

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 p. m. Monday, April 18, 1966

MR. CLERK: Resolution No. 1 resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$528,147 for Legislation. Resolution 1 and 2 for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March 1967.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I'm not sure, was the motion put?

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes I have the motion and I did read it.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Madam Speaker, but was it eventually put?

MADAM SPEAKER: I shall so do again.

MR. PAULLEY: Carry on . . . we're jovial tonight.

MR. CLERK: 2. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,123,884 for Executive Council. Resolutions 3 to 6 for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March 1967.

3. Resolved there be granted . . . --(Interjection)--

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I just want to speak to this resolution just briefly, dealing with the Executive Council. I cannot help but make the comment that while we have before us an expenditure of \$1,123,884 we have the most negligent Executive Council the province has ever had.

MR. ROBLIN: I can't help but thank my honourable friend for his complimentary remarks.

MR. CLERK: 3. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$21,353,528 for Agriculture and Conservation, Resolutions 7 to 20 for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1967.

MR. CLERK: 4. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,783,291 for Attorney-General. Resolutions 21 - 30.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): . . . It's going so fast that I couldn't even catch up to the clerk. I would like to speak on the Resolution on Agriculture and Conservation.

--(Interjection)-- (It's passed) I was up but nobody heard me, I'm sorry. --(Interjection)-- I don't think that you should hold to that. If I couldn't draw attention. I was up, so I think. I

MADAM SPEAKER: I observed the honourable member as soon as he took his seat, I called for Order and we were already on Attorney-General.

MR. TANCHAK: Well could I have permission of the House to come back and speak on that, Madam Speaker?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, on a point of Order. Surely if a man tries to get up and the Clerk is going so rapidly you can hardly . . . you should recognize it.

MR. TANCHAK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Attorney-General's Department is before us unless the House gives leave.

Has the honourable member leave to proceed in Agriculture?

MR. ROBLIN: I think we will give him leave as far as we are concerned Madam Speaker, but I urge the opposition to be a little more alert in the future.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: I think that maybe the Clerk should read them just a little bit slower and give us more time, but I'm not complaining as far as the Clerk is concerned on this.

I would like to make reference at this time to the government policy on flood protection and I'm speaking only on the flood protection in the Red River Valley south of Metropolitan Winnipeg and also re drainage policies in southeastern Manitoba. And here I would like to say that the efforts of all the people who took part in flood protection operations are very commendable. They did what was humanly possible and this against time and elements of weather and so on and I think that we should really highly commend them for that. And I think that in an emergency such as arose now from this flood threat that the province did whatever was humanly possible and what could have been done, because an emergency did arise.

Emergency dikes for the protection of towns themselves became a must because the flood threat was here. It created an emergency, the flood threat. Now most of this emergency preparation could have been avoided if the present government had a proper flood control policy south of Winnipeg and in southeastern Manitoba, but here I have to condemn the government for the lack, its lack of any policy except remedial measures after the emergency arose.

(MR. TANCHAK, cont'd) . . . There was no flood protection policy south of Winnipeg, except a remedy for something that had already occurred.

What did the government do for the eight years since it has been in office for the protection of the people of southeastern Manitoba? We can easily answer that question - it was nothing and double nothing. The government have done nothing for the protection of the people south of Winnipeg. Every Session since 1958 I asked the government, and they well know it, I asked the Minister, what steps, what measures are being taken to protect this area in the event of another flood, such as we had in 1948 or 1950, and then I backed it up by other floods, smaller floods; but the government was dormant. In fact I was often ridiculed in this House for suggesting certain measures to be taken. I was ridiculed by the Minister and here I would like to say that the Honourable Member for Morris was no better in this respect.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, I want him to prove that statement. I want him to prove that statement.

MR. TANCHAK: I'll say it again, the Honourable Member for Morris was no better in this respect - that is proof enough. That is proof and it is proof for the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. When I asked for some kind of protection, the honourable members, none of them helped me, they said it was ridiculous, these dikes could not be built because it was dangerous to human life. And I didn't hear the Honourable Member for Morris support me at that time, although now he is supporting.

MR. SHEWMAN: Madam Speaker, this is just going a little bit too far. A person can take so much abuse but when the Honourable Member from Emerson stands in his place and a remark just as he made -- he should withdraw that remark.

MR. TANCHAK: I have nothing to withdraw, and I'll repeat it again. He was no better, he sat there and he did not support me and he did not give me help - evidently he was not interested in the welfare of the people that he represented because he did not support me when I asked for this protection. Neither did this government.

I asked the government to construct permanent dikes. They said it's a threat to life - no this is dangerous - it can't be done. The report said it's impossible to protect them. I had answers like that for eight years in succession and I say that if we had a government which was concerned about the permanent welfare of the people south of Winnipeg as far as flood protection is concerned, if we had a government who were concerned about it, we would have had something done. I see the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources grinning as he usually grins. I don't think this is a matter just to pass off lightly, a matter to laugh about. Those people are concerned.

The government said the dikes are dangerous, they cannot be built. But we have proof this year that the dikes hold. The dikes at Emerson held and in most of the places the dikes held. We have proof that they did the job and if they were permanent would have been so much better. True we had a breakthrough at St. Jean but that again proves my theory that if we had permanent dikes this would not have happened at St. Jean because it stands to reason that if you have permanent dikes, built at the proper time, solid dikes, not those oozy dikes -- and I'm not complaining about the work that was done this year, they did as good a job as was humanly possible at that time but if we had had permanent dikes these permanent dikes would have held even in St. Jean. Emerson is protected by bush and the waves did not cause as much damage there. Probably some of these dikes might have gone, broken down if there was no protection. But again it comes back to what I said that if we had permanent dikes built - and this government had plenty of time to do it in the last eight years. They chose to do nothing at that time. Sure I'll give them credit this time, the government, that they're trying to help the people. Anybody would have done it; it was an emergency. But these dikes should have been constructed many years before. They would have been finished by now.

The Honourable Member from Morris supports my idea that permanent dikes should be built now, the other day he said it. He didn't say so before. I never heard him in this House supporting my request. I made other requests to raise some of the buildings, raise them a little higher. Again I heard the same story, now - when was it, on Saturday? - that some of them could be raised and some of them could be relocated, some buildings, where it is impossible to protect them. Those were the requests that I made for eight years in a row here and I got nothing but ridicule from the government and grins as I just referred to one minister. I don't think this is a laughing matter in here. These towns could have been protected. I'm not saying that all the farms could have been protected, but there could have been certain protection for these people too out in the areas and this government chose to do nothing, before

(MR. TANCHAK, cont'd) . . . the fact; but when an emergency arose - yes. Anybody would try to do something. These dikes will cost a lot of money - a lot of them will have to be taken down. And it isn't a waste of money if they serve their purpose I will say, but it is a waste of money in the fact that there will be nothing permanent left. It will just cost a lot of money. I asked if some of them may be saved later and I believe - I didn't hear objections from the government up till now on that. Maybe some of these dikes will be retained and added on later. But there are many places that there could have been protection afforded before, before an emergency existed, but this government always waits until an emergency arises and then they go ahead and act.

I had other suggestions - one year I suggested that some tributaries be dammed so as to slow down the flow. I was ridiculed again. It's impossible to do those things because the retention basins are not large enough to retain any amount of water, any amount, but a certain amount would have been retained. There is an article here in the Red River Valley Echo, I. J. C. - that's International Joint Commission we were discussing here on Saturday. "I. J. C. delay on Pembina Dam a disappointment." They were asking for a dam on Pembina. And this - I'm not going to blame the government wholly because there was an International Joint Commission but partially the government is to blame for that; they could have pressed that something be done on the Pembina River. I could read parts of this, "Manitoba and North Dakota residents have cause to feel disappointment that the International Joint Commission has reached no decision on the Pembina River project at its March meeting." Just as late as the last meeting there was . . . "People in this part of the province fully expected that the I. J. C. would make a recommendation to the two federal governments this month, so that these governments could consider it at their present sessions. However, Governor Mathew Welsh, new chairman of the United States section of I. J. C. said in Walhalla last week that they were asking for some more additional information on that." I asked the government, if the government tried to influence them, tried to speed it up, I do not know; probably they have an answer for that, but I do not know.

"The completion of the Floodway will control future damage in Winnipeg. United States has constructed many dams on Red River tributaries, but nothing has been done in Manitoba to mitigate the damage of flood waters between Emerson and Winnipeg, except the construction of floodways between the escarpment and the Red, which bring down the waters even more quickly every year, " and so on. This is in an editorial from the Red River, it's not my words - "Red River Echo." That was one of my suggestions years ago - that tributaries could be dammed probably, maybe it wouldn't hold too much water, but it would help some alleviate the floods. There are other suggestions that I have made. But no, there is nothing - the government wouldn't consider any of those. And it's not only the policy in the Red River Valley, but there is a lack of proper policy throughout southeastern Manitoba as far as the flood is concerned; and every year the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, remember, because I always referred to him, what he had said at one place, at one village in my own constituency, that the present government is going to do a better job in drainage in southeastern Manitoba, because the former government only drained Paul and drowned Saul. This government has done nothing to change the situation, because these people, all the way, not only in the Red River Valley, but all the way to the boundary of Ontario, are suffering; they are flooded every year. I could bring you another editorial from another newspaper which condemns the government for doing nothing at Piney. The people at Piney have been flooded and they say it's a simple matter to do it. They've been asking it for years. The people at Sprague have been asking for drainage, some drainage, and the government completely ignores them, doesn't act on their request. I can go all the way through every town, Piney; can go through Sundown, it's the same thing. They have been flooded this year right in the Town of Sundown. The same thing happened at Vita; the same thing happened at Caliento, and at Zhoda and at Arbakka and Stuartburn, Dominion City - all through those towns. And not only in years of flood but even high water, heavy rains causes an awful lot of damage in southeastern Manitoba.

This government has no definite policy. They'll tell me, we have a policy, we have taken over some certain drainage ditches as 100 percent government and the municipality is responsible for the balance; in disorganized areas, we are doing it all. But, if all means nothing, that's not enough. And that's what - practically nothing. I will not say nothing, but practically nothing is being done in southeastern Manitoba in the disorganized areas, and it seems to me that if they want any kind of drainage, the municipalities have to really dig in and do it themselves because the government evidently has no proper policy for southeastern Manitoba.

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

I could mention other instances but I think I have taken some time on this concurrence, but I would still like to get an answer from the government, whether the government is considering permanent diking of these villages and these towns and some help - permanent help for the farmers south of Winnipeg.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. SHEWMAN: Madam Speaker, I have a lot of respect for the English language, and I hope I can maintain that respect. But sometimes it's hard, very hard, to have to listen to what we just went through. I just wonder where a member that spoke the way the previous member spoke, what respect he's got for the English language. It's a wonderful thing to say, I said so. I said so. I told you you're wrong -- and after it's all over. Hindsight is a wonderful thing and some people try to live on that, but they're making a big mistake, a terrible mistake. If the Honourable Member from Emerson was loyal to his Party, as a man should be, he would never utter the statements that he uttered here tonight; never utter the statements he uttered tonight.

He stood in his place and he accused me of not trying to help the people of the Red River Valley. I was in this flood a long long time before the honourable member was in this House. In my 16 years in this House, I have been working for the people of the Red River Valley, and it was a flood that got me into this House, the flood of 1948, when we asked the government then for assistance for the people in the Red River Valley, which we didn't get. I wish the Honourable Member from Emerson would just use a little of that brain matter he's got, do a little reading - if he has such a thing - because I honestly believe in brains - that if brains were made of castor oil, he wouldn't have enough to physic a flea.

Madam Speaker, I maybe should apologize for that statement; I will apologize but when we get in heated debates, it slips out so easy, that I am sorry I made that statement. I have more respect for the members of this House and I am sorry I made that statement. But we have worked - I have worked for the people of the Red River Valley in years gone by and I want to be fair and say I don't like to rehash this again, because it has been rehashed and rehashed, but the Member from Emerson is away off base. I'd like to know where his party has been in the last eight years and previous 30-some odd years before that, when they weren't working for the people in the Red River Valley. We have done more in the last eight years for the people of the Red River Valley than has ever been done in the history of Manitoba as far as flood protection is concerned.

Now it's true that we had to wait for the time and the money to help the people in the Red River Valley, which we have done. And the people in the Red River Valley are very thankful for what the government has done for them, realizing that it takes time to cure these ills, and they are quite willing to wait a little while longer until a perfect job is made of it; which the previous government had refused to do. I don't like to go on with this, rehashing this, but I had to say something in my own protection after the outburst that we had from the Honourable Member from Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: May I ask the honourable member a question, please? Did the honourable member support my request for . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . request his permission for a question?

MR. SHEWMAN: Madam Speaker, if it's a sensible question, I'll try and answer it.

MR. TANCHAK: Well my questions are always sensible. The answers are usually not sensible. The question is, did the honourable member support my request for permanent dikes - protection for people in southern Manitoba, south of Winnipeg?

MR. SHEWMAN: I don't remember at any time hearing the honourable member request dikes, until just on Saturday past, for dikes in southern Manitoba.

