

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

MR. JAMES T. MILLS (Kildonan): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of St. Paul's College and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate St. Paul's College.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and receiving petitions.

MR. CLERK: The petition of the Community Chest of Greater Winnipeg praying for the passing of an Act respecting the transfer of the assets of the Community Chest of Greater Winnipeg to the United Way of Greater Winnipeg.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting reports by standing and special committees.

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 13, an Act to amend The Interpretation Act.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon) introduced Bill No. 11, an Act to amend The Health Services Act.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 33 an Act to amend The Water Power Act.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the five proposed resolutions standing on the Order Paper.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the House. The first resolution before the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Agricultural Credit Act by providing authority for the government to borrow money for the purposes of the Agricultural Credit Corporation and to guarantee the repayment of principal and interest secured by securities issued by the Agricultural Credit Corporation.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, this bill represents a broadening of the powers of the Agricultural Credit Board with respect to its financing operations to bring it in line with other Crown corporations of a similar character.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed? The second resolution before the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to establish a School Capital Financing Authority with powers to borrow money, and authorizing the Provincial Treasurer, on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, to guarantee the payment of principal and interest of securities issued by the Authority.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the Throne Speech gave an indication that we were going to seek authority to take the necessary steps to give the school boards who wished to borrow for construction of schools the first claim on the funds that will be available to us through the Canada Pension Plan, and this bill is the means by which we propose to bring this into effect. The procedure is that a Manitoba School Capital Financing Authority will be established by statute as indicated in this resolution. This Authority will be composed of the Provincial Treasurer and other members of the Executive Council, and perhaps others, and they will have authority to go into the market to procure funds which can be lent by them to the school boards of Manitoba. The intention is, of course, that they will do this by means of issuing provincial guarantees to the Canada Pension Plan for the money required, and they will then see that the funds are transferred to the school boards in question.

The Canada Pension Plan Fund requires that the securities that they accommodate in this way should either be provincial issues or provincial guarantees. We shall take the route of provincial guarantees. The result of this will be that the school boards of the province will be

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd. . . .) able to obtain the capital funds they require at a saving of about one percent, and one percent on five or six percent is a saving of something in the neighbourhood of 20 percent in the cost of borrowing money for building new schools in this province, and we think that this will be a rather satisfactory tax saving to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba.

The procedure that the school boards will use will be exactly the same as they do now. They will place their requirements by way of a referendum, by way of a debenture issue before the voters of their particular district. The voters in turn will pass on them in the way that they do now, but instead of the school authorities having to go into the market as they do now and obtain whatever price can be obtained for their requirements, they will be able to lodge these securities instead with the School Capital Financing Authority, which can then see that they get their funds at the rates that I have mentioned. I think that this outlines the of the scheme, Mr. Chairman, and the actual detail will of course be made available in the bill.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, there is one point I wish the First Minister would clear up and that is this: I understand that the main source of monies to be used for this particular purpose will come from the province's share of the Canada Pension. Now, has the Canada Pension Fund -- is it being funded on a strictly actuarial basis, and does that mean that the province's share of the money coming from the Canada Pension Fund will have to yield a certain return in order to comply with the actuarial set-up? In other words, is there going to be any restrictions on the rate of interest which the province can charge, either minimum or maximum, under the monies that they are using from that source?

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, the Member for Selkirk already touched on the point that I was going to raise. If I recollect correctly, there is a minimum return that these funds have to yield. I don't know -- maybe the First Minister could inform us as to what this rate is.

My other question is, does the government intend to subsidize these school debentures or bonds in any way in addition to opting them from the Canada Pension Plan Fund?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I have just one or two questions to ask of the First Minister regarding first of all the set-up. The Provincial Treasurer told us that the School Capital Financing Authority would be comprised of members of the Treasury branches and others. I would be interested to know if he could indicate what he means by "and others." Also, I would like to ask my friend when it is contemplated that this procedure will commence. The Canada Pension Plan only started, of course, on January 1st of this year, and I would imagine that there is not too much money in the Fund at the present time and will, of course, be built up over the number of years. But if we are going to have the expansion in education as is contemplated in the Throne Speech, it would appear to me that there will be considerable outlay both at the local level, and other levels as well, in capital costs for education. This is one of the reasons I am asking about whether we have to wait, or the Authority will have to wait, until there is a considerable amount built up within the Fund, and if not, on what priority will school districts have on utilizing the funds during the process in which they are being built up. Also, as I understand it, and I am subject to correction, under the present school financing system that we have, there is an additional amount of interest penalty paid by school districts of any amounts of money that accrue that the Provincial Authority borrows. If I recall correctly, or if I'm correct in this, at the present time, if the school board is unable to obtain money outside of the Provincial Authority, there is an additional penalty of $\frac{1}{2}\%$ or 1% over the amount of interest that the Provincial Treasury has to pay when it raises money by way of loan, and I would like the First Minister, if he could, to give clarification on these points.

MR. ROBLIN: Answering the questions, Mr. Chairman -- the rate of return is set by the Federal Government. We expect it to be their borrowing rate at the time. The rate to the school boards may have a small surcharge to cover operating expenses or various maneuvers in the financial business, but just -- it's a nominal charge only. No element of subsidy is involved other than giving them the preferred position on these rather -- well, it's hard to say "cheap" when it's about 5.2%, but on these reasonably economical funds considering all things. In effect they will be getting an advantage of about 1% over what they get at the present time.

The "others" referred to is the Deputy Provincial Treasurer; I think that's what the Statute provides for. This fund will be accumulating at the rate of about \$2 million per month and it started on the 1st of January, so you can see that the money is now beginning to come in

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd...) and we expect it to take effect as soon as the bill receives Royal Assent. We do not expect to run into problems with respect to priority, because our calculations indicate that there will be money left over after the schools' needs have been satisfied, and I do not know of any penalty in connection with this thing that my honourable friend refers to.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Is it the intention of the government to put all of the Canada Pension Plan money coming in into this fund, or will some of it be used for other purposes?

MR. ROBLIN: We'll be discussing that no doubt in the budget speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed. The next resolution before the Committee: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the reception, care, treatment, custody, and rehabilitation of juvenile and adult offenders and to provide, among other matters, that the cost incurred in the administration or for the purposes of the Act be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, this is the first step in the enactment of a new and comprehensive Corrections Act. It will contain provisions from a number of existing statutes relating to this general topic, together with a number of new provisions related to the subject field of probation and corrections generally, both as affecting juvenile offenders and adults as indicated in the resolution. The bill is quite comprehensive in its nature and we will be able to deal with these specific matters of course when the bill itself is before the House.

MR. HILLHOUSE: May I ask the Honourable the Attorney-General, Mr. Chairman, if this bill is patterned on the recommendations that were made by Mr. Justice Favreau and never adopted by the Federal Government, or is there going to be a re-delineation of responsibilities between the Federal and the Provincial governments in respect of offenders?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Selkirk refers to Mr. Justice Favreau but I assume he means Mr. Justice Fauteux. I think, Mr. Chairman, that undoubtedly some of the provisions of the bill have their genesis in recommendations that were made but it is not based in any sense on any re-defining of the authority, the responsibility as between the federal and provincial authority because of course the provisions of that particular report were never actually acted upon, and this bill is based solely on the present situation insofar as our respective jurisdictions are concerned.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, are the Estimates going to contain appropriations for the expenditures of any funds required with this program?

MR. McLEAN: Well yes, Mr. Chairman, there will be -- throughout all of our Estimates of the Department will be sums of money, in many instances with fairly substantial increases, for the functions that will be performed under the authority of this statute if, as and when it becomes part of the law. For example, probation is provided for in this bill and we have money for probations services, jails, rehabilitation camps, foster -- all the whole gamut, but no particular item is in the Estimates just related to the Corrections Act but rather to the functions that will be performed in the Department in discharging the responsibilities that are part of the bill.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am at a bit of a loss with the resolution. It seems to me that most of the items contained in the resolution are presently contained in the general Acts of the province and also, as far as the expenses are concerned, expenses that we have passed each year when we're dealing with the Estimates. Now we have had a number of reports by eminent criminologists and others -- I was thinking of the fatal Fauteux report and I was also thinking of the report to the Winnipeg Welfare Council that was produced by Mr. Don Thompson, of recommendations to the Provincial Authority of changes in treatment of offenders. Also, there has been a fight for some considerable period of years to get the government to agree to take care of the costs of social welfare of families whose breadwinner may be incarcerated for a period of more than one year. Will that be consolidated now, Mr. Chairman, into one comprehensive Act so that we lay people may look at an Act and know what is what insofar as the treatment of offenders and probation and the likes of that? Now, I can appreciate the fact that the Minister can well say to me, "You just wait until the bill is before you and you will see these," but I would like, if he could, to give us just a little preview of what is likely to be in the bill, for our consideration.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't know that I at this stage can say anything much more than I have already said. The bill does not deal in its entirety with new programs because it's quite correct, as the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party says, that

(MR. McLEAN cont'd...) we are already performing many of these functions. This will give, I think, in one enactment all of the relevant provisions that deal with this field of correction, so that to that extent it will be in one place and we hope clearly set forth.

