



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 26 8:00 p.m. Monday, March 12, 1962.

5th Session, 26th Legislature



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 12th, 1962.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 85 - passed, 86 --

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to see if there are any other questions on this vote before I reply to the questions that were asked. If not then I'll proceed.

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition generally felt that there should be some statement as to the value we are receiving for the money spent, and asked me to make my comments with regard to sirens and other warning devices on the policy of shelters and to give some information about alternate headquarters. Warning to the public generally is the responsibility of the Canadian Army which they have now assumed. It's based on connections for information with the NORAD Headquarters, and in fact with all the world headquarters as far as the strategic situation is concerned; and it's the responsibility of the Prime Minister to initiate warning to the public. He advises the Premier of the province and at the same time warns the public and the warning is carried by the Army and the Army communications system right to the public, and this of course includes the CBC.

With regard to sirens there's no question that they are not satisfactory, but at the present time they're engaged in a program of improving the sirens in three phases -- only the first one had been concluded by the time of Tocsin "B" exercise last November. The second phase in this improvement is now under way and the third phase will be engaged in as soon as the second one is completed. It's not a bit certain that even sirens will be completely effective, particularly in this climate where we're closed in by double windows in the winter time. At least two supplementary systems are being investigated; one is a series of devices in every home which would be turned on and off by an impulse sent through the power wires to actuate a buzzer system in each house. Now this is a very expensive system. It would be worked in much the same way that the water heaters are now turned on and off by a special impulse sent through the wires at times when their peak power is required for other purposes. There's another system that's in use in Sweden in which the telephones ring a special signal -- I believe in Sweden it's three rings repeated and then a pause and then three rings, then three rings . . . . . That has been investigated as a possible, not alternative, but supplement, to the warning system that I have described, and so the question of warning is receiving study; it's admitted that the siren system is not now completely effective and it's hoped that improvement will follow.

With regard to shelters, I think it's acknowledged on all sides that fallout shelters of the type that we know are not effective against blast or heat, they are of such intensity that no structure above ground would withstand them and it's very unlikely that home-made shelters, even underground, would withstand a blast. My understanding is that as the centre of a ground zero bursts, a crater 175 feet deep would be dug, and so it's easily seen that no home shelter could possibly be put at a depth sufficient to give protection from blast or heat. Nevertheless there is a very considerable possibility that the danger to us would be confined to fallout, and at least something can be done in that regard, because the ordinary home shelter has a protection factor of what they call one hundred, which means that it reduces the radiation on the outside to one-one hundredth when it gets inside and this is thought to be sufficient to protect a family during the period of a fallout cloud passing over the city, to levels which would be not fatal and probably would not cause serious injury or serious illness to the people inside.

I couldn't agree more with my honourable friend that should nuclear war come, it would be a disaster of such proportion that you can hardly contemplate the results. Nevertheless, I take the view that a responsibility has been placed on us here in the province to form parts of an organization or part of a machine to carry out a plan, and I consider that any plan is better than no plan. I consider that some effort directed according to the best advice we can get is better than no effort. I think that the senior government responsibility in the province calls on someone to think out the plan, try to make the best arrangements possible and to stay on the job to see what can be done. I'm sure that in many, if not most, circumstances that we can contemplate in a war, some proportion of the people would be safe, and I think there has to be a plan to care for those people should the ultimate disaster befall, and so we take it as our clear duty to do the best we can with the best effort that we have and the best advice that we can

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.).... secure, and that is the plan we're proposing.

With regard to evacuation, we don't see the possibility of total ordered evacuation. We do see the possibility or even the likelihood of time being sufficient for some fair number of people to be evacuated from the target area and plans are being made accordingly. I think it would be wise if an international situation should begin to look so ominous that war seemed inevitable, for the evacuation of some personnel at least, at least the people who are not required, or not essential.

The Leader of the Opposition drew attention to the fact that the general public did not seem to be involved in or taken care of, or brought into Tocsin "B" exercise or Tocsin "A" for that matter. Well, they weren't intended to be; explicitly the exercise was for those in government service only. The only item that might have been thought to be public participation was the sounding of the warning system, the sounding of the sirens and playing a certain amount of the film over TV so that it could be brought home to the public that an exercise went on, but it was explicitly excluded from Tocsin "B" exercise that there should be any public participation. Public participation will doubtless come in future exercises, but this was merely to determine and to exercise the plans that governments, both provincial and municipal, had for co-operating with the federal authorities.

With regard to natural disaster, it would be almost impossible in money terms or in any other measure that I can think of, to tell you how much of the expenditure might be of some use in a natural disaster. Nevertheless, some of the items might be mentioned so that one can put his own evaluation on each one and determine for himself whether they have some practical dollar and cents value for the ordinary civilian purposes of the province. Take for example the training as was mentioned by some of the honourable gentlemen of the St. John's Ambulance. They offer training in First Aid, home nursing and what's called hospital experience courses in which a number of their trainees get into hospitals and find out the routine and the duties that they would have to undertake in a hospital. With regard to fire training, eight classes were held in 1960-61, 14 classes held last year and 14 classes are planned for the current year.

Hospital Disaster Plan: Complete plans entitle a hospital to a free emergency kit, stretchers, bandages, etcetera, and 12 of these have been issued in the past few months, and more will be issued in 1962-63. To qualify for one of these kits a hospital must have a completely written and planned disaster plan. I attended the first of these at Victoria Hospital in Winnipeg and, partly by prearrangement it must be admitted, a call suddenly went out "Calling Doctor Marshall, calling Doctor Marshall" which was the code name or the code signal that the disaster plan was to be exercised, and within a matter of a very few minutes, from memory it was something of the order of eight or ten minutes, the cafeteria downstairs had been converted into a casualty clearing station where first dressings were applied and other rooms of the hospital had been converted into emergency use; all patients who could be evacuated had in fact physically been evacuated and the wards made available for emergency cases. It was a striking demonstration of what can be done. This has its peacetime significance, I think, that one can imagine a drill of that kind would probably be useful in the event, say of a fire or a scare of any kind in the hospital; and 12 hospitals have plans of that kind in being now.

Communications was a problem in Tocsin "B". From the Headquarters at Shilo we did find very considerable difficulty in getting information as to the situation and to get orders transmitted from the Provincial Headquarters at Shilo to Brandon where the secondary headquarters was and thence out, because of a lack of communication capacity. There were teletypes linking the two and some telephones. They were not sufficient and the plan is now being withdrawn, not withdrawn but redrawn, to provide additional telephone and teletype capacity and additional personnel to work them -- personnel directly under the provincial control. We expect that any emergency now would be handled and that certainly any new exercise will be very much more effective. I think I mentioned that teletype now links Winnipeg, Portage, Brandon and Dauphin in one net, the teletypes are in being, the machines themselves are there in place. In radio there are five mobiles plus base stations at Winnipeg, Portage and Brandon where there are two, Shilo, Lac du Bonnet and Dauphin. There had been some difficulty with the type of radio we were using due to static interference and other technical things

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . . I don't pretend to understand, but they are very much more powerful, 100 watt instruments are being used and it's anticipated there will be clear reliable reception under all circumstances.

With regard to schools, the new technical school at Brooklands will have a fallout shelter in the basement and the whole problem of nuclear warning to the students in school, and the possible use or building of further shelters in the schools themselves, is at present being discussed between the Department of Education and the Civil Defence officials with the object of trying to develop a plan.

Public buildings in Manitoba have been surveyed as far as the federal responsibility is concerned by a team of specialists who came here from Ottawa and surveyed 51 buildings, measuring the radiation resistance and advising as to what steps had to be taken to make them even more radiation proof. The province has surveyed three of its main buildings and the Metro organization have assigned to their assessment department the responsibility of surveying the buildings in Greater Winnipeg which come under their control. This is going to be a little difficult because it requires some technical personnel to carry out these surveys and these people are not available in sufficient numbers yet, but it is proposed to go ahead as quickly as possible.

With respect to alternate headquarters, the main headquarters for the province will be established at Shilo in a completely fallout-proof and to some extent blast-proof concrete shelter underground at the regional headquarters at Camp Shilo. In this camp there will be federal, army and provincial personnel. The provincial staff, which is contemplated -- and I think this is the same staff which was exercised in Tocsin "B" last November -- consists of 26 principal officers with nine sub-staff to move to this joint federal-provincial headquarters at Shilo. It is really the Manitoba Cabinet with the exception of three ministers. The Minister of Industry and Commerce is at the alternate headquarters at Brandon; one minister would be at Dauphin and one minister would be at Portage la Prairie where the target area headquarters so-called, that is the area to which Metropolitan Winnipeg would remove its administrative staff, would also have one minister and representatives of the various departments it heads. The details are here as to the particular officers and particular ministers that go to Shilo and to Brandon. I don't think it would really add very much to the committee's information if I read them all. Those are the alternate headquarters. Does that touch on most of the points that my honourable friends asked?

I think perhaps in discussing that and without going into the larger question that my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP raised, I may have touched on the one point that seemed to me that I should deal with within the detail administration of my department. Not to slight his point of view, but I don't propose to enter into the larger debate as to the world situation and matters of that kind. And I'm not trying to say that should not have been brought forward, nor am I trying to say that I don't think that my honourable friend deserves credit for having raised his point of view and having stated his views. I don't agree with them. I think that one must do the best one can in any circumstances you find yourself in. I have a clear-cut responsibility handed to me and that is to try and make the best use of whatever tools that we can find at our hand. I'm trying to do that and within that responsibility I'll make comments concerning my estimates.

I think the one question that my honourable friend raised, and quite properly, was that on a direct hit no bomb shelter that I know of could possibly be effective. This building would not -- on a direct hit would no longer exist -- it would just have disappeared. There would be a hole 175 feet deep from ground level where we are now. Nothing would survive that. But the probability of anyone placing a bomb on Winnipeg is still somewhat remote. I would think that before any enemy capacity got knocked out they would prefer to direct their attention to other targets, and that the thing we must protect ourselves against in the first instance would be danger from a drifting cloud of fallout. I can only imagine the nightmarish situation in which anyone with my responsibilities would find himself, if he were told that a fallout cloud a hundred or two miles away was coming this way driven by a wind at 25 or 30 miles an hour and he had not discharged his responsibilities to try to provide what shelter could be provided for the people. And I would think that any government with any sense of responsibility would have to try to provide as best they could some protection in those kinds of circumstances which are

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . . quite probable, rather more probable in my view than a direct hit on Winnipeg.

I touched on the point for my honourable friend, I think, about shelters in schools and perhaps he listened to the remarks that I mentioned when I was talking about the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition.

My honourable friend from Rhineland asked questions concerning the division, as I took it, of responsibility and of financial contribution as between the province and the federal and the municipality, and I would like to give him some information in that regard. In this year's program, or in any year's program, the division for most of the items is 75% federal, 10% municipal and the remaining 15% provincial. The federal share is 75% in all cases. In a few of the items the municipality does not share and the province takes up the remaining 25%. Now I don't know whether my honourable friend would like me to deal in detail with the items as between the central administrative staff here, the amounts in the eastern, northern and western zones in metropolitan Winnipeg, or is that information sufficient for his purposes -- the percentage division?

MR. FROESE: I think my question was more or less directed as to whose program it was and whether we were assisting Ottawa, or is it our program?

MR. EVANS: The main plan and the main scheme is, I think it's fair to say, a joint responsibility and the result of joint considerations. The Prime Minister's office in Ottawa has assumed the main responsibility for the emergency measures organization. Certain responsibilities have been assigned by them to the Canadian Army. There are some eight responsibilities in all. The first is to assume responsibility for communications, that is, they have a teletype system right across the country and connected with NORAD, and that is backed up with a complete radio system so that if one breaks down the other can carry the full load. The next responsibility is if there should be a bomb hit their first responsibility is to take charge of the area, assist in evacuation, assist in trying to quell the fires and then to re-enter the area, because they have the technical equipment such as radiation measuring things; they have the equipment, the trained personnel and so forth to be able to re-enter the area that has been hit; to rescue such people as may be alive, to evacuate casualties, to attempt to establish traffic control and other measures of that kind. Then it is understood that civilian forces move in with them on the re-entry operation and assume control as quickly as possible because the Army must be released in case there's another bomb hit, or in case there's a conventional invasion of any kind from the air or otherwise. Now those are the main responsibilities of the Army. The province has assumed certain very specific responsibilities and I think perhaps my honourable friend wouldn't want me to run through them all. They are practically speaking, appropriate to each of the departments. One can understand that Public Works would be responsible for turning out their heavy equipment and their engineers and people of that kind to assist in clearing roads, clearing debris and rubble and generally managing the heavy equipment business. There's the evacuation, there's feeding, there's shelter and all those matters which seem to be appropriate to each of the departments. So it's a question of the provincial government assuming its normal functions under these completely new circumstances.

