

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Saturday, April 16, 1966

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, when the House adjourned yesterday I was pointing out that if the resolution passed as amended it would mean that the government should introduce legislation to provide compensation for those who assist law enforcement officers after having reasonable notice that they are required to assist and who are injured when they give such assistance. That this would be very narrow application of this compensation I think is shown by the letter that was read from the Winnipeg Chief of Police, Chief Blow, in which he said that he had never known of anyone being injured while trying to assist a police officer. It wouldn't help, as I pointed out, the young 21-year-old Second Lieutenant, R. J. Lucas, who recently came to the rescue of two young men when they were attacked by a person wielding an axe, along with another person. Nor would it help another chap whom I heard of recently, who was from Winnipeg and working in The Pas, staying there in a hotel, and he had occasion to be on the street, he did what he thought was the right thing and stopped a fight between two residents of that area. Later in the evening one of those that had been involved in the fight, along with two of his pals, attacked this Winnipeg salesman and as a result he was brutally beaten, his arm was broken and he suffered greatly by virtue of this criminal attack. Not only did it cost him considerable money because of the injuries, because of loss of work, but he lost additional time by having to go back to The Pas to testify when these men were charged in court.

I think we should consider though, compensation for those who help police officers without notice or those who take action to prevent a crime taking place and for those who attempt to catch a criminal; and we should also study not only these matters but a committee should study the other part of the resolution as introduced by the Honourable the Member for St. John's and that is study the question of compensating those who are victims of criminal activity.

Other matters that should be considered by a committee are whether or not the compensation should be payment by way of a lump sum as in Great Britain or by payments of monthly compensation as we pay compensation usually through the Workmen's Compensation Board. The disadvantages of paying lump sums are real disadvantages in that persons who get the lump sums may speculate them and lose them so that the people for whom help was given need help again. Furthermore sometimes the lump sum is not sufficient compensation because as the years go by it can be determined perhaps that compensation should be increased because of changes in the physical condition of the person that was hurt or because of changes in the cost of living; and accordingly, too, compensation might very well be decreased in some cases where a person recovers completely and this was not anticipated at the time an award was made.

Then we should also consider the question as to whether or not the compensation should be set by court or by a special board as in Great Britain, or could we make use of our own Workmen's Compensation Board in setting the compensation; or should we just follow the resolution that is proposed for the House of Commons at Ottawa where it is proposed only to provide compensation in the event of death or permanent disability.

Perhaps we should also consider whether or not this is the question or part of the question is one that should be looked after by Ottawa. Should the compensation be paid to everyone as it is California where the person is hurt while assisting a police officer or trying to prevent a crime or catch a criminal, regardless of that person's income or wealth. Or should we be paying compensation as California pays to victims of criminal activity by paying only compensation in accordance with their scale of welfare payments and where they only pay payments where there are dependant children involved insofar as that type of compensation is concerned.

In Great Britain no compensation is paid where damages do not exceed \$140.00 or where the person injured is off work for three weeks or less. In Great Britain compensation is based on actual earnings only to the extent that the person's earnings come up to twice the national average. If the person's earnings are greater than that they are not taken into consideration when fixing the compensation.

Another question that would have to be decided is should money received from accident or other insurance be taken into account when settling the amount of compensation? Should money received from a civil action be taken into account when settling the amount of compensation?

(MR. COWAN, cont'd) . . . Should moneys from other government sources be taken into account, such as moneys from old age pensions, unemployment insurance, disability pensions or other government payments? Should the criminal be required to pay compensation if he is able to do so?

It seems to be generally agreed that payment of compensation should be made to those who help a law enforcement officer or those who help to prevent a crime or to catch a criminal, and that this would not involve a very large sum. But the question of payment to victims of criminal activity might be another story. There is very little experience to go by. As I pointed out the very first laws providing for this sort of help were put into effect in 1964. In Great Britain during the first 18 months of their scheme, ending on January 31, 1966, there were 2,489 claims or claims at the rate of 1,600 a year; but now claims are coming in at the rate of 3,500 a year. So the extent of payments that may be required under this latter part of the proposal, to victims of criminal activity, may involve quite a large number of claims and quite a large sum. In Great Britain they are now increasing their staff, their administration staff from 20 people to 30. In Great Britain most of the experience shows that most of the claims are in respect of assault; a number in respect of murders and manslaughter.

That this proposal is one that is very worthwhile is shown from a quotation of the first report of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board in Great Britain issued in October, 1965; and I would like to quote from that report: "The need in the modern state for a scheme for the compensation of victims of crimes of violence has been well shown even during the few months of the running of this scheme. It is true that many of the applications submitted relate to comparatively minor injuries and the compensation paid is correspondingly small, but no one who is called to deal with those cases in which a blameless victim has been seriously disabled, sometimes for life or with those cases in which the elderly and infirm have suffered injury and shock, can fail to feel deeply what a worthwhile part is played in the full administration of justice by the power to award compensation."

As I said yesterday, we are now spending millions of dollars and taking a great deal of time to help criminals, to clothe them, to feed them, to provide them with shelter, to provide them with psychiatric services, vocational courses and to help them find jobs and surely we should be willing to spend some money and some time to help the innocent victims of those criminals. Crime is the concern of the whole society and it is certainly true that the victims of criminal activities should also be the concern of the whole society.

Because of the time that was spent in Great Britain studying this question - about five years, before legislation came into effect - that shows that this is a problem that does require some study, and because there is little experience to go by in other jurisdictions and because of the studies being made elsewhere at the present time, particularly in various states of the country to the south of us, it is important that we study all aspects of this question instead of now requiring legislation in one rather limited portion of this field, and accordingly, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the amendment be amended by deleting the word "paragraph" in the second line of the amendment, and by substituting therefor the words "and second paragraph"; by deleting the word "and" in the fourth line and by deleting all the words after the word "years" in the 9th line and by substituting therefor the following: "And whereas in a number of jurisdictions the advisability of paying compensation to citizens who suffer loss, property damage or injury while engaged in assisting law enforcement officers or while attempting to prevent a crime or to catch a criminal, or who are victims of criminal activity, is being considered and studied; and Whereas a resolution on the subject of paying compensation to victims of criminal activity has been introduced into the House of Commons, Canada; Now Therefore Be It Resolved that a Committee of the Legislature be directed to consider the advisability of paying compensation to citizens who may suffer loss, property damage or injury while engaged in assisting law enforcement officers or while attempting to prevent a crime or catch a criminal, and to consider the advisability of paying compensation to the victims of criminal activity.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, this is quite a complicated amendment. I wonder if we might have time to study it. I tried to follow it as the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre was reading it and also while you were reading the copy. I haven't a copy and I wonder, Madam Speaker, if we could just hold it until we have an opportunity. It's quite a lengthy amendment.

MR. EVANS: . . . there's even a simpler way of somebody taking an adjournment. Would

(MR. EVANS, cont'd) . . . you like to consider just taking adjournment or someone in your group take an adjournment?

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest Madam Speaker hold the subject matter.

MADAM SPEAKER: In my opinion, the amendment seems to be in order.

MR. PAULLEY: Okay, you're the boss.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I'm going to disappoint the Honourable Leader of the NDP by making no reference to the State of Massachusetts, no reference to the State of New York and only a slight reference to the Province of Saskatchewan. My reference to the Province of Saskatchewan is going to be confined to a news broadcast I heard the other evening, to the effect that the Saskatchewan Government insurance office had announced a loss of \$400,000 in this year's operations and had further made the statement that unless the number of insurance accidents in the Province of Saskatchewan would materially decrease, they would be out of business within the next six months.

Now when one considers, Madam, that in Saskatchewan there is a \$200 deductible in respect of all claims and when one considers too that in the Province of Saskatchewan, the government insurance is to an extent subsidized by the private insurance companies inasmuch if I as a resident Saskatchewan am involved in an accident and I have - and I must have the Saskatchewan government policy, but if I also have a policy with a private insurer as well, which I carry as additional insurance, that private insurer would have to exhaust all of its liabilities under that policy before the Province of Saskatchewan would be called upon to pay a cent. So when we take these things into consideration, Madam, I don't think the Saskatchewan government compulsory insurance scheme is just as good as my honourable friend would make it out to be.

But, Madam, I don't think we should approach this matter with any degree of complacency. I think we have a real problem in respect of automobile insurance. The rates are increasing naturally as the result of the number of accidents - and it might be revealing to mention to the House that since 1960 the number of vehicles in Canada has gone up 33 percent but the cost of accidents during this particular period has gone up more than 100%. Now there has not been 100 percent increase in insurance premiums in Canada during that particular period, which would indicate to me that the private insurance companies in Canada are certainly not passing on to their policy holders all the losses that they are suffering. But as I have said, Madam, I don't think that we should look at this matter with any degree of complacency. I think that we should try to find what would be the cheapest and the best way to ensure to the public of Manitoba that no one will suffer as a result of any automobile accident and that the costs of giving that protection will be as low as we can possibly make them.

I cannot therefore, Madam, support the resolution of the Honourable Leader of the NDP. Not because it refers to compulsory insurance and not because it refers to a scheme operated by the government, but simply because I think his resolution is far too restrictive in order to deal with the various matters that confront us today in the insurance field.

The Honourable the Provincial Secretary has a resolution on the Order Paper which I think would more adequately meet the situation than the resolution of the Honourable Leader of the NDP, because the Minister's resolution, I think, with one slight amendment, would cover the whole field of insurance and it would not restrict us in our deliberations to dealing with compulsory insurance and with compulsory insurance instituted through a government policy.

I don't know whether I'm in order to refer to the resolution that's on the Order Paper but this resolution as I say, with one little amendment, would in fact I think, cover the situation perfectly. And reading the operative part of that resolution it reads "that a special committee of the House consisting of nine members be appointed to review the proposed variations in automobile insurance rates as well as any rate increases which have been effected in recent years for the purpose of considering and weighing the factors to which these increases have been attributed and thereby assessing the justification for such increases and without restricting the generality of the foregoing, to investigate all such aspects." I stop there Madam, because that is where I would suggest that an amendment should be made striking out the word "such" and if

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd) . . . my amendment was carried it would read "to investigate all aspects of automobile insurance" because I feel if we leave in the word "such" there, that we are confining ourselves to investigating rate increases solely and I don't think we should restrict ourselves to that at all. I think we should make this investigation as wide and as comprehensive as possible.