With respect to the one matter to which he alluded concerning the payment of welfare to the family of a person who may be in custody or in jail, that is not provided here. That will continue to be the responsibility of the welfare people and will operate under the Social Allowances Act in the regular way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed. The next resolution before the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Winter Employment Act by providing, among other matters, that, where the Government of Canada contributes to the cost of carrying out a winter works project, the Government of Manitoba may contribute that part of the wages of persons employed on the project in respect of which the Government of Canada does not make a contribution.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, QC (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, up until last year, the Government of Canada legislation on this matter allowed them to contribute up to 50 percent of the wages the cost of labour on a winter works project, and our legislation followed theirs very closely and also allowed 50 percent. Last year, however, they introduced an amendment which allowed them to designate certain areas for additional contributions, where they could pay up to 60 percent of the wages. Now rather than try to amend our legislation so that we spelled it out in exact terms, we have just amended it to indicate that we will contribute for that portion of the wages that is not covered by federal contributions.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the Government under this to go into any projects in which the Federal Government does not contribute?

MR. SMELLIE: There is no other change in the Act being contemplated. This merely says that on a project where the Federal Government does contribute that we will contribute on the unpaid balance, or the balance that's not receiving any federal contribution. We are at the present time contributing in certain areas where the Federal Government have not, but they are very very limited.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed. The next resolution: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Public Housing and Urban Renewal Act by providing, among other matters, that the government may make contributions towards public housing projects in respect of the acquisition of public housing accommodation.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, this is legislation that's complementary to the federal legislation which was changed recently and deals particularly with the subject of public housing, and this change will allow the acquisition of existing buildings in an area for public housing, so that all of the public housing does not have to be new construction for this purpose. In other words, some of the buildings -- you will remember last year the Act was amended which allowed us to leave certain buildings in an area. This will allow us now to, through the partnership, purchase some of those buildings and use them for the purposes of public housing.

MR. MOLGAT: Similarly here then, Mr. Chairman, I assume that this is merely to make us conform to the federal Act and that any contribution other than this would be a partnership contribution with the Federal Government, not an individual contribution by the Manitoba Government.

MR. SMELLIE: That's correct. It is complementary to the federal legislation. There is one other thing that I should say, that the change in this legislation will allow us to include in the cost of projects, certain preliminary work and investigation that is deemed necessary or expedient to allow the project to go ahead. These will be included as costs of the project, so that it will allow an additional contribution by this government.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Honourable the Provincial Minister of Municipal Affairs whether, under this legislation, on the acquisition of the public housing, whether or not it would be permissive for this government to continue ownership of the public housing which is acquired on a subsidized basis. Now as the Minister points out, last year in a given area of urban rehabilitation renewal, certain buildings could be left. It is my understanding under the legislation proposed that these buildings now can be purchased or acquired by the Provincial Authority and/or in conjunction with the Federal Authority. Now in many areas where rehabilitation is taking place are in relatively slum or near-slum areas, and it might have been that the houses that were left were those that were in reasonable shape. Now,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) in addition to legislation dealing with the question of urban renewal and rehabilitation, we have subsidized housing. Can I be correct in presuming - whether this government does it or not is of course beside the point - but under the contemplated legislation, it could be permissive for the Provincial Authority in co-operation with the Federal Authority to carry on a program of rehabilitation or rebuilding of the houses acquired and allow these units to be used for the purpose of subsidized housing?

MR. SMELLIE: Yes.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and has instructed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, QC (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 19, an Act to amend The Agricultural Act.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: May I just amend the motion? I know the paper says The Agricultural Act but it's The Agricultural Credit Act - I should have stated that.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Agricultural Credit Act.

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

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 18, The School Capital Financing Authority Act.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 37, An Act Respecting the Reception, Care, Treatment, Custody and Rehabilitation of Juvenile and Adult Offenders.

MR. SMELLIE introduced Bill No. 4, An Act to amend The Winter Employment Act; and Bill No. 14, an Act to amend The Public Housing and Urban Renewal Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. When might we expect the printed copies of the bill rescinding the Heat Tax?

MR. ROBLIN: Shortly, Madam Speaker.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, QC (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report for the period ending March 31st, 1965, for the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. Copies of this report, I understand, have already been forwarded to honourable members. And the report of the Board of the Manitoba Farm Loans Association for the period ending March 31, 1965.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation for the year ended March 31, 1965; the Annual Report of the Milk Control Board of Manitoba for the period October 1, 1964 to September 30, 1965; the Annual Report of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation for the year ended March, 1965; the Annual Report of the Drainage Maintenance District of the Province of Manitoba for the year ending December 31, 1964; and the Annual Report of the Co-operative Promotion Board for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a number of reports to lay on the table of the House. First, the report of the Liquor Control Commission for the fiscal year April 1, 1963 to March 31, 1964 - copies of this report were forwarded to all members some time ago; the Report of the Comptroller General - a statement of assets and liabilities, profit and loss account for the fiscal year ending 31st of March 1965, of the Liquor Control Commission; a memorandum showing statement of general administrative and prosecution expenses by the Liquor Control Commission for the liquor law enforcement for the fiscal year ending 31st of March, 1965; a report covering the operation and enforcement of liquor laws in Manitoba for the calendar year ending 31st of December, 1965; a copy of a nil return under The Controverted Elections Act for the calendar year 1965, from the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Appeal, and wish to report that no rules were made by the judges under the Act; copy of a nil return under The Trades Practices Enquiry Act for the year ending 31st of December 1965; and a copy of the report of the Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada for the year 1965.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, QC (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House the 26th Annual Report of the Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Fund for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1965; and the 14th Annual Report of the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board for the year ended March 31, 1965; and The Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the year 1964-65.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Has he anything further to report on the conversations with Ottawa regarding the Nelson River Power Project?

MR. ROBLIN: The House may be assured that when there is an announcement to be made I will be happy to make it.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if the First Minister would be kind enough to give us an account on the Throne Speech. When will the sub-amendments come up for the last day.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, if my honourable friend will refer to the Rule Book I think it is clear there, and starting from the opening of the debate on Monday you count the days. I don't think I would like to offhand give a ruling on that. That's something that Madam Speaker will do at the appropriate time.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works although he's not in, I see, and I'm sorry I didn't give him notice. Possibly I can direct the question to the First Minister or to the front benches. Coming in on Highway No. 1 this afternoon there's a very thin layer of ice and very slippery on it. It seems that a little bit of calcium chloride or something would help very much, and I'm just wondering if the Public Works Department would make sure, would consider to look into this matter before there are more vehicles in the ditches.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I thank my honourable friend for his information. I think I may say that the Department of Highways have been doing an absolutely first class job in keeping the roads of this province free from snow this year. I think there has been freer access on the public highways of Manitoba than in many previous occasions, and I am confident that they are on the job with respect to this icing problem too.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Did the Manitoba Government present a brief to the Poverty Conference in Ottawa in December, and if they did can we expect to receive a copy of that brief?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, no brief was presented as such by the Government of Manitoba. This was not a governmental meeting; this was a meeting of senior civil servants and discussion papers were presented, so there's no brief to be referred to in this respect.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Education and the School Board of St. Boniface, any group of citizens, or any individual, regarding the contemplated establishment of a "French Option" elementary school in the Windsor Park Area of St. Boniface.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following: 1. The number and names of school districts and school divisions that have entered into agreements with private schools under the "Shared services" legislation. 2. Copies of all agreements entered into and approved by the Minister. 3. The number of proposed agreements which were rejected by the Minister.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. Copies of all correspondence between any Minister or Ministers of the Government of Manitoba and the Transcona-Springfield School Division No. 12 and Transcona School District No. 39 School Boards and School officials, since September 1, 1965, relating to payments to School Trustees. 2. Copies of all correspondence between the Minister or Ministers and individuals regarding the same matter. 3. If the Minister of Education has been requested to institute and investigation into the above matter, if so 4. What action has been taken on the request, and by whom.

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

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 2, An Act to amend The Municipal Board Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, as members of the House are aware, the Municipal Board has occasion to deal with applications where title to land is affected, particularly in the cases where there is a cancellation of plans and a re-vesting of title in lands taken for streets and roads etc. The proposed amendment is designed to cover certain cases where they've had problems in finding the owner of the property who may have been long deceased, that sort of thing. And this will give them the same rights for service for an application under The Municipal Board Act that would be found under The Queen's Bench Act, The Real Property Act, and The Surrogate Courts Act. There would actually be service upon the official administrator for the surrogate district where the person can't be found and you can't discover any estate for that person.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I would just like to ask the Minister one question and I should have done it myself but Section 80 of the Surrogate Court Act, is that the section that provides for the payment of the \$30.00 fee?