MR. TANCHAK: You have short memory.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I don't intend to make a speech but I've got some really quotable quotes here, going back to 1960-61 --(Interjections)-- I think that - Pardon --(Interjection)-- No. I just want to pick out the very good ones. I'm not going to stick to my honourable friend the Member for Emerson. I think he and his colleague all shared a particular point of view back in those days when we were considering these indecisions. Let's take '61, there's some pretty good ones here. --(Interjection)-- Oh, I find it pays to keep track of what people say from time to time. Now this is the Honourable Member for Emerson and this is 1961. That's five, six years ago. He said, "There's extravagance I don't agree with, but coming back to the Floodway I say that

(MR. HUTTON, cont'd) . . . the people of Winnipeg are entitled to some protection. They have a certain amount of protection here, not that this government is giving them, but the former. They are entitled to a certain form of protection, but I say this right now, I am opposing the construction of that Floodway."

MR. TANCHAK: I'm not talking about that.

MR. HUTTON: "I say I am opposing it until the present government gets a guarantee that Ottawa will contribute at least 75 percent of the cost. I don't believe in that - that we will go it alone. Go it alone? I say that this would be provincial suicide for the Province of Manitoba to go it alone. They say that it might cost \$100 million. Who knows? It might go to \$125 and I say that the Province of Manitoba cannot stand that."

He certainly wasn't very much in favour of it. He's got another one in here. This is the Honourable Member for Emerson, the same Session, "But I would say again as I mentioned once before that if Manitoba is to carry this load by itself and if Ottawa does not contribute at least 75 percent of the cost of this project, I say that rather than go it alone, we leave it alone." That was a pretty smart saying in those days. It wasn't nearly so smart this spring.

Oh, there's some beauties in here. Here's the Honourable Member for St. George. He says he doesn't think the floodway's necessary. "I think the enormous cost of this program isn't justified for the benefit that Greater Winnipeg would receive."

Oh yes, he had a beautiful position on this. He said that in respect to the project on Lake Manitoba up at Fairfield, (that's in his constituency) he said that was practical and he endorsed it; but the one on the Red River is not practical and whether the Federal Government pays 75 percent or 100 percent, still isn't practical. So he was really opposed to it.

Oh, this is a beauty - He says - The Honourable Member for St. George: "The Premier said last night, and he's quoting the Premier here, "we're accepting this recommendation because the Royal Commission recommend it, and we're going ahead with it." And then he goes on and he says: "The Premier's also - speaking of the Premier - "he also says that he is quite prepared to go to the people on this subject. Well I challenge him to go to the people on this thing because the people of Manitoba are not the fools he thinks they are. And if this diversion is ever constructed this white elephant will be regarded forever as "Roblin's Folly." Boy, that's an interesting one in the year 1966. Real interesting.

Well that was an interesting Session. Here's some - the Honourable Member for Emerson again - "Well," he says, "It seems to me that the government or the Minister" - (guess he was speaking of me) - "is accepting this old slogan that we say 'a pig in a poke' and wants everybody in this House to endorse acceptance of this" (and he's speaking here again about our financial arrangements and supporting this contention that if we didn't get 75 percent we shouldn't do anything. Well, he says "Again the government" - this is the same session - "Again the government wanted to make - some of the senior members of the government wanted to impress the people and show that they're the go-getters, forging ahead so what happens? Studies - sure there were studies, but the First Minister was so anxious to push that through that in a moment of temper, I imagine, a moment of haste, he committed the province to go it alone. I think it would have been nicer and much better for the Province of Manitoba if the First Minister would not have committed himself to this." So this is the Honourable Member for Emerson. Now he says on this one, "I was agreeable on the 75-25 percent basis. We haven't got it now and I think it was the First Minister who lost it for us." This is what he's saying. In 1961 again. And what did his leader have to say at that time? Some interesting things. Oh, he was objecting too, to the breakdown of costs. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. "Well", he says, "there it is Mr. Speaker, on the one hand, haste, hurry, bad management, poor planning - referring to the Floodway - haste, hurry, bad management, poor planning. And if I remember correctly, in his speech in this Session of the Legislature, he was castigating the government because we didn't have the Floodway finished. --(Interjection)-- No, your Leader, your Leader, your Leader.

Well here's a dandy here. The Honourable the Member for Portage made a wonderful contribution in 1963. He said, "I say the intended creation of a Floodway around Winnipeg and the Diversion Channel of Portage la Prairie into Lake Manitoba are the two greatest mistakes ever to be undertaken by any government in Canada up to the present time." Now that's quite a statement! Boy, that sure puts him as opposed to this Floodway, I would think. I like that quotation.

I got quite a good one here, I think, I should just close with this one. This was in 1962 -

(MR. HUTTON, cont'd) . . . the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition said in 1962, "Insofar as our Party is concerned, Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to approve the financial arrangement proposed in this resolution and we shall vote against the resolution on that basis." In other words, because we didn't get a 75-25 deal with the Government of Canada, the Liberal Party in Manitoba was officially opposed to the construction of the projects, both on the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. They made that quite clear.

Now, let not the people of Manitoba be fooled because if indeed the Leader of the Opposition and his Members had been responsible for the conduct of public affairs in this province, we have it on their say so, not anything we've said, but on their say so, that you wouldn't have a spade full of dirt turned on any of these projects. My honourable friends think, and the Honourable Member for Emerson thinks that the people that he represents, and on whose behalf he is appealing here tonight, would have had a ghost of a chance with that attitude, he's thoroughly deluding himself; but he isn't deluding the people that he represents because if the government had not proceeded with a general and comprehensive program of flood control on both the Red and Assiniboine - and I might say in the hinterland on many of the tributaries of these two great rivers - there wouldn't be any hope. But the fact is that we are fast approaching the day in Manitoba when due to what might have seemed like haste and bad management in 1961 and 1962, has turned out to be pretty provident and prudent planning in 1966, and I think it just points up the fact that fortunately, we have a man in Manitoba who has a great deal more foresight than some of his most partisan critics, and I say we are lucky to have the First Minister, Premier Roblin, in Manitoba, and the evidence is here to substantiate that statement.

MR. TANCHAK: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question? It's a sensible one and I'll get a sensible reply. Right? Permission? I would like to know what that has to do with what I've got up here south of Winnipeg? And I ask him one specific question. Does the government intend to give any form of permanent protection for the citizens south of Winnipeg? I didn't mention Winnipeg at all. I want to know whether the Minister intends to give any permanent protection for the people that I represent and also the Honourable Member for Morris - he can speak for himself. The Minister did not answer my question, and that's all I brought in.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I am happy to answer his question. Last summer the Water Control and Conservation Branch of the Department of Agriculture began a study of the Town of Emerson, which is in the honourable member's constituency, as to the feasibility of constructing a permanent earth dike. Unfortunately, we never got a chance to get started on it. But I think that we made it quite clear last summer in our approach to the requests of some of the people that the honourable member represents that we are prepared to consider this, and I would remind the honourable member on this subject, that even some of the people locally were not, prior to the real flood scare we had last spring, were not too acceptable, or didn't find the idea of a ring dike too acceptable; so attitudes have changed there and we are co-operating.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, if what was in the . . . well anyway if what has been said by the last two speakers was music, they'd have the biggest brass band in the land. I think it's a shame to come in here during a flood and try to talk the way these last two members did. It seems to me that this government -- it seems to me the government, and the First Minister, feel (Interjection) Yes, I'm talking, and I think that this government has tried to make this a crime to represent one's constituency. The Member from Emerson asked a perfectly sensible question; he's worried about the people in his area, but this is a crime. The Member from Rhineland a while back was very concerned about people from his district. He asked a simple question, he tried to discuss this flood. This was the greatest thing, the biggest thing, the most important thing in all the people's minds, but the government would not let him ask his question, would not give him leave to discuss this thing. His own constituency. And now today, especially the members of the front bench think this is a big joke. Think this is a big joke because the member . . . and we have heard quotes. Oh boy, he's been promising this for a long time. He was all set with all his big books hoping that we should say something, to be able to say, "You voted against the Floodway." He talked about certain Members from Portage, Members from Emerson, and Members from Rhineland who are interested in their own constituency. What is this Floodway doing for them? What is this Floodway doing for them? And he couldn't find anything else in his quotes but that the Members of the Liberal Party

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) . . . did not like the way that this was done, the negotiating; and if any one of the front bench can stand up and tell me this was good negotiating -- . . . it was in the days of Diefenbaker, and the First Minister did lose his temper and after rubbing his little moustache for a little while he said, "We'll do it alone, " we'll do it alone; and we're stuck with an awful lot of money doing it alone, so let's not . . . The flood is a big thing - I never dreamt for a minute - I couldn't believe when some people say that the Roblin Government was a little disappointed last year when they lost the crest, but I've started to think that maybe this is what they wanted. He was all ready with his books, the Minister, to give us a lecture. And what did he say, that the members felt that it was poor negotiating, poor negotiating. The man with the foresight he was in Ottawa last week with a different government. There was no politics, there was nothing. What did he get? What did he say when he left here that he wanted at least 75 percent, and he got it. This was a little different then. This is a little different. It's a different government. But he didn't dare . . . he didn't do this at all because he lost his temper. And you can say what you want, this is the government of foresight. Where is that \$6 million it was supposed to spend last year? Was it waiting for the crest again?

What did they do in 1962 when they promised that this would be done in 1965? And to have the gall, to have the gall to pretend that there are some members, and members in the House who are not interested, who are not trying to do something about a flood. Did any of them, did any of them give credit to the former First Minister of this House for this permanent dike. Where would you be, Mr. Minister, if you didn't have these permanent dikes to start in? Where would you be? Can't you give a little bit of credit? Are you that almighty and that wonderful that you do it all alone? That you don't need anybody else? Did you hear anybody here on this side of the House all during the Session bring up this question of flood? You were hoping, with your . . . the Member from Rhineland, who brought it in, and this Member who is asking about his constituency. You arranged for us to fly over this constituency. Weren't you worried? Is it a sin for a member to get up in this House and say that he is worried about the members of his own constituency? What are we elected for in a constituency for?

Then he talks about the Member from Portage. What is that going to do for these people? The great friend of the farmers; the farmers are going to pay an awful lot of money and that water will just go back in that valley year after year. The great people that are so satisfied. They want to challenge us on the flood. It's an Act of God, it'll give him a platform. Why he can't quote me on this and I come from the city and I live near the river, but I still say you've got to negotiate, you try to negotiate something decent when you deal, the same as he did this year with a different government. And why is it are you dragging your feet? Never mind what we did, you were the government. That's right, you were the government, and you out voted us, and I voted against the Floodway. I voted against the Floodway on the same reason because of this negotiating, this lack of negotiating. And I would vote again. We've got so many people living in this province. We've got . . . (Interjection) Yes, I would on the same thing, I would vote against this. This government is not out there to just throw the money away. We've got a certain population here in Manitoba and there's so much they can pay.

Oh yes, it's a big joke. You tell the people on the farm, your great friends the farmers what you are doing for them on this flood. You tell the people of Elm Park. We saw not too long ago that this Floodway will do very little for Elm Park. Isn't that true? What are you going to do there? What are you going to do there? Why don't you give a little bit of credit? There was no playing politics in this Session at all on this question. --(Interjection) -- All right, tell me who did? The Member from Rhineland who was worried because you authorized another government to go and blow dikes? That was wrong for him to have the nerve to ask you why? That was wrong? Did you give him an answer? Did your friend give him an answer? He told him he was being parochial. He's alone on this side so run him down. He can't defend himself. You won't even give him a chance to talk. Run him down. Tell him how wonderful you are. Run him down. And you're the great defender. You stall - you'd like to stall long enough to have a flood, wouldn't you --(Interjection)-- well why did you promise in '62 that this would be finished in '65. Why did you promise?

MR. HUTTON: I never made any such promise.

MR. DESJARDINS: The government didn't promise in '62 that they would have this ready in '65? They did? They did? We'll have some quotes too, my dear friend, because you

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) . . . know. Where's that \$6 million you were going to spend last year? Why get excited now. Couldn't you rush this a little bit? Or did you want to prove - to be able to quote - get out your big books and say that the Member from Emerson did not like this flood. He represents the constituency that's not helped a darn bit, except that they have to pay for it. The other member also - he can't even ask you why another government will come in and blow the dike. He can't even ask you that. Now they're supposed to blindly vote for this?

No, Madam Speaker, let's be honest on this thing. These people know, the members of the front bench know that there wasn't any politics because everybody was careful not to play any politics on this. There were some questions been asked. I myself had a lot of questions and I ask you personally because I felt that you were doing your best. I know you were doing your best and I give you credit for this, but to come in here and gloat tonight and not have the decency of giving a little bit of credit to the man and the Party who built a permanent dike. Is it fair to compare 1950 to 1966? Is it fair? Weren't you prepared in 1966? Did you have to go through the same thing in 1966 as they did in 1960 or 50? Is it fair? Don't think that you should have the courage of giving credit for what was there? Madam Speaker, do you think we would have been as successful this year if we hadn't had that start, that base, and if God almighty hadn't helped us by keeping the rain away from this province?

