

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 26, 1966

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

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the Table of the House a Return to an Order No. 44 on the motion of the Honourable the Member from Ste. Rose, and also Return to an Order of the House No. 36 on the motion of the Honourable the Member from Ste. Rose.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I may direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister? Could you indicate when the Committee on Law Amendments might be meeting in order to consider Bill 41?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, this matter has been given some consideration and my colleague, who's not here tonight, tells me that he does not intend to proceed with the Bill.

MR. PAULLEY: Does that mean, Madam Speaker, that there will not be changes to The Election Act before the next provincial election?

MR. ROBLIN: I can't answer that question.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wonder if the Honourable First Minister is now prepared to give me an answer to the question I put to him on the Orders of the Day at 2:30 re Bill 118 and the Bill 95.

MR. ROBLIN: I haven't got that information yet.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, a subsequent question. If we prorogue tonight - there is a likelihood I suspect - how do I get the answer then?

MR. ROBLIN: I'll be glad to give it to my honourable friend when I get the information.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member from Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, before 5:30 we were speaking about the desirability of constructing a road from Portage la Prairie to Windygates on the border of North Dakota, and the motion was amended by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia to the effect that construction should start in 1966, and the government saw fit to vote this motion down.

Madam Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of Members of the House an announcement that was made by the Honourable Minister of Public Works at that time. This would be September 23rd, 1964, in Portage la Prairie, and I quote the headlines, "Weir Outlines Department Plans." And if I may quote from part of the news report. This is at a meeting of the Portage City Council, Portage Chamber of Commerce representatives and representatives of people south of Portage who were interested in this particular road. And I quote: "The meeting received a pleasant surprise from Mr. Weir when he replied to a further query by Mr. Inglis concerning the long-awaited road south from Portage to connect with Southern Manitoba. Mr. Inglis asked when a connecting road from Portage to Highway 31 could be expected, and the Minister assured in the not too distant future."

Madam Speaker, there can be various interpretations put upon the words "connecting road", but at that time in 1964, September 23rd, we had a "road". We are not arguing that point at all. We had a road that with some perseverance you could get down and arrive at St. Claude, and through various other roads that connected up, one could arrive at the border. But I would draw the attention of the House to the words "the meeting had received a pleasant surprise from Mr. Weir." In other words, Mr. Weir, in my opinion, - I was at that meeting - had promised more than just a little upgrading, although he didn't say it. The road is still there, but outside of a few loads of gravel, it definitely has not been upgraded, and I submit, Madam Speaker, that the people of Portage la Prairie and the people south of Portage were led to believe by this statement that there would be at least an all-weather market road, if not

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) asphalt paving, and this is why I brought in my resolution. The people of Portage and district were led to expect that there would be a definite upgrading of the road and this is why I bring in my resolution at this time.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House, the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak, and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Bilton, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Moeller, Roblin, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 13; Nays, 22.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, it is not my intention to take up a great deal of time of the House tonight in discussing this motion that is before us tonight. I listened with some care to the Honourable Member for Portage when he introduced it and it seems that he has resurrected, for what purpose I don't know, a pretty well-chewed old bone that lost all of its meat last year, and I don't know that there's too much more that can be said.

For those who would like to have the detailed reply that I could give, may I in the interests of brevity tonight refer honourable members to Pages 114 to 134 of Hansard, Volume II, 1965, wherein, I think, they will find a sufficient answer to the bulk of the allegations that are contained at the speech that I made last year. I hate to refer to my old speeches, but I'm doing this in the interest of brevity. I'm doing this in the interest of brevity tonight. If my honourable friends wish, of course, I could reread it with proper emphasis on paragraphs and so on, but I don't think I'll bother.

As I say, Madam Speaker, this is an old bone, all the meat's been pretty well chewed off it. Last year it was thought worthy enough as an issue for the Leader of the Opposition to bring it in. This year it's declined in importance to the place where only the Member for Portage brings it in. So I don't know who's going to handle it next year. Perhaps it will die a natural death in the third year or the fourth year, I don't know. But in any case, it is now before us and I suggest that without going into the great detail that one could on a matter of this nature, that I try to give in very brief form the highlights of the past - and this is a matter now of history - in connection with this matter.

Let me first of all say that I find it passing strange that our honourable friends opposite should be asking for an enquiry this year into a matter which they raised last year once and then let drop like a hot potato after they found out what the facts were. But in any case, this is their responsibility for bringing these matters in, not mine, so I suppose if they keep bringing these matters forward in the interests of proper information that should be given to the public, I suppose we have to keep repeating the facts as long as they keep repeating the allegation.

The only new piece of information that I detected in the speech of the Honourable Member for Portage was that he read into the full record an editorial that had appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press. I still have a taint of legal training left in my hide and I don't regard that as factual evidence at all, that's editorial comment, and there wasn't even anything in that comment that deserved much reply, so I shall get back as I mentioned, to the highlights of this matter.

As I mentioned last year in Pages 114 to 134 of Hansard, Volume II, 1965, the government had been interested in this property for some considerable time, this property at Delta, and had an understanding, albeit a verbal one, with the estate that they would be given the first option to purchase the property when it became available. For reasons best known to the estate, this verbal undertaking was not carried out and the estate, for its own purposes - and who can inquire into what those purposes were - sold all of the real estate in the estate of the late Mr. D. H. Bain for a lump sum by option to a group known as Octave Enterprises Limited. Now that is all the land in the estate. The Crown of course was interested in one portion and ultimately

(MR. LYON cont'd.) became interested in a second portion of it in connection with the diversion channel which is being built by my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture. This land effectively came under the control of Octave Enterprises some time in the summer of 1963, and, as I say, they had acquired it by option.

The province learned that this land was about to be alienated to people outside of the province or to others. My honourable friend from Portage knows better than I do that there were others who were trying to buy it, because as he admitted last year, he was a member of a syndicate himself who had some particular interest in this land, or were interested in purchasing it at one stage. So the land was up for sale. The province, under my predecessor the former Minister, negotiated with the optionees. They settled on a price of \$170,000 for the Delta property and for the Grants Lake property which was confirmed in September of 1963.

Before the agreement was carried out, the province had this land appraised, which is the usual procedure, a reasonable procedure, a businesslike procedure, a prudent procedure, a procedure we always follow in connection with land that we buy. Our appraisers, two of the senior appraisers in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources who have appraised land in all parts of Manitoba for many years, whose appraisals to the best of my knowledge have never been called into account before - both of whom while not accredited appraisers are writing their examinations for accreditation, one of whom is a graduate in agriculture, one of the senior appraisers in governmental service - they gave us what I would call a conservative appraisal at a small fee of the two properties, the Delta property and the Grants Lake property, of \$157,000. That was the figure they gave us. It's in an Order for Return and I mentioned it in the speech last year. I know that all this must be terribly boring to my honourable friends opposite but I must for the sake of the record repeat it.

The question arose at that time, because this was a question as to whether or not after title was not delivered within the time stipulated whether or not the Crown should expropriate or whether we should carry on with the negotiated agreement that we had for \$170,000, and as I assured my honourable friends last year, that question was gone into quite carefully. The best advice we had from the appraisal people at that time was that we had a very good deal at \$170,000, and that had we expropriated we could well have paid more for this particular property. And while I don't always accept the advice of experts, this was one occasion when I accepted the advice of the experts. It was good advice and it still stands, and we purchased the Delta and the Grants Lake property for \$170,000, a figure which is \$13,000 in excess of the appraised value that was set by the appraisers, but of course as the appraiser said, "If you get anything within 10 percent you've got yourself a good deal so go for it." We did and we bought it at that price.

I might mention by way of addition that had we expropriated the property as was recommended by my honourable friends opposite, in the light of hindsight and all of the other information that they were able to acquire, that we -- when I say that we could well have paid more, I call to their attention again the well-known fact that the property at Delta, for example, contained roads that were built at a cost we are told of approximately fifty to \$75,000; contained some of the finest beach property in Manitoba; contained a very valuable marsh; contained extremely valuable buildings; contained something like - or in approximation something like 600 acres of some of the finest Portage farm land that you find on the Portage plains - land, by the way, that I understand there of the land, that we are paying considerably more for in the expropriations south of there for the Portage Diversion than we paid for the Bain property. But again, Madam Speaker, these are almost trite things to say now because they are known by everybody in the House; they are known by the populace at large; and I repeat them only to get them on the record again.

A great point was made by my honourable friend from Portage about the south farm. This was a farm that was acquired by -- 219 acres acquired by the Department of Agriculture and Conservation for purposes of the inlet structure for the Portage Diversion, a farm that was acquired some several months after the Department of Mines had negotiated for the purchase of the Delta and Grants Lake property. The south farm, unlike the Delta and Grants Lake property which had only one appraisal, the south farm had in effect three appraisals done on it. One by Mr. Price Rattray, a man who is extremely well-known in this community as an appraiser and dealer in real estate. It was reviewed then by the Price Rattray Commission, consisting of Mr. Price Rattray; Mr. V. E. Driver, the mortgage manager for Montreal Trust Company, an accredited appraiser - one of the first lecturers I think in appraisal in the Province of Manitoba; and the third review member was Mr. Harvey O'Dell, the past president of the union

(MR. LYON cont'd.) of municipalities who has a keen knowledge of farm lands and farm values. And further to that, there was a third appraisal done by an accredited appraiser who also certified that the value of the property and that the price the government or the Department of Agriculture should offer to the then owners of the property was \$75,000. One of the appraisals was seventy-five to \$80,000.

So in that case we didn't act just on the advice of two appraisers as we did on the Delta and Grants Lake property, we acted on the advice of, first a single appraiser - and again I mention this is all in detail found on Pages 114 to 134, Volume II, 1965 Hansard - a detailed appraisal from the one appraiser; a further review by Mr. Rattray; and then a review by the three appraisers; all of whom set the same price as being a fair and reasonable price (a) for the province to pay, and (b) for the vendor to receive, having regard to land values at that time. And amazingly enough, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and his department accepted that advice and that's the price they paid, because they were told by knowledgeable people in the field that that's the price they should pay. Again, a prudent procedure, common procedure that is followed by government agencies with respect to the purchase of property; a procedure, may I say, Madam Speaker, which has now been enshrined in the law of this province which was voted for by my honourable friends opposite, so that the Land Acquisition Board which presently works today works on what basis - on exactly the same basis. A department of government certifies that it wants to buy a piece of property; the Land Acquisition Board takes a hold of it, and what is the first thing they do? They go out and make an appraisal, and based upon that appraisal, they then make offers. The appraisal indicates whether the value is fair to the owner and whether it's fair to the public. This is the kind of advice that you act on, precisely the same kind of advice that was acted on in this case.

Now my honourable friend from Portage may disagree with the appraisers. That is his privilege. Anybody may disagree with appraisers or with experts. That is his privilege, but they are hired to do a particular job; they are hired to give advice; and in these particular instances, the Delta and Grants Lake property and the south farm, I feel - and I have never had any reason to doubt it - they gave us good advice; they gave us proper advice. We accepted their advice. We accepted the appraisals that were made and we bought according to those appraisals. My honourable friend may argue with these appraisers, but I don't think that an argument between my honourable friend and the appraisers is sufficient justification to set in motion a public enquiry merely to satisfy my honourable friend.

I mention again for the sake of the record, if there was any question about the province losing money on these deals, the net cost of the land at Delta and Grants Lake to the Province of Manitoba was not \$170,000 as my honourable friend mentioned, it was \$85,000 because the Government of Canada shared 50 percent in the acquisition of these properties, Delta and Grants Lake, and furthermore the -- (Interjection) --

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, could I ask a question of the Honourable Minister?

MR. LYON: Certainly.

MR. MOLGAT: Was it not the Government of Manitoba who made the deal in this regard and was it not the Province of Manitoba who agreed to pay \$170,000 with no reference to the Federal Government as to the amount that would be paid?

MR. LYON: Quite so. The Federal Government came along after we submitted the price to them and they paid 50 percent of it. Now is my honourable friend trying to suggest that the Federal Government is so negligent that they would pay half the price of something they thought was a ludicrous price?

MR. MOLGAT: If they accept the figures of my honourable friend, yes, and I think that

MR. LYON: My honourable friend may have that opinion of his federal counterparts, but he is entitled to have it. If he thinks that they're wasteful, profligate, spend money of the public of Canada on matters that they shouldn't, he's the one who said it, not me.

MR. MOLGAT: On your advice.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, all I say is that the net cost to the people of Manitoba was \$85,000 and that the public of Canada, through the Federal Government, picked up the other half, not only of the Delta and the Grants Lake property, Madam Speaker, but of the south Portage farm - \$37,500 of that was paid by the Federal Government as well. So what are we going to enquire into? What is the purpose of the enquiry? The facts are already before us. We know that appraisals were made; we know that the government acted on those appraisals.

(MR. LYON cont'd.) Are we going to enquire into Octave Enterprises? Is my honourable friend opposite suggesting that Octave Enterprises are a group who should be enquired into? My honourable friend last year made some suggestion that who were these people whose pockets were being lined by the Government of Manitoba? I told him who these people were. Two principal officers of the Liberal Party of Manitoba were the two principal members of Octave Enterprises.

MR. MOLGAT: Go ahead and check them.

MR. LYON: I don't have to go into any detail on that, that's all on the record, Pages 114 to 134 of Hansard of last year. If my honourable friend has any questions about Octave Enterprises, let him ask the two leading members of his own executive, and I'm sure they'll give him any information he wants about Octave Enterprises who these people are. As I said last year, and I repeat again, we have no reason to feel that these men acted in any way improperly at all. They were optionees. We dealt with them through a real estate agent, Messrs. Meltzer, Essers and Gold - they were dealt with through a real estate agent and a price was settled upon and negotiated, and subsequently confirmed by an appraisal and the land was purchased.

Now I don't see anything very sinister in that but apparently my honourable friends do, and I suggest to them that if they feel that this is sinister, that these people fleeced the public of Manitoba, why don't they go and ask them, because they know them much better than we do. We only dealt with them in a business way; they deal with them in a partisan way all the time.

Our concern, Madam Speaker, was to get value for our money, and I suggest that in this instance we did get value for our money. We paid the price which the appraisers indicated to us should be paid, as we do in all land expropriations today, the same procedure as I have mentioned that has now been enshrined in the law of the province. If my honourable friend is going to question every piece of property purchase that the Government of Manitoba enters into, he's going to have himself a busy time, because we purchased land for waterfowl and diversion purposes in this area -- and I want to tell my honourable friend that the Government of Canada is going to be spending between five and \$10 million a year on the purchase of just this kind of land in the future in Canada, and I warn him right now that this government is going to make every effort that it can to get as much of that federal money channeled into this province as we can to purchase waterfowl and wildlife habitat.

He can look at all of these purchases as long as he wants, but I suggest that they're going to carry on, and what my honourable friends opposite occasionally refer to as "just a goose preserve" is going to have a lot of money spent on it, because these things that they refer to as just goose preserves are extremely important to the future of this province and to the wildlife resources of this province. So without attempting to be argumentative, I merely point out to him that this is only the beginning of a number of purchases that are going to be made, not only by this government but hopefully even more by the Federal Government, of lands for waterfowl purposes in the future.

I mention again, Madam Speaker, just so that there will be no question about it, the prices that were paid, we were satisfied from what the appraisers told us, were reasonable and fair prices both for the public Treasury and for the vendors of the properties. All of these facts are on the record - emblazoned on the record.

