

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, Monday, February 17, 1964

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills -- The Honourable the Minister of Industry & Commerce.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the First Minister I would ask that this Order be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINBKOPF: Q; C; (Minister of Public Utilities)(River Heights) introduced Bill No. 28, an Act to amend The Amusements Act.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson) introduced Bill No. 20, an Act to amend The Transcona Charter.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q; C; (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Secretary, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution standing on the Order Paper in my name.

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. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting assistance to certain local authorities in financing certain capital works projects and providing, among other matters, authorizing loans to be made to certain local authorities to assist them in financing certain capital works projects.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, this bill, of course, refers to the Municipal Development and Loan Fund, which was established by the federal government. This bill will validate the agreement that Manitoba has already made with the federal government and will authorize the Province of Manitoba to loan the moneys received under this fund from Ottawa to the municipalities of Manitoba and will allow the establishment of the necessary staff to look after the administration.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two on this. First of all, I think that the government should be criticized for coming before us at this time asking for the validation of an agreement of this nature, because, in my opinion, an agreement of this kind, which deals with the expenditure of both provincial and municipal revenue, should have been agreed by the House and not by the Government. It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that other jurisdictions have found that this was necessary. The province to the east of us, Ontario, found it necessary to call a session of that legislative body before entering into the agreement with Ottawa on this important matter. I believe such was also the case as far as the Province of Quebec was concerned. I think that when matters of this magnitude affecting all of the municipalities, as it does in the Province of Manitoba, that we here in this Legislature should be given an opportunity first of all of seeing whether the agreement is a good one in our opinion, as also in the opinion of the Government, so I want to criticize first of all my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs, for producing this bill after he -- and he has told us also in his introduction -- would authorize us, or ask us in effect to place a rubber stamp on what the Government has already done, because I think that there have been -- and I'm asking the Minister this question -- how many agreements have been entered into insofar as the municipalities of Manitoba are concerned? Has the Government of Manitoba entered into any agreement with the municipalities of the Province of Manitoba? Has the Government inferred to any of the municipalities in the Province of Manitoba that if and when this Legislature validates this agreement then we consider the agreement valid? Because I'm under the impression, from

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . some superficial investigation, that the Government of Manitoba has assured some municipalities that they will be co-partners in this agreement with Ottawa. If this is the case, Mr. Chairman, I think it reaffirms, or confirms, my objections to the attitude of the Government respecting this bill.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure my honourable friend, the Leader of the NDP, that the agreement which was entered into with Ottawa was subject to the approval of this House and so stated in the agreement, so that we are not trying to by-pass the Legislature in any way, nor have we made any loans to any municipalities prior to this date, nor have we signed any agreements with any municipalities prior to this date, although I must confess that in order to facilitate the operation of the municipalities so that they could take advantage of this fund if they deem it desirable to do so, we have invited them to make proposals to the Province and we have approved, in principle, five proposals up to this time, subject, of course, to this bill being passed and the agreement with the Federal Government being confirmed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, this I think substantiates the point that I have made. I don't think that the Legislature of Manitoba, no matter what its complex, politically speaking, should enter into the type of an agreement subject to approval that this Government has. Now the Minister admits -- the Minister admits in his last statement that approval in principle has been given to some municipalities on entering into this agreement. He didn't quite answer my first part -- my first question was, "have any of the municipalities actually entered into the agreement," and what I had in mind at that time, "and gone forward with making expenditures," because I can conceive of the possibility of some municipalities, on the basis of the agreements and approval in principle, having commenced operations under the terms of the agreement, and I believe that some have. I believe, despite the nodding of my honourable friend's head, that some municipalities have already started construction on projects for which they anticipate receiving a return under this Municipal Loans Fund. Therefore, I reiterate that this Government had no right, first of all to enter into the agreement of Canada without the approval of this Legislature, and secondly, and maybe far more important, had no right to infer to the municipalities, subject to the authorization of this Legislature, "you go ahead," because, having had experience in municipal affairs, I know what this means insofar as the municipalities are concerned. So I say, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister had better investigate a little more than he has apparently, to find out whether or not any of the municipalities have proceeded with work, because I am under the impression that they have.

MR. SMELLIE: My honourable friend can be under whatever impression he likes. I can't help what impression he may have. The fact of the matter is, that until an agreement is completed between the municipalities and the province, the province is under no obligation to provide the municipality with anything. If they want to proceed with a project before they make an agreement that's entirely up to the municipality, but we are under no obligation whatsoever to enter into the agreement with them until they apply to us with an agreement signed by the municipality. Before they can enter into an agreement they have to give us details of their proposals. In some cases the proposals have had to be returned to the municipalities for further clarification or for details about grants that they may receive from other sources, which may affect the amount that they would be entitled to under the Loan Fund. It was not necessary for the Province of Manitoba to enter into an agreement with Ottawa at all. We could have done like our friends to the west did and abandon the municipalities to the tender mercies of Ottawa and let them go their own way. We felt this would be an abdication of our responsibilities in this matter and that it was preferable that Manitoba should retain some interest in what was going on. Therefore, propose to enter into an agreement, subject to the approval of this House, and regardless of what my honourable friend thinks, I think there is nothing wrong with this procedure.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, admits that there have been tentative agreements, or matters for consideration under this agreement between the municipalities and the Government of Manitoba that have been considered. He didn't start out this way, Mr. Chairman, in reply to my original questions. He now admits that tentative agreements have been received by the Government of Manitoba between the municipalities, that these agreements, Mr. Chairman, in my honourable friend's own words, have been re-submitted back to the municipalities for further consideration. As to what other third party's --

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . and I presume by this, the Government of Canada -- what part did they have in respect of these laws? So I think my honourable friend is coming along now, and if he gets up another couple of times I think he will agree eventually that I'm right, that the Government of Manitoba had no business to do the sort of manipulating insofar as this agreement that they have done. Now, I would like to hear from my honourable friend. Is there not a time limit as to when, a time limit for receiving applications, and what is that time limit of receiving applications for construction? I may be wrong, but I'm under the impression that it's somewhere at the end of March/64 in respect to the first year, and the projects must be completed toward a year hence. I ask my honourable friend, is this not so? If it is so, and he can answer the latter with the if it is so, that there is a time limit for Ottawa receiving requests under the shared municipal loan agreements, then by virtue of not having a session of the legislature after the legislation has been approved in Ottawa, has he not prevented the municipalities from Manitoba from full consideration as to their projects?

MR. SMELLIE: As usual, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is about half right. -- (Interjections) -- I may be flattering him a little, but under the proposal put forward by the Federal Government, a project must be approved and work on a project must have been completed before the 31st of March, 1966, and only that portion of the project which is completed before the 31st of March two years hence will be considered as being eligible for a loan under this proposal. When we contacted the municipalities first, we recommended to them that they should submit their proposals to us before the 31st of March this year. Indeed, many municipalities have indicated interest in the fund, but have not yet submitted any proposal for a definite project. Others have made inquiries. They want information about "if we went ahead with such and such a project, would it qualify?" -- that sort of thing. In every case, the municipalities have been assisted as much as we can, giving them information about how other methods of procedure could give them additional grants. For example, under the National Housing Act or under the Winter Works Act, we have attempted to help municipalities to make up proposals which could fit under the federal proposals, and provided, of course, the agreement we've proposed for your consideration is ratified.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I'm not usually on the side of the gentlemen on the far side of this Chamber on issues, but in this case, I must say that I find great deal of value in what the Minister said. I may disagree with the decision of this government to take this program as a provincial program. I would want to find out from the Minister why they chose that course rather than the course chosen by other provinces which left it up for direct negotiation between Ottawa and the municipalities. I want to know from the Minister how much additional cost this will mean. But having made the decision to proceed the way the government has, then I say that the Minister was right in using all haste to get this in process. Because, Mr. Chairman, the concern of Canadians at this time, and of the members of this House, as frequently repeated, is the matter of employment; and this measure introduced by the Federal Government is one to combat unemployment. It was urgent that the measure be put into effect as quickly as possible, and I think that the course that the government has followed, once it made that decision that it was to be handled through the Manitoba government was to use all haste to get the projects that could be considered into process, to get in touch with the municipalities, and to do everything possible to get this program effectively at work to combat unemployment. My honourable friend, I think, has not here changed the practice followed in other departments as well, where an agreement is made with Ottawa subject to ratification here. And in this particular case I certainly don't stand on this side of the House criticizing the government for speeding up a program which was so essential to unemployment, and also, Mr. Chairman, so essential with many of our municipalities in this province. Municipalities who may have been considering projects, didn't know whether or not they would proceed with them, can now proceed to plan, to lay out their work in advance and hit that deadline established by Ottawa.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a brief comment respecting the words of my honourable friend to the right. I think he has substantiated -- although he has endeavoured to butter up the forces on the other side in doing so -- I think he has substantiated my whole point -- (Interjection) -- when he states so vigorously that he is concerned about the problems of unemployment -- a different cry than we usually have from

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . my friends to the right, but I accept it. But this is the very point that I was raising, Mr. Chairman, that this government, and apparently their colleagues to my right, were prepared to delay actual start of this thing until the start of this Legislature. Here it is -- here it is well into the middle of February. The Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec have been using this Municipal Loan Fund for creating jobs to take care of the unemployed. And this is the point that I state that we should actually have had a session to ratify the agreement so that we could have got on with the job of providing jobs for the unemployed in Manitoba. So my honourable friend to the right is just batting his usual average when he interprets my remarks as he did, and when he comes to the support of the government opposite I say they are both wrong, as I have said on many occasions, and, like peas in a pod, very similar.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, if the Leader of the NDP would hold to one position, it might be possible to debate with him, but in view of the fact that he shifts his ground constantly, at one stage being against haste, and at the other stage being for haste, I must confess the discussion is rather pointless. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the House the reasons for which the Manitoba government chose to handle this through its own departments rather than the procedure that was followed in other provinces, and do this directly between the municipalities and Ottawa, and what cost he expects that this will impose through the provincial departments.