If they want to say that the members, some members, or the members of the Liberal Party voted against the floodway, they should pull out their big books and tell the people why. And he says that we wouldn't have had anything if we would have been in power. That's not true because we got nothing this year, the floodway's not ready. We might have taken another year to negotiate, but I'm sure that things would have been done permanently. How much is this floodway really going to cost? Right now the people are worried - oh yes, oh, yes, these are the millionaires out there. What's a few dollars? --(Interjection)-- Will you tell me in '68 how much that's going to cost in interest and everything? All right, and then you tell me what we've lost out - what we lost because of poor negotiating from your government and your First Minister because he acted like a spoiled boy scout and he says "we'll do it alone." You tell me --(Interjection)-- did you hear about the flea, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from St. Boniface is disobeying the rules of this House to accost me in such a manner. I ask the honourable member to take note of the rules of the House and if he continues to disobey me in such a manner as this and accosts me in that fashion, I shall have no other recourse than to name him.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Madam Speaker, I won't tell you what I think, I'll try to be more careful. It seems that I have the knack or something of saying the wrong thing, contrary to some of the members here. Nevertheless, I still feel that in this thing, especially in this time of the year when we are just going through the flood, it's not good for the people of Manitoba, trying to scare them and trying to say that a certain group of people are not interested in their welfare at all. Or try to muzzle or to stop some people from the rural points or from points of Manitoba who are not getting anything but debt from this cost of the floodway. And as I said, I think that the Minister did a very good job. I think he did during this time; I think he tried his best; and I think that the Minister of Public Utilities did the same thing. I think that everybody did their job and I think that we should congratulate all the people, and the Army and so on who worked on it.

But I don't think it's proper because a member stands up and wants assurance that the government will not forget his constituency - who's been hit probably more so than any other constituency - or the constituency of any other members in this House. I don't think that it's quite proper to pull out these big books and start quoting them that they didn't like, because these people did not like the way they negotiate. You didn't negotiate a single thing, a single thing, that didn't explain exactly what the member said, that they felt that we should have had 75 percent. And you haven't got the floodway ready, the floodway didn't save the people in 1966. And you say that you hadn't promised this in 1965 and a lot of people know different - a lot of people know different. And you haven't told me what you did with that \$6 million that was earmarked for this. You haven't told me that yet.

Madam Speaker, as I say I will congratulate even though I don't like the arrogance that they have and the way that they try to muzzle some of the people, especially the one that's alone in his Party. I think that if they want to tell the people of Manitoba the story about the flood and the story about the floodway, I think they should tell all - not misrepresent, not give the impression that people from one side of the House are not in favour. The people of one side of the House didn't like the way the negotiating was done - the favour that it cost the people of Manitoba - and it's going to cost an awful lot of money. A lot of negotiations should have been

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) . . . done with the government of the United States because a lot of this water comes from there. And I think if that had been, if we hadn't - we rushed into deciding this but we didn't rush in completing this.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I think I should make a few comments in connection with the debate that has just gone on and continued until now. I too voted against the floodway when it was brought up in this House and I'm quite free in telling this because at that time, as still is the case, the people south of Winnipeg did not receive any protection and I felt that if we were going to spend money on the floodway, certainly the people south of Winnipeg were just as much entitled to protection as the people in the City of Winnipeg. And this is still true today. This is one of my reasons for voting against it at that time.

Also, there's been talk about the amount of money that was supposed to be spent and is being spent and while this was first put on capital account, later on when it was stated that this might be a white elephant, and they had other terms used at that time, the government changed it so that they would put the item under current expenses and in this way take the money out of current account for the project so that there would not be any interest accruing, so that they would not be blamed for this in later years when this would still show up on the books and we would still be paying interest on it, that they would change it so that this would not be the case.

Well, I still hold those views that I held at that time and I will stand by them, that if we're going to build protection for some people we should build protection for the farmers along the Red to the U. S. border as well. We find that these people are the very people that bear the brunt of the whole flood. They had to leave their homes; they had to move their cattle and livestock and belongings and these are the people that are suffering today, even though the floodway is not completed, so that right now today we are depending on the dikes that were built originally as well as the ones that have been built and constructed this spring. I too congratulate the government for building the dikes this spring and doing the job they have done. I think this is remarkably well. . . The people in southern Manitoba have contributed a lot toward getting the dykes in order and maintaining them, as well as the Army. We have had a lot of people from our area going into these towns and assisting day in and day out and this is - a lot of this is volunteer work so that we have every right to be thankful to these people and we should give them credit and public thanks for the job they have been doing.

On an earlier occasion, during this Session, we had a flash flood in Winkler. Later on we had another flood occurring in my constituency which was prompted in the first instance by blasting of a municipal dike and at that time I was treated, I think, rather unfairly, by the Minister of Natural Resources. That night after I had given an account as I saw it and as I was informed and the Minister that night said the following - and I quote from Page 1561 of Tuesday, April 5, 1966 and I quote "instead tonight as was the case this afternoon, we are treated to a dissertation by the honourable member on certain allegations that have been given to him and which he is entitled to believe, although not necessarily spread all over the face of Manitoba, in connection with a small bit of flooding that was occurring in his constituency, and which he alleges, falsely so I'm told by the Minister of Agriculture and as he said today on the Orders of the Day, was caused by forces outside this country". Well this allegation, if they call it an allegation, was not a false one. I can prove it for that matter and the people, the people in responsibility, the Reeve of the Municipality, the Council, they can all bear up and vouch for this, that this was not a falsehood that I was telling the people here in the House - This was fact; this was the truth - that they had received orders or at least had been given the okay to do just that and when I reported it, I'm treated to these kind of statements.

There is a further statement on the following page - 1562, where he has further things to mention by the same Minister, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and I quote: "While we're sitting here listening to my honourable friend for Rhineland, they are packing their bags, moving out of their homes, going to other places of accommodation". This sounds as though I was to blame for this whole thing. I certainly had nothing to do with causing the flood, I'm sure of that.

And further on on that same page - 1562, at the bottom of the page he continues and I quote: "It makes one wonder when one has to be treated to something like ten or fifteen minutes of debate by an honourable member who's complaining about an alleged flooding of a municipal road in part of his constituency. I would hope that that will be all that he will have cause to complain about after the flood waters have come and gone from southern Manitoba". There were further things said at that time. But I just wanted to come back to it and say that this was

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . .not a falsehood, that these were not just allegations, that I was speaking of fact.

Madam Speaker, in speaking on the flood protection for southern Manitoba, this afternoon I mentioned the Pembillier Dam which could be used for agricultural purposes, for irrigation, and to grow small crops, canning crops for the area in my constituency and that of the Honourable Member for Pembina where we have the canneries and so on where we could make use of this. And further to that, if these dams were built they would help in avoiding excessive flooding. We were told I think at the time that we discussed the whole matter of the Floodway that about eight percent of the flooding waters come from Pembina. Then we have other creeks that flow into the Red just a little further north of the U.S. Border such as the Hespeler and others. I am sure these also contribute to the flooding of the Red. Naturally this year they came a little earlier, and probably it was a good thing they did come a little earlier so that the river was opened up, channels were opening up before the main flow of water came from the south.

I would urge the government to give consideration and do everything in their power to get the Pembillier Dam constructed and give every effort and endeavour to the International Joint Commission to speed up the matter of getting the Pembina Dam built. I think this is one way of getting protection. Further to that, we have these dikes now in these smaller centres such as Morris, St. Jean and Emerson, and perhaps we could make these of a more permanent type so that in future this work would not have to be done during the rush of a flood but that they would be able to be built in such a way that they would be durable and that they could be permanent, I think if this was done it certainly would be a help for any future floods.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, when one goes into politics from time to time one can expect to have one's statements misinterpreted, perhaps distorted, and from time to time used in some manner that may be embarrassing if at all possible. But I heard an amazing statement tonight from the Honourable Minister of Agriculture when he quoted me as having made certain statements in a debate regarding water conservation in 1963.

I would like to refer to the 1963 Hansard, Page 926, I have made a speech and I have quoted from certain authorities, and down at the bottom of the page -- Madam Speaker I would like to quote exactly what is here in print. I'll begin the paragraph. "Now when I read from a minority report, I am not reading to prove a point for myself. I am bringing this forward to say that there is differences and serious differences. Another person, quite far removed from the scene, who is not closely, or shall we say, emotionally connected with this particular item has something to say along this line and I would like to read it." Madam Speaker, I would like to remark at this time that quotation marks now follow the next statement. "The Honourable Mr. George Hutton made a statement at the Winnipeg Junior Chamber of Commerce meeting recently that Manitoba will be safe even from major floods by 1967. This exuberant message carries with it the spirit of Mr. Hutton's political statement that now the Roblin Government has done it's best in the interests of Manitoba's future. I make this statement as a challenge to those who are for the Floodway and a Diversion Channel at Portage la Prairie. I say the intended creation of the Floodway around Winnipeg and a Diversion Channel at Portage la Prairie into Lake Manitoba, are the two greatest mistakes ever to be undertaken by any government in Canada up to the present time. The diversion of Manitoba water from central Manitoba around Holland and the Souris basin to Lake Manitoba, is a disaster of the first magnitude. These waters should be kept up on the plateau. From there they should be let down by gravity to be used when required. There the water can be used for the benefit of the whole province. Diverting these valuable waters into Lake Manitoba make the water useless. It must be remembered that Lake Manitoba is from 25 to 50 feet lower than the Holland Dam area, and 100 to 200 feet lower than most parts of Manitoba where this water could be used. Once in Lake Manitoba the water is lost to 90 percent of agricultural Manitoba. The only use for this water will then be to divert it into Winnipeg to clean up excess sewage rubbish. The loss of this water which has great potential use west of Portage, will in time be a serious matter for Winnipeg. This great city cannot live by and to itself, but only if water can be built up above the first level," Madam Speaker, the quotation marks end there. Then I quote again, "He goes on to state that, we are living in a 10-inch annual rainfall country but the government is taking steps in terms of a 50-inch annual rainfall country. Now again I don't say everything this gentleman has to say is true, but it sounds quite reasonable, quite sensible and quite reasonable.

Madam Speaker, for a Minister of the Crown to stand up in this House tonight and

(MR. JOHNSTON, cont'd) . . . deliberately, deliberately, attribute and misrepresent in a manner that he has done is a disgrace, it's a disgrace; and if he's man enough he'll get up and apologize.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I'm man enough to get up and apologize. I'm sorry. It was an honest mistake that I made; and we do make mistakes sometimes. I apologize to the honourable member.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister a question? Do you accept the question? How many other people have you misquoted tonight?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of the Attorney-General.

MR. CLERK: 4. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,783,291 for Attorney-General. Resolution 21 to 30 for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967.

5. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$82,965,454 . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before this . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Before this motion is placed before the House, or voted on, I rise on a question as to the correctness of the figure that has been presented to you as a vote for the consideration of the members of this House. If I heard the Honourable the Clerk correctly, he mentioned a figure for Education of \$82,965,454. I ask you first of all, Madam Speaker, is that correct? - that that was the motion that was presented for the consideration of the House? Is that the motion?

MADAM SPEAKER: These are the figures on the paper, unless the Clerk made a mistake in . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Then, Madam Speaker, I protest the whole proceedings of the House thus far, because the figures - if the figure for the Department of Education is an indicator of the figures for the other departments -- and I must confess I did not watch them as closely as I did this one -- then I respectfully suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that all the motions that have been placed before the House thus far, are incorrect.

I suggest Madam Speaker, that you look at the Estimates for the Department of Education as contained on page 10 and 11 of the document which I have, a gold covered booklet titled Manitoba Estimates and Expenditures of Revenue for the Fiscal Year ending March 31st, 1967 as presented to the Legislature. The figure which has been read out of \$82 million, 900 odd thousand dollars, is a figure which also takes into consideration contributions from the Government of Canada. We are only concerned here, I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, with the amounts of money which have to be raised by the taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba, and that it is erroneous for the government, through the Clerk, to present motions to this House asking for greater amounts of money than have to be raised within the province.

I appreciate very much, Madam Speaker, that we have in Manitoba at the present time a government who loves to glorify themselves; who love to magnify what they are doing in Manitoba; but I respectfully suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that the motion before us is not a proper one because it is not the proper amount, and if it is true of the others which have preceded this, then I would respectfully suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that it is your duty as Speaker of this House, to rule as being incorrect, all the motions which have been presented to the House thus far; because they contain monies raised by the federal authorities and monies which are contributed by the federal authority to the people of Manitoba. They are not expenditures of money, of and by the people of Manitoba.

So I rise at this point, Madam Speaker, not to discuss the question before the House of the estimates of the Department of Education -- I will have something to say on that - but I rise, Madam Speaker, on a point of Order, and I ask you to consider whether or not the procedure thus far is incorrect - and I refer Madam Speaker, to substantiate the position that I am taking, to the Journals of 1965 Page 449, wherein we deal with the question of the estimates of the Department of Health last year, and the amount of money that was voted on at that time was precisely the amount of money which had to be raised by the Province of Manitoba. There was a recorded vote on that motion, Madam Speaker, a vote for general administration of \$1,120,399. That was for last year, and I'm referring now to Page 12 of our gold covered booklet -- and I think it's appropriate it's in gold -- that this year the suggested amount, or total for last year would be \$1,467 odd thousands of dollars. My point is, Madam Speaker, we did not vote last year for \$1,467,659, that the motion for \$1,123,099. So I suggest, Madam

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . Speaker, it is erroneous for us to vote here in this House for any amounts that are not the actual amounts for which the taxpayer of Manitoba has to provide out of its own revenue sources; it's not proper for us to have to consider a motion which includes monies which come from the taxpayer of Canada and I ask you, Madam Speaker, to rule in this regard.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, this is an interesting discussion. Perhaps I could make a comment on the point of Order that's raised because it's quite without any foundation whatsoever. There's no reason to pay the slightest attention to the proposition that's been put forth by my honourable friend.