MR. SMELLIE: I can't remember offhand, Madam Speaker. I'll check the Act and deliver a legal opinion to my honourable friend as soon as I have the opportunity.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I'm not qualified to enter into a discussion with regard to the legal points involved in a bill of this kind, but I would like to give notice now that I think I shall do a little checking when we get to the committee stage, because I recall a bill coming in here just a few years ago, where the statement was made in the bill that the appropriate authorities, including the police who had been called upon, had made investigation with regard to the people who had some claim on the title of land, that they were unaware of their whereabouts and had been unable to discover their whereabouts (this was land in the Portage la Prairie district) and I personally knew the whereabouts of two of the families involved and I was just positive that if I knew the whereabouts of the heirs of two of the families involved that it seemed certain that certain other oldtimers in Portage la Prairie area would know the whereabouts, and to me it was inconceivable that the Land Titles office and other officials with the aid of the police had given us a bill in here which said that it had become impossible to establish the whereabouts of the heirs to this land. So I have the feeling that some serious difficulty could occur under a provision of this kind, because I would gather that if the Act says that -- it's very seldom, Madam Speaker, that one of my speeches brings down the House, but I'm pleased to see it happen at least to some small extent. They even can produce the evidence, I think. -- (Interjection) -- I was trying to make the point.

Divesting someone of his land is a mighty serious matter and I'm afraid that the ramifications of this bill might even go that far. I know there's no intention to act unfairly but sometimes an unfair result can happen under circumstances of this kind.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, I only asked a question the last time. Now regarding the first part of the sub-subsection (a) of this subsection 3, it seems to me that there should be two different methods provided in this. The first one should be a method of substitutional service under the rules of our court. Now the second, sub-subsection (b) applies to a person who is dead. I can see the logic of serving the official administrator in his case, but I can't see any logic in serving an official administrator in respect of a person whom you know to be alive, and I think there should be two alternative methods provided here: (1) substitutional service under the ordinary rules of the Court of Queen's Bench or County Court, and (2) service by the

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd. . . .) official administrator where you know the person is dead and no representation has been taken up in his estate.

Now regarding what my colleague from Lakeside said about locating people who were alleged to be missing, I remember a classic case which happened to me. A chap came into my office one day and he asked me to apply to the Court of Queen's Bench for a declaration of presumption of death in respect of his wife. He said he hadn't heard from her for twenty years so I said, "What was her last address?", so he gave it to me and I wrote her a letter, and I said, "If you receive this letter, telephone me reverse call tomorrow morning," which she did. So you can see the wisdom in what my colleague has been saying.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I don't suppose that I can answer all of the points that have been raised by the two learned gentlemen opposite, but I would advise the Honourable Member for Selkirk that I have checked the Surrogate Courts Act and Section 80 is the section which provides for the \$30.00 fee, so that I don't think that it's likely that anyone is going to use this section for substitutional service unless it is necessary to do so.

Insofar as the locating of persons is concerned, any of us who have had experience in trying to locate persons after a number of years I think will recognize that in many cases there are considerable difficulties, and we aren't all as fortunate as the member for Lakeside with a memory for persons and names. He is one of very few people who have a memory like that, and I certainly have wished on many occasions that I could compete with him in this field. But it is true that an effort must be made, a very real effort by the applicants to locate the people involved before any application is made to the Board, and they must also provide the official administrator with information as to what steps they have taken to locate the missing party before they can proceed. I think this is an administrative matter that will make possible the proceeding with certain applications which have in the past been found difficult and that have been rather onerous upon the people making application to the Board. It doesn't provide any unusual method. It's the same method that we find in the Real Property Act and in the Surrogate Court's Act, so that I don't really think that we are broadening the scope here beyond reason.

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

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 3, An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, this Bill arises out of an error that was discovered in the description of the boundaries of the Local Government District of Pinawa. At the time that this Local Government District was established there was a school site, Brookfield School, that was to be excluded. It appears that Brookfield School site was held at one time under two certificates of title and has since been consolidated under one certificate of title, and this amendment was just designed to correct the error that was made in describing the boundaries of that Local Government District.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, in the past when we have had some of these requests for changes in boundaries or anything affecting municipalities, the normal practice of members of the House has been to ask whether the measure has the approval of the two bodies involved, because quite obviously if you are changing a boundary there is another body involved. I presume here that Lac du Bonnet are satisfied with the changes going on and the Local Government District is actually a government body so presumably that has been cleared. Last year, however, a difficulty developed in this method that we have followed of simply satisfying the two bodies directly involved, and the discussion that has arisen the past few weeks regarding the garbage dump in the Kildonan area is a case in point, because last year when this matter came before the House, as I recall it we asked, "Has this the approval of the two municipalities concerned, Old Kildonan and West Kildonan?" and we were told yes, it has been approved by them. But we neglected to ask whether it was going to affect any other municipalities - in this particular case West St. Paul - and we now find ourselves in the position that a third body has an interest but apparently was not considered, so I would like to be sure that in this case -- and I agree that the change here is probably insignificant but we have no means of knowing from here; we must depend on the Minister who is, with his staff, in a position to know exactly what the change in boundary means. I would like to be assured as well that not only Lac du Bonnet and Pinawa are satisfied but if there are any other possible municipal corporations that could in any way be affected by the change, that they have been consulted too.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I think the comments of the Leader of the Opposition on this matter deserve some comment. Certainly it was true, the information that was given to the House last year on the other bill to which he refers, that the two municipalities concerned did agree. I think it would be impossible for us to determine whether every individual within a radius of miles of those two municipalities is satisfied that this is a good idea.

In the matter before the House at the moment, at the present time the description of the Local Government District of Pinawa describes the exception, this Brookfield school site, as being described on Certificate of Title No. 534785. This has been struck out and substituted with the following words, "the former Brookfield School site as described in Certificates of Title Nos. 534785 and 984071 and subsequently consolidated in Certificate of Title No. 988023. There is no real change as far as either the Municipality of Lac du Bonnet or the LGD of Pinawa is concerned, because in the application it was thought by everyone that the school site had been accepted from the LGD of Pinawa. It was subsequently discovered that they had missed a second Certificate of Title that covered a small additional area that had been added to the school site, and when this error was discovered it was brought to our attention and we agreed to introduce the amendment as soon as possible so that the situation that everybody understood to be the situation is in fact.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 6, an Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, there are two matters provided for in this bill. A reading of the Queen's Bench Act at the present time appears to, or can be interpreted to mean that all of the judges jointly of the Queen's Bench must set the dates of hearings of that court, and one of the provisions in this bill is to allow the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, or a judge designated by him to establish the sitting dates of the court.

The second provision in the bill has to do with the vacating or withdrawing of what is known as a certificate of *lis pendens*. There has been some confusion in this respect particularly in view of the possibility that there may be appeals from a decision of the court, and we have endeavoured to clarify the provisions in this respect to make it more certain that a certificate of withdrawal or discharge of *lis pendens* may be filed at appropriate times.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Attorney-General said that the Act could be interpreted to require the judges to sit together to fix the sittings in the various judicial districts. I'd like to ask the Attorney-General: what has the practice been?

MR. McLEAN: The practice has been for the Chief Justice to establish the sittings. The wording in the Act uses the expression "they shall establish" - it's presently the use of the word "they" which would appear to indicate that it must be done by all the judges together. The Chief Justice and the judges of the Court have asked or suggested that this amendment might be an appropriate one.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, there are two or three matters in this bill. First, it deals with the provisions which were enacted last year with respect to consent payments in cases of alleged infractions of either by-laws or statutes - provincial statutes - and there is in this bill a provision to make it clear that where a consent payment may be made, that is to say, where it may be legally made, that in the case of a by-law case the amount to be paid is \$2.00 minimum or the amount as provided in the by-law itself, and in the case of an offence under a provincial statute a minimum fine of \$5.00, or as provided in the statute itself or in the regulation.

Then there is a provision that where these consent payments are made they are to be dealt with in the same manner as in the case of fines which follow a conviction. That is to say that under the, for example The Highway Traffic Act, that the fine or a portion of it depending on the practice followed, is paid to the municipality concerned. It appeared from the previous legislation that in all of these cases the money in such instances was to be paid to the province, and that was not our intention and this will correct that situation.

The further matter has to do with the recording or forwarding to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, reports from offences where consent payments are made and where these would

(MR. McLEAN cont'd. . . .) normally be reported to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles if it had in fact been a case heard in court; in other words for matters in which persons choose to pay by consent the matter is reported. If it is reportable at all it is still reported and gets dealt with on the points system with which some members at least of us are familiar, in the office of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles.

Another provision in the bill relates to provincial offences with respect to the suspending of sentence, and brings the procedure insofar as provincial offences are concerned, into line with the procedure which is applicable under, in respect of Criminal Code offences, and in a sense this provision of this bill is complementary to the bill which was in committee and before the House earlier on first reading with respect to correction. It just simply is to make it abundantly clear that in respect of provincial offences sentence may be suspended in accordance with the arrangements as set out in the bill itself.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I opposed the principle embodied in this legislation at the last session, and I still oppose it. I have no objection to suiting the convenience of a citizen who receives a parking ticket and allowing that citizen to go down to the Police Court and pay the parking fine over the desk. But I do have a strenuous objection to having what they're now euphemistically calling "consent payments." I think it contravenes one of the most basic concepts of our system of justice. I think it is axiomatic that justice must not only be done but, what is more important, justice must have the appearance of having been done, and the best way to ensure that both of these principles are adhered to is by having justice administered in an open court. I object to these "under the counter" settlements.