Now going on, I would say that if we struck out "such" it would read "to investigate all aspects of automobile insurance as it deems appropriate for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the public and to make such recommendations as are deemed advisable thereto."

I believe, Madam, that that would be the proper approach to this problem. It's a problem as I have said in respect of which we cannot adopt any attitude of complacency. It's a problem which is going to grow in its immensity and importance as time goes on, because we are shortly in Manitoba going to reach the point of having one car to almost every three people and this situation is not going to minimize, it's going to increase.

Now for these reasons, Madam, I certainly could not support the resolution of the Honourable Leader of the NDP, but if the Honourable Minister of Provincial Secretary will move his resolution I will give it my wholehearted support.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, on this question I think the Honourable Member for Selkirk has covered every point that I would have introduced into the discussion. I can see his point regarding the change in the Resolution of the Minister. I concur in that also. There are points that have been advocated by the Insurance Industry elsewhere in this country that are not covered by restricting it to that word "such". I concur in that also. I think our best problem here is to vote down the resolution of the Honourable Leader of the NDP. --(Interjection) --

There are always future times when the Honourable Member could reintroduce it Madam Speaker. I move that --(Interjection)-- Even the Members of the NDP party would be in good stead to vote against their own resolution inasmuch as we have a proper resolution on the Order Paper to cover the same subject.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution, as amended, of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie; and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for St. James.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker. May I have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for LaVerendrye; and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Souris Lansdowne; and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, may we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I thank you for having given me a minute or two to get back in to the House to speak on this resolution. I had been called out.

Madam Speaker, the resolution that is before us, has been amended by the government and then amended by ourselves again to try and get some action on this matter. For the third year in a row now my group has presented in this House a resolution asking that the use of purple gas be extended to farm trucks. We are not seeking in this that farm trucks that are being used for other than farm purposes be exempt. In other words, that say trucks bearing farm plates if they are employed in the hauling of gravel or the hauling of pulp, should be exempt. That is not our purpose. Our purpose is farm trucks being used for bona fide farm purposes. This, Madam Speaker, is based on what is being done in other provinces. That is what is being done in Alberta; that is what is being done in Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan change was made more recently but in the Province of Alberta it has been in effect for many years.

In our opinion there are some very sound reasons for doing this. We speak in this House very frequently about the cost-price squeeze on farmers. We hear reports about this again, as I mentioned the other day in another discussion, on farm implements; whenever farm

(MR. MOLGAT, con'td) . . . groups get together, whenever we get reports from farm organizations, the fact of the cost-price squeeze is emphasized. And it is a true fact. Here is an opportunity to alleviate to a certain extent the cost-price squeeze on the farmers of the Province of Manitoba. When you consider the amount of this tax by comparison to the actual cost of the product involved, it is even more evident that this would be of substantial help to the farmers, because as I have been able to find out, Madam Speaker, the farm gas at the moment runs at about 24¢ per gallon to the farmer that is the cost of the gas itself, average, across the province. The tax on top of that is 17¢, so on a product that has a base cost of 24¢ the farmers in the Province of Manitoba are being forced to pay an additional straight 17¢ tax, which is more than 70 percent of the cost of the product to begin with. This is a very onerous tax to be levied, Madam Speaker, and it is not a tax that is facing the farmers of Alberta or Saskatchewan.

Well we wanted to be reasonable in our proposals to the House and when we first introduced our resolution some years ago, we suggested that maybe there should be some limitation as to the amount that would be used and we suggested then that it be based on the number of quarters of land that a farmer had. Then that presented some difficulties because in the different methods of farming up in the Interlake and my own territory, the practice is to have a very large tract of land because you're dealing by and large with cattle production, and in those cases it might not be fair because you might not be using all of the allocation whereas in other areas it wouldn't be enough. So we had another look, this was turned down by the House; we had another look at what is being done in the other provinces and found that they simply exempt it as long as it was for bona fide farm purposes.

There is a further factor here that when the branch line abandonment program starts again - and I would hope that it won't start too soon and I would hope that it will be done on a rational basis, but the facts are that one of these days undoubtedly the legislation will be passed at the federal level and the railways will be asking for further abandonments. The use of the farm truck will be even more important then to the farmers because they will be faced with a much longer haul to market for their grain in particular. This will change once again the economics of farming in the Province of Manitoba.

So it's for these reasons, Madam Speaker, that we have introduced this resolution. We believe it to be sound. We believe that it will be of substantial help to the farmers of Manitoba. We believe it will alleviate to a certain extent the cost-price squeeze. We think the tax at the moment is an exorbitant one on the product involved.

Well, what action has the government taken? They have voted consistently against our proposal, Madam Speaker. Each year they have refused the resolutions presented by this side of the House, consistently. Last year an amendment was proposed that the farm truck licences be reduced. This was passed, Madam Speaker, by the complete support of the gentlemen opposite me. Action was not taken. The government has done nothing at all about reducing farm truck licences. On the contrary, just before the amendment was proposed the government had just proceeded to increase farm truck licences, just a matter of some two months before it was discussed here in the House. They then proposed to reduce them and they have done nothing about it.

This year the technique used by the government is a delaying one. We are finding that they are proposing the establishment of an independent study on the matter, and to delay the matter further. Madam Speaker, the position of my group in this regard has been made clear in the House and I want to repeat it. We say do it now. Don't put it into your platform now as an election promise or that you're looking at it or something of the sort. We have said to the government for three years, let's do this; let's proceed with it. It's being done in the other provinces; it has been checked by them and it is effective. Do it now. The purpose of our sub-amendment is to see to it that there is no delay in the actions in this regard, Madam Speaker. And I want to say that insofar as my group and my party are concerned, we stand on this policy, that purple gas should be made available at once to the farmers of Manitoba for use for bona fide purposes in their farm trucks.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I just wish to say a word or two in connection with this resolution. I might say that as the result of the deliberations last year and the amendment that was accepted by the government, that we in this group too had thought that there might be some alleviation of excessive costs which have to be borne by the farmer of Manitoba in respect of his operations. In saying that, Madam Speaker, in effect I am saying we trusted the government, that having accepted a resolution by a majority of the members of the House, that this

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . was in effect a directive that would be adhered to. But as is the case in so many other instances, particularly of recent years, one wonders whether or not we can accept what we receive from the other side of the House as being valid and being adopted by them.

This year the same resolution as was introduced last year - or was originally before us - only this year the amendment instead of calling for a reduction in fees for licences, says that because of the fact that Dr. J. C. Gilson of the University of Manitoba has been retained to conduct an investigation, they will procrastinate a little bit further. And now the Member for Gladstone has suggested that the government ask Dr. Gilson if he would hurry up with the study in order to relieve the costs of farm operations in the Province of Manitoba. Well, Madam Speaker, I am going to accept - my group will accept the amendment by the Member for Gladstone - but in accepting it I want to point out one thing however, that when we accept the amendment to the amendment as proposed, we urge Dr. Gilson to complete his study as quickly as is consistent with the importance of the subject, so the government will have no reason for further delay; because one thing we have to bear in mind - that the government cannot change taxation without the approval of this House. I think this is very important. It has been mentioned during the debate that there may possibly be an election before the next regular Session of the Legislature. So I say that even with accepting the amendment as proposed by the Member for Gladstone, action cannot be taken until approved by this House. So actually what we are doing, Madam Speaker, by accepting the amendment to the amendment, or even the amendment, actually what we are doing is only giving lip service to the plight of the farmer in Manitoba whose net income is being reduced over the years.

And so I say, Madam Speaker, that we of the New Democratic Party are prepared to accept the amendment to the amendment and the amendment: but I say to the farmer of Manitoba, hold out no great hope for any immediate relief to your problem because we're going to have to meet again, no matter what Dr. Gilson's report means, to change legislation in order to give relief to you the farmer, the backbone, as we often hear you called here, in this Legislative Assembly. I think, Madam Speaker, the government has let the farmer down by not doing what they said they would do last year in respect of reducing licence fees and now, if perchance there happens to be an election - which I welcome - between now and the normal next sitting of the House, they are going to have to wait another year or have to wait until after the results of an election, if one should intervene in the meantime. And I suggest to them if they do want, the farmer of Manitoba, relief from their excessive costs of production, they would be well to change the Government of Manitoba.

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 amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Bazley, Beard, Bilton, Cowan, Evans, Hamilton, Harrison, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 14; Nays, 25.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye, as amended.

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

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

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I find that I am in sympathy and in accord with the principles enunciated in the preamble to this resolution. I wholeheartedly agree that in the area of consumer purchasing there are numerous complexities and continually altering conditions and devices which have the effect of nullifying or blunting legislation designated to protect the consumer. I also agree that long range improvements in this area are contingent on a continuing program of research, education, supervision and legislative review.

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd)

I further agree that it is necessary to maintain a favourable climate for consumer purchasing just as we now concern ourselves with providing a favourable climate for industry and commerce. But I do not, Madam, agree with the remedy suggested by the Honourable Leader of the NDP to achieve that end.

We have just recently voted concurrence in a report submitted to this Legislature by a special committee on consumer credit; and in that report, Madam, there was a recommendation made respecting consumer protection. I think it would be well to read that recommendation to the members of this House, and that recommendation reads as follows: "This committee recommends that the responsibility for consumer protection should be entrusted to an agency such as the Better Business Bureau, the Family Bureau or any similar non-profit organization. If it is seen fit to create an entirely new agency such as an Office of Consumer Credit, quite separate and apart from any of the existing non-profit organizations presently concerned with this area, its management should be by a committee or board drawn from such interested groups as the Better Business Bureau, the Credit Grantors Association, the Family Bureau and the Manitoba Branch of the Consumers Association of Canada."