I would like to point out to him that in the first place in the statement that was made when the revenue expenditures - when the expenditure estimates were submitted to the House was made - it was quite clearly pointed out at that time that we were going to go to a new system of accounting, namely the gross basis instead of the basis that we're on in previous times. The only reason at all why the old basis is shown in these estimates before us now is to provide members as a convenience so they could make a more reasonable comparison with the expenditures last year. So the House was put on notice - that this change in the method of estimates and the method of voting and the arriving of the sums were put on notice that this was our intention. And there are a number of good reasons for this change because the previous estimates going back for quite a number of years were neither fish, fowl nor good red herring, because they were not on the net basis that my honourable friend seems to be speaking for. They were on a mixed basis - both mixed, net and gross and that obviously when you consider it was a mistake, so we decided that we would go to the gross basis rather than have this mixed basis that existed before. It's no sense trying to protest that last year the estimates went through on a net basis because they did not - they went through on this mixed basis both net and gross - very confusing I submit - and it was decided in the interest of clarity, in the interest of accuracy, to take this step of putting them all on a gross basis. The House was notified of this weeks ago.

Further, Madam Speaker, why does my honourable friend discover the need to investigate this matter now? Does he not know that in the Committee of Supply he has already voted - already voted - for every one of these items on the gross basis, just as we're asked to do tonight, and to suggest on this occasion that it is something that - presumably the Clerk has made a mistake or that you should rule on is of course something that's quite out of the question.

And why is the gross basis the proper system of doing things? Very simple - because the shared cost programs that we have from Ottawa come into our hands as part of our Consolidated Fund - as part of our Consolidated Fund; and now we are asking for appropriations from that Consolidated Fund. And if we don't ask for it on the gross basis we'll never get the federal money appropriated to the various items and departments for which it is intended. So clearly the system that we are following now is to be preferred to the one that we followed in previous occasions and that there's really no substance in the point raised.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may speak to the point of Order again, I do not agree with my honourable friend at all. I say to him that I accepted the explanation when we started the estimates for comparative purposes, but only for comparative purposes, and -- (Interjection)-- I beg your pardon. I thought I just heard a mumble over across the way from my honourable friend. You . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has already spoken. If he has a question to ask or point of Order to raise he may speak, otherwise he is . . .

MR. PAULLEY: And I take it Madam Speaker, that you're curtailing my rights to reply to my honourable friend. . . . Enforcing the rules? . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has spoken. I think he has exceeded his rights. The estimates for the Department of Education.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, what is your ruling on the point that I raised please?

MADAM SPEAKER: I think I must say to the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party that the House was put on notice when we started this that there was a new system of accounting. I think that you were duly aware of it when we were in Supply and that these amounts have been voted and I have - I now call on the Clerk to continue with the amounts for the Department of Education.

MR. PAULLEY: Then I understand then the motion before the House is consideration for an amount of money for \$82, million 965. Is that correct? Then, Madam Speaker, I must

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . say in respect of the figure that we have before us and this has nothing, Madam Speaker, to do with your ruling - I'm speaking in connection with the amounts of money that the Province of Manitoba is going to spend in respect of Education - so kindly relax.

I want to say to this government that no matter what type of bookkeeping they may use, be it in respect of education or any other department, they are letting the people of Manitoba down. They are particularly letting the people of Manitoba down in the field of Education, because if the objective of my honourable friends opposite was to inflate the figures that we have under consideration, I suggest that they could have inflated them far more by taking full advantage of the offers of the federal administration for contributions to education - and in particular to the federal contribution for technical and vocational training. Madam Speaker, Manitoba is the lowest on the whole totem pole in respect of contributions from federal authorities - federal departments in the field of vocational training.

The Minister of Industry and Commerce this afternoon suggested to us that the Province of Manitoba and Monoca are going to go 50-50. You said it. Going to go 50-50 in bringing into Manitoba skilled personnel. At the same time skilled personnel are leaving Manitoba. My honourable friend has entered into this agreement when there has been for a number of years grants at the federal source to make provision for trained personnel in the Province of Manitoba.

So I say, Madam Speaker, that had this government been on its toes this figure might have looked even better than the inflated figure that it is at the present time. Not only in the field of vocational, technical training have they failed in education, while we were considering the estimates of the Department of Education, almost simultaneously as we were considering the advent of Monoca, or the Churchill Integrated Industries here into Manitoba, the government was suggesting with the building of a vocational school at The Pas, they would start training personnel.

Madam Speaker, the other day I asked for Orders of Return dealing with correspondence over - dealing with the possibility of an Integrated Forest Industry in Manitoba. It goes back to 1962 - the correspondence that I received - four years ago, Madam Speaker, that government was talking about . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I think the honourable members in the House should lower their voices if they wish to speak and to give the honourable member who is speaking an opportunity to continue.

MR. PAULLEY: I know, Madam Speaker, it's sometimes hard to get through their skulls and I accept their raised voices. I'll yell just a little louder in order to penetrate. It is tough and I thank you for your support.

I was just saying, Madam Speaker, four years ago the Department of Industry and Commerce started -- according to the correspondence that was tabled the other day, they started negotiating for an Integrated Forest Industry here in Manitoba. They may have started sooner, I believe Arthur D. Little mentioned it prior to that - 1958 if I remember correctly. The report on COMEF in 1960 I believe mentioned it. But anyway, Madam Speaker, in the correspondence that was tabled the other day, it appeared as though the government was seriously taking this question under advisement. It's not until 1966, Madam Speaker, that the government even announces that they're going to go ahead with vocational training in The Pas area insofar as training skilled workers in an Integrated Forest Industry. When the Honourable the Minister of Education laid before us the brochure or prospectus in regard to the vocational training school at The Pas, there was no reference at all to the training of personnel insofar as a forest industry is concerned, except that they would make some provision for minor courses. There was no provision, as there was indeed in the field of mining, for education at the higher level.

So I say, Madam Speaker, in the field of education this government has let Manitobans down and let them down badly. They have had no vision; they have had no foresight; yet they are pleased to butter up estimates to the degree that we have before us today. I ask the government, I ask the former Minister of Education, the present Attorney-General, were you, Sir, not aware of a vast potential in the area of The Pas for development of our forestry? When you were a Minister of Education my friend, why did you not undertake the training of the youth of that area in order that the Minister of Industry and Commerce today does not have to say to us in this House, that the taxpayer of Manitoba is going to go 50 - 50, in addition to all other costs, in the provision of importing -- yes, Madam Speaker, of importing skilled labour from outside the boundaries of Manitoba and possible of Canada, as well.

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd)

This afternoon my colleague from St. John's pointed out many deficiencies in what we think is the Agreement in respect of this industry. But, Madam Speaker, may I say in all due respect that the deficiencies in the financial arrangements cannot equal the deficiencies and the failure of the Roblin administration in the field of education. It is admitted, Madam Speaker, that there is an exodus of trained personnel from Manitoba because under our economic so-called climate wages are not sufficient to retain our workers. Just the other day we had an instance of it in the City of Brandon where skilled workers are leaving in the building of a plant in Brandon because of the lack of wages. But because of the lack of training of the young men and women in Manitoba in the field of vocational training and education today, the Minister of Industry and Commerce says we are going to have to go 50-50 with a Swiss company that's going to exploit the resources of our province, because we haven't got trained personnel here in Manitoba. And at the same time, Madam Speaker, at the same time, Manitoba has been at the bottom of the totem pole in receiving federal contributions in utilization of the benefits of establishing vocational training schools. And I say, well might the First Minister leave this Assembly because I'm sure what I'm saying is not palatable to his ears, or anyone who truly thinks, erroneously as it may be, that we have a progressive government in Manitoba.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C.: Madam Speaker, perhaps in the absence of my colleague the Honourable the Minister of Education, I might be permitted to say a few words in response to the contribution which the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party has made to this debate. This allegation that not sufficient has been done, not sufficient money has been devoted to technical and vocational education in Manitoba, is of course an old and almost dead horse that has been beaten to death every Session of the Legislature, with the exception of the first one that I attended. And while I suppose one might say there's really no point if you haven't been able to make an answer so far, that will be either listened to or understood, there's probably not much point in trying again. However, for the sake of the record let us say, I think there are some things to be said.

First of all, the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, of course, has managed to drag into this particular discussion, a new item, namely to imply or to say that we have been negligent because we do not have already trained the people who will be required for the forest product industries related to Monoca A. G. and the arrangements that have been made; and I think that I might deal with that first because that's a specific matter which I think he will agree, on reflection, - stands on quite a different footing from the general problem, the general responsibility, or the general program respecting technical and vocational education.

It must surely seem obvious, Madam Speaker, that one can only deal with specific areas of training related to a specific industry or specific industries, when you know that you have those industries and require those skills. Looking at the situation in Manitoba in, for example, 1961 or 1962, while one might have hoped that there would be a forest products industry established in Northern Manitoba, one couldn't say for certain that it was going to be, and if indeed we had started then to train people to take part or to work in a forest products industry in Northern Manitoba, and we had not been successful in that regard, just think what the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party would be saying to us tonight. He'd be hitting us over the head saying how foolish we were to train people for non-existent jobs. And so it goes.

We have for example had established in recent months in Manitoba, a chemical industry at Brandon. Obviously, while one may have hoped with all his heart that a chemical industry would be established, until there were specific opportunities in that field, it would have seemed rather foolish and improvident to have been training people for the specific job in that particular industry. That is a special job which is done in relation to the industries when they are established or expanded as the case might be, and I think stands quite aside and apart from the general problem of technical and vocational education.

And that brings me to my next point because while we cannot provide training for the specific industry employment until the specific industry is available to provide the employment in question, there is the necessity, a very real necessity of providing the general, technical and vocational education that may be required and which forms the base upon which those who are going to move into specialized fields can move. And so, we do have the program which has been planned and in operation for some time in the province, of providing technical and vocational education of a general and to some extent, specialized nature, but which is a basic education given

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)... beyond the high school years for young men and women and others of the province.

I would submit to the members of the House, Madam Speaker, that the suggestion that not enough has been done is again erroneous and without foundation because we must always remember, and I want it clearly understood I'm not making any comparisons between what happened before 1958 - that's something that is past history and really not too much concern of mine. But we always have to remember that there would have been no point, no point in spending millions of dollars in the development of technical and vocational educational institutions until we had sufficient young men and women students, who had completed their high school education and were ready to proceed into the post-secondary field of educational training. We could have built the buildings and done all sorts of things but they would have been useless because we had not developed the educational system below that point to a sufficient degree for that purpose; and so in the development of the educational program in the Province of Manitoba it was absolutely imperative that there be developed an adequate available system of secondary schools in the Province of Manitoba. We make no apology for this. That was the basic approach that we took. It was the, I suppose one might say one of the main programs which we undertook as a government to provide that secondary school education facilities which were needed in the Province of Manitoba.

And I don't need to recite the story, I've said it many times here, but we know what took place. But it was an absolute prerequisite, an absolute prerequisite, Madam Speaker, to any development of technical and vocational education in the Province of Manitoba, or for that matter to university education -- all the fields of post-secondary education in the Province of Manitoba, because the people who were going to use the post-secondary educational facilities such as the technical and vocational schools and the universities, first had to receive their high school training, and there were as we know, literally thousands of people, young men and women in the province who were unable to do that until the facilities for that purpose were provided. And let it not be overlooked, Madam Speaker. --(Interjection)--

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, would you permit a question?

MR. McLEAN: Well, it will spoil my speech, but carry on.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I don't think it can be any more. Madam Speaker, is the Honourable the Minister suggesting there were no high schools prior to 1958?

MR. McLEAN: I am not suggesting that, have never suggested it, but I do say this to the honourable the -- I thank him for asking that question because it gives me the excuse to make the speech that I really wanted to make of the hundreds and thousands of pupils in the Province of Manitoba who were unable -- who had no right, who had no legal right, aside from no place to go, for purposes of a secondary education. That was the purpose of the school division plan which was a very simple one in its design, which gave the responsibility for providing high school education facilities for every boy and girl in the Province of Manitoba, which provided the tax base for providing that education. I'm not arguing now what proportions of that came from where, but provided a tax base; provided transportation so that the people who were going to use those facilities could get to them and literally burst at the seams the number of boys and girls in the Province of Manitoba who are taking secondary education. And I don't have to suggest that there were no high schools before that. There were. The trouble is there were too few of them, and the trouble is there were too few of the young people of the province that were able to get to them; and the trouble is that the proportion of pupils who were taking and completing their high school education was too low, and the Leader of the New Democratic Party knows that just as well as I do. That was the basic program which we had to develop, and the other has of necessity, and properly so, come in second place to that important and basic development.