The nub of my honourable friend's argument seems to be this - it was the same argument that they advanced last year and it's rather a tired and shopworn argument, now - that because a syndicate was able to go to an estate and purchase all of the land in the estate for a lump sum price, the individual price that was attached to parcels of that land being lower than the price that was ultimately paid by the government, then the government was taken in. But I suggest to my honourable friends, as I did last year and I repeat again, that the price that a person pays for a piece of land is only one of the factors that is taken into account in an appraisal when you determine what fair value is. And I use an example again - if my honourable friend from Portage has a home that's worth \$30,000 and he wishes to sell it to me for \$15,000 because he likes the way I part my hair, or for whatever reason, that's his business, and then the Government of Manitoba subsequently comes along or some municipal authority comes along and expropriates that property from me, is he honestly or seriously suggesting that the expropriating authority would get that property, the appraised value of which is \$30,000, for 15,000 just because that was the previous purchase price? What a ridiculous philosophy. Of course not. Appraised value is appraised value. It means market value; it's one of the factors that's indicated.

(MR. LYON cont'd.)

We have no reason for knowing what motivated the Estate to sell for a lump sum all of the property in the Estate to these people, to Octave Enterprises for the price that they did. That, I suggest, is the business between the Estate and Octave Enterprises, and my honourable friends can consult with Octave Enterprises, with their principal officers, at any time because they're very close to them. But the price that the government pays is a matter of public interest, and the price that the government pays must be based on appraisal as it was in this case. So I think that the parallel is sufficiently drawn without having to worry my honourable friends any more with that.

Last Session we heard from my honourable friends opposite, or at least they started to say although they didn't end up saying this, that we were paying too little in Birds Hill, and I gave them an example which again appears in last year's speech of Hansard about this matter of where a certain piece of property was purchased for X dollars. Some few months before we expropriated in Birds Hill, we took three quarters roughly of that property and we ended up offering for the three quarters of the property that we took on an appraisal, twice as much as the owner had paid six months before. And do you know what that owner was saying? The owner was saying in that particular case that they wanted not twice as much, but how much more did they want? Twenty times as much. Twenty times as much as they paid. So I merely use these as examples, shopworn examples, examples that commend themselves I think to anyone of reasonable and average intelligence, that this is what happens in appraisals and in land purchases.

Madam Speaker, I don't intend to take the time of the House any longer in this matter. I suggest that my honourable friend has not made a case for an enquiry into this matter. The facts are on the record. Having regard to certain recent enquiries that we have had at the investigation of my honourable friends opposite, and I'm referring to Grand Rapids Haulage Inquiry as a prime example, I can't honestly say that it would be in the public interest to expend public money on this kind of an enquiry. I'm in a mellow mood tonight, Madam Speaker, this is probably the last night of the Session, and I think that the kindest and the most charitable thing that I can do for my honourable friends opposite, and certainly the thing that would be the easiest on the taxpayers of the province and most in the public interest, would be to vote against this resolution and that's what I'm going to do.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I had not really intended to get into this debate until my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Resources has really urged me to get into it because of the statements he has made tonight. He has referred us on numerous occasions to his speech of last year, and I think it's an interesting speech. It took him about three weeks to prepare it and it was certainly very long, but it's a little short on the final facts of the situation.

MR. LYON: Five days.

MR. MOLGAT: Five days? -- (Interjection) -- I think that my honourable friend had better check that. But be that as it may, the whole question in this matter, Madam Speaker, was that the government had known at the outset that it was interested in this property. The government had shown some interest in the property before the owner ever died. The owner had shown some interest in having it transferred to the government, or at least parts of the property transferred to the government, for conservation purposes. When Mr. Bain died, the government was in a position, because of the previous negotiations with him, to be the first to try and get the property because they knew it was there and they were interested in it. But the government failed to act. No action was taken for, in fact some months. Finally, someone else got in ahead of the government.

Now my honourable friend wants to make a great case about some of the people involved in Octave Enterprises being involved in the Liberal Party. Well, Madam Speaker -- (Interjection) -- Well, this is half the case of my honourable friend. Let me tell my honourable friend again what I told him last year. We bring matters up in this House because we think they're of concern to the people of Manitoba, and if it happens that some of the people who may be involved in the party in other activities are involved here, it makes no difference. The easiest thing for me to do would be not to bring up the matter at all. The fact is that I didn't do so for the plain and simple reason that, in my opinion, this is a question of public interest; and in my opinion, the facts that I put before this House on the basis of the appraisals that were made for Estate tax purposes, on the basis of values that were sworn to by vendors in these lands, the values that the government paid were far out of line.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)

My honourable friend can talk all he wants about appraisals. We have asked him on two occasions now to give us the details of the appraisals because I put in an Order for Return last year, Madam Speaker, on this question, and I have put in an Order for Return again this year on this same question. I have not had the answer.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, that Order for Return was filed some weeks ago.

MR. MOLGAT: It was not handed to me in that case, Madam Speaker. Oh no.

MR. LYON: I'll check on that because I'm convinced . . .

MR. MOLGAT: . . . doublecheck because one of the questions I asked for example - were the government appraisers accredited appraisers? Well then I'd love to see the reply because I have not seen it as yet. -- (Interjection) -- All right, would you mind. This was a great case with my honourable friend at that time, that these were accredited appraisers.

Madam Speaker, the point is that there were appraisals made for Estate tax purposes; there were appraisals made for the purpose of the affidavits made at the time of sale; and those were substantially below the price that the government paid. The government was in a position to move at any time; the government did not move. For some reasons, known to my friends only, not to me, the government did not proceed to move in and expropriate as they have done elsewhere; did not proceed to move in and make the purchase as was done elsewhere. These are facts. The result was that the government paid over a very short period of time - some eight months - a price of roughly \$102,000 -- Pardon me, \$142,000 over and above the price for which the land was transferred eight months before. Now my honourable friend can say all he wants. Those are the facts of the transfers, the affidavits, and the price that the government paid.

MR. LYON: I would like to interrupt my honourable friend, Madam, on a point of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, more for his information. I filed the return to that Order on the 28th of March of this year, and it's filed in the records of this House, Sessional Paper No. 80.

MR. MOLGAT: I'll be very happy to look it up, Madam Speaker. Could the Minister inform me as to whether or not the government appraisers were all accredited appraisers?

MR. LYON: I have to refer my honourable friend to the Return. In the case of the Delta and Grants Lake property, there were two senior appraisers from the Lands Branch of the Province of Manitoba, both of whom are writing their final accreditation papers at the present time and both of whom have done all of the land appraisals for this department for a good number of years, I think even preceding the present government.

MR. MOLGAT: The facts are, Madam Speaker, that none of the government appraisers were accredited appraisers.

MR. LYON: That's on the Delta and Grants Lake property. On the south Portage farm, Mr. C.R. Bradford, who is an accredited appraiser, did the first appraisal. The second appraisal was done by Mr. Price Rattray, who is in the real estate business in Winnipeg; Mr. V.E. Driver, who is an accredited appraiser and who was the first accredited appraiser in the Province of Manitoba, who lectures in accredited appraisals to the University of Manitoba; and the third review man on that team was Mr. Harvey O'Dell who is not an accredited appraiser but he knows a great deal about farm land in the Province of Manitoba. I'll admit that we only had Mr. Vic Driver there as the accredited appraiser.

MR. MOLGAT: So the facts are then, that on the first two parcels involving some \$170,000, the government did not have accredited appraisers.

MR. LYON: Would my honourable friend permit a question?

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. LYON: Would my honourable friend tell me if the appraisals to which he refers that was done for Estate tax purposes by Mr. Tilley of Portage was done by an accredited appraiser?

MR. MOLGAT: But, Madam Speaker, that's the very point. Last year when we made our presentation, my honourable friend said that our appraisals were no good because they were not made by accredited appraisers but his were. The fact is that his weren't. They were not made by accredited appraisers and my honourable friend knows it. He knew it then; he knew it when he made his speech in this House. Right? Did you or did you not know it? You knew it.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I would suggest to my honourable friend that, as in so many cases, he get the facts before he starts making any allegations. He wasn't even aware that the Return was in, that shows his interest in it.

MR. MOLGAT: Is he making a speech or am I? My honourable friend knew it last year. He refused to answer the Return for last year. It took him several weeks this year to reply to it. The facts are that he knew it then, he did not have accredited appraisers. (Interjection) -- He did not reply, Madam Speaker.

The points are simply these, that between the time that this Estate was transferred to other hands and the time that the government bought it, other people moved in and there was a substantial profit made by other people. This was the whole basis of our argument at that time, that the government did not move in when it should have; did not proceed to buy this land when it should have; did not proceed to expropriate it when it could have. The result was that the taxpayers of this province paid substantially more than they should have.

That, Madam Speaker, was the basis of our statements last year and is the basis of the proposals made this year by the Member from Portage la Prairie, that if my honourable friends feel that there should be investigations made into matters of land transactions, then all right, let us have a complete investigation on the matter because here is a case where, on the facts and figures presented to the House, there has been a substantial overpayment made on these lands.

Now my honourable friend says, "Well it isn't that bad because the Federal Government has paid a large part of it." Well, Madam Speaker, that has no bearing on the situation at all, because the fact that the Federal Government has paid more simply means that my friends opposite have given the federal department bad advice because the federal department doesn't go and check into the figures. They depend on the figures presented by this government, and if this government gives them figures that are not based on sound appraisals, sound values, then it's not the Federal Government that's to blame - although I would strongly recommend to them when they're dealing with my honourable friends that they improve their checking practices - but it's my honourable friends for making those sort of approaches to the Federal Government.

And I would say this, Madam Speaker, that there's a grave risk, if that's the procedure under which the Manitoba Government is going to operate, there is a grave risk that in the future the Federal Government may look pretty carefully at any proposals coming from this government, because if this is the basis of the proposals that my honourable friends make, that they can simply say, "Well you know it's really none of our concern because Ottawa is going to pay half of it," then I say that the Federal Government have every reason to look with very careful and very great scrutiny at the proposals that are made by this government.

That, Madam Speaker, I think is not a good basis on which to continue our dealings with another level of government. It is obvious that we will have to be dealing with them in many deals and we can only deal with them on the basis of trust, and for my honourable friend to get up and say, "Well it doesn't make any difference, they're paying half of it," is the soundest fastest way that I know of breaking any trust between the Federal Government and ourselves. There are many areas where they can assist us. Undoubtedly, what he says is true, that in the future there will be more land purchasing, both by the Federal Government and by the Provincial Government. There are many things that need to be done. We can only do these if we do them on a basis of mutual trust, and I don't believe that the basis on which this government operated establishes that type of trust.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I never said for a moment that the Federal Government had lost money. I said and repeated and reiterated three times that the province got good value for its money on the basis of the appraised value set. I mentioned that the Federal Government had paid half that price. I stand here tonight and say that the Federal Government got good value for its money and will continue to get good value for its money so long as it follows through an appraised value. If, on the other hand, it accepts the advice of my honourable friend, then they start to lose money.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Madam Speaker, if my honourable friend is so satisfied that the price is right, I say to him then, proceed with the proposals that we have before you, accept our resolution and let's find out the facts. If the facts are right, as you say they are, then fine, there are no problems - perfect - everyone will be satisfied. That's the simplest way of settling it.

My honourable friends were prepared to set up an investigation on other matters which we

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) ... didn't raise in this House. They wanted to do so; that was their privilege. If they are interested in so doing, then I say to them, here is a case that warrants proper investigation. Let us clear the matter once and for all; let us have a proper investigation. Vote for the proposals that we have here and the matter will be settled.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I think the longer that this Session lasts, the more one comes to the conclusion that both the Government and the Official Opposition are selling the taxpayers of Manitoba and of Canada down the river. There is an old saying you know, Madam Speaker, that "when friends fall out the devil gets the hindmost," and I think this is obviously true insofar as the discussion which has taken place tonight is concerned.

We're dealing with a resolution which suggests that the investigation being carried on by Mr. Justice Dickson in respect of Totogan Farms be extended into the so-called "goose preserve" and the acquisition of land at Portage la Prairie and Grosse Isle. You know, Madam Speaker, it's most interesting for those of us who do not belong to either the Liberal or the Conservative Party to see what happens when investigations are indeed carried on into the activities of government, be it at the Federal or the Provincial level, as to the acquisition of property. We have had a number of royal or judicial enquiries in Manitoba recently, most of which I think were instigated by the Official Opposition or the Liberal Party of Manitoba, and I think on most of the occasions the reports of the commission have indicated the failure of the Liberal Party to establish the points which they have raised and the reason for which they have suggested that there should be investigations or commissions of Enquiry.

Isn't it amazing, Madam Speaker, to hear tonight from the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition a statement which, if I understood him correctly, intimated that notwithstanding the fact that the federal authority paid half of the cost of land acquisition insofar as the Bain Estate was concerned, that the onus rested on the Provincial Government. It seemed to me, in hearing the Leader of the Opposition, he said that if the Federal Government paid out more than the land was worth it was because they did not check into the figures that were given by them by the Conservative Government of Manitoba. By the same token, Madam Speaker, the Liberal Party here in Manitoba says that the Conservative Party of Manitoba paid too much for the property. Where now, Madam Speaker, does the taxpayer of Manitoba and Canada stand? Here we have the Liberal Opposition saying Conservatives pay too much, and the disciples of the Liberals here in this Assembly say that the Liberals in Ottawa did not check as to what the federal taxpayer had to pay because they went 50-50.

I ask the Leader of the Opposition, if he is right in his contention that the Conservatives paid too much for the land, how can he justify the Liberal Government in Ottawa, who are the custodians of the federal taxpayer, --(Interjection)-- were justified in accepting their figures? Of course they shouldn't, Madam Speaker, --(Interjection)-- That's what you said, yes. So I say, as an impartial independent between Conservatives and Liberals, that they both are guilty of dereliction of duty if this is the case. --(Interjection)-- My honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says, "He knew that I was coming to this". Of course, Madam Speaker, is there any other conclusion that one who is really interested in the taxpayer of Manitoba and Canada can come to? Here we have a situation of the Liberal here in Manitoba saying to the Conservative, "You pay too much"; the Conservative in Manitoba saying, "But your buddies down in Ottawa said we didn't"; and I say, there's no justification for this course of action.

But I do say this, Madam Speaker, that as far as we here are concerned tonight, we have before us a motion proposed that the terms of the Totogan Farm Enquiry Commission should be extended to investigate the aspects of the purchase of the property at Grosse Isle and Portage la Prairie. I say that thus far, Madam Speaker, the investigations have been very revealing that have taken place. We had the investigation into Grand Rapids; we've had investigations into many other things here in the Province of Manitoba; and I suggest to the Government -- I suggest to the Government that they should accept the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie for one reason and one reason alone. It has been admitted here tonight, by the Government on one hand, that they are puritans; it has been admitted by the Leader of the Opposition that if the Federal Government, and apparently he admits it, have failed as custodians of the Federal Treasury, that they're at fault. And I say, Madam Speaker, that the taxpayer both at the federal and provincial level are entitled to know conclusively how both Liberal and Conservative are showing a lack of concern for their dollar; or, on the other hand, showing concern for their dollar; because if an Enquiry by Mr. Justice Dickson into the purchases at Portage la Prairie, the Bain Estate, and Grosse Isle indicates that everything was done "according to Hoyle," then I say the Government of Manitoba will be vindicated of

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . their actions and the Government at Ottawa will likewise be shown to have used their judgment on a 50-50 basis.

For this reason, Madam Speaker, I am going to support the resolution proposed by the Member for Portage la Prairie. If indeed though it proves out the fact, or the proposition of the Leader of the Official Opposition that our federal authority nilly-willy follow the lead of this provincial government or any provincial government without investigation, they are not worthy of being the Government of Canada; if as a result of the investigation by Mr. Justice Dickson it is shown that the Government of Manitoba paid excessively for this property, if the methodology in obtaining this property was wrong, then they too are convicted in the eyes of the public to the same degree as the Liberals to my right.

So I say to the Government, don't reject this, accept it. It's another wild goose chase possibly. We've had a number of them since I -- Oh, I won't go back over past history -- I could though. But it is a fact -- my honourable friend the Member for Emerson says tell us some more. I don't think he wants me to tell him what I have found out about the investigations that have been ordered as a result of these squawks of my friends to my right, not one of which has been substantiated.