MR. SMELLIE: Well, first of all, Mr. Chairman, we are involved in, of course, a constitutional question here, and the first concern is the concern of the province for municipal government which is of provincial concern. I think on this point we are all agreed. Many of the provinces in the first instance felt the same way about it. In fact the provinces were pretty well unanimous in feeling that the provinces should look after this. When some of the provinces saw the agreement that Ottawa was going to require and some of the red tape that would have to be looked after in this matter, they decided that their principles in the constitutional question could be by-passed for the moment and they would allow the municipalities to deal directly with Ottawa. Four of the ten provinces are administering this scheme, including the Province of Manitoba. Insofar as we are concerned, we have been trying to persuade the municipalities of Manitoba to plan their capital programs five years in advance, and this project has been going along fairly well. Many of the municipalities now are able to tell you what their plans are at least three or four years in advance, many of them five years. It was felt advisable that we keep in close touch with this thing as it went along. Insofar as staff is concerned for the Municipal Development and Loan Fund, there has been one person taken on staff to look after this administration, and it would appear that he will be quite capable of looking after the whole of this by himself without additional staff.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the Dominion Government is going into the finance business once more on a larger scale and they're already up to their neck in debt. I am wondering why we didn't use our own Crown agencies in Manitoba for that purpose if there was a need for it. Certainly, if there was a need, why didn't we develop our own fund for that purpose and set it up so that we could help our municipalities? However, if there is a subsidy coming from the federal government under this plan, I would like to know just what this subsidy amounts to and what is the interest rate that they are going to charge the municipalities, and how much does the government expect it will cost our province to be the middleman in this case.

MR. SMELLIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps I should answer my honourable friend's question if I can; I'm not sure that I completely understand it. The proposal outlined by the federal government has been detailed on many occasions in the newspapers, and I thought that all of the honourable members would be familiar with it. The proposal is to provide funds which will be loaned to municipalities for projects which they would not otherwise do before the 31st of March, 1966. It could be a project that they would not contemplate at all or it could be a project that will be advanced before that date. In other words, the work will be completed sooner than it would have been without the use of this fund, the idea being to increase the work available in this next two years. No other project can be deferred or deleted because of a project being introduced under this scheme. Once a project has been approved, the loan is available for two-thirds of the cost of the project after deducting all grants of any other nature from

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd). . . . either the federal or provincial governments. For that portion of the project which is completed before the 31st of March, 1966, and which is eligible for loan, 25 percent of the amount of the loan will be forgiven, but only on that portion of the project completed before the 31st of March, 1966. The rate of interest will depend upon the rate of interest at which the Federal Government can borrow money and it is a fraction of a percentage higher than the rate at which Ottawa borrows money. I believe the present rate is 5 -3/8 percent to the municipalities.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, it is correct that all of the funds that will be loaned are Federal Government funds; are they not? There is no Provincial contribution in this either by way of the loan money or the 25 percent which is cancelled. This is all Federal Government money, is it not?

MR. SMELLIE: That is correct, Mr. Chairman, that under the present scheme and the bill which will be before you shortly, this is all Federal Government monies, although there will be a proposal here for the facilitating of the loans for the use of the postwar fund, if necessary, for advances, although there have been no advances made and none are contemplated before this Act will be passed if the Legislature proceeds with its usual speed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted. Carried. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted a certain resolution, 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 the member for Springfield that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SMELLIE introduced Bill No. 26, an Act to Assist Municipalities to Finance Capital Works.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the galleries where there are seated some 14 first-year University students from Canadian Nazarene College under the direction of their teacher Miss D. Thompson. This group is from the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Johns. Also, there are some 25 Grade 11 students from Holy Cross School under the direction of their teacher Sister Anne Margaret. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. There are some 75 Grade 8 students from Cecil Rhodes Junior High School, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. A. M. Kozak and Miss J. Delbridge. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. There are some 35 Grade 11 students from St. Joseph Collegiate under the direction of their teacher Sister Henri de Marie. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

Nous vous souhaitons la bienvenue ici cette apres-midi. Nous esperons que tout ce vous avez vu et entendu a l'assemblee legislative vous sera utile dans vos etudes. Puisse cette visite vous inspirer et stimuler votre interet dans les affaires de la Province. Revenez encore nous visiter.

TRANSLATION: 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.

HONOURABLE STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Before the Orders of the Day, I wish to place on the table of the House a copy of the regulations filed between February 28, 1963 and February 6, 1964.

HONOURABLE GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Education for the year ended June 30, 1963.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I think the members of this House should recognize the achievement of one of the civil servants who works in this building. I am referring to Bruce Hudson of the Queen's Printer's office, who won the British Consols Saturday night, and will represent Manitoba at the McDonald Brier. Mr. Hudson, who follows in the footsteps of his late father, I am sure will give an excellent

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . account of himself in Prince Edward Island in the beginning of March. I think that all members of this House will wish him well when he represents the Province at that time.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, as you

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I would like to join with the Honourable Member for St. George in expressing my congratulations, and I am sure the Honourable Member has mentioned the congratulations of the whole House, to one of our distinguished employees on this great achievement. As the Honourable Member has mentioned, Bruce Hudson's father was one of the curling "greats" of this province, and as one who curled with him -- as a matter of fact I think one of the few games he ever lost was the time that I curled with him. He was a wonderful curler but he couldn't quite carry that load. I would like to hope that Bruce has now started to emulate the great career that his father succeeded in achieving. We know that the Consols event that's taking place is pretty tough competition, but I think the name "Hudson" belongs in that class of curling at all times, and I certainly would want to join with expressions of congratulation to Bruce, a worthy son of a great father, and to hope that he will restore -- he and his rink will restore the Province of Manitoba to their rightful place as the holders of the curling trophy emblematic of the championship of Canada, which of course is emblematic of the championship of the world in this regard.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, on the same subject, I too would like to extend congratulations to Mr. Hudson. As you know, the Queen's Printer's office comes under the Department of Provincial Secretary, and it seems that for the last seven or eight months everything has been going right in that department, and we hope that it will continue that way until at least the Charlottetown British Consols bonspiel. This year is a particularly important one in that the National Bonspiel will be held in Charlottetown as a part of the 1964 centennial celebration down there, and it will only be right that Manitoba does take its place at the head of the results when they are announced, and I wish Mr. Hudson and his rink all the success down there that he can have.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I too would like to lend a word of congratulation to Bruce Hudson, a clubmate of mine at Strathcona Curling Club. He does all the winning, we seem to do most of the losing, but we have enjoyed the association nonetheless. At the same time I would like to say a word of congratulation, too, to the Ross rink from Carman, who were such worthy opponents in the finals of the Consols event in Manitoba. These young men put on a remarkable performance, and I think we will hear more from them in the future.

MR. WILLIAM HOMER HAMILTON (Dufferin): Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate Mr. Hudson on his victory, but it certainly wasn't a very easy one. I am very proud of my boys from Carman, and they will win it some day if they stick together. But Carman also has won the ladies' championship of Manitoba, Mrs. McGregor and her rink, so they are going to take it in Edmonton.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I would like to apologize to my honourable friend the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. I did not realize when I interrupted him that he was rising on the same subject. I am very sorry. I wouldn't have done it had I realized that.

HONOURABLE CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Public Works) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to reply to two questions that have been posed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. He asked me first of all if we would be bringing in the annual report on inspection of meat-processing plants throughout the province, and I wish to advise him that the information is being compiled at the present time, and a full statement will be made during consideration of the estimates. He further asked if the canteens of Government were purchasing meat from government-inspected facilities, and I wish to advise him that all meat that is purchased through the Central Purchasing Office is stipulated to be Canada Approved, and the meat that is purchased by the Crown corporations is also stipulated to be Canada Approved, and while the same stipulation does not apply to the canteens in the Norquay Building, or in the building here, we are advised that the only meat that is purchased in these two canteens is Canada Approved.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): I wish to thank the Minister for his answers, and I am glad that he has stated that we will have the report in time for his debates. It should be very interesting.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Leader of the House, based on a Canadian Press report from Halifax dealing with the Legislative reporters in the House of Nova Scotia. The newspaper report, Madam Speaker, is as follows: "Reporters in the Nova Scotia Legislative Press Gallery have been barred from drinking coffee and fraternizing with House members in the Members Lobby adjacent to the Legislative Chamber. In a verbal statement to three reporters Thursday, Attorney-General Richard Donahoe said he didn't mind reporters coming into the Members Lobby to get a cup of coffee, but he asked that they not remain in the lobby to drink it, but take it outside." I ask my honourable friend is there any intention on the part of the Government to put such restrictions on the members of our Press Gallery here in Manitoba?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I think this involves two matters. In the first place, I can say the Government has no such intention, and in the second place the conduct of the Assembly and the rooms connected with the Assembly are, during the time the House is sitting, a matter for the concern of the Internal Economy Commissioners; I am one of them; no such matter has been proposed to us.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised to see the Leader of the NDP suggesting that the newspaper reporters should not be allowed in our lounge. Personally, I welcome them.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Is it true that the Brandon School of Nursing has applied for assistance to rebuild and have been turned down? And is it also true that if this assistance is not forthcoming they'll be forced to close down?

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, meetings have been held with the board of the Brandon General Hospital and the matter is under consideration at the present time.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Water Conservation, which I would like him to take as notice. Has he received any indication as yet that a certain number of families living in close proximity to the Floodway north and east of Winnipeg have had their water supply depleted, either completely or in large part, and if he has received such indication, could he tell us what immediate steps he has in mind, since it is after all a matter of great inconvenience to people so affected?

