 additional hospital beds were added to the bed capacity of the province, bringing the total for acute treatment and extended treatment beds to 6,566.

While I'm dealing with the subject of the hospitals, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface wanted some more information with respect to the Deer Lodge Hospital, and in reply to a question of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition I advised that in October the former Minister of Health had written to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and proposed that negotiations

(Mr. Witney cont'd) . . . . be instituted with the Department of Health in Manitoba to determine if 100 to 125 beds in the Deer Lodge Hospital might be made available to serve the community needs, and Dr. Johnson was doing so at that time on the basis of the Manitoba Hospital Survey Report. The Minister received a letter from the Minister of Veterans Affairs which concurred in the suggestion and in January a meeting of the technical people, with Dr. J. N. Crawford of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Ottawa and the Manitoba Hospital Commission took place.

The items that could summarize the discussions at that time were that the Department of Veterans Affairs stated that they had no intention of becoming involved in the direct operation of community hospitals but were willing to make their facilities totally available for community needs under certain conditions. The Department of Veterans Affairs said that they would be prepared to turn over the operation of the Deer Lodge Hospital to a competent non-federal agency if the agency was acceptable to the Department of Veterans Affairs, and they laid down these following conditions: (a) That the department would be given an unconditional guarantee of the priority use of sufficient beds to meet its responsibilities with respect to treatment services to persons with service-connected disabilities, members of the armed forces, and the RCMP. The determination of the need for such treatment services would rest exclusively with the senior Treatment Medical Officer. (b) That the department would be assured of the adequacy of institutional accommodation in the community to meet the needs of recipients of War Veterans Allowance. (c) That suitable arrangements would be concluded with the department to protect the employment status and accumulated pension credits of civil servants employed at the Deer Lodge Hospital at the time of any change. These negotiations are continuing and I have yet to receive a recommendation from the Manitoba Hospital Commission. I believe that the information that I have given here was also released in the Financial Times or Financial Post.

The member for St. Boniface also raised the question of the seven day week in hospitals. Of course he will realize that, just in case it was misinterpreted, all public general hospitals do operate on seven days a week. But I think that he was referring to recent proposals by the Manitoba Hospital Commission that the existing services in the hospitals such as the laboratories, the X-ray departments, the physiotherapy and the occupational therapy departments and the operating rooms, etc., should be utilized more intensively on week-ends.

In 1963 the Commission invited representatives of the Winnipeg General Hospital and the St. Boniface General Hospital to accompany them to the eastern United States to see what achievements had been made in this respect at a large hospital in that area. Since that time, the Commission has urged the major hospitals to study the matter intensively and implement any proposals that would effect more intensive utilization of services on the week-end. They have also approved additional expenditures to cover the cost of changes proposed by the hospitals to achieve this end. Furthermore, a health grant has been approved for the Winnipeg General Hospital to undertake a detailed study in this area. The honourable member might be interested to know that Manitoba really instituted the studies, on a national basis at any rate, on the matter of the seven-day week, in conferences of the Advisory Committee on Hospital Costs to the Federal Minister.

He also drew attention to the cost of research and education, and I think perhaps he will recognize that it has been traditional in the health field that hospitals would engage in research and education. These educational programs not only assure a ready supply of qualified personnel to serve the community, but they also provide for education and research to greatly contribute to the improvement of patients' care. One of the interesting factors is that when the Hospital Commission program was set up, the Federal Government recognized research and education and they do pay through federal hospital grants, 50 percent of this activity. Soon after the Hospital Services program was introduced, the Minister of Health in Ottawa appointed a Scientific and a Research Advisory Committee to advise the commission as to the division of cost between research and patient care. I'm sorry -- apparently that was done here by the Department of Health under the former Minister.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface also made reference last night to the St. Boniface hospital and some confusion that surrounded the future development of the hospital. Apparently the former Minister of Health wrote to the Sisters of Charity in March of 1961 approving the development of a new 250 bed extended treatment hospital adjacent to the St. Boniface

(Mr. Witney cont'd) . . . . . General Hospital, but evidently the order had some reservations about the recommendation of the Manitoba Hospital Survey Board and they have been carefully considering its future program for the development of the facilities of the whole complex of St. Boniface. Following a series of meetings, the Order has indicated that they will be in touch with the Manitoba Hospital Commission before the end of March to present their proposals in this respect.