The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has told us tonight he can substantiate the action of the government. Then I say, Madam Speaker, if this is the case, fear not, let the enquiry be opened further if you have nothing to fear; you have nothing to hide. And if, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said, Ottawa is at fault together with you on that side, I say, let the taxpayer at the provincial and the federal areas of jurisdiction know what I firmly believe, that neither one of you here in Manitoba or down east in Ottawa are serving the ratepayer and the taxpayer of Manitoba or Canada to the degree that they deserve to be treated.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, earlier in some debate, certainly not this one, I asked the government the relationship between the assessed value as placed by government assessors and the actual cash value of certain properties, and I have not yet received an answer, but since there is a definite relationship between the assessed value of property as placed by the government assessors and the actual cash value, it would be interesting to know what is the relationship in the parcels referred to in the resolution that is before us -- the relationship between the assessed value and the price paid by the government.

Now I think that we should know what that is, because it will point up, if we do know the answer, it will point up how accurate and how qualified the government assessors are in their field, on the one hand, and it will point up too the relationship between the assessed value and the price paid by the government. And I think that we have a right to know what that is.

Now, Madam Speaker, surely the government agrees with the resolution down to and including the third "whereas". Surely they agree down that far, because it was not the Official Opposition that established the Totogan Farms Inquiry Commission and down to and including the third "whereas" we are just repeating what the government has already established. It is the fourth "whereas" that they disagree with, and of course the "Resolved" part of the resolution that they disagree with. But I hope that at some time during this debate -- and I hope that it will be soon, because if we are going to get out of here before midnight we should be moving along to another resolution, I guess -- but maybe if we did have now some figures to show that in respect to the property that is set out in the fourth "whereas", show what the relationship was of the assessment as placed by the government assessors to the price paid, then it might satisfy us to some degree or extent.

Madam Speaker, I have said this every year and I'll repeat it again now, that I place a lot of faith in the provincial land assessors, so much so that it has tended to make us mediocre real estate men kind of lazy. We have come to recognize that there is a relationship between the assessment as placed by the government assessors and the actual cash value, and I have said this, that in the Town of Neepawa, if you take two times two and a half times the assessment on a house or a business establishment in the Town of Neepawa -- that is, the house and the land -- you will pretty well arrive at the actual value, the price that you can sell it at. On farm lands it's getting now so that if you take about three and a half times or four times the assessment, you will arrive at a price that you can sell the property at. Now, I don't know, and I don't suppose anyone in this House knows, outside of probably the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, what the assessment was on the property that is referred to in the resolution

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . that is before us. I think we should be informed of that so that we might consider this aspect of it.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I think this matter has been fully discussed. It's probably needless for me to make any comments at all but since we're going to vote on this resolution I think I should make some remarks why I'm taking the stand that I do.

When this matter first came out it received wide publicity in the press as to the prices paid and also the gain that was attributed to this party that they apparently made in the purchase of, or in this transaction and the sale of this land. Now surely we cannot disregard this because in a way it's adverse publicity for the government, and what remains in the peoples' mind is this very fact about this gain; this remains with them and this is still in their minds, and people today still think about this matter; what went on; were there any connections? And why were they able to make this gain? Surely there must have been some connection. This is what people think in general about this matter, and now that -- when we came to this Session we find that the government is going to make an inquiry on the Totogan Farms. Well surely, if one is worthy of notice and inquiry I think this other one is doubly worthy of an inquiry, and we, as members, I think should know. So I will definitely support the resolution because I could not support the Dickson Inquiry or the Totogan Farms Inquiry and not also ask that if we already set up a commission that they look into this other matter of the Bain Estate or the Octave Enterprises as well.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, is closing . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I will close the debate. But I must admit I was rather at a loss to understand the approach of the Honourable Member who is the Leader of the New Democratic Party. In fact, for the first ten minutes of his discourse I thought he was the Assistant Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. He didn't really add anything to the debate. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that last year the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, Mr. Schreyer, who has now gone on to Ottawa, took quite an active part in the debate about the matter of how this government acquired all of the land in the Bain Estate. --(Interjection)-- Perhaps not all, but a large part of them; I will take that back. But this year, the Leader of the Opposition seems to go with the wind. Perhaps he would like to come down on both sides of the fence. There's a word for it - I believe it's a mugwump - so that's all I will have to say about his contribution.

Madam Speaker, when the honourable member who is the Minister of Mines stood up, to "defend" I suppose is the word, to defend his position of last year at this time, I could hardly believe my ears. He added nothing new; he dragged out his 20-page speech of last year that took him three weeks of worry, I think, to come up with, and he hacked it over and pushed it around a bit, and . . .

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker . . . point, but I do like my honourable friends opposite to adhere to the facts occasionally. I know that they can't very often, but I think the speech given by the Leader of the Opposition was given on a Tuesday, as I recall, and I think I spoke the following Monday. I don't count that as three weeks. If my honourable friend does he better go to a mathematician. I think he needs mathematical advice in any case.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, will the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources deny the fact that day after day he was asked to give a reply? --(Interjection)-- I'm coming to that.

Let's look at the resolution that is before us. The government, without any other request than their own, decided to set up an inquiry. --(Interjection)-- Nothing? Would you like to speak on this? Go ahead.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I offered the Honourable Member the Minister of Welfare the chance to speak. The Honourable Minister of Welfare seems to forget that last year we had a debate and we asked for an inquiry on this very matter, but this year this government sets up an Inquiry on another matter. --(Interjection)-- Who raised it in the House?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (The Pas): You commented on it.

MR. JOHNSTON: That is not a correct statement, Madam Speaker. I ask you to notice that that is not a correct statement that the Minister sits in his chair and makes.

MR. CARROLL: On a point of privilege then, Madam Speaker, there was an interjection which I heard myself attributed to the member.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): . . . my honourable friend speak of privilege?

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) He's been sitting there against the rules, interrupting, and yet he raises a point of privilege. Where does it come in? --(Interjections)--.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie is speaking.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, in the resolution that is before us tonight, we have asked this government to enlarge the terms of the Totogan Farms Inquiry to include another matter, that there has been large-scale questions and propositions raised, and my honourable friends sit across there and pretend that they don't know about this. What nonsense! What nonsense! Let us look at the facts in the resolution. The facts in the resolution are -- and anyone who cares to go to a Land Titles Office in Portage la Prairie and check out will find that people, for I presume speculative purposes, bought land knowing that they could sell it to the government with something like \$102,500 which they did not invest -- they invested \$100.00 on an option -- they turned around and in less than a year netted \$142,500.

MR. LYON: Will my honourable friend permit a question, Madam Speaker? He made the statement--

MR. JOHNSTON: Later.

MR. LYON: All right, fine. I know it would be embarrassing if he tried to answer.

MR. JOHNSTON: Now, when my honourable friend got up tonight and referred back to his 20-page speech of last Session, last year, he said -- and I do not have the benefit of reading from Hansard -- but he said why didn't my friends ask for a full inquiry? And he said, and he used words something like this: "They dropped it like a hot potato." Well, Madam Speaker, I have here a newspaper clipping from The Tribune. I do not have the date on it -- the date is not on this piece but it can be ascertained as correct if so wished, and I would like to quote. The headline is "Full Probe Demanded on Land Buys. Liberal Leader Gil Molgat demanded a full inquiry Tuesday into purchases of land by the Provincial Government. He threw down the gauntlet as the land debate gained new fury in the Legislature, producing sharp clashes between government and opposition members. Point by point, Mr. Molgat attacked Resources Minister Sterling Lyon's rejection Monday of Liberal charges that the government paid too much for three properties it acquired from Octave Enterprises Limited for a goose preserve." And it goes on.

Now is my honourable friend suggesting that we drop this like a hot potato? The question we raised, and we raise it again: Why did not the government expropriate? Why did they not treat this like any other land expropriation that they instituted at Birds Hill? Why did they not? I'd like to know that.

I have here an Order for Return that came in today under the Department of Public Works, and the questions asked were, showing the owners of land who had been purchased and the legal description of land with respect to the Portage Diversion and the Portage By-pass; with respect to the acreage purchased and the amount paid per acre to each owner on the Portage Diversion and the Portage By-pass.

Another question: Details of any other payments to each owner under the following headings: description of; amount paid for each building purchased; moving costs; amount paid for fences or other improvements; severance allowance, or other; with respect to lands purchased or acquired by expropriation on the Portage Diversion and the Portage By-pass.

Another question, the total amount paid to each owner. Another question, the date of each purchase. Another question, the names of property owners against whom expropriation proceedings have been started by the Provincial Government, and their legal description; and the date of the beginning of expropriation procedures. Whether any expropriations have been completed; if so, the details of expropriations. Also the question, the appraised value of each of the above properties -- and this refers to expropriated property, property already purchased or property under negotiation and/or expropriation proceedings.

And I have some very interesting figures, Madam Speaker, in some of the answers that were given. When we examine the land that was taken for the Portage Diversion we find there was marsh land, there was poor farm land, there was average farm land, there was prime farm land, and there were some lands that were of no value because of drainage problems, etc.

Now I would like members of the House to note some of these prices that were paid. One 45-acre piece went for \$125 an acre; another piece of 115 acres went for \$140 an acre; another parcel of 226 acres went for \$140 an acre; another parcel of 5 acres went for \$20 an acre; another parcel of 110 acres, \$130 an acre; and so on, Madam Speaker. Prices varying from \$20 to \$125 to \$140 an acre. These are to farmers on the route of the Portage Diversion.

Now let us look at the that Octave Enterprises received for their land at the river

(MR. JOHNSTON, cont'd) . . . end of the Diversion; not at the riverbank, where I understand there is some valuable market garden land that has been used as such, but ordinary farm land. I dwelt on this at some time earlier when I said this farm had 219 acres of which 47 acres was unsuitable for farming - swamp land and sandy soil. So really there are 172 acres involved. Yet here is what this government paid by their appraisal methods. For 45 acres of this land they paid \$350 an acre; for 110 acres of this land they paid \$250 an acre; for 25 acres of this land they paid \$200 an acre; for 15 acres they paid \$300 an acre; and for 24 acres they paid \$25 an acre.

Now Madam Speaker, this is the price of the land. But it is a well-known and accepted practice that when a farm changes hands, the buildings are in with the farm, and the whole proposition is based on farm land and the buildings are part of the deal. We find in this case that the buildings were paid for also, over and above the land price. If we were to look at this proposition the way a farmer would look at it buying land, we would find that for the 172 acres of arable land, this government paid \$442 an acre, including buildings. Mind you, this is taking into account the 47 acres that were unsuitable, had no use, swamp land and sand. So for the Minister to get up here tonight and try to justify this is beyond comprehension.

The Minister went on at some length about the people who he had making the appraisals.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, on . . . privilege. Is the honourable member going to leave the insinuation that the government, in the case of Octave Enterprises, purchased and paid for land plus buildings, and that in the other case where buildings were included that they didn't buy the buildings separately or value them separately?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well Madam Speaker, I'll make the correction. On some of the occasions where \$140 an acre was paid for land - and I quote from one: Southeast quarter 5-13-7 West, acreage 130; price paid per acre, \$140; description of buildings, nil. No buildings. Now this does not hold true in all cases. Some had buildings, some did not. But I do note quickly three of the prices I have quoted where there are no buildings; others there are buildings.

Madam Speaker, in my original presentation some weeks ago about this same piece of land, I am quoting from the estimate of a large food-processing company who made an offer to buy this land. They offered in the neighbourhood of \$30,000 for this land. And I must apologize to this House that when I quoted the government as having paid \$65,000 for it, I was wrong and I stand corrected. They paid \$75,000 for it.

As far as the argument advanced by my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources about appraisers, I would think that he would pay some attention to appraisers who were familiar with the area. And he quoted a name tonight - I have no desire to bring in names, but he quoted a name tonight of a person who has been appraising land in the Portage plains for over ten years, and his business consists largely of buying and selling farms. So I cannot really accept that proposition that appraisers from elsewhere have a more intimate knowledge than one on the spot who has been in business successfully for some years. That question was already answered, my honourable friend. We said he was not an accredited appraiser.

MR. LYON: He was a real estate agent. Let's get our . . . straight.

MR. JOHNSTON: Right. But dealing in farm lands. Madam Speaker, we come back to the original question as to why all people are not treated alike. At Birds Hill, expropriation; on the Portage plains for some of the Diversion, negotiation, for others, expropriation; and by the Order for Return I have before me here, there are I believe four - perhaps there is one more, but there are at least four - who are being expropriated. Well, why the different methods of dealing with people who have similar land and similar locations? Would you like to answer? You can't answer.

MR. LYON: It would take too long to penetrate my honourable friend's grey matter.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, we have based our propositions on this resolution on the fact that there are varying methods used by this government to buy land. Sometimes it's expropriation, sometimes it's by bargaining, sometimes it's by the veiled threat - and the Minister snorts. I would like to quote him something.

Here is a letter from someone who is having experience in selling land to the government. I'd like to read the letter into the record. This letter is dated April 21, 1966. "The Honourable W. C. Weir, Minister of Public Works, Parliament Buildings, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

(MR. JOHNSTON, cont'd) Dear Sir: Re expropriation of our property. We wish to register a protest to the way this has been handled. There has been little or no effort on the part of the government representatives to negotiate or communicate, and little concern has been shown for the individual who has been kept uninformed and has been subject to endless delay and frustration.

"In the early spring of 1965 we were told by an official of the Highway Department that it would be pointless to go ahead with our customary procedures of adding several hundred dollars in improvements to our property each year, and planting a large garden, having live-stock, etc. He said that we would be out within a week to discuss terms and that we would have to move out some time that summer. Neither event occurred and it now appears that we will have wasted two summers before we can get re-established.

"Several months later we were visited by Mr. Kuran representing the Highway Department, who made us an offer of \$16,500 for our property, which we refused. About six months after this we were notified to appear before the Land Value Appraisal Committee if we wished to defend or justify the price we wanted for our property. At this time the Highways Department's offer was reduced to \$16,000."

Now Madam Speaker, this is what I mean when the other method of expropriation is used. I would like to quote and show the members here of another method that is used. This is from one of the persons on the route of the Portage Diversion who have had expropriation papers served on them. I would ask the members to bear in mind that there has been no written offer to purchase, but expropriation proceedings have been instituted as of June 17, I believe, 1965. These people - or this person rather - was sent a letter on March 25, 1966, saying in effect that the Department of Water Control and Conservation -- "that we are advised by our engineers that the above described land will not be required for construction this year," and stating in effect that if the people wished to farm this land they would have to sign a lease. They were given until April 4th to return the signed lease, which is ten days - ten days' notice. In the terms of the lease, Madam Speaker, it states the rental but the terms of the lease are cash. Two lines are stroked out, which on another person's land in the area gave them some time to pay - so much down and so much time to pay - but in this person's lease, although they have received no money from the government, they have received no offer, they are required to make up their mind and sign a lease within nine days - and a certified cheque or cash. So I would ask my honourable friends why this different method of a leasing. Other people had the opportunity of making a down payment and the rest at the end of the crop year, but this person did not have this opportunity.

May I suggest a reason? The other party had their land deal completed with the government; this party are not satisfied. They have been expropriated but they haven't received an offer, let alone the money, yet they get a demand for a cash figure to lease their own land, so my honourable friends may wonder all they wish why we raise this question, why we raise the question that if there is a demand, in their opinion, that the Totogan Farms inquiry should be instituted. Well then, Madam Speaker, I submit to you that there are many, many people who would like to have the other aspects, namely, the Bain Estate deal, investigated also.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House, the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 16; Nays 27.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we continue with the business of the House I would like to read to you Rule No. 5: "The Speaker shall preserve order and decorum and enforce the rules and shall decide all questions of order subject to the appeals of this House."

