

Name	Electoral Division	Address
ALEXANDER, Keith	Roblin	Roblin, Man.
BAIZLEY, Obie	Osborne	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
BJORNSON, Oscar F.	Lac du Bonnet	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
CAMPBELL, D. L.	Lakeside	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARROLL, Hon. J.B.	The Pas	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron	Portage la Prairie	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man.
CORBETT, A. H.	Swan River	Swan River, Man.
COWAN, James, Q.C.	Winnipeg Centre	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
DESJARDINS, Laurent	St. Boniface	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
DOW, E. I.	Turtle Mountain	Boissevain, Man.
EVANS, Hon. Gurney	Fort Rouge	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORBES, Mrs. Thelma	Cypress	Rathwell, Man.
FROESE, J. M.	Rhineland	Winkler, Man.
GRAY, Morris A.	Inkster	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
GROVES, Fred	St. Vital	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
GUTTORMSON, Elman	St. George	Lundar, Man.
HAMILTON, William Homer	Dufferin	Sperling, Man.
HARRIS, Lemuel	Logan	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
HARRISON, Hon. Abram W.	Rock Lake	Holmfield, Man.
HAWRYLUK, J. M.	Burrows	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C.	Selkirk	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C.	Ethelbert Plains	Ethelbert, Man.
HUTTON, Hon. George	Rockwood-Iberville	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
INGEBRIGTSON, J. E.	Churchill	Churchill, Man.
JEANNOTTE, J. E.	Rupertsland	Meadow Portage, Man.
JOHNSON, Hon. George	Gimli	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
JOHNSON, Geo. Wm.	Assiniboia	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
KLYM, Fred T.	Springfield	Beausejour, Man.
LISSAMAN, R. O.	Brandon	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C.	Fort Garry	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MARTIN, W. G.	St. Matthews	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
McKELLAR, M. E.	Souris-Lansdowne	Nesbitt, Man.
McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C.	Dauphin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MOLGAT, Gildas	Ste. Rose	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne	Pembina	Manitou, Man.
ORLIKOW, David	St. John's	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
PAULLEY, Russell	Radisson	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
PETERS, S.	Elmwood	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
PREFONTAINE, Edmond	Carillon	St. Pierre, Man.
REID, A. J.	Kildonan	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
ROBERTS, Stan	La Verendrye	Niverville, Man.
ROBLIN, Hon. Duff	Wolseley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SCARTH, W.B., Q.C.	River Heights	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
SCHREYER, E. R.	Brokenhead	Beausejour, Man.
SEABORN, Richard	Wellington	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
SHEWMAN, Harry P.	Morris	Morris, Man.
SHOEMAKER, Nelson	Gladstone	Neepawa, Man.
SPELLIE, Robert Gordon	Birtle-Russell	Russell, Man.
STANES, D. M.	St. James	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
STRICKLAND, B. P.	Hamiota	Hamiota, Man.
TANCHAK, John P.	Emerson	Ridgeville, Man.
THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C.	Virden	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WAGNER, Peter	Fisher	Fisher Branch, Man.
WATT, J. D.	Arthur	Reston, Man.
WEIR, Walter	Minnedosa	Minnedosa, Man.
WITNEY, Hon. Charles H.	Flin Flon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WRIGHT, Arthur E.	Seven Oaks	4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 5th, 1961.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.
Reading and Receiving Petitions.
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.
Notice of Motion.
Introduction of Bills.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 74, An Act to amend Certain Provisions of the Statute Law (1).

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 96, An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act and to facilitate the Establishment of a Nuclear Research Area.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk) in the absence of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface introduced Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953 (2).

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill. -- (Interjection) -- Order stand. Committee of the Whole House.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CARROLL: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act (2) by providing, among other matters, for the increase of the maximum earnings which will be deemed to be an average annual income consequent upon which increased compensation may be payable under the Act. Resolution be adopted?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, the one provision of the Act is that we're raising the minimum under which the payments are made to totally injured workmen through loss of time -- it is at the present time \$4,500. We're planning to raise that to \$5,000. I believe the last change was made two years ago. We're now bringing it in line with existing changes in working conditions and so on. The Province of Ontario at the present time is \$5,000; the Province of Saskatchewan is \$6,000. We're bringing it more in line with what we believe to be a realistic figure. There are a few other minor changes in the bill, one which gives the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg the right to pay on all accidents for employees of the Metropolitan Corporation rather than a levy. This is the same provision that exists with respect to the Province of Manitoba employees, with respect to the City of Winnipeg, the railways, federal employees and so on. There are a few other minor changes as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 2: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Highway Traffic Act by providing, among other matters, for an increase in the fee payable for the first set of dealers' number plates from \$20.00 to \$50.00.

MR. CARROLL: on this one, Mr. Chairman. Well to begin with, there are, I think, something like 700 dealers' licence plates being issued, 700 different firms getting dealers' licence plates, and I think the record would seem to indicate that there are probably less than that number of bona fide dealers within the province. These are facts which are brought to our attention by the Manitoba Motor Dealers Association. We are providing some increased use of dealers' plates, and we feel that if we raise the price of the first set of plates, anyone who is not a bona fide dealer will likely be eliminated as a result of the higher fee for the first set of plates. At the same time we're making a little wider use, allowing a little more latitude in the use of these plates, which is, I think, a little more realistic, and which has been requested from time to time by the Dealers' Association.

One other provision which will be extremely popular I think, we're enabling an individual

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) to drive on a certificate for a period of up to five days, on a certificate that he may get from his dealer. This takes care of the complaints where people buy cars after the Motor Vehicle Branch has closed for the weekend. This enables them to drive for a few days without the actual plate. It will be a sticker that will be placed on, giving the expiry date and things of that kind. A few other minor clean-up amendments to the bill — nothing of any great importance though.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, that point of the Honourable Minister interests me insofar as the certificate being authorized by the dealer. Will it or will it not be necessary to have changes made in respect of automobile insurance policies that this certificate will be recognized as a fully licenced automobile?

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, large dealer, but what about the small man, maybe has only one set of plates, like in the country where he's a dealer and possibly \$50.00 might be quite a hardship for him, and I believe in the long run that the government might lose revenue because a lot of these small outfits may not take dealers' plates out.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): How does this compare with other provinces in regard to this rate that you're suggesting? I mean does it compare with the other provinces in the figure that you've just set?

MR. CARROLL: Well with respect to insurance, we understand that there will be no difficulties with respect to the issuing of the insurance to individuals who have stickers on their car. The sticker will be the same as a licence during this interim period and will give him the full protection that he should have. The \$50.00 fee for the first set of plates, we think will be more than compensated by the increased use that he has of these plates. For instance, we plan to enable a dealer to be able to furnish a customer with a set of dealer plates to use another car while his vehicle is in being repaired. At the present time a dealer can't legally take a vehicle from the freight sheds to his premises. He can't do this legally on a set of dealer plates. We're allowing him this privilege. We're allowing him much wider latitude in the use of these plates and we think, we're told by the dealers themselves, they certainly will gladly pay the increased fee for this wider use of plates. I'm afraid that I don't at the moment know how this schedule of fees compares with other provinces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted certain resolutions, asked me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act (2).

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 93, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (1).