Now I know it has been suggested, Madam, by speakers who have spoken on this resolution that these organizations have not the personnel nor the equipment nor the necessary knowledge to effectively deal with such a complicated problem as that mentioned in the preamble to the resolution. Now that may be true, Madam, to a certain extent, but this is a new field into which government has ventured and I think it is a field into which the part that government will play in the future will from time to time be enlarged. And I do not think that we should at this particular point restrict or constrict our efforts or agencies through which we can operate. I don't think that the time is quite ripe to establish a separate department of government but I do appreciate the fact that these non-profit organizations have been rendering a real service to the consumers of this province and I do think that they should be encouraged.

Now during the hearings of the Special Committee on Consumer Credit, we had the services of an excellent lawyer who acted as our advisor and counsel in the person of Harold Buchwald, Q.C. Now during those hearings I got the impression - I think all members of the committee arrived at the same impression - that there was an individual who was quite dedicated and quite interested in the subject which he was assigned to deal with. Now it is my feeling that we could greatly assist these organizations in this particular work at this particular time if the Department of the Provincial-Secretary would employ the services of a full-time counsel to co-ordinate the work and efforts of these various agencies. And I would suggest that no better person could be chosen for that position than the man whose services we have already made use of.

Now I also feel too, Madam, that since this is a matter of continuous study and something in respect of which we cannot let our guard down, that we should appoint as a Standing Committee of this House, a Committee on Consumer Credit, and by that means and through the agencies of these voluntary organizations, plus the assistance and help of a counsel, I think we could at least make a start in doing something towards keeping an ever-watchful eye on these individuals who through their business methods or other methods are taking advantages of the consumers of Manitoba.

So for that reason, Madam, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the resolution be amended by deleting the operative part thereof and substituting therefor the following: Be it resolved that the government in order to more effectively carry out the recommendations in respect of consumer protection contained in the report of the Special Committee of this Legislature submitted at this Session, give consideration to the advisability of (a) Establishing as one of the standing committees of this Legislature, a Committee on Consumer Credit, and (b) The appointing of a special counsel to advise and co-ordinate the activities of the Better Business Bureau, the Credit Grantors Association, the Family Bureau and the Manitoba Branch of the Consumers Association of Canada.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I'd just like to point out one matter that may be in conflict with the resolution. My honourable friend the Member for Selkirk is suggesting the establishment of a Committee on Consumer Credit. The subject matter under debate is the question of consumer protection and I wonder whether or not there may be a conflict.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well, Madam, the committee that had been established to investigate this was a Committee on Consumer Credit and what I am asking is that committee be made a

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd) . . . standing committee of this Legislature, but empowered to deal with the particular matter mentioned in this resolution.

MR. PAULLEY: Which is protection and not credit, Madam Speaker.

MR. HILLHOUSE: It all comes in the field of consumer credit.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will take the resolution under consideration and give my ruling at a later date.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Health. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have this stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Arthur. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, it is no wonder, I am sure, that in a Legislative Assembly that includes so many representatives of rural constituencies that the discussion of farm machinery and all matters pertaining thereto should receive a lot of consideration. My remarks I hope will be somewhat in keeping with the spirit of the Assembly that prevails at this time of year and at this stage in the Session. In other words they'll be a little briefer than they might have been had I been occupying the floor a bit earlier.

The resolution points out the fact that agriculture is the basic industry of the province; agricultural prosperity is vital to the over-all economy; the cost of production the major factor; farm costs have increased rapidly. And it comes to machinery by mentioning that machinery operation is much the largest single item in our farmers' cost of production. I think that even to those of us who have an agricultural background that unless we pause to consider that matter carefully we wouldn't think of the importance of that particular statement. But it is a fact. And it's a fact also that the price - the cost of the machinery itself, in addition to the operation of it, separately and together, constitute one of the very large items in the cost of production of the farmer. And that is one reason, Madam Speaker, that some of us have been so interested in trying to think of practical measures to reduce any or all of the components that we have any control over in the farmers' cost.

Speaking of the capital cost of machinery, it runs in the Province of Manitoba, according to the estimates that I have been able to find, including the Year Book on Agriculture published by the Department here, at something in the neighbourhood of 50 to 51 or 52 million dollars per year. And it is interesting to note in passing that the costs of operation as given in this Agriculture Year Book are actually considerably higher than that annual capital cost of the machinery itself. It is probably interesting to note too that the Department of Agriculture include in the machinery operation schedule the operation of a truck and even a car for the farm share only. It's perhaps interesting to note also that while the price or cost of agricultural implements in Canada as a whole are given by competent authorities as something in the neighbourhood of \$380 million, or thereabouts, that we at \$50 million - a little bit more - have something like 13 or 14 or 15 percent of the capital cost of the whole of Canada, which of course is very much higher than our proportion of the population, which is only 5 percent, or less. So that we have a big interest - agriculture has a big interest in the question before us.

And one of the points that I wanted to make in connection with this discussion was the one that I think should be stressed, that is the contribution that our local industry is making in the field of agricultural production, and sales. We have in the Province of Manitoba a young and rapidly growing machinery company which is now selling farm machinery not only in this province and not only in the prairie provinces of Canada, but to the neighbouring states to the south. And I think this is an example of how industry can be developed here. I am sure that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is particularly interested in the fact that here is a company that started up in the Province of Manitoba and was logical enough to develop implements that have a particular application to this area - and not only to the prairie provinces but to the four neighbouring states whose agriculture economy is very similar to our own; and by specializing on implements that are particularly adapted to the conditions of these three provinces and those four or five states, that it has been able to operate in an unusually efficient way because it is relieved of the necessity which some of the larger companies have imposed on them by virtue of their organization and their long term policy of carrying the manufacture of a whole range of farm implements, and this local company by specializing on ones of which it makes a speciality and where the market is close and concentrated, has been able to do exceptionally well.

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd)

This is no mean company, Madam Speaker, because in the year just ended, well, ended last August, 1965, that company's sales amounted to almost \$11-1/2 million, manufactured right out here, just a little ways from where we're sitting, and is now selling almost as many implements in United States as in Canada. This is a major achievement in my view. I think this is a demonstration of the kind of thing that can be done by people of initiative and imagination under free enterprise who develop a market to suit the local circumstances and who take into account the high costs of distribution and therefore concentrate in an area; concentrate in two ways: (1) by specializing in certain machines and (2) choosing those machines on the basis of what is particularly needed in the way of implements in the close-lying territory. This company having almost pioneered the field in such things as self-propelled swathers and having been among the leaders in some other implements of that type, has now recently moved forward into the manufacture of a combine and is also starting to manufacture a tractor. I think this is most encouraging. And this is something that can do, can make, have an effect on farm machinery prices because they can, by restricting their operation to a few special lines and by selling in the market where those lines are predominant, it can cut costs of production and I would think that as it grows and prospers that it will make a still greater contribution.

There's another company that is operating in this area - and while I didn't give the name of the first one, I think perhaps I should of the second one - it's the Canadian Co-op Implements Limited - this company had sales last year of practically \$28 million. Now it's not like the former one that I mentioned in that it does not manufacture all of its implements, to some extent it purchases, and in the case of its combine and to some extent with its tractor as well, it has had to meet a variety of circumstances. Right at the present moment it is purchasing its combines for the next years operation in Europe - and this I think would seem rather odd to the most of the members of the Assembly that it's possible to bring combines from Europe here - it seems a little bit like carrying coals to Newcastle - but the fact is that this machinery is manufactured over there. I am told that this is an excellent combine and it's being brought here for sale in this area and this company has been able through the years to make a considerable reduction in the price of the implements that it has sold to the people who patronize it. And perhaps the main point that I should draw from that company's experience is the fact that it actually originated, that company, from parliamentary and legislative investigations into the farm machinery situation. It was actually an outgrowth, directly I would think of the farm implement investigation in the Province of Saskatchewan going back to the late 1930's that sparked the development that led to the establishment of Co-operative Farm Implements.

Now I'm not going to take the time of the House, Madam Speaker, to speak at any length about the other companies that - incidentally I should mention that in addition to importing machinery here, and while I have attempted to praise greatly the company that is manufacturing all of its implements here, I do not for a moment deprecate the good efforts that this company is making in importing machinery either; because Madam Speaker, I am sure that you agree with me in saying that trade is a two-way street and if we're going to continue to sell to the nations of Europe in the way that we would like to sell to them, particularly farm products, then we have to be prepared to buy from them too, and I believe that this company in importing from Europe is following a sound procedure as well. But there are other companies more than the most of the members would be inclined to think that are manufacturing farm implements and farm equipment right here in the Province of Manitoba. That's one of the things that I wanted to bring to the attention of the Committee.

Now that brings me to the discussion of should we have such a committee sitting here. I believe it would be of value to have such a committee and my honourable friend the Member for Arthur didn't take kindly to the resolution that we moved in all of its aspects so he amended it to suggest that instead of the committee being established here, in the Province of Manitoba, that the suggestion should be endorsed of having the Federal Government conduct an investigation and that we should in this province in addition have a committee to investigate and report on all aspects of sale and use of farm machinery and repairs in Manitoba and to also examine the method by which machinery is designated for agricultural use and exempted from excise tax and duty under federal legislation with a view to making recommendations in this respect. Well my first impression was that I might still further amend my honourable friend's resolution and try and bring it back a little bit closer to the original, as closely as you would likely allow, Madam Speaker, but again having regard to the stage of the Session that we are in, I decided against that and I suppose there is no use of arguing against my honourable friend's suggestions

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . in this case. I believe that we are all aiming at the same result; we would like to see something done that would get a more efficient production of farm implements, a more efficient distribution of them, because I think that the committees that have considered this matter in Parliament and in the other Legislatures, have almost unanimously decided that the distribution is the more fertile field of the two to cultivate, and believing that consideration by representatives of the farm interests and the Legislative Assemblies and others concerned in this matter would be of use, that we should conduct such an investigation.