HONOURABLE GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I'm not prepared to give an answer in detail at this time but the question of local water supply has been under very close surveillance for a period of almost two years now and we are taking appropriate action where it is clearly indicated that we are responsible for any depletion. I would like the opportunity, however, to get a detailed up-to-date statement in reply to the question that has been put to me.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education. I think many parents in Manitoba are deeply concerned about news reports recently regarding a morals charge involving a school teacher. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the House what checks are now taken to make sure that this does not re-occur and what steps the government has taken to tighten up its checking on this subject.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, with respect to the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition, in this particular case the day it came to the attention of the Deputy Minister that a teacher was up on a morals charge, the matter was checked into with the Attorney-General's Department and licence cancelled. There are something like 3,300 or more teachers licensed by the Department of Education and my information is that seldom, if ever, does a case of this nature -- or could it arise. In this particular instance the Department have on record investigation and letters written to British Columbia with respect to the gentleman who moved here from that province, and they asked there about his teaching record and received what they considered adequate information. There is no way apparently, without going into the most exhaustive investigation in every particular case of issuing a licence, to catch a particular case like this. It is most unfortunate. I think everyone associated with the incident are most distressed by it, but as to any new or positive measures we may take other than the Department exhausting itself where it can and checking on a person's background, can this be avoided in the future. However, as I say, the Deputy Minister of Education did explore the matter of determining by what means the Department might determine a short criminal record on teachers being licensed on morals charges, and was told that the procedures would be quite impractical. However, I

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) feel that the Department are going to be -- everyone is concerned about it but we just really don't know how we can cull out the odd case like this that can get by.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'm surprised that the Minister does not indicate that the Department will take some very drastic steps to revise its procedures if what has happened in this case is an example of its control, because it is my understanding that this case was a recorded case in Manitoba, and surely the Department did not have to go to British Columbia; it could investigate the records here. It seems to me that the Department has been most lax in the subject.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I refute the statement of the Leader of the Opposition that the Department has been lax. A very full report -- at the time that this man came to the Department for re-instatement of his licence the Department did write to his previous employers. There was no way except by, as I understand it, a very full investigation through the Attorney-General's office, might you have picked up this misdemeanor which had incurred while this gentleman was in the province during the period of 1950 to '54; and, my honourable friend, while it is of no comfort, this sort of thing has happened in the past from time to time and there has been no way over the years of finding out this sort of information. I can only go on what the Department and the Attorney-General's office tell me as to the possibilities of a detailed check on a possible criminal record of every teacher coming before them for a licence. The bizarre events in this particular instance are regretted by the Department very much, that they weren't able to determine this criminal background for a period of four years in the past, and I'm only saying that the Department, the Manitoba Teachers Society, the men associated with this chap at no time reported anything about any criminal background. I have the letters on file. I would be glad to table any correspondence between our Department and this

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, a further question. Could the Minister of Health indicate to me whether it is true or not that the Manitoba Funeral Directors Association opposed the licensing of one Jack Harrison, who sought to operate in Manitoba. I'm told that they opposed his application, their objections were disregarded, and this man is now facing, I believe, 152 charges of fraud in the Dauphin area.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I would raise a point of order at this point, that I think the honourable member is asking for information that is not within the competence of the government. He is asking for information concerning the action of someone else, and it would seem to me that that is not a proper question to put to the Minister.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I disagree with the Minister. I asked if this Association had gone to the government objecting to this man's application. That's my question.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, in answer to the honourable member, I know nothing about this particular case, about the Funeral Directors coming to the government. I can take notice of it though and find out.

HONOURABLE J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Department of Welfare for the fiscal year 1962-63.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Labor. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 9, an Act to amend The Municipal Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, there are several things involved in this bill. I will try to stick to the four main principles that are involved here. First of all, the first period of amendments give municipalities the power to do together any of those things which they would have power to do by themselves. Secondly, on borrowing by-laws this bill would reduce the majority required from a three-fifths majority vote to a simple majority. The third

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.) . . . provision, or series of provisions, deals with the matter of tax notices and will provide in general that municipalities may have some flexibility in the matter of sending out tax notices and in fixing different dates upon which taxes may become due. Generally speaking, a municipality can send out separate tax notices for municipal taxation or school board taxation and, if they so desire, for a Metro tax bill, for those to which this applies. Similarly, they could divide their total tax bill into quarterlies and send out quarterly statements if they so desire, or they can make arrangements for the collection of taxes monthly, all of which is just designed to give the municipality some flexibility so that they can enter into different arrangements as they themselves see fit.

And lastly, the next principle is the question of the disposal of the proceeds of land which was acquired by the municipalities through tax sales. The old provision provided that the moneys from the sale of lands acquired through tax sale must be placed in the consolidated fund of the municipalities wanted to use this for their reserves. The Act has now been amended to provide that where they have an actual cash surplus they can put the money directly from the sale of lands acquired through tax sale into their reserve funds if they have a by-law that provides that this is where it will go. It also provides that if they haven't got an actual cash surplus then they can't, of course, do this and if they have already transferred the money to reserve funds it will have to come back to their general funds in order to meet the deficit.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): The Honourable Minister, in introducing his explanation, referred to four principles, and when he mentioned the third principle he stated the simple wording to the effect that the money by-laws shall be approved by a simple majority of ratepayers rather than a three-fifths majority. He did not proceed to elucidate on just what principle was involved, nor to what extent the government has seen fit to change the former principle. If the principle was one to create a better sense of democracy, or if the principle was designed to make it more possible to proceed with capital works or other projects which require borrowing, then I would like to suggest that the government is still far behind the will of the people and far behind the thinking of what it is that should require, what nature of approval should be obtained in approving of borrowing for money by-laws.

We now have quite a mixture in this province of requirements. There are many occasions when municipalities may borrow for their needs without reference to any of the ratepayers or electors. There are others where reference may be made to ratepayers 60 percent required for majority. There are others where a simple majority is required. Then there are distinctions made between ratepayers and electors, as if electors do not have the responsibility or the feeling of responsibility that ratepayers have. And it seems to me, Madam Speaker, that when the government has considered the principle, as it has, and has come to us, as it does, in order to request a change, which it is doing, it should have thought through its principle to the extent where it would realize that either the people who are elected to take office in municipal government are sufficiently responsible people that they can properly make decisions and bind the municipality for borrowing without reference to money by-laws, or at least that they ought to be required to obtain the approval of a simple majority of electors and not set them up as a lower class of citizens and say "we will go to the ratepayers rather to electors".

I would like to suggest, Madam Speaker, that the government be prepared to come before Law Amendments Committee and voluntarily come along with the idea that the whole idea of money by-laws should be taken away from the reference to the people either as electors or ratepayers. I think we ought to recognize the integrity and the ability of the people who are elected to municipal office. I wouldn't be surprised that there are quite a few of the people who are elected to this House who may have learnt their approach to the rights and the duties of taxpayers in municipal affairs. And if we in this House are given the responsibility of dealing with large sums of money and with the lives and property of so many of the people of the province, and we are elected and put here by electors, then surely we ought to consider that electors who also elect municipal people should have sufficient faith in the people that they elect to give them the authority to deal with money by-laws. But if the government is not ready enough to recognize that municipal governments alone should be given that responsibility, then there might be well thought out checks and balances created in terms of reference to, let us say, the Municipal Board, rather than to the ratepayers or electors, so that the Municipal

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . . Board will satisfy itself that the credit of the municipality is not being taxed too strongly. And there are other checks and balances, such as a limitation based on the assessed value of the property within the municipality. These are all factors that municipal people know about, and I am sure that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, too, knows about the principles that could be established. And if the government is still not ready to move along with the times and remove any reference to the people, then at least the government ought to recognize that the electors have the same amount of responsibility as do the ratepayers. Indeed more, because the electors either own or contribute by way of taxation either by contributing to the income of the head of the family or as tenants, to be very, very closely connected to any increase in taxation. And the time is long past when one considers electors not to have the responsibility that ratepayers have in making decisions of this type. I think the government is not up-to-date in its thinking in this respect. I think that if it is, if it stands behind the principle which it has carried forward in this bill, then it is a derogation of the consideration to which electors are entitled, and I would urge the government to consider carefully whether it should not come ahead and acknowledge the progress that has been made through the years in our municipal life in the province so as to recognize what ought to be the proper consideration to be given to the passing of money by-laws.

MR. MOLGAT: I don't rise to object to the passing of the bill at this time and sending it on to Committee, but I'm rather surprised that the Minister is introducing the bill at this point. It has been my understanding from last year's discussion that he intended to have a complete review of the Municipal Act, and was to present the House with an over-all and complete new Municipal Act. Now we're proceeding once again here with a piecemeal approach to the problem, and I wonder why the Minister is giving us this rather than the over-all review that I had understood he was undertaking and would propose.

MR. SMELLIE: If no-one else wishes to speak, Madam Chairman, I would like to reply to some of the remarks that have been passed. In reply to the Honourable Member for St. John's, I would tell him that this matter of the approval of money by-laws, generally speaking, will be considered with the general amendment of the Municipal Act. The present amendment just brings all other municipalities in Manitoba, into the same position now enjoyed by the City of Winnipeg, and this was the only intention at this time. The other question that my honourable friend raises will be considered at the time of the general amendment to the Municipal Act.

In reply to the question from the Leader of the Opposition, I must frankly confess, Madam Speaker, that if I thought I could have the Municipal Act revised in time for this session of the Legislature, I was very naive and over-enthusiastic about my new responsibilities at that time, because it's a much larger job than could be accomplished in the space of the time that has elapsed since last we sat. I would report to the House, however, that the former Legislative Counsel, Mr. Rutherford, has been engaged in the revision of the Municipal Act. He worked through most of the 1963 season and came up with the first draft of the revised Act, which is now being studied by a committee composed partly of members of the staff of the Department of Municipal Affairs, but also being served by certain other members from outside the service, and at this time I would like to express publicly my thanks to those members of this committee who are giving of their time for this purpose, and they are: Mr. Clive McLeod, who is the solicitor for the Union of Manitoba Municipalities; Mayor Kushner from West Kildonan, who is the executive-director of the Manitoba Urban Association; Dr. Fisher, the former Deputy Minister; and of course, Mr. Rutherford. This committee has been working on this problem for some time. They have been meeting approximately once a week up until the time that the House opened. They meet all day, and these people have been serving on this committee, the ones who are not in the government service, without remuneration. I would like to express my public thanks to them for the job they have been doing and will continue to do in revising the bible for the municipalities of Manitoba. This is a very tremendous chore. At this time, in five meetings, this committee has covered approximately fifty sections of the revision. It is expected that this work will continue again as soon as the House is finished. I would like to say that we hope to have it ready for next year, but I'm certainly not making any promises in the light of the experience of the past year.