Now one of the most basic reasons for punishment is to deter others from committing a similar offence. Now how are we going to deter others from committing a similar offence if we're going to allow offenders under our law to go up to a counter, pay a fine, and there's no publicity whatsoever? I have been sitting on a Highway Safety Committee several times during this summer, and it has become more apparent to me than ever before that we must give the greatest possible publicity to ensuring highway safety in our province, and Madam, I feel that the best way to ensure that highway safety is to make the offenders of our Highway Traffic Act conscious of the fact that if they do commit a breach of that Act they're going to be punished. And the best way to inflict that punishment is publicly, not under the counter, by allowing a person to walk down someplace and pay a parking ticket or pay a ticket.

Now just recently north of Winnipeg there has been a bit of a furore over the dismissal of a certain police official. Now that police official was only on that job for about three months, but I understand - and the Attorney-General can correct me if my figures are not right - but I understand that during that period the amount of fines that that man collected were over \$14,000. Now that is a small area. There's only about four miles of that municipality on Highway No. 4; there's only about four miles of that municipality on Highway No. 8. Now I would like to know how many of those tickets that that man gave were for offences under the Highway Traffic Act other than parking. I would like to know how many of those offences or penalties or fines were paid by the recipient of one of these tickets marching before a J.P. in that municipality and quietly and silently paying a fine. I think the concept and the principle involved in this bill is vicious, and I think the sooner we put a stop to it the better.

Dealing with highway safety; as I've said, publicity is the best way to ensure highway safety. Now I know that what I have to say in this House is going to fall on deaf ears because the government is committed to this legislation, but I do urge the government to do this, that if they're going to have any of these consent tickets, that they mark on the back in legible, large print, what our demerit system amounts to under The Highway Traffic Act and how many points that person is going to lose or suffer by way of demerit for these particular offences. The thing that I object to most of all is that there are a lot of citizens getting these tickets today who figure, rightly or wrongly (and wrongly in my opinion) that they have no right to defend themselves; that they must walk in there like sheep and pay that fine. Now to me that seems to be a system where it's our police that are determining the guilt or innocence of an accused person, not our courts; and I think the sooner we stop this the better.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, a similar bill was brought before the House I believe at the last session, and I opposed it on the same grounds that my honourable colleague from Selkirk has. I believe the legislation is wrong. It isn't proper just because it makes it convenient for somebody to go in and pay a fine. The reason for this is, no doubt, that we have very many offences committed under The Highway Traffic Act and probably under some of the other Acts, and because we have insufficient Justices of the Peace or other personnel to look

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd.) . . . after these fines for these charges. Some people on a small charge, an infraction of The Highway Traffic Act, have to wait for probably a week, sometimes two weeks, sometimes a month before the case can be heard, and it is more convenient for one to dispose of it by going and paying the minimum fine. But is that what we should really be concerned about, or should we be concerned with seeing that this person knows that he is being penalized, is being found guilty, and that it is a matter of record? And I would venture to say, Madam Speaker, that a great many of those who pay these consent fines do not realize that there is a conviction entered against them. And I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that instead of doing it in this fashion, that we have sufficient court personnel appointed to facilitate the hearing of any of these charges, get away from this principle of consenting where the individual does not know that he's actually entering a plea of guilty and that a conviction has been registered against him.

My colleague also raised the point of the fact of the demerit system. How many of these people know that this is registered against their licence? How many of them know how it is going to affect them in the event that he is charged later on and the matter brought to the attention of the Court? Very few of them would know the significance of going in there and paying the fine. I agree with my colleague entirely, this is wrong in principle and I for one am going to vote against the bill.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the government would be well advised to take this bill back and reconsider completely the approach to this particular question. I won't cover the same ground my two colleagues have covered but I am concerned about one of the developments that seems to me to be growing, and that is a tendency to get people to plead guilty to something to which they may feel they are not guilty of, but it's so much simpler to plead guilty that many people just simply say, "well, I'm not going to take the time away from my work and all the difficulties involved - I'll pay the fine", and they simply go in and they admit to an offence of which they may be thoroughly convinced they are not guilty, and I don't think that this is good for our whole legal structure. I think it's a bad practice and it should not be encouraged.

I agree to making things convenient insofar as parking tickets, certainly that is not the type of offence that I think too many of us would be concerned about, but beyond those, to follow this practice I think will encourage even more people to proceed as is the custom now in many areas, to simply admit the guilt rather than to fight it where they think they are justified in so doing. So I would recommend to the Minister that he takes this bill back, not proceed with it at this stage, let's have a complete look at this whole question again, because I'm sure he'll agree with me that it's not the intention of his department to have people pleading guilty to things of which they are not guilty.

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

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

..... continued on next page

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 8, an Act to amend the Gas Pipe Line Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, under the regulations under The Gas Pipe Line Act, there has been a practice of adopting standards as set by associations such as the Canadian or American Standards Association, and in reviewing the regulations recently the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations pointed out that there was no provision in the Act that such complete regulations under a code could be adopted as a regulation, and the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, by regulation, to adopt, or constitute as regulations or code, a complete regulation under someone else's code.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, it's true all of us want to see safety in this particular line, in particular, followed very closely. Certainly when we see, for example, the accidents that occurred in Montreal last year, we want to be sure that the installation of gas pipe lines are properly done and that we are following proper standards. I am concerned however when I see an Act like this one, that makes the provisions retroactive - I think any retroactive features have to be looked at very carefully - and here's one where it is deemed to have been in effect since the 1st day of August 1959. This is now making it retroactive some, almost seven years, and I wonder what position this may leave some of the people who have proceeded with installations. Will this mean that they will be suddenly subject to some new standards of which they were not previously aware? Are there some citizens of the province who will be forced to spend large sums of money to come up to these new standards? Are there any possibilities that under this retroactive feature we will be putting an onus on people who are actually quite innocent of any action and unaware, but by simply making it retroactive over this period, who will find themselves caught? I'd like to know from the Minister exactly where this will leave the people in the province.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, the regulations referred to have been in effect since the 1st day of August 1959 - that is the code as set out by the American Standards Association as part of the regulations, and all installations have been made in accordance with that code, and this is only to regularize the procedure that has been followed and not in any attempt to bring in any new regulations -- and of course if there are any new regulations, they will be from the time that they are proclaimed and not made retroactive. --(Interjection)-- It has been under the code but there has been no authority in the past for adopting a code holus bolus in the regulations and this is what we're trying to regularize.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

I would like to, before we proceed here, I would like to bring to the attention of the members of the House, that in the Throne Speech the scope is rather wide and we allow this type of speech to be made and we also ask that the members try not to read from their notes. I know that a rule is only as good as the co-operation that we get from the House Members, so I would ask you the first time on your feet this year to try to live within that rule of not reading from your notes, but if you should have to refer to them we'll try and abide with you too, but make every effort you possibly can as you speak not to read directly from your notes. On the other hand, we are this afternoon discussing the amendment to the amendment, and here again, it's rather hard to stay within it and not refer to the sub-amendment and also to the Throne Speech. Every person speaking to the Throne Speech today, try to stay within this if you can and let's see if we can have the co-operation of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Honourable Member for Rhineland speaks, may I draw to your attention you were using the word "notes". Now there's a difference. The Rule of the House deals with a prepared speech and you have referred to the word "notes". Now, in my opinion, with all due respect, Madam Speaker, there's a difference.

MADAM SPEAKER: I didn't prepare mine either. I mean do not read your speech direct. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, before I begin to speak on the matters dealing with the Throne Speech, let me congratulate you on the way you have conducted the business of the House in past years and I trust we will have the same kind of spirit prevailing and the same kind of attention given in this coming session.

I would also like to congratulate His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on his being chosen and accepting the position that he now holds. It's a very honourable one and we wish him well.

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . Likewise, I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder to the Speech from the Throne. I think they performed very well and their speeches were informative and appreciated by all members. We hope to hear more of them as the session goes on.

In continuing, I would also like to pay tribute to our former member for Brokenhead who has left us to join the ranks in the Federal House. He was a very personal friend of mine and on so many occasions I had the opportunity of using his name as seconder to my motions. We had many things in common, I think even to the extent where he subscribed to some of the principles in connection with monetary reform and so on, so that I appreciated him very much and I sure do wish him well in the Federal House.

Now the Speech from the Throne is a very lengthy one this year and contains many items; some already have been mentioned in other years as has already been mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, but I was rather taken on by the last one concerning the Throne Speech, and it seems as though the speech was prepared, and after it had been fully prepared, they added one more item, and that was "that conditions will be made for the alleviation of certain tax measures now on the statute books". I think this just came after it had been prepared and surprisingly it has already been taken under consideration and is being acted on as one of the very first items. Nevertheless, I congratulate the government on taking this, and putting this measure forward and deleting the heat tax. I think after what he mentioned yesterday, that the people of Manitoba will also appreciate not having to pay this tax in the future.