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. JOHN THOMPSON (Minister of Public Works (Virden): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table a Return to an Order of the House, No. 10, on the motion of the Honourable the Member from Ste. Rose.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to remind the members of our trip to the Winter Fair at Brandon tomorrow. The arrangements have been made with the Canadian National Railways. I have the train fares here, and I'm stuck, and I make an appeal, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the House first of all to turn up at the CNR Station tomorrow morning before 9:00 o'clock, and I make another appeal to them to turn up at my office with \$10.00. It would be a great help. There are 48 berths available coming back from Brandon tomorrow night, and the members will arrive well rested in Winnipeg at 7:00 o'clock next morning, fresh, relaxed and so on, ready for the fray of the political arena again -- (Interjection) — Oh, we don't acquire hang-overs. No; we're all honourable men. I would like to point out to the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, that the arrangements that were made with the railway were that the honourable members could use their passes going up to Brandon, but that insofar as sleeping accommodation was concerned it would cost us approximately \$10.00 apiece. If 48 members made use of the two sleeping cars it will be spotted at Brandon for our benefit about 10:00 o'clock

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) tomorrow evening. So I think the honourable members will realize that it doesn't matter how many members come back on the sleepers, it's going to cost us just the same amount of money, and so I would appeal to every member that possibly can to first of all take advantage of the service that's being offered to us, and secondly to get the Minister of Agriculture off the hook. Thank you.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add a word to that. The arrangements in Brandon will be that when we arrive in Brandon there will be a lunch provided by the Winter Fair Board and then at 5:00 o'clock a dinner for the members. The reason for moving the dinner on that early is so that the Directors and the members can get to the evening show of the Manitoba Winter Fair in the evening, and then I understand that the two sleeper cars will be spotted behind the CN Station, behind the Prince Edward Hotel, at 10:00 o'clock that evening, and any member from that time on can go and take his berth.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the only reason I'll be missing on this trip so that members would know, that this is Passover Week and that no Passover food is provided on the train. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Second reading of Bill No. 76. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Municipal Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, there is no one principle, of course, to this amending bill. There are a number of points that are dealt with in it; I shall not attempt to deal in any detail with all of the amendments in the bill but will attempt rather to point out some of the highlights of this rather extensive amending bill. There is an amendment providing for the Rural Municipality of Charleswood to become a suburban municipality within the meaning of that term as defined in The Municipal Act. There is an amendment providing for ratification and approval of certain types of agreements which have been entered into by, particularly suburban municipalities around Winnipeg, in connection with large land development. It has proven essential in the past that these municipalities have this power to enter into these agreements. At the same time it should be made abundantly clear that they have always had this power so that earlier agreements will not be open to question, and that is the substance of the amendment to Section 3 of the Act. The amendments contained in Section 3 to Section 8 are largely covered by the explanatory notes. This is a function in connection with apportionment of assets and liabilities among municipalities where there is a change in area by transfer of territory from one to the other. It has been deemed advisable to substitute the Municipal Board for the Minister in such cases. We now have a five-man Municipal Board which is capable of devoting the time, and sometimes it is considerable time, to these hearings, and we feel that this function can best be now discharged by the Municipal Board rather than the Minister himself.

There is another amendment providing for the bringing into line of nomination days in certain of the suburban municipalities of Greater Winnipeg with respect to -- it arises with respect to the Metro elections. This was requested by the Urban Association of Manitoba. I would point out to the House the proposed amendments that are being suggested with respect to maximum remuneration payable to reeves in rural municipalities. This maximum is being raised. It is suggested it be raised from \$700 to \$1,200 per annum and the maximum remuneration to councillors suggested be raised from \$350 to \$600 per annum. In the case of cities, towns, and certain suburban municipalities the maximum remuneration of the mayor is suggested to be raised from \$1,200 to \$2,000 and the maximum salary of aldermen or councillors from \$600 to \$1,000, and in the cases of cities, towns and suburban municipalities having a population of over 10,000 that the maximum salaries of the mayor be raised from \$2,000 to \$3,600, and the maximum remuneration of aldermen from \$1,000 to \$1,800. Honourable members will recall, Mr. Speaker, that these are merely the maximum limits; that the actual salaries are set by the council within these limits. I may mention that these increases were suggested jointly by the Urban Association and by the Union of Municipalities, and while I don't believe that these amendments conform entirely with the recommendation of the two associations, they are in general agreement with that recommendation, and certainly the government believes that there is merit in these maximums being raised because they haven't been touched for some few years.

There is another group of sections, 18 to 21, in which the Municipal Board is substituted

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) again for the Minister. These sections relate to disputes on inter-municipal drains, and I am not trying to deal with all of these amendments exhaustively where I think the explanatory note pretty well covers them. I am leaving those out unless there are questions that arise in connection with them. There is a special amendment at the request of the City of Winnipeg for the withdrawal of Winnipeg from the Parks Board division of The Municipal Act; this arises by virtue of the take-over by Metro Council of certain of the functions of the City of Winnipeg. I would point out particularly Section 36 of the bill which amends 843 of the Act; it places a limitation on the mill rate for Parks Board purposes. What I would like to clarify, actually, is the explanatory note which is incorrect in the printed bill in front of you. The second line of the explanatory note reads: The Amendment changes the provision with respect to St. Boniface and St. James. It should read: The Amendment changes the provision with respect to St. Boniface but not St. James. This was made at the request of the City of St. Boniface by resolution.

There is an amendment provided to broaden the definition of the type of animal that may be kept in captivity and within settled suburban areas. Apparently there was a problem in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan about a coyote, and I wasn't aware that there were any coyotes over in East Kildonan, but apparently there are, and it was deemed desirable to bring that in. I should also mention in that connection that there is an amendment in the Act brought forward at the request of the City of Dauphin to prohibit the use of certain types of shoes on horses who may be plodding along the streets of Dauphin, and that amendment was -- (Interjection) -- The Minister of Education let it be known that he disassociated himself from the need of such an amendment but nonetheless we put it in at the request of the Council.

I would point out, in particular, the section dealing with the exemption from taxation of all fallout protection structures. This provision is made applicable to all municipalities in Manitoba and it includes the City of Winnipeg and the City of St. Boniface. We feel that this will be one means whereby some incentive can be given to the erection, if that is the proper term, or to the building of fallout shelters in homes in Manitoba, and certainly we feel it to be justifiable legislation in light of the campaign that is being carried on by the Departments in Ottawa who look after Civil Defence, and of course the joint campaign that's being conducted by the Honourable the First Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the CCF Party. I don't think it can be said that they have a personal or a fiscal interest in this bill so I hope they will be able to vote on that particular section -- (Interjection) -- There is an amendment providing for an annual equalized assessment to be made by the department, and in that same section, that is with respect to Section 994, I should advise the House that the wording as it appears on the bill at the present time, that is Section 41, has been reconsidered by the Legislative Council and we will be introducing a change in the form of that amendment when it gets to the committee stage, but it's not a matter of substance; the intent will be the same as is indicated at the present time. We are also proposing the amendment in Section 41 to provide for the Provincial Municipal Assessor to appeal, where he finds that there is an error in equalization made by him and reported as provided in the section in question. At the present time as was indicated during, I believe, estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs, if an error arises in the equalization the Provincial Municipal Assessor has no means by which this can be rectified unless he goes to the municipality and asks them to appeal, and it was thought that he should have this right to appeal so that he could initiate the appeal himself where an obvious and patent error had arisen.

Section 43, of course, refers to an amendment necessitated by a recent judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench that's designed to make it clear that the value of gas transmission lines includes the items mentioned in that section. I think that meets with the general approval certainly of all the municipalities of Manitoba who have been interested in this matter since the judgment was handed down. Now I may well, Mr. Speaker, have omitted some section which the honourable members feel deserve comment. If so, I'll be quite happy to make any comment that arises from questions.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say that generally speaking I approve of the bill. I'd like to make a comment with respect to Section 12 which raises the indemnity payable to reeves and councillors. I might philosophize a little bit and say: "O tempora O mores" -- to translate it freely saying that "people change as time goes on". I remember

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) very well that in 1942 or '43 I was sitting as a backbencher at the other side and feeling that the reeve at that time was not receiving adequate indemnity — indemnity was at \$300. I moved an amendment to The Municipal Act at that time, and my motion, my bill got second reading, but when it came before the Municipal Affairs Committee I remember very well that the late Mr. Hugh McIntyre, who was the President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, appeared before the committee and opposed the increase on the basis that the Reeves of this province were not mercenary people, and they were doing this work just for the honour and as a public duty to their neighbours and fellow citizens, and they objected to my bill, and my bill was defeated in the Committee of Municipal Affairs. I see today that the Union of Municipalities has apparently unanimously approved of a ceiling of \$1,200, so I think that's quite a change in their feeling. And I don't begrudge this at all. I think in large municipalities it's only fair that these men should not give their time for nothing for their fellow citizens, and I'm sure that the fellow citizens would like to compensate properly these municipal men who devote so much time and energy to municipal affairs.