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

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, this amendment allows the psychiatric nurses to have honorary members appointed to their association, and it also makes it clear that the members of the association -- that in order to become a licensed psychiatric nurse you do not have to be a member of this association.

MR. PETERS: I would like to ask the Honourable Minister a couple of questions. First, I would like to ask him who is asking for this change; and secondly, if the honorary members would have a say in the association -- a vote or anything.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, the amendments are being requested by the Association of the Psychiatric Nurses, and the honorary members, to my understanding, do not have any other powers, except being honorary members.

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

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 15, an Act to remove The City of St. Boniface, The City of Portage la Prairie, and The City of St. James from Supervision of The Municipal Board for second reading.

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

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 10, an Act respecting the Provision of Planning Services for Municipalities and Agencies of the Government and for the preparation of Planning Schemes for Regulating the Use and Development of Lands and Buildings, for second reading.

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

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 19, an Act to amend The Winter Employment Act for second reading.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Dufferin, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, congratulations for again occupying the high position the Chair in this House, which is the symbol of the Throne. And I also wish to congratulate you for being in a position to add a woman's touch to this House, which ordinarily is a man's domain. Best of health, and a lot of endurance.

The mover and the seconder to the Throne Speech -- I wish to congratulate them on -- give them credit for performing their duties. I enjoyed listening to them, although I do not agree with the contents of their presentation, but the presentation was well done. I feel sorry for them, because I feel that in some instances they are a little bit confused. Now, the new Ministers -- I wish them success. What about the Ministers that were given different positions or the re-shuffling of the Ministers. I know that it's the Premier's prerogative but there was one remark that he made at the time for the reason he had done it, kind of struck me as something novel, and that is that one of the reasons for re-shuffling of the Ministers was to give the Government and the respective Ministers more depth. Well, if that is the case, I wish that the Ministers re-shuffled really profit through that and that this depth reflects in their new responsibilities.

But there are more Ministers, and I wonder about the rest. Are they deep enough? Don't they require any more depth? And looking at the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, probably he will find his depth in the Winnipeg Floodway, especially around Bird's Hill. It is quite deep there. What about the Minister of Industry and Commerce -- the genial Minister is so easy to get along with. I wonder -- I guess he will just have to live without extra depth. The Minister of Labour probably will have to keep on labouring without any depth. The Minister of Welfare probably will have to trail along without depth also. What about the Minister of Municipal Affairs? I guess he will just have to wait until the Michener Report comes out so he'll gain his depth. Somehow, I feel a bit sorry for these Ministers, for to me it appears that for another year they must -- for at least another year -- they must remain shallow.

Now, the Premier says that the shuffling of Ministers -- or maybe he doesn't exactly say it but he must be thinking that when the Ministers are re-shuffled maybe in time if this procedure continues that these Ministers will become jacks-of-all-trades. But I'm afraid if

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.). . . . this is an indication of the future procedure that these Ministers may be master of none. I didn't intend to speak on the amendment. I intended to speak on the main motion, but a few issues were brought up last Friday by some of the speakers, and especially the new Attorney-General, that prompted me to adjourn the debate. The Attorney-General implied that it is the duty of the Opposition to criticize with a view to improving the Government, and it is also the responsibility of the Ministers of the Government to defend the policies of the present Government. I am not going to say that the present Government didn't -- that it's guilty of the crime of doing nothing. I'll agree that there were certain things that were done right, but I'll let the policies or the good deeds speak for themselves. But when the Attorney-General accuses the former administration of being a "do-nothing," I think it is time to remind him that this story is about 7 years old. I think it is time that we faced the present day. If he wishes to live in the past, I suppose that is his privilege, and I am not concerned too much about the validity of those exaggerated remarks that he made last Friday. I was not in the Government then at all. But I would like the Minister to wake up and face present day realities, that today the term "do-nothing" applies pretty well to his own Government and applies very, very -- and most effectively I would say. Why torture yourself with the past? Let us examine the present Government's record of "do-nothing." Since that was brought up by the honourable member across I am going to use it. He used the term "do-nothing" -- his own words. Now let us consider this. What did the Government do for over three months about the 21 truant children in St. Vital? What did the Government do to solve the separate and the private school issue? What did the Government do? What was the Government's policy up till now? The same thing -- just do nothing. That's what the Government's policy was. What did the Government do to resolve the differences of opinion in the proposed boundary division which is not in division yet? What did the Government do? Any suggestions, or anything? No. Their policy was simply sit back and do nothing, and I am not accusing the present Minister because he hasn't had time. What about the Government's policies regarding the Mississippi Parkway, where the State of Minnesota and the Government of the United States were willing to spend millions of dollars in helping Manitoba in certain highway construction. What did the present Government do? Just sit back and do nothing; and I agree with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, sit back and do nothing. Now what about the leadership? Where is the leadership? This Government has been hiding. This Government has been hiding behind a front of very expensive publicity. Hiding behind a front of spending of great huge figures, enormous quantities of money. This captures the imagination of the people but where does it come? Hiding behind a front of review commissions, committees and so on, but no leadership on its own. Wait for somebody else to do it. Hope that some of the issues would eventually fade away on their own. Now here are just a few examples. Committees, commissions, reviews, and so on. A one man commission -- Quite a few years back. Since the Minister took us back 7 years I suppose I could take us back about 5 years -- a one man commission on margerine, and what was done? No action, no leadership there. One man commission on margerine. Another one, a one man commission which is sitting right now on the problem of retarded children. That's another commission. What about another one, a livestock marketing commission -- we just have the tables -- the reports. What about the highway planning committee? That's years back. Is the Government following it to the letter like many other instances commissions that were brought down reports? No. What about the labour of your committees? For three years they had to sit. What about another committee? Share -- the Sharing Program Select Committee which is to be There is no leadership, I would say, on the part of this Government. Yes, somebody mentioned Metro. There is another committee. The Minister dealt at length on Friday with the problems of the curriculum revision. He did say that the director of curricula and his committee are now engaged in a revision but the Minister was responsible and the new Minister now is responsible. Therefore, the former Minister should have shown more direction and more leadership. I don't think it is enough to say that we've solve the problem. You've got someone else working on that at the present time. It was the duty of the Minister -- I don't think there was leadership on that. Now speaking about the sales tax. When I look at the Attorney-General I can't help smiling because he's so affable and smiling. The Attorney-General says now he had to go way into Ottawa to defend the present policies. It wasn't enough here -- his policies -- and he insists -- Ottawa

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . and he insist -- that Ottawa have a mandate to bring in a sales tax. I presume he means a construction material sales tax; whatever he wishes to call it, it's a sales tax. He says the government had no mandate to introduce this sales tax. I'm not going to quarrel with him. That's the responsibility of Ottawa. I don't see really what the connection is between our party here but let us discuss this mandate and the sales tax. Our leader indicated, and I agree with him, that we are not in favour of a sales tax but the present government here -- not only that they did not have a mandate from the people of Manitoba -- mandate as such -- to increase and invent new taxes, but on top of that the present Government broke a solemn pledge given a few years back and repeated by the First Minister of this House -- a pledge not to increase taxation. Did the government get a mandate for that from the people of Manitoba? He brings the mandate in. I don't think the government did. Now let's look at some of them here. Did the government have a mandate from the people of Manitoba to spend some \$13,000,000 reserve left by the former government? They ate that up.-- they used that up without a mandate. Now what about the increase in gasoline tax? Did the present Government have a mandate from the people of Manitoba to increase tax on gasoline? No, I would say not; but they did it. When was the mandate given to the present government or the Leader of this House, the Premier -- the mandate to impose a new tax, a provincial income tax? Who gave the mandate? He just did it on his own. I don't think the people of Manitoba, just by voting, gave the mandate. No. It wasn't mentioned. What about all the kinds of dues, fees, licences, permits and so on? Did the people of Manitoba give this mandate to the Government? I would say no, there was no mandate. What about the mandate -- last tax -- the cigarette tax? Did the people of Manitoba give this government a mandate to impose this new tax? No, there was no mandate. No mandate for any of these, but still the present government keeps increasing taxes every year. I don't know whether there is -- I'm not going to presume that there will be a sales tax presented on Wednesday, or reported to us. I hope not. No mandate for any of these. But listen to this. Solemn pledges given by the First Minister and the first one -- a solemn pledge at Lac du Bonnet, pledged by the Premier, and this is exactly what he said as its reported in the papers -- "The Liberals are saying taxes will have to go up. They are wrong on that." It's not too solemn a pledge but listen to this one -- again on television, this is what he had to say; this is his quotation -- "Don't be frightened away from progressive government in Manitoba by this liberal talk of new taxes. I give you my solemn pledge that there will be no increase in taxes." That's where the solemn pledge comes. It wasn't a mandate, it was even a broken pledge. So talk about a mandate. Here they have no mandate and on top of that a broken solemn pledge given by the First Minister. When my leader says it is time to halt this burdensome increase in taxation I fully agree with him. This Government in many departments is a "do-nothing." The Government lacks leadership. It increases the burden of taxation every year without mandate from the people and it has made a farce of the Leader's solemn pledge. On top of this, the government is now, and has been for at least two years, robbing the aged. Therefore, it does not have the confidence of this House and neither does it have the confidence of the people of Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, in speaking to the amendment to the Speech from the Throne, and after hearing the last speaker talk of the "do-nothing" Government of Manitoba I do feel now is an opportunity for a Member from Gimli to have a few words if I may.