One authority that I had hoped would be in the House when I spoke on this matter is the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. He hasn't been here for some little time, and I wanted to remind him that he is quoted in the Canadian Farm Equipment Dealer of January of this year as having shown some interest in this matter. I have before me the report of the Manitoba Implement Association Annual Meeting at which my honourable friend the Minister was the guest speaker and he had some interesting comments to make - and I read from that month's issue of the Canadian Farm Equipment Dealer: "The guest speaker for the Annual Meeting was the Honourable G. Hutton, Manitoba Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, a practical farmer of wide experience. On the matter of complaints from farmers on the availability of repair parts, he fully realized the high cost of part inventories essential under The Farm Implement Act and he suggested that the wholesale trade could benefit greatly by explaining to agricultural meetings their side of the story. At an agricultural meeting in Alberta he had heard an excellent address by a farm machinery head office executive who gave a lucid explanation of the cost factors in maintaining stocks of parts for very old machines and also the cost incident to annual repair parts supply and wholesale distribution. He thought the Manitoba Association could offset the many complaints made by farmers who just did not know about the high expense involved for the factories and wholesales." Well now, Madam Speaker, if my honourable friend were here I would perhaps tease him a little bit about the farmers not being aware of the high expense. Well they're aware of the high expense so far as it impinges on them and this is the reason I'm sure that an investigation would be of benefit from the point of view of the agriculturalists themselves.

I admit with my honourable friend the Minister that the farm machinery companies have their side of the story too but the point that the farm interests would like to present to them, I think, would be this one that has been mentioned so frequently and has been mentioned again this afternoon. This is the major part that the cost and operation of farm equipment plays in the cost-price squeeze which is of such paramount importance to the farmer in these days. This is why, Madam Speaker, that we have tried to bring before this House the question of farm implements, the question of the exemption of purple gasoline for farm trucks, and other matters that are, at least to some extent, within the control of this province, especially the latter, the gasoline; and to alert the public to the difficulty that the farmer faces if we're going to have this little or no rise in the prices that the farmer himself receives and continuing escalation in the costs of the farmer.

As the resolution mentions, there has been notice given already of an increase in the cost of farm machinery for this present season that we're just entering now and certainly as the Honourable the Leader of this group pointed out a few minutes ago, there's a very heavy tax on gasoline and these are major factors in the farmer's position. Anything that we can do to first alleviate the situation or secondly if we can't do very much about it in the Provincial sphere, at least by such meetings as this and investigations we can call the public's attention to the situation in which the farmer's placed.

So Madam Speaker without attempting to further amend the resolution that's before us and with appreciation of the point of view that's been expressed by my colleague who introduced this resolution and the others who have spoken on it, I commend it to the consideration of the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye, as amended. Are you ready for the question?

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 Elmwood and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Springfield; and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I would like to make a few brief remarks on this resolution. I would like to make a few comments on the sub-amendment to this resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

His sub-amendment at least deserves some comment which is more than I can say for the government's. The Member for Assiniboia has recognized the importance of three of our recommendations. He recognizes the need for an immediate and detailed study of the effects of automation - a study which will be carried out by all parts of the community likely to be affected. He recognizes the right of labour to be informed in advance about developments affecting them. This principle was accepted in the settlement of the oil and atomic workers strike in BC and by the Freedman Commission of Railroad Runthroughs.

Now, Madam Speaker, I would like to read off to you what was accepted by the government of BC and by the Freedman Commission of Railroad Runthroughs. 1. Employers be required to notify employees or their representative six months in advance of intent to institute changes in working methods or facilities which would involve the suspension, termination of the services of any employee. 2. Employers be requested to co-operate with the government in every way possible in training and re-training any employees. 3. Severance pay equivalent to one week's pay for each year of service in the employ of the employer be paid to the employee whose services are terminated because of automation or cybernation."

Now, Madam Speaker, having read this off, it is too bad that this government can't see fit to do the same and I say that these people that have worked in these various places oh we say, we haven't got it here now - but the time is going to come and the time is coming fast on our heads. The Minister of Labour said there the other day, when he said the different ages - the stone age, the bronze age, the iron age and come all the way down, and he was on the moon the first thing that I knew. Well that was fine. He was putting a point across. But I say we have to recognize what is coming in the future. And where are these people going to turn? They are going to turn to the Province of Manitoba and say, well now, I have nothing for my services which I have put in - 20, 25 or 30 years in this place and something has come up beyond my scope and where do I have to go. I have to turn to the Province of Manitoba to keep me. All right, who is going to keep them? I say the people in Manitoba from taxation.

Now surely these firms have something to give to these people for the services they've put in through the years and I say that they are the people that should put something away to safeguard these people. I went to one place there the other day, there was a group of people talking, and a certain group in there - one spokesman got up for them in particular and we were talking about pensions and he said, "oh, I have put \$50,000 away so that we can look after the pensions of our group of people." Now the greater mass of the people in there they were not protected under this \$50,000 clause but just a small group of people. It seems to me in this world that we like to look after ourselves, we are self-centered in our ways. I think we should open up a little bit and say, let's have a look and see what we can do for the other guy too. But no, it seems that we seem to think fit that as long as I get along, I don't need to worry about the other man at all.

Now, Madam Speaker, as I said, I want to be as brief as possible. The Member for Assiniboia also sees a need for a retraining program. No mention of this is made by the government's amendment. However, the Member for Assiniboia has not seen the need for companies to pay compensation to displaced workers. I ask him to remember that companies bringing in automated equipment in order to increase profits, by increasing productivity per man, no one wants to stop this from happening. I don't want to stop it. I think it's great. - It's all right. But I say that we should have a little bit of forethought not hindthought, forethought. This is what we need. But hasn't a company some duty to the men displaced in order to gain higher profits. Hasn't a company some duty to society which will be forced to support displaced workers until they find a new job? We say that companies do have such a duty and that some of their expected profits should go into paying compensation so that they will properly carry out their duties. Thank you.

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

MR. PATRICK: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House, the proposed motion in amendment to the amendment of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Cowan, Evans, Hamilton, Harrison, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

CLERK: Yeas 13; Nays, 25.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Springfield.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. I have had the amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party under consideration and in view of the policy as being announced in Bill 81, I must rule that the proposed resolution of the honourable member is out of order.

MR. PAULLEY: I will not challenge your ruling, Madam Speaker.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Could we have this stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PAULLEY: Could we have this stand, Madam Speaker.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, if I speak now I will be closing the debate. It has come to my attention that someone else wanted to speak on this debate. I have no objection but if I start speaking now, I will be closing the debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wish to speak?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if I may, I would like to say a few words on the motion if I am in order.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjournment is in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I'm prepared to give consent by agreement but it would be a departure, I think, from Beauschesne -- I'm not sure.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition leave to proceed? The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. On an occasion such as this, one should have a very full scale speech obviously with copious notes and a great deal of reference material on which to work, if it requires special leave of the House to make the speech. I regret that I have not made that preparation. What I really intended to say, Madam Speaker, will be rather brief.

I am concerned about the development of crime in Canada as a whole. The difficulty of course at all times is that a good deal of the information in these matters is not the type of information that can be made public, and I sympathize with some of the problems facing the Attorney-General in this regard. On the other hand, Madam Speaker, I think that at times there is a tendency to keep maybe too many things secret; that there might be some advantage insofar as the public in general if they were more aware of what is happening and of the dangers that are facing it.

I must confess that I am in no position to judge whether or not Manitoba is threatened by organized or syndicated crime. I do not have access to the files. But I do get a lot of phone calls, Madam Speaker. Due to the position I hold, a great number of people phone me, a great number of people who are prepared to identify themselves to me but are not prepared to appear before a committee or to sign an affidavit or to make a public statement. They will speak to me. If it is an anonymous call, I simply do not do anything about it; if they are prepared to identify themselves then I do my best to find out the facts of what they tell me. And I find a very general concern on the part of a lot of Manitobans about the possibility of organized crime

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . developing here. I get, for example, a persistent statement from various sources that there is a possibility that financial resources are coming into the Province of Manitoba from organized crime, and that while those resources are maybe not engaged here in illegal activities, the fact that they are the result of illegal activities elsewhere may jeopardize some Manitoba businesses, may place Manitoba businesses in hands that I think we as citizens would prefer not to see happen. I realize the difficulty in controlling this. How do you prevent someone from purchasing a business? I must confess, Madam Speaker, that I don't know the answer to that question. I don't know exactly what could be done. But surely it is a question of sufficient concern to deserve the attentive consideration of this House and of the Department of the Attorney-General. Surely if this is happening we have to look at this very closely and see what steps can be taken to ensure that Manitoba doesn't end up as being the investment area for illegal funds made elsewhere. Because I would then be deeply concerned as to what might happen to Manitoba's business.

So, while I recognize some of the difficulties involved in having an absolutely wide-open committee hearing, I say, Madam Speaker, that I think it is time that some of these matters be brought out in the open. That is why I am not happy with the resolution, or the amendment that has been proposed by the Attorney-General; because the Attorney-General's amendment in fact says, "Put me on the back and let me continue doing the same things as I am doing." Because the operative portion of it simply says that the Attorney-General continue, in co-operation with the Government of Canada and law enforcement to take all the necessary steps to prevent the establishment and/or operation of crime syndicates in Manitoba. Well, this seems to me to say, "Let me carry on my own way now and let me simply carry on with what I am doing." Well I am not so sure, Madam Speaker, that he is doing everything that needs to be done. I have no means of so knowing.

We were told in the House that the Attorney-General had appointed a special investigator, Mr. Arpin, to deal with this question of organized crime. The question was asked of the Attorney-General, "How much has the special investigator been paid?" And as I recall it, the answer was "Nothing". Well, from my experience with legal establishments I find that for the payment of nothing, normally the services are nothing, Madam Speaker. With all due respect to the legal profession, they have to earn their keep like anyone else and if they do some work they get paid for it. So I can only assume from the answer of the Attorney-General that there has been no action taken by the special investigator, or presumably he would have been paid some money.

So I say, Madam Speaker, that I am not satisfied with this resolution. I agree with a number of the "whereases" that we should co-operate with the Department of Justice in Ottawa.