I would like to comment on Section 43 with respect to making it clear what was included in the assessment of gas lines. I understand that this is the result of the work of the Town of Steinbach and it has been approved by nearly all towns of Manitoba, and I wish to commend the government for bringing this legislation at this time, because due to this recent judgment the towns were not receiving fair taxes from these projects because the work involved in the building of the pipes and all the installations, it was not possible to assess them. Now this will make it clear, and I'm glad that this has been brought forward, and I support this bill going to committee.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've just one brief comment to make, and I make it in order that the Attorney-General and Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs might be prepared. I note that in the definition of suburban municipality in the Act it lists the Rural Municipality of West Kildonan and also the Town of Transcona. As the Minister is aware there are two bills before the House in respect to making these both cities, and suggest that if approval is granted, this would require an amendment. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, in general, amendments proposed by the Minister -- I agree with them in general. I don't think I'll be taking advantage of the exemption from municipal taxation on the fallout shelter as I indicated the other day but I repeat my offer to the First Minister that after the session's over if he would like some assistance from me in that I would be glad to assist him in the completion of his shelter, in order that he may have the exemption.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: Can anyone tell us how many more than one shelter are in the City?

MR. SPEAKER: Ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 57.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli) presented Bill No. 57, An Act to regulate and control funds provided for the Prearrangement of Funeral Services, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been the practice, as I understand it, for funeral directors in Manitoba on request to contract for the provision of funeral services on a pre-need basis. The principle of prepaid funeral arrangements is considered to be sound business practice, but in recent months and years there has been greatly stimulated public interest in pre-finance funeral plans. However, there are certain dangers in any plan for prepaying funeral expenses unless it is surrounded by proper safeguards. After all, in a long interval between full receipt of the purchase price and contract performance, the risk of insolvency with consequent inability to perform becomes apparent. In prepaid funeral contracts there's no present sale of services or merchandise, really, and the only thing certain at the time of the contract is death itself, and the payment of the purchase price. The need for regulation in prearranging or pre-financing of funerals has become readily apparent. I might point out that the proposed bill that is before us now seeks to institute these necessary controls for the protection of the public, and the principal features of the bill I think can be summarized in this fashion. The sale of the contracts in this bill is limited to those who will provide the service, namely, directors or funeral directors, or their authorized agents. The directors desiring to provide service, funeral services under prearrangement plans will be authorized to do

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) so only with the issuance of a licence by the department. All monies collected from the sale of such contracts are required to be deposited with an authorized trust company. By this means the profit motive is eliminated at the time of the sale and applied only at the time of provision of service. The purchasers will have the right to withdraw their money at any time, subject only to a penalty of 12 1/2 percent if the contract is terminated within three years. This Act, of course, does not apply to mutual benefit societies, fraternal organizations, or the like. There is ample provision for appeal if it is proposed to cancel the licence of any funeral director. The Act does not apply to prearranged funeral plans entered into before the coming into force of this proposed Act. We are informed on contacting other provinces in Canada that similar legislation is in effect or is being contemplated in most of these provinces. This really is the principal -- these are the principal points as covered in this bill, and I think at Law Amendments there will be certain minor points that I would like to bring forward and no doubt others would too.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, while the Honourable Member for Minnedosa and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface are holding a post mortem I would like to say on behalf of our group that we approve of the principle of this bill. There is only one feature, though, I am a little bit worried about and that is this. For the last year and a half these services have been sold in Manitoba, and I'm just wondering, under this bill there's going to be no protection given to those people who have already purchased these services. Now I appreciate the fact that making a bill like this retroactive is pretty vicious legislation, but I do think though that we should try and do something in committee to try and strengthen it some way so that we can catch some of those people who have been selling these services, and in respect of which the purchaser actually has no protection at the present moment.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, it's tragic enough for many people in this province, in the city, or in this world. Hard to make a living, and here we come with a bill how to die. And it's tragic to see that certain people should take advantage of his fellow citizen, and even clean him or take advantage of him on the anticipation that this man will some day die. I think the whole thing is so tragic that it's hard for me to understand it. Now here we are -- we are born to live. We are worrying and worrying day in and day out how to make a living; how to educate our children; how to maintain our lives. And all of a sudden comes the so-called morticians, and -- I don't blame them -- suggest that we have a bill here to protect the average man of being -- what do you call it? I need a word here. Being fleeced -- is that a good word? -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? No. Or of being fooled, of anticipation of his death. The bill is perfectly noted, it's a protection for the people. But I'm just wondering, where are we coming to that we are fooled in our lives and we anticipate being fooled when we die. It's something which is not right, period. I agree with the Minister in his bill to protect the people. And then he says that if the contract is not carried out the man who made the contract is losing 12 or 14 percent of the contract. Why have this down there? Why should he pay a penalty that he made a contract to be buried in a certain cemetery and then he changes his mind because somebody else, or his relatives live in Hamilton or somewhere else, he wants to have the body down there. Why should it put a penalty on the man to lose so much money because he has made a contract for it. I think this should be explained. But my purpose of rising is, how difficult it is to live in this world. The moment you are born, you've got to think of the time that you're going to die and then worry about it, and make a contract earlier in case he is so called on or whatever they are, will come then later on and say, here now, we want so much money and if I make a contract earlier I'll probably get away with less. I think the whole thing is so comic if it wasn't so tragic.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say that I welcome this bill that's proposed by the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare. I agree with the remarks of the Honourable Member for Selkirk that maybe we'll have to give consideration, or should give consideration to the possibility of having a retroactive clause in this bill. One of the reasons that I say that, Mr. Speaker, is just an hour ago I received a call in connection with the very point that's been raised by my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk. I don't know whether there is increased activity of the salesmen of this type of plan as a result of the publicity that was given as to the introduction of this bill, but the case that I have in mind at the present time is the case of an elderly person, a widow over the age of 70, who was interviewed for over two hours one evening last week by a couple of salesmen of one of these organizations that are operating in this particular field at the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) present time. They got from this particular individual a cheque for \$100. On reflection the following morning, she came to realize -- I believe she's a war widow -- came to realize that she had a considerable amount of protection in any case. She then attempted to have the cheque stopped at the bank, and from the evening previous until the afternoon the cheque had been cashed. She is now faced, under the term of the contract I understand, with the payment of some \$300 to \$400 within a year on the basis of the contract. She has made an appeal that the money be refunded to her. As late as this morning, Mr. Speaker, the refund had not been made, so I suggest to the Minister that when the bill is in committee that some consideration be given to some retroactive nature of this bill even if it is only retroactive, Mr. Speaker, to the time that it was first announced in the House, and I'm not sure whether it was in the Throne Speech or not, to the effect that there was going to be legislation controlling this type of operation in the province of Manitoba. I have a suspicion that there may have been increased activity within the recent month or two simply because of that introduction or proposed comment on this particular bill, so I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health and Welfare that possibly this could be taken into consideration by himself and his department. I think it is a very serious matter. As I said in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, I welcome this type of legislation because of the fact that, as we are all well aware, notwithstanding the remarks of my honourable friend the Member for Inkster in reference to the living, it is when one is considering the passing out of this good old earth of ours that we view the matter sometimes a little emotionally and make provisions or enter into agreements that we might normally not do. So I suggest to the Minister that this be taken under consideration.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I would like to say that I, Mr. Speaker, that all the matters that have been raised today have been the subject of much concern to the department and myself and the deputies as we worked on this bill, and a lot of time has been spent on it, and in view of certain people we had to speak to, and as this type of legislation is coming up across the country, there's no doubt that -- it's no secret that increased activity -- I have found also in my own constituency -- has arisen latterly. However, the main principle of this bill is to protect those who may be entering into prearrangement agreements with parties who are not able to deliver the service when the time comes. I think that is clear, and I think that we have to proceed with the greatest of caution. I'm not a lawyer, but I've heard everyone talk of retroactive legislation so forcibly in this legislation, I think we have to be very careful, and I think this is something we might discuss at length in Law Amendments. I also think the fact as brought up by the Honourable Member for Inkster could be explained more fully at that time also. However, this is one date we have to keep, but I do feel that the greatest protection has to be given to the public in this area in view of the experience not only in Manitoba but across Canada. It seems also just a little strange to me that after so many years this should suddenly become such an acute problem, and I guess that's why our forefathers had the House adjourn every year to look at these matters.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker -- I have spoken already?

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

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare that the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Resolution 50. Resolved that there be granted her Majesty the sum not exceeding \$10,785,945 -- Public Welfare Services, Health and Public Welfare.