Now I think that's the list of questions as far as I remember.

MR. MOLGAT: Coming back then to the statement of the Minister. What then is the present policy insofar as fallout shelters? Are we encouraging people to build fallout shelters or are we telling them that it's not worth it?

MR. EVANS: Neither one, Mr. Chairman. We are playing our part in a program of encouraging the construction of shelters which emanates from Ottawa. They have, I think as my honourable friend will have seen, engaged in television presentations -- what is the name of the program that they did have two or three issues on, and the CBC has been co-operating very closely. Mr. Frank Willis is the conductor of the program. In any event, it is perhaps the major or one of the major programs on CBC. They have done a certain amount of radio publicity and have published drawings and plans for fallout shelters. This leaves it up to the individual to make up his mind whether he wishes to make a shelter for himself or not. It's my view that no publicity drive should be launched of such intense character as to persuade a very large proportion of the people to immediately engage in shelter building unless on a national plan with every means of national publicity behind it and the co-operation of the

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . . provinces and the municipalities with it, because it would have no chance of success.

I think the expenditures and the experience in the States have indicated that it is not likely that without even larger efforts than they made down there, that there would be any widespread building of private shelters under those circumstances. So I have held the view that there is no use starting an independent drive in Manitoba, and I've urged upon Ottawa, and they are giving consideration to the fact, that if this becomes an urgent necessity to try to persuade everyone to build their shelter immediately, that the plan should originate from the central headquarters. There are dangers to endeavouring to do that. And one is the danger of inducing something akin to panic or something akin to despondency, and if a drive of that kind should happen to coincide with an international crisis at any particular time, one can hardly tell where it might lead. So there is no immediate plan and there's no provision in the estimates for a large scale concerted publicity drive to endeavour to persuade all, or most of our people to build shelters at once.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, that doesn't really answer my question. What is the policy? Does the government recommend that people should build them or should not build them? I think the public is interested in this. The individuals at the moment have no means of determining whether they should or they shouldn't. I gather from the comments of my friend the First Minister this afternoon that he almost regrets having put one in his basement -- he wouldn't recommend them to anyone else. Well, I think the government must take a position on this. Either it's recommending them to people or it's not.

MR. EVANS: We bring the information to the individual person, leave it to him to make his own judgment. I'm not at the moment launching any publicity drive or by other means endeavouring to launch a drive which would result in the building of a large proportion of shelters in Winnipeg houses. My honourable friend asked whether we were for the policy or against the policy. If anyone were to ask me if he should build a shelter in his own basement, I would say that if he can afford to that he would be well advised to consider it and to put in his own shelter.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I regret the last statement made by the Minister. Surely shelters are a feasible defence against nuclear attack, and I question that they are, but surely if they are then they ought not to be the exclusive property of the people who can afford them, which is in effect what the Minister is suggesting. I want him to consider what he said -- that's the only inference that one can draw from what the Minister said. Now it seems to me, Mr. Chairman -- I'm not going to make a long speech tonight -- I don't think the over-all question of nuclear war really comes within the jurisdiction of this Legislature. I want to say that as far as I personally am concerned, and I don't claim to be an expert, that I am very pessimistic about the possibilities of any defence against nuclear warfare. It has been estimated that the Americans and the Russians between them have enough nuclear bombs so that they have the equivalent of a 1,000 tons of TNT for every person in the world -- not just in those two countries unfortunately; if we could leave it to them to fight it out amongst themselves it might be all right -- but 1,000 tons of TNT for everybody living in the world, so that I think if the nuclear war starts that there won't be many, if any of us, left around afterwards. --(Interjection) -- Well these are the statements which I've seen made and if the honourable member questions them I think I can bring the material which I have seen and I think he will see that my mathematics are as correct as the experts who made these calculations can be. I don't claim to be an expert and I am certain that the Honourable Member from River Heights is no more an expert than I am.

Now this being the case, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that while I'm not a pacifist, that there's not much hope of any kind of real defence against a nuclear war. Now some governments, the governments of Sweden, the governments of Switzerland think that there is a defence. They're not talking about a home-made shelter or a shelter in the basement; they're going ahead with the expenditures of very large sums of money for large community shelters which will house thousands of people, which have their own power plants, which have supplies of food and clothing and all the other necessities to keep people alive. Now I don't know whether that will work, but obviously it may work where the shelters which are proposed in Canada are really of little if any value. I'm not as certain as the Minister that Winnipeg might escape being bombed if nuclear war starts. After all Winnipeg is one of the places

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . . where, if they want to, if Canada is involved, where the railway system of Canada can be cut in half by the bombing of Winnipeg so that it's quite possible that we will be attacked. Now I agree with the Minister that this is the responsibility of the federal government, but if it is, Mr. Chairman, I can only agree with him that the directions that we're getting from Ottawa are, to say the least, confusing. The Minister said this afternoon that it is now felt that evacuation is not very practical. I wonder what would happen to this city if the enemy were to decide to drop a bomb some winter, in December or January when the weather is 45 below, and if they knocked the electric power out and we had no lights and we had no power to run our heating systems and we'd have none of the basic necessities, I wonder what the few people who would survive would do, how they would exist. This is why -- not that I am a pacifist -- but this is why I am so doubtful about the whole question of defence. Now, having said that, I still think we have a responsibility since we are asked to assume part of the task and we are spending some money -- granted it is not a large amount of money -- we have the responsibility of asking ourselves whether the money is being adequately spent -- whether it's being wisely spent, and whether the staff that we have is being put to useful productive work. Now the Minister has said that evacuation is not very practical and the First Minister said this afternoon . . . . .

MR. EVANS: . . . . . say that in certain circumstances I did see very considerable evacuation.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well, I'm of the opinion that the enemy will not be so gentlemanly that they'll give us much notice.

MR. EVANS: Well, you quote yourself and don't quote me on that.

MR. ORLIKOW: That's the impression I got -- I certainly have no intention of misquoting the Minister -- this subject is unfortunately too serious for us to be very partisan or to make jokes about it. I got the impression that the Minister was sceptical about the possibility of successful evacuation. If he isn't, I certainly am. The First Minister was very sceptical about the value of shelters. Now if you take out--if evacuation won't work and shelters won't work then I want to raise the question of precisely what are the purposes to be gained by a civil defence program. This doesn't mean I'm opposed to a civil defence program; I just would like to know what are our objectives. As I say, if evacuation won't work and if bomb shelters won't protect people, then it seems to me there is very little left, because if you have an attack then if you can't evacuate and you can't stay in your own place and be sheltered then it seems to me that we are not any further ahead than we would be--or very little further ahead than we would be even if we didn't have the civil defence organization.

I want to say just one more thing and then I'm finished, Mr. Chairman, and that is that it's the easy thing to do--I think this is the first time since I've been here in the House that I've said anything about this--the easy thing to do is to let the appropriation go through and not say anything, and that's what most of us have done--probably what most of us will continue to do. But the average person that one talks to, Mr. Chairman, rightly or wrongly--this is why I get up to ask the questions I do, because maybe the Minister can give a better explanation than I've heard up to now--the average person is of the opinion that the programs which have been devised up till now in Canada, are not or will not be effective and that they are to a very large extent window dressing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't mind fooling somebody else but I hate to fool myself, and I want to say that as far as I'm concerned, that I don't think that the program which has been devised--and I'm not being critical of this government or even of the former government, because I'm not certain that the mere expenditure of a large, a very large sum of money would be successful, if and when there is an attack--but it just seems to me that the things that have been done up till now, in the opinion of most people, will be of very little value in terms of a nuclear attack. Now if the Minister wants to say that as a side result of this kind of organization which we're building up we have an organization which can fight other kinds of disaster--floods or forest fires or things like that--that's an entirely different matter, but in terms of defence against modern warfare I for one think that we have very little at the present time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I tried to defend the government, the Minister, for their work in this--for their attitude in this, but I think that this was premature because the Minister got up today and this question of shelters is really ambiguous now. First



(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . . . the Leader of the House tells us that he cannot see too much value in it to my suggestion that maybe we should start thinking about maybe to see if it was feasible to have shelters in the schools; told us that that wasn't practical at this time. Then this evening--that was the Leader of the House, Sir, not you--I know, I know, I'm coming to this. Tonight you got up and told us that you were considering it. I was coming to that--that's exactly it--there's a clash of opinions now. The Honourable Minister got up and told us that he couldn't see any value in the shelter, then he tells us, when he's asked to give us his policy on this, he tells us that "if you've got money, well go ahead--it doesn't matter very much." Now the question was not should we start a big drive for this, but what is the policy--a government that's had experts to give them opinions--we should have--it's a rather new field but it's not completely new. I remember 10 years ago following a course in Ottawa in the civil defence and they must have learned something since then. I think the question is this: What is the opinion of the value of a shelter? Not that we want to get everybody panicky and that they should start, but this is an important question. You can't just say "well if you want a shelter go ahead if you've got the money." It's not a pedigreed dog that only the rich people can afford and say--"Well I've got a shelter; I'm a big shot"--that's not the point. And if it has some value you should start thinking about it--you're building new schools, and if it has some value I think it should be started now. People are building homes; there are new apartment buildings going all over the place. The people are entitled to know. If we're not sure, if we don't know, well let's answer "we don't know yet; we're still studying this." But the Minister gave us the impression that he's going ahead with this for one thing because Ottawa is giving us \$350,000, and another thing, because he's got a job to do and it's his job. There doesn't seem to be any interest at all. If he doesn't believe in it and if the Cabinet does, well let's get somebody else to look for. It's all right to try to defend a policy from here but when the Minister is not interested himself I think that's another thing. We want to know--do you know anything, that the government has any information to give the public on the value of a shelter. We're not asking you if you're going to start having all kinds of contests and so on, on this question, or try to tell the people "all right, you'll be forced to do it." We want to know is there any value and are we doing--is the government doing anything. Are you thinking about it; are you giving any directives for these new buildings going up; for these new schools going up, and is Ottawa looking into this? But right now we're just getting--well, it doesn't matter. The Leader of the House tells us it's no good; the Minister tells us it's not very good, but if somebody had asked him he'd say: "Well, if you've got money go ahead." Well it's really ambiguous--the Minister that is in charge of this should have a little more interest. All right, maybe we don't know enough on this subject; but if it's worth doing let's do it right. The people of Manitoba certainly are entitled to have some information on this. If we don't know what the heck we're doing let's quit.

MR. PAULLEY: All of this has been very interesting and if you recall this afternoon most of this discussion started because of the fact that I drew to the attention of the committee the question of nuclear bombs and possible results. Now it seems to me that the long--(interjection)--No, it wasn't new at all. I agree with the Honourable Member for Lakeside this wasn't new as far as I was concerned. I raised it--it was new for this afternoon--I raised it last year and in between times I continuously raised this question and I'm accompanied by a goodly number of seriously thinking people, both here in Canada and throughout the world, and again I make no apologies for drawing it to the attention of this House.

I would like, Sir, just to read a quotation from a remark that was made by a very outstanding Canadian soldier--Major General W. H. S. Mackling, December 17th in 1960 in Regina, dealing with this whole question, and I quote: "In 1949 Russia exploded a nuclear bomb and the grim truth is that in the blast of that device the long comfortable military immunity of the North American Continent was swept away. It has gone, and gone forever, but the colossal error that our defence department has made is to assume that somehow, anyhow, we can get that immunity back if we just spend enough money on such things as jet interceptors, radar chains, anti-aircraft missiles like the Bomarc and the fire control system such as the . . . ." It is in accordance with this illusion that we have lavished billions upon billions of our dollars in what we consider to be defence and which has been pointed out to us from time to time is of no avail. Speaking this afternoon, the Honourable the Premier of Manitoba made reference to a bomb, a nuclear bomb called a "clean bomb". How, Mr. Chairman, do I ask, can such a terrifically

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . . disastrous weapon of any description, of any magnitude of this, be called a clean bomb when by its sheer explosive effect without the dangers of radiation and fallout, can render destruction on an 85 mile radius?

MR. ROBLIN: I hope you're not intimating that I approve of it.

MR. PAULLEY: No, no, I don't intimate, Mr. Chairman, that my honourable friend approves of it. I know he has enough intellect that he doesn't; but this is one of the misconceptions that some people now are placing on these weapons of destruction. They're calling them "clean bombs".