There was reference made last night too in the speech by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that there were settlements of 1962 deficits to be undertaken by the Manitoba Hospital Commission, and I am pleased that he was able to note that the Hospital Commission had been able to effect more speed in processing of the 1964 budget.

In the matter of the deficit, the '62 deficit of the total cost of hospital operations for 1962 were some \$162,000, that is \$162,000 outstanding on the 1962 hospital deficit. The balance of the payments on these deficits will be made to hospitals on completion of the review by the Commission, the Provincial and Federal Auditors. This should be done within the next few months. In the meantime the net outstanding sum of \$162,000 spread amongst all hospitals in the province should not represent an undue burden.

There was reference last night by the Honourable Member for St. John's of the day-care program and I found that in the psychiatric services they are actually providing what could be termed a day-care and a night-care program, or the day-care is not really known as day-care but as out-patients provision. Such patients that come into the psychiatric hospitals for out-patient care might be, for instance, a person who would come in to take electro-shock treatment and would stay at the institution and then would return home later in the day, possibly picked up by a relative of the person.

In night-care most of these patients are considered to be in-patients, and usually they are patients who receive whatever treatment is indicated in the evening. They sleep at the institution and then they go to work during the day, and their work might be in industry, or office work, or occasionally a housewife who would return to her home. This procedure is used for those patients who give some indication that they require gradual release from hospitals and continue to require the support that the hospital is able to provide.

The day-care concept, as such, has not been adopted by hospitals in Manitoba to any marked extent. Nevertheless, all the large hospitals do offer an extensive program of services to out-patients, and the Manitoba Hospital Commission has encouraged this practice with a result in savings in the cost of in-patients' care and through the extension of coverage to a lengthy list of out-patients procedure. And this coverage is one of the most extensive of any of the provinces in Canada. During 1963 it is estimated that at the Greater Winnipeg hospitals alone there were 300,000 visits to the various hospital out-patients departments. And it will be of interest to the committee, I believe that the Manitoba Hospital Survey Board has recommended a number of innovations in this area as part of the forthcoming construction program of the Winnipeg Municipal Hospitals and it is hoped that developments of this proposal can take place in the near future.

I think I should add, too, on the matter of people on shortage of beds that there is never a shortage of a bed for emergency procedures in the hospitals in Greater Winnipeg.

I believe that I have covered most of the points that were raised in the committee last night, except to say in relation to the questions of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface on home care, I spoke on those last night just near the end of the sitting of the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would like to thank the Honourable Minister for his broad answers. He did answer quite a few of them, not all satisfactory unfortunately.

He started by talking about the seven-day service. I am aware that there is something more being done during the week-end, the operating rooms are still functioning, but I am sure, I know that they are only doing this for emergency. I know that, for instance, Victoria Hospital is not doing too much on this, and I still think that we can improve this and we can have more beds.

Now, he also mentioned and gave us all figures -- which was very interesting, I'm glad to receive this, on the increase in beds. I said last night that I was trying to be reasonable; I knew that Rome wasn't built in a day and I didn't expect him to have that many beds so soon. I was talking mostly about shortage of -- maybe I shouldn't have said beds -- but shortage of

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) . . . . . -- waiting lists. This was the point that I was trying to make. I am not quarrelling with the Honourable Minister that they are not building fast enough. This is not the main point. I think that I also mentioned home care. I felt that more should be done in this. I am not quite satisfied with the explanation of the Minister of just still waiting and being ready for this. I know that for instance, the St. Boniface Hospital are ready to go in this. They've been ready for quite a while. They like the idea. They were invited to go and see how it worked. I think it was the former Minister of Health that invited him, and this was something that a few years ago the former Minister was very enthused about and last year he didn't seem quite so enthused. If this program is shelved we would like to know why. If not, well I think we should do something. There is no reason to wait any longer. This is something that would release more beds. This is the point that I am trying to make. I have an article here from January 21st, 1963, the Free Press, -- 1,700 can't get into a hospital. Well, this was a survey of six Greater Winnipeg Hospitals. Now I'm sure that there is not that much difference now. We couldn't have built that many beds in a year.