Resolution 51. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding

MR. GRAY: Is this 51? Old Age Pensions? Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- all right, go ahead.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,379,675 -- The Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons' Allowance Board and Disability Allowances -- Health and Public Welfare.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan, that while concurring in Resolution 51, this House regrets that the government has failed to recommend to the Federal Government that the basic rate of the Old Age Pensioners be increased.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, before we're asked to move this vote of non-concurrence, I would like to raise a point of order, and I am raising this point of order not because I'm not in sympathy with the objects of the honourable member's motion, but simply on account of the fact that this House has already passed the resolution on this particular point, and the resolution was passed on the 17th of March.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, an amended form of the motion presented by my honourable friend was given consideration and passed. I don't think that the subject matter that my honourable friend is raising can be construed as being a repetition of the amended motion that was passed by the House.

MR. ROBLIN: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I really can't follow the reasoning of the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party. I'm not anxious to prevent any amendment on this resolution because we expect them at this time of the year, but the original proposition, I believe, was submitted in the form of a motion by the Honourable Member for Inkster. It's true that particular proposition did not pass in the form that he moved it. It was then amended, but the subject matter was indeed the subject of a debate here and a decision reached. It wasn't the decision hoped for by the Honourable Member for Inkster, but nevertheless it was decided and the matter was dealt with, and I do agree with the Honourable Member for Selkirk that it would mean the revival of a debate already concluded, and I think that's the main thing at issue here, and perhaps if some other way, some other wording of this resolution could be found, some means could be sought of presenting the idea that my honourable friends have in mind — that it seems to me that the way they're doing it here they are indeed reviving a debate already concluded.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, there is a Biblical saying that not the words are important but the deed. Now we are dealing now with the Old Age Pensions

MR. SPEAKER: On this point of order first, are you speaking to the point of order?

MR. GRAY: I'm speaking to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Right.

MR. GRAY: I say that it's not the words but the deed. It's true that the resolution was defeated but at the same time the Old Age Pension estimates are under Resolution No. 51, and I hope that the House do not wish to take advantage of the wording. If I'm not in order on account of one or two words, the English language as such is flexible and it could be changed. I do want to make a statement on it.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): On a point of order here. This, as I caught this resolution, this is not basically correct. This is asking for an amendment suggesting that we petition the Federal Government for an increase, as the Honourable Member for Inkster says, in the basic pension. Well the way our resolution is being forwarded and passed in this House, such is the case in the case of need, and I want that made abundantly clear.

MR. ROBLIN: Speaking to the point of order, Sir, perhaps I can offer a suggestion that will be helpful. I continue to believe that the amendment proposed is out of order, but if my honourable friend wishes to make a statement on the subject, then I think it would be open for him to do so on the resolution itself. Let us not consider the amendment, because I believe that is to be out of order, but the honourable member could make the same statement exactly on the resolution that is before us, and if they wish, there could be a vote on that or if that is not desirable the statement would be on the record and we would know what his views were, so I think that would enable him to say what he wants.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may again, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable the First Minister has stated it pretty accurately. On reflection I can say too that the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk is a valid one. I'd suggest to my honourable colleague if he wishes to make a statement that he should do so. Of course we should not vote against the concurrence resolution because all of our amendments indicate acceptance of the resolutions except four.

MR. SPEAKER: It's quite apparent that the motion is not in order, and you also have the right to speak when they call the resolutions, so if you wish to speak now, you may.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, whether I submit the amendment or not, I don't think it will make any difference in this House. As long as they are a waste in the wilderness anyway and it

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) would be defeated as usual, the usual procedure which has been carried on for the last 20 years since I am in the House, in order to express a protest against certain resolutions passed by the administration in power, so I am not going to avail myself of this pleasure, because I know that I will not defeat the government on this issue and I do know that there are many members on the opposite side of this House who are in sympathy with the original resolution which I have made, but they are not going to change their mind now because this will be considered a vote of non confidence. I am not too anxious at the present time, Mr. Speaker, until the new labour party has been inaugurated and created, to defeat the present government, because I don't see any alternative now until such time as we have our convention, so even if you could defeat the government I'm not too anxious, because nobody else at the present moment could take your place, not because you are good, but because I feel that at the moment probably it would be the best diplomatic move.

What I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, is this. I remember coming into the House about 20 years ago and the pension then was \$20.00 a month; now it's \$55.00. At no time has any resolution on our part been passed, but I distinctly remember that when Mr. Garson was the Premier of this province and I suggested a \$5.00 increase, when it was only \$25.00 or \$30.00, he objected to it and the resolution was defeated, but two months later, actually two months later, the old age pensioners got another \$5.00 a month. I don't know on whose authority he granted it, but they did get it. The purpose of my resolution was that if they do not want to give me the pleasure, historic pleasure, of proving it, at least I want them to think about it, and perhaps before the next session comes up here they will suggest the very same thing that I have suggested today, namely, recommend to the Federal Government that in the opinion of this House, the opinion of the people of Manitoba, the opinion of the Government of Manitoba, that the old age pension should be increased. That's all I'm after. I didn't say let's go and give them \$75.00 a month now. I know it would be impossible. I know it would be financially impossible, but that's all that I wanted to do, and I hope that they will, before long -- I'll let them get all the credit they want, Mr. Speaker; I have never asked for credit. I have never -- I always pay cash, I never ask for credit. Let them have the credit as long as we get something, and there are many laws on the Statute Books in the Province of Manitoba that we haven't suggested that for years, and the government in power, whoever they may be, approved it -- "I supported it" or "I proposed it". Let them get the credit for it. We don't want the credit. I want \$5.00 a month more for the old age pensioners; that's all I want; let it come from wherever it may be. So I would respectfully suggest that irrespective of whether this amendment is in order or not, irrespective of whether I should get the approval of the House one way or the other or not, I am suggesting to the powers that be, to the administration, please do not side-track this resolution which we have submitted because it comes from us; do not ignore it; think of it; discuss it, and find out whether it is proper and right to make the basic rate of the old age pension instead of \$55.00 a month, \$75.00, and let me tell you something else, if they do it they'll save more than the \$20.00 a month; they'll save more by not having to pay from the so-called Social Allowance, because the average man is honest, the average pensioner is honest, and they will not ask for any more than they actually need to maintain themselves, and my final plea is, let's help the builders and the defenders of our country.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Inkster has re-opened the debate that I thought we had concluded during the passage of the resolution previously and estimates and so on. I just appeal to the Honourable Member from Inkster once more to look at the whole problem, going back for the past two and a half to three years. I am sure the Honourable Member from Inkster will agree that the province has moved further and faster than in any of the other previous 25 years that he sat in the House. Now I feel that the Honourable Member from Inkster should be very pleased with the accomplishments that have been made to date. I have tried over and over again to tell he and his colleagues the tremendous advantages of the present Social Allowances program as compared with programs where you give across-the-board allowances and do not necessarily meet need. I spent some time during estimates explaining to my honourable friend from Inkster the reason and the great benefits that can be brought, in terms of money and service, to these people. The Honourable Member from Inkster asked for many returns, as to numbers of people receiving care and attention. These have all been given to him. Now he is making a plea for a little more each year, and I think being in

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) the Opposition that should be his function; he should keep pressing us to do more and do more; that's his duty. But I do feel also that we should also have it on the record that since he brought in the resolution after my time as Minister of Health and Welfare and this government in office, that he has seen more activity, concern and action of a positive nature than he had ever seen in his previous time in this House. I think he's trying to say this. We are not saying that people are not going to be honest. This isn't part of it.

I know the Honourable Member from Inkster continually reiterates his statement that allowances and pensions should be across the board, elimination totally of means test, and so on; yet his party, and he and his colleagues, are the first to want the number of returns as to how many bursaries we are giving for social workers so they can go out and adequately measure need and do the job properly. Now, this spells of a little split personality in this sense. Now I know everyone in this House is concerned about the elderly fold. We heard the commissioner say this morning that the numbers of people in the older age groups, over 65, the number of people in our population, has increased from 31,000 in the '30's to over 81,000 people today. We all, without exception, realize that, or feel that the answer in the future is for federal authorities now to give every stimulus, and provincial governments, the people too, purchase contributory pension plans to provide for their later years. In the meantime we feel that we should do at the provincial level everything we can to meet need within our jurisdiction. We're going ahead on this philosophy. We have a good sound program. Alberta's copied it; Saskatchewan's copying it; British Columbia's copying it; Ontario will copy it; New Brunswick has put it through the books; Nova Scotia's got it on the statutes. We were first, and I think the Honourable Member from Inkster should join with us on this side of the House and in the Province of Manitoba, and express his great happiness in seeing that Manitoba was the first, and after all these years he's achieved his life-long ambition. Thank you.