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't mind my honourable friend saying that I made the remark, but I hope he isn't trying to leave the implication that I'm unaware of the situation or approve of it, or myself think that this is a harmless toy.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh no, definitely, Mr. Chairman, I just finished repeating that I don't think my honourable friend thinks this, but unfortunately, unfortunately while we're dealing with these matters, the impression is getting around that there is such a thing as a clean nuclear bomb, and there's no such an animal--(Interjection)--My honourable friend, this afternoon, when he was speaking of federal policy, he stated, and I believe he stated accurately, the policy of the federal authority, that it is something to this effect that, "not necessarily nuclear weapons but nuclear weapons if necessary." I suggest that that is no program. It is no policy. Once the havoc starts if it is to start, it's no time then to make up decisions as to whether or not we're going to have nuclear bombs in our control. I say, and this was my whole purpose from the offset, in this whole matter and this whole debate, that we have to continuously raise the question of the abolition of nuclear weapons throughout all of our world, and we must lead the people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder just--we've gone along now for a long time. I don't think exactly the purpose of the debate is to discuss the nuclear weapons or nuclear bomb, but whether we're prepared to pass this specific item of civil defence and not an argument on the question of--

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in all deference to your remarks, I must disagree. We're dealing with the question of civil defence; we're dealing with expenditures of money presumably as a defence against the effect of nuclear attack. My suggestion is, and has been in this debate, that this is the only time we have an opportunity of raising these points, and that if we get rid of the cause of the necessity of having such items in our estimates for the defence against these weapons, we're doing all to the good.

So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, in all deference, that it is very pertinent, and all that I ask of every member in this Legislature, is that they use every effort they can, and that this House uses its efforts to try and bring about a full understanding of all of the ramifications of this dread terror. I think it is something that we've got to take under our consideration. I think too long--too long we have been living under the misapprehension that it is of no concern of the Legislature of Manitoba. We must give aid to all of these organizations that are taking the lead in this matter, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this debate has been all to the good; and again, the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, in answer to a question from the right of me, wanted a statement of government policies in respect of bomb shelters, as to whether we should build them or whether we should not. Far better, I think, Mr. Chairman, if the government of Manitoba and the Minister of Industry and Commerce would give a firm statement to the effect that we are going to make representations from this Legislature to the government at Ottawa to redouble its efforts--and I appreciate the fact that some efforts have been made at Ottawa, both with the former administration and the present one--but I think that far better for the people of Manitoba would be a firm statement from the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Premier of this province that we are going to request that our federal authorities who have direct representations at United Nations, should redouble their efforts to make sure that this curse of humanity is obliterated from our world.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, I've listened to this discussion for some time and I admit I'm learning quite a lot, but it seems a lot of the members are--the two members who spoke previously to the Leader of the NDP party, confined their observations entirely to the merits of shelters. Well I think it's been pointed out many times by the Minister of Industry and Commerce that shelters are merely a part of this civil defence program.

(Mr. Corbett, cont'd.) . . . . . We all know that one of the greatest agencies we have to protect the public in times of disaster, either natural or man-made disasters, is the Red Cross, and a lot of the work that is covered under these civil defence agencies is very much, goes hand in glove with the work of the Red Cross in times of trouble. A lot of our speakers have confined themselves rather than to the matter of civil defence, have confined themselves to showing us the iniquities of the tremendous amount of money spent on armaments in the world. Well that is something over which we as the Legislature here don't have any great control; that's confined to the two greater countries of the world. We can talk and argue on this thing which I don't think will accomplish very much, but the main thing about civil defence as I see it--I'm not speaking as a government member, I'm speaking as an individual--is that it is one of the greatest adjuncts that our Red Cross and our other organizations that are created for the good of the public in times of trouble, and as such, this measly little appropriation should be passed through without so much discussion. I must admit that the--I had another thought when I got up to speak--that the breakneck speed with which we are passing these estimates I thought might be heating up the legislative machinery slightly and that it would be good to pause for a little while and let it cool off a little bit--but the main thing is that the question is whether--shelters we admit, I admit, could be useful, but they will not stop these million megaton bombs from busting us wide open. The member for St. John's said shelters won't work; other protection won't work, what hope have we? Well if nothing else works we have no hope--but in the meantime to get an efficient organization which I believe this civil defence is, doing whatever they can to better conditions as they are at present, and would be a great help in times if this terrible capacity of nuclear war should come up, they at least will be there taking their part in the welfare of the few people that will be remaining in this world. Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, like quite a few of the other members who have spoken in this debate, and I'm sure this opinion is not unanimous, I have the feeling that this discussion, lengthy though it has been, is worthwhile, because as several speakers have said, this is an important subject; it's a sombre subject, and I don't think we should feel at all embarrassed by the fact that we take some considerable time in discussing it. But I think that my honourable friend, the Leader of the NDP has not over-stressed, but restressed more than is necessary, the argument with regard to the ultimate solution being the complete disarmament, so far as nuclear activities is concerned and, of course, so far as other military activities are concerned, too, because that's one subject I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, on which this Legislature, and one of the few, on which this Legislature is a complete unit. I don't think we need to argue that point greatly--and goodness knows, if the solution lay with this House on that matter, there would be no difference of opinion. We could settle that very, very quickly.

I think if my honourable friend would introduce a resolution here, going on favour of expressing the opinion of the House as being in favour of complete banning of the use of nuclear weapons for military purposes, he could get wholehearted support from every member of the House. So, though it's important, and though I admit that it's something that is quite relevant to the discussion, I don't think that we need to belabour that point. The important point is, I think, that seeing that we can only express our opinions as being in favour of that most desirable objective, then, inasmuch as that's about all we can do--and I'm all in favour of us making that plain to the federal government so that they can carry our views along with their own into the appropriate channels--but having done that, we still are faced with the position--what do we do in the light of the world as it exists today. True, if we could just get our opinions accepted by the rest of the world then we'd fix things but until they're ready to accept those opinions we've got to carry along with the kind of a world that we've got.

I've a good bit of sympathy with the Honourable the Minister in this position because I had to for several years attempt to lay before this House the program, and it wasn't usually one that was a very emphatic program either--lay before the House what we were attempting to do so far as civil defence was concerned. We weren't spending as much money as now; we weren't too sure of ourselves the same as the government now, and I think it's exactly five years ago to the month that the honourable the present First Minister speaking from a position very close to where I am now, said to me when I modestly introduced our modest appropriations and made a very modest speech regarding them, the Honourable the then-Leader of the Opposition said: "Well it appears, Mr. Chairman, that what the Minister has said is that we're just going to have

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . more of the same thing; and I can assure him that in the light of the situation as we see it this isn't very satisfactory." Well now, I don't hold that against him because the fact was that it wasn't satisfactory then. And it isn't satisfactory today. And I don't think it ever will be satisfactory. My honourable friend the First Minister realizes now, maybe he realized it then too, but he realizes now that it's mighty hard for a provincial government to, let alone have the complete picture to work on, to do anything adequate to the situation that might develop. So I have some sympathy with the Minister. It's difficult to outline any very elaborate program that you can say, "here's the right thing to do." We're circumscribed by the circumstances that exist. The senior government has more to say in this particular area than the provincial one; it's very difficult to get the senior government to be definite. I have read and reread the discussion in the House of Commons that took place--I forget the date--September 13th, . . . . . sequence 1961, I have read and reread that debate, and I can say that without any criticism because I know that they're in a difficult position also, that they find it difficult if not impossible to declare a definite policy. They, too, have to try and accommodate their plans and programs to what they esteem the world situation to be at that time, and the world situation changes considerably.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that while we can all heartily endorse the statement of my honourable friend as to the over-all objective--no argument on that--that in the interval there is room for difference of opinion. And like the honourable gentleman who leads this party, I do not agree with my honourable friend that in the interval we should say that there should be no testing of nuclear weapons. If the other side--even though the other side carries on such testing, I do not declare so emphatically as he does that there should be a no nuclear weapons allowed on the North American Continent or even in Canada if the over-all defence program should appear to need those. We have to deal with the situation as it is and we have to look at the best information that we can get as to how the other side of the equation is operating. And I do not think it's realistic, even though I agree wholeheartedly with him as to the desire of everybody for ultimate peace and the avoidance of a nuclear war. Of course we all agree with that, but I don't think that you can leave that to be decided unilaterally until we have some agreement that others also will take that position. I do not think that we should be advising the federal government or the United States government to stop all testing and to let down their defences without any guarantee that others are doing the same thing.

Well now what should we be doing apart from that in this situation? I think that I can agree with my honourable friends of the NDP in one regard. I wouldn't go so far as to call this a hoax. I don't think that that is correct. That it may lead some people into a false sense of security is right, I agree with that; but that isn't intentional and I don't think for that reason that it should be called a hoax. Where I think the danger is, is that if we try to be too positive about our assessment of this situation that we could give people a false sense of security. I think that has been done already in some cases and I would quote from an article that appeared in "Time" almost two years ago which outlines the program that Governor Rockefeller of New York proposed. Now Governor Rockefeller is one of the senior United States statesmen, quite properly, I think, but I think that his program--and I believe that this just goes to emphasize the danger that any of us could run if we appeared to be too positive in these matters--recognizing that "Time" is frequently more catchily written than it is accurate in my opinion, I quote from what they say of Governor Rockefeller's program. He is reported to have said, and here I'm quoting: "With tough minded logic he urgently endorsed the recommendation of a special study committee that fallout shelters stocked with two weeks food supply be required by law in every private and public building in New York by July 1961." And the honourable members of the House will realize, Mr. Chairman, that New York State has a population practically equal with that of Canada. You can see what a program this would be. Incidentally, his program of course, was designed for fallout protection rather than nuclear blasts, but he suggested the program would cost a billion and a half dollars. And again quoting from "Time". "To sweeten the plan shelters would be exempt from local real estate taxes and construction costs could be deducted from state income tax." Well now, that's an example of where I fear that program can be made to lead the public astray, because I think they can develop a false sense of security, because here I am in complete agreement with NDP that I think it has to be recognized at the present moment that there is no defence against nuclear war in general. The layman and

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . the laywoman, certainly the children do not realize the complexity of this situation; the fact that we have spent the afternoon and a good bit of the evening discussing it as we have shows that it's not an easy subject. And while we have in this House this afternoon and evening been in general agreement on most of the main factors in this complex question, yet I think the point that I would like to make is that we should be warning the people--here I'm rather in line with the NDP people--we should be warning the people that to the best of our knowledge at the present time there is no defence against the atomic attack. I think there's a danger of a lot of people taking out fallout shelter programs such as Governor Rockefeller has advocated and has worked hard at, of them taking that as something that is going to be protection against a nuclear war, and therein, I think, lies great danger. And anybody--and periodicals like this, any means of communication should I think make the point that any program that we're even talking about here or that Canada is talking about is dealing with palliatives not the main question, because we haven't yet been able to deal with the main question. I say to my honourable friend the Minister that the argument that I see against going out at the moment with a wholesale advocacy of a shelter program is not that it might induce panic or that it might induce a sense of despondency, but rather the reverse. I think one of our great dangers today is that almost anything that we say and certainly this kind of thing is apt to induce a sense of security that isn't there. It can't be there. It just can't be there.

And so, I think, I end up by coming back to agree with my honourable friends in this part of the program at least, that there just isn't any defence; therefore, we must do what little we can to see that we add our might to the whole wave of opinion that says, "Let us get rid of the nuclear bomb for aggressive purposes." And I say, once again, in this House what I have mentioned on many previous occasions, that I believe that Winston Churchill made the correct prophecy years ago when the atomic bomb hadn't attained anything like the power that it has today, while the hydrogen bomb was either unknown or in its very early stages of development, and Winston Churchill who has so frequently been right on his prophecies said even in those days that the thing that was ultimately going to prove to be the salvation of humanity with regard to the danger of a nuclear war was the fact that the countries had learned the secret of making such terrible--using that word in its proper sense--awful ability for destruction, that the very fact that they had weapons that could cause destruction would in time be the best guarantee that the nations of the world wouldn't use them. And I think that Winston Churchill is once again going to be proved right in that assertion made many years ago; that I think the feeling is permeating, even the folks that we're not inclined to give credit to for much humanitarianism, that this thing is too big to stop, and while I know the danger of somebody making a mistake and having a hand on the trigger and getting a little light fingered just at the wrong time--and while I appreciate the dangers that are inherent in giving the bomb secrets to an ever-widening group of nations--yet I still say that I think the soundest basis for optimism today is that the awful destructive power of this weapon is becoming so well known that that in itself will prove to be a deterrent. Now that may not be a very logical basis on which to found one's optimism but like the Honourable the Leader of the House, in spite of all the difficulties, I remain a bit of an optimist about this, and I think the thing that we can agree on in this House is; number one, that the important objective of course is to do what little bit we can to add our small voice to the many others who are urging the ultimate solution and that is ban the bomb. multilateral, not unilateral. And the next thing, to just move along with the best programs we can in the interim--I think that's about all we can do.