I do want to first of all, Madam Speaker, congratulate you on the service you are rendering to the people of Manitoba and to this Legislature, and the able way in which you are conducting the affairs of this House and I congratulate you most warmly on that point. I also want to congratulate the mover and seconders of the Speech from the Throne for their expression of faith in the administration and their happiness and the progressive way in which they presented the problems as they affect them in their own areas, and expressing confidence in the team to which they belong.

Madam Speaker, I hope to make my remarks short, but I hope to be to the point, which I've been accused from time to time of wandering from, but only in the interests of trying to explain a little better to the Members in the Opposition, and I had hoped you see over the years that the osmotic pressure would rise somewhat but every year I find that I have spoken for nought; because, about the most important matter it seems to them has been the switch in portfolios of some of us on this side and I can understand that, but I just say to them, you know

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . the first hundred years in Opposition they say are the toughest and there probably will be many more changes in the years to come, back and forth, in order to give the Ministers a better idea of affairs on this side of the House. However, I personally, Madam Speaker, have welcomed the opportunity to serve as the Member of a fine constituency and to have had the honour of serving on this side, both in the Department of Health and find a real challenge laying before all of us on this side in the field of Education and again I am very happy to have the opportunity to serve in this capacity. I don't think the Opposition should take too much happiness from the change in scenery enjoyed by some of the members on this side. We are a team effort over here and we will continue to remain that way. However, I do rise at this time after hearing, for example, the last speaker talk of the "do-nothing" Government -- the "no leadership" Government. It seems that we either go too fast or too slow for them, Madam Speaker, but I do want to say to my honourable friends opposite that they were accused of commissions in their day. I think we both must agree that the Royal Commission is a wonderful instrument of our British parliamentary system and I think we have used it judiciously on this side and I think it should be used from time to time in those matters of urgent public concern to give the widest consideration possible to all matters. I think it was -- ignored? -- well I think when the people of Manitoba -- of course they can talk all they want, but I think that the mandate that the people gave our group was a mandate for human betterment in the Province of Manitoba. And what have we done concerning human betterment? Well, since we came to office, let's take in the field of social welfare, we all know the story there, and I'm not talking of dollars and cents, I'm talking of people. Certainly the costs of administering programs have risen but we've made attempts through The Social Allowances Act and instruments of that nature, to bring the kind of help the aged people of this province required and desperately needed in 1958. We made vigorous attempts at producing the housing which we found would be so necessary -- elderly persons' housing and the hostel development programs and, as was announced in the House last year, more housing units were built in Manitoba than any other province in Canada last year under this type of program. Under the Social Allowances program I have not any more to say than the concept of need which was established in our legislation and was copied by most provinces in Canada. It was rather hilarious when pensions were raised the last time that the Federal Minister should admonish Manitoba in the administration of The Social Allowances Act. I found that was rather difficult to understand. However, I noticed that they got off that tack pretty quickly because, after all, we are administering in this province, without sharing from the federal authorities whatsoever, the present Social Allowances program. They also don't share of course in the medical care needs or the administration. We have seriously attempted to, and have succeeded in, administering a program of social welfare in this province based on the concept of the needs, and tests have proven its worth over and over again. We are meeting the actual problems and applying the large amounts of public assistance where they are required and when required, in addition to the across-the-board programs, of pensions and so on.

Now these things have -- and then we talk of no leadership -- nothing. I say again, what about Community Development, which has now grown, which the federal counterparts of the members opposite find most interesting. At the recent meeting that I attended in Ottawa in November, as the Minister of Health, it was Manitoba who were able to give some leadership at that level in discussing with the Honourable Mr. Favreau of Citizenship and Immigration at that time the concept behind Community Development, what might be achieved with it, our experience to date, and I'm happy to note that he was most interested and enthusiastic about this approach to this great problem facing the people of Indian ancestry in this province. He showed great insight I must confess, and I would look forward to more assistance from the federal authorities toward the Community Development program initiated in this province.

Well, when you talk of -- I can go on -- when you say there's no leadership, and I say we had a mandate for human betterment; let me remind the House of years ago, long before our time, or the time of any member of the House, it is interesting to note that in 1876 you know when the constituency which I have the honour to represent was then beyond the Province of Manitoba. The Legislature at that time debated at great length the reasons for the large expenditure of \$3,000 to control the small-pox epidemic which had broken out amongst the few settlers in Gimli. There was one road into the community, and they put a policeman on that

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . road to make the people coming out have a bath and change their clothes before they let them into Manitoba. But the Icelanders had friends and daughters at home and other children, so they came through the line quite often and went back with clothing to clothe the family, and of course this resulted in the expenditure of \$3,000.00. My understanding is they were so expensive the province thought they'd better bring them in, but the moral of my story is that here was the expenditure of \$3,000.00 contested with rate figures so many years ago, and I think it's one of the first recorded evidences in this Legislature of the terrible problems in preventative health which would face the Province in the future and for which they had to prepare.

However, I do say that that in preventative health programs -- let's be honest, the program was started on the right way, it just needed beefing up, it needed staff, and it needed to be developed and enhanced. And what was done about it? Northern Health Services was initiated. This was an area north of 53 that had had no provincial public health services prior to 1959, where a great need was crying out for prevention, treatment and cure. These steps were taken, especially in the preventative field. Again, what about the facilities created in the last few years? I think Manitoba, for a million people, can be proud of the kind of facilities she has created within the four borders of this province; a beautiful new cancer facility where the Blue Cross funds were diverted and enhanced by government grants, which is a two million dollar treatment and research centre, the finest of its kind; a re-hab. hospital, probably unequalled in Canada and most of North America in content for its size and efficiency in concept of service. New additions, for example, to the major teaching hospitals in Winnipeg; the service wing at the Winnipeg General which was a tremendous undertaking; the major hospitals at major centres, Brandon, Dauphin; many smaller hospitals enlarged and enhanced at key points throughout the province; the fact that expended treatment concepts as outlined in the Willard Commission was adopted. It's understandable that everyone would like to see their facilities enhanced by the development of extended treatment hospitals overnight, but of course this is not possible. It's understandable that this will have to come on a year-to-year basis, but the program's there. The province is on the right track. The blueprints are down and they know where they're going.

These are pretty wonderful things and, despite the Hospital Plan which came in as a premature infant in its early days and had walking and growing pains, I would say that universal hospitalization is here to stay. It's a fact of life. It's a fact of Manitoba life today. It's a fact of life across Canada today. It has much to benefit and this administration I think cannot be accused of not giving leadership, of not being interested in the patient, in human betterment. This has been our policy right from the beginning. And we made a start in Medicare along sensible lines, in partnership with the professional group who felt compelled, and were anxious to enter a partnership to meet the needs of those direct responsibilities of this administration. And where research and time and effort and evolution, and not the revolution my honourable friend preaches, will eventually come to pass, and we will . . . see the preservation of those things that are good in Manitoba medicine today. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and we'll stick to quality and you can have your quantity, sir. And this is about it, Madam Speaker.

However, I'm not going to go on at great length there. I just want to point out some other things that this government, that is showing no leadership, that's done nothing. The St. Amant Ward in Community Mental Health, 125 capacity, one of the finest, in fact the finest, expressed by many experts in the field as unequalled in Canada for progress. The Community Mental Health program mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. That work wasn't known in this Province until this Government came to office. There were three people in Community Mental Health program in 1921; there were 16,000 being treated as out-patients in the Community Mental Health Program last year, some 3,000 in '58. It's busting out all over with service, the more and better service, the more and better and greater demand for these services. Little did we think a few years ago; because, Madam Speaker, the Government doesn't take full credit for these wonderful cures or the wonderful break-throughs that have been made in mental health, but I think we have the satisfaction of knowing, and the people of Manitoba should have the satisfaction of knowing, that we were concerned enough about their betterment and about this whole problem, to give it the emphasis it deserved and to give

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . the people within our service the support in funds, the moral and financial support, to break out with these new concepts and take advantage of them. There were 1,250 people in one of our large mental hospitals in '58 but these newer concepts have reduced the patient population below 1,000, despite an increased patient case-load that is staggering. And in that particular hospital this spring will open a brand new community mental health facility, a unique experiment in mental health. The two large hospitals now have many teams going out from them servicing the community, and more are anticipated, I am happy to see in the Speech from the Throne. New cottages are coming up at Portage . . . three cottages for certain types of mental deficiency, rather than too much in the way of bricks and mortar. Here it is hoped more service, more of the newer concepts of treatment and care can be given to the boys and girls in that institution.

Now, Madam Speaker, when we hear this is the Government that has done nothing, this is the Government that has not given the necessary leadership, I say this is the Government that has concerned itself primarily in the first instance with those measures which would bring about a betterment of the human values of the . . . in this province. I am happy to say that the Opposition opposite, whenever we have critical matters dealing with the human betterment of the people of this province, do stand up and vote with us. I just hope and pray they stand up and say these things during the Speech from the Throne, and encourage us in that way, because these are the things that count to the folks, and this is the attitude and the progress and the way we should be talking about these things that are so close to all of us.

In rehabilitation, need it be said across Canada the wonderful partnership arrangement which exists between the voluntary and the government agencies in the field of rehabilitation in this province is looked upon as a model. This comes from the federal authorities without solicitation. They send the other provinces here to watch it in operation. The kind of partnership that exists for example, between the Society for Crippled Children and Adults and the various voluntary groups and the provincial government, where in the last year, was opened the new pre-school centre for the deaf and spastic children. This is the concept of this partnership that exists between 38 voluntary help agencies in this province, all of whom are co-ordinated by a very excellent director. This program, I frankly admit, began in 1954, and has been developing and enhanced from year to year, and is breaking out all over now that it steps into the field of mental illness, and we see the opportunities there under vocational training and other agreements to make this an even finer rehabilitation agency and concept that we are pursuing in this province.