MR. CLERK: Resolution 52; Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$185,000, Provincial Buildings and other Projects, Chargeable to Capital Division, Public Welfare.

Resolution 53 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$164,515. Administration.

Resolution 54 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$985,840. Forestry Branch - Administration, Mines and Natural Resources.

Resolution 55 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$224,550. Game Branch - Administration, Mines and Natural Resources.

Resolution 56 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$169,070. Fisheries Branch - Administration, Mines and Natural Resources.

Resolution 57 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$994,095. Field Operations, Mines and Natural Resources.

Resolution 58 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$216,575. Surveys Branch, Mines and Natural Resources.

Resolution 59 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$377,525. Mines Branch.

Resolution 60 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$234,275. Air Service, Mines and Natural Resources.

Resolution 61 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$149,750. Lands Branch, Mines and Natural Resources.

Resolution 62 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$17,830. Administration, Public Utilities.

Resolution 63 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$87,030. The Public Utilities Board, Public Utilities.

Resolution 64 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$21,845. Censor Board of Manitoba, Public Utilities.

Resolution 65 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$781,510. Motor Vehicle Branch, Public Utilities.

Resolution 66 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$740,940. Administration, Public Works.

Resolution 67 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,152,329. Operation and Maintenance of Government Buildings, Public Works.

(Mr. Clerk, cont'd.) . . .

Resolution 68 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,124,145. Highways, Planning, Design and Administration, Public Works.

Resolution 69 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,877,500. Highway Maintenance, Public Works.

Resolution 70 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$328,500. Provincial Buildings and other projects - Chargeable to Capital Division, Public Works.

Resolution 71 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$91,950. Administration, Municipal Affairs.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that while concurring in Resolution No. 71, this House views with alarm the deteriorating financial position of the municipalities and the ever increasing load on municipal taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say a few words on this matter, which to me is an important matter. I have analyzed the financial statistics presented to us the other day and to my mind it shows that the position is deteriorating. In 1958 there were 146 municipalities operating on a cash basis, and in 1959 only 105, a reduction of 41. The tax arrears are increased by three quarters of a million dollars in one year. The taxes imposed are increased by \$4,675,000 in one year, of course. The assessment has increased too, but as a percentage it is a great increase. But the final figure in these statistics that I have before me shows that the municipalities of this province have finished the year 1958, the last year available, having a deficit of \$2 1/2 million and I say that this is alarming, and I think that this motion should be passed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think we have threshed the straw to the point where it has now become dust, and all we're doing now is moving some of the dust around with some of the air that comes from our mouths in the Chamber. I do not, of course, share the rather gloomy outlook that my honourable friend from Carillon takes with respect to the municipalities of Manitoba. He is the one, not I, who said that figures don't lie, that sometimes liars figure and -- (Interjection) -- well that's the correct quotation. I don't know what my honourable friend said. -- (Interjection) -- And, of course, I'm not making any reference at all but I'm saying that you can make figures say practically anything you want. But I do say that these hard facts are proven from the summary of the statistics that were handed around at the time of the estimates, namely, tax collections, which is generally regarded as being a fair indicator of the financial health of our municipalities in Manitoba, financial collections for the year which we last have record, were the second largest of the ten-year period from 1950 to 1959. My honourable friend was concerned somewhat about arrears of taxes and so on, and I've already gone over this ground, I thought sufficiently, when we were in estimates on the Department of Municipal Affairs, pointing out to him that in ratio the proportion to the amount of taxation levied by the municipalities, that the ratio of arrears to amounts collected is actually lower now than it ever was during the period when my honourable friend graced the front benches of this government. So while we are not saying that we are complacent about the situation; while we are not saying that it is not a situation that requires, by any government, continuous watching, we are saying that the financial condition of the municipalities of Manitoba today is not one as would justify any support for the type of resolution that is brought forward by the Member for Carillon.

We know as well, as has been previously mentioned, that the rate of support by both direct and indirect grants from this government to the municipalities of Manitoba is higher now than ever before in the history of the province when one considers the grants, the tremendously increased grants that are being given in education and social welfare, municipal aid grants and aid for municipal roads, and so on through all of the departments where either directly or indirectly municipalities benefit from government service. We know this to be a fact, as does the Honourable Member from Carillon. And we know as well that municipal services are increasing, and I think that this is perhaps the point that he fails to comprehend or perhaps is blind to. But the municipalities today just as -- (Interjection) -- the people of Manitoba are demanding more service of their municipalities than was ever the case before. The people of

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) Manitoba are finding from their Provincial Government that service can be made available at the provincial level and I think they are now asking of their municipalities to give them greater service at the municipal level. And this is exactly what is happening. I don't think one has to be afraid about spending a little bit of money for waterworks improvement, for road improvement, for improvement of suburban or rural facilities, or amenities that are given to the public. And this is exactly what is being done throughout Manitoba. And if I may be so bold as to say so, I think that the Provincial Government is leading the way in this regard and showing the path to the municipalities that a stable financial condition can be maintained and progress achieved at a much greater rate than was ever the case when my honourable friend sat on this side of the House, than perhaps they ever dreamed. So now we see that the province is moving ahead, provincial level; the municipalities are moving ahead. They're spending a bit more money, yes, but the people of Manitoba, by and large, I suggest are satisfied. They're happy that they're now getting progressive government, particularly at the provincial level, and they're happy to see that the municipalities are trying to emulate what is being done at this level.

MR. PREFONTAINE: the Minister two questions. . . . The first one is: what about the \$2 1/2 million of cash deficit at the end of the year; and the second question, will he ask his Leader how he was critical in the old days of the rising debt of the municipality under the old regime?

MR. LYON: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the questions of my honourable friend, that my Leader, the First Minister in this House, had ample reason to be critical of my honourable friends opposite when they were over here about the rising municipal debt, because my honourable friends opposite were doing nothing about that debt. In the three years that we have been in government, use education as one example alone. The estimates have increased something like two-fold in the past two years. They were \$12 million one year, within the last four years. Now they're up to \$33 million. And this is money which is all going back into the municipalities where formerly the municipal taxpayer was paying for generally what was regarded as a substandard form of education that they were getting from my honourable friends opposite. Well now they're getting a better and a finer standard of education than was ever the case before, and it costs money, and this government has had to pour in millions, literally millions of dollars more, as my honourable friend well knows because he's voted for every nickel of it, to assist the municipalities to bring their standards of education, for one example alone, to bring their standards of education up to what the progressive-thinking people of Manitoba in 1960 or 1961 think is desirable for a province at this particular period of its development. So we are not concerned about any remarks that might have been made by the Honourable the First Minister when he was in Opposition, because as in all cases, if he made criticism it was justified criticism, and in all cases when he came into power he did something about the criticism that he formerly levelled.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George) the Minister. He said that the present government had increased grants to the municipalities, mentioned education -- which I'll agree. But in what other fashion other than education is this government helping the municipalities, other than the way the previous government did?

MR. LYON: Now, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has been sitting in this House a bit longer than I have, but he's been sitting here all the time that I have while I've been on this side of the House. He has heard the increased grants to municipalities for road construction announced by the Minister of Public Works here some two, two and a half, or three years ago. He has heard about the Social Allowances Act of my friend the Minister of Health. He has heard about all of these things, I would trust. He must know that further money is accruing than was ever the case before. I don't have the exact figures in front of me to show just how much more is going to municipalities in terms of road grants, but we know, having just passed the estimates of my friend the Minister of Public Works, that the expenditures in that department are larger than ever before and that roads are being built with these increased grants. Snowplowing grants are increased. We've got grants for school van routes that my honourable friends opposite never even thought of -- (Interjection) -- Bridges, access roads; you name it, and there has been an increase in the grant to the municipalities. So I merely ask my honourable friend in what particular jungle he has been wandering while the rest of us have been doing this work and getting on with the business of Manitoba?