I sympathize with the position of a Minister who has to try and make a sort of a whole cloth story out of an area where the material is so admittedly rather patch-work, but I think the justification for an item in this estimate can be; number one, that we should be doing what we can do with the best knowledges we possess; and, number two, hoping that the need will never arise for using it for the cause of defending ourselves or rehabilitating ourselves in the event of war, is that there is some advantage in an organization of this kind and in the training that is put into it for other disasters that do come along once in a while. We have had flood at times--we have had holocausts--we could have hurricanes--particularly if the hot air in places that I might mention continues to build up over the time--we can have disasters of one kind or another and there's some advantage in having an organization ready to meet them.

Well now, like the others who have spoken, I don't know all the answers to this situation.

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . . It would be a brave man who would try to prophesy what will happen in a few years, because, though I consider Churchill to be one of the great prophets of recent years, I'm sure that the situation has changed a great deal since he made his pronouncement but I think the changes that have taken place rather tend to reinforce the intuition or the logic or whatever it was that he had then.

..... Continued on next page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 85 - pass?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't in any way want to delay the passing of this estimate. I realize that from our standpoint it's a small amount; however, from the standpoint of the people of Manitoba this question of shelters is an important factor, because if they are going to proceed to build shelters, it will be a very large expense to individuals first; to municipal corporations if they proceed; to school districts if they decide to build them; and I think that it's essential that the government have a policy. I cannot say I'm satisfied with the policy enunciated by the Minister. I appreciate fully the difficulties and I sympathize with him in this regard. It seems to me, however, that we simply can't say: "Well, this is a tough decision and we don't know what to do." We must tell our people what we recommend to them. Now at the time that the Tocsin exercise was analyzed in Ottawa, this was to be one of the topics. Mr. Harkness at that time said that the fall-out shelters would be one of the topics to be discussed, and I think it's essential that at this time we come out and tell people: "Yes, you should proceed to build fall-out shelters, particularly if you're building a new house, or if you're making changes in your home, do so; or you shouldn't." I don't think we can leave them in the position now of saying - "Well we really don't know what you should do." The people in the long run who should know best are those who are in the position of my honourable friend of having some information. We can't expect the public to know unless my honourable friend tells them.

MR. EVANS: . . . . . seemed to slight my honourable friend's remark. He made the same speech a few minutes ago -- or a little while ago. I gave the only answer I could and that was that the development of a policy on shelters is in Ottawa's hands, who are the only people who can take up a policy of that kind effectively. There are some new developments in the field. I have now a pamphlet here which describes or tells how to build a shelter costing \$100, in comparison with approximately \$500 or \$600 which was the previous shelter that was out. I have said before that we have no amount in the estimates and do not propose an individual drive on a provincial basis to try to persuade any large proportion of the people to build shelters. That matter is in Ottawa's hands. We'll follow their lead.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, doesn't he recommend that people do so?

MR. EVANS: My honourable friend has read the literature that comes out from Ottawa and seen the publicity himself.

MR. MOLGAT: The advice I have here from this newspaper clipping doesn't say anything, Mr. Chairman. This is important. The public -- they should know. Now what is the policy -- should they or shouldn't they? -- (Interjection)--

Well I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I can't force the Minister to answer me, but I regret that there isn't a more clear statement so far as the public is concerned in this regard.

Another question, Mr. Chairman, in the matter of sirens. Is the government going to continue to develop the siren system, or in view of it's apparent weaknesses, will it stop now any further development?

MR. EVANS: Didn't my honourable friend listen to me when I answered his question? I took some considerable pains to tell him of the three phase program that was underway. The first phase is completed; the second is under way now; and the third will follow. Experiments are being tried with another device to put into every home, and there is the possibility of just some use of the telephone system. Now if my honourable friend would only listen to the answers to the questions he asks it would be so much more worthwhile to ask them.

MR. MOLGAT: I listened to that, Mr. Chairman, but that still didn't answer the question. Are we adding more sirens or are we not? That's the question I want answered.

MR. EVANS: You didn't ask that question. The answer is yes.

MR. MOLGAT: We are putting more sirens up -- so far as the alternate headquarters at Shilo, Mr. Chairman, is that the responsibility of this government or the responsibility of the Federal Government?

MR. EVANS: Federal.

MR. MOLGAT: Completely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 85 -- pass?

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I missed a few of the Minister's remarks. Did he deal with the survivor course?

MR. EVANS: I'm not sure what my honourable friend means by the survival course.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What I was going to ask the Minister was how many members of the Civil Service took part in the course.

MR. EVANS: I don't recognize the title of any course called "The Survival Course." Now there are a good many different kinds of courses that have been offered at Arnprior and some courses that are being offered at now the Provincial Civil Defence College at Brandon. Does my honourable friend mean the recruits that were taken into the army?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm dealing with this release which reads: "Provincial civil servants who can be spared from their jobs can be granted time off to attend one of the six national survival courses being run by the army." This is a release issued last November.

MR. EVANS: I haven't the figures here on the number of civil servants who took any of those courses or all of them.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Were those civil servants who did take part in the course paid salaries while they were away?

MR. EVANS: Yes, they were.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 85 -- passed. Resolution 86, Item 8. Manitoba Development Authority.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I was up when we were still on the item on Civil Defence. I just have a brief question. I know it's rather difficult to try and gather from the Minister's answers just what the policy of this government is with regard to fall-out shelters and, in a way, I can understand the position that the Minister is in, but without being facetious, I would wonder if one could justly describe this government's policy regarding fall-out shelters as being one of accepting the federal government's policy in that regard.

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. SCHREYER: And which in a sense then is a neutral sort of policy by this government. In other words, accepting the federal government's policy. At the same time, despite this tinge of neutrality in that regard, it's sort of a positive approach too, because last year this government recommended to this House, and passed into law, an amendment to existing statutes which gave exemptions to those people building fall-out shelters, an exemption on the actual shelter value. There's no real estate tax on it, so from that it would seem that this government is following a slightly positive approach, and I'm just wondering if I'm correct in assuming that.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit disturbed that members opposite should ascribe to us a position of neutrality or of not knowing what our own mind is and all that kind of thing in connection with shelters, because I think that in doing so they have missed the point of the dilemma, and let's be frank and admit that there is a dilemma in this question of shelters. The point is simply this, that the shelter policy, in fact, is not made in Winnipeg. The shelter policy, in fact all the policy in connection with civil defence, is made in Ottawa: Now I think I can say without betraying any secrets that all the reservations, the questions, the difficulties that members have raised here in connection with this problem of fall-out shelters, have occurred to us. In fact, we have endeavoured to elucidate concrete, precise, definite answers to these problems ourselves with the Civil Defence authorities at Ottawa, but they find themselves in no position to give us the kind of answers that my honourable friends would like us to give them here tonight, so we must recognize that fact. I thought that when the Honourable Member for Lakeside spoke he made a decided contribution to this debate because he brought us all back to earth and sketched in the realities of the problems that we face, and he gave us particularly the thought which I think is important, that none of us knows with certainty what course should be followed in this respect. We don't know, sitting on this side of the House, because we have to rely for any advice or instruction that we get from those who are in charge of Civil Defence at Ottawa. We raised these questions with them and they are not able to give us the kind of definite answers that some people would like us to have. If we could lay down a policy which we thought was authoritative and sound, that was more definite than the policy that we get from Ottawa, perhaps we'd be glad to do so; but we can't. We can't have a provincial policy in this respect because it's not a matter that lies within our competence or, in my opinion, our jurisdiction. If anyone were to ask me what I think about civil defence I think I would say that it is fundamentally and totally a federal problem, and I would be very glad to see it dealt with in that way. However, it's not. It partly devolves on us, at least for the payment of part of the bill, and part on



(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) . . . . . municipalities, and each of us at our various levels try to give what firm leadership we can in those fields about which we can be certain.

Now there's been a lot of emphasis on fall-out shelters, but please remember that that is only a small part of the whole civil defence picture. I think it's the most unsatisfactory part of the civil defence picture because I'm quite in sympathy with those members, like the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and others who have spoken, asking for more definite views as to whether we should have fall-out shelters in schools and public buildings and all that kind of thing. I wish that I had a cut and dried answer I could give him. I haven't got it. The Minister hasn't got it, and to be quite candid about it, neither have the civil defence authorities. When I say that I'm not talking about the politicians, I'm talking about the men who are the technicians in respect of this matter and whose advice we must take, so let us frankly face the facts, that in connection with fall-out shelters we have an unresolved difficulty. At one time the advice is full speed ahead perhaps; and the other time, as circumstances change, then the advice changes. At the present time we are not provided with that firm outline of policy that members, quite understandably, would like to see, so we just simply have to leave it at that because we're not in a position to tell you any more than we know ourselves.

But there are certain other aspects of defence policy which, I think, have been clarified in quite a satisfactory way. The Honourable Member for Lakeside was referring to a debate that he and I had in 1957 or thereabouts on this matter, and I remember the occasion quite well because one of the points that I was making at the time was that if to get an effective civil defence mechanism, one had to be sure that the militia, if not indeed the army itself, was made responsible for some of the major aspects of it such as communication, rescue operations, re-entry, and all those complicated matters of civil defence procedure. At that time it wasn't done by the army and I was putting forward the idea that they should do it. I must say that recently it has been adopted as policy and that is what is being done in this field of civil defence; namely, that the military authorities have a very important and major role in the problem of evacuation, in the problem of communication, in the problems of rescue operations, re-entry, and all that kind of thing. I think that from that point of view then, that we have a much firmer, a much better line of policy than we had at the time. Now I'm not criticizing the people in 1957. I may have criticized them at that time but I don't criticize them tonight, because I say that one had to develop this concept. At one time, if you had told the militia that they had a responsibility in civil defence they'd have been very unhappy indeed, because it wasn't recognized by them or by others at that time how important and necessary their role would be and, indeed, the role of the army. But since those days we've had a further development of public opinion on this matter and we have these changes that have been made.

The question of communication between various parts of the country, I think, has been immensely improved in the past few years, in that we now have several alternative methods of communication from one end of the country to the other which would enable us to cope much more adequately than we otherwise could with breakdown in communication; well one can imagine the chaos that results.

In other fields of activity, for example, in the organization of the provincial government itself, until the last year or two there was not an emergency organization -- an emergency skeleton organization set up for all the departments of the administration so that if we had to carry on, or try to carry on under the type of circumstance that one might visualize, there was no very firm line of policy that would enable us to do so. Now that has been improved. That has been changed and we have an emergency plan which each department formulated for itself and which has been co-ordinated with the provincial plan. Up until recently there was not alternative centre for the provincial government to operate from. It would seem to be a logical necessity under the circumstances that one visualizes, and that centre has now been put into concrete effect. It exists, and it's being provided by the federal government at Shilo, as people know. The provincial government has got arrangements to operate its activities, if it has to from Brandon and from Shilo, also from Portage la Prairie or from Dauphin, depending on the problems that result. So on this rather macabre subject, I would like to say that there has been this development.

Now we take absolutely no credit for it because I don't think we would wish to do that. We merely say that we have been doing what we can to strengthen our organization along

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) . . . . . the lines of guidance that we have received from the federal authorities and civil defence at Ottawa, and I think that in these fields substantial progress has been made, if you can use terms like "progress" in connection with these matters. Heavens above, please don't imply a literal interpretation to the use of that adjective, as I was afraid my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP was about to apply to my use of the word "clean" with respect to another argument, but I merely rise to say that this progress has been made. No one on this side is going to claim that we have a shelter policy about which we can be firm because we haven't. We can only say that those who are expert in this thing and whose advice we are necessarily bound to accept, haven't got one either, because if they have, they haven't shared it with us, and one has to admit that their advice has changed. At one time it was quite firm, that fall-out shelters were the thing; now there are these reservations and second thoughts for the reasons that were well expressed by the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

I don't want the committee to feel that we're trying to dodge firm and concrete answers to these questions. Where we know a firm and concrete answer that we feel justified in giving, we give it; but where we frankly cannot, because our advice is such that we cannot give it, then we are compelled to tell the House the truth. We try to take the House into our confidence, to share the difficulty with them, because I feel if we do that then nothing but good can come from it because all concerned will have a better idea of the type of bomb we're up against. I did want to say this word or two so that it would, I think, complement what has been said by the member for Lakeside, to try and place the whole of this rather gruesome problem into the perspective as it appears from this side.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for being late. I met the ex-Prime Minister of Israel who is in the city, so now, irrespective of what others have said, I simply wanted to be on record and say my few words which I intended to say on this here question. As young as I am, I have lived through three terrible wars. I remember them vividly -- all of them, and these are the Russian-Japanese war, and the result of the war was better preparedness by one of the two powers. I remember distinctly the World War in 1914 -- the tragedies, the millions of graves, the number of cripples that came back. They're still at the Deer Lodge hospital here, and everywhere else. They're still suffering and they're condemned for life to suffer and only get their subsistence. I very tragically remember the last world war, where it started at the beginning by the Italians invading Ethiopia, and the powers that be have never said a word about it. They say this is a business between Ethiopia and Mussolini. They have not seen a mile ahead of them, that this is the beginning of the bitter end.