Now, as I said, my main point was the compulsory plan. I'm not blaming the Minister for this. This is a compulsory plan and in fact this government inherited that, but that doesn't mean that they have to stay with it. My point was this, there is a contract. People are entering into a contract. It's not the Plan's fault; it's not the Minister's fault; it is not the members of this House now, but we have to take a look at this. We have to face it. People are paying -- are forced to pay, mind you--are forced into this contract, and the government is not fulfilling; or the legislature, you might say, is not fulfilling its part of the contract. And I think this is wrong. I don't think that we could -- we can talk about this all day -- we cannot justify this.

Now I think the Honourable Minister said that there has never been any trouble about emergency cases. Well, it depends on what he means by emergency. I think if somebody has been shot through the heart or something, I know they are going to let him come into the hospital. But I think that there's different -- maybe this is where we are debating the question of emergency but I know for a fact that some people, and it is not my word, it's qualified doctors who feel definitely that certain cases should be in the hospital -- certain of the patients should be in the hospital, and they are not. Now there is no home care; they are not even given their premium back. I think this is wrong. I am not trying to place the blame on anybody. I know, everybody knows that you are not all of a sudden going to build that many beds. Although talking about beds again, the Minister projected the beds that we would have next year, or at the end of this year, in '64. He didn't include anything from Deer Lodge Hospital. I'm satisfied now that we've had some explanation. By the way, all the explanation that he gave today wasn't in the Financial Post. I've got that write up. There was something about it but I don't think there was as much as the Minister mentioned today.

But this is not quite that good enough. The Minister tells us that they are still negotiating, negotiating with the Federal Government, and then he tells me that the government will go ahead with this hospital in St. James, the Grace Hospital. Now, is this the wise thing to do? Politically, no doubt it is. Politically it is certainly the right thing to do. But I mean looking at it, the dollars and cents, is this the correct thing to do, to go ahead and build if you are going to end up getting 640 beds? I don't know. I'd like to know. I'd like to know what they are going to do with these beds.

And while we are talking about building I'd like to know how the government intends to pay for these new constructions; what they intend to do? There is an important question that the Honourable Minister did not answer -- this 20 percent? Are you going to keep on with this policy of asking the hospitals to raise this 20 percent which is practically impossible. Now, I think this is something. It's a problem. I think that the people of Manitoba are very interested, and they are entitled to know more about this. I certainly would like to know more about this. There's 20 percent that has to be raised. Mind you, it looks like the government is paying 80 percent, and that's not true either. The money has to be raised and I don't think that the people could think that they are getting a free hospital without paying for it. They certainly have to pay for it.

Now because of this idea in people's minds now when we are going so much towards socialism, part of the people of Canada here think that everything is free, that the hospitals are free. And this is what I object to. I think that people of Manitoba should be made to realize how much this costs, and what they have to pay for it. I think it is about time that this is done.

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) . . . . Right now the people think that this is free, and I think this is wrong. I'm not necessarily talking against this plan. I'm very against the compulsory part of the plan and, as I said yesterday, I did not, as reported in the paper, talk against the medicare plan, I think this was the Honourable the Leader of the NDP that talked about the medicare plan for a long time. I did say this, that I wish that they'd straighten out this Hospital Plan to make sure that if they want to stay with this compulsory form; if they want to keep on with a contract that they can't fulfil at times -- not the majority of times, but at times -- I think this should be done. We should know what we are doing. This is something new that came in a few years ago. This plan has certainly helped the people an awful lot. Nobody expected it to be perfect, I'm sure of that, and I'm only suggesting, this is not actually criticizing the government, I'm only suggesting that they should look into this. It is criticizing the government if the government feels that it should close its eyes to these problems and just pretend that this point doesn't exist. That everybody is satisfied that the contract is being fulfilled; that they are living up to their part of the contract. If this keeps up for too long, then I'm criticizing the government, because I think this is wrong.

I've also stated that the -- oh yes, I am anxious to know -- there is something that I wasn't quite aware of that the . . . .

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