No, Madam Speaker, I think it is primarily government's role to create the atmosphere, to do those things that the voluntary agencies can't do, but to lend that support and maintain that partnership arrangement between the people and the agencies that are in various fields of endeavour and ourselves. This is our prime job as a government. It's a job which I have been happy to participate in as a member of the team on this side of the fence. I also feel that the remarks made during the Throne Speech on the Department of Education are indeed really happy remarks. They are all commending the Government for their vision and for their effort in getting on with the job of vocational training, technical training, of breaking out again all over with new programs and new endeavours. And this is the way it should be. I know that every member in this House stood up and voted for the larger school divisions, which have created the kind of facilities, Madam Speaker, throughout this province, where the boys and girls can stay at home and receive excellent instruction and prepare themselves much better than they could in the past, because they are in adequate facilities, and I've had the pleasure since becoming Minister, of opening three 13-room high schools in 24 hours in the Swan River Valley, and I'm telling you, Madam Speaker, it was a stimulating experience to see the kind of facilities--gymnasium class room, and the calibre of teaching staff who will be able to prepare these boys and girls for brighter and brighter futures. And the challenge is up to us, Madam Speaker, and this Government appreciates and is experiencing the need for a host of different programs; and of course the basic training program is off the deck. There are now, I can say, about 800 unemployed people in our upgrading classes--basic field classes--and we're going to go on from there; but this is the sort of thing that government must be sensitive to; this is the proper role of government in a province such as ours.

But, Madame Speaker, I don't think we in the Province of Manitoba, any of us, should feel at all reticent about expressing our pride in the many measures which this government has

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . supported and bent their backs to in the last few years. And many of these we share with the members of the Opposition. Many of these they have supported, and this is proper. Their job is to criticize. I feel that this is quite proper, of course, but when we are referred to as a "do-nothing" group, then Madam Speaker, surely this requires rebuttal when we think, and we should be proud as I say, of our schools, of our hospitals, of our welfare programs, of our community mental health program, of our northern health services, of our teachers, doctors, lawyers, whatever they are in the Province of Manitoba. We're breaking out all over; we'll keep breaking out all over; and I imagine the honourable members opposite will probably be there for many years to see Ministers come and go from one portfolio to the other.

However, Madam Speaker, this is all I wish to say at this time. But I do welcome the Honourable members to -- be honest, fellas; let's get together and tell the people that we have met the needs of Manitoba and we're proud of these several areas of endeavour.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable minister a question. Could he tell us the source of the community development program that he expounded on at great length?

MR. JOHNSON: That was a commission, ordered by the previous administration, on Indian Affairs. It gave an excellent report and we implemented that report as written. This is the privilege of Government -- to take or not to take. If it's good we take them, if they're no good we don't take them.

. continued next page

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Thank you, Madam Speaker. As one of the younger members of this House it gives me quite an education to listen to the three different points of view that come forth, and from limited experience only, I will add my few words to this debate. One of the first things that struck me on the business of this House, as it is transacted and that is the position the NDP Party take from time to time. They seem to run from one side of the House to the other, so to speak. If it suits them at the particular time they stand up and they praise and give thanks to the ministers for what has been done, and other times they turn and snarl at the people on their right. They never seem to really hold true to a position for any great length of time.

I would like to pay tribute to the mover and the seconder of this debate, Madam Speaker, on the cheery, friendly way that they gave forth with their remarks as if all was well in the Province of Manitoba; there was nothing to worry about. And, oh, one of them made a remark that struck me as rather odd, and I believe it was the member from Dufferin, when he said he hoped some members of this House had changed their mind about Grand Rapids since they had been on the trip in the past year. I was wondering just exactly what he meant, although I think maybe he was trying to read a meaning in there that wasn't there, and I'm thinking now of last year and the Grand Rapids debate that took place here on what was called then an unconscionable contract. If he was referring to this, I think he will find that the members on this side have not changed their minds about that particular facet of the whole affair. I don't think there was any disagreement from any members in this House that I know of who were against the initiating of the whole Grand Rapids project.

On going over the remarks made by the seconder, the Honourable member from Kildonan, I find that he touched briefly -- and to quote his words -- first of all I didn't know what he was talking about, but he had skipped daintily through the daisies onto the next subject -- and it was something -- I guess it was about the school question in Manitoba -- and he said that it was a relationship between the public school system and the private school system that was very close to him personally. Before there was any more information, I guess it was time to move on to another subject there, I don't know, but I was wondering what he meant by that remark. Perhaps he could cast some light on it, if this committee is appointed to deal with this very sore question that is troubling Manitoba.

I would like to take issue with what one of the Ministers said -- I believe it was the former Minister of Education and he is now the new Attorney-General, I believe -- and he was speaking grandly about what had been done in the schools in the Education Department under his tenure. I was struck by statements that have come out, in the past month I believe it was, when the First Minister of this province again promised Brandon a Junior Vocational School. I believe this is the second or third time this promise has been made and I know the people of Brandon are getting a little anxious. I understand the people at The Pas have been promised one of these schools, and we may be excused on this side and also I would think in the back bench of the Government itself, if there was not some concern shown for the rest of the province in this regard.

I believe it has been freely admitted by the minister, and others, that there is a gap in our educational system, that is the grades up to grade 9, and this gap is showing in all parts of the province, not only in Brandon or The Pas. I am sure St. James, Transcona, Portage la Prairie, Flin Flon, and other larger market areas, Swan River for instance, would like very much to come in under this program, and it is with a little puzzlement that I wonder why this administration didn't take any advantage to speak of, of the proposition put forth by the Government in Ottawa where 75% of the construction cost of schools of this nature were supplied and the province only put up 25%. I can't understand, myself, why Ontario would take advantage to the extent they did, I believe into the hundreds of millions of dollars, and Manitoba took advantage to only rebuild one school of a technical nature.

Another thing that I have noticed in the past year -- of which I am speaking now from my own experience -- last session there was a Bill put forward to this House for the regulation of the television repair people, and at the time it was being discussed in this House I believe it was pointed out that it appeared that this Bill was inadequate. All it was doing was setting up rather a loose set of standards and from then on these people pretty well ran

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

their own show. There was no clauses to do with enforcement. There was no protection for the public other than a \$10 license fee which the government took for writing the exam. I don't know what the nature of this particular Bill was. It certainly didn't supply any more technical education to the television repair business. All it did was register them, probably, and encompass them under this Bill, but with no particular meaning. I am referring now to an article in the Free Press of January 9, where Alderman Claydon of the City of Winnipeg says he is ashamed to be associated with the television repair business, and he knows that people of Manitoba have no protection whatsoever. All the regulation this Bill has done is given a cloak to a few unscrupulous operators who can mulct the people at will. There is no provision for inspection, seeing how their work meets the moral and the legal laws of the province. In other words, these few people flourish more greatly than they ever did. I'm sure that the people in the television business would like very much to have these people who are fleecing the public and making it difficult for bona fide operators to operate, I am sure they would like to have regulations in their business.

Now, Madam Speaker, I would like to turn for a moment to this delegation that came from Portage la Prairie in here last Wednesday to meet with the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture. I believe a new precedent was -- or a precedent rather was involved then, at least upon enquiry among the older members, I find it's the first time a delegation received coffee and doughnuts. Now we know that the First Minister has a talent for smooth words. It has been called leadership, yes, but I believe in this case it was the attempt at the soft answer to turneth away the wrath. Probably this was the reason for the coffee and doughnuts, I don't know. These people, when they came in with their objections -- and I don't wish to harry old ground by enumerating every particular objection they have -- but I am suggesting to this government, Madam Speaker, that the people of this area feel the price they are asked to pay is too high, and they are asking serious reconsideration for this particular piece of government work.

I would like to list briefly some of their objections and perhaps explain one or two. One of the objections they raised is the number of acres of fine farm land that will be taken out of production. I read in a government release it was 2,800 acres, but by measuring what the surveyors are doing and rough calculations, it could be 4,000 acres, so somewhere in between I presume is where the actual amount of acreage lies. I am suggesting that this is taking out of production forever, and taking off the tax roll forever, money that would amount to around \$100,000 a year that will be lost to the economy of Manitoba.

I would like to raise an objection to the minister's people who do the soil testing in that area. We were assured last year that the soil testing had been done, was satisfactory, and they were proceeding as the route was then marked out, I would like at this time to thank some of the members of PFRA office at Regina whom I spoke with, along with other members from Portage, and I found at that time that the soil testing did not answer the questions that we had to raise, and it was as a result of that trip, I believe, that more extensive soil testing was made; that more close attention was paid to the rise and fall of the water level -- the water table of that area; and I believe that anything we have to thank for taking the proposed route of the Portage diversion away from Portage la Prairie, we humbly direct our thanks to the people of PFRA at Regina who took note of our objections and I understand had them checked out.

Another item that is irritating to say the least, to the people in my area, is the amount of misinformation that has been given out at meetings . . .

MR. CARROLL: Here, here, you can say that again.

MR. JOHNSTON: I certainly can, and I'll say it again. I would like to give an example of some of the questions that were asked and the answers that were given. If the members here will recall that at one time this government proposed a Holland dam, and then for reasons that we have since heard, they changed their mind. On a public platform the question was asked of Mr. Griffiths, of the Water Conservation section I believe it is: "Why could not the Holland Dam be reconsidered?" He stated that in his opinion the dam would have possible flaws in it and there was a possibility of water coming down from any breakage in the dam and endangering downstream people. Yet we read in other parts of government literature that the Holland dam is on the books for consideration for the year 2000. Now this brings to light a hypothetical question, I suppose. Either our engineers will be better by the year 2000, or

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd)... perhaps they might want to drown and take out more people by the year 2000, I don't know which.

It has been said in this House and it has been said in news reports that due consideration has been given to the effects of the diversion on the basin of Lake Manitoba or the neighbouring area. It has been said that there has been an adequate study made of the results of the proposed effects of this works on the Delta marshes, on the lake level itself, on the water table in the area, on the effects to the wild life of the area. Madam Speaker, I contend that there has been only lip service paid to this serious question. Yes, we have been told that there have been studies made. We haven't had a report of these studies; we don't know how deep they were, how all-encompassing they were. We don't know anything.