I think this is essential, this is not a field in which we can go off on our own, admittedly, and that we should have further conferences with them and I'm all in favour of that. It is quite obvious that every aspect of the system of justice and of police across the country must work together. We will gain a lot of information from other provinces and we should be doing all these things, admittedly. But I am not satisfied, Madam Speaker, from the proposed action under this resolution, that enough is going to be done in the Province of Manitoba by the Attorney-General. And I must confess that I have not seen from the statements made and the action so far that we can simply rest back and say, "Continue what you are doing." I think that there is a serious problem that must be looked at and that we have to make sure that our defences are up at all times against any incursion of organized crime, be it by crime being here itself or by investments by criminal syndicates in the Province of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, early this year Commissioner George B. McLellan of the RCMP advised the delegates attending the Federal-Provincial Conference on Organized Crime that crime syndicates were growing in Canada. He warned that if Canada did not take strong measures now to prevent the growth of organized crime, it may be too late to do so once it became strong in this country - imbedded in this country. He pointed out to the situation existing in the USA. American law enforcement officials, Madam Speaker, unanimously agreed that a few million dollars spent on better prevention a number of years ago might have saved them the multi-billion dollar crime that they pay today and also many lives and much hardship.

Speaking of criminals, the Commissioner added that many posing are accepted as members of the business world or as members of reputable professional fields. Many have never even been charged of a criminal offence and some possess but a very minor criminal record, although they have led a life of crime. The Commissioner gave the delegates information dealing with the Mafia and Casanstra and so on, and of groups composed of both local and

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) . . . foreign criminals. The Attorney-General of this province seemed to think that organized crime has to come from the United States - if it's organized or syndicated it has to come from the United States. And we know differently; we know now that there are organization here right in Canada. Now the Commissioner made the specific charge that members of this community, ostensibly in legitimate business, meet with members of the so-called Mafia in United States.

Now during the summer of 1965 the then Chief of Police of Winnipeg, Mr. Robert Taft, had warned the people of Manitoba - and this is what he said at the time: "Let no one be deluded that organized or syndicated crime has not got its tentacles in this city." This is what the then Chief of Police of Winnipeg said. And although he did not give names he said that three people in Winnipeg stood out from others in being involved with crime syndicates in deals totalling hundreds of thousands of dollars. "They are participating in syndicated deals", he said. "And I know where they held their meetings and what they have done," the chief said. Mr. Taft proceeded to explain his charges and also to go into more detail. A few months later the Attorney-General of this province, without further discussion with Mr. Taft - so it is reported anyway - maintained that he believed that crime syndicates did not exist in this province. Now Councillor Charles Huband of Metro said that he had been told by the Toronto Chief of Police that certain people in Winnipeg were operating with the Mafia and that he could name names. This is the Chief of Police of Toronto. He said that he could name names right here in our city.

Later on the Mayor of Winnipeg, a member of the Police Commission, supported his Chief of Police of this city. Mr. Taft said publicly that the Attorney-General of Manitoba should have consulted him as Winnipeg's link with syndicated crime, before popping off. These were the words of the Chief at the Federal-Provincial Conference in Ottawa. And now we have a resolution telling us that there's so much co-operation. Proposal for a national criminal intelligence unit to help all police forces in their uphill battle against the underworld were sidetracked - sidetracked, Madam Speaker - because there were no agreement as to how to organize it. And this resolution tells us that - well we're going to this federal-provincial meeting so everything is fine. Leave everything in our hands. But it was reported that all the delegates agreed on the need for a fuller exchange of secret files between law enforcement bodies. The municipal police is responsible for the Greater Winnipeg area but the Attorney-General of the Province chose not to believe the Chief of Police of the largest city. It is a known fact that in the past no known organized criminal groups operated in Manitoba. This can happen. It's happened before. The Attorney-General said, "Well, Manitoba is not important enough. There is nothing lucrative" -- in this sense I mean. I am not trying to misquote him. Oh yes, he said that it wasn't lucrative - he doubted if they could find anything lucrative enough in Manitoba. He did say this, and I'll find Hansard again. Usually he's the first one to forget what he says. This has happened every year that I'm here, and I'll find this for him, because he definitely said that. Now here, as I say, we know that it's happened - in 1956 under the guise of O. K. Sales Limited, Lee Schaffer of Chicago and a group of associates directed a continent-wide betting business and the turnover was reported to be more than a million dollars. Police broke up the ring and fines of \$50,000 were imposed and collected from the group. And we have knowledge of other activities in the underworld.

Now what concerned the police more is the establishment or purchase of existing businesses, growing businesses here in our city and Manitoba or in Canada, anywhere, where criminal elements from other areas move in unknown to the people of Winnipeg, of Canada, and often even the managers of these enterprises have no knowledge of this at all, that the owners are criminals active in syndicated crime.

The Attorney-General while presenting his estimates to the Legislature was quite vague -- at least if he would have given us something. Reassure the people of Manitoba and the members of this House. First he denied that there was any syndicated crime in Manitoba and then he hedged. He said that as far as he was concerned there was nothing to prove that there was any organized crime in Manitoba. You have the Attorney-General who says as far as he's concerned there's no organized crime; you have the police chief of the largest city of pretty well - at least one-quarter of the population of Manitoba - who says "Yes, I can name names." And the Attorney-General keeps on saying "No, they don't exist." And these two people are not talking together and we have a resolution tell us let us continue the way we're going now.

Madam Speaker, I'm of the opinion that stamping out syndicated crime in our country and preventing syndicates from taking a toll in Manitoba is of vital importance. I think that

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....this is no laughing matter. We're not making accusations. I hope this is not going to start again like the report that we've been discussing. But I'm saying there is a possibility - there's enough, there's enough evidence to warrant an investigation. And this is all I'm asking - to warrant an investigation, to reassure the people of Manitoba. And I could second the words of my Leader - I also have received many phone calls. It's true some people are so afraid they don't even want to give their names but others do. There was no accusation of the government trying to do anything or being mixed up and we certainly don't say this. But they told me that if Mr. McLean, if the Attorney-General of Manitoba thinks there's no organized crime here he has another think coming. Now I can't substantiate this; I don't know; but the people of Manitoba are worried. The Whip of the Conservative Party says "Well what'll you do?" Well this is it. This is what we ask for - an investigation. The Attorney-General announced that he had named Mr. Maurice Arpin special counsel. Now my Leader says he doesn't think that he did anything. I'm sure he didn't do anything because my Leader forgot something else. The first question from the Member from St. George was this: What is he paid? The Attorney-General said he's paid for only

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, on a matter of privilege. The question was how much has he been paid? I answered that question truthfully and correctly.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, there were two questions and again I could refer to Hansard if my honourable friend wished. The first question was "Has he been paid anything so far?" The answer was "No". "How is he being paid?" "He's being paid for the work that he's doing." And the second question was "How much has he been paid so far?" The answer was "Nothing." And everybody smiled. So he didn't do anything. This is clear. (Interjection) No, it doesn't mean that. How much is he paid? How is he paid? He is being paid so much a month, so much a year - no he's paid for what he's doing - any work that he does. Has he been paid anything? No. That doesn't mean that he didn't Well, I don't know Madam Speaker. I don't know. To me this is what it means. Unless this is a charitable organization.

Now, what is this - if at least the Attorney-General would tell us what this man is supposed to do. He's a special counsel. He's not being paid, doesn't do anything, but he's a special counsel. This is the important thing. This is why we are going to prove this, because we named a special counsel who hasn't done anything - who hasn't been asked to do anything.

Now the only thing that the Attorney-General said was this: He'll be the liaison or the contact between the RCMP and the Attorney-General's department. Why do we need somebody between the Attorney-General and his department and the RCMP and Ottawa? Why should we go outside of government for that? Get a practicing lawyer, a criminal lawyer? Isn't it possible that this man might have sometime a conflict of interest? He's one of the best known criminal lawyers here in Manitoba, probably in all western Canada and his services are in demand.

I asked a question about Mr. Arpin before and the Attorney-General told me well who would you name? Who would you name that would have something like that and I was talking about a part time, part time and I said a full-time. And it doesn't have to be a lawyer. There are some people that aren't lawyers that have a little bit of judgment. And in a case like this I think a police officer, somebody from the RCMP or something I think would be better qualified. We're not prosecuting anybody - we're trying to keep crime away from here. This is not meant to take anything away from Mr. Arpin who I think is a very well known, as I said very capable lawyer, but I would like to know what his job is; what he's supposed to do.

A few short weeks ago Winnipeg was robbed by a very daring multi-thousand gold robbery. The Attorney-General says there's no organized crime. We have no proof of that. What is organized crime? It doesn't necessarily mean the Mafia - and this is what he said himself. Organized or syndicated crime. It doesn't mean that they have to come from the United States or Italy. It doesn't mean that at all. And I think when we find out we may find out a little more about that. Isn't it true, I ask the Attorney-General, isn't it true that the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario know of a ring that exists, that specializes in the robbery of precious metal and so on. Isn't there a squad that was formed just for that a few years back - to deal with these people? This is the information that I've received anyway.

Now these people needed some kind of work and they had to be set up somewhere, you don't -- they weren't successful, that's true and I'm not saying they're syndicated crime, but I think that there is. And then we had the -- oh, I thought he wanted to stand up, I'm sorry. I think he was just straightening (Interjection) Well - a waste of time. This is this government. This is the government who would bring back something, rehash something that's

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) been dealt with many times -- but it's a waste of time. A waste of time to talk about crime, to try to keep it away from Manitoba. It's a waste of time. You heard, Madam Speaker, you heard the words of the Attorney-General it would be a waste of time. Well, that's his responsibility. If this honourable gentleman wants to take the responsibility, if he wants to assure the people of Manitoba that there's no such a thing as recognized crime, if he wants to do nothing and if he thinks he's going to get all the members of this House to pass a thing like this! What is a waste of time? This resolution is a waste of time. Why don't once in a while at least, we stand up and have the guts to say yes or no! Did you ever hear such a resolution? "Therefore Be It Resolved that the Attorney-General continue" - continue - we have to have a motion to ask the Ministers to continue to do their work. This is a terrific resolution. It's not a waste of time at all, Madam Speaker. "In co-operation with the Government of Canada and all law enforcement agencies". This is "in co-operation with all law enforcement agencies". Now what does the Chief of Police -- the former Chief of Police here in Winnipeg says "why doesn't he talk to me before he goes popping off like that?"

No, Madam Speaker, we're not trying to scare anybody -- I'm not trying to scare anybody with this resolution. What would be lost? Would it be a waste of time to have a committee to be assured that there's no organized crime? Would that be a waste of time? I don't think so. This is where we differ, I guess.