I refrained from interrupting the debate which we have just completed to bring to the attention of this House the conduct of two of its honourable members. Both members have been absent during the course of this debate and I have not had time to reprimand them, but the dignity of this House must be preserved. We are here as elected men and women to conduct the business of this House in a proper manner, and I appeal to the members to so do. Therefore I ask the Honourable Member for St. Boniface to return the parcel which he removed from the place assigned to the Honourable Member for St. Vital immediately, and ask the Honourable Member for St. Vital to remove the parcel from the House. I request that this be done immediately. Order Please. The Honourable Member for St. Vital is required in the House. The Honourable Member for St. Vital is required in his seat in the House.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George. The Honourable the Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Madam Speaker, I certainly would support any movement for roads in northern Manitoba and I congratulate both the Member for St. George and the Grand Rapids Chamber of Commerce on the recognition of the need for this type of a road which would extend the highway system from Grand Rapids north to the Thompson Highway, and I am certain that the Member for Rupertsland would join with me in this, because this goes through, of course, most of his constituency and is important not only to the Grand Rapids area but also throughout the heart of northern Manitoba.

Roads are certainly necessary if northern Manitoba is to progress. I believe that we have to have alternative transportation which has been the problem in many of the areas in the North where we are entirely dependent on one form of transportation or another. Certainly roads encourage integration of our resource industry in the productive areas of our resources. I would like to point out that probably there are three basic areas, Madam Speaker, which require development at this time in the North. I believe a priority and a very top priority should be given in recognition of the necessity of the road to Lynn Lake, particularly inasmuch as the area of Lynn Lake itself is undergoing a development which should prove to be sizeable enough to double the town of Lynn Lake within the few short years to come.

I think secondly, that we must consider a highway system which will at some future date connect the Port of Churchill. This is a project that many of the people in Churchill have undertaken and also the Hudson Bay Route Association, which we are all aware of, and other interested persons, because the development of Churchill will open up many of the areas of the North which today are struggling to keep their heads above water.

While congratulating the Member for St. George, I do find that I'm a little confused as to the thinking of some of the opposite members, because while we are supporting roads to resources - or roads to our resources in the North - on one hand, on the other hand we hear the members, such as the member for Ethelbert, who stood up and said awhile ago that we shouldn't be investing government dollars in roads to open up our pulp resource area, that we are subsidizing pulp and forestry industry by building these new roads; but he forgets or does not realize that these areas that we are opening up to the forestry industry are roads that allow the fishing industry to become better integrated, and it also allows for relief of the isolation of many of these small communities in northern Manitoba which to date have to rely on either air service or train service to communicate with other parts of the province. And so Madam Speaker, with the integration of these small communities through the forestry industry, then we can expect an opening up of many of the areas in northern Manitoba, and what better way can you do it than with the harvest of our resources, and particularly, as far as the government of Manitoba is concerned, with the assistance of industry up to 50 percent of the cost. This is for a public road system.

I think that in considering a public road system, secondly, to link up the northern part of not only Manitoba but of Canada, we have got to reflect on the value of these resources, not only to the provinces where they're being developed but also to Canada as a whole, and Canada as a whole benefits in some shape or form, economically particularly, in the resource industry, in the development of these resource industries. In pointing this out, Madam Speaker, I think that Canadians as a whole should invest in the public roads, just as they are called upon to invest in health, in education, and many of the other programs that we find are interlocking our provincial program where communication and transportation allow the people to move back and

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . forward across their country; and in considering this I think that we should reflect on not only one road, not only Grand Rapids Road, but on the Lynn Lake Road and the Churchill Road and the roads to some of the other areas that are so necessary.

This, Madam Speaker, is going to take many millions of dollars, and probably these three roads alone -- I am that you could foresee the day when you would spend some \$15 million. Now, if we reflect back on the program which introduced roads to resources in the first place, I believe we were allocated some \$7 1/2 million, and here we are saddled with a cost that is astronomical as far as the province of Manitoba is concerned and would take many years. Then if we can cut our costs in half through our roads and resources program -- which is going to benefit all of Canada -- I think we could then justly say that our time is going to be cut in half and the developments are going to go ahead in all areas. So Madam Speaker, if we could cut this cost in half -- and possibly less than that because in many cases the resource industry itself is allowed through the resources program to contribute a third of the cost -- I believe that this would help us get ahead with the job of developing northern Manitoba.

On sitting down, I think, Madam Speaker, that in listening to the Member for Portage la Prairie this afternoon, he was very confused about the number of signs that were being placed up in his area and he was concerned about them, and I would say that if he is that concerned then I would invite the Minister to pick up the signs and come on up to northern Manitoba, because we will welcome them up there, and possibly that will also help us, Madam Speaker, in getting northern Manitoba back on our road map where I would certainly like to see it.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Madam Speaker, if I may be permitted. My interest in the North, of course, is well-known to everyone and by that feeling, Madam Speaker, I feel that I would like to say a word or two, a very brief word or two in this regard. I believe the proposition that has been put forward is well worthwhile and I compliment the Honourable Member for St. George in his thoughts toward opening up northern Manitoba.

The highway situation that he talks of will be well worthwhile and it has possibilities. However, Madam Speaker, I would remind the House that we have No. 10 Highway north from Swan River into Flin Flon, some 300-odd miles, which has been completed in the last eight or ten years, making it, I might suggest at this particular time, possibly a super highway, one of the super highways of Manitoba; and running parallel with that highway, Madam Speaker, is a long-established railway that feeds into the area that my honourable friend talks about. Along that highway too are many settled communities and with the highway into Thompson that we have now, that feeds off to No. 10 for the furtherance down to the southern part of the province. I should say that No. 10 Highway has been completed, the total expense many, many millions of dollars in these recent years, and is an expense, as I said a moment ago, to the people of Manitoba.

The roads that spread out from the northern end of that highway, rooted out as it were, have been provided to a large extent with the assistance of the Dominion Government in the Roads to Resources, and it is my feeling that the suggestion put forward just now through this resolution, that possibly the same proposition might be developed, and I think in adopting that proposition all of Canada is assisting Manitoba to open up this virgin territory for generations yet unborn.

With these thoughts in mind, Madam Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the resolution, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, as follows:

WHEREAS the Government has announced plans for the construction of a power development on the Nelson River;

AND WHEREAS all northern Manitoba's economical development depends on the orderly development of our transportation and communication system;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Canada be requested to renew its Roads to Resources program so that adequate funds will be available to continue northern Manitoba's orderly development along with our recently-announced program.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): point of order. As

MR. MOLGAT: . . . to this Bill as well. Well my point of order, Madam Speaker, is going to be that the statement made does not refer in any way to the resolution that is before us. It neither says "add to" or "delete" or "change" or anything of the sort. It's a resolution that stands by itself and I'm prepared to debate it as such, but it has no relationship to the resolution before us.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion of the honourable member is out of order. As it stands it would require a Notice of Motion.

MR. BILTON: Madam Speaker, I would be very pleased to amend that if I have a moment.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member would not be able to do so without leave of the House.

MR. EVANS: I'm sure with unanimous consent we could allow the honourable member to correct his motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave of the House to . . . ? No?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . unanimous consent at this time to bring in a separate resolution. It's a . . . Why don't you accept it?

MADAM SPEAKER: The resolution is out of order. Are you ready for the question?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, if I might just say a word or two on the resolution that is before us. I think that it's a very commendable resolution and I really believe, like the Honourable Member for Swan River, that it is an area in which the government of Canada should contribute. I have been seeking assistance along this line for some considerable period of time, not just for this road but for others.

Some of the reasons that are given within the resolution I think are possibly open to a slight bit of doubt. The question of the haul distance and the cost of haul to the Nelson Development, I think that before we could be consistent in knowing what the savings might be, we would have to be constructing a road not just from Grand Rapids to the Thompson Road but also getting it to Kettle Rapids because the projection of that would be required to give alternate means of transportation to the site, and at the present time just going that far would require off-loading onto rail from truck and other means of transportation.

I don't think, Madam Speaker, that I'll carry on to any great extent, but I think that I would like to make an amendment to the resolution which would read that the resolution be amended by deleting all those words after the word "whereas" in the third line, so I'd like to move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Welfare, the resolution be amended by deleting all those words after the word "whereas" in the third line, and substitute therefor the following: "all northern Manitoba's economical development depends on the orderly development of our transportation and communications system, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Canada be requested to renew its Roads to Resources program so that adequate funds will be available to continue northern Manitoba's orderly development along with our recently-announced program."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, you're sure that this is in order, are you?

MADAM SPEAKER: I see nothing wrong with it.

MR. PAULLEY: Fine, Madam Speaker, but I'd like to speak to it. I'm sorry that I haven't got the resolution, the amendment as proposed by a Minister of the Crown before me, and I would appreciate it if I may be given a copy of the amendment before too long, because I think this raises a very important proposition. Because as I listened to the proposition, to the amendment, it indicates to me that the Government of Manitoba, contrary to the announcement of the Honourable the First Minister in respect of the development of the Nelson River Power Development, has now come to the conclusion that that development is going to await the Federal Government reinstating the Roads to Resources program. My honourable friend the Minister of Welfare nods his head - and I could hear it from here. --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon? Waiting for my explanation? The rattle? Indicated to me the explanation, because Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Highways has said in effect by this amendment that he proposed, that the development at Kettle Rapids, the development on the Nelson, is going to have to await. . .

MR. WEIR: I did not.

MR. PAULLEY: What does your amendment say? Do you remember?

MR. WEIR: Well Madam Speaker, my amendment didn't say anything about the awaiting of the development of a road to Kettle Rapids before it could be proceeded with.

MR. PAULLEY: Is my honourable friend aware of the amendment that he proposed, and Madam Speaker, in order that I might be clarified, in order that I might be clear as to the proposition of my honourable friend the Minister of Highways on behalf of the government, would you, Madam Speaker, be so kind as to read the amendment that is now before us in order that we are properly discussing the matter under debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Clerk is preparing copies of this and I do not have it before me.

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd)... If you wish to wait it will be here in a moment.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I suggest we await the amendment by my honourable friend the Minister of Highways, because while I may be stupid, idiotic, I sensed something in the amendment of my honourable friend that I would like to have before me. --(Interjection)-- I'm wrong eh? You wait, buster.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I have the amendment handed to me. I can read it: That the resolution be amended by deleting all those words after the word "whereas" in the third line and substitute the following: "all northern Manitoba's economical development depends on the orderly development of our transportation and communications system, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Canada be requested to renew its Roads to Resources program so that adequate funds will be available to continue northern Manitoba's orderly development along with our recently-announced program."

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I am now in possession of the amendment proposed by the government and I wasn't too far out when I started my remarks a few moments ago. I regret very much, Madam Speaker, that at this stage in the Session I find myself in a position where I have to speak on this resolution which is now being proposed by the government, and I respectfully suggest that it would have been well for the government not to have introduced the resolution. I say this, Madam Speaker, because of the fact that when we were considering the development of the Nelson River and its power potential, when I raised some questions as to the development the Honourable the First Minister said that I was wrong and the development was going to start the next morning. If I recall his words correctly, he said, "If the boys haven't got out their picks and shovels tomorrow then I want to know the reason why." And that was in respect of the Nelson River Development.

We have before us a resolution by the Honourable Member for St. George suggesting that insofar as the supply of materials were concerned to the Peace River or the Nelson River Development, that a road should be constructed from Grand Rapids northward to Ponton, an extension of Highway 6. And now the government by the amendment by the Honourable Minister of Highways says that "the northern development depends on our orderly development of our transportation and communications systems." Get the difference, Madam Speaker. The First Minister some weeks ago said, "We're all set to go and if they haven't got their picks and shovels in action I want to know the reason why." Tonight a Minister of the Crown says that our northern economic development depends on our orderly development of our transportation and communications systems.

I suggest, Madam Speaker, there's a vast difference. We have a transportation system into Kettle Rapids at the present time - my railroad, the Canadian National Railroad, and yet... (Interjection)-- Our railroad. I say "mine" Madam Speaker, because if and when we finish the sessions of the House, I have to go back there to get some bread and butter for the Paulley family. --(Interjection)-- We've already got the eggs, thanks to the Member for St. Vital. But Madam Speaker, this is really something, that this development is now going to depend on the orderly development of our transportation and communications systems.

And then further to that, our friend the Minister of Highways says that unless the Government of Canada reinstates its Roads to Resources program so that funds will be available to continue Manitoba's northern development, we're not going to be able to do it. What logic! What logic! How can, then, the Government of Manitoba continue its orderly development around and along with its recently-announced program. The recently-announced program was: "Here we are. We're ready for the development." Now, as I say, the First Minister says, "We're going to have it." And now we have the Minister of Highways say we can't go ahead until such time as the federal authority comes along and reinstates the Roads to Resources program.

You know, Madam Speaker, it's really comical, the turn of events tonight. We had the Honourable the Member for Swan River attempting to introduce a brand new resolution dealing with this question, which was obviously out of order, and then in a moment of conflict in the minds of my friends opposite the Honourable the Minister of Highways, aided and abetted, it appeared to me, by one or two other honourable members of the Cabinet opposite, introduced this ridiculous proposal. You know, Madam Speaker, I think in all fairness to the government, what we should do with this amendment to the resolution of the Honourable Member for St. George is for we members in opposition to take compassion on the government, and I'm not often one who suggests compassion upon the government but I would suggest to honourable members in opposition that we should take compassion on the government and by unanimous

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... consent allow them to withdraw this ill-conceived, ill thought-out amendment to the resolution. Because I really do believe, Madam Speaker, that the First Minister meant what he said a month or a month and a half ago, that we should get on with the Nelson River development and that he hoped that it would proceed. As a matter of fact, since that time I have been watching the advertisements in our local papers and there have been advertisements for personnel to assist in the development of the Nelson River. And now the Honourable the Minister of Highways turns around and says that the Government of Canada be requested to renew its Roads to Resources program so that funds be available to continue our orderly development.

So I want to make an appeal, Madam Speaker, not to the government - they've got themselves into this jackpot - but I appeal to the honourable members in opposition; show compassion, please, tonight to the government; allow them to withdraw this ill-conceived amendment in order that the development as announced by the First Minister on the Nelson River may progress.

MR. BILTON: Madam Speaker, would the honourable member allow me to ask him a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, with pleasure.

MR. BILTON: Is the honourable member suggesting that the CNR be denied the privilege of hauling into the Nelson River project?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Madam Speaker. The Canadian National Railway, I am sure - and I'm not speaking for them now - but I am sure the Canadian National Railway would welcome the increased business on the Nelson River development. But, Madam Speaker, my honourable friend, a supporter of the government, my honourable friend the Member for Swan River, if he supports this resolution, in effect is saying: "Let's not proceed until such time as the Government of Canada reinstates the Roads to Resources program in order that we can continue northern development." This is the difference in the opinion between my honourable friend and myself. Again I appeal to opposition, be compassionate on my poor friends who introduced this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I think the amendment poses some questions and certainly poses some questions in my mind. The amendment calls for the Federal Government to fork up some money for the Resources Program and that in order to meet the necessary capital that will be required for the northern development. Well, this is the very point that we questioned about this firm that is moving in; whether it was sound; whether it had the necessary capital; and whether it would be able to carry out its program. Now we are coming here with an amendment. We are asking the Federal Government to fork up additional money for our roads to resources so that they will have the necessary funds to meet the requirements. I think this just points up that the firm that is moving into northern Manitoba must be weak, otherwise we wouldn't have a request like this before us.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, the government is really going out in a bit of glory this evening. This amendment has leadership written all over it. A terrific amendment. This government is so anxious to get out of here, not only it has the eggs and tomatoes ready - something that shouldn't be thrown in this House by the way - but will do anything not to accept its responsibility. It will do anything at all. We've had committees working on certain things. No, we don't vote on this. Or yesterday we moved motions establishing committees that will never meet. And now, a very simple and good resolution by an opposition that's not supposed to have any ideas at all, demanding a very, very simple thing. And the brave members across us, disorganized as ever, with a motion, an amendment that didn't make any sense at all. Then we had to have a caucus, a Conservative caucus, and wait until they amended another resolution, and very unusual -- the Clerk had to prepare it, and we had to wait until somebody that knew a little bit of shorthand could take it down, and we still haven't got a copy in front of us. This is --(Interjection)-- you know what you were told a while ago. Just keep on shaking your head.