Then Mr. Hitler came in power and the first ones he attacked were the Jewish people the world over and particularly down in Germany. Everybody smiled, it was a popular sport. Oh well, let him deal with the Jews as he likes. We are not going to interfere. After the destruction of a third of the Jewish population of the world, everybody still kept quiet. Then he attacked labour and labour at that time didn't say a word about it. Then he attacked those who helped him to destroy the Jews. Then when he waited, just like us and the others after the famous return of Mr. Chamberlain with his umbrella, that peace is established, he destroyed the world. The only reason that he was defeated, and if he would not be defeated in time, we would live now for the next 10,000 years of the Hitler regime, slaves and nothing else. However, we defeated them, by the great men like Churchill and the others, and we defeated them by the preparations that the allies at that time in America have had, with the ammunition of those days, probably out of date today. And today, what do we see? Millions and millions of graves the world over; millions of people still begging, asking: "mister lend me a dime", or "spare me a dime." They may be looked after better in the democratic countries like America and Canada, but . . . . . to look worse in the other countries. They give their life, they give their sacrifice in order to maintain our own way of living; in order to maintain democracy, in order to live like human beings. It was only a toss between Hitler winning the war and the allies winning it; and this was preparedness and sacrifice. We don't know what's happening now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm trying to get this item through and pass the appropriation on civil defence -- (interjection) -- Curtail your remarks --

MR. GRAY: I'm dealing with civil defence, Mr. Chairman, once and for all I'm not blaming you, but there are certain individuals get up 150 times a day and talk more foolish.

(Mr. Gray, cont'd) . . . . I talk foolish, and I'm out of order, but they are just as much. I'm not waving my hand to any part of the legislature. I'm coming to it and I've only spoken three minutes. I'll speak another minute and then let's not rush away. I've seen people speak for an hour or an hour and a half and have not said as much as I will in three minutes. And if I . . . . for myself, who the devil will. The same thing is on this subject. I don't know the inside of Ottawa, of the defence department, I don't know anything about the inside of the President of the United States and his preparedness. I don't know. I know one thing, is that we deal with a man whose word is law and obedience for about 250 million people. That's what I'm worrying -- one man. He doesn't have to come to the legislature to ask for permission or guidance or advice -- just one man. I don't know when this man will press the button. He said once -- he said I'm going to have my machinery with the bombs flying all over the world like a sausage factory, like weiners so it were. He said it; he made a statement. He said I and I and I will do this and that and that. He said it. I don't know when he's sober; I don't know when he's not sober; I don't know if whatever he says he means. He threatens -- it may be all a bluff, I don't know. Well if I don't know, I think this is a matter entirely to be left to the federal government who are closer to the scene, or closer to the scene. As far as the civil defence is concerned, I'm not worrying about the \$70,000 we are spending here, because it's only \$70,000; I'm not worrying about it. If anything should happen and these people should go and save one family, take them out from the city and take them over somewhere in the country, this is enough. So while I'm against war -- I've lived through three wars and I know the tragedies about it -- while I'm against all the weapons they're creating now; while I'm opposed to hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars being spent for ammunition and destruction at the same time they need so much money for education and health service and creating a healthy youth and create young men who would contribute to this world; maybe --- of our system is better being a detriment instead of being a . . . . . Well I believe in everything. I don't think, personally that I would go in now into the philosophy of creating a civil defence with the exception locally in case anything should happen, or even a flood as they say. We are worrying now all day long about the \$57,000. Yes, there's a principle to it too. But personally, I feel that this is a matter of the federal government. Principally you are against war, principally you are against nuclear war manifesting abomination. It's a waste but I don't think that we in this House know enough whether there's a danger or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 85 -- passed. Resolution 86 . . .

MR. MOLGAT: This is largely an inter-departmental body, is it not, Mr. Chairman? It has not outside activities, it merely correlates the activities of all the various groups involved in this department?

MR. EVANS: It's essentially an inter-department organization -- yes. Well let me tell my honourable friend the composition of the body. It consists of two parts. It's a committee called the Director of the Manitoba Development Authority, which consists of the Ministers interested in a particular matter under the chairmanship of the Premier, and with myself acting more or less as an adjutant for the matter. They discuss the policy matters having to do with inter-departmental developments of various kinds. It is assisted by the Board, which consists of the Deputy Ministers concerned, and this entire authority then is assisted by a permanent staff. Now practically all their activities are concerned with something outside. My honourable friend will know it's the Authority that conducted the representations to the Royal Commission on Transportation. They are conducting the stenographic and secretarial service and technical services now for the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future. This is the body that originated and instituted the program for southeast Manitoba and a number of other programs that I read out at the time that we were discussing the early part of my estimates.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I presume the big item here, which is clause (c), is the governmental contribution to the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future. There was an item previously in connection with that, and I don't want to jump the gun over (a) and (b), but there were items in there before in the neighbourhood of \$15,000.00. I wonder if the Minister could tell us exactly how much of this, when he comes down to (c) is going to be used for the purpose of the Manitoba Economic Committee study and whether or not there are any other studies that are being contemplated under this general section in the estimates? I note that in the report that the department has before us, dealt with such matters as northern development

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . . . . and, as the Minister, said, the programs for the Southeast Manitoba Birch River, Whiteshell Nuclear Research Establishment, Resources for Tomorrow Conference and the likes of that. I wonder if the Minister would, on the heading under Salaries give us a general outline of future items that may be under consideration under this general heading.

MR. EVANS: The estimates include this year \$125,000 for the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future. My honourable friend will remember that \$75,000 was provided in this estimate last year, which comprises the government's complete contribution in this regard of \$200,000.00. This leaves \$25,000 for other special investigations as they develop. I think it should be understood that in most of these programs the execution of them is very often done by the individual departments and that it is the co-ordinating function that is carried on here. That is why the \$25,000 remains for special projects of that kind. --(Interjection) -- I'm sorry, I missed that question.

MR. PAULLEY: My quest, Mr. Chairman, was -- as you know we have representations in connection with the Royal Commission on Transportation. This dealt with freight rates. Also this item, if I recall correctly, is that in a more or less state of -- my honourable colleague said suspended animation -- it's never in that -- but it's in the state of not much progress pending the developments on the recommendation of the Commission. Would I be correct in presuming that?

MR. EVANS: The presentations to the Commission have of course been completed, and it remains to be seen whether an opportunity is presented or whether there's any need to present our views, say at Ottawa, or whatever other body may be taking action.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry if I ask the same question twice possibly. While we were discussing Resolution 81, I asked about the increase of a sum of \$20,000 in the Information Service Branch and the Minister told us that was because of industrial research, market service and publications. Now we see under this Resolution 86, research again. I wonder if this is industrial research or what kind of research; what difference there is; and why should we have it under two headings -- this research? Now here's an addition this year of \$135,000 and the Honourable the Leader of the House told us the other day that it is from this vote that the expenses of the trip of the Trade Mission would be paid from. Now is this item to defray expenses of the trip, or what part of it is to defray expenses -- of some members that will make this trip or all the members that will make this trip -- those who don't want to pay on their own? I wonder what the amount there that is earmarked for this Trade Mission trip overseas?

MR. EVANS: I would expect, Mr. Chairman, for example if I go or the members of my staff go, that our travelling expenses would come as they normally do from the regular votes within the department. As far as I'm concerned, under Administration; as far as the Deputy Minister is concerned, it would be under his vote. Then we anticipate that an amount of about \$10,000 may be required for additional expenses of the trip as far as the general conduct of the mission is concerned. We anticipate that those who join the mission from private business and organizations, and those are the main classes, would furnish their own expenses.

MR. PREFONTAINE: . . . . . President of the Farmers Union? Will his expenses be paid?

MR. EVANS: It's not even known whether he'll be coming. I can't answer a theoretical question of that kind.

MR. ORLIKOW: Could the Minister give us some detailed breakdown of that \$150,000.00?

MR. EVANS: The \$150,000 is comprised of \$125,000 for the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future; \$25,000 for other projects, including an estimated \$10,000 towards general expenses of the Trade Mission.

MR. ORLIKOW: Could you give us some idea of the \$125,000.00? I don't like to be difficult, but that's a nice round figure. Surely the House can get some details on what that will be for -- salaries, etcetera.

MR. EVANS: It is a grant to the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future, which completes the province's grant of \$200,000 to that organization.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, surely the House is entitled to some report on what that committee is going to be doing; how much staff it will have; what kind of staff; what their

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd) ..... approximate salaries will be. I'm not saying that the House or even that the government needs to give them detailed daily instructions as to what they're doing, but if we're putting up a substantial part of their expenses, surely the people of this province are entitled to know what they're doing. I'm not saying that what they're doing is wrong; I'm not saying that they're hiring too many people; I'm not saying that they're paying too much money. I think if the committee is going to do a job that it needs to get the best possible people. I might think that they're spending too little or not paying enough, but I think that we're entitled to have some idea of what they are proposing to do.

MR. EVANS: Well my honourable friend frankly disappoints me in not having either listened or been present when I tried to give explanations on the matters he asks questions about. I passed him an outline which he may recognize by sight, of the most searching inquiry of a provincial economy that has ever been undertaken. I told him about the organization and the plans and the hopes that we had. I told him about the 43 professional consulting firms that had been retained. I think he even paid enough attention to it at that time to ask me who were these consulting firms -- were they Manitoba firms; were they Canadian; were they American? How many came from outside the country? I gave him that information. Oh, I'm sorry, that was my honourable friend's Leader. Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to refer him to Hansard for the answers to the questions that he has just asked.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, may I carry my questioning a little further, but not very much further. This news release that was released on Saturday, and the result of which came on the air, and I read it at night although I haven't got it before me, I'm quite sure that it stated that two representatives of the main farm organizations would be going on that trip. Now I suggested a few minutes ago that maybe the government would pay the expenses, and I saw the First Minister shaking his head. Now may I ask the Minister whether the expenses of Mr. Usick, if he goes on that trip, and possibly Mr. Ransom, whether the government will pay their expenses. If the government does not pay the expenses, will he be included -- I'm sure they won't if they don't want to pay their expenses. I would like to have an answer -- I think we are entitled to that. Although the First Minister stated -- if his statement was not approved by Cabinet, it was not denied. It was not denied tonight in the paper. It was not denied that I know on Saturday or at any time. I think we are entitled to know the policy of the government, whether it will pay the expenses of anyone at all or of everybody.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I tried to tell my honourable friend that we have not yet got to that stage in our planning. I must say I can't help what appeared in the newspaper, but we have not invited Mr. Usick or anybody else for that matter, at the present time, to form part of this delegation. That's the point I'm trying to get across. That story, I think must be described a speculative story, and it may well turn out to be correct. We may invite people of the stature of Mr. Usick. It would be quite a natural thing to do, I would think, that we should do that; but I want to tell my honourable friend that we've made no approaches that I'm aware of, and I think I'm right on this, we've made no approaches to any of the gentlemen that he has named with respect to this because we've not reached the point yet in our planning for this organization that we know exactly who to approach. But let me say this, that regardless of who we approach, our hope will be, and it remains to be seen how far this hope is justified, but our hope will be that the delegation will be largely self-supporting, in fact if not entirely self-supporting, because we feel that this project that we have at hand is something which is very near to the self-interest of all the people concerned. We have always taken the view that where we get into a position where the self-interest of people is concerned, and quite a proper and commendable self-interest that we should expect them to share the cost to pay their own way and not, if at all reasonable, ask the taxpayer to pay it for them. It seems to me that in this delegation we perhaps may be in that position.