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say very much. I'm not going to be very long. I'm a little surprised at the phrase which the Honourable Minister used a moment ago. I yield to no one in my admiration of the ability of the First Minister, but I thought that the First Minister was a human being like everybody here. I just heard the Minister in replying -- (Interjection) -- beg pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: I want to confirm that statement.

MR. ORLIKOW: All right. I just heard the Minister say in answer to the question, that in all cases when the Honourable the First Minister was in the Opposition he was right, and in all cases since he has been the First Minister he is right. And I want to suggest that no human being can always be right. So I think that the Minister ran a little ahead of himself. Mr. Speaker, I just want to put in the record something which I have said on other occasions. No one will question the fact that this government has increased the amounts of money which are being spent by the Provincial Government in various fields. At the same time I want to tell the Minister who just made the reply that it's pretty cold comfort to the people of the urban areas. Today's newspaper carries the report that the mill rate in the City of East Kildonan was increased yesterday by seven mills. Last week the members from Winnipeg of this House had lunch at the invitation of the Winnipeg School Board and the Finance Committee of the City Council, and we were told that the mill rate was going up seven mills

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): All for education.

MR. ORLIKOW: Oh, I'm not saying all for education -- I'm not saying that for a moment. The Members for St. James, the two members who come from St. James will know better than I do how much the increase in the mill rate is in St. James. And I suppose that the Minister who comes from Fort Garry will find that this year the mill rate in Fort Garry will go up. So that while no one would question the fact that the government has increased, and increased substantially -- and we certainly in this group have no objection to the increases which have been made -- the fact, the record speaks for itself. As far as the local taxpayer is concerned, the mill rate has gone up this year, went up last year, and I want to predict -- and you can call me a prophet of gloom or whatever you want to -- but that next year the mill rate, and largely for education, Mr. Minister of Education, the mill rate in the municipalities will be up. And I for one -- the First Minister is the Provincial Treasurer and he has the technical staff and maybe they can calculate when this increase will stop, but I don't think it will be in the time that the members here are here, certainly not before the next election that the mill rate and the taxes on the local taxpayer in the municipalities, in the urban areas at least -- and this is true, not only of Greater Winnipeg; I am sure the same is true of Brandon, of Portage, of Flin Flon, of The Pas -- these are going up and will continue to go up, and this is a fact.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion defeated.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Carillon, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, which reads as follows: That while concurring in Resolution No. 71, this House views with alarm the deteriorating financial position of the municipalities and the ever increasing load on municipal taxpayers.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Bazley, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Watt, Weir and Witney, and Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. SPEAKER: Yeas: 20; Nays: 33. I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: Resolution 72 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$83,725. Municipal Board, Municipal Affairs.

Resolution 73 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$14,945. Local Government Districts, Municipal Affairs.

(Mr. Clerk, cont'd.)

Resolution 74 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$125,365. Municipal Assessments, Municipal Affairs.

Resolution 75 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$112,535. Administration, Labour.

Resolution 76 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$155,065. Mechanical and Engineering Division, Labour.

Resolution 77 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$144,575. Employment Standards Division, Labour.

Resolution 78 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$37,638. Apprenticeship Training Division, Labour.

Resolution 79 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$289,485. Labour Relations Division, Labour.

Resolution 80 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$136,655. Administration, Industry and Commerce.

Resolution 81 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$105,320. Industrial Development Branch, Industry and Commerce.

Resolution 82 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$178,200. Regional Development Branch.

Resolution 83 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$126,880. Information Services Branch, Industry and Commerce.

Resolution 84 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$24,675. Office of Agent-General, Industry and Commerce.

Resolution 85 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$336,555. Travel and Publicity Branch, Industry and Commerce.

Resolution 86 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$43,148. Civil Defence, Industry and Commerce.

Resolution 87 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$73,880. Manitoba Development Authority, Industry and Commerce.

Resolution 88 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$213,000. Manitoba Development Fund, Industry and Commerce.

Resolution 89 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$650,000. Salary Increases.

Capital, 1 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum for Capital Expenditures \$12,050,000, for Utilities required. 2 - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for Capital Expenditures a sum of \$23,850,000.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that while concurring in certain items of this resolution, in B (3), the House regrets that with respect to flood control on the Red River, a navigable river, approximately 80 percent of whose flood waters originate outside the boundaries of Manitoba, the government on March 18th, 1959, committed this province to huge expenditures of money towards a project about which it evidently had no prior official consultation with the Federal Government, as to whether the Federal Government - (a) agreed that the project was economically sound, and (b) that it should be willing to pay 75 percent of the costs, a share established by precedence in similar projects, and further, this House regrets that after two years of supposedly active negotiations with the Federal Government since this province has been committed to the project, this government has not yet been able to show definite proof that the Federal Government considers the project economically sound and that it is willing to pay 75 percent of the cost.

MR. ROBLIN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the mover would do us the courtesy of supplying us with a copy of this rather involved resolution so that we may ascertain its significance, if any.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, I had to add to this, Schedule B, Section (3) because I thought each vote would be taken separately, but I see that we are voting on the full \$23 million at the same time.

MR. SPEAKER: I expect this is in order.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, I have spoken often about this flood project in this session already, I do not want to be too long. The resolution has been moved in order to point out that this is a navigable river and that about 80 percent of the floodwaters in this river originate outside the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba. This goes to point out that the Federal Government has a responsibility with respect to this water and that to my mind, the Federal Government should have been consulted fully about such an important project which tied them in before the announcement was made by the Province of Manitoba. In this motion you have noticed that the motion states that evidently there had been no prior official consultation with the Federal Government on these two problems: whether the Federal Government agreed that the project was economically sound and that it was willing to pay 75 percent. And in order to prove this point, Mr. Speaker, which to me is a very important point, that the Federal Government was not consulted with respect to this scheme before the announcement was made, I would like to quote from Hansard of March 13, 1961, from a speech by the Minister of Agriculture. Quote from page 788: "The economic report of the Royal Commission on Flood Cost Benefits which recommended construction of a floodway, was received by the government on February 9, 1959. On February 27, 1959, Manitoba presented the Federal Government an outline of its flood control policy particularly in respect of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway and requested assistance, financial assistance towards the cost of undertaking such a major program".

Mr. Chairman, between February 9th and February 27th, we have no record of any visit made to Ottawa by the government; in fact no such statement was made at any time. No statement was made by the First Minister when he made his flood statement in the House on March 18, 1958, that there had been consultation with respect to the principle of the project. I have reread all the speeches made by the First Minister and the Minister of Agriculture since that time and in none of these speeches we can see a quotation to the effect that the Federal Government agrees with the principle of the project. Now we know that the Federal Government has passed a token vote that it would contribute something to this project. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this is no definite proof that they agree that it is economically sound. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when the First Minister of this province made this statement in March 1959, that it was a surprise to the Federal Government that had not been consulted on the project itself, and that by that announcement the Provincial Government was dragging into this project the Federal Government prior to having had with that government any consultation on the principle of the project, and I say that this is wrong.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Government has been dragging their feet on this project. It's two years now; we haven't had a statement in this House that they agree with the project except coming in to help to a certain extent. They've been forced to come in. Is it conceivable, Mr. Speaker, that the teacher would let his pupil down and not come in to rescue him to a certain extent after he has made this premature statement in March 1959. It's not conceivable, even if his colleagues in the Federal Cabinet do not agree that this is economically sound, they will come in to the rescue and help the First Minister of this province. To what extent I do not know, but they will come in and bail him out some day with some sums of money to rescue him from the predicament that he is in and the stronger we can talk on this side of the House and bring the pressure the more likelihood there will be that we will get more for Manitoba. Now the First Minister has stated -- (Interjection) -- now they may laugh it off. I know very well they can laugh when they have no argument, and they can insult too -- they're pretty smart at that in insulting members of this side -- and funnily the press seem to report any insults as good newsworthy material but this is no proof that there is a good argument behind laughs and insults. Certainly not.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, that I expect that the more pressure we put and the more publicity we make about the matter the better is the chance that the Federal Government -- "Dief will come to the rescue of Duff" with more and more money, even though it might be against his better judgment. The fact that we have had no tabling of correspondence in this House is to me an indication that there is something indicative of the fact that the Federal Government is not too anxious to come in. Let us put ourselves in the shoes of Mr. Diefenbaker in Ottawa and his Cabinet Ministers. The Federal Government has spent \$5 million already on diking around Winnipeg. They know very well we have the perimeter road and that it can be raised very easily and it can protect the City of Winnipeg