There are many items I could touch on from the Throne Speech and also mentioned in the amendments before us, however, I will limit myself to some of them. There has been mention made in the Throne Speech about the Nelson River Project. Here is a project that's of immense proportions and will take a lot of funds to put through. We know of the B. C. project, of the Columbia as well as the Peace River projects, both large projects, and which are both in the process of being processed or worked on to completion. I would hope this government will do everything in its power to see whether funds cannot be provided by the Federal Government through the Bank of Canada so that the costs will be less or will not be increased through large interest costs.

I am sure that industry can be developed in Manitoba that will take care of part of the energy that will be produced and can be put to use in this province. We still haven't got a paper mill. B. C. at the present time has 16. Surely enough with all our resources in Northern Manitoba we should be able to attract some mill coming to Manitoba; but I think so much will depend on how and at what cost we will be able to provide this power. B. C. through its advance sales of power, collected \$275 million and this is being used to build their plants. The amount thus received will reduce the interest cost tremendously, if we figure on a span of 20 - 30 years that monies will be borrowed otherwise and the interest thereon. The project in our case, if it's mentioned now at 800 million, could amount in the final answer to some 20 million, or \$2 billion, not just 800 million; and therefore, this is going to be a very big item.

We see today that the Federal Government is contributing to other countries for projects of this type. Pakistan is getting money. Why cannot we then as the Province of Manitoba get some funds in this way and get it at nominal cost and not have to pay exorbitant interest rates. I think this is the prime consideration that will have to be given in a project such as the Nelson project, and I think this government should do everything in its power and see to it that monies will be made available at low interest cost.

There is a number of references in the Throne Speech in connection with education and I don't want to dwell at any length on the matter of education at this time. I will wait to see just what the government has to offer and just what the program is going to be.

However, I feel there is a considerable amount of confusion today in the Province of Manitoba, because of the government not informing properly the parents of this province in connection with the courses offered, in connection with the General Course and the University Entrance Course. I find I meet young people who are taking the General Course and when you ask them what they intend to do later on in life, - "Well, I want to go in teaching". Well, surely enough these young people should have been advised and the parents should have been advised. What happened in some instances is the teachers told them about it in school, talked to the class and then the students in that class took the message home to the parents, and on that basis the parents made a decision. Well, you can well imagine that these reports going back to the parents will be of such a different nature from one case to another, that the parents, in making their decision, will not be the right one and that's why you will have confusion of this type. I am sure there is going to be a backlash of criticism against the government because of

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . this very fact. We should have better information going out and it should go out to the parents so that they can make the decision, work together with the students on this matter, because later on they will find themselves in a position where they cannot readily change and as a result have not put their time to proper use. I will no doubt have many things to add in connection with education later on. Also in connection with Bill 39 and the matter of Division Boards taking over the elementary schools.

I would also briefly like to touch on the matter of crop insurance. Crop insurance today is costly to many farmers and they do not reap the benefit that they expected and I think you will find a dropping off in subscriptions and subscribing to the crop insurance plan by farmers in the more well-to-do areas of this province. I already see this happening where farmers, if they have a considerable amount of acreage in wheat, well they won't subscribe to it. If they have a small acreage in wheat they will consider subscribing to this crop insurance plan in order not to have to pay the PFAA Assistance Act which is one percent of your gross income from grains and is deducted from your cash ticket when you deliver grain to the elevator. They figure that they're better off and it will be less costly to subscribe to the crop insurance plan in that respect. But they don't enter - a lot of them don't enter the crop insurance plan with the intention that they will be benefiting by this, because the way the plan operates it is only if you're having almost a complete crop failure that you will be able to collect. If you buy hail insurance and you have hail, you collect a certain percentage immediately depending on the amount of damage done. But in crop insurance you can have probably 75 percent loss and yet you're unable to collect. In so many cases these farmers will have to leave the crop in the field, they can't work it because there's sufficient crop left so that they would not qualify for benefits later on, and as a result they have to leave the crops on the field. So that unless we divide the province into zones and have the rates accordingly, have special rates for the better areas and different rates for those sub-marginal areas I don't see the plan going to be one that is widely proclaimed. I think this is a must for crop insurance and will probably have to be subsidized much more in the future than heretofore. I would venture that if the Federal Government is intent on crop insurance and that they want it furthered, that they should contribute a greater share of the cost. This is briefly my contention on crop insurance and when we discuss the estimates I will have further things to say on it. And I wonder whether we should not invite the people who are in charge of operating the plan to attend committee meetings so that we can question them on certain aspects of the operation of the plan.

I also note that, and as a member of the Municipal Affairs Committee that sat during and after the prorogation of the last House, that there are certain changes going to be advocated and also a recommendation of setting up Commissions. It is in connection with these commissions that I would like to say a few words. To me the matter of setting up commissions is not doing the thing that I would like to see done. I would like to see committees established by this House taking on these duties. I think we are here as elected representatives to do this kind of work and if we need extra experienced help this can always be got and we should not resort to commissions all the time. To me it seems as though we appoint commissions just to do the thing that isn't popular or things that are not the will of the people and we are trying to enforce these by these commissions making those recommendations and then later adopting them. I think this is wrong and I've seen this happen too many times. I am not in accord with setting up these various commissions of this type.

Madam Speaker, some of the former speakers who have already spoken on the Throne Speech seem to have a certain amount of pessimism as to the outlook on the future of this province. I hate to degrade the province in any way but when I see that there isn't proper stewardship given by the government and I find them lacking in so many places that you can't help but be pessimistic in certain regards. I think the matter of the farm situation, the farm income, is one where pessimism prevails. Except for the matter of livestock at the present day the outlook is grim. The net income of the farmers is going down; while the gross income might go up, still the net income is down. I have the figures here from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics which are contained in the Canada Year Book but apparently we have more recent ones and I would briefly like to read one paragraph from the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board Report of 1965, which states, and I quote: "Preliminary estimates indicate that the value of agricultural production in the province will have reached a new high of \$433 million for 1964. This would be \$7 million above the previous high established in 1962. Approximately \$290 million of the total figure is accounted for by crop reduction and the other \$143 million by livestock".

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . The gentlemen here refers to gross agricultural production, but when we come down to the net we find that it's going down. The net farm income in Manitoba for 1962 was \$170,465,000; in 1963, that figure was down to \$115,472,000; in 1964, it was up from '63, but still down from '62, to a figure of \$160,792,000.00. This represents a six and two-thirds percentage decrease.

When we compare this with the Canadian over-all statistics we find that the decrease is much larger. The Canadian net income figure for farmers is \$1,432,258,000 for the year 1964; this was a 14.3 percent decrease over 1963 and a 13.4 decrease over 1962 -- and this is all in spite of gross income in '64 of 345 million for the Province of Manitoba, and I've already given you the figure for 1964, so that we see where we can have larger gross incomes and yet the farmer finds himself in a worse squeeze than ever before. And during all this time we find that the farmer, the western farmer, is still compelled to provide cheap wheat to the Canadian consumer, to give those who earn much more than he does the Canadian Government through its crown agency is forcing the farmer to keep grain in storage and on hand, pay large amounts in storage costs to companies for years on end and often unable to sell his product. and from all indications there is no help in sight. Listening to the Leader of the Opposition the other day I could not agree with him when he said the answer to be in the reduction of operating costs. I think we have reached the bottom of it, the minimum has long been passed, because as we are asking for lower operating costs we find that the family farm farmer just capitulates and he cannot operate and exist under those circumstances. The answer lies not in decreasing costs; the answer lies in better prices for his produce and productivity income.

I think this principle was recognized by the government and I would like to refer to one paragraph on Page 13 of the Manitoba Budget Statement and Economic Review of 1965, and I quote: "There is one recent development in agriculture that is causing farmers and the government some concern. Recent terms in wheat prices have not been encouraging. For this reason and for the future problems that can be foreseen in international wheat trading, the government has requested the federal administration to convene a meeting on the subject. While we do not recommend direct subsidies in present circumstances, there are other methods of helping the producer to face subsidized international competition and these must be studied". I just wonder, has this meeting been called? I have yet to hear about it. The answer definitely lies in better prices, but I have come to the conclusion that the Wheat Board which is a Crown Agency of the Federal Government is designed to keep priced down and is not working in the interests of the Canadian farmer but in the interests of the Canadian consumer. I have yet to hear that Board raise its voice on behalf of the Canadian farmer in this respect. It seems that they are puppets of the Canadian government, just to keep their soft jobs and sitting on their fannies. In my opinion they do not look after the farmers' interests at all. While I have some very good friends working in the Wheat Board, in their offices, I still do not go along with the present way of operating the Canadian Wheat Board.

Certainly there should be some increase in prices sometimes, but we don't see this happen at all. The price of wheat will have to have a substantial measure of increase and I would think a dollar increase would be a minimum that farmers should be getting today. The way we're operating now, the farmers in Manitoba are getting deeper into debt, and if it were not for the fact that we have been blessed with exceptionally good crops, the last few years, our farmers would be in dire straits.