Now members know that when we started on the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future, I think it was assumed in some quarters that we would be paying the whole bill for that. Well we're not, because we felt that if this idea was any good at all we could get the people who were interested in it to put their money into it. We were successful in that because by far the largest portion of the money to be spent on the Committee for the Economic Future is being put up by the labour unions, by the industrialists, by the farm organizations and by other people in the province, rather than the taxpayers as a whole. Now it's true that we're making a pretty

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) . . . substantial contribution, \$200,000 in all, but it's something less than 50%. I don't use that as an illustration of what we may do under this system, but merely to indicate that on matters of this sort I think it is quite reasonable to expect those who have a definite interest in the matter to put some of their money into it as well. It seems to me that if you get that kind of a situation you're going to have a far more successful effort than if it's merely a free ride at the expense of the taxpayers, because then it becomes perhaps a glorified junket; but if people are sufficiently interested in this to put their own money into it, when they go over there to make these studies and to assist in trying to reconcile Manitoba's situation with the facts as we find them, then that is the ideal situation. That's the view we took with respect to the committee itself when it started, although I will admit that we afterwards put up a considerable sum of money, but it was supported more than 50% -- considerably more -- by private money. And why is that? Simply because these people who are taking part were convinced of the worthwhile nature of this and were willing to make a contribution. Now it would be my hope that in connection with this Trade Mission that the same situation would arise, and although I cannot speak with any certainty because, as I say, we haven't quite reached the stage where we have consulted any of these people to find out what their views are, surely that must be done, our expectation would be and our hope would be that there would be sufficient interest in this thing that they would pay their own way. If that happens, then I think we will probably have an even more productive venture than would have otherwise been the case. Now I've tried several different ways to explain this to my honourable friend. I hope that I have made myself clear on this occasion, but that would be our expectation.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that the First Minister hasn't been successful in answering my question at all. He rambled all over the place but he has not given me an answer, whether expenses will be paid or not. He hopes that they will not be paid, but he is leaving the door wide open for paying the expenses. I haven't got a definite answer, and I think this House is entitled to get such an answer. In view of the statements that seem to originate from the government, because the name of the Deputy Minister was attached to the statement that appeared in the Press and on the air, I think we're entitled to have an answer from the First Minister -- not only hope that this or that might happen and develop. We're responsible people; we're voting sums of money and I think we're entitled to know beforehand what's going to take place when we approve of estimates. I think we should know. As far as I'm concerned, I believe that a mission like that of 100 people, is too many people.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . going to be a hundred people.

MR. PREFONTAINE: . . . . . the paper said so.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh well, my honourable friend has read a good many things in the paper that he's alleged to have said, which he pointed out to us he never said and which weren't right.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Will the First Minister stand up and say that this report to the newspapers was imagined by the newspapers or invented by some irresponsible people, and would have been believed by the newspapers and that they would print this out from someone that isn't responsible? The figures were proclaimed all over the air on the radio and the papers, from 75 to 100. That's great imagination -- I do not for one believe so. Certainly not, and I think we're entitled to have more facts. In fact, if I were at the bottom of this I would have made sure whether there would be 50 who would pay their own way and I would certainly be ready to pay the expenses of the representatives of the two farm groups in this province, because they're going to go there to study the problems of selling agricultural goods. According to the First Minister, if they don't want or can't pay their transportation they will not be included at all, unless he changes his opinion. He has left the door open to pay the expenses of some, but if he starts to pay the expenses of some he may have to pay the expenses of some more -- maybe every one. I think we are entitled to know the policy of the government with respect to this trip.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh my honourable friend, you know, he loves this issue. He's having a fine time with it. Well that's fine. I don't begrudge him his little bit of sport here -- that's fine. I'm just going to repeat what I said because that's all I can say, and that is that, I can neither confirm or deny the report that is in the newspaper because what has been given there has been attributed to a gentleman that he named, and for all I know -- I haven't spoken to Mr. Grose -- for all I know he actually gave that statement and that's all I can say about it.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) . . . . .What I'm trying to point out to my honourable friend is that it cannot be interpreted, and we do not accept it as a statement of our policy on this matter at the present time. It may turn out to be completely correct -- maybe 75 or 100 people will go on this mission. It may turn out to be completely correct. All I can tell my honourable friend, and I tell him sincerely, that this matter has not been settled by the Executive Council as to what kind of a trip we will have or how many people will go or anything of that sort. He asks me the specific question of: "Are they going to pay for them?" I give him the specific answer that our hope will be and our expectation will be that those who go on this trip will pay their own way. I cannot give him a positive assurance or undertaking that that will be the case without any deviation because we haven't discussed the matter. We haven't got that far enough into it. We have a small item in here for -- well, it's not small -- it's \$10,000, for contingency expenses which might be called upon, but I'd like to assure him again that our aim will be to have the people who go on this trip pay their own way, and I think we'll be successful in doing that.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I frankly can't understand how my honourable friends across the way operate. They present to us a resolution on Friday last; give us a long speech on this whole affair; and now tell us that they've actually no plans. The Executive Council apparently has not decided what this is going to be all about, but they present the resolution to the House and now either have no plans or won't tell us what they are. What was the purpose then of presenting the resolution? Was it simply a cover-up at this time? Why didn't my honourable friends decide what they were going to do, then present the resolution when they were ready.

MR. ROBLIN: You know we're really under no obligation on this side of the House to run our affairs in a way that meets the approval of the honourable gentlemen opposite. As a matter of fact, judging from their past record and our past record, we usually run our affairs a little differently from the way in which they would approve of. But I just want to state the plain truth of the matter. There's no secret; there's no cover-up; there's nothing to hide. We bring a proposition before the Legislature, namely, that in dealing with this problem we should take the course of action that we propose. When the Legislature has discussed it; when we have received the benefit of the advice of my honourable friends opposite, because I'm sure we're going to have a good many speeches to listen to from that side of the House on this matter, and it may be stretching the imagination, but I live in hopes that we'll get a good idea from them as to what we should do about this; we are simply going to present this general proposition to the House and it's going to be debated. Then when the debate is concluded and we find out where we stand on this matter, we'll take the next step that's quite obviously called for under this proposal here. I've got no apologies to make because we haven't got the details of a trip like this or a Trade Mission like this laid down with respect to these points. I don't think it's germane to the issue at all. What we want to find out is whether this is a good course of action for the province to follow. Regarding the financing of it, I think that we have made our position abundantly clear and I think it's a position that we can stick to.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, in other words, my honourable friends have approached no one at this stage to see if they would participate in this mission? They've made no plans for it? That's correct, is it?

MR. ROBLIN: As far as I know, we've approached no one, and let me go farther than that. Let me say that last year when we brought in the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future we approached no one in the sense that my honourable friend is talking about now, because our duty is to discuss these matters in the Legislature. I feel very sure that if we had gone out and scurried up a lot of interest in this thing and signed people up and what not before we brought our motion into the Legislature, we'd have had an awful howl that we should have discussed the resolution in the House first. That's a point often taken, particularly by the Honourable Member for Carillon, who is very concerned about the proprieties in this respect. Some people I know take their resolutions to the press before they ever come to the Legislature. In fact I think the resolution on having an Auditor-General and the resolution on having an ombudsman, or whatever it's called, was not only both of them filched, if I can use that expression, perhaps not parliamentary -- at least they were anticipated, let me put it that way, by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead when he spoke here, although I have to admit in common fairness that my honourable friend's party -- his convention -- did discuss at least one of those matters and maybe both for all I know.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)

I was interested to read in the paper tonight that my honourable friends opposite had submitted a resolution to the Clerk of the House about trade and had to withdraw it on hearing what we had in the Speech from the Throne, but I confess that I checked with the Clerk of the House and no such resolution was ever filed with him that he is aware of. I think that there's a good deal of substance to the suggestion that it's a good idea to discuss these resolutions in the House first. That's the place where we're discussing this resolution here, and I say again, our expectation will be that there will be no great expense to the public of Manitoba in connection with this trip. Our expectation is that the whole proposition will sufficiently commend itself to the kind of people that we want to go, and that is sincere people who think that something good can come of it, that we can persuade them to spend their own money. What amazes me, Mr. Chairman, is that I had such a hard time getting this idea across, particularly to the Honourable Member for Carillon, because I think if we had come in here with the suggestion that we appropriate \$100,000 or some large sum that he mentioned earlier on today for a purpose like this, he'd be the first man to tell us it was too much money to spend and that we should do it some other way. I kind of think he's right, and I was rather expecting that when I told him that our policy would be to ask the people who come on this trip to pay their own way, I honestly thought that he would rise up to approve of what we had done rather than to at least leave me with the impression that he really wasn't quite so sure that we had done the right thing . . .

MR. PREFONTAINE: Who says I'm not approving? I'm not approving the expenditure of \$100,000 without you telling us why.

MR. ROBLIN: Well I'm doing my best to tell you why and I've tried on three successive occasions, but I'm not evidently getting across. Well I'll do the best I can, but that's the facts of the matter.

MR. DESJARDINS: But aren't we touchy tonight. I think it would help --the Leader of this House was telling us that he wanted to be sincere in that. It could be easy. He wouldn't have to keep on with this long speech. Why doesn't he just make the statement that Mr. Grose was a little premature with his release and he's embarrassing the government? That's all he has to say. He doesn't have to smile and be so touchy and bring some other things -- apparently he knows more or what happened at the Liberal convention, so he must know that that was spoken and all set, way before it was brought in this House. Just make that statement and we'll go on to something else. You're in a hurry.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to discuss another matter very briefly in this connection, and that was because the Minister informed us that it would be this Authority that would be supplying the secretariat for the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future. I wanted to check on -- like my honourable friend from Carillon I'm interested in the expenditures, and I notice the Minister said the other day when discussing this committee that the expenditure would be \$575,000.00. I had noticed from some previous press reports that the expenditure had been quoted as \$671,000.00. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have here an article from the Winnipeg Free Press of January 22nd. The heading is: "Many Serve on Research Committees -- The committee on Manitoba's Economic Future was told Friday that \$656,700, or 87% of the \$761,000 necessary to finance operations of the committee has been raised and the money is being provided by donations from the provincial and federal governments, business firms and private foundations." It mentions quite a few other items of interest here but definitely the statement is, and I don't want to take the time of the committee to read this but my honourable friend from Carillon would be interested to know that apparently this report also came from Rex E. Grose, Executive Director of the Manitoba Development Authority, Director of Research for the committee. He was reporting that 40 consulting firms will be involved in the research program and this is the sum -- \$671,000.00. Has the Minister any comment on the discrepancy in the two figures?

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to come back to the questions which I raised and the answers I got from the Minister, which I'm sorry don't quite answer the questions which I asked. I know that the Minister said that there were 43 consulting firms. I'm still interested in how many members, if any, of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future are working full-time on the job and are being paid. Now on Page 9 of this pamphlet which we got, there's a box which says "secretariat" and it says: "a permanent group of government employees consisting of the Executive Director, Executive Secretary and Executive Assistant of the Manitoba



(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd) . . . . Development Authority and a Junior Research Economist of the Department of Industry and Commerce. Now how many of those people are working, if any, are working full-time for the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future, and are these the only people who are working full-time? These are the questions -- if I didn't phrase them properly the first time, Mr. Chairman, this is the information which I want.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I've been trying to get your eye for awhile but it's been very difficult. I just want to make a correction and it is this. The First Minister -- I'm sorry that he's left -- took the advantage, and he's very able -- (interjection) -- oh, that's fine, that's fine -- and he was looking up there, that I was apparently opposing this Trade Mission. He had no justification to make this suggestion in the hope that it might be printed, no justification at all from anything that I've said except, in principle, I objected to a government asking us to vote \$10,000 -- as he said there was \$10,000 for this trip -- without telling us how it would be spent.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of the source of the figures of my honourable friend's article, but the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future research budget -- source of funds: Province of Manitoba, \$200,000; to be raised from business and other private sources, \$125,000; Foundations, Productivity Council and Government of Canada, \$125,000; contributed research, that is by private firms, the Government of Canada and trade associations, to the value of \$125,000 -- total \$575,000.00.

With respect to the members working and paid, the entire secretariat services, the entire administrative staff of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future is provided by the Manitoba Development Authority from their permanent staff. There are no members, in that sense, of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future who are either working full time or being paid. They are business men; members of labour organizations; people connected with the University; and other people of like character who have come together voluntarily, formed themselves into committees to supervise these research studies; and then the secretariat is provided by the Development Authority -- (interjection) -- Well I can give my honourable friend the staff of the Manitoba Development Authority. The Manitoba Development Authority embraces one -- well there's the Executive Director who is also the Deputy Minister of the Department so we don't count him, one Executive Assistant, one Executive Secretary who is an economist, one Industrial Development Engineer, one Freight Rates Economist and four stenographers.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, but I asked the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce whether or not this is a separate fund. Is it in trust of the total amount of this money or will it only be expended on approval of the Comptroller-General? Has the Dominion Government of Canada made its contribution into the general fund? If it is in the general fund, how will disbursements be made from it?

MR. EVANS: Well, the finances of the committee are in charge of its own Treasurer and under the control of the committee itself. They do not come in to the consolidated revenue of the province. The province makes its grant in cash to the committee.