Madam Speaker, this is the government that is giving us this leadership. What has it done in this Session. And it's going to go to the people of Manitoba. It's going to go to the people of Manitoba. What is it going to -- with these kind of resolutions, with this kind of resolution, it can't vote Yes or No on a simple matter such as this? The great visions to the north? Thinking about the north? Oh they're anxious to go. They had all the ammunition. This was going to be the last sitting. The eggs were going to fly. Well there'll be more than

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... eggs flying if this government doesn't give a little bit of leadership.

I challenge any one of them, including the Minister of Welfare, to tell us the kind of leadership that we've received in this Session. Reports of committees that we're not going to hear about; nothing will be done. But a lot of other committees will be set up to be dissolved probably two or three days after. And now at least if this government does not want to take its responsibility, if it must go and ask Ottawa for everything - everything - why doesn't it let the rest of the members at least have a chance to vote on a certain resolution? Why bring something that is completely different from this resolution? Anything at the last minute in a fit of panic. They're going to write something because why? What's the reason? Because they cannot vote Yes or No. This government cannot say Yes or No, and it doesn't want to give anybody else a chance. It doesn't want to give anybody else a chance to say Yes or No. This is the courage, this is the leadership of this government that wants to tell the people of Manitoba: "Look at our record."

Well let us look at the record of this government. We don't have to go eight, ten years ago; we can just look at this Session and what has been done, and mostly what hasn't been done. Madam Speaker, I certainly -- I wouldn't care what it is, and they can go ahead on their television program and say, "Who voted against this? Messrs. Campbell, Molgat and Desjardins," and so on, I'm definitely not going to vote, I'm not going to be party to a cowardly act. It's not the first one. This has been repetitious in this Session, a thing like this, that people have not faced the responsibility. People that want to be pensioned off. Now I see why; they cannot face responsibility. What are we here for? Why are we thinking about the next election? Why don't we think about the election of 1962, that we promised to do a job; we promised to accept the responsibility? I ask you, Madam Speaker, is such an amendment accepting responsibility? I certainly won't go for this amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the question is put on the amendment, I'd just like to say a very few words. It seems to me that the resolution that the Honourable the Member for St. George originally put forward is one that commended itself to the members of the House. I listened attentively to the Member for Churchill who spoke in glowing terms about the resolution, and he told us what it could do for the north and how important this was - with which I agree. I listened to the Member from Swan River who was equally fullsome in his praise about the idea of having such a highway. He did remind us, admittedly, that No. 10 is there, with which I agree, and no one means to remove No. 10 quite obviously. This is another connection to northern Manitoba. There was no objection on the part of the Member for Swan River, as far as I could tell, to the resolution that is before us. And yet what did we get from the Minister of Public Works? After my honourable friend the Member for Swan River was unable to promote the amendment he wanted, the Minister of Public Works proposes one that simply kills the resolution that is before us.

Had my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works added onto the end of the resolution the words that he has, I would have said we're prepared to support you. I, too, believe that the Roads to Resources program is one that can help provinces like Manitoba, and I would like to see it continued, and I have said so before in this House. And I am prepared to support an independent motion recommending that the Roads to Resources program, a joint program between Canada and the provinces, be continued. But the amendment, Madam Speaker, does not do that. The amendment kills completely the proposal made by the Member for St. George. It kills completely that very thing that the Member for Churchill stood up in his seat and said that he supported. It kills completely that which the Member from Swan River said he supported. It kills what I'm sure the Member for Ruperstland would be prepared to get up in his seat and say that he supports. Because I think that any reasonable honourable member who looks at a map of Manitoba will agree that once we have on the west boundary of the province a highway leading up to Flin Flon, and we have in the central part of the province a highway leading up to Grand Rapids, the logical next step is to connect the Grand Rapids one with that cross highway that's opposite, and that after that we can look forward - hopefully in the near future - to a connection from Thompson or else to Lynn Lake or to Churchill. Those, Madam Speaker, I think are logical developments in our northern areas.

I think we have to face the facts today that we are not going to open up our north country unless we put roads in our north country. In the early days it may have been satisfactory to open this up by rail. That is no longer sufficient. In the early days we depended, not by choice

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)... on most occasions, but by necessity, on air transport. That is no longer sufficient. I think a good deal of our problems in Thompson over labour matters, dissatisfaction in the area, were based on the feeling of isolation of the people of Thompson, and the very fact that a highway has been built into Thompson changes completely the attitudes of the people in that area. And I say that we have to look forward throughout our northern areas to roads leading into these points, hopefully that these will be in the future complete all-weather highways, but certainly to start with they must be access routes into all of the points.

Now my honourable friend the Member for St. George when he proposed his resolution was simply asking for a reasonable connection, which from straight looking at the map indicates that it is the logical next step. There is the agreement of members opposite. Now surely the resolution that is before us in those circumstances is not a reasonable resolution. If my honourable friends, as I say, want to move it as a separate resolution, it will get my support. If they want to add it on to this resolution, leaving the resolution as is and adding it on as a request to Ottawa, it will get my support. But, Madam Speaker, I cannot support this motion when it kills completely the resolution proposed by the Member for St. George, and, I repeat, accepted a few moments ago verbally by members on the opposite side of the House, and I am convinced a sensible motion.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm not prepared to support the amendment to the resolution as is. I will vote against it on the basis that it kills the very proposition that we are trying to put forward of this connection, that it kills what the people representing Northern Manitoba themselves are prepared to say is right for Northern Manitoba, and we are not prepared to support it on that basis.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, I am just going to make a couple of very short comments. The first is that our friends have certainly learned a great deal about highway construction since 1958 because they are now the greatest highway builders in Manitoba. They build them all on paper, because before that time they didn't know much about highway construction in northern Manitoba. I lived about 100 miles from the south and I waited 17 years for that highway to get into The Pas, and our friends a little farther north in Flin Flon had to wait another 12 years, and as far as I know, these were the only highways that were built in northern Manitoba in the some 40 years that his friends had something to do with the highway policy of the Province of Manitoba.

And talking about leadership, I just want to draw attention to the great leadership of the Federal Government who have led us right out of one of the greatest ideas for northern development that this country has ever seen, the vision of John Diefenbaker which took roads into northern Manitoba to help to build up and relieve the kind of isolation that our friends now say they are concerned about. They weren't concerned about it a number of years ago. They were dragged into these things for other reasons. They certainly didn't have much vision about construction of highways at that time.

I think the resolution that is before us is a very reasonable one. I think the only way that highways can be built is on the technical advice and with the proper planning that goes into it. We can't build highways on the basis of the knowledge that is presented here in the Legislature. I think the only way it can possibly be done is to be left with the department which is in effect what this resolution says, together with the support that we are requesting from all sides of the House for this program, Roads to Resources, to be renewed so that we can proceed at a faster pace with highway construction in northern Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? Is he in favor of the connection of the road between Grand Rapids and Ponton.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, I'm afraid I can't answer that question because I don't have the knowledge; I don't have the information. You may be able to build it for two or \$3 million and that's one thing, but if it costs \$50 million it's another thing, and I don't know those facts. Possibly the Minister of Highways does, but I don't know it and I think that we are quite irresponsible in this House if we try building highways until we get a lot more facts than what we have before us at the present time.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George as amended.

MR. GUTTORMSON: When I heard the Member for Churchill get up to speak tonight I was rather hopeful that my resolution would be accepted. His remarks were all favourable and expressed keen concern to see this resolution be adopted, at least that was the tone of his

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd)... remarks. However, when the government amended it and destroyed the resolution, I was greatly disappointed because I really thought this was a resolution that the government would adopt in the interest of northern Manitoba and Manitoba as a whole. Can you imagine the tremendous tourist value that we would have had here by linking No. 6 to that highway of the north? We could have had a road from the Gulf of Mexico to perhaps Lynn Lake, Thompson or perhaps even some day Churchill, and why the government would reject this resolution tonight, I just can't understand it.

The road offers great potential for northern Manitoba. It has a wealth of lakes and rivers to draw tourists. There is a wealth of pulp stands which would be available for the pulp mill at The Pas, and without this road going through, we can't take advantage of the resources that are presently there. We have the Nelson River which is planned and is going to take millions of dollars to construct, and materials that will be required for this construction could have been transported over this road. As I said before, it is inevitable that this road will be built and we could have used the savings on the freight to pay for a large portion of the cost of building this road. The terrain that this road would have to be built over is not difficult terrain. Not too long ago a cavalcade of some 20 cars travelled over it, and I think only on one occasion did they have to portage over a small river, which gives you an indication that the terrain is not difficult to build.

I'm at a loss to understand the reasons for the government turning it down. Their attitude toward the North isn't as great as I had hoped it was prior to submitting this resolution. I'm afraid that the people of the Interlake, Grand Rapids, Thompson, Lynn Lake and other towns in the area are going to be sadly disappointed by the rejection of this resolution. The amendment which has been introduced destroys completely the main point of my resolution, because what the resolution says, in effect, if we get a northern Road to Resources Program from the Federal Government. We on this side of the House hoped that the Federal Government would introduce such a program, but in the meantime we mustn't stop progress in Manitoba on the basis of federal policy. We have got to stand on our own feet as well, and I think if the Federal Government -- on the basis of this resolution, we may never get this road built if we have to wait for policy of the Federal Government. So I would tell the government that I think they are going to disappoint a lot of people and are missing a wonderful opportunity to develop northern Manitoba.

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

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

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that

WHEREAS education in all its aspects is of paramount concern to all members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, and

WHEREAS sound, practical and extended educational facilities and programs are vitally necessary to the young people of Manitoba in preparing themselves to make their full contribution to the social and economic life of the Province, and

WHEREAS high levels of reading skill and reading comprehension are basic prerequisites to the attainment of an adequate education, and

WHEREAS the Royal Commission on Education, in its report in 1959, strongly and unanimously recommended the use of articulated phonics in initial reading instruction, and

WHEREAS the Manitoba School Trustees in 1961, in convention assembled, also unanimously recommended increased emphasis on phonics in the teaching of reading, and

WHEREAS for a decade, experienced and competent educators, businessmen and parents have expressed concern at the lack of reading ability and comprehension among many students, and

WHEREAS during a three year period, 1962-65, the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 conducted a scientific research project to compare a sight method reading program (Curriculum Foundation Series) with an articulated co-basal program (Phonetic Keys to Reading) in Grades I, II, and III, and

WHEREAS though the administrative staff of the said division reported somewhat negatively on this experiment, the statistics themselves were very favorable and the board trustees went on record as approving the use of the articulated phonics system, and

WHEREAS a large majority of the teachers who used the articulated phonics system heartily endorsed that method of teaching reading, and

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)...

WHEREAS the elementary seminar reading committee set up pilot classes in September, 1965, to test six different primary reading programs, and

WHEREAS we understand no control classes were set up with which to compare the new programs, and no scientific research data will be issued, and

WHEREAS the said committee plans to recommend a basal reading series to the Advisory Board this spring for implementation in the fall, after 7 or 8 months' informal evaluation, and

WHEREAS the selected reading series will probably influence educational standards in this province over the next 20 years, and

WHEREAS it is in the public interest that this important subject matter should be further investigated and considered by the Legislative Assembly,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Committee of the House, to be named later, be authorized to enquire into these aspects of reading instruction around which controversy has centred for several years, and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, to consider:

- (a) the educational value of articulated phonics and its role in initial reading instructions;
- (b) the educational value of independence in reading and its relationship to initial reading instruction.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, in the expectation that my resolution might in fact reach the floor of the House at this time of the year when speeches are not normally listened to with too much attention, I put the majority of my speech in my resolution, so this will put me in a position where it is not necessary for me to explain in great detail the purpose of the resolution. I merely want to say a very few words on the subject. I'm speaking on this matter not as an educator, not as a specialist in matters of teaching, but as a Manitoban deeply concerned about the obvious disagreement that exists at this stage in the whole question of reading and as a parent who is highly concerned about his children learning to read properly.

I think the situation at this stage is this, that for several years there has been a very active discussion on the question of the methods by which reading should be taught in the Province of Manitoba. Some experiments have been conducted and there has been discrepancy in the results of those experiments insofar as those of us who are not directly involved in the Department of Education or in teaching are concerned. For example, when I think the City of Winnipeg conducted some studies, certain things were said by some groups and then there were minority reports by others. Dr. Moore notably took a different position. This argument is continuing and there is certainly a deep concern in the people of Manitoba about the way in which the children are learning to read and whether or not we are following in fact the best method.

I could give any number of quotes from various authorities to show the real concern of people, parents, educators, businessmen at all levels. I would like, for example, to quote from the Winnipeg Free Press, May of 1963. This was a panel that was held here in Winnipeg. "Stenos Poor Spellers. There was consensus of an education panel discussion in the Fort Garry Hotel Monday night sponsored by the National Office Management Association. Hugh Ross, Department Store Executive and NOMA representative on the panel, said many of today's commercial school graduates were woefully weak in such fundamentals as grammar and spelling."

Much more recently, in September of 1965 in the Winnipeg Tribune, there was a headline: "University Freshies Being Taught To Read." The story said: "The University of Manitoba's Student Counselling Service is teaching freshies to read. Many of these students have not learned to read quickly and comprehensively, said Dr. R. I. Hudson, head of the series. Dr. Hudson said that all of the students who need the help could not be taken because of a lack of staff and facilities, so the service has taken the most salvageable students."

These are some of the statements, Madam Speaker, being made across Manitoba by knowledgeable people, and as I was quoting here from someone in the university, someone in the business management field, there is a real concern on the part of Manitobans about this whole question of reading. As I said at the outset, I don't pretend or pose to be an expert in the matter but I know of the concern of people at all levels and I know of the concern of parents, and there does not appear to be any consistent policy being followed at this time.

The Royal Commission on Education in 1959 made the following statements, and I quote from Page 131, "The Teaching of Reading." They said, "One of the most vexing problems placed before the Commission was the teaching of reading in the elementary school, especially in Grades 1, 2 and 3." And then later on, Page 138, "Advocates of the sight method have stated to the Commission that in the case of retarded readers it has often proved helpful to teach letter

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)... sounds in isolation. The Commission has come to believe that there is benefit for all beginners in reading to have the use of this method of word attack." On Page 57, "If beginners in reading are taught letter sounds in isolation, the Commission believes that parents will find it possible to help their children to learn to read at home, if they have need of help." And on Page 58, "With this change, slight though it may seem, the Commission believes that what is best in both methods will be put at the disposal of the child."

Madam Speaker, I just want briefly to put forward the concern that is, in my opinion, common across Manitoba now in many areas about the methods of reading - the teaching we are using, the feeling on the part of many people that our children are not learning to read properly; the fact that there appears to have been a number of studies and reports on the subject but there doesn't seem to be any conclusion coming forth; and the recommendation to this House that a committee be set up to hear both sides of this question, to hear all of the people who can give us some advice on this matter, and to settle it.

I must say, Madam Speaker, that I share the concern of a lot of the people of Manitoba that our children are not being taught to read properly and I think that this is an essential in our education system, that if that essential is missed, then the whole field of the later education of our children will suffer. This is a most important subject and we cannot afford to simply let it slide by and not deal with it properly. I recommend to the House the establishment of this committee so that we can hear people who can give us knowledgeable views on this so that we can settle this matter instead of continuing as we are now with no apparent policy.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): It is incumbent upon me to speak to this resolution, and in doing so I recognize that in the controversial field such as reading, and not as a professional educator, as the Leader of the Opposition has stated he is not an expert in this field either, I nonetheless realize that everything I say will be in Hansard and will be quoted back to me by the proponents of the various methods of teaching of reading but since I have come in as Minister this has been one of the most active areas of discussion between myself and the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of curriculum, whom I consider probably one of the outstanding men in the teaching of English language in the Dominion of Canada, and I've heard that elsewhere. I also say to the Committee, Madam Speaker, that the Department were successful in having as the Assistant Director of Curriculum one of the top elementary teachers in the City of Winnipeg.