Our economy is based on the profit system and if our farmers as well as other business people could make substantial gains in their endeavour many of today's problems would disappear and be solved very readily. Just recently there was a meeting in the City here of realtors, real estate people, and one of the speakers during that conference said that the investment in farms was one of the lowest bearing interest on the capital invested. He mentioned a figure of three percent. Surely this isn't good enough for the people of Manitoba; surely enough the investment on our farms should be equal to those of other industries, otherwise our farmers will, more of them will leave the farm and go into other areas of business -- and this is what we see happen today. The older people stay on the farm until they retire, then they sell out and they sell to other farmers who probably have large holdings, because their sons and daughters have left the farm and it is a matter of the largest that can survive.

We have to subscribe to the principle of having better prices for our farm products -- and I'm referring mainly to wheat and grain. The Federal Government today is contributing to the carrying costs, to the cost of storage of wheat in elevators and in the terminals. This amounted in '63-64 to \$26,797,000, yet the cost to the farmer of storing the grain and carrying

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . these costs amounted to \$40,628,000 so that he was still left to pay the balance of \$13,831,000.00. I am sure this would not be left up to the farmer to pay if we did not have the Wheat Board operating because then once you sold your grain it was the responsibility of the purchaser to take care of those costs; but today we as farmers, sell our grain to the Wheat Board and then the Wheat Board holds it in store and we have to pay the cost of storing, as well as carrying the other carrying charges. So that, Madam Speaker, I think the present government is not fulfilling its proper role. It's not doing it's duty in seeing to it that our farmers are getting a better return, a fair share of the national income. I think more has to be done and I thought when this Western economic association of the three prairie premiers was formed that this would be one subject that should be discussed by them. After all wheat forms a large part of the income in Western Canada and we can see where the Crown Agency can stifle the economy of Western Canada by not giving a fair price to the farmer, by not having sufficient sales made in a given year. The total amount that will come to the farmer in income can thus be stifled and had it not been for the big sales to China I don't know where they would be today. The farmer would be really bad off. So that I think this is an area that has to be looked after and that our provincial government should raise a voice in these matters when they confer with the Federal Government.

My next point is that of farm labor and which has a very close relation to that of the farm income in Manitoba. If our farmers had a better income, our farm labor would receive more in return. Between 1946 and '63 employment in agriculture dropped from 1,186,000 to 641,000. It was almost cut in half. This is a decline of 46%, and you can refer to the Canada Year Book page 723 if you like. This means also that where we had one in four employed in agriculture before, it has now dropped to one in ten, and as a result we find fewer and fewer people available for agricultural work. The percentage of labor force in Manitoba in 1961 was 59,301 people or 17.3% of the total labor force. Some of the other areas or other industries: logging, .4% of the people were employed in logging; fishing and trapping, .3%; mining 1.7%; so that we had a total of 19.7% employed in primary industries.

Coming to the secondary industries, we had 46,713 people employed in manufacturing or a percentage of 13.6%; construction took 20,900 people or 6.1%. This gives us a total for secondary industry of 67,613 people or 19.7% of the labor force.

Then you have other supporting industries such as electricity, gas and water, transportation and communication which had 10.4% of the labor force; trade 16.7%; finance and insurance and real estate 3.6, and service of 18.7%. This gives you an idea as to the number of people employed in agriculture and also the percentage as well. And even for the other industries we certainly have nothing to brag about in Manitoba, for I find that the wages, the weekly wages in Manitoba amounted to \$77.56. Whereas most of the other provinces had substantially higher weekly rates, we are only next to the Maritime provinces. All the other western provinces and Ontario have higher weekly wage rates for employees.

This means that the average worker in Manitoba gets an annual wage of \$4,000.00. If we compare this with the wage that is presently being provided, or that our farm help gets, it's I think very very low, because our hourly rates in Manitoba for farm help in '65 was \$1.07, in '64 it was \$1.02, in '63 it was 95¢. These were rates with board. Without board they were \$1.21 for '65, \$1.13 for '64 and \$1.08 for '63. Then monthly wages as per Dominion Bureau of Statistics and contained in the Canada Year Book in '65 with board they were \$163 a month, in '64 \$149, and in '63 \$142. They are gradually increasing or going up. The same wages without board were \$203 in '65, \$188 in '64 and \$175 in '63. Then they also give a record of the annual wage of the farm helper in Canada of \$1,795 in '65. This is what our farm worker gets.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to remind the Honourable Member that he has five minutes left of his time.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood) As far as our group is concerned we would extend the courtesy to the honourable member to continue until he is finished.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the agreement of the House that this should be done? Agreed.

MR. FROESE: If we take these figures into consideration that I quoted, this would mean that our people employed in industries other than agriculture would average about \$4,000 income compared to those in agriculture I think making around from \$1,900 to \$2,400 -- in between. There are different wage rates and as a result there is a difference here, but it would average out between \$1,900 and \$2,300.00. Surely enough we know that at this rate we cannot expect to keep farm help on the farm and that something has to be done to encourage more people to stay on the farm. Farm help today is really in a critical stage, especially so on the special

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . crop areas and also especially in regard to experienced help. Southern Manitoba would have been very hard up if it were not for the people coming back from Mexico, people who work on the fields and take on agricultural occupations. Also, the help that we get from the Indian people.

At a recent meeting of the Vegetable Growers of Manitoba, held at the University of Manitoba, they had a panel discussion in connection with farm help and what remedy could be sought. We were told at that time by an official of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture that last year out of 3,000 placements that had been made, 1,500 of them came from Indians, so that we find many more Indians taking employment on the farm and assisting in farm help. Maybe, after all, some day the Indian will take over our land again.

To me, it seems it should be made possible to attract and retain more of our people back on the farm. Governments are not realizing the seriousness and the gravity of the situation, and where they do, they are proposing the wrong remedy in my opinion. They are always referring to reducing costs of operations. This is utter nonsense. This has been carried too far in my opinion and many farmers are going broke, especially the small farmer who has no choice but to capitulate. Many smaller farmers, carrying on before with no encumbrances, are now finding themselves up to their ears in debt by borrowing to carry on with farming as a way of life to them, and which they don't want to change at this particular time. It's not as easy when you've lived your life on the farm for many years and then leave the farm and go into a different vocation, take on different job when you are not accustomed to it and you do not like other employment.

One thing which was also brought to our attention quite forcefully at this Vegetable Growers Meeting was when one of the social workers informed us of their program that they were carrying out, and which I would briefly like to comment on. We find today that under the Unemployment Insurance program they are providing classes for training and retraining our unemployed people in the various areas of this province. Up until very recently just a few areas have added this service, but we will find that more and more of this will come about as time goes on.

We were informed also that under this program, which presently pays the unemployed while he takes this training, roughly \$200 a month. Now we understand this is going to be increased to \$300.00. I do not deny the unemployed or begrudge the unemployed any of this money. I think they need it, and I think it's much better to do it this way than to carry them on welfare indefinitely, but it's going to present a real problem to the farmer because the farm wages today cannot even meet this amount that they are presently offering to these people who take these courses, so that a farmer will find himself where he cannot engage these people because these people are better off by being unemployed and taking this training than to work as farm help. I can see where this is going to be a bigger problem as the remuneration is going to be increased.

I do not think denying farm help this opportunity, or lowering the assistance is the answer either, as his income already is far below that of other industrial workers. The answer in my opinion, and that I would suggest, lies only in giving the farmer a better return so that he in turn can give farm labour a better return. Now I am sure this would happen, that the farmer would receive a better return. I think the atmosphere, or the attitude today of pessimism in farming, would be changed to a great degree if this happened.

We see today just because of the increase in prices of livestock and in hogs what this really means. People are going into production. They are talking of what they are doing, and they are talking of the gains that they are making, and this brings about a completely different atmosphere and people are more ready to invest in projects of this type and go into greater production. But when you have an attitude such as the people, the farmer today, who produces grain and other crops and does not receive a fair return, it just degrades and you finally have a pessimism about.

Also, they refer to the real estate people who say that the farm wasn't able to give any better return than a three percent interest return on investment. Well surely no one wants to enter into farming if he can get better returns elsewhere. This is the area that I feel that our government should take a much greater interest in, should concern themselves much more with, and do everything in their power to do something about it.

I have some more letters that I will no doubt be speaking on at a later date and I will probably have another opportunity to make myself heard on the main amendment. However, there is one further item that I want to touch on at this particular time and that has to do with the Department of Industry and Commerce, and more in particular with the Manitoba Transport Commission.

(MR. FROESE, cont'd)

I would like to congratulate the government on the action they have taken so far on the hearings in the Thompson inquiry and the contributions they have made to the inquiry, and on the work that they've done in the connection of trying to develop international air transportation services in Winnipeg. I think they deserve to be congratulated on this. However, I think what is happening today is we are reaping the fruits of the power phase that we have been promoting in this province of ours and I think the Canadian government is probably doing likewise, and that is the matter of centralization. If it were not for centralization, we probably wouldn't have this trouble in connection with TCA and the air base.

But this government in this Province of Manitoba is following a similar course by centralizing in so many areas. We see it happening in hospitalization; we see it happening in the school structure; we find that there is going to be a commission on the boundaries of the municipalities; and so on with regard to further centralization. I think this is wrong. I think we should not further the policy of centralization but try and decentralize and involve more and more people instead of casting them out and not letting them have a say in matters. I think this is one of our basic troubles and we are now reaping the fruits of what we have sown in the past in this connection.