MR. PAULLEY: Will the committee, Mr. Chairman, be making an annual report that will come to the Legislature as to the expenditure of the funds in the overall amount?

MR. EVANS: The report of the committee is expected to be ready by this time next year. I see no doubt at all that they will publish an audited statement or receipts and expenditures -- a complete financial statement.

MR. PAULLEY: Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, the report of the committee will be finished at the end of this year, did you say?

MR. EVANS: By this time next year.

MR. PAULLEY: By this time next year. Will, in the interim, the total amounts of monies that have been contributed from the various sources be expended at that time?

MR. EVANS: I expect that if their work is complete by this time next year, that those amounts will have been expended. Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Minister correctly to say that \$200,000 would come from the Province of Manitoba -- \$125,000 this year from this appropriation -- that is 125 out of the 150, and 75,000 from last year? Where was the figure last year, Mr. Chairman? I don't see it in our estimates.

MR. EVANS: I think I'm correct in saying that the amount was provided last year by special warrant.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to the report that I have here, if the Executive Director was correct in reporting that \$656,000 odd has been raised -- (interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. EVANS: It's not correct.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh I think this is correct, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a correct report because the -- is it not a fact that the letters that the committee itself sent out had these various headings? In fact, the letter itself stated that a budget of \$761,000 has been established for the overall program. The anticipated sources of funds are summarized as follows: Province of Manitoba, \$200,000; to be raised from business and other private sources, \$125,000; contributed research by private business firms, \$45,000; grants from foundations and government agencies, \$125,000; contributed research by federal government agencies, \$80,000; contributed advisory and administrative services, Province of Manitoba \$186,000 -- a total of \$761,000.00. That appears to be the total budget. My guess would be, Mr. Chairman, that the discrepancy between the figure that the honourable gentleman gave us and that I give will be that \$186,000 which I think if subtracted from the 671 will likely leave the 575. Surely that should have been taken into account if the other contributed research is taken into account.

MR. EVANS: What is given now as the budget of the committee does not include any amount for the services of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future. It would certainly not equal anything like \$186,000.00. There's another revision in the figure and that is, I think you have a figure of some \$45,000 in there that's for Foundations and the Productivity Council and the Government of Canada.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, the \$45,000 item is contributed research by private business firms.

MR. EVANS: Yes. Well it seems quite clear that since that tentative budget was first drawn up or whatever it is my honourable friend refers to there, there have been revisions and the figures I have quoted now, \$575,000, is the budget on which the committee is operating.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if we take the figure then as \$575,000 and if the Province of Manitoba is contributing \$200,000 directly; then grants from Foundations and government agencies, \$125,000; and contributed research by Federal Government agencies plus the contribution that the Secretariat under this Development Authority will make, surely that is much more than half of the total budget of \$575,000.00. The Honourable the First Minister said a few minutes ago that by far the larger part has been paid by such people as labour unions, industrialists, etcetera. I would figure that to be the larger part.

MR. ROBLIN: I'll have to correct that, Mr. Chairman. What I was comparing in my mind -- I think my honourable friend will recognize that I don't see these figures every day and I must confess that what I was doing was comparing in my mind the \$540,000 total with the \$200,000 that we put in when I made my statement. It appears from what the Minister has said that part of that \$340,000 -- I'm not clear how much, I admit -- is not private money but other governments, namely the Government of Canada. I don't think that their contribution is anything like as large as ours. I think that probably it would be right to say that of the \$340,000, something over \$200,000 is being contributed by private agencies, although my honourable friend can correct me if my breakdown is inaccurate. I admit that what I was comparing in my own mind when I spoke was the \$200,000 I knew we were providing compared to the \$540,000, so it may have been that I have exaggerated the amount that private individuals put in. If so, I thank my honourable friend for allowing me the chance to correct it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, what I really would like to get, and I accept my honourable friend's explanation because certainly it's difficult to keep these figures in one's head at any time, but what I'm quite frankly trying to get is what amount has been contributed by the public at large as distinct from the taxpayer in one form or another?

MR. EVANS: That's going to be a little difficult to answer. I am told, although I have no direct knowledge of it, that the \$125,000 being raised from business and other sources in cash throughout Canada is largely in hand or in sight, so that's \$125,000.00. Then the distinction between the taxpayer and private foundations is a little bit difficult for me. I don't know which ones of these are private foundations and which ones come from tax money. I'm

(Mr. Evans, cont'd) . . . .not able to say. That's another \$125,000.00. And then contributed research -- some of it is being done by private corporations. One of the leading banks is undertaking one of the studies for us; one of the leading universities is doing it. That university I think, is privately supported; is not tax supported; so it's a little difficult to sort out the funds as between tax raised and privately contributed.

MR. CAMPBELL: This figure of \$125,000, Mr. Chairman, that I would take as being the part to be raised from business and other private sources. I was just wondering how fully the public had responded in that regard. My honourable friend's information is that it is either promised or already in hand pretty largely. Mr. Chairman, I have one other comment under this heading. My honourable friends, both the Minister and the First Minister, will realize that I do not have any great reputation as being an instigator or studies and assessments and surveys and such like, but I'm interested in them -- I'm interested in them -- and so I've been paying some attention and it's contained in this same article that I was quoting from earlier. It appeared in the Free Press of January 22nd of this year. It tells of Dr. Sylvia . . . . . who is heading up one of these studies, and it's to be on population. "She reported to the committee at that meeting on methods being used by the University's Department of Economics in the study of Manitoba's population being carried out for the committee." The population figures of this last census, that I think have just been made public -- it's quite probable that the provincial government had them before they appeared in the Press a few days ago -- but apparently they have been made public now, and if they were actually reported in the papers, Manitoba's population has now reached 921,000-odd. What I was going to ask my honourable friend is if he could tell us what other population studies have been made comparatively recently in Manitoba, and how close they were to the mark -- the mark being established by this recent survey. Of course what I'm getting at is to try and establish the likely accuracy of any further studies that might be made or, alternatively, whether a population study was necessary; whether perhaps the ones already made would have served the purpose. It's interesting, Mr. Chairman, that on the same page of the Free Press from which I clipped this particular article, right beside it is an equally long story, I think a little more exhaustive one with regard to the National Productivity Council's activities. There was some reference made to that particular study by my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP a few days ago and, of course, one of my concerns in this regard is that it seems to me that there's a certain amount of duplication, if not considerable duplication, going on here. What I would like to know, dealing with the general question of duplication is how well have the surveys regarding population that had been made before turned out, in the event that we now have the population figures and, if so, was there a need of this further study

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the population study isn't really to determine the total number of persons in the same way that the census determines the count of people. It will be an analysis of trends and studies, and if my honourable friend would care some time to refer to Page 10 of the outline, he will see that one study is envisaged which would examine the following aspects: the historical growth and forecast of Manitoba's population and labour force to show age distribution, family size, occupation and income;--now he will recall that the object is to study and to look forward, as far as it might be possible at this time, for ten years until 1970--the distribution of the population and labour force in the various regions of the province and factors effecting the movement of population and labour force; and factors which can change the expected population and labour force, that is, such factors as immigration, emigration, employment of married women and retirements, and whatever the forecast of those may be. Then there will be a further analysis of the projection of regional, national and international conditions influencing the growth of Manitoba's economy. That, however, that second title I've just given you doesn't bear directly or as directly on population. It's really an attempt to forecast, in using the trends that we have now of the nature-cut, the make-up and distribution of Manitoba's population and work force goes to constituting the market and the ability to produce between now and ten years from now.

I might say to my honourable friend that as a reconciliation between the figure that he quoted of \$186,000, I find a reference to the fact that contributed research by the various agencies and departments of the Manitoba Government plus the value of the administrative services to be provided by the government itself, do account for something of the order of

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . . \$186,000--a rough estimate--which then does seem to reconcile the estimate that he has there and the one that I quoted here as the official budget.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think that would be correct, Mr. Chairman. I notice that "Dr. . . . . study"--and I'm quoting again from this press report--"will attempt to predict the size of the province's population by 1975 and will involve an analysis of the factors affecting wages and labour costs." In that regard it's interesting to note a little further down that, "Dr. . . . . in a preliminary report"--skipping some of it--"said that while the legal minimum wage in Manitoba was higher than in some other provinces, the cost imposed by legal provisions did not appear to be higher in this province." So I freely concede that the study is going further than just populations. Well I wonder if my honourable friend is familiar with the figures of some of the recent estimates on population and how closely they worked out.

MR. EVANS: Well I'm sure my department has them in hand and are now considering them. I haven't really had the opportunity to look at them myself.

MR. CAMPBELL: As one who doesn't usually get too enthusiastic about surveys, I should mention to my honourable friend one that was conducted not very long before his government took office. I'm referring to the population survey that was made by representatives of the Manitoba government, and I expect that at least some of the people taking part would be the same ones that are connected with the administration of this Authority. I was interested to see just how closely they had come, for in the brief that we prepared, and I take no credit for it myself - my honourable friends will know that it is a little out of my line--in the brief that we prepared for the Gordon Commission, we estimated the 1960 population to be 913,000 in 1960. I've applied to that the annual rate of growth that has been experienced in Manitoba according to the figures that we got a few days ago, the census, to that for one more year to bring it up to '61, and according to my figures, that would bring it out to 927,000 and the census says 921,686. Now then, I'm a cautious man, but I'm going to offer to bet my honourable friend that his experts don't come any closer than ours did on that. I'm not suggesting to him that we will hold out as closely as that on the future years, but I think those estimates go right on to 1980 and I believe that they are also divided up as between males and females, and perhaps there's some element of a working group in there as well. So I assume that any material that we had so thoughtfully provided for my honourable friend will be available to this committee to work with.

MR. EVANS: I'm reminded of the words of the song that "anything you can do, I can do better than you." That's what my honourable friend has sung from the other side of the House so often. I am sure that if I had known he was available as a consultant in population forecasting, I would have commended him to the committee a long time ago.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I do not see in the next item any appropriation for salaries. Under the present item, Manitoba Development Authority, I see that there are eight on the staff, but at the same time I'm aware to a list of the salaries paid the Deputy Minister, that Mr. R. E. Grose is receiving \$3,000 over the \$15,000 as Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce, that he is receiving \$3,000 as Vice-Chairman of the Manitoba Development Fund. Is the money, in order to pay this \$3,000, under the plans for Development Authority?

MR. EVANS: They're entirely separate organizations.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Well there's no item for salary under--

MR. EVANS: Well my honourable friend is perhaps--

MR. PREFONTAINE: I'll ask the question later when we come to the Manitoba Development Fund.

MR. EVANS: Yes, the Manitoba Development Fund. That would be the correct place.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the Authority, there are a number of studies undertaken during the course of the year by the Authority. On Page 43, some of them are listed. Are these available to the members of the House and the public? For example, there's one there on the investigation of possible markets in Europe for Manitoba fish. Another one on the possibility of the mobile or stationary fish meal plant on the utilization of rough fish, which is something that my colleague from St. George has discussed before in the House. Are these available?

MR. EVANS: I couldn't answer without consulting the records for this reason, that some studies, either by the department direct or by the Development Authority are undertaken in co-operation with some private concern or some private economy who may be considering making

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . . . the development. In such a case the information is not available to the public. In some cases, it is confidential information. In other cases, the copies of the studies can be made available. If my honourable friend would like me to find out which ones are available and which are not, I would be glad to.

MR. MOLGAT: No need to have the information now. There's one in which I'm particularly interested in, Mr. Chairman, and that's the one--this is the booklet that covers the period ending March 31, 1961, and this indicates that a study was done and a report prepared on the Redevelopment of the Churchill Townsite. Now last summer my honourable friends stated that there was an interim report which you'd have ready shortly. This report ending March of last year indicated that a report had been done. I wonder if that report would be available, and what is the subsequent report my honourable friend was talking about?

MR. EVANS: Yes. The reports on Churchill are not available at this stage because they're the subject material on which we're negotiating with Ottawa in connection with the plans to redevelop the townsite, and so the reports themselves have not been made public until the discussions are completed with Ottawa.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, was there a subsequent report to this one that is indicated here?

MR. EVANS: There was a study called, for some reason called the Part 5 Study of Churchill Townsite, which was to investigate the feasibility of one of two alternate ways of developing the Churchill townsite--either to take the present location and redevelop it, that is to say put in the municipal services and the streets and so on and build a new townsite there, and that was evaluated; or as an alternative, select a new site. The first part of this study determined that it was not economic to redevelop the present site and that the course to follow was to find a new site and to build a new townsite. Then the second part of that study, after that decision was arrived at, is to outline what might be done in the new site. That study has been completed and the two together are the subject of discussions at Ottawa now.

MR. MOLGAT: There's no further studies to be undertaken by this government? The studies are complete so far as the Manitoba government is concerned?