But, Madam Speaker, what the honourable member and many others overlook is that there was an important element of technical and vocational education included in the plans for the high schools that were established under the school division system. I don't need again to recite the facts that schools were built including provision for technical and vocational classes on an optional basis and as part of the program, that special grants were provided for that purpose, that encouragement was given to the training of teachers who would teach in the high schools, all a part of the training in the general field of technical and vocational education and as part of our high school program. So that for anyone now after all these years and after what has been done to attempt to suggest that we have been lagging in this field is surely less than accurate in the presentation of the facts as they are in the Province of Manitoba.

(MR. McLEAN cont'd). . Madam Speaker, I'm not just too sure just what the conclusion of this round of debate is other than if the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party was endeavouring to suggest that we ought not to approve the estimates of the Department of Education for the reasons which he has mentioned, then I most strongly refute that suggestion. I say to the House, Madam Speaker, that there has been not a perfect development, because I don't think that anyone has ever said that it was a perfect development, but there has been an orderly progressive development in the field of providing all forms - not only technical and vocational education - but all forms of post-secondary education in the Province of Manitoba which of necessity had to follow a properly established secondary school system in this province.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the case that my honourable friend the present Attorney-General and former Minister of Education makes it so convincing to him that I hesitate to shatter the complacency in which he is basking, but I just want to remind my honourable friend, because I have listened to this so frequently in this House, I just want to remind my honourable friend that practically the same difference, the same increase in high school enrollment took place in the City of Winnipeg as did in the rest of the Province of Manitoba, and my honourable friend in connection with this program that he boasts about so greatly and is so proud of did absolutely nothing in the City of Winnipeg - nothing except to change the name from School District No. 1 to School Division No. 1. That's all that the new program meant to the City of Winnipeg and yet this same influx of high school people occurred here as occurred in the rest of the Province of Manitoba - variations of course in different areas. And though I hate to shatter my honourable friend's dream, Madam Speaker, this is the fact. The program that he's talking about had the same effect in Winnipeg as it had outside of Winnipeg where the new program made no difference whatever except a change of name.

Now, what is the reason? The reason is that that influx of young people had just at that time come to the high school age. That's what made the difference. I'm not trying to pretend that my honourable friend's program didn't build some new schools, of course they did. They built some new schools, but the people who wanted to go to the high schools were getting there before anyway, and a large proportion - not all perhaps - but a large proportion of those that were coming along into that age group would have got there too, and more schools would have been built. But this is in the realm of speculation as to just what would have happened. And of course the great day dawned and my honourable friends came in to put their program into effect. But if it were so great, if it made all the difference as my honourable friend suggests, how is it that the same thing happened in the City of Winnipeg as happened in the rest of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I'll be very brief, I didn't intend to get into this at all, but listening to the former Minister of Education I just have to get up. I promised I wouldn't tangle with him any more so now I'm sorry I have to break my promise. But there's only one point that I must say that is not right and he's not telling us - I won't say the truth because he believes it's the truth - when he comes up and tells us that the students before 1959, 1958 had no place to go - had no high school, maybe they did not belong. But I'm sure that the Honourable Minister will agree with me that prior to the school divisions we had more high schools in Manitoba than we have now. I do not say they were any better. I agree that a larger unit - he knows my stand on that - will give a better education; but if you go to these small towns a lot of them were one-room high schools and some of them were not even high schools, they were just an extension of the elementary schools but they were teaching high schools in those. So the students had a place to go. It isn't true, it isn't a fact when the Minister gets up and says that they had no place to go to high school. They had places to go to high school and at that time those high schools suited the purpose. They brought some wonderful products forth - educated for young people. But it isn't right and it isn't fair to come out and say that there were not enough high schools for the students to go. There were more high schools and they were closer together. I do not say that they were better high schools, but there were high schools to take care of those, and anybody who wanted - the parents who wanted to send their children to high school had a high school to go to. I didn't want this to go by not refuting it.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I had this in my mind that there was something in the COMEF report to substantiate what my Leader has said and I wish to speak briefly on this. I'm looking at Chapter Two of the COMEF Report, 1962-63, the heading is Education and Training Requirements for Economic Development, and I notice the headings here: levels of education must be improved. Another, heading: lack of technical education a major weakness. Madam Speaker, we only have to look once again at the plywood factory at

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd)...

Birch River to show where we were completely unprepared to cope with the supplying of labour to this plant which had been started many years ago and when we wanted to train people we had to send to British Columbia for an instructor.

I just want to quote from the bottom of Page 11-2-3, whatever that means, and I quote: "By and large many of the present standards respecting technical and management education will be inadequate to the intensive competition of the more technically advanced 1970's. Moreover, there appears to be some danger that the development of an adequately educated population can be discouraged by present standards and attitudes. The future success of the Manitoba economy in the face of increasing national and international competition will demand some change in the present situation and a positive, energetic and dedicated interest and formal education and technical training at all levels. It is stressed that the requirement is not merely the improvement of the education of a specific section of the population but rather the upgrading of the level of education of a majority of the labour force." I suggest Madam Speaker that back in those days they saw the need for the training of people in the field of vocational training and it seems to me that it's much more in view of the fact also Madam Speaker that the COMEF Report said back in those days that the lumber industry in Manitoba was a sick industry, it predicted that much had to be done by 1965 - the years of 1965 and 1966. It seems that we did miss the boat by not taking more of the \$643 million that was appropriated by the federal government for technical and vocational training.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Department of Education.

MR. CLERK: 5. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 962,454 for Education, Resolutions 31 to 35 for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1967.

6. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$69,720,297 for Health, Resolutions 36 to 40 for the fiscal year...

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker on this resolution, I wonder if the Honourable the Minister of Health could indicate to the Committee any proposition which he might have now - formulating respecting the plan for Manitoba entering into the Dominion Health Scheme.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, there is no change to the statement that I made in the House a while ago.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I don't think it's fair for the Minister, if he doesn't want to answer it's fine, but I don't think it's fair for him to say there's no change, especially when this government is thinking of an election - going to the people. I think that the members of this House and the rest of the people of Manitoba should know what this government intends to do, and we certainly don't know this.

The Minister was asked repeatedly, he was asked many times during his estimates and he wouldn't give us anything at all. The Minister was also asked this with the motion brought in by the NDP and he didn't give us anything at all. I think that we're entitled to know, especially if this government wants to enter into an election I think that the people of Manitoba are entitled to know what they intend to do, not just say well we'll take advantage of this plan. We certainly haven't received any information. Of course, Madam Speaker, that is pretty well par for the course with this government before an election, this is what this government will do. We had a small fortune of the money of the people of Manitoba spent on a Safari all across this land to study the denturists which certainly should come under this department, and this Minister, the Minister of Health, certainly told us, and certainly gave us the impression that this would be done, at least move concurrence of the report, and this wasn't done, Madam Speaker. And this is the government that wants to go to the public and feel that it's ready to go to the public. I say Madam Speaker, that it's ready because it's hiding anything that's controversial. If there's any controversy at all, this government will hide it.

This is what it has done with this Medicare Plan. We know that they are interested - well everybody is interested - and we're told that they will bring a Plan, but we don't know how they propose to do this. We don't know how they propose to do this, and I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that certainly this government has had, the Minister of Health, the First Minister has had some discussion with the people in Ottawa and I think that we're entitled to know something about this - to know what this is all about. Right now we haven't received anything. We're told that the Medicare Plan is coming but that is all we know. And on this Denturist I certainly think that we should protest the way that this government has treated this. I'd like the Minister to tell the people of Manitoba how much this has cost; what it has

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)...

achieved. I don't think that the Minister is showing much courage, or the government is showing much courage, after this trip, after all this wonderful trip, and all this would-be study to come here and say well, we'll wait. Why wait? Can the Minister justify this?

Now the Minister has not given us anything either on the - he hasn't given his intention on the question of hospital premiums. We were told, and this is what I was quoting, I was talking about a few days ago about misrepresentation. The people of Manitoba were led to believe, led to believe that this was a great gift by the government, and this is why the premiums hadn't been gone up, when all the time, Madam Speaker, it was a change in the financing of the hospital plan; it was an income tax; a hospital tax that was brought in and we were spending an awful lot more money. This was done. The Minister then flew a kite and he tried to prepare the people for an increase in premium, although we had been told at a Special Session that this wouldn't be done. You see, Madam Speaker, in this department, the leadership, or rather the lack of leadership, that we're getting. What are in the people's mind right now? Medicare - they won't give us any statement. The Denturists - We won't find anything about it until the election is past. The Premiums - Will the premiums go up? We won't know this either.

And what has this Department done with the Willard report - the second part about personnel? This is a government that is building a lot of hospitals, new beds, but it can't staff these beds. Madam Speaker, I have told the Minister many times over the past few years that they would have trouble with this; and they're having trouble with this. We haven't enough beds but we can't even staff those that we have now. This has been pretty well by-passed. What did the Minister say on his estimates on this? What did he say about some new nursing home, a few more nursing homes, but look at all the beds, the way we're increasing the beds. And what did we see from the papers just last week? That they were so short of beds. And this is a plan, this is a contract, this is a contract, a compulsory contract that this government has with the people of Manitoba. They say "We force you. Here Manitoba, we'll take care of you. You give us your premiums, you give us your taxes and we'll take care of you." Well a contract, Madam Speaker, should work both ways and there are two parties to a contract. You can't just put a gun at the head of somebody and say "all right, you give me your money, I'll take care of you," and do nothing about it.

It is morally wrong to force the people to pay premiums, and if they don't to be ready to put them in jail and then not to be able to give them beds, because they did not follow the Willard report and this is another reason why this is costing us so much money because the cost of construction is much higher. They haven't done anything or very little. They named a Committee to study. They had a report, the Willard report, who told them all about this, about this personnel. Now, just late last year the Minister named a Committee to study the question of personnel, and especially -- well I don't know if I should say especially, but the nurses. Now what did the Minister tell us about personnel? What about the lack of doctors? What about the lack of doctors in rural points? The shortage of doctors. And we are ready to go into a Medicare plan. Who's going to take care of these people? Are we going to have the same shmozzel in the Medicare as we have in the Hospital, because this is what it is.

I think I should take this opportunity to protest the way the estimates have been presented, because there again you could not get anything. We have a report from the Commission a financial report. Everything is all mixed up. We're talking about grants -- the premiums and so on are supposed to be for the administration and so on, for the keeping of this hospital not for construction grants, but they're all mixed up in this. The grants from the province also. And to this day, to this day, Madam Speaker, this government will not tell us, will not tell us how much money they get from the income tax, that special five percent and that six percent tax. This is still as mixed up now as it was in 1962 when this was started. And this is the famous tax, Madam Speaker, when the government decided that finally it had the way to promote an ability to pay tax. This is what the First Minister and the members of his Cabinet said at the time in that Special Session, "Now we have the way, and we will promote the ability to pay tax. We're not satisfied with this deal from Ottawa, but we have to take it and at least it's something good. The people will have a chance to pay -- their ability to pay." A few short years after this, this was changed. This was changed, and the income tax was reduced and we're talking about raising the premiums.

Madam Speaker, this is certainly a Department, and I don't blame only the Minister, because he has to listen to his Chief. I blame the whole Cabinet and the whole party for the mix-up they have in this Department. And we're just starting our trouble, Madam Speaker.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... We're going to have a lot more trouble. We're talking about Medicare. You'll have people up there up in the North and so on who won't have a chance to see a doctor. Will they have to pay? What have we heard about this? Nothing. What about these premiums for these hospitals for people that can't get in? There's a bigger waiting list now in these hospitals than ever before and I hear from reliable authority, I hear that we cannot fill any new need at all, we're just taking care of what they call the emergency on this waiting list. Oh, the First Minister is never here in the time of crisis. I think he will probably follow the-- well this is beside the point. I'd better wait, Madam Speaker. I don't want to tempt you again.

Madam Speaker, I certainly protest the lack of leadership of this government, and unfortunately the Minister must take the blame because he is responsible, and I think it's up to him to tell his Chief that they have to have a little bit of courage to talk about this Medicare. It's not fair to go to the people of Manitoba to have an election and say "No, we can't tell you any more about this." This is not fair; and it's not fair not to bring in this question of the Denturist. And it's not fair not to do anything about the personnel of these hospitals that we are building for. This is not fair, Madam Speaker, -- especially in this department and a lot of other departments, mind you, there is certainly lack of leadership and I certainly protest and -- I hope I'm wrong but I prophesy that if we keep this government very long their Department of Health will bankrupt this province and will not give the proper medical and hospital care that the people of Manitoba are entitled to receive.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, a few words before we pass this item. I too would be interested to find out and to know whether there have been any further negotiations with the medical profession, with people from the medical profession or with MMS in connection with the medical plan that they are planning for to go into effect sometime next year. Certainly if further developments have taken place I think this House should be advised so that we could be better informed when we talk with the public on this matter.