Now the Attorney-General made a big thing of saying well you don't tell the criminals what you're going to do. I wasn't talking about law-breakers, or setting up a bunch of these members in this House as detectives. I asked for an inquiry and there's nobody - a committee that would enquire, that would try to find out - no, not would replace the RCMP. I never suggested that at all. And if certain things had to be said in camera that could have been up to the chairman. Probably the Attorney-General himself would chair such a committee and he certainly could ask for certain things to be done in camera.

No, Madam Speaker, I certainly don't intend to vote for this resolution which means nothing at all. The Attorney-General felt that I was wrong. That it's a waste of time to have a committee. That it's not worth it. That he's not interested if there's going to be crime here or not. He's not interested to know or even to reassure the people. Well he could have said no. But to change this; to bring in another one of those wishy-washy resolutions that mean nothing, a resolution patting him on the back and saying this House asked him to continue to do his work. Well if he doesn't want to do his work I think he should just resign his post but I don't think we should have a resolution. It would be quite the thing -- we've got how many Ministers now? And every day we get two or three more -- and we're going to have a motion congratulating them and telling them to continue to do their work? But that's not a waste of time!

Well as I say if the Attorney-General wants to take this on his shoulders, if he wants to assure - if he's sure there's no crime and it won't exist as long as he's there and as long as he "continues" to do his work like this . . . if he doesn't want any suggestions from this side, and more than this if he feels this is a waste of time this is his responsibility and he's the one that will have to shoulder the blame. But this is not going to help the people of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I'm not going to vote for a resolution that means nothing.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution as amended by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Patrick, Smerchanski, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 28; Nays, 8.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, but if anyone else wishes to speak I'd have no objection.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I just want to make a brief comment in connection with this resolution and to explain to the House the position that this group intends to take on the resolution.

As the resolution reads, Madam Speaker, it indicates that the Government of Manitoba should interfere in the internal operation of Manitoba Hydro. We have had a considerable amount of debate in recent weeks and months, I guess two or three years as to whether or not the government or Manitoba Hydro should be responsible for the generation of power, the setting of rates, and it is our opinion as supporters of a publicly-owned enterprise, that having once entrusted to management the operation of that public utility, then we should give them all of the support that we can. If, Madam Speaker, in the operation of a public utility such as Manitoba Hydro, that the inner workings of that organization was subject from time to time to directives such as the one that is suggested by this resolution, then I fear greatly whether there could be an efficient operation of the utility.

It really doesn't matter, Madam Speaker, whether we are dealing with the question of Manitoba Hydro and electrical power, whether we are dealing with the question of Manitoba Telephones which is also a publicly owned utility. During the hearings of the Committee on public utilities, in answer to a question I raised, the manager of Manitoba Power indicated to us that in the area of Flin Flon, that at the present time the people in Flin Flon were receiving a lower rate for electrical energy than they could if indeed it was supplied by Manitoba Power. What a position it would be for us to say to Manitoba Power, notwithstanding this, then you shall go into Flin Flon and provide power in order that we complete coverage insofar as power publicly owned is concerned. I don't think, Madam Speaker, that a government comprised of real avid supporters of public ownership such as my group are would advocate that in order to complete, have complete publicly owned enterprise that we would go into a situation like that. Neither do I think, Madam Speaker, that we should in this instance say to Manitoba Hydro this is what you have to do because we politicians think it is advisable for you to do.

Now Manitoba Power has told us that they are in the process of extending the transmission lines from Grand Rapids and Kelsey into the area of The Pas, in order that rates will be reduced progressively, and I think it would be well for us, Madam Speaker, to allow that to be done.

There is also Madam Speaker, another part of this resolution that I cannot agree with because I can't understand it. The final sentence or few words of the resolution says "to provide these Northern areas with the same rates as in the remainder of the province". We have already different rates in the province under our publicly-owned enterprise. We have the rates in the Greater Winnipeg area, we have the rural rates as well, so the resolution in itself is not explicit, it doesn't say anything and I take the position as do members of my group that we have a capable and efficient, a qualified group of individuals who are charged with the responsibility, and conducting that responsibility admirably in the best interests of the people of Manitoba, and we are content to leave to the Power Commission the setting of the rates; but naturally I say in addition to this, Madam Speaker, that I trust and hope that the electrical energy rates - the rates for electricity - will be uniform throughout the whole of the province as quickly as possible. I feel convinced and sure that this is one of the objectives of our Manitoba Hydro Commission and I leave it in their hands.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party has just given us a demonstration of the fact that he does not realize the implications of this resolution. He appeared to think that he had a point in the statement that he made here, but I can assure him that so far as I understand the situation, that he is wide indeed of the mark.

I agree with him about the Manitoba Hydro operating the day to day business of the utility for which they are responsible - and this is their job. But when it comes to a matter of government policy such as equalization of rates all over the Province of Manitoba, or to something of that kind, where they have to move out of the sphere of just administration of a utility itself and into the field of public policy, and particularly if some money has to be taken out of the public purse, as differentiated from the receipts of the Hydro themselves, then it is definitely the government itself that has to make that decision. Would my honourable friend attempt to say, or would anybody else in this House attempt to say that when the government of this province, back twenty years ago, decided that it was time that farm electrification was made possible in this Province of Manitoba, that that was interfering with the Power Commission as it was called in those days? This was no interference with their business at all. This was no

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd), . . . lack of confidence in the Power Commission of that day. This is the difference between administration of a utility and a public policy that is instituted in order to get a certain job done beyond the method of administration.

And what did the government of that day do, Madam Speaker? Every once in awhile, because I hear my honourable friends from this side of the House, and this area of the House, talk about the sins of omission of the former government in cases of this kind, that once in awhile I have to remind them of some things at least that were done in those days. And let me say this to you, Madam Speaker, and I think I have mentioned it before in the House and it's time that some honourable members understood it. My honourable friends on the other side of the House and those who sit in this group have never yet put into effect in this Province of Manitoba, a policy that had the imagination and the initiative behind them, that the farm electrification program had 20 years ago. Not once have they thought of something that had the initiative behind it or the imagination, if they want to use that, that program did. This was a field where we, the government of the province, properly moved, rather than the Manitoba Power Commission because it required taking money from the consolidated revenues of the province in order to put in as a subsidy, if my honourable friend likes to use that word. This may require a subsidy --(Interjection)-- You would support it! It's right there. It's right there in front of you - right there in front of you, that this asks the government to do it. And this is the difference in this.

I haven't even reviewed the famous farm electrification program for years, but what was done? There was money taken from the public purse in order to see to it that the farm people of this province got a chance to put themselves in the same position as the folks that lived in the towns and villages and cities of this province. And talk about over-planning! We were looking at this matter even while the war was still in progress. We didn't attempt to do the job while the war was in progress because we didn't want to take the men and materials that were needed in the war effort from that effort, but we were planning even in the latter days of the war, and we had plans ready to put into effect the very summer that the war ended, because we could see that it was coming to a conclusion. And the very year that the war ended we tried out, under field conditions, the program that had been put on the drafting board and that year, if my memory serves me properly, we electrified something like 1,600 or 1,700 farms. The next year we went up to 3,600 farms and the next year we hit the objective of 5,000 farms and we carried it through at 5000 farms every single year, every year, until all the farms in the settled area had electricity available to them. And that meant - and it's well that once in awhile we should be reminded of this - not only the 5,000 farms, but the schools and the community halls and the churches and public buildings of one kind and another that were in the areas as well. And do you know what that meant? In terms of building lines it meant building a line every year because of the scarcity of population on the farms - it meant building a line every year that if joined together would have been long enough to start at the far end of Cape Breton and go across the straits into New Brunswick and go right across the whole of Canada and stick four or five hundred miles out into the Pacific Ocean - building that length of a line every year. And I'd just like to hear my honourable friends when they are talking about the fact that nothing was done by the previous administration, I'd like to hear them tell sometime about what was done that minimizes that program, every year. But this was a government decision. This was a government decision and that's what's asked for here. This is the field --(Interjection)-- I suppose if my honourable friend had wanted to make these points he could have made them awhile he was on his feet instead of on his seat; and as long as he's not on his feet, let him stay in his seat and when he gets an opportunity he can make a speech. --(Interjection)-- Well what is that noise that I heard then?

MR. PAULLEY: The nodding of my head.

MR. CAMPBELL: Does my honourable friend - is there a rattle in my honourable friend's head?

MR. PAULLEY: Could well be, but I'm not the only one

MR. CAMPBELL: Could well be, because I heard something. No, but my honourable friend is the chief exponent of it I would think. Well, this is where the difference is, between a public policy and a matter of administration. All the matters of administration are properly carried on by the Manitoba Hydro, as it is now, or Manitoba Power Commission as it was in the days I'm speaking of. But when it comes to a public policy of where you want to expand beyond; in addition to the ordinary and everyday and forward-looking administration matters, then the government comes into the picture; and this is what is being asked now. I'm amazed that my honourable friend didn't recognize what this resolution is suggesting.

MR. PAULLEY: Would my honourable friend permit a question, Madam Speaker?

MR. CAMPBELL: Certainly.

MR. PAULLEY: Was there equalization of rates under his administration in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. CAMPBELL: Sure there was equalization of rates as between the farm services that we put in. You don't have equalization of rates between every individual in the province but for broad groups you have equalization of rates, and there was equalization of rates under that program.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask another question, Madam Speaker?

MR. CAMPBELL: Sure, all you wish.

MR. PAULLEY: Does not the resolution proposed by the Leader of my honourable friend's party suggest that the northern rates were the same rates as the remainder of the province? The whole of the province, not part of it.

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend can interpret this in the way that he wishes to, but what is evidently being asked here, is to do something, something along the line that I have been talking about, that you get -- in broad terms you bring these people into the system as a whole so far as the matter of rates are concerned. This should be quite apparent, even to my honourable friend.

MR. PAULLEY: Even if you don't say it.

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . stands in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, could we have this matter stand? But if anyone wishes to speak, we'd have no objection.

.....continued on next page.

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

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Dufferin, Whereas it is well known

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please. Did I hear Dufferin?