Madam Speaker, this is all that I would like to say at this particular time and I hope to contribute something further at a later date.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. DONALD M. MCGREGOR (Virden): Madam Speaker, I certainly deem it a privilege to make some small contribution to the Throne Speech Debate. Firstly, I would like to congratulate you in the way you govern this House. Secondly, I would like to pay tribute to our late Member from Inkster. I remember Mr. Gray so very well when I rose last year to present a particular resolution, knowing full well there was some opposition to that resolution on this side of the House, and I am a believer that where there is an opposition you don't draw the best out of anything, and the first member to speak in favour or support that resolution was our late friend Mr. Gray. I also think at Christmas time we've always had the message - I'm sure we've all got it - and with that message of greetings was a certain religious tone, and I couldn't help but admit - maybe I'm not the most religious person - wondering am I religious enough or what does religion and politics -- where is the tie-in? I would like to extend to his family certainly a most sincere condolence, belated as it may be.

And also to another member of that same party, Mr. Schreyer, who I think showed this House, as I observed him, a real sharp political brain, a man who has went off to greener pastures - maybe a higher level or lower level, it depends what one may think of that particular level of government - and I am one who will maybe predict, and maybe wrongly predict, that that honourable gentleman, quite possibly his political philosophy may change. I see the Honourable Member from Radisson look very gloweringly with that statement, but I sort of sense this and maybe quite wrongly.

Also, the First Minister isn't in his chair and I would like to pay some tribute to him. Maybe my appreciation of him and his appreciation of me are not always on the equal side of the fence - or equally shared, I should say - but I think I sat back in Virden with the press clippings that were going around and wondering if he was making this step into the higher level of government. I think I very much appreciated when he said that he would stay with Manitoba, because we need men like the First Minister to guide us. Not that there isn't men to fill his shoes by any means, there are many men to fill his shoes, but I think that we need every man in Manitoba to add, subtract and come up with the very best that we have got because we are sometimes in a slightly isolated territory and we have to go with the very best in order to get the job done, and I say to that respected gentleman that we need him in Manitoba - with or without his moustache - we still need him.

To my honourable gentlemen to my upper left I think there is no one that has got me in the hot seat on a couple of occasions more than they have, but it was true reporting, and I say this - I don't try to defend this - but they do goof once in awhile and I do use that word. I think the Honourable Member from Portage isn't in his chair but the Portage ploughing match this past year was an instance of this happening.

The year before I think the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose got the Minister of Agriculture's trophy. I came second, so I went back last year with the determination that I'd beat the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose if I do nothing else. Well, during the afternoon I ran into the Attorney-General and the Minister of Mines & Natural Resources, and I was

(MR. MCGREGOR, cont'd) . . . quite enlightened because I felt that if I can't beat anyone else I can beat these two city gentlemen, but they took the liberty to inform me that they were going elsewhere and they weren't ploughing, so then I was right back in the middle, I still had to beat the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose. However, I did beat him and the Honourable Member from Lakeside must witness this, but what did the press do? What did the weekly press do? I was placed below the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose. How can you win?

I would like to just comment briefly on Virden constituency and it's not much different than my contribution last year. The oil concept is slightly changed. I referred to the flood-back program which was playing a major part in the increase in production and this was true a year ago. Today it is not quite so true. We have one hundred new wells drilled this past year, and while the production is up, it's the new wells that has brought this production up, and I'll try very hard, Madam Speaker -- I'd better take that off my desk in case you think that's notes - there is a slight one here, because facts and figures -- yes that's right, there were 100 new wells drilled this year and we have reached a gross in barrels of 56 1/2 millions as of noon today approximately, slightly over. There was something like 800 wells pumping at this moment and that is the only industry in Virden. Mind you, agriculture is still basically the industry, and I say to the Minister of Industry and Commerce we desperately need a small industry, a satellite out of the Simplot plant. This I won't demand, but I'm certainly dragging on this note.

There are many things that we can criticize any administration but I think we have also got to give credit, and I think one thing that will always be a milestone or a thought -- whether my term be long or short, and there are those in the opposition that would like to see it much shorter than it is and I realize this -- but however, it's the senior citizens home. This is about \$335,000 and if ever there's a place that I look up to, it's one of the finest. I have a mother-in-law here in town that we brought in several years ago - six. We covered the City of Winnipeg and we left her in a home that day with the very best. For that home in comparison to the home in Virden - I know that many new ones have gone up in recent years - and I haven't seen one finer than the one in Virden, and this to me is a credit to this administration. They gave a grant of something like \$81,000 to start this ball rolling and was left with the local initiative - and this is right - it shouldn't be a one-way street. I won't go into the details, but it's something like \$335,000.00.

In assessing what has been said from the opposition ranks at this moment, there was many very varied points that give one to a lot of thought, but if I had to put them all in one bundle, I probably would have to coin a phrase from that respected and honourable gentleman from South Africa, Cecil Rhodes, who I believe is attributed to this statement, "So very many words to say so very little".

I must defend the member from Emerson who gave us some thoughts towards the Public Works Department, I think that I have not been used any better than anyone else, but I am sure that I have been treated in a way that I am very proud. The roads that I have seen since my very few years here in this Legislature, and I don't think there is a constituency that I have covered more than I have the constituency of Emerson, and I would question his thought. Maybe it's a vote catcher, maybe it isn't, I'm not sure, but I know that I spent more time in the Emerson constituency than I did in any other constituency from the opposition ranks.

He also spoke of Phase I, and Phase II of education, and it's true that Phase I haven't got all the problems ironed out, but I believe that if we're progressive we cannot hang on one phase without moving into the other one and letting the machinery that is set up today correct those problems that are still in Phase I.

As an agriculturalist I have always been a defender of it and a believer in it, and if I could take you down just a little bit of an imaginary trail and try to bring the point that I would like to bring at this time. If you took all your doctors and put them in a bag, weighted it and dropped them in the Assiniboine, we could still survive. You could take all your lawyers and use them rightly the same, all your teachers, but believe me, Madam Speaker, could you foresee taking all the agriculturalists and do this? You would all starve. This is right. -- (Interjection) -- I'm not one for repetition.

There is one other area, and I realize as an agriculturalist I'm really in hot water on this one, but I really believe that no industry has to take the advantage of cheap labor. I believe today in Manitoba our minimum wages are much too cheap. We must move in a much faster, more accelerated program in this field. I realize this is going to hit agriculture but I believe that agriculture must meet this thing with full and I believe there are ways

(MR. McGREGOR, cont'd) . . . and means of getting out of it.

A MEMBER: \$2.00 a bushel.

MR. McGREGOR: \$2.00 a bushel this is right, the honourable member, but I think we have to move in other fields.

Someone criticized the Minister of Agriculture and I was sitting in the airport in Calgary on July 22nd waiting on a flight east and I happened to meet the association with a president of a fertilizer company and these were his words, as we kicked it around that I was somewhat of a hairbrained politician - call me what you like, it doesn't matter - but however this was his statement, that Manitoba had more soil analysts than the other two provinces put together. He was a Calgarian. He was not a conservative by any stretch of the imagination. To me, when you are out in hinterland and you receive compliments of this nature, it does one's heart good that you are a Manitoban.

The last point that I probably got is regarding to a university status at Brandon College. I look at the Honourable Member from Brandon and he may wonder what is coming and I wonder too, but I really think that this is something that is bigger than any town. If the Manitoba University came up with a Transcona name or St. James or Winnipeg I would fight it, and it well may be I'd take all the rest of the Legislature on and I may bite the dirt again and it isn't the first time, but I would suggest that this University should be named the University of Western Manitoba because this is all Manitoba. This is not one area. I realize the contributions have come from basically the City of Brandon for the biggest majority, but I say that the money that has been poured in there to build this up to a place where they can apply for a university status, a lot of it came from the treasury of Manitoba.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

..... continued on next page

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND: (Hamiota) . . . the debate but I have no objection to anyone else speaking.

MR. JAMES T. MILLS: (Kildonan) Madam Speaker, in taking part in this debate, I would like to extend to you at the outset my greetings and wish you well in this Session. I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech for their dissertation on their different constituencies and to bring out to this House the good that can be expelled from the Throne Speech to their different areas. I would also like to extend my greetings to the members opposite this side and also to convey to Ed. Schreyer, our former member, my sincerest greetings. Brokenhead was my neighbour and I hope him well in his chosen field at Ottawa.

Madam Speaker, although yesterday we made a motion of condolence to the honourable Mr. Gray, who I will call honourable - to me he was a very honourable man - but I would like to convey to his family my personal greetings. May God rest his soul.

Madam Speaker, after listening to the leaders of the opposite parties regarding the loss of confidence which they feel we have created after eight years of our administration, and that we have failed to promote adequate growth and productivity, that we have not shown ourselves as being capable of running this province; Madam Speaker, speaking as a member of this Legislature and a taxpayer in Manitoba, I don't think remarks of this type should go unchallenged.