We have had the report from the Committee on the Denturists, but I have had so many other Bills to look at that I certainly haven't had the time to go through it in detail and study it. But one thing I'm sure, personally, that whatever the government comes up with that I will be supporting the Denturists. I think they should be allowed to operate and deal with the public because we have too few dentists in Manitoba. We have hardly any in the rural parts of the province and too many of our people haven't got the means whereby they can go to the dentist and pay the dentist's bill, so that very often the work gets sloughed off and the people wait till they have to have a denture made; and naturally they then go to the denturist because they can get service for less cost. This has been very evident over the years when we find people from the United States coming into Manitoba and getting their dentures made here. They can well take a trip from California down here and get their dentures made with no additional cost because the amount that they save having the work done here, pays for their travelling bills, and then some. So we should definitely keep the denturists in business and let them operate. I don't see any reason why the dentists should have a rake-off on the work that these denturists perform. They have already shown that they can do a good job and that they are no amateurs in the making of the dentures. They have carried on this work for years and I think this would be wrong to deny them now by bringing in legislation prohibiting them to operate in the Province of Manitoba.

We find that the western provinces of British Columbia and Alberta have authorized them to operate. Certainly we could place some conditions, but nevertheless, they should not be denied the opportunity to operate in this province. I do hope the Minister has some additional information to give us on the matter that I raised first and that was also raised by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I will certainly look forward to hearing from him.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister in reference to the status of the Children's Hospital. Madam Speaker, last year we had a discussion on the matter of the Grace Hospital being located in two sections and in two areas. The additional cost that was wasted by this government, of the taxpayers' money, was some \$2 million; and the reply we received from this government last year was that the medical staff in conjunction with the Commission, justified the construction of this hospital in two areas. And this was not so. And yet this year we have the same government telling us that the staff, the doctors, the research members of the Children's Hospital in the City of Winnipeg are not competent enough to make a decision on their own plans for the expansion of a badly needed Children's Hospital.

Madam Speaker, it is very difficult to reconcile the thinking of this government, when you

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd)... have two opposing factors. This seems to be the continuous policy of this government that that which is politically expedient has to be the expediency that the taxpayers of this province have to take; and when it is not politically expedient then it is not a very good project.

Madam Speaker, in conjunction with the proposed Children's Hospital, I want to mention to this government that the Ladies Auxiliary, the hospital staff, have not been encouraged - and these are dedicated people - have not been encouraged by the decision of this government to refuse to acknowledge their ability to plan for the type of hospital that would be most efficient and the type of hospital that would give the best care to the children who are going to be patients in this hospital.

I wish that this government at the oncoming election would take a little time at the hustings to tell the people the true story about the Children's Hospital, because there are many members of the people who live in the Province of Manitoba at one time or another have had their children to the Winnipeg Children's Hospital and they would like to hear the true facts concerning the delayed construction plans, the continual delay in the finalization of this most necessary project. I would like this government to tell the people of the province at that time why this has been done, because the members of the staff and those people associated with the Children's Hospital are anxious to know the facts and anxious to know why this project is being delayed. From what I can understand, Madam Speaker, there is no good reason why this project is being delayed, why the Children's Hospital plans are being continually frustrated, delayed, re-planned, planned and delayed some more, and I think that this is a most unfair attitude on the part of this government to the Children's Hospital.

..... continued on next page

MR. CLERK: 6. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$69,720,297 for Health, Resolutions 36 to 40, for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1967.

7. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$40,665,975 for Highways, Resolutions 41 to 44, for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1967.

8. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,051,500 for Industry and Commerce, Resolutions 45 to 54

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: I wonder would the Minister give his reply now to the questions asked him before supper, as I'm interested in listening to what he has to say to what was asked him then.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I don't wish to speak at this time. I suggest that all honourable members who have any comment to make would make them now, refresh whatever questions they wish to do so, and I'll try to reply at the end.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I am speaking here on a point of order. I understood that the arrangement that was agreed to this afternoon was that the Minister would be prepared to make his statement first and then the discussion could continue.

MR. EVANS: I'm quite prepared to answer any questions, and the two questions that I had on my records were to do with Damascus and the Interlake Lumber Company - or Forest Products or whatever it was. I think my honourable friend from St. John's had a question, and if my honourable friend from St. John would be good enough to remind me of that question.

MR. CAMPBELL: If I might speak on a point of order again, my reason for suggesting before the dinner adjournment that it be done this way was because - I'm sure that you would agree with me, Madam Speaker - that the Minister must speak first. In other words, if the Minister does not speak at the time the motion is made, that he can't reply. Now you've been allowing, and I think quite properly this evening, that we have had considerable latitude in the discussions and I have no objection at all to that continuing, but I think I'm correct in saying, Madam Speaker, that this is the Honourable the Minister's motion that's before us. Even though it's read by the Clerk of the House, it is actually the motion of the Honourable the Minister, and this was why I was suggesting this afternoon that that would be the proper time for the Minister to make his statement, and certainly I'll not object if we enter into a discussion, but just so there'll be no danger of the Minister being called out, I thought that was the time he would want to complete it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for St. John wish to state his question once more?

MR. CHERNLACK: I assume, Madam Speaker, that I will not be making an address, I would just be re-stating the question which I had earlier asked. On that basis, as I recall it amongst many others, one of the important questions was how this \$45 million was being financed and to what extent the Development Fund or any other means of financing was available to the company - Monoca.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend - two of my honourable friends, I think the Leader of the NDP and the member for Lakeside, asked me questions concerning Damascus Steel Products. I think the first question was: was I aware that the former manager, whose name I have forgotten -- (Interjection)-- Yes, Mr. Ross Henderson, was now employed by Dosco in Eastern Canada. Yes, I am aware of that. He asked me to explain, if I could, the reason for his apparent success down east where I had said that he was incompetent here. That's a rough summary of his question to me. I think that the answer is quite simple, that here he was handling duties for which he was not qualified as General Manager, as one in charge of sales, one in charge of finance, one who undertook to authorize the erection of buildings and direction of finance in the way that it had not been intended to go. In the east he is superintendent of a small division of a very large corporation where his duties are entirely different. I believe that he is being successful there. I hope so and I wish him well.

As to the subsequent history of Damascus, because the company was unable to meet its indebtedness the company's assets were advertised for sale. Bids closed on June 15 and by closing date only two bids were received. One bid reserved the right to withdraw by June 25, 1965, a condition which could not be met by the Receiver as the Court of Queen's Bench had to approve all bids and this could not be accomplished before July 7, 1965. This bidder was advised to this effect but would not change his bid. However, both bids were placed before the Court of Queen's Bench and approval was given to the Receiver to accept the bid of a Mr. F.G. Ellis for \$50,000.

(MR. EVANS cont'd).....

On receipt of Court approval, possession of the plant and assets was given to Mr. F.G. Ellis, Damascus, and some of the shareholders, applied to the Court to have the sale set aside for a further period so that sufficient monies could be raised to pay out the funds. A Court of Appeal upheld the lesser court's approval of the sale. The Receiver paid out all the secured creditors, and the balance of monies remaining, following completion of these payouts, was paid into the Court of Queen's Bench together with a complete statement of the Receiver's operations. This terminated the Receivership and the Court of Queen's Bench in its discretion attended to the payout of the remaining monies paid to it.

The new owners took over on July, 1965. They found that the machinery and equipment required extensive overhaul before any production could be accomplished. A complete overhaul took some four months before any production was effected. Before attempting to sell any products it was felt that a good inventory of screws should be established so that satisfactory delivery could be accomplished. The company therefore did not undertake any sales until January of 1966. To date, the product has been accepted by firms who previously did not purchase from the original operators. Sales for the first six months ending June 30, 1966, will exceed \$60,000. This compares with total sales of \$57,639 over a two and a half year period by the previous owners, so that in the first six months ending June 30, 1966, the new owners made sales equal to or in excess of the sales that were made by the previous owners in two and a half years. Production, with the addition of new machinery purchases, is 1,000 to 1,500 pounds per day.

Since taking over, the following has been accomplished: all existing machinery and equipment completely stripped down and rebuilt; an overhead electric crane installed; a complete plating department installed; an office was built; a tool room was built; a new annealing furnace was built; a laboratory for testing hardness of screws was set up, which effected required quality control on sheet metal screws. The following additional machinery was installed; one large header, two small threaders, one large threader, one large pointer and shearer, an oil reclaimer which was unserviceable at the date of purchase was put into working order effecting a large saving in oil purchases.

To effect all the foregoing, the company has had to lay out some \$40,000 in additional capital. The additional machinery has satisfactorily upped production. The plating division has reduced the cost previously paid by Damascus for this service from five cents a pound of product to one and a quarter cents a pound. The previous company used to pay a 23 percent duty on dies imported. On its own initiative, the new company on representation made to Ottawa had the duty reduced to seven percent. Since taking over, some \$11,000 in new dies has been purchased.

Our latest inspection of the plant found all machinery fully utilized with five persons employed full time. The company conservatively estimates that some 30 people will be employed in the next two years. The whole production flow now established is as different as night is from day from the original set up. All machines are working at two to three times the old capacity due to proper maintenance and rebuilding. So that is the subsequent history of Damascus Steel.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask who the author of that statement is?

MR. EVANS: That's a report compiled for me by my advisors in the department.

With respect to Interlake forest credits, this matter arose in the first place by a letter addressed on September 17 to the Manitoba Development Fund, and copies sent to Premier Duff Roblin, Minister Gurney Evans, MP Steve Patrick, Walter Lupryta, who is President of Interlake Forest Products Limited, and Steve Melnyk, the Winnipeg Tribune. I take it from that list of people that the letter was made public and that one is free to comment from it.

Interlake Forestry Products - on September 13 and September 17, Mr. Singer, of Interlake Forest Products sent me a copy of letters that he had written to the Manitoba Development Fund. He had also sent copies to Premier Roblin, Mr. Steve Patrick and the Winnipeg newspapers. On receipt of these letters, I made some investigations to determine what were the problems. Subsequently, arrangements were made for Mr. E. L. Underhill, an experienced Canadian Forest Products consultant, to carry out an independent survey of the operations of Interlake Forestry Products. I have a copy of Mr. Underhill's findings and a copy was sent to Mr. Singer. The conclusions of this independent report were unfavourable. As presently organized, success seems doubtful. That is the statement that I have with respect to Interlake.

(MR. EVANS cont'd).....

With regard to the Development Fund and Monoca, Monoca has their own financial resources. As far as I am aware, they have not made any arrangements with the Manitoba Development Fund, although as my honourable friend knows I do not pretend to be in day to day touch with them. I have already said that this industry would be eligible to apply, and if they applied they could then satisfy the Manitoba Development Fund as to their credit worthiness and as to the liability of the proposal for which they want the money. I don't see why particularly they would want to apply to the Manitoba Development Fund because they are an investment group themselves. Nevertheless, they might want to. Some investment groups do want to have a local-partner so that there will be local interest in the development that takes place.

So I am not aware of any approach or application that has been made to the Manitoba Development Fund. I have not been informed to that effect, either by Monoca or, naturally, by the Manitoba Development Fund. I think those were the main points that were outstanding.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, would I be permitted a question to the Honourable Minister? He did state a couple of days ago that he would deal with the \$50 million capital increase in the Manitoba Development Fund when he had an opportunity, and I think this is his last.

MR. EVANS: Thank you. I'm glad that my honourable friend reminded me of that particular question. I had forgotten it. That is just at this stage an estimate which our department makes to the Department of the Provincial Treasurer. As to the amount of money in the coming year that might be required by the Manitoba Development Fund, it can be no more than a good guess at this stage, so our estimate is that if some of the things for which we are hoping in the coming year do come along and if some fair proportion of them do apply to the Manitoba Development Fund, that their requirements can be met within the limit of \$50 million.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, may I speak on this matter please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Madam Speaker, we find here the Manitoba Development Fund which has been in existence for some years and now has a fund for loans of I think it's about \$9 million as of the last statement, and which started at a lesser amount, is now suddenly being given \$50 million more for this coming year, which to me is a very surprising increase. I don't think that there's anything in the Budget statement of the Premier's, and let's discount for a moment the lack of enthusiasm that others of us who spoke on the Budget did have for the growth potential in this coming year, but even the Premier's statement on the Budget -- I really mean the Provincial Treasurer's Budget Statement, did not indicate that there would be such a marked increase in activity in this province, in general, which would justify an increase in the Manitoba Development Fund from \$9 million to \$59 million.

Not only that, but there was no indication that the Manitoba Development Fund would be going into higher risks or different fields. There was an indication in that address, as I recall it, to the effect that there would be greater risks taken; but as I recall it, that had to do with the Nelson Agency, that's the name of the organization which was going to derive revenues from water rights. The Minister shakes his head but I don't know the purpose for which he is doing it.

MR. EVANS: The two shouldn't be confused.

MR. CHERNIACK: No. So he indicates that the two should not be confused and I appreciate his telling me that, but I do not recall any indication that the Development Fund was going to change its procedures or its principles or its standards or its terms from last year to this coming year, so that it seems to me that there has been no explanation at all as to this tremendous increase. It's a 500 percent increase or more, and yet the Minister says, "Well this is a pretty good guess." He says it's only a guess and I acknowledge that it must be, but there was no indication, no justification at all for the expectation of this other than, as I suggested earlier and I guess it's quite possible, that this money or a substantial part of it would have to be made available to this enterprise, or possibly others that we're not yet aware of. When I say this enterprise I of course mean the Churchill Development.

Well now it seems to me that the Minister expects that the money -- well the Minister does not know where this money will come from, let's put it that way. Of the \$45 million which was the first phase or the first phases which are planned, we know of \$5 million from the Federal Government; we know of \$600,000 - and less - because \$100,000 is going to be tied up. So we know of half a million dollars by the company and that's all that we know aside from the money that the government is going to contribute.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd).....