In support of this contention I have here a letter from a person who is well known and highly respected in his work in the wild life of Manitoba, and it says in part: "Thanks for your letter of January 27, in which you present details regarding the proposed new course of the Assiniboine River diversion. Your map clearly explains this new route and I am grateful for this information. I am surprised that you were given to understand that the influence of this diversion on wild life and recreation has been resolved. Our staff met with members of the Manitoba Department of Mines and Natural Resources on January 17 last, and this group had just learned of the new route, indeed by way of the Portage la Prairie Graphic. The man on the street had more information on the new route than the staff of the Manitoba Games Branch. It was also made clear at our meeting with the Department of Mines and Natural Resources that there are many possible adverse influences of the diversion on wildlife and recreation that are not yet understood, because no study had been made of these aspects of the problem. Actually, the new route does not change the picture in regard to wildlife and recreation at all. The major, and as yet unstudied influence, will be the flood of water to Lake Manitoba in the high water years. This will pose the same problems regardless of the route the diversion follows. It is clear that this diversion is being rushed through, regardless of the unknown consequences on the vast natural resource values of the Lake Manitoba basin. To me, the saddest feature of this whole venture is that statements having no foundation in fact are apparently being made to the public in regard to the influence of the diversion on natural resources. It is certainly not true that the wild life and recreational aspects of the diversion on natural resources. It is certainly not true that the wild life and recreational aspects of the diversion have been carefully and satisfactorily considered." Perhaps I'm going to be asked to table this letter, and I will do so on the acknowledgment of the author. If he is agreeable, I will certainly table it.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, my honourable friend has read a letter into the record and I ask him right now to table that letter, with or without the approval of the author. If he didn't have that approval he'd better not have read it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member read the letter and he is obliged to table it.

MR. JOHNSTON: I'll table it. I'm sure that he would like to have this tabled. Mr. Hochbaum, Director of Research, the Delta Waterfowl Station.

Madam Speaker, one of the interesting sidelights of this Throne debate took place, I believe yesterday, when the then Minister of Education took it upon himself to try and embarrass the leader of the Liberal group as to why he wouldn't appear on television, and I believe that was amply answered when our leader got up and challenged him to substantiate a statement, and after much groping around, the Minister couldn't find anything else to go on, and the only thing he could attack him on was the action of another jurisdiction, the Government in Ottawa. Yet I contend, Madam Speaker, if that is all these ministers can rebut with, they are stating their case from very weak grounds. Thank you.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity, Madam Speaker, just to put the record straight on two or three points, but first I take the opportunity to congratulate you and to extend to you my best wishes for your continuing success in carrying out your responsibilities to the benefit of the people of Manitoba. I would also like to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. They did an admirable job.

Madam Speaker, there has been so much confusion about the water control program of

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... this government and one which I am responsible for administering, that I think I should rise and reply to some of the statements made by the honourable member for Portage. I want to make one thing abundantly clear, that it wasn't PFRA who moved the diversion from the original location to the one that is now proposed as being in the best interest of Portage and community. The fact is that nobody knew at any time -- nobody knew at any time, until a very few weeks ago, where the best location would be for the proposed diversion of the Assiniboine into Lake Manitoba.

PFRA, in their original studies and on the basis of their preliminary engineering studies, had suggested and recommended that it take the route that everyone is familiar with, the Fort Lorraine route, which came out adjacent to the City of Portage, just west of the City of Portage, and proceeded north along the railway tracks. The soil testing was carried out under the supervision of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture and Conservation, and it was discovered on the basis of the soil tests that the original location proposed some very difficult engineering problems and so alternative routes were examined, soil drilling was done, soil tests were carried out; and it was on the basis of this entire data that the engineers agreed or reached their consensus of agreement that the best possible location in terms of efficiency of the proposed waterway, in terms of costs and so forth, was the location that they now recommend, which comes out approximately 2,000 feet west of the water tower which serves the City of Portage, proceeds northwest and takes a northerly route in a line about 2 1/2 miles west of the City of Portage.

To say that it was due to the influence or pressure of PFRA that this location was decided upon is entirely without any basis in fact. That is the only way I can put it. As a matter of fact, there were certain engineering aspects of the Portage diversion which were difficult, because it is true that there is a problem with soils in the Portage area, and we had to be mighty sure, after giving the assurances that we had, that the interests of the people of the City of Portage and the surrounding countryside would be protected. We had to be mighty sure that the proposal that we made did in fact protect their best interests, and it's only after very prolonged engineering studies that the engineers were prepared to make the recommendation for the final location. To give you some idea of how critical the soil condition is in that area, I might tell you that where the engineers recommend that the diversion be constructed on the west side of the road running north from the Mount Pleasant School, they will not recommend that it be built on the east side. The soils and the changes in the soil conditions are that critical in the Portage area. But they do feel that they can recommend safely, and on the basis of sound engineering principles and information, that it be constructed in its presently proposed location.

Another point that I want to clarify is that this department went out and said that we were changing the proposed location in the general area of the Delta marshes. The original location and the one recommended, given top priority by the wildlife people and the Department of Mines and Natural Resources was originally associated with the earlier proposed channel which lay 2 1/2 miles east of the one that we now recommend. It meant that to connect the new route of the Portage diversion to the No. 1 priority of the Mines and Natural Resources people, there had to be more severance and of an adverse nature to the farmers' concern than if we were able to run the Portage diversion straight north into the lake. And so, in an effort to try and reduce the adverse effects of the Portage diversion, the engineers explored the possibility of designing a channel straight into the lake which would meet the objections and meet the demands of the wildlife people in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. That decision has not yet been made. It wasn't made at the time that I visited Portage together with the engineers to discuss this matter. It was an alternative at that time, and it still remains an alternative to the No. 1 choice of the wildlife people. If we can give them assurance that we can meet the demands that they make on us, then we will be able to reduce the adverse effects on the local residents and take it straight in. If, however, we are unable to meet the demands of the wildlife people, then we're going to have to revert to their original No. 1 choice. But this decision has not been made finally as yet.

As for the reasons given for the Holland Dam and this charge that you can't reconcile the answers given by the Department, I would just like to say this, that the Honourable Member for Portage has reinforced -- albeit he didn't mean to -- but he has reinforced the government's

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) . . . stand that the Holland Dam cannot be built at this time. First of all, the PFRA engineers in their report to us in 1961 indicated there would have to be drastic limitations put on the size of any reservoir constructed in that area because of the soil conditions. It was absolutely unsafe to go to a very large reservoir. Secondly, from an economics point of view, one couldn't justify the construction of that reservoir at this time, and it was on the basis of the information that we had, it appeared that the waters which might be held in that reservoir would not be needed until at least the year 2000. It seems to me that it is not difficult to reconcile these reasons that are given; they compliment one another.

This has not been an easy question, or an easy decision for the Government to make, and certainly it hasn't been an easy program to carry out. As a matter of fact, everybody has a cross to bear and mine seems to be the Portage diversion. But I would just like to say here, that whenever the public moves ahead in the field of public policy, whenever something is achieved, some sacrifice has to be made, and I don't care whether it's a local drainage ditch some place or a small stop-watering dam or a larger reservoir or a floodway, in order that the majority may benefit a minority must pay a price, and the only thing that the Government can do is to try and compensate these people so that the impact on them is not an unfair one. We have tried to do this in the case of the Red River diversion, and I believe that there is good reason to believe that the vast majority of the people that we have dealt with out in that area now feel that the Government has been fair with them. Yes, they now feel that the Government has been fair with them. I know that 100 percent aren't happy, but you have to be pretty good to back 100 percent in the field of public relations. But I think the majority of these people are satisfied that they have received fair treatment from their Government here in Manitoba.

In the case of the Shellmouth reservoir, I actually tremble, Madam Speaker, when I think of the impact of this public works upon that community who will lose -- in the first place, the municipalities will lose a large percentage of their assessment. I know of one ranch up there belonging to one of the outstanding pure-bred breeders in Manitoba -- a beautiful place, a Ponderosa -- and when this project is completed, that farm will be under 60 feet of water. There are going to be about 30,000 acres of land flooded in Manitoba and Saskatchewan through the construction of that project. And you know, Madam Speaker, I don't care whether you've got the best land in Manitoba, the Portage Plains, or whether you've got a gravel ridge or a piece of gumbo that I farm out at Rockwood, it makes no difference to the individual how you class his land, it's all dear to those who own it; and if you've made your home in one place in Manitoba for fifty years, that piece of land is just as dear to you as the best piece of land anywhere in this province is to the owner there. And I have just as much compassion, every bit as much compassion, for the people up in Shellmouth who had to break up their long standing time, who had to move right out of the district, who are going to see their little community disrupted and destroyed to a far greater extent than the people in the Portage Plains. Now how can we on the one hand applaud the construction of a public project that is going to dislocate so many people, and so far as the local people are concerned, cause them so much disappointment and, I suppose, heartbreak? If these people have to accommodate the general public in Manitoba, then I think it's fair to ask all people to make the same sacrifice when it is in the public interest that a public project be carried out.

We will attempt to treat the people at Shellmouth fairly and to compensate them fairly for the sacrifice that they're making for the rest of the people of Manitoba. We will extend the same treatment to the farmers, the land owners in the Portage la Prairie district. We will extend the same treatment when we come to build the Antler reservoir in southwest Manitoba. Those people don't want to lose their valley either. To every man, it's "How Green Was My Valley", and it makes no difference where you are in Manitoba, they're all first class citizens and they're all going to get the same treatment. And this applies in compensation; it also applies when it comes to making sacrifices at the local level, because we cannot call upon one group in Manitoba to make sacrifices in the public interest without being prepared to ask all other Manitobans to make sacrifices under similar circumstances.

Now I haven't anything else to say at this time, Madam Speaker. I'm one of those Ministers who is "between the ears" and in the girth and nowhere else, according to the Honourable Member from Emerson. But I want to say this, that it has been a great privilege for me to serve the people of Manitoba under the leadership of our First Minister and in

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... association with my fellow colleagues in the Cabinet and backed up by such a wonderful group of representatives as we have in our caucus. Despite the charges that are made by the Opposition, which are rather vague and hazy, and despite their continuing warnings and their apprehensions, I believe that with this group of able people and with the co-operation of the people of Manitoba, that we can achieve greater things for this province.