We have an elementary staff, or a committee of experts who have been studying this for the past three years. This House referred the matter to the Advisory Board and to the department, and the Advisory Board have been looking to the Elementary Seminar Curriculum Committee on Reading, which is a group of outstanding teachers from across our province. I am concerned, as the Leader of the Opposition is, as a Manitoban and a parent, as we all are in this House, that our children are exposed to the best method or curriculum in reading that we can humanly devise. But I understand, as I read into this, that this has been under active discussion since the days of the Egyptians, and right at this moment the whole matter came to my attention today that the Elementary Seminar Curriculum Committee had just reported to the Advisory Board on this matter certain recommendations and studies which they have conducted to date and are working with the Advisory Board in this area at this moment.

Like the honourable member, I can find any number of attitudes towards the teaching of reading and I also hear various reports from various parents and so on, but we are following a consistent policy. After all, the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of curriculum development in my department and the Secretary to the Royal Commission on Education, he was very well aware of the representations made. All material that has come to my hands through individuals or groups reporting one method over the other have been reported to the Elementary Seminar Committee and the Director of Curriculum, to the Assistant Deputy Minister and to the Advisory Board, and I'm just somewhat concerned that to set up such a study at this time, while not denying the competence of the members of the House and their right to look into certain aspects, I feel this is an area where we could be denying the competence of this committee, to say nothing of the Advisory Board.

I really think the (b) section of the resolution as quoted by the honourable member is about as necessary as setting up a committee to investigate the medical value of early diagnosis of disease and its relationship to proper and successful treatment. With respect, I suggest that such a committee could also set back the progress that has been made by our committees to date and take at least two to three years to just review the material as they have, and I might

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)... report to the Committee that the Manitoba Teachers Society are at this time embarking on a very thorough study over the whole matter and they reckon it will take them at least two years.

I have made individual comments on the various attitudes or the various "whereases" here, and I don't want to delay the work of the Committee this evening but I want to make one thing clear that does not seem to come out. Whereas No. 5 there, for example, no one has ever denied the importance of phonics as a significant component of reading instruction, and I'm sure that the trustees in recommending increased emphasis on phonics were not intending to discard a significant advance that has been made in the teaching of reading over the last thirty years. As I said earlier, such concerns have been expressed for decades and the same concerns led to the abandonment of the old rigid phonic-based system and the introduction of the much maligned and inaccurately interpreted "look-say" method that people talk about as the present curriculum series. This statement implies that a majority or a considerable proportion of these groups have expressed concern and I doubt this could be validated statistically.

Also, when the experienced and competent educators referred to in the Whereas No. 8 reported on the experiment in Winnipeg, a minority of one on the Trustee Committee challenged their findings, and he in turn ended up in his last conclusion and his individual study, "Actually there should not be any controversy over sight versus sound methods of teaching reading; the best of both should be used."

Whereas No. 9 here in the Report depends entirely on the subjective judgment of course and the weighting of the person assessing the teacher's comments, and other assessors found they diametrically opposed - or they were diametrically opposed in their reaction, and the Committee actually in Winnipeg generally was impressed only to the point of recommending PKR as an option to the present series. Now I'm not favouring one method over the other; I'm trying to remain objective about this. But I did receive the other day - just to show you the concern of people across the province, and this is a letter -- I want first of all to point out there is a policy; we are pursuing it vigorously, I can assure the committee. All the findings of the Seminar Committee and the Advisory Board will become public knowledge and will have to be reported to this Legislature in due course. All the material has been funnelled in.

But the other day, a principle of one of our elementary schools in Winnipeg sent me a copy of a letter which he sent to the parents of all the children in his school. This man is President this year of the Home and School Association for the Province of Manitoba. I thought I would just go through this just to show the conflict from the one extreme to the other, and I thought this was quite revealing. "With so much being written, said and telecast these days criticizing the teaching of reading, I feel it might be appropriate to give you some information regarding this subject. I have been a supervising principal of elementary schools for 17 years. I have seen thousands of our primary children taught reading and have supervised hundreds of reading lessons. I have taken post-graduate study in the teaching of reading. I am a past president and founder of an International Reading Association. As a representative of this organization, I attended their annual conference in New York where 3,000 of the best educators on the continent met for several days to study the teaching of reading. I have spoken to many parent-teacher groups on the teaching of reading. I have been most fortunate in having so many opportunities to study and observe the teaching of reading.

"May I say at the outset it would be a sorry day for education when the lay public loses interest in it. I am not criticizing in any way the motives of those people who are promoting phonics with such vigour. It has been said that education is everybody's business. "It would be wiser to say that education is everybody's concern, as the Leader of the Opposition just said. "The business of educating in schools should be left to the educators in like manner that medicine is left to the doctors, dentistry to the dentists, and so forth. It should be the concern of parents to co-operate with the educationalists so that the home and school work can work as real partners in the educative process.

"The present system of teaching reading in our schools, which includes a great deal of phonics, was developed first by necessity and secondly by much research. People in my generation were amongst the last to be taught by phonetic approach only. I still remember the dreary "Ah Bu Cuh" drill business which I first encountered in Grade 1. How glad I was when we finally got the reader and began to read. The number of failures in Grade 1 under this system was so appalling that something had to be done about it. This resulted in a great deal of research to discover more effective ways to teach.

"Another big criticism of this method was that by and large it did not produce people who

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)... loved to read. This is reflected in our dismal reading record among adults, when last year in Winnipeg 17 percent of the adult population used the public libraries. The "Look-Say" title given by some people to our system of teaching reading is the worst title which could be found. This could only be applied for the first few weeks in Grade 1 when the teacher teaches a few dozen sight words which are part of their every-day vocabulary. Students entering One have been told for a long time that they will learn to read when they enter this grade. Expectancy is high, and how utterly pleased they are when they immediately are given a book and begin to read."

Then he goes on to say, "Reading is experiencing and not word calling. However, very soon those familiar words are used to teach the sounds of all the consonants. Not much vowel work is done until Grade 2, as vowels are so tricky. This is done extensively in Grade 2 and carried on in Grade 3. In Grade 2 they get more phonetic work in vowels than we ever got in school. The main difference between the Phonetic Keys experiment and our present system is that the vowels are begun in Grade 1. Some teachers claim they are too young and that these very young children tire in learning these complicated rules and lose interest in reading. I marvel at how well they do in Grade 2."

He goes on to say, "The finest thing which can be said about our system of teaching reading is that most children love to read and enjoy their reading lessons." And ends up by saying, "Parents are chiefly concerned with what their child becomes as a result of this schooling. Those that continue to fuss about phonics are boxing its shadows and pursuing a meaningless question. There has always been a great deal of phonics in our schools. Parents can do something much more constructive; they can help provide good libraries," and so on. These are the conflicting views. All of this material is passed on to our people and I feel that it would not be timely at this time to adopt the member's resolution.

In Whereas 13, for example, I could take it that the Leader of the Opposition believes that any series recommended now wouldn't be changed for 20 years. This again is something we don't know. I don't think we should possibly delay any change for a further length of time, that we should risk the possible resignation of our people if we as the Legislature are going to determine the educational excellence of either of the various methods. I am not trying in any way to suggest that maybe the members are not competent to do this, but my own personal opinion would be we'd be wise to leave these professional matters in the various sensitive areas to our experts to bring in recommendations. Government must take responsibility for accepting or rejecting recommendations and explain them to the members of the Legislature, and I would seriously suggest, for these reasons, we reject the resolution presented by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Minister a question? I would just like to ask my honourable friend - and I'll preface my question by saying that at this late hour I am not going to make a speech, unless encouraged to do so. But I would like to ask my honourable friend, does he not think - and I appreciate his objective approach - but does he not think that it would be useful for a committee of this House, lay people, to meet as a committee so that both groups, both sides, all sides, many people could come and present their views. Doesn't he agree that it would not be a case of us sitting in judgment on them but getting the information from all people who are interested and concerned about the reading program?

MR. JOHNSON: There may be some merit in the concept of having a committee of the House examine the final recommendations of the experts as they are made to us to ask any questions, but the resolution here is -- we're not prepared to accept this, "The educational value of independence in reading and its relationship to initial reading instruction" - I'm afraid your committee would take at least two years to get enough background in the various arguments and what have you to be able to make a fair judgment. And where would this lead? Possibly to all the courses, and after all our entire program from 1 to 12 is under revision. Would we be setting a precedent of examining the advisability of all the subject material? Reading, mind you, is most important, but I am somewhat concerned about - having referred this to the Advisory Board, of sitting in judgment the way this resolution is worded.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will be closing the debate.

MR. MOLGAT: I don't in any way want to inhibit the many members who I'm sure are anxious to get into this very interesting debate, Mr. Speaker, but if there are no others who wish to speak, then I would like to close the debate.

I thank the Minister for his statement. I think that what he has said reinforces what I

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)... have been saying, that there is a great deal of confusion at this stage in this whole question. No one really seems to know what is the right thing to do. My hope was that by setting up this committee of the House we could, at least in the minds of the members of the House, seek some clarification on this subject. We could, hopefully, in the case of the people of Manitoba, by having an open discussion on it where all groups could present their views, bring out a good deal of information that would be of interest and importance to the people of Manitoba. And while the members of that committee would not admittedly be experts in the field of education, I am sure that as members of this House they would all be people involved and concerned about education, that we could possibly come out with some useful recommendations to make to the experts.

This was the basis of my resolution, and I still believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is a sound reason for having this sort of an open discussion on the subject so that all views can be aired; all sides of the question can be discussed in an open atmosphere with newspaper and press present reporting the discussions, so that everyone can get the value of an open explanation of this subject which appears to me at this stage to be highly confused; and hopefully, that we could out of this arrive at some sensible recommendations on which the people of Manitoba could depend.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the resolution has merit to it. I recognize many of the statements made by the Minister and I recognize the difficulties with which he is faced, but I think that this would be helpful as an educational process for the members, for the public, and to clear the air on this matter.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 14; Nays, 27.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The resolution is lost. As Madam Speaker is away and has a ruling with respect to the next resolution, we'll pass on to the following resolution, the resolution in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are two resolutions before any resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. There's one in the name of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My mistake. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you kindly.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that

WHEREAS for every role an individual plays, or is expected to play, in our society, specific knowledge and skills are required in order to satisfy the demands of that role; and

WHEREAS opportunities must be provided to all individuals in our society, regardless of their age or income, to acquire new abilities when they are required;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Government consider the advisability of:

- (a) Establishing a provincial directorate of adult education,
- (b) Carrying out an extensive decentralization of such adult education facilities as present exist in order to place them within reach of all potential users,
- (c) Taking full advantage of Federal assistance available for such a program,
- (d) Establishing adult education day classes beginning with academic and vocational credit courses and then expanding into other areas,
- (e) Co-ordinating such a program with the Departments of Agriculture and Labour,
- (f) Providing provincial capital and operational grants for such a program,
- (g) Establishing courses for adult education teachers,
- (h) Making greater use of publicity to promote participation in adult education programs.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I almost feel like apologizing for bringing this resolution into the House at such a late stage, but I am reminded of the days when we had our annual curling

(MR. WRIGHT, cont'd) . . . wind-ups and we were told that if we wanted to listen to a good speaker, we had to get him on the program before the boys got too boisterous, and it's because of the climate of weariness of this house that I am going to forego the preparation in regard to this resolution and speak more or less extemporaneously and very briefly.

Mr. Chairman, I was prompted to submit this resolution because of a recent report in the Winnipeg papers indicating that the Winnipeg School Division is contemplating discontinuing the practice of allowing students over 21 years of age to enroll for day classes in the high school. Now the teachers, the administration board and the students would agree that the present practice has not been very satisfactory. The position of the teachers of adults is a very different one from that of a teacher of adolescents, and of course the interests and experience of adults and adolescents are of such variance as to make it difficult to integrate adults into classes of 16 to 19 year-olds. The adult students have passed beyond the stage at which they can submit themselves to discipline and passively accept the dictates of authority.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the need for adult education simply points out the admission of some of the failures of our present educational system, because if we were able to take children when they start school and to give the time and the necessary training to them to find out their aptitudes and to fit them for the best way that they can enjoy their life and to contribute to society, but we have adult education and we are hearing much more of it these days. Now I know that the Honourable Minister is well aware of the need for it. In fact, in Law Amendments he proposed an amendment to Bill 16 which would allow school divisions to have adult education classes or to band together with other school divisions in order to accomplish this and I appreciate his interest in the matter.

I believe that it is said, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to get anywhere, you not only have to speak but you must have empathic listeners, and at this stage of the proceedings I believe this is almost impossible. So I would stress the fact to the House that this is an important subject. The Minister is well aware of it. I believe he will disagree when I have suggested a directorate of adult education, but I don't think -- we are not going to hold to this; we don't care whether it's a directorate of adult education or whether it's an ancillary part of another department. This isn't really important.

The thing in bringing this resolution before the House is to get the light of consideration thrown upon it and to hear what the Honourable Minister -- because I imagine he will respond to the resolution -- and I would just like to say that I will not be coming back into this House at the next sitting but I want to say at this time that I have a great regard for the Honourable Minister of Education. I think his is a very difficult job, and in these days when we all admit that top priority must be given to education, his task, or whoever has the responsibility for education, will certainly need all the help they can get. It is with this in mind and submitting this for consideration that we want to be constructive. We think there is a great need for more money to be spent by the government toward adult education and I would solicit the help of the house to have them endorse this resolution.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON: First of all, may I say how much, and I'm sure my colleagues will join with me in saying how much some of us will miss the Honourable Member from Burrows who came in at the same time I did and who continued and who has always made such a -- (Interjection)-- Seven Oaks -- oh gosh, Burrows -- that's deadly -- I'm sorry -- the wonderful support he has given to so many measures in the House. This one I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to speed things up which I will -- I think the amendment pretty well explains the government's position.

I would explain to the House that the idea of a provincial directorate of adult education was something which we gave serious consideration to in the organization of the department, but really, adult education -- we are up to our ears in it these days with everything from basic up-grading courses throughout the province, the operation on William Avenue, the night and day classes of course at MIT, and the tremendous activity in the Vocational Branch which has recently been reorganized into three sections which are really concerned largely with adult education.

We felt the amendments this Session, as the honourable member knows, have paved the way for the fuller type of adult education program that I'm sure he visualizes in his resolution, and in spirit I agree with it but for the establishment of a specific directorate for really what would be a portion of the academic part of adult education which we are now playing such an active role in, but which we will be arranging with various divisions for the operation of the

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd) . . . program rather than having it come from the central source in the department. I can assure him though that the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of vocational training really is full time pretty well in this area, but a specific directorate as such I can't accept.

I appreciate his resolution. It is well thought out; I accept his spirit, and I would like to propose the following amendment, Madam Speaker - and I have extra copies here for the three party leaders - (a) That the resolution be amended by adding thereto after the second paragraph of the preamble the following paragraph:

"AND WHEREAS every school district, school division and school area will now have authority to conduct full time and part time adult education courses; and

" WHEREAS the Department of Education and the Department of Agriculture and Conservation and the Department of Welfare and the Department of Labour are co-operating in the promotion of adult education; and

"WHEREAS the Manitoba Institute of Technology is conducting varied and extensive programs in adult education; and

"WHEREAS the Vocational Centres at The Pas and Brandon and the Regional Vocational Schools will all provide extensive facilities for adult education; and

"WHEREAS full advantage has been and will be taken of federal assistance for the promotion of these programs; and

"WHEREAS the Vocational Teacher Training Program of the Department of Education has been greatly expanded; and

"WHEREAS the University of Manitoba conducts an intensive program of adult education;" and (b) by striking out all the words after the word "that" in the operational part thereof and substituting therefor the following: "The Department of Education continue to expand and promote adult education programs in co-operation with other related departments of government and the University of Manitoba."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Who is the seconder of the motion?