My address today will not dwell on the province as a whole; my remarks will be contained in the Greater Winnipeg area, namely the Metropolitan area of Winnipeg. My remarks, Madam Speaker, today will be on projects and actions that our administration has been responsible for in creating and doing during the past eight years for the peoples of Greater Winnipeg, and, Madam Speaker, this is by the Roblin government.

I would like to give a short resume of the so-called plans and projects that our government has completed in the course of their reign. I do not think the people of Winnipeg and of Greater Winnipeg and Metro Winnipeg think that the recent Throne Speech was a confession of failure, but one of a giant on a march and of benefits that will accrue to everyone in Manitoba.

A few of the Public Works I would like to cite at this time was one of -- the Disraeli Bridge. The area east of the Red River used a small inadequate bridge at one time. Today we have a beautiful bridge or a freeway called the Disraeli Bridge. This was brought in by the people or the representatives of this government. The St. James Bridge. This bridge cost approximately \$2.2 million and represents 60% of the cost. If you speak to people using this bridge I don't think they'll think this government has been a failure. The St. Vital Bridge, which was just opened recently, just as recently as last December, at a cost of \$2 1/2 million -- the provincial government assumed 60 percent of that particular cost.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the NDP Party and myself one night travelled this bridge and I think he in his own heart could not help compliment the government for their forwarding look in the building of this bridge over (interjection) Madam Chairman, I don't think it was the bridge that was weaving. The St. Vital Bridge and its complex is something that I feel is unexcelled. The longest bridge to be opened in Manitoba was just recently opened, just as shortly as December 21st of last year. This just formed another link in the perimeter that is going to eventually surround the whole of Greater Winnipeg, to enable tourists and the residents of Manitoba to reach their destinations faster and surer and safer. This freeway, Madam Speaker, is a key way to our summer resorts, our parks, and will prove a boon to our tourist trade which we so much depend on. The re-alignment of Highway 59 - I hesitate in my opening remarks to speak about the area that I represent, and that is of Kildonan. This Highway 59 is a beautiful new highway and for those members who have not travelled this highway they are in for a real treat. It is a key to the opening of the summer resorts up through Beausejour and east. This particular highway is a treat also for the residents of my area and all North of us.

Street system grants. As early as last year the system of grants was changed and the grants received by the Metropolitan area, or rather the Metropolitan City of Winnipeg that we receive from this provincial government certainly helps to improve our street system in Greater Winnipeg.

Now we will go to another sphere, namely the schools. This is another area that we have come under heavy fire. Madam Speaker, our school and teacher programs have been unexcelled over the period of eight years. I am sure the people of Manitoba or particularly the people of Greater Winnipeg will not criticize our program of schools and education. I think

(MR. MILLS Cont'd) . . . maybe they think we're going ahead too fast. We take pride in the following institution, namely, the new Institute of Technology that was opened in Brooklands. This was opened with a registration of approximately 1,200 students and there courses out at that particular institute was so popular and was so demanding that an addition was built last year where we accommodated 2,200 students. It is staffed with 161 teachers. I think this is a step in the right direction. It does not show or lack failure on behalf of this government to institute good programs in education. We are now in the throes of building a new junior technical vocational school somewhere in Winnipeg and this school will be made accessible to many of the boys and girls in Winnipeg and surrounding areas.

Madam Speaker, how about our public buildings? This provincial government has been interested enough in building or supplying the funds to build a new Manitoba Telephone System Building on Portage Avenue in the St. James area. We have provided headquarters for the Hydro on Portage Avenue. There is a proposed Juvenile Detention Centre and Juvenile Family Court which will cover facilities, the finest in western Canada. A Magistrate Court falls in the same category.

Going now over to the fair for next year - the Centennial Year. Madam Speaker, the people of Greater Winnipeg are astonished and will be more astonished when they will see the Centennial Centre, the Cultural Centre completed. The extent of this building and its benefits to Metropolitan Winnipeg is beyond compare or imagination. The benefits that will accrue to the City of Winnipeg alone are beyond imagination.

One department, Madam Speaker, that is close to my heart, and when I hear the criticism thrown across the floor at our hospital plan. Madam Speaker, it has been said that we are lagging and falling behind in our hospital plans for this province. I do not know what's happening outside of Greater Winnipeg, but I think the people of Greater Winnipeg are very pleased with our plans. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface shakes his head. Rome was not built in a day and it still costs money, and from my reports here there's an approximate \$26 million has been spent in the last eight years.

Madam Speaker, I would like to cite a few of the things in the hospital projects that have been completed since 1958 to December 31, 1965. The Children's Hospital. Addition and renovation to Nurses' Residence to accommodate 48 more nurses, a total of \$332,000.00. A Heart Catheterization Unit and an area for school department clinic \$80,000.00. But the big money will be spent in the following: The Manitoba Rehabilitation Centre. Have any of you fellows ever been down to visit this particular centre? I don't think you've been down there to realize what this government has done for these people. These people - I have seen them - we create miracles every day for them, if you believe in miracles. This, Madam Speaker, ran in the neighborhood of \$5 million to construct. The Misericordia Hospital's new Nurses' Residence, another million dollars. The Grace Hospital conducted by the Salvation Army; the new Maternity Wing at \$1 1/2 million. The Winnipeg General Hospital Service Wing, Heating Plant, and other facilities, \$3 1/2 million. The renovation of two other wings, a mere \$115,000.00. Additional wing for 174 beds, x-ray equipment, and boiler expansion, \$2 1/2 million. The Manitoba Cancer Foundation. They had a new building built to the tune of \$2 million. In addition to these major projects there were several smaller projects carried out at this particular time and they were included at the Misericordia Hospital, the St. Boniface, the General Hospital, the Winnipeg Municipal Hospitals and Victoria General, at a cost of approximately \$200,000.00. The total capital cost of these projects I have listed amount in a period of eight years to \$60 million. And other projects underway as at January 1st of this year is the new Grace Hospital located in St. James which when completed will contain 258 beds, a School of Nursing, and a Nurses' Residence. The Winnipeg General Hospital. It will contain a new laundry building and renovation of another wing. The total cost of these two particular projects amounts to approximately \$10 million. Madam Speaker, there is your \$26 million we have spent or are spending since 1956 to the present time.

Madam Speaker, if the spending of this amount is lagging behind, shows failure in our government, lack of confidence in this government, I wonder how much you must spend - what is the maximum you must spend, to be a hero.

Madam Speaker, we have a program of elderly and infirm people, and I would state that over the years since '58, '59 there has been millions of dollars spent. We have, I understand, spent \$23 million, an increase from \$7 million in 1958 to 23 millions today.

You say gentlemen that we have taken over the cost of the municipalities. Yes, we have; this is a portion included in this. But I think this has relieved the taxation burden on some of

(MR. MILLS Cont'd) the taxpayers living in these municipalities, other cities? We care for approximately 4,000 patients or elderly or infirm people throughout Manitoba -- 4,000. Just recently we constructed and helped construct, or rather a grant was paid to the Lion's Manor on the corner of Portage and Sherbrook. Has anyone been up there to see that building? The people in there are very happy. This particular building includes a grant from us of approximately \$295,000 and it houses 210 people who are enjoying the twilight of their lives, living right downtown.

Other developments that this particular province, provincial government rather, has done, is the Floodway. This floodway for all those living in Greater Winnipeg, will give a lot of rest, peace of mind, to a lot of home owners along the Red River, and I just hope with the amount of snow we've received this winter, I would like to have seen this floodway in operation this spring.

Another major project that this government is responsible for: the Bird's Hill project, the park area. There will be a man made lake out there of approximately 82 miles in size -- rather acres -- (interjection) -- I'm sorry. There will be an 18 hole golf course out there; there will be buildings; there will be picnic grounds; there will be horse trotting - I understand - grounds eventually. I understand that this park will be open for the public, part of it, in the fall of 1966. We will have the official opening, Madam Speaker, in 1967, for Centennial year.

You know, Madam Speaker, I am not a in this. As I sit back on this side of the House and look across over here at these gentlemen, I kind of feel sorry for them. It must be pretty hard to prepare replies to the Throne Speech in a vein they must carry it on. They are up against terrible odds and I tell you what gentlemen, or Madam Speaker, with our recent Throne Speech and its contents, it just proves that this giant is still on the march and further plans and projects for a better Manitoba for all Manitoba citizens to enjoy for a better way of life.

MR. ROBLIN: I was going to move the adjournment, but if my honourable friend wishes to speak, I'll wait until 5:30. Otherwise I'll move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney Did he want to speak now?

MR. PAULLEY: No, I thought that the honourable, the gentleman standing behind you

MR. ROBLIN: Oh he was doing it on my behalf because I wasn't in the House at the time.

MR. PAULLEY: Most delightful, you can do it yourself.

MR. ROBLIN: I'd like to speak tomorrow so

MR. PAULLEY: Oh lovely, we'd like to hear you.

MR. ROBLIN: Well I don't think you'll be so pleased when I'm finished, I would like to move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: The suggestion has been raised that we should cease and desist and I think Madam Speaker, that's a good idea. There is only ten minutes left so I move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General that the House do now adjourn

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