MR. LYON: Will the Honourable Member permit a question...?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Not now, after I'm through speaking. No, no, not now. After I'm through speaking. -- (Interjection) -- You're much better than I am with your tongue Sir. Would you just excuse me if I don't agree right now.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Federal Government, if I were in their shoes, I would say, "Well we came in with 75 percent during the time of the '50 flood; if there's another flood we'll come in and we'll help you. We have paid 75 percent of the diking system; we have fulfilled our obligation and a future flood is somewhat in the future. It may be very problematical whether we'll have another one or not, and there are those who predict we'll never have again an 1826 flood -- if the figures of the 1826 flood are right, nobody knows. It's quite an extensive guess-work. But again, if I were in Mr. Diefenbaker's shoes, and maybe if the Honourable the First Minister were in Mr. Diefenbaker's shoes -- maybe he'll be there someday, I don't know, apparently he's looking towards that part of Canada - but certainly the first reaction in Ottawa would be, "Well we will come to your rescue when the time comes." This to us, seems a very costly project, possibly not necessary and it might be that they have agreed with Ottawa with the minority report. Let us not forget that there is a minority report that has been tabled by no person no other than Mr. McDowell who has lived on these rivers all his life and has studied as thoroughly as the other four members. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that I do believe that Mr. Diefenbaker will come to the rescue of his colleague, if I can call him that, here in Manitoba -- of his pupil. And I say that will be a good day because we are pledged now. We are stuck with this project. Even if they don't like the principle of it in Ottawa we, we are tied -- the government has declared itself two years ago and they are now purchasing property and it's bound to come. I suppose that we can't stop it even if we could. Mr. Chairman, the best that we can do is to try and get and put enough pressure and have enough publicity that we can get more money for Manitoba. The First Minister told us the other day that the taxpayer is one indivisible. It doesn't matter who pays. To me Sir, it matters very much who pays; whether this is going to be spread all over Canada or whether we're going to pay it all ourselves. I'm sure that if the First Minister on March 18, 1959, had seen Mr. St. Laurent in Ottawa that he would not have made the statement, "We'll do it alone if necessary." But he knew very well that Mr. Diefenbaker being there that he would not -- Mr. Diefenbaker would certainly rescue him, help him and come out with some assistance.

Now I think that this resolution is a most important one. I think that it declares the policy of some of us at least, although as far as I'm concerned I'm not sure that the old program should have been gone through. I believe Mr. Speaker, that the economic advisors of the Federal Government are not convinced and we have had a statement from the First Minister last year that there were a few more details to iron out and that the policy, the contribution or the part paid by Ottawa will be published, finalized. Well Mr. Speaker, are we so naive to believe that for a year now they've been discussing details, a few details to iron out. No Sir, Mr. Speaker, it's the main question of the percentage that's holding up an announcement. Certainly it's not a matter of detail; I am as sure as I am standing here that if the First Minister had in his bag a promise of 75 percent, even if a few details were not included, that he would have announced it last year and he would have announced it this year. I'm sure that it is the main decision that is still not made. He has stated that it would be made on the basis of facts, technical information, and then he goes along and tells us, "Well, have patience with me, I want to make the best possible deal with Ottawa, even if it means waiting more and more, maybe a year, I'll get a little better deal." He's a dealer but he has lost his bargaining power by making this famous announcement. He would have lost it with anybody else but Mr. Diefenbaker at any rate. So Mr. Speaker, I think that this is an important matter for the people of Manitoba. Very important. It is very important that we should get 75 percent. We cannot hope for more. I say we have precedence in order to insist on getting 75 percent, and I say that there would not have been such a protracted answer from Ottawa if Ottawa were sure that the project was economically sound, because there was no such protracted -- it was mentioned at different times in other provinces, and we have three precedents to show that on a matter of this kind Ottawa should pay 75 percent. We have our own situation in Manitoba in 1950 and '51 with respect to our present dikes; we have the South Saskatchewan River Dam, it was mentioned by the First Minister himself as a precedent, and we have the Fraser River Valley diking system which is

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) another precedent. So I say that if the project is so sound, and if the financial advisors of the Federal Government are satisfied that this is sound financially, that they should have come out much sooner with an announcement and that we should expect this at any time.

As far as I'm concerned, I repeat that I believe that the recommendation of the majority in the commission do not stand up wholly. If the Federal Government had been willing to come openly right at the start in order to assure that they would contribute 75 percent that would have affected my judgment very, very much so, because these men would not over there, be influenced by local politics. The Cabinet is composed of men from different parts of Canada; they would not be moved by political considerations as the possibilities are with our own Cabinet Ministers in Manitoba, because they are so close and so personally involved in their constituencies surrounding Winnipeg. But if the Federal Government had jumped in immediately and come in -- and they might have come in if they had been consulted, but I maintain that they had not been consulted on the principle before the announcement was made. So I have spoken too long before and maybe too long now, and Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your kind patience.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I think that I should say a few words in connection with the Honourable Member from Carillon's opposition to the building of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway because despite all of the words in his resolution it all boils down to his personal opposition to the building of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. Now the honourable member's attitude in this respect certainly surprises me, and the other night when he spoke on this subject what he said certainly was a great disappointment to me. I can remember when I was a member of the Municipal Council in St. Vital, he at that time was the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the province, and I regarded him very highly and I can remember many pleasant times with him at Municipal Conventions. He was a sort of a father you might say of a lot of us budding young politicians that were on the Municipal Councils during those years. What I heard from the honourable member last night was very disappointing because it shows, I think, how badly he has slipped since the years when I regarded him so highly. My hero, so to speak, of days gone by has slipped pretty badly. He tried to build a case the other night on the government having promised during the 1958 election campaign the building of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway, which is ridiculous. He is indeed -- as the Minister of Agriculture stated -- a master at taking things out of context.

He read, the other evening, from a speech that I made on April 3rd, 1961, in which he quotes me as follows: -- (Interjection) -- 1961, I'm sorry. Now these are the words of the honourable member. "But Mr. Chairman, we know that this government had in the election of 1958 come out favouring the floodway around Winnipeg." Well I say that they didn't come out in 1958 favouring a floodway around Winnipeg. Then he goes on and he says: "Remember this was said in March of 1959 in the last election campaign. That's in 1958. Much was said about flood control and it was the policy of our party, and we put it in our literature;" he's quoting me now, "It was one of the planks of my platform so to speak, that the Conservative Party was prepared if given the opportunity to take office to take action on flood control." That is right; they were prepared to take action on flood control. Then he goes on to quote me again: "We made this promise and this government has kept its promise within a very short time of its assuming office." Well the government did keep its promise to take action on flood control. Then further on, and these are his words now: "And here's the Member for St. Vital telling us that in 1959 that eight or ten months previously the government had pledged itself to adopting this policy of a floodway around Winnipeg." Well again I say the government did not during the election campaign of 1958 adopt a policy of a floodway around Greater Winnipeg and I'd like to prove that. First of all by reading from one of my own election pamphlets in which I said: "A yes or no answer on flood control and a government policy that will relieve the present insecurity of this whole constituency that has been and can be again subjected to disastrous flooding." No mention of a floodway here. And then from a pamphlet that was issued by the Conservative Party during that election campaign: "Manitoba need not live in the shadow of a flood menace. In the face of the pennywise dollar foolish attitude of the present government we have consistently urged immediate action to protect the homes and livelihood of Manitobans against the ever present dangers of floods. When elected a Progressive Conservative Government will do all in its power to provide adequate safeguards against this hazard." No mention in this about

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. -- (Interjection) -- Adequate safeguards. There were all kinds mentioned in the reports that were submitted to the honourable members when they were in the government. And then from a speech of mine that was made during that same campaign: "The people of this area are entitled to a yes or no answer on flood control. If the answer is yes, something can be done; then let us get on with the job. If the answer is no, nothing can be done within the economic means of the province, then let the government make a definite statement to this effect and let the people know where they stand." So that there is no mention in any of my statements, or statements of the Conservative Party during the election campaign of 1958 of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. The floodway then was not a policy of the government as such at that time and wasn't until after the report of the cost-benefit study was made. This was the red book that the honourable member quoted from the other evening. This book, I think, makes a strong case for a floodway; and it makes a strong case for the cost-benefit ratio of three to one. He no doubt noted when he was reading this report of the Flood Cost Benefit Committee that they went to a great deal of pains to determine what the economic damage would be from various levels of future floods.