Now the Minister suggested that this company being an investment firm, he doesn't quite see why they should go to borrow money. But this company is not an investment firm, it's a form of a developer; it's a form of a syndicate operator. If it were investment monies that it was looking for it would be in the mortgage business; it would be in the finance business; and it isn't that at all. It's been clear to us and I certainly hope it's so, that this company is interested in the developing of an industry in forest products, and if it is, then certainly every good operator in any kind of development like that puts in a minimum of his capital and a maximum of borrowed capital, because if they have money to invest in this type of venture, they certainly aren't going to put it out at six or seven percent interest. They would much sooner pay six -- and I'm not an international financier, but I'm suggesting that I'm right and that the Minister is wrong in thinking that they're looking for investments for their money.

I am sure, and I don't discredit them in any way for it, that they are looking for a development of what may be a potential good return in their field, which is the development of forestry products, and certainly it cannot be conceived that they would be themselves putting up the money for the balance, but rather would be borrowing it. And the question still remains and will be answered someday, because I must indicate with some amusement that all this secrecy of the Development Fund is really no secrecy if you have the name of the firm or person that you think is a borrower, because in the office upstairs of the Provincial Secretary you can get a copy of the debenture that's given to the Development Fund; you can go to the Land Titles Office; you can go to the County Courts; you can search the chattel mortgage or the real property mortgage; and it won't be any problem at all, if indeed the Development Fund becomes involved in Churchill, to find it out because our own laws indicate that there has to be a public record of this type of loan, so that we'll find out sooner or later.

Obviously, the Minister doesn't know because if he did I'm sure he would have told us, so he doesn't know where the financing would come. I must say that I don't look very favourably to a government which enters into a tremendous project and undertakes a tremendous undertaking on its part, involving the construction and setting up of vocational schools and roads and all the rest of it, and relying only - and I think I'm correct in saying this - relying only on \$500,000 put up; \$100,000 bond; and the reputation of a company which I think is four years old, and the reputation of that company has nothing to do with its capital structure or its capital worth. All that this government has been told, if I can summarize it and I hope I'm not minimizing it, is to say that the indications from the bankers and from other banks are that this company has honoured its commitments. Well that's fine - that's fine. This government, I am sure, has honoured and will honour its commitments; that its commitments are concrete, specific, they're laid down in the Agreement and this government will honour them. But the commitment of the Monoca is nothing near the commitment of the government.

Well, I hope that the Minister's faith in the company is well based, because it is important for this province that this project once entered into should develop and do well, but it would be an awful shame if it was found that the people of Manitoba were financing this project and that the profits of this project - and everybody must expect there will be such - will not be used for the benefit of the people.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I'd like to add something in the way of the rural industrial development which, in the government's reply this afternoon, seemed to be that everything was in proper shape and that rural industrial development in Manitoba was going at full steam ahead. Madam Speaker, I simply want to illustrate my point by confining myself to the Interlake area, and seeing that there was some quotations earlier in the evening, I too would like to make a quotation.

On April 3, 1963 in this House, we were talking about the Interlake area and the Minister of Agriculture and the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce made various remarks about the Interlake area, and I would like to read one paragraph in particular, and this was by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. "Now turning to the Interlake," I quote, "I feel quite sure that there will be opportunities discovered up there. What they are I don't know, because if I did we wouldn't have to make the study; we'd just have to ask me. But there's a surprising little industry has grown up at Souris. For example, just out of an old abandoned gravel quarry, as I understand it, they went into that thing and found rocks that could be polished up and made into costume jewellery, and a very nice little industry - it's a small one - but a nice little industry has grown up on that. Who should say what could be made of the rocks that are taken out of the fields that my honourable friend referred to? I don't know;

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd). . . . I don't think he knows; but if somebody looked at them, they might find some kind of a use."

Now, Madam Speaker, the point I was trying to bring out this afternoon is that the development of industry in rural Manitoba is not progressing on a satisfactory basis. Now in the Interlake area particularly we have had a series of studies, and I venture to say some 24-odd studies, and it's a very strange thing, Madam Speaker, that this Interlake area should be -- part of it considered as not belonging to a designated area. In other words, there has been somebody that says that the Interlake area is not devoid of industry and is not a designated area. I challenge that type of a decision because this area is not developed; this area needs industry and this is just one of the many instances in the Province of Manitoba where you have not got the proper approach of rural industrial development.

And I'd like to further prove this point, Madam Speaker, not by what I say, not by the research that I have done, but simply by the very same remarks of this government that was made here on March 1 of this year. This is the Honourable Minister of Agriculture making a statement. "One of the most interesting things I think about the program in the Interlake is that when all of these area development boards had been formed and had sat down and studied their problems, almost without exception they came to the conclusion that their number one problem in the Interlake was education." Not industry, Madam Speaker, education. After all these studies, after all this research, after all these experts going into the area, coming to the conclusion that the people in this area must be educated in order to discover themselves - to discover themselves.

Now, Madam Speaker, I would like to quote further from the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, and he talks about Manpower Mobility Program. Now, Madam Speaker, at one time this was regarded as a poverty stricken area, by the remarks of some of the personnel who were working in this area under the sponsorship of the Department of Agriculture.

Then we have in March of this year another statement on Manpower Mobility Programs, and you know, it's very interesting to have the ability to coin some of these phrases, but these phrases, Madam Speaker, will not bring in and will not develop rural industrial industries in the Province of Manitoba, and that is what I'm concerned with and this is specifically what I was talking about this afternoon. If the government side wishes to quote or make reference to some of the facts that they're not aware of, that's their responsibility, not mine. But mine, Madam Speaker, these are the facts based on statements recorded in Hansard on the basis of what the government themselves have said, and to say that it's different is completely immaterial, because these are the facts and some of the statements that were contracted this afternoon were not based on fact.

Now, Madam Speaker, we're now going to spend another \$297,000 on the Manpower Mobility Program in the Interlake area in order to give the people of the Interlake area an opportunity or the right to rediscover life and to rediscover themselves, because I don't think that according to these descriptions, the people don't know that they even exist in this area. The people themselves don't know this. I wonder, and I have made this remark before, just who are these superhuman individuals on the part of the government that are in a position to make these statements about the people in the Interlake area. I would say it's an insult to the people in the Interlake area. When you have bodies such as the Area Development Boards that have been appointed and have been set up for not one year, not for two years but some for three or four years and nothing that has been concrete, nothing of any substance to encourage rural development has come forward from these boards; Madam Speaker, at best, this is a failure on the part of this government to give rural Manitoba the proper type of industrial development, and this is what I was striving to put across this afternoon.

Madam Speaker, it was brought again to my attention that one of the many industries that were developed was not unlike the chemical industry of which I may have been associated with. Madam Speaker, it was only natural for me to extend a courtesy to the Manitoba Development Fund for having made the loan. I got no favours; I got no privileges. I had to hypothecate and give my personal guarantee and this is why I have the knowledge to a certain extent, limited as it may be, that when I say that the Manitoba Development Fund is being operated on too stringent a banking basis, this is exactly what I mean. The Manitoba Bridge built a lot of the equipment in connection with this particular industry. They too were mentioned in the advertising paper. They too were recognized on the basis of common decency and courtesy. This is good business. But to bring out forcibly as a specific, bulls-eye target, this is not fair.

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd).....

Madam Speaker, there is a consultive board appointed by this government that does a certain amount of studying, but I learned this afternoon for the first time that the responsibility of this board is to develop industry, and if I understood the Honourable Minister properly, I thought that this was the responsibility of the Department of Industry and Commerce.

Madam Speaker, one of the other Ministers earlier in this Session on the other side made the remark that was in quotations, "just too juicy", and this was made in reference to the fact that Saskatchewan was trying to take away from the Province of Manitoba some of the projected plans in connection with the pulp and paper industry, as if, Madam Speaker, it is so difficult to encourage and interest companies, big or small, to take an active part in the industrial development of our Province of Manitoba. This government has at its disposal the technical know-how; the advise, both from the standpoint of feasibility studies, cash flows, capital costs, projected earnings; and with this type of information and with a proper face-to-face approach by the proper authorities of this government, it is a very very simple matter to sell industry to locate in the Province of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, this is not being done, and specifically in the rural industrial development of this province.

Initially, we heard much about the Kaolin products in the Interlake area. Nothing has been mentioned about that. This is some two, three years. Two or three years ago we heard about the caesium deposits in Bernard Lake, the only known world deposit; a highly desirable type of element in the matter of the space age research and atomic industry. Nothing has been made of this. Nothing has been mentioned about it. Now, Madam Speaker, these are the areas, these are the industries that can be developed, all in rural parts of Manitoba in order to make our community that much more prosperous and that much more contributing in terms to our tax structure in the Province of Manitoba.

Maybe, Madam Speaker, I don't understand the program of this government; maybe I cannot comprehend as to what is trying to be accomplished by this government in rural development in this province; and it is for this reason, Madam Speaker, that we on this side are so anxious to have the entire province of Manitoba declared as a designated area. Much can be done in expanding existing plans by 100, by 200, by 400 percent, because you're only working with an investment of a 75 cent dollar. The other 25 cents is given to you as a grant by the Federal Government, and I can think of no other method that will encourage the expansion and the development of industry than by requesting the Federal Government to make the entire Province of Manitoba a designated area.

I made quite a point of it because I truly and honestly believe that this is the way to develop Manitoba. To talk about other priorities of other provinces in other parts of Canada is one thing, but to develop the industry in Manitoba is another. This is our responsibility. This is my province; this is my land; this is where I want to develop industry and I want to develop it on a proper basis, Madam Speaker. This is why I strongly recommend again that all of Manitoba should become a designated area so that we can expand and can develop our industrial growth.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I asked the Honourable Minister some questions this afternoon on the financial statement. There are some discrepancies in the figures and I wanted some answers on it.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I apologize to my honourable friend. It slipped my mind. If my honourable friend will turn to Page 8, he will find I think that his difficulty exists down in the fourth and fifth figures which of course should not be added together because the fourth figure down is office furniture and equipment at cost - the total investment in office furniture - and the next line is accumulated depreciation, which of course should not be added together. It should be taken off until you come to a net figure. Consequently, the correct total should include items 1, 2, 3 and 6, and I think if my honourable friend will add those up he will find they do come to the correct figure at the bottom.

MR. CLERK: 8. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,051,500 for Industry and Commerce, Resolution 45 to 54, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967.

9. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$920,650 for Labour, Resolution 55 to 61, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967.

10. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,144,219 for Mines and Natural Resources, Resolutions 62 to 73, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967.

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

11. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,757,215 for Municipal Affairs, Resolutions 74 to 83, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967.

12. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,435,760 for Provincial Secretary, Resolutions 84 to 95, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967.

13. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,379,598 for Public Utilities, Resolutions 96 to 99, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967.

14. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,063,940 for Public Works, Resolutions 100 to 104, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967.

15. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,727,614 for Treasury, Resolution 105 to 111, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967.

16. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I just have one question that I'd like to direct to the Honourable the Minister of Welfare. Has the individual whose income is only \$67.50 been granted a Medicare card, because I understand that he is soon going to require medical attention.

HON. J.B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare)(The Pas): I don't know, Madam Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Apparently he doesn't know whether he's been granted a Medicare card or whether he's going to need medical attention. He doesn't know anything. Fine.

MR. CLERK: 16. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$29,650,605 for Welfare, Resolutions 112 to 117, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967.

Capital Supply. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$179,000,000 for Capital Expenditures. Schedule A - Manitoba Telephone System, \$14,800,000; Manitoba Hydro Electric Board, \$100,000,000; The Manitoba Water Supply Board, \$200,000; Manitoba Development Fund, \$50,000,000; University of Manitoba, \$4,000,000; The School Capital Financing Authority, \$10,000,000.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the ways and means for raising of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution before the Committee - Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various Capital purposes, the sum of \$179 million be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Resolution passed?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a copy of that first before I give my approval on passing it. I do not have the information. --(Interjection)-- Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll read it more slowly if you like. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various Capital purposes, the sum of \$179 million be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. The list was distributed to all the members a few days ago.

MR. FROESE: Apparently I must have left it in the House at the time because I certainly haven't got the information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution -- passed. The next resolution - Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967, the sum of \$284,271,677 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Resolution -- passed. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and requests leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS: I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Capital supply. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various Capital purposes, the sum of \$179 million be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Main Supply. Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967, the sum of \$284, 271, 677 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

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

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 55, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967.

MR. EVANS presented Bill No. 55, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I point out - I believe I'm correct in stating that this Bill can not be read a second time except by leave.

MR. EVANS: May I have leave to ask the Speaker that second reading was in fact done by leave of the House. Have I that permission to ask Madam Speaker to insert that in the records?

MR. PAULLEY: I just would like to take one quick glance at it.

MR. FROESE: I still haven't got a bill before me, so I would

MADAM SPEAKER: We'll wait until the bills are distributed. Has the honourable member, by leave, permission of the House . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before we proceed to that, perhaps I can move the first reading of the Capital Supply Bill which would be next.

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 22, An Act to authorize the expenditure of moneys for Capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same.