MR. JOHNSON: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. DEPUTY MINISTER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot endorse the amendment proposed by the Minister of Education. To begin with, the item here marked No. 5 is absolutely incorrect. It is incorrect in fact. The amendment says, "And Whereas full advantage has been and will be taken of federal assistance for the promotion of these programs" - that is referring to vocational programs. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is absolutely untrue. The Province of Manitoba has failed to take advantage of the federal programs. The Province of Manitoba has lagged behind every province in Canada, bar none. Every province in Canada has been ahead of the Province of Manitoba in the development of vocational programs; every province in Canada has used the federal funds to a greater extent than has the Province of Manitoba. We have lagged behind even poor provinces like Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland in our use of these programs, and to make a statement like this is an absolute untruth and I do not intend to support it.

I might add further, Mr. Chairman, that the operative part of the resolution proposed by the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks in my opinion is superior to the operative part of this resolution which is simply another case of the government and the Minister patting themselves on the back for things which they haven't done.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was quite intrigued with the contribution of the Honourable the Minister of Education and I'm sure that all members of the Assembly will agree with him that a start has been made. I appreciate very much that the Honourable the Minister of Education, in my opinion, has a desire to expand the facilities for adult education in the Province of Manitoba, but I'm not perfectly satisfied that what has been done is sufficient for the furtherance of adult education in the Province of Manitoba. While I will agree with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that insofar as clause 5 is concerned of the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Gimli, our esteemed Minister of Education, which clause states that full advantage has been and will be taken of federal assistance in the promotion of these programs, I think that there is a large area yet uncovered. I don't want to be too critical at this stage of my honourable friend the Minister for Education, but I do think that his amendment required just a little bit of brushing up. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, if you would accept my handwriting, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Minister of Education be further

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd)... amended by the deletion of the words "continues to" in the operative part of the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Minister of Education. Then the operative part of his amendment would be: "that the Department of Education expand and promote adult education programs in co-operation with other related departments of government and the University of Manitoba."

The purpose behind my amendment to the amendment would be a direct directive - if this is proper English - to the department to expand and promote the Adult Education Program.

Now my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition - and I suggest maybe properly, Mr. Speaker - has suggested why don't I delete Item No. 5. He has definitely a point and I'm not going to argue as to whether or not Item 5 should be deleted. It is rather difficult however, Mr. Speaker, at this stage in the proceedings of the House to fully assess the whole resolution, but to me the most important part of any resolution is the operative part thereof, so therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the amendment to the amendment which you have before you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, could I clarify...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Well, I was going to raise a point of order, Mr. Chairman, because it seems to me that once the change is made that we simply are restoring what was in effect the motion of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, because this suggests that the Department of Education expand and promote adult education programs in co-operation with other related departments of government and the University of Manitoba. That's exactly, in my opinion, what the original resolution was saying, although the original resolution said it in greater detail. I would suggest that the amendment is out of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The original resolution gives a great many details as to ways in which the program should be expanded and the government would be committed to consider the advisability of all those details, whereas the amendment to the amendment doesn't refer to any details and in my opinion it is in order. Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Before a vote is taken, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment to the amendment, I am prepared to admit that the sub-amendment improves the operative part of the resolution by the removal of the words "continues to" but due to the fact that Item 5 is not a statement of fact, that it is incorrect, we are not prepared to support the sub-amendment or the amendment.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the amendment to the amendment carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Evans, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker and Tanchak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 34; Nays, 10.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion is carried. All those in favour of the amendment to the amendment?

MR. S. CHERNIACK, Q.C., (St. John's): Mr. Speaker...

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the point raised I think is worthy of consideration and I personally believe that it is valid; and that is, the clause that reads - the fifth clause: "AND WHEREAS full advantage has been and will be taken of federal assistance for the promotion of these programs," I think is a statement of fact to which there is considerable question as to whether or not it will be taken. This is a matter of intention and we're not sure even of that, but certainly the question as to whether or not full advantage has been taken is of considerable question and both the Leader of the Official Opposition when he spoke on various occasions, and our Party when we spoke on this question, challenged the government and stated that they did not take full advantage of federal assistance for the promotion of such programs. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that Item 5 of the amendment be deleted and the subsequent sections be renumbered.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment that was just proposed. If it weren't for this amendment I certainly would not support the over-all amendment to the resolution that is before us, because I too feel - and I've stressed this on other occasions - that we have not been taking advantage of the federal grants under this section.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays, please.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House, the sub-amendment of the Honourable the Member for St. John's that Item No. 5 of the amendment be deleted and the subsequent sections be renumbered.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; Nays, 29.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

The motion before the House, that of the Honourable the Minister of Education, as amended.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, on the same division, if this is satisfactory.

MR. MOLGAT: It's satisfactory to us.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The motion of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, as amended.

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

MR. PAULLEY: This one, Madam Speaker, would be the same motion in reverse, on division.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The resolution standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Honourable the Member for Burrows.

MR. GOTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, perhaps we could wait until a little later on, or...

MADAM SPEAKER: Is any member going to move the motion?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I expected him to be here and perhaps he will be here before the end of the Order Paper, so that's why I suggested we wait.

MADAM SPEAKER: If no member moves it, there must be special permission of the House to allow it to stand. Otherwise it drops on the Order Paper. (Interjection)

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside that WHEREAS the Government has announced plans to proceed with the development of the Nelson River for hydro-electric purposes, and

WHEREAS the full development of the Nelson River for hydro-electric purposes will mean the construction of a series of dams and so a series of lakes, and

WHEREAS there is a possibility that with appropriate locks at these dams the whole of the Nelson River could become navigable, and

WHEREAS this would connect key centres like Winnipeg, Selkirk, Thompson to one another and directly to the ocean at Hudson Bay, and

WHEREAS this would open up tremendous possibilities of low cost transportation and great industrial development for Manitoba, and

WHEREAS this would permit grain shipments directly from the heart of the continent by water route to world markets, and

WHEREAS the studies on the Nelson River relative to hydro power already provide much of the basic information to assess the feasibility of water transportation,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House recommends that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of conducting an investigation into the possibility of establishing water transportation from Hudson Bay, the Nelson River, its tributaries and Lake Winnipeg, at the same time as it is conducting its investigation of the development of the Nelson River for hydro power.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

..... continued on next page.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, my comments will be very brief. I had actually prepared a very voluminous speech but I don't think I'll give it on this occasion.

The point of the resolution, Madam Speaker, is based actually on some of the studies that have been conducted for the Nelson and I am referring to a profile of the Nelson River itself contained in the Nelson River investigations which show quite clearly that from Hudson's Bay to Lake Winnipeg there are a series of steps, steps which must be dammed in order to make the Nelson productive for power purposes. In the process of this damming there is obviously going to be a lake built up behind each dam. By appropriate locks at each one of these dams we would be in a position of moving, shipping, from the Hudson's Bay itself right up the whole series into Lake Winnipeg and so eventually to Selkirk and Winnipeg or to Pine Falls or to other centres along the lake, into Thompson which will in any case be on a waterway now because of the damming and the increased flow in the Burntwood River.

This would open up tremendous possibilities, Madam Speaker, for western Canada. It would make Manitoba once again the very key to the whole distribution network of the west. It would open up to our farmers a very low cost transportation. It would open up to many of our manufacturers an opportunity to ship their product by a cheaper and shorter route to world markets. There are many developments going on now in the field of water transportation. We hear constantly of programs by our neighbours to the south to set up great water projects through Western Canada. Very recently at the meeting here in Winnipeg of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce National Farm and Business Forum a speaker from Washington, D. C. who is a consultant on water policy for the Ralph M. Parsons Co. of Los Angeles and New York said, "Winnipeg Seen as Seaport". He was seeing Winnipeg as a seaport connected with the southern water transportation system as a result of a great inland waterway. Well, I don't know how far his plans are into the future, Madam Speaker; they may be at this stage purely dreams; but we are at the point now where Manitoba is proceeding with the Nelson River, not the whole of the project at this moment, but one of the dams, the Kettle. It seems to me that for the amount of money involved, I understand that with the work that has been done for the power project in any case, that a good deal of the work - at least the field work has been done, the work required now would be mainly office work, of getting the figures out as to the levels and what would have to be done and what the costs might be; and that with a minimum of expenditures we could find out at this time whether it is feasible to proceed along this line.

The urgency of the question, Madam Speaker, is that the engineering for the hydro project should be done at the same time as the engineering for the seaway project, if it is to proceed on an economical basis. I'd like to point out that the St. Lawrence Seaway was in fact that type of a project. It is a combined power and transportation project. In that particular case the main criterion is transportation. In our case now we are thinking more of power. But by combining the two, there is the distinct possibility of making them work. There is the added advantage of, I think substantial possibilities of federal funds. In the case of the St. Lawrence Seaway the total expenditure was one billion, 500 thousand dollars of which the provinces contributed nothing insofar as the transportation aspect. They contributed strictly to the power aspects. It is now settled insofar as Manitoba that we are proceeding with the power aspects. My resolution proposes that we have a look while we are still in the process, while we have not committed ourselves to steps that would preclude in the future the possibility of a seaway, that we make the investigations now and see if it is feasible. Madam Speaker, if this were proved to be feasible the potential advantages to Manitoba are unlimited.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, the idea of locks and canals on the Nelson and the vision of ocean freighters and even passenger ships tied up at the Alexander docks and Selkirk wharfs is certainly a very challenging one, and if there was any chance of it ever happening I'm certainly all for it. I feel that the Leader of the Opposition however, might have added in his resolution besides the commodity grains, such things as minerals and ores, that could be shipped if this dream came true. But the concept is a very challenging one and I will support the motion.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George. --(Interjection)--

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker the member is I am sure. Could it be held for the time being?

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

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside:

WHEREAS the permanent closing of the San Antonio Gold Mine at Bissett, Manitoba, will have a serious and lasting effect on the economy of this province, and upon the residents of the town of Bissett, and

WHEREAS Manitoba's industrial development, according to the government's own economic consultants, is lagging behind other provinces, and

WHEREAS every possible and sensible step should be taken by the government of Manitoba to retain present industries in Manitoba, in addition to trying to get new ones, and

WHEREAS the principal reason given by the government for the closing of the mine is that there is a shortage of labor, and

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has not at this time, either itself or jointly with the management of the mine, taken any action to preserve the mine for the future or to continue its operation now, and

WHEREAS the opportunity of preserving the mine will be lost if immediate action is not taken,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. the government of Manitoba immediately arrange a meeting in Winnipeg with the senior officers of the San Antonio Gold Mines representatives of the federal government, for the purpose of exploring every possible means of preserving the mine and keeping it in operation;
2. the government of Manitoba immediately give consideration to the advisability of arranging for a survey of the gold and other mineral resources in the area of Bissett and for a study of the economic feasibility of mining operations in the area;
3. consideration be given immediately to a joint job-training plan with the federal government and the San Antonio Gold Mines to provide mine workers for Bissett, in particular from the Indian and Métis population in the area on the east side of Lake Winnipeg;
4. the government of Manitoba urge the federal government to take whatever steps are necessary to promote the immigration into Canada, of persons suitable for performing work of the type required in the mine at Bissett, and in other mines in Canada;
5. the government prepare a study of alternate means of developing the Bissett area should it prove impossible to preserve the San Antonio Gold Mine, and that particular attention be given to the development of the area for purposes of recreation and tourism.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I think once again here that the bulk of my reasons for moving the resolution are in the resolution itself. My concern is for the continuation of an industry that now exists in Manitoba and unless steps are taken immediately to prevent the dismantling of the mill itself, an industry which certainly will not re-open in the province.

I recognize fully the difficulty with Gold Mines in Canada. I believe that we have here the opportunity with joint federal action in the field of training, the possibility of setting up a mining school, various other means of this sort, that none of them should be overlooked at this time to see if we can continue this mine. I feel that at the moment the management of this mine has moved away from Manitoba to Toronto and that there may not be the concern on the part of the present management for the preservation of an industry for the province of Manitoba. I think there would be some sound reasons for the province of Manitoba to encourage a meeting between the present mine officials, all of the directors, the government of Manitoba, the federal government to see what steps can be taken. It seems to me that if it were feasible to have the management of this mine returned to the province of Manitoba that this might be an improvement insofar as the attitude towards the development and the keeping of this industry here. The specific steps that we recommend I think are clear and need not have any further elucidation from me at this time.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I intend to follow the salutary example of the Leader of the Opposition and be very brief in responding to his resolution.

First of all I must say that the government cannot support the resolution for reasons which will become apparent very shortly. I refer first of all to the second last paragraph in the preamble on the top of Page 18 of the Order Paper, which says "WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has not at this time, either itself or jointly with the management of the mine, taken any action to preserve the mine for the future or to continue its operation now." I suggest, Madam Speaker, that this is a misstatement of fact because of course, this action has been taken in the past, has been taken over the past three years. As I mentioned during the debate on this matter, some weeks ago, this mine has been on the verge of closing on more than one occasion and joint action has been taken before in order to preserve it. I'm thinking more particularly of the joint Federal-Provincial and Mine meeting that was held in Ottawa last fall, last November at the instance of the Province of Manitoba and the Mine Management, at which time the final subsidy was arranged.

I go down the operative clauses of the resolution, the first one "that there be a meeting between the province, the federal and San Antonio." I tell my honourable friend that that meeting was held six months ago, so there is no point in suggesting that there be a further meeting. I also tell him that from the discussions we have had, or the correspondence we have had with Ottawa since the announcement of the mine closing, that they have indicated categorically, that they have no intention whatsoever of putting another nickel into this mine by way of subsidy, because they accept the fact that the cost-price squeeze is such that the mine cannot operate economically. This is not my statement. This is the statement of the Minister of Mines of the Federal Government.

No. 2. That the government arrange for a survey of gold and other mineral resources in the area. That Madam Speaker was done a year ago. Project Pioneer is presently underway; the most thorough-going geophysical, geological exploration that's ever been undertaken in the Province of Manitoba; again a year late.

No. 3. A joint job training plan with the Federal Government and San Antonio Gold Mines to provide mine workers for Bissett. That was done - again too late. A good suggestion, a worthy suggestion; but two pilot schools were operated at San Antonio Mine long before the announcement of closing took place, with very mediocre results, very mediocre results, and as a result they couldn't get the men that they wanted.

The latter part of that resolution, the Indian and Metis population in the area on the East side of Lake Winnipeg. I must tell my honourable friend that San Antonio Mines have had full-time recruiters in the field in Manitoba and all over Canada for the last 18 months that I am aware of. And particularly with respect to Indian and Metis, let me tell him as an example that the Fort Alexander Indian Reserve which was very close by San Antonio, or close to Bissett, San Antonio had many circulars, posters, advertisements on the Reserve; they offered to train, they offered to employ, they offered to transport Indian or Metis people from that community. The answer they received according to my information by and large from the population there was that they were not interested in "underground" work - and I stress the underground portion, because there is some tendency apparently on the part of Indian and Metis, Indian people particularly, to be very hesitant about going underground in mines.

In any case I suggest to him that the mine has been in operation in that community for well over thirty years and that if this kind of labour were available, it would have been available long before this point and it would have been available three years ago with all of the efforts that were made by the mining company.

One other matter that could be mentioned is that with the active pulp cutting going on in that area, Indian and Metis workers I am told can earn up to \$30 a day during the active cutting season for surface work. This is part of the problem that the mine has faced in all occupations in trying to get people from other occupations to come into their own. As was mentioned in the debate, they can't compete on a price basis. Their base rate is \$1.92; the base rate in the base metal mines is \$1.00 higher, 45 percent higher. They can't compete; they haven't got enough money to compete, it's an uneconomic operation.