MR. SHEWMAN: Oh, I am sorry - the Honourable Member from Brandon. He was there just a moment ago.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Brandon, WHEREAS it is well known that the Red River Valley between the United States boundary and Winnipeg is subject to periodic flooding; and

WHEREAS this question was studied by the Manning Royal Commission who found themselves unable to recommend any measures to protect against this natural hazard; and

WHEREAS 80 percent of the flood waters originate in the United States of America; and

WHEREAS the International Joint Commission has been set up to deal with water problems that cross national boundaries;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba should give consideration to the advisability of asking the Government of Canada to request the International Joint Commission to recommend measures to protect the residents of the Red River Valley of the north from flood threat.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SHEWMAN: Madam Speaker, the resolution speaks for itself, and I would like to take this opportunity of thanking those people who so graciously gave us help through this flooding situation that the citizens of the Red River Valley have been facing and will face for some time yet, and on behalf of them and myself, I would like to say thank you. To start in to mention those who have given us voluntary assistance in a good many ways, it would be impossible in the time that I have at my disposal to name them, but I would like to say on behalf of the people, thank you.

I would also like to thank the departments that have so willingly given their assistance in this time of need, and also the Army. Colonel Matheson, the Colonel-in-charge of the Army, and his men, deserve credit that is hard to express in a few words in saying thank you. They have in some instances worked around the clock in fighting water, keeping the water outside of the towns and villages that had been diked, and I would like to also thank them.

Now the thought behind this resolution, some years ago there was an International Joint Commission set up with the co-operation of the United States government and the Federal Government of Canada to study water problems such as floods, from the water that flowed in and out of Canada and in and out of the United States. It is true that there have been studies made both in Canada between the International Boundary and Lake Winnipeg re flooding - flooding protection and such like - and it is quite true that there has been quite a bit of work done in the United States over the same problem where the Red River rises in the south and to the International Boundary just south of Emerson.

But it would appear to one, after reading these reports, that the boundary was a dividing line as far as controlling water was concerned. In the United States they have spent a considerable amount of money on flood protection, fighting floods, and the International Joint Commission in some instances has taken part in the preparations that have been made for fighting floods and the controlling of water, and the Province of Manitoba along with the Dominion of Canada has done the same thing south of the International Boundary. But it would appear to one that a further study needs to be made because we have had since 1948, Madam Speaker, a flood that affected the Red River Valley quite severely in 1948; there was the flood in 1950 that created a lot of havoc and a lot of damage; then we had the flood threat, then high water in 1956, also in 1960, 1962, 1965, and we're in the situation today of a major flood.

Now the question is, before the House on account of this resolution today, wondering what can be done. In the studies that I have made, I cannot find any detailed report where it starts in Red Lake in Minnesota and traces the water that flows down through the Red Lake River and other rivers into the Red River which empties into Lake Winnipeg. Now we are told that 80 percent of the water - flood waters that we receive here - originate in the United States, and in the United States, Madam Speaker, it affects somewhere in the neighborhood of 42,000 square miles. Approximately 800 square miles are in South Dakota - that's quite a ways south of the line; 21,000 square miles, which include approximately 3,940 square miles in the Devil's-Red Lake area and the sub-basins affected by Devil's Lake area; in North Dakota, 16,400

(MR. SHEWMAN cont'd). square miles; and in Minnesota, there is 2,000 square miles in Canada along the Pembina River and the Red River.

So when asking that we ask the Federal Government to request this International Joint Commission to make a complete study of the Red River and the flood area between Lake Winnipeg and the source of this river, I don't think we are amiss.

Now as I mentioned before, it is true that there has been some reservoirs built in the United States, some dams built in the United States, and the materials that I've had at hand, in reading it, it would appear to me that they have spent quite a few dollars over there in water conservation. The second thought would be flood protection, and we have had the Manning Report tabled here - presented here in 1958. The Manning Report is a very thorough report, but it was based partly on a cost-benefit plan scheme as far as the Red River Valley from the boundary north was concerned. They did bring forth the recommendations which could be used such as the diversion from Emerson on the east side of the river, bringing the water that flows through the Roseau River and extending it north through a channel into the Marsh River and bringing it back into the Red River some place around Ste. Agathe. Now that possibly is one study that could be made in conjunction with this International Joint Commission, and I think some benefit might come out of it. Not being an engineer, I am just stating the facts as I see them, Madam Speaker.

Now it must be a serious proposition as far as United States is concerned, and I think that at this stage we can get the support of the Federal Government in the United States. On March 24, 1966, President Johnson of the United States declared the eastern part of the State of North Dakota a national flood area - disaster area - and when you talk to army engineers who control the water resources in the United States, they would welcome, I am sure, an opportunity to work with the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Manitoba for a study such as I am recommending today.

They have in the United States a public law which they call 875 which deals with disasters in general and especially flood disasters, and it's with this thought in mind that I present this resolution today. The public law of 875, as it's termed, looks and studies all disaster but they will look and study flooding, and I think that we should be asking them in co-operation with our own engineers to make a thorough study of the Red River Valley and the Red River and the tributaries that flow into it. It's something that has to be done to give peace of mind and take this continual threat of flooding out of the picture as far as the residents of the Red River Valley are concerned.

I have been interested in this, and I'm happy to say now when the diversion is finished around Winnipeg that you can call the City of Winnipeg safe as far as flooding is concerned, and I think that we should be doing our utmost to remember the people in the Red River Valley. There's been different - as I mentioned before - different studies made by different committees, and the latest one that I have here is the Water Resources Development in Minnesota - the engineers - in January 1965, and they go on to say that something has to be done to protect the citizens of the Red River Valley south of the international line. So why don't we here pass this resolution and ask the Federal Government along with the Government of Manitoba to make the study and make it as soon as possible.

I'm sure that the diking that we've seen around the towns and villages along the Red River when we flew over it the other night is appreciated by the people of those towns and villages, because it means a lot to them to be able to walk onto a dry floor in their own homes when this water recedes, and these dikes should be constructed - some of them will have to be moved and reconstructed on a permanent basis for the future protection of the towns and villages south of us between here and the boundary of the United States.

But in the same breath, Madam Speaker, you have to give some consideration to the farmers who are living in this valley. The farmers were fortunate this spring in this respect, that they had weather that allowed them a week of grace, you might say, to get their grain out while it was frozen, while the ground was frozen or the roads were frozen, but other years the break-up comes quite suddenly as a rule and the roads go and they cannot get their grain out, but this year they were fortunate enough to get the grain out which meant a good many dollars to the farmers in the Red River Valley.

Now there are other things that I am going to suggest that I think the government should be doing, and it wouldn't cost a great deal of money, until something more permanent can be established and brought into being. I think that a ring dike for farmers is the immediate solution, and what I mean by that is a ring dike around the farm site and raise that dike possibly

(MR. SHEWMAN cont'd). a foot and a half or two feet about 1950 level and make it wide enough in spots where the farmer would be able to put his granaries and his machinery on top of this dike and they wouldn't have this threat and this worry of getting their grain out in the spring or the damage due to flooded machinery.

Now I think that that is a must, and I think that in proposing this idea that has been proposed this spring to the farmers of the Red River Valley, that they would be allowed \$500, the first \$500 for constructing a dike, and on account of the frozen ground - and I've only heard of three dikes being built to date - I think this \$500 should be extended possibly to the 31st of December, 1966, allowing the farmers to build this dike during the period when it is possible to build a dike that is going to be stable and sound. Now, Madam Speaker, I'm hoping that this resolution will go through this House unanimously.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I won't be very long, Madam Speaker. I too wish to thank all of the provincial workers who participated during the flood to provide protection for the many residents in southern Manitoba, and I also wish to show appreciation to the different local governments who worked so industriously trying to provide protection for their respective areas. I would say that all of us have been successful in protecting towns and villages south of Winnipeg, but I agree with the honourable member who has just spoken that it's the farmers who have suffered the brunt of the damages south of Winnipeg. They have suffered disastrously, maybe not less of grain or cattle because those were taken out. The grain was hauled out and the cattle were moved to a higher place, but insofar as their buildings, they sustained heavy damages and it is very disastrous for them. Our sympathy goes to them and I hope that something could be done that when another flood, even smaller than this one or larger than this one comes, that these farmers will be protected.

I do not rise to opposed this resolution. We are willing to support it, because even if it doesn't accomplish anything, I think it is our duty to try and do whatever is possible to see that protection is obtained for these people in the Red River Valley south of Winnipeg.

The honourable member is a member of the government - on the government side of the House - and probably did not believe that his party was doing enough as far as permanent protection was concerned. So I agree with him that we had to resort to a resolution to try and push his colleagues to give some permanent protection - and I say permanent protection - to these people south of Winnipeg. I'm sure that the resolution - as far as the honourable member is concerned, he is sincere now about trying to look into the situation and trying to find a solution to this. I'm also happy that the honourable member at last is willing to give me a hand in the requests that I have made every year for the past eight years in regard to some permanent form of protection for the residents south of Winnipeg, because I recall other times when I got up and spoke and invited him to speak, he did not seem to be too interested in that except in attacking our group.

MR. SHEWMAN: On a point of privilege, I never remember attacking his group on this question. I think he did a good job and I've been behind him 100 percent if he'd only stop and realize it. I never remember in the history of this House of me ever attacking the honourable member from Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Attacking our group on the past performances.

MR. SHEWMAN: That's better - that's better.

MR. TANCHAK: Well if that makes the honourable member happy, fine.

I've asked for permanent dikes every year practically since I've been in this House and I was told by the government that it isn't feasible, that it is dangerous, because ring dikes would be dangerous, but now we see that ring dikes do help and do protect these towns. They are serving the purpose and I would suggest that if permanent dikes such as I had requested in the past were constructed around these towns they would even do a better job, they would be much safer. There wasn't any disaster, no sever breakage through of the dikes, and there was no life lost this year although the water was fairly high. That was one request that I had made. At the time, the honourable member at the time did not support me in my request.