MR. ROBLIN, by leave, presented Bill No. 22, an Act to authorize the expenditure of moneys for Capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if in the interests of Manitoba, if members of the House might get the bill before we pass it.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I think that's a sound idea, Madam Speaker. What I would suggest is that if the House is agreeable, we might take the Committee stage on both these bills and defer third reading until tomorrow.

MR. PAULLEY: I'd just like to see

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, while the bills are being distributed, wouldn't it be just as well to leave the second reading stand. After all, we're going to be meeting for a day or two yet by the looks of things, and in case anyone who isn't here tonight or anyone who isn't in the Chamber at the moment is interested in a last word on either of these bills, that they might have that opportunity on second reading and the Committee of the Whole.

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Madam Speaker, we need unanimous consent for that, and I take it that would not be the wish of the Member for Lakeside, so we are bound then to leave it over until tomorrow.

I'd now like to proceed, Madam Speaker, with the second readings of the Private Bills which will be found on the last page of the Order Paper, Page 16.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 42, an Act for the Relief of Dorothy J. Ungar, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, over the years we have had a very few bills like this bill before the Legislature, but it is along the same lines as three Acts passed by this Legislature in 1963. In this case, a dwelling in the Municipality of St. Clements was burned down and an adjoining garage was partially destroyed by fire in April, 1964. There was a fire insurance policy for \$5,000 on the buildings owned by this lady and her husband who is a working man.

The owner and her husband weren't successful in obtaining a settlement, and at the end of July or early in August, 1964, they went to a solicitor for assistance, but difficulties arose.

(MR. COWAN cont'd). The husband was working long hours with construction machinery and it was difficult to contact him. The policy was lost; it was difficult to contact the adjuster, he was away a great deal and didn't return telephone calls. Then the solicitor came under doctor's care as he was not well and the year slipped by. Subsequently, the solicitor underwent an operation.

The insurance company is not prejudiced by this Bill because the fire took place only two years ago Saturday. The evidence is still available. One of the Bills we passed three years ago was in respect of an incident that had taken place five years before, less one month. I would point out that an ordinary contract entered into between members of this House and between individuals, that one has six years from the time that money becomes due or an obligation is to be carried out under a contract, you have six years to enforce that contract, but in the small print in a fire insurance policy there is a provision that court action in respect of claims must be taken within one year.

Three years ago when the three bills came before this House asking for an extension of time, the Legislature and the Committee decided not to give extensions of time but decided to refer the question to the courts, because the court is in a position to call witnesses and hear all sides of the story and have the witnesses give evidence on oath. At that time the three bills were all changed to make provisions similar to the provisions that are inserted in this Bill in Section 1, which provides among other things that Dorothy J. Ungar may apply to the Court of Queen's Bench, and on the hearing, the Court having regard to the real question in controversy, the very right and justice of the matter and all the circumstances of the case, may, in its discretion, enlarge the time for the bringing of an action against the said insurance company.

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

MR. COWAN: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House, the second reading of Bill No. 42.

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

YEAS: Messrs: Beard, Campbell, Cowan, Desjardins, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Johnston, McKellar, Martin, Moeller, Patrick, Smerchanski, Stanes, Watt and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs: Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Evans, Harris, Hutton, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McLean, Paultley, Roblin, Shewman, Smellie, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Weir and Witney.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; Nays, 21.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The second reading of Bill No. 66. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 66, an Act to incorporate Manitoba Conference Corporation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, for second reading.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, the general purposes of this Bill are to make uniform the provincial Statutes incorporating the Church body in the various provincial jurisdictions. Prior to this date the Seventh-day Adventist Church was incorporated in various provinces throughout Canada by bills which were not at all uniform but which had been passed over a considerable number of years in the various provinces. In many cases the corporate designations were quite different and in some cases the legal set-up varied to some extent. In the general interest of the church, it was thought desirable that a uniform Act should be enacted in the various jurisdictions. This Act - a similar Act has now been passed by a number of jurisdictions in Canada and the proposed Bill in Manitoba will bring a similar enactment in force in this province.

Madam Speaker, with regard to Section 13 in the Bill, it is proposed that in Committee that it be substituted for a section similar to Section 7 in Bill No. 77. Bill 77 is an Act respecting the Diocese of Rupert's Land and it is in connection with the transfer of title. The section in Bill 77 doesn't provide that there will be no fees, but the result of having a similar section put in Bill 66 instead of the present Section 13, would mean that a nominal fee of \$2.00 per title would be charged in respect of memorials put on titles of the organization in question.

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

MR. LISSAMAN presented Bill No. 77, an Act respecting The Diocese of Rupert's Land, for second reading.

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

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 96, an Act to amend An Act to incorporate St. James Scholarship Foundation, for second reading.

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

MR. LISSAMAN presented Bill No. 86, an Act to incorporate The Brandon Community Chest, for second reading.

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

MR. SHEWMAN presented Bill No. 106, an Act to incorporate The Manitoba Institute of Registered Social Workers, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SHEWMAN: Madam Speaker, this Bill is to improve and increase the knowledge, efficiency and ability of its members so as to ensure that the public at all times receives the service of proficient competent social workers of high ethical standards and to do all such lawful things that are incidental and conducive to the attainment of such objects. Any person who has graduated from an accredited university school of social workers with a Bachelor's Degree or Master's Degree or shall be a member. Consideration will be given to evidence of other qualifications which in the opinion of the Institute are equivalent to the above. The Institute will have authority to issue certificates of registration to all its members.

The provisions of the Bill in no way restrict the right of anyone to practice or work in the welfare or social service field. Its only restriction is the use of the designation "Registered Social Worker." Only if a person chooses voluntarily to become a member of the Institute and thereby a registered social worker, does such person become subject to disciplinary procedures of the Institute.

This Bill gives the right to the employer to employ any person that's qualified, whether they belong to the association or not, and it also gives the employee the right to join if they so wish but it isn't compulsory that they join - if they do join this association, to practice their profession.

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

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews) presented Bill No. 120, an Act for the Relief of Tjitske Medgyes, Feikje Bosman and Tina Stuve, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, the three persons mentioned in this bill and seeking relief were passengers in a car driven by a Mr. John Wassenaar on the Henderson Highway on the 5th day of January of last year. When they came to the intersection of McKay Avenue - Henderson and McKay - the Wassenaar car stopped to allow the oncoming traffic to pass before he made a left turn, and when his car stopped, a car driven by a Carl Nysnik drove into the rear of the Wassenaar car.

The three ladies, the passengers in the Wassenaar car, suffered severe injuries. One of them, the first lady, Mrs. Medgyes, suffered a sprained neck - the back of the neck - and her arms were numb and her recovery took several months. Mrs. Bosma had suffered the injury of eight fractured ribs and her complete recovery took a year. In the case of Mrs. Stuve, she suffered strained muscles of the back and neck and for several months had treatment in the Manitoba Rehabilitation Hospital.

The first lawyer who had the case had to give it up and the second lawyer only came into the picture in June last. He gathered the information that was necessary, but he found that the case couldn't be hurried because it took a while to determine the extent of the injuries suffered by the ladies. In fact it was only until very late in the year that it was determined whether Mrs. Stuve could have permanent recovery from her injuries.

In addition to that, the lawyer's partner - his senior partner - suffered serious indiffidence of health and was away from the office very much which made it double work for the junior partner. The time slipped by, and before a settlement was made, the twelve months had expired. In The Highway Traffic Act, if there is a statement for claim, it must be filed within the year. That meant that it must have been filed by the 6th of January of this year. Now it was a little time over, but it was only 16 days beyond the time in which the appeal should be made, and as was said in connection with a bill that was before us the other day, it makes a difference if the evidence is fresh and the witnesses are available. Well those things, both of them were impossible in this case.

When the insurance company discovered that the time for filing the claim had expired,

(MR. MARTIN cont'd).....the lawyer for this insurance company said they didn't have to pay anything and they were not going to pay anything. But there is a provision in The Highway Traffic Act that I would read here. It appears here in Section 1 of the bill, that by way of originating notice of motion to Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench for Manitoba, and on the hearing of said motion, the court having regard for the real question in controversy and the very right and justice of the matter and all the circumstances of the case, may, in its discretion, enlarge the time allowed by subsection (1) of Section 98.

Now a similar bill, Madam Speaker, was before this House in 1963 - an identical bill. It was a collision - two cars. The time expired - the twelve months went by, and in this instance it was because the lawyer put down in his notebook November 22nd and he should have put October 22nd, and that was a month in error as far as the date in his diary was concerned. The bill passed this House, received the Royal Assent on the 6th day of May in 1963, and then came before the Court of Queen's Bench. The case was heard by Mr. Justice Ferguson and the learned judge granted the application for an enlargement of the time for the filing of the claim. It's true that the decision of the judge of the Queen's Bench was appealed, and the Court of Appeal upheld the decision of Mr. Justice Ferguson.

So I feel, Madam Speaker, that under the circumstances of the case and the few days that they were over the allotted time, in view of the fact that The Highway Traffic Act provides that the time for filing a statement of claim may be enlarged at the discretion of the court, as in the case of the bill three years ago, I feel that this bill should be given second reading and go to the committee.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I'd like to say a word on this bill because of the fact that it involves the principle - that is the principle of the Statute of Limitations itself. Now it's my understanding that the Honourable the Attorney-General was going to take under consideration all sections of the various Acts on the books and make recommendations to the House as to proper applications of the Statute of Limitations, whether they should be for one year or two years, three years, or some other period of time, and this hasn't been done.

Now the case that we have before us this evening, which has been ably presented by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, however it's a question of starting the action, as I read it. As my honourable friend says, the injury took place and they were just - the parties aggrieved were simply waiting to see the extent of the injury. Now whether this comes within the idea behind the law of the Statute of Limitations or not, I don't know. It seems to me rather peculiar that the action wasn't taken at the time when the injuries were suspected, and the fact of the limitation of the time - the accident was the 6th of January in 1965; action not started by 6th of January, 1966. My honourable friend from St. Matthews mentions the fact that they knew that the injuries were there and no action had taken place. I am wondering how long it could have been conceivable that we in this House would have been asked for remedial legislation.

At one point - the point that I wish to raise at the present time is the first point that I raised. Has the Attorney-General - and I think it's proper for me to raise it on this bill, Madam Speaker, because we're dealing with setting aside the principle of a year's limitation - what has happened to the promise of the - as I understood it - the Honourable the Attorney-General to look over this whole matter and make a recommendation to the House.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few brief words on bills of this type in general. These are very perplexing when they come to the members because the decision has to be made too much on the basis of the heart rather than the mind, I think. I do believe that where there is instances of knowledge being found or discovered pertaining to the accident after the period of limitations has expired, then I believe there is some grounds for allowing an extension. But personally, I can't feel that it's the duty of members of this House or the Legislature to appear to concur or excuse the actions of a solicitor who may have been a bit at fault. So I think a bill of this particular type, I will be voting against.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I know that speeches at this time of the night are not likely very popular and I hesitate to delay the House any longer, but my few remarks are in answer to what my honourable friend from Brandon just said, because while it's true that a bill such as this may appear to excuse the fault of a lawyer or someone else, yet if it's not granted, the penalty is paid by people who are perhaps themselves completely innocent.

I must confess that I find it difficult to go along with a lot of members of this House who take the position that we should never be asked to waive this Statute of Limitations. I think that we have a perfect right, in fact I think we have a duty to exercise our judgment in many of

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).....these cases. It is a constitutional right of the citizen to come to the foot of the Throne to ask for relief, and when they have been unable to obtain that relief in any other place, then they can come to this Legislature.

We often remark on the fact that this Legislature is the highest court in the land, and it is, but we don't very often exercise our judicial authority here. The fact that we don't often exercise it doesn't mean that we don't possess it. We have it here. It's something that was a tradition in the mother of parliaments through the years and we received it - Canada received it at its birth 99 years ago. It's infrequently that cases of this kind come before us, but when they come, I think we should look at them - we should look at them in the spirit in which they come. They have to come by a petition and the petitioners have always been, according to the British Constitution, they've always been required to exhaust the legal remedies first, and I would esteem it that in this case the legal remedy has been exhausted, not properly it's true, but not through the mistake of these people.

I'm always concerned about the folk who think, and I know that this opinion is honestly held - if my seat-mate and colleague were here tonight I am sure that he would take the other side of the argument to what I am taking - but I am always concerned by the fact that so many people think that we should not break the Statute of Limitations because it's likely to lead to a flood of cases. Well if we have a flood of cases, we'll deal with them on their merits here. I think we get so few that we have a responsibility to deal with them in that way. So I would urge the members of the House to at least let this bill go to the committee where these people get an opportunity, through themselves or their representatives, to put their case before us more fully. I think that's the least we can do for them.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Were the Yeas and Nays asked for?

MR. SMELLIE: Please, Madam Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, under the circumstances, having dealt with one of these bills already, we must have the yeas and nays on this one.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the second reading of Bill No. 120.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Beard, Campbell, Cowan, Desjardins, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Johnston, Klym, McKellar, Martin, Moeller, Patrick, Shewman, Smerchanski, Stanes, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Evans, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Lissaman, Lyon, McLean, Paulley, Roblin, Smellie, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir and Witney.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 17.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

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

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 o'clock Tuesday morning.