There's one request I have to make of the Opposition, Madam Speaker, and it's this. I think that an Opposition has a responsibility to the people which, although different to that of the government in some respects, is just as important and one which I feel has not been forthcoming from the Opposition here in the Province of Manitoba. I think that they have more to do than just to oppose. I think that they could do well to offer some worthwhile and constructive alternatives to the proposals that are made by this government. It is rather difficult, Madam Speaker, when you don't even get the stimulation of a new thought from the Opposition, when you don't even get the help of an odd prod in the right direction, and I think that rather than criticize the government for this and for that, they might turn their critical gaze to themselves and come forward with some real constructive ideas and help us to improve what I believe is good government in Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Minister who has just spoken? He referred to a PFRA report in 1961 re the Holland Dam. Was this report published and given the members of the House?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, the report is published and I am sure it is available to the members of the House.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the Minister would make it available to the members, Madam Speaker.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the speaker would permit a question -- The Honourable Minister of Agriculture? It's my understanding that the Shellmouth Dam is being carried out in its entirety by PFRA. They're calling the contracts; buying the land and overseeing the construction. Could the Minister tell this House why this is not the case with the Assiniboine River proposal?

MR. HUTTON: Well, Madam Speaker, when the agreement was made between the Province of Manitoba and Canada for the construction of the Assiniboine River control projects, it was agreed that PFRA would be responsible for the engineering and construction of the Shellmouth Reservoir because the PFRA are the acknowledged experts in reservoir dam construction in Canada. They have had more experience than anyone else. They were given that responsibility in the case of the Shellmouth Reservoir with the exception of the purchase of land in Manitoba. The reason for the exception of the purchase of land was that we feel that the expropriation legislation under which the province would be acquiring land is more helpful to the land owner than the legislation under which the land could be acquired by the PFRA.

It was also agreed that the Province of Manitoba would be responsible for engineering and constructing the Portage diversion because our engineers are rather expert, and I think I can say that with some pride and you can share that pride, that our engineers in the Province of Manitoba are quite expert in the construction of channels. They have a long history and experience behind them in the construction of channels and drainage in Manitoba, therefore, they were best suited by training experience and so forth to carry out this work and that is the reason why the work was divided. Now we unfortunately, Madam Speaker, lost our Soils Engineer very suddenly here in Manitoba and Soils Engineers are very hard to come by. We have not yet been able to replace our Soils Engineer and at this time PFRA are assisting us in carrying out the soil studies that are required in designing the Portage Diversion channel. Now this is the breakdown of responsibility between the two projects.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the suggestion by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation that the Opposition should furnish him with some suitable alternatives and should propose alternative projects when they make criticisms of present plans, leads me to take part in this debate very briefly. I have the feeling still that there are alternatives which can be proposed, alternatives which, it seems to me, have not been fully explored.

The Honourable the Minister has made quite a moving suggestion about the attachment of farmers to their land and how they are loathe to see them taken for projects even though those projects be in the public interest, and he has enunciated the perfectly proper view, I think,

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)... and policy, that the people, the farmers will be dealt with in these various projects, regardless of their location, fairly and in exactly the same manner. I'm all in favour of that and I wouldn't for a moment suggest that the people of the Portage la Prairie area are asking for any special consideration. They are not opposing this proposal because of the fact that their own lands are personally affected. It's not because of a personal interest. It is because they honestly and sincerely believe that this is not in the public interest. The people whose lands were to be taken by the first location of this diversion are opposing it just as strongly now that the location has been moved away from their lands as they were before. Why? Not because of their personal interest, but because they really recognize the magnitude of this whole water control and conservation program and they really believe that there is a better way of doing this same thing.

They recognize, and indeed it's been before the public recently in so many forms, that water and the conservation of water is going to be increasingly important in this province and in this country in years to come. You have only to notice the international discussions that have been in progress with regard to the Columbia River power and the question of whether it should or should not be sent into the United States to see even the international ramifications of water conservation and control. And very able engineers in our neighboring provinces to the west are still prepared and preparing to put forth a gallant battle in order to suggest that the Columbia River waters should not be allowed to go south, but that they will sometime be needed in the national interest to come to the east and come down to the prairies where they are needed now and will be needed more greatly in the future.

In this whole matter of water conservation that is at issue in this Portage la Prairie diversion, the one point I think that the folks out there place more stress on than any other is this question: Is it better conservation of the water that is coming and is going to come down the Assiniboine River from the west, to hold it up behind dams -- and I always suggest a series of dams rather than just one dam or two big dams -- to hold it up behind a series of dams and keep it there for when it is needed, or to facilitate its short-cut out to Lake Manitoba and sent into Lake Winnipeg and sent to the Hudsons Bay?

Now if the people there were not convinced that this matter of conserving water by the building of dams is a better solution than the other one, they, I'm sure, would be willing to bow to the public interest and to withdraw in very large part the objections that they have, but they are firmly convinced on the other side of the case that it is better to conserve that water. My honourable friend, the Minister and I, have already engaged in this discussion in the House and in its committees on more than one occasion and the end is not yet, I am sure. We will have more to say to one another. But I pose to him once again the question: What about the evaporation on Lake Manitoba? My honourable friend likes to say that this is a conservation measure because we will conserve this water by putting it out on that great storage basin of Lake Manitoba, in spite of the fact that in an average summer two feet of water are taken by evaporation from Lake Manitoba, because it is a shallow lake; because the full surface is exposed.

Now my honourable friend can say perfectly truthfully that that evaporation is going on anyway. Correct. But we're talking about the water that is coming down and is going to come down for centuries to come along the Assiniboine River. That amount of water is what we are dealing with. Now where is the best place to put it, in the name of conservation. Is it to hurry it out to Lake Manitoba where it will be exposed, in a very shallow body of water with a 2,000 square mile surface, to the elements to go off into the atmosphere in evaporation, or is it to hold it up in narrow, deep pools behind a series of dams. I maintain, it is difficult I know for the average layman to argue against the expert opinion of the engineers, but I have the conviction and the people out there share this conviction, not because I told them this but because they have arrived at this point of view from their own experience and their own study of these matters, because they have been studying it very carefully, that the better way is to hold that water up behind a series of dams, and we feel that the question of the series of dams has not been thoroughly explored. If there's difficulty about building the Holland Dam with the huge quantities of storage that have been suggested for it -- 630 thousand acre feet or something of that order, I believe -- if that is endangered by the foundations that exist, then for goodness sake let us take another look at a series of dams further back, because from Portage la Prairie

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)... on west there are many places where water can be impounded. Our people say it is not conservation to run this water out to the lake and expose it to that measure of evaporation when it can be held behind a series of dams. I'm no engineer, but I have the feeling that a series of small dams could be built, would be safe, and would be cheaper than the other.

Now, Madam Speaker, this is a great position for a member of the House to be in, because I have people in my constituency who honestly and sincerely support this argument that I am making; I have many people, I think more than the others in my constituency, who support the proposal for the Portage la Prairie diversion, and that's a position that a politician would always wish to avoid. If this one can't be avoided, and I have said to the people in the east end of my constituency, said to them quite honestly, if I were not certain, if I were not convinced in my own mind and by everything that I have studied and read on this matter that alternatives to the flooding control that is inherent in the Portage la Prairie diversion, if alternatives could not be found for the flooding control, then I would certainly withdraw my objection to this plan, because I am aware of the difficulty that the people in the east end of my constituency have suffered from flooding. I have said this quite frankly to them, but I also believe, in spite of what my honourable friend the Minister says here, that you can have both water conservation and flood control.

We'll be going into this at a later occasion no doubt, but I am convinced, and so are the people who formed this delegation the other day and many others who join with them, that from the point of view of conservation there is no question that building of storage dams -- and I say a series of them -- is much superior as far as flood control is concerned by holding the water up; and while the Holland dam may be too big for the kind of foundations that there are there, the fact is that the Holland dam, Madam Speaker, as proposed, the Holland dam alone would take the whole flow -- the whole flow of the Assiniboine River at flood stage for three weeks.

My honourable friend says you can't have both conservation and flood control, but it seems to the layman most simple, that you would lower the water in there in the fall so as to make it available to perform flood control in the spring. Well I'm not arguing the technical operation now. If I were not convinced that flood control measures can be combined with conservation, then I would go along and say let's protect the follows who need the flood control. I'm sure they can, but the point I got up to make is that these Portage la Prairie people, and incidentally a good many of the farmers who have taken part here are in the constituency of the honourable member for Portage la Prairie and not Lakeside -- but a good many of them are also in Lakeside -- I'm certain that those people and the Portage la Prairie people too would not be found in the ranks of those who, if convinced that a matter was in the public interest, would oppose it because of any local self-interest. They oppose this plan because they are convinced it is not in the public interest. They are sure, as I am sure, that it does not deserve the name of conservation, and conservation is going to be more and more important as time goes on in the Province of Manitoba.

Once again, I suggest to my honourable friend for whose practical approach to matters I have a good deal of respect, that he get the PFRA and his own engineers -- and I endorse what he said that we have capable men even though I appear to differ with their conclusions at times -- I admit that according to their light and training they are capable men, but get them to take another look at the conservation aspect and the question of a series of dams. And I must once again re-emphasize that the people who are making, still making representations against this program even though the route has been changed so that their land is not affected now, are not in any way actuated by personal, selfish, or other unworthy motives. They are actuated one hundred percent by what their assessment is of the public interest.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I know of one or two other speakers who would wish to be heard in this debate. I wonder what the reaction would be to calling it 5:30.

MR. PAULLEY: Favourable in this corner.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition would care to say.

MR. MOLGAT: 5:30 is fine by us.

MR. EVANS: Well then, if it is agreeable to the House, Madam, perhaps you would care to call it 5:30.

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