I suggested that some buildings be relocated and there are some buildings that should be relocated regardless, even though there are ring dikes built, because it would be costly to protect some of these buildings. We have a few buildings at Emerson and we have quite a few buildings in St. Jean which cannot even be protected by ring dikes. I have suggested on several occasions that some of these buildings could be relocated, that it would be cheaper to relocate them than to try to protect them. Again I did not get too much support from the honourable member as far as this request was concerned.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).....

Now six years ago I suggested that some buildings could even be raised on their foundations, and some people have done it in these flooded areas. They raised the buildings - some have raised the buildings on the foundations as high as 4-1/2 feet and then they banked them up with earth and raised the whole land and they had protection, and I think that was a very good suggestion at the time that some of these buildings could be raised. This year these buildings, even if there were no dikes, would have been safe. Of course you can't do that with all the buildings but some of them could be.

Another suggestion that I made - that's only four years ago - I suggested that the American Government and the Manitoba Government and the Federal Government look jointly into the feasibility of controlling the flow of the different tributaries. The honourable member mentioned that, that there is some control - the Americans have resorted to some control, whether it is conservation or not, on their tributaries. We in Manitoba didn't do so much. We've got conservation or a dam on the Rat River, but so far nothing has been done on the Pembina River. Although the question has been before the Joint Commission, they don't seem to agree on what should be done on this, and I still think that a certain amount of control could be had by damming some of our rivers for this purpose. It would probably slow the flow down. I didn't get too much support as far as that was concerned.

Now although the honourable member did not support me in my requests in the last eight years, I am going to support his resolution because I believe that any action - any action is better than no action at all as far as permanent protection is concerned. But now I have a suggestion to make. I have missed what - I think three parts of a session this year out of necessity - funerals and the flood kept me away and I don't know if this was suggested.

I have been asking the government, as I said before, to erect permanent dikes in towns involved south of Winnipeg. The government did not choose to do this in the past but now millions of dollars were spent - and I'm not complaining about this, I realize it was necessary - on dikes. These towns have been diked and my suggestion is now that the government engineers and the local people get together before they go and start cleaning up and destroying these dikes, that there may be portions of these dikes that could be saved as permanent dikes, and then gaps in between where it is impossible to save these temporary dikes and have them become permanent dikes, these gaps probably could be filled in later. That's one suggestion that I would like to make at this time because I realize that with our drainage - the farmers now have better machinery to drain their own farms, to drain every slough - water runs off so fast that this may be almost an annual occurrence, flooding along the Red River, and we have to do something.

Now as far as the farm property is concerned my suggestion would have been the same, that where possible, ring dikes should be built around farmsteads - farm yards, to protect them from the damage. Some buildings probably could be raised under foundations the same as in towns, especially the dwellings could be raised under foundations, the earth around could be built or the lawns - it could be raised so it wouldn't be too much of an inconvenience. But I still say that although we have this resolution before us, the Manitoba Government should act now and not wait for the outcome of this resolution, because a commission has a habit of studying for several years and we may have this danger again next year. Who knows? We hope it doesn't.

I would say that in the case of the Winnipeg Floodway, we did not wait - Manitoba did not wait too long - so I think that we, the Legislature and the Provincial Government should take immediate action, even this year, to start on some kind of permanent flood protection for the people of south of Winnipeg. In my opinion, I'd say that action in the Red River should be taken now, and we are going to support this resolution because I don't see how the resolution could hurt.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris, upon the introduction of this resolution, asked for the support of all the members of the House on behalf of his resolution. I want to say to my honourable friend, as far as this group is concerned, we support the contents of his resolution. And I want to say to him that one of the reasons that we can find ourselves ready in supporting a resolution such as he proposed is because of the fact that we recognize that all of the people of Manitoba are making a contribution to the building of what we call the Winnipeg Floodway. We have an expenditure here of some, I believe \$65 million, from the Consolidated Revenues of the province, with assistance from the federal authority.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....

It is our hope, those of us who represent Winnipeg constituencies, it is our hope that after this vast expenditure of money has been made, that the properties in our general areas will be protected. I believe in fair play and turn about, and I would be prepared to support reciprocity in relief or in fair play in the matter of providing relief from flooding in the lower part of the valley, or indeed in any other areas of the province, such as on the Assiniboine River as it happens from time to time.

So I want to say to my honourable friend from Morris, I certainly am not going to say that we told you so years ago. I realize the fact that if this matter is a matter of very grave concern to the people in the valley, it is a concern to all of us as Manitobans, but I would say I also agree that this matter has to be given consideration on an international basis and it's not a problem just peculiar to Manitoba itself. I trust and hope that the recommendation of the member for Morris will receive the speedy action of the Government of Manitoba as well as that of the Government of Canada, and that the International Joint Commission will be able to recommend measures to protect the residents of the valley as quickly as possible.

I make but one suggestion, and that is the consideration of the retention of some of the dikes, if at all feasible, that have been built to relieve the situation this year, because it is most unfortunate as we look into the future to have to come to the realization that the Floodway, that is the Winnipeg Floodway, is not going to apparently relieve the lower part of the valley, and if we can retain without detriment the emergency dikes that have been built in some areas down in the valley, it may be worthwhile.

With these few remarks, I extend our support to the Honourable Member for Morris in his resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Madam Speaker, the other day when I got on this helicopter, it was one of the biggest thrills for me to go down the Red River Valley and to have my fellow members along with me there pointing out the various places of interest, and showing me their places, their homes and such like. I was quite proud to be along with them and to see the effect of this flood.

It seemed to me that looking at the river just like a serpent going down, I thought to myself, I've heard of the various governments through the ages that have done projects. Surely we in Manitoba could do something with this river and not say: well, we'll build some dikes. We have engineers; we have all the ingenuity that goes along; and I would say we should go along to this river and try to straighten it out. "Oh," they say, "that's too much money," but when you think of the amount of money that's going every flood time in this river and who is paying the shot, it's the farmer that is paying the shot, and we people in the city are safeguarded to a certain extent.

But I think that we, as I say, should make an international project right from the source of this river and tell the United States to look after their end too as we will look after ours. I agree with the member from Morris that we should have something done here and that our people here should look into this thing thoroughly on the engineering end and bring this thing under control. Thank you.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I don't propose to be very long, but for one who was stationed in Morris during 1950 during the flood and one who has had quite an interest in the flood this year and seeing what can be done when the people and the army and the government all co-operate in trying to do a job and get it done well, I see the benefits and the advantage of a long-range program such as suggested by the Honourable Member for Morris, and I wholeheartedly support the resolution, as I hope everyone else in the Assembly will.

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 Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: In the absence of the Minister, can this matter be allowed to stand?

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for St. Boniface, that WHEREAS the government has announced plans for the construction of a power development on the Nelson River; and

WHEREAS a great deal of material will be required for the construction of this project; and

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd).....

WHEREAS it is vital that the government take steps to transport this material in the most economical way; and

WHEREAS an extension of Highway No. 6 to the Provincial Road 391 would cut the hauling distance by approximately 250 miles; and

WHEREAS a road between Grand Rapids and Provincial Road 391 would open northern Manitoba for further tourist developments; and

WHEREAS it would open the north to the rich stands of pulpwood and timber; and

WHEREAS a road from Grand Rapids to Provincial Road 391 would also save the people of Thompson, Snow Lake, Wabowden, Wekusko and other northern communities approximately 250 miles when travelling to Winnipeg,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of immediately constructing an extension to Highway No. 6 to the vicinity of Ponton on Provincial Road 391.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, the resolution is virtually self-explanatory. The Provincial Government has announced a major power development on the Nelson River, and unquestionably it's going to take a great deal of material for the construction of this development. I have made arrangements for maps to be provided to the members so they would see the proposition that I am suggesting to the Legislature.

Undoubtedly, this road that I have proposed from Grand Rapids straight north to the vicinity of Ponton would open up the north for a great deal of development. It would open up areas previously unavailable for tourist attractions. It would also open up development for these rich pulp stands which are existing north of Grand Rapids, and with the pulp mill which has been announced for The Pas area, this would provide access to these stands for the mill which will be constructed in the near future.

It is my considered opinion that with a road extending north from Grand Rapids to this provincial road, it would enable the provincial government and its corporation, The Manitoba Hydro, to save untold sums of money on freight costs if this road were made available for hauling the materials to the project.

It's inevitable that such a road will have to be built, and I foresee where such a road could perhaps be linked with Highway 75 and we could perhaps have a continuous road from the Gulf of Mexico to the far north of Manitoba. This unquestionably would save the people of the Thompson area and the other towns that I have mentioned a great deal of time when they are travelling to Winnipeg and other southern parts. Therefore, I would feel that, as I say I think the road is inevitable, and that if it was built now the cost of construction could be largely borne by the money that would be saved in the freight costs for this project.

This road would also be a great help to the Interlake district. It would also help promote development in the Interlake as well, and for the tourist area in the Interlake. I also feel that there are tremendous possibilities for all sorts of development in this area.

Just recently there was a caravan proceeded from Grand Rapids to Thompson. The member for Churchill, the member for Rupertsland and I were all invited to take part in this caravan, but because of sittings in the Legislature none of us were able to take part, but they were able to proceed by truck via the power line which is now being constructed as a right of way north of Grand Rapids to 391, so it gives you an indication -- Madam Speaker, with leave of the House, I'll be about two or three more minutes and I will conclude my remarks. It indicates that the terrain for constructing the road that I propose here would make it feasible because they were able to travel by truck, even at this time, without too much difficulty. They encountered a couple of small rivers - I believe one is the Williams River and the name of the other one slips my mind - but they did manage to get through without too much difficulty.

This is a project that has met with the approval of the Thompson Chamber of Commerce, the Grand Rapids Chamber of Commerce, and the district along No. 6 highway between Winnipeg and Gypsumville. It's true that No. 6 highway, if this road was to be used for hauling materials to the development, would have to be improved, and I would feel that if this road was pushed though the Minister of Public Works would have little choice but to improve No. 6 with a paved road, which we have been after for a number of years. I feel right now that this road is justified, and with this extension to 391 it would just increase the importance of the road, and I would ask all members of the House to support this resolution because I believe it has opened up a wealth of opportunity for Northern Manitoba and would save the development of the Nelson River a great deal of money.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GORDON W. BEARD: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.