The fourth point is an interesting point, the question of immigration. There is a grade 10 minimum level provided by the Federal Immigration laws at the present time. There was a recent editorial in the Northern Miner, which my honourable friend may or may not have seen, which pointed out that in the present situation it is very highly unlikely that a person having this degree of education would get into the mining field first of all, or if indeed they

(MR. LYON cont'd), did get in, would stay in the field for very long when they could gravitate into other trades in that field.

The final point that the government prepare a study of alternate means. This has been going on for some time, Madam Speaker. There are all kinds of suggestions, some of which are before us at the present time and all in all, to be brief, the best I can say to my honourable friend is that I think he is well motivated in moving the resolution but really there is no point in supporting it, because the bulk of what he seeks to be done, is already being done or has been done.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker on this resolution, if I may just make a brief comment, I am sure that all Members of the House are concerned with what is going to happen and is happening insofar as Bissett is concerned. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has proposed a resolution dealing with this question. It seems to me that the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has certain objections to the resolution proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, among which is the fifth WHEREAS in the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose the Leader of the Opposition which states WHEREAS the government of Manitoba has not at this time either by itself or jointly with the management of the mine, taken any action to preserve the mine for the future or to continue its operation now.

I suggest, Madam Speaker, that I think I must agree with the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the Government of Manitoba has done this; because in concert with the Honourable the First Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and myself, we did endeavour to make some arrangements whereby the mine could continue, and as a result, the Province of Manitoba did put up a considerable amount of money for the continuation of the mining operation at Bissett.

So therefore, Madam Speaker, I would like to suggest an amendment to the resolution in order that the resolution be brought back into its proper perspective to recognize that the government of Manitoba as I indicated a moment ago has by joint action of this legislature, taken steps to see that the mine continue its operation. So therefore, Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the fifth whereas be deleted from the resolution.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'll not take any time at this time except to say this, the reply given to me by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is simply one of defeatism. He says we have done everything that we can. I don't agree that everything that could be done has been done. I'll admit the government has taken steps; I didn't deny that. We have assisted and approved of the steps taken in the past but I think that at this stage when the mine is closing that there could be a last effort made by the government to see if action could not be taken at this time to prevent the final closing of this industry for the Province of Manitoba.

So far as the statement of the Minister regarding what has been done, he spoke about the Pioneer Project but he didn't give us any results, and if in fact, the Pioneer Project shows that there is ore of mineable quality there, then I think this is the basis of taking the other steps to see to it that we can preserve this industry for the people of Manitoba and employment for the people in that area.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

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

YEAS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; Nays, 29.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, could I read my resolution now? I admit I was out of the House for a moment and

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think the Order has dropped to the bottom of the Order Paper and my honourable friend will have to wait.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Thank you.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, WHEREAS Brandon College, through its distinguished record of academic and community achievement, has demonstrated its qualifications for recognition as a university,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of establishing Brandon College as a university under a name to be selected by the Board, Faculty and present students of the College, by such methods as they may determine.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. I have had the resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside under consideration. The proposed resolution of the honourable member refers to a matter which has already been decided upon by the Legislature. May I refer the honourable member to Bill 71, an Act respecting the Establishment of Universities. And therefore I must rule that the proposed resolution is out of order.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, do you rule, then, that Bill 71 actually established Brandon College as a university?

MADAM SPEAKER: I have given my ruling.

MR. CAMPBELL: I am asking for an explanation of your ruling, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have no obligation to give you an explanation for my ruling.

MR. CAMPBELL: But Madam Speaker, I'm not asking for an explanation of the ruling itself, I am just wanting to know the basis of the rule.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have given my ruling and it stands.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well Madam Speaker, I have no option then but to challenge your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

YEAS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 28; Nays, 16.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before I move the resolution itself, I wonder if I might have leave of the House to withdraw or delete from the resolution Paragraph 3. At the time that I introduced the resolution to the House, Paragraph 3 in my opinion was a correct statement of fact. Since then, the Minister in charge has moved concurrence in the report so Paragraph 3 no longer applies, but I had no means of knowing that when I originally gave this resolution to the Clerk. So, if I have leave of the House, I would move the resolution without Paragraph 3.

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Madam Speaker, that my honourable friend had better read the resolution as it is, and then when it is may amend it afterwards if he feels it is not correct.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, the only danger in that, Madam Speaker, is that Madam Speaker may rule it out of order on the basis of Paragraph 3, and therefore there is not much point in my moving it with Paragraph 3 in it and have it ruled out of order; whereas without Paragraph 3 I believe that it is in order and therefore could proceed. If it's not going to be in order, I obviously can't have anyone amend it, so I ask leave of the House to delete Paragraph 3 and move the balance.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, if no one else was to raise the point of order when the resolution is read, with or without the paragraph, I would ask that attention be drawn to the fact that it attempts to resolve something that has already been settled. The fate of the ombudsman idea has been settled by the disposition we made of the report of the select committee, and therefore, in my view, whether you have this Paragraph 3 in or out, it's still out of order. And I would certainly raise that point when my honourable friend presents his resolution.

MR. MOLGAT: Well Madam Speaker, I obviously don't have leave of the House, so I'll introduce my resolution as it was originally proposed.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that

WHEREAS the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders sat during the past year to study, among other matters, the advisability of having an "Ombudsman" or "Public Protector" for Manitoba; and

WHEREAS the report of the Comitée which was presented to this Legislature on February 23, 1966, recommended that the Committee hear Sir Guy Powles, the New Zealand Ombudsman, before making its final recommendation to the Legislature, and

WHEREAS the Committee heard Sir Guy Powles on March 1, but since then no action has been taken by the Honourable the Attorney-General, Mr. McLean, Chairman of the Committee, to move concurrence in the report or to re-open the question of an "Ombudsman" or "Public Protector", in spite of repeated questions from the opposition benches, and

WHEREAS the indications are that the House will be prorogued or dissolved by the government before any decision is made on this most important matter for the protection of the individual,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House recommends that an officer to be known as "The Public Protector for Manitobans" be appointed.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

I have had this resolution under consideration. The subject matter contained in the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has been dealt with at this present Session. Concurrence has been moved. The committee appointed by the House this morning has been instructed to consider the matter. In my opinion, the Legislature has given its policy and its decision on this matter. Therefore, I must rule that the resolution is out of order.

Is it the wish of the House to call the

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think that we would be very pleased to hear from the Honourable Member for St. George.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for Emerson, that

WHEREAS there is much concern about the extremely low level of water in Lake St. Martin; and

WHEREAS there was a time when Lake St. Martin supplied a large amount of marketable fish; and

WHEREAS Lake St. Martin was considered by fisheries authorities to be one of the best Whitefish spawning grounds in Western Canada; and

WHEREAS Lake St. Martin is still one of the few natural spawning grounds for Whitefish in Manitoba; and

WHEREAS the low water in Lake St. Martin deprives many fishermen of a source of livelihood; and

WHEREAS as a result of the low water there is a large winter kill of all species of fish caused by the ice freezing to the bottom in many areas; and

WHEREAS a few years ago Lake St. Martin was an angler's paradise attracting tourists to the Interlake; and

WHEREAS if the flow of water could be regulated the lake would remain fresh and provide a breeding ground for waterfowl and muskrats;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of immediately constructing a control dam on the Dauphin River with a fish ladder or opening for the migration of fish so that the water level of Lake St. Martin can be regulated and at the time allow fish to move freely back and forth between Lake Winnipeg and Lake St. Martin.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I'll be extremely brief. This has been a resolution of a proposal that I have made for several years. The problem has been caused since the construction of the Fairford Dam which, because — in the interest of keeping the water level of Lake Manitoba at a reasonable height. There isn't water flowing downstream into Lake St. Martin as there used to, and consequently Lake St. Martin is virtually dry all the time. The only way that we can keep water in Lake St. Martin is to put a dam to keep the water in the lake, because of the downstream flow of the Dauphin River.

As the resolution points out, Lake St. Martin was one of the best Whitefish spawning grounds in North America and it would be a shame that we don't restore this in the interest of the fishing industry, particularly that of Lake Winnipeg. It was a wonderful waterfowl area. The fishing industry provided livelihood for a great number of people in the area, and not too many years ago, this government, at my request, put in a small beach on this Lake which has now gone by the board because of the water situation. So I would urge the government to accept my resolution in the interest of the province and the fishing industry as a whole.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I am not going to make a very long speech. I was hoping that the Honourable Member for St. George though would give credit where credit is due here and inform the legislature that his resolution was moved by the Area Development Board of Camper-Gypsumville. It has been submitted to the Department. It's a very good resolution. There is a great deal of merit in the argument. It does prove that ARDA and the local committees in the Interlake are doing something and are achieving something, and this particular request for a control structure on Lake St. Martin is included in our over-all program, development program for the Interlake.

There is just one thing wrong with the resolution as submitted by the Honourable Member for St. George, and that is that he says "immediately". If he would allow me to make a slight amendment I can support his resolution. Therefore I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the resolution be amended by deletion of the word "immediately" in the fifth last line thereof.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, being in a benevolent mood I'll be happy to accept the amendment made by the Minister of Agriculture. It's quite true that this is a request made by that Board, but this is a request that we have made several years previous to this in the House and asked for this, so

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

MADAM SPEAKER:main motion the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. George, as amended.

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

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Madam Speaker addressed His Honour in the following words:

May it please Your Honour, The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed several Bills, which, in the name of the Assembly I present to your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. DEPUTY CLERK:

- No. 2 - An Act to amend The Municipal Board Act.
- No. 3 - An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act.
- No. 4 - An Act to amend The Winter Employment Act.
- No. 5 - An Act respecting Travel on Highways, and the Operation of Vehicles thereon.
- No. 7 - An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.
- No. 9 - An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba), 1962.
- No. 14 - An Act to amend The Public Housing and Urban Renewal Act.
- No. 15 - An Act respecting Transfer of the Assets and Liabilities of The Community Chest of Greater Winnipeg to the United Way of Greater Winnipeg and to repeal the Acts of Incorporation of The Community Chest of Greater Winnipeg.
- No. 16 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1).
- No. 17 - An Act to amend The St. James Charter.
- No. 21 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "The J.W. Dafoe Foundation".
- No. 24 - An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act.

(MR. DEPUTY CLERK cont'd).....

- No. 25 - An Act to amend The Livestock and Livestock Products Act.
- No. 26 - An Act to amend The Employment Services Act.
- No. 27 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.
- No. 28 - An Act to establish the Wards in The Rural Municipality of North Kildonan and to Decrease the Number of Members of the Council of the Municipality.
- No. 31 - An Act to amend The Prearranged Funeral Services Act.
- No. 32 - An Act respecting The Town of Winkler.
- No. 33 - An Act to amend The Water Power Act.
- No. 34 - An Act to amend The Gas and Oil Burner Act.
- No. 37 - An Act respecting the Reception, Care, Treatment, Custody, and Rehabilitation of Juvenile and Adult Offenders.
- No. 40 - An Act respecting the Registration of Psychologists.
- No. 44 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.
- No. 46 - An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act.
- No. 47 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Teachers' Society Act.
- No. 50 - An Act to amend The Plant Pests and Diseases Act.
- No. 51 - An Act to incorporate the Rabbi Kravetz Foundation.
- No. 52 - An Act to incorporate St. Paul's College and St. Paul's High School.
- No. 53 - An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act (1).
- No. 56 - An Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act.
- No. 57 - An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.
- No. 58 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1.
- No. 59 - An Act to amend The West Kildonan Charter.
- No. 60 - An Act respecting Transfer of present and prospective Assets and Liabilities of The University of Manitoba Foundation to The Winnipeg Foundation.
- No. 61 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Grace Hospital".
- No. 62 - An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act.
- No. 65 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Trafalgar Savings Corporation.
- No. 66 - An Act to incorporate Manitoba Conference Corporation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.
- No. 68 - An Act to amend Certain Acts respecting The North-West Line Elevators Association.
- No. 71 - An Act respecting the Establishment of Universities.
- No. 72 - An Act respecting Embalmers and Funeral Directors.
- No. 73 - An Act to incorporate The Wildlife Foundation of Manitoba.
- No. 75 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.
- No. 77 - An Act respecting The Diocese of Rupert's Land.
- No. 79 - An Act respecting Annual Vacations with Pay for Employees.
- No. 80 - An Act respecting The Manitoba Development Fund.
- No. 81 - An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.
- No. 83 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.
- No. 84 - An Act to amend The Consumers' Credit Act.
- No. 85 - An Act to amend The Securities Act.
- No. 86 - An Act to incorporate Brandon Community Chest.
- No. 87 - An Act to validate certain By-laws of The Town of Dauphin and The Rural Municipality of Dauphin and to enlarge the Boundaries of The Town of Dauphin.
- No. 89 - An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.
- No. 90 - An Act respecting The Rural Municipality of Old Kildonan and The City of West Kildonan.
- No. 91 - An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture and Conservation Act.
- No. 92 - An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.
- No. 93 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (3).
- No. 94 - An Act respecting the Incorporation of The Town of Thompson.
- No. 95 - An Act to amend The St. James Charter and to validate By-law No. 10109 of The City of St. James.
- No. 96 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate St. James Scholarship Foundation.
- No. 97 - An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

(MR. DEPUTY CLERK cont'd).

- No. 98 - An Act to amend The Transcona Charter.
- No. 99 - An Act respecting The Village of Powerview.
- No. 101 - An Act to validate Certain By-laws of The Town of The Pas, and to enlarge the Boundaries of The Town of The Pas and the Boundaries of The Kelsey School Division No. 45.
- No. 102 - An Act to amend The Education Department Act.
- No. 103 - An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate "Brandon College Incorporated".
- No. 104 - An Act to disestablish The Town of Brooklands, dissolve The School District of Brooklands Number 1440 and to amend The St. James Charter.
- No. 105 - An Act to establish a Commission to Recommend the Reorganization of Boundaries of Local Government Units.
- No. 106 - An Act to incorporate The Manitoba Institute of Registered Social Workers.
- No. 108 - An Act respecting the Establishment of The Manitoba Agricultural Productivity Council.
- No. 109 - An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act.
- No. 110 - An Act to amend Certain Provisions of the Statute Law and to correct certain Typographical Errors in The Statutes.
- No. 111 - The Commissioner of Northern Manitoba Affairs Act.
- No. 112 - An Act respecting Agreements made with respect to the Canada Pension Plan.
- No. 113 - An Act respecting The City of Brandon.
- No. 114 - An Act to amend The Optometry Act.
- No. 115 - An Act to amend The Brandon Charter.
- No. 116 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 19061, 19190 and 19204 of The City of Winnipeg.
- No. 118 - An Act respecting The City of Portage la Prairie.
- No. 119 - An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act.
- No. 120 - An Act for the Relief of Tjitske Medgyes, Feikje Bosma and Tina Stuve.
- No. 121 - An Act to amend The Social Allowances Act.
- No. 122 - An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act.
- No. 124 - An Act respecting The Department of Tourism and Recreation.
- No. 125 - An Act to amend The Development Authority Act, 1963.
- No. 126 - An Act respecting Access to Certain Highways and the Control of Land along Certain Highways.
- No. 127 - The Mineral Exploration Assistance Act.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

MADAM SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills:

No. 55 - An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March 1967.

No. 22 - An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same.

MR. CLERK: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to these bills in Her Majesty's name.

HIS HONOUR RICHARD S. BOWLES, Q. C. (Lieutenant-Governor): Madam Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly: The work of the Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the Members for their faithful attention to their duties and to convey my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our province. I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of government.

(MR. BOWLES cont'd).....

In relieving you now of your present duties and declaring the Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence, our Province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health and the happiness and the well-being of all our people.

MR. STEINKOPF: It is the will and pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.