MR. EVANS: No, I would think depending on whatever course is decided on in our negotiations. There may indeed be further studies, engineering studies, other more detailed studies that might have to be undertaken.

.....Continued on next page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 86--passed. Resolution 87. Item 9, Manitoba Development Fund.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, on Resolution 87, last year I asked for specific information dealing where money was going to from the development fund and we were refused. This year the Leader of the Opposition asked the same question. Now I don't see, Mr. Chairman, how we can discuss the Manitoba Development Fund if we don't know where the money is going to; whether we can discuss it properly; whether they're spending the money wisely; whether they're giving money to places where they're duplicating industries. They claim that they're supposed to be creating new jobs. I'm going by the Review of Activities during 1961, and on Page 4 it says that this department, Industry and Commerce, had something to do with the new Custom Abattoir in St. Boniface. Now we don't know whether they got money from the Development Fund or not. With the Custom Abattoir in St. Boniface, it says the employment is 35, and that's supposed to be new jobs. Mr. Chairman, I don't think those are new jobs because we had three custom killing plants in St. Boniface; namely, the St. Boniface, Public, and Farmer's Abattoir that were doing custom killing. They were working on an average of 40 to 45 hours a week before this Custom Abattoir started up. These three plants are now operating anywhere from 18 to 25 hours a week. The men are getting paid 36 hours a week because, due to their agreement that they have negotiated with the company and the union, they are guaranteed 36 hours of pay each week. As I said, Mr. Chairman, before this Custom Abattoir started up, they were working 40 to 45 hours a week; now they're down to 18, 20, 22, 25 hours a week. Now if the Custom Abattoir has got money from the Development Fund, I think this is one place where they made a mistake. I think in the light of this, we should be given information in this House who is getting money and how much, so that we can discuss it. How do we know where it's going? There are other industries probably in the same position as Custom Abattoirs. I feel very strongly on this, Mr. Chairman, because I don't think these are new jobs that were created. True, I talked to people who are working in this plant. There are 37 people working there as of last week, but as far as I'm concerned they're not new jobs. All they've done here is built a new plant. The plants that were in operation already were able to handle all the beef cattle that were available for slaughter, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that the department should tell us where they are giving money to and how much, if we're going to discuss this Manitoba Development properly. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, on the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Fund, on the inside cover, I noticed the Board of Directors, and the Chairman is Mr. Bonnycastle. I have nothing against Mr. Bonnycastle but I think that he has a job on his hands that will take all his time; namely, Chairman of the Metro Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. I don't think if he's doing the proper job for the Metro Corporation of Winnipeg, that he could be doing a job on the Manitoba Development Fund also.

MR. EVANS: I think I should inform my honourable friend that Mr. Bonnycastle resigned as Chairman and that Mr. Morris Neaman is Chairman of the Committee.

MR. REID: . . . . . the same fund. I see that there's going to be put into the fund this year, \$250,000 more, but yet, looking back, I see one million and three quarters that hadn't been loaned out as of 1961, so I was just wondering why we are putting money into the fund when you have a million and three quarters in the fund that haven't been loaned out. Also, I notice--I don't know how it works out, but the Deputy Minister, which is his department, on the payroll of that department, yet when it comes down to Development Fund he's drawing an extra \$3,000 as Secretary or Chairman of the Development Fund. Now I say, if he's Deputy Minister of a department and if it's within his cope, why should he be drawing extra money here? After all it's just his job. He's the Deputy Minister, yet down here he's drawing an extra \$3,000.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I would like to ask questions pertaining to the fact that we have no list of salaries--we don't know how many people--I understand that the government would like to keep this Board away from politics. The Minister made the statement the other day that they should be away from politics completely. Now I for one cannot see how this Board can be independent completely of the government when it has as its main officer, I should believe, a Deputy Minister directly responsible to the Minister. In fact the name of Mr. Grose appears three times on that second page with respect to the Manitoba Development Fund. He appears as Vice-Chairman of the Board of Directors and apparently, according to the list that has been

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . . . supplied to us; he's getting \$3,000 for that job. Now he appears again as General Manager under the heading "Officers", and then he appears again as Chairman of the Executive Committee. I take it, I suppose, that the \$3,000 includes these three jobs or three positions, but we have a Chairman of the Board of Directors--Mr. Bonnycastle. Apparently he has resigned. I wonder how long he was there and what salary he received while he was there. We have ten members of the Board of Directors. Are these ten members receiving a salary or a stipend of some kind and, if so, how much? With respect to the Officers, we have Mr. Bonnycastle again; Mr. Grose; Mr. W. Elliot, Secretary; and Mr. Little, Treasurer. Now are these people receiving some money for their services and, if so, how much? We have an Executive Committee: Mr. Grose, Chairman; Mr. D. L. Croftman, Mr. Neaman, Mr. Elliot. The same question--are they receiving any stipend of some kind and, if so, how much? I am surprised in a sense that they have no staff. I'm sure that they must have a staff. There might be good reasons for not telling us how many people are working there; what their salaries are. Does it come all from this vote of \$457,000, Debt Servicing Charges? I don't know what other appropriation we have voted or will be voting to pay these salaries, if any. I wonder if the Minister could answer.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, just looking over the report of the General Manager of the Manitoba Development Fund, and I think we are all pleased with the fact that industry is moving out into the outside areas, and on figuring the amount that went outside of Winnipeg, it would seem that the amount that I have figured out here comes to about \$2,891,000--about 64% of the amount. It also indicates that it has created employment for approximately 600 people, which definitely is needed in the rural areas. There are just two things that I would like to make a statement on here. First, I think there should be some criticism made, particularly due to the fact that the money coming from the Fund comes from the government, which represents the whole province, and yet we have a criticism made by the Mayor of a town who feels he is in a position to be very critical of the work of Metro. Not but what I feel that he has every reason to . . . . . criticism, but I don't think he should be so overwhelmingly definite in his criticism of the work of Metro when this government is responsible in creating industry outside of Winnipeg with the funds that come in from all sources to the Treasury. Two questions that I have to ask. First, have there been any defaults of any payments to date with regard to any of the loans? And, secondly, is there a maximum amount that loans can be given out to industry--a maximum amount that the government issues as far as money is concerned?

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, before the Minister -- I thought maybe he'd want to reply to all these questions at once. Before the Minister answers, I would like him to answer this question -- just one question I have. Is it not a fact that authorities of the Manitoba Development Fund wrote, or is writing at the present time, cheques covering the payroll of Columbia Forest Products Ltd., at Sprague?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have several questions as well. First of all, I would like to question the Minister in charge whether any loans have been made to members of this House. Secondly, whether any loans have been made to companies or organizations in which members of this House are principal shareholders. Then I also have some questions on the financial statement. I see that they show \$24,000 allowance for losses on loans. They also have a reserve of \$71,700.00. Is it necessary to have both of these? In the case of the reserve fund, is it invested or what happens to this reserve? Is it the policy -- will this practice be carried on that earnings will always be put into the reserve as it has been done in this last year?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . a question. Just one that I would like to ask. My colleague from Burrows touched on the question of default of these payments of loans. I would like to know, and I think frankly, Mr. Chairman, that this should be in the statement from the Board to us, as to whether or not there are any outstanding amounts of interest due to the corporation. I read the report of the corporation and I don't see any indication of that. I think that the report could be expanded a little further than the one we have before us. But in addition to the question of any non-payment on capital, I would like to know whether there are any arrears insofar as interest is concerned.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I cannot furnish my honourable friend from Elmwood with

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . any information about any private company. My honourable friend for Kildonan asked why the salary for Mr. Grose is included in the expenses. It's common practice for Deputy Ministers to have positions on other Boards and to be paid extra money. My honourable friend from Carillon drew attention to our pledge to the public that the administration of this fund would be kept away from any political consideration. He asks how, if Mr. Grose is the General Manager of the Fund and if he occupies some two or three positions -- Manager, Secretary and Member of the Board, etc. -- can this be done and be the Deputy Minister at the same time. I can only say that the administration of the Fund is in the hands of the Board, whose stature and integrity are completely beyond question and that it is mainly upon this Board that the administration of this Fund rests; that they are people of such character and of such leading positions in the province, that they are the guarantee. I can tell my honourable friend that I have never discussed the terms of a loan with anyone before the Board's decision has been given and I have never asked the Board to vary a decision that they have given. That Board runs this Fund in a completely independent way and completely divorced from politics. It would not be thought that Mr. Grose would either have sufficient numbers, nor would he be inclined to try to interfere with the administration of a Board of that character. Now the salaries, if my honourable friend will look at the report of the Manitoba Development Fund, in the statement of income and expenses there is listed for the year 1961, salaries in the amount of \$25,684.00. There is no amount for salaries in this connection under the votes in my department. The amounts that are provided in the estimates are made up of Debt Servicing Charges, \$475,000; less recoverable from the Manitoba Development Fund, \$198,375; or a net of \$258,625.00.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Where does the money come for the salaries?

MR. EVANS: From the operating margin of the Fund itself -- the earnings on the Fund's own money. The earnings on the loans that they have out pay the salaries. If my honourable friend will look at the income of the Fund in 1961, the interest earnings on their Fund in 1961 on the loans that they have outstanding are \$146,087; the expenses are \$84,580; and excess of income over expenses for the year, \$61,507.00. My honourable friend from Burrows asked --

MR. PREFONTAINE: I asked whether the 10 members of the Board were receiving a salary or a stipend or something.

MR. EVANS: I understand they are paid from directors' fees -- not salaries or stipend in the term that my honourable friend speaks of. They do get directors' fees.

MR. PREFONTAINE: The Chairman also?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. He is not paid a salary or anything comparable to a salary.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Do you have the fees paid to the Chairman?

MR. EVANS: I haven't it here. I can try to get it for my honourable friend -- see if the Board has released that information. I might say that I can't undertake to get it. This is an independent organization but I'll see if it's available.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister told us that the fact that there is a Deputy Minister there does not mean at all that politics are involved, because there are ten upstanding men on the Board of Directors who make all decisions and that the Minister has nothing to do with it and the Deputy Minister hasn't got much influence. I would like to ask the Minister whether the Board meets to consider every decision made or whether decisions with respect to loans might not be made by the four officers named in the special Board here or the Executive Committee, or both; or, I might ask how often is the whole Board of Directors meeting and whether they decide on every application for a loan -- the whole Board of Directors?

MR. EVANS: The members of the executive committee of the board who pass on the individual loans are Mr. Morris Neaman, Mr. D. L. Preston, Mr. R. E. Grose, Mr. P. G. McDougall; and then all of the loans of the board are reviewed, as they are in any institution of this kind, at the regular and full meeting of the board. I might point out that Mr. Neaman attended ten executive meetings and three directors' meetings; Mr. Preston attended ten executive meetings and two directors' meetings; and the numbers attended by other members of the board are here. I'm not sure that this number of meetings is really too significant.

MR. PREFONTAINE: May the board make a loan to a director who might be interested in a particular company? May a loan be made to a firm where a director might have some



(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . financial interest?

MR. EVANS: No, these things would be governed as they are in any financial institution of that kind. Certainly no company would receive a loan at a meeting at which that director had sat and had considered the loan.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I see that it has reached our time of adjournment and we're not finished with this particular item, so I am prepared to move that the Committee rise. I wonder if this would be the appropriate moment to make what usually is an annual appeal to members of the Committee as to whether or not we could not get along a little more expeditiously. I have to report that we're very much behind last year's schedule and that took us 98 or 100 hours to get through, which is again some 35 or so hours above the average of the past years in recent times, so that you can see if we don't smarten up a little bit we're going to take a record more time on these estimates. I want to make it quite clear that the government hasn't the slightest interest; it doesn't serve our purpose to curtail or in any way infringe on the rights of members to speak in this committee and I don't suggest that for a minute; but I do suggest with humility -- I suppose that's the right word to use -- that if members would concentrate their thoughts a little more and would refrain from speaking more than two or three times on the various items that come up, we'd get along a lot faster without in any way harming the public business. I think probably that after having made a rather leisurely start at this business, it wouldn't be out of the way for me to remind the members of the committee about it and ask for their co-operation. I think that if we would allow our Chairman, -- and I'm not saying this from the government's standpoint, if we would allow our Chairman to be a little firmer with us when we wander from the field and accept his advice to get down to brass tacks in good spirit and without thinking that he's attempting to curtail our liberty of speech here, but if we just sort of trust him as being a reasonable man and when he sees us getting a little off base, allow him the right to remind us about it and co-operate with him in being a little more concise and a little more to the point, that we could save the time to nobody's harm and to everybody's benefit. So with that hopeful little speech to the members of the committee -- I would be glad to move that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.