The floodway should be proceeded with, and it should be proceeded with at all possible speed. We should remember that we're working against time and that the next flood could be next year. Serious flooding in the Winnipeg area could have, as it did in 1950, serious economic effect on the balance of the province. So that in connection with the floodway I would like to sum up my attitude this way: "Off with the heads of those that are opposing the floodway, and on with the job."

..... Continued next page.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a few words. The Honourable Member for Carillon has charged the government with rushing into this matter without making sufficient study of it, without sufficient consultation with the Federal Government; but I think probably the most illuminating statement that he has made, both for himself and his party, is that he waited two years -- he waited two years before he bothered to read the report himself. Then he came to this House, Mr. Speaker, and he told us that it was worthwhile reading. Well the Government of this Province found out two years ago that it was worthwhile reading this report. How any of us, how anyone would be so naive in their approach to this problem as to not even bother to read the report; and then be so naive as to come into this House and admit it, to this Assembly and to the people of the Province of Manitoba, that their interest in this matter was so superficial -- so superficial -- their interest in the welfare of the people of this province so superficial that they didn't even bother to read a report for two years after it was laid before the House of Manitoba. This is the nub of their whole attitude. This is the best -- (Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker, I don't offer any privileges to the opposition that they don't offer to us. He says we're good at insults over here. We're good at insults. Mr. Speaker, I bow, I bow to the Honourable Members of the Opposition when it comes to insults. I am but the pupil to the teacher. I am but the pupil to the teacher. We have much to learn. We have much to learn. We're in the kindergarten on this.

He makes the point here again that some predict that there will never be another flood of the 1826 proportions. I don't know who his authorities are, but any literature written on this subject by people who are supposed to know something about it have indicated that chances are that you will have a flood of equal proportion. There is no guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that you won't have a flood of greater proportion. -- (Interjection) -- Well, 460 -- but the thing is, which year is it going to be? Which year is it going to be? There are no regularities in weather. Now according to authorities that I have read on this subject, what they say is this, that if you take the largest flood that you have had in history that's recorded, although there is no guarantee whatsoever, it is likely that if it is exceeded it will be exceeded by 15 or 20 percent. I think it's 10 to 20 percent. But these, of course, are just pessimists. Floods take place because of a coincidence of factors, and these factors are in the hands of Providence and not in the hands of men. How any man can stand up in a Legislature as a representative of the people and suggest that they or we together should offer to the people, or suggest to the people, that we can in any way guarantee them against disastrous losses, is beyond my comprehension. It's just beyond my comprehension.

The record shows, Mr. Speaker, that there has been the closest collaboration between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government on the procedures to be followed; that we have sought the approval of the Federal Government in every respect in proceeding with the floodway. Now this gives the lie to the contention of the Honourable Member for Carillon that the Federal Government is being dragged into this. I suggest to the Honourable Member for Carillon that we have today in Canada a Federal Government with its eyes open; a Federal Government who are governing this country in the best interests of all the people of this country; and they are not so asleep, or so immune, or so callous and indifferent to the welfare of the people in this country that they were unable or unwilling to accept the report of a Commission of the stature of the Manning Commission on Flood Cost Benefit. Why don't they come out? It doesn't suit the Honourable Member for Carillon, Mr. Speaker, that they haven't given their answer yet, and he's making a great deal over this one little point. Well what does it really matter, Mr. Speaker, what they are waiting for as long as negotiations are continuing satisfactorily and as long as the building of the floodway is proceeding satisfactorily.

He is just trying to make a point for political purposes, Mr. Speaker, and in so doing he has dug himself a hole, using a torrent of words; and words erode just the same as water. Mr. Speaker have you ever -- I know many of us have watched a torrent of water and the way it will erode. It'll erode the earth; it'll erode granite if you keep up long enough. Maybe this is the principle he is invoking here. Through this torrent of words on the floodway he has eroded his own position, his own position with the people of Manitoba; because it isn't the government of this province that wants the floodway, it's the people of Manitoba that want the floodway. They want the floodway. The people -- the Honourable Member for St. George can sit there and nod his head, but you know, Mr. Speaker, if there was one man in Manitoba that was

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)....thankful for the Fairford River works, it was the Honourable Member for St. George; and for once in his life, for once in his life he was so carried away with his enthusiasm that he called me and thanked me. He called me and thanked me because the people in his area had been trying to get this for 40 years -- 40 years -- 40 years. A former member of that area told me he'd been working -- and he happened to be a member of your party -- he had worked right within the government caucus and he had worked for many a year-- and he told me it was 40 years since he had begun to work on this and he couldn't get anywhere-- he couldn't get anywhere -- he couldn't get anywhere until this government came along. Now the reason that this work was undertaken on Fairford to give water control on Lake Manitoba was on the basis of a cost-benefit study. It was on the basis of a cost-benefit study that we were able to justify carrying out these works and able to convince the Federal Government to contribute towards these works. It was because in three years around Lake Manitoba, in three consecutive years the agricultural losses amounted to \$1,500,000 -- in just three years -- and we showed them that these works could be completed for something between \$500,000 and \$600,000 and certainly it was justified. It was fine for those people, because the Honourable Member for St. George represents them.

What about the people along the Assiniboine? Aren't they entitled to flood protection? When you say that we shouldn't proceed with the Greater Winnipeg floodway, should we not proceed with any of this? Are you willing to go to the people of Manitoba and say it's all a costly business; it'll cost tens of millions of dollars to carry out flood protection, flood control, water control on the Assiniboine. Are you prepared there to tell these people? Go out and tell them. I challenge you to go out and tell them that they're not worth saving. That's what you're saying. Tell them that they're not worth saving, that it's a waste of money and that unless somebody else in Canada will come to their assistance, the people of Manitoba will not. That's what you are arguing. That's what the Honourable Member for Carillon is arguing, that the people of Manitoba should not assist themselves, it's up to the people in other parts of Canada. Do you remember the story about the larks who had her babies in the field and she heard that the farmers -- the young birds heard that the farmer was going to get his neighbours to come in and cut the crops and they told the mother lark. She assured them that there was nothing to worry about, but when the young birds heard that the farmer himself was going to cut the crops, it was time to get busy. Well the same thing applies here. If the people of Manitoba aren't interested, what a ridiculous -- what a bunch of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, that unless the people of Canada are willing to come to our rescue, we shouldn't be prepared to do anything.

I suppose I could talk here, Mr. Speaker, for the next hour if they would let me, but it wouldn't penetrate; it wouldn't make a bit of difference. But the fact of the matter is that this government has undertaken to do something about the water resources of this province; has undertaken a program of water control, flood control, water conservation. It's going to cost a lot of money, nobody denies that, but on the basis of extensive studies by competent people, it can be established that for every dollar we put into this we'll get between two and a half and three dollars out of it. I'm speaking of all the projects, and I want to remind the Honourable Member for Carillon that of all the projects in Manitoba, the benefits from the Greater Winnipeg floodway are the highest. Of all the projects -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that's a good one. Thanks for reminding me about the Seine River. You know there was quite a large project in Manitoba known as the Seine River diversion, and the government of the day, which isn't the present government, wanted to get some protection for the people in this area and they couldn't get the Federal Government of the day to go along with them and see eye to eye with them. So for some reasons which aren't quite clear maybe, they decided to proceed, run straight ahead, move straight ahead and undertake this work. This all happened -- let's see no, 1957 -- yes I think the work started in 1958 on this project. Let's see -- '58, '59, '60 -- that's right. It started in the year 1958. I'm not going to make any charges on this, I'm just stating facts. It was supposed to cost, I think the estimated cost was about \$1.7 million. It didn't cost that much because something happened in 1958, there was a change in the administration. For some reason or other we got this job done, and I think it will cost in the neighbourhood of \$1.2 million. But at an estimated cost of \$1.7 million they went right ahead with it. They didn't bother to wait and get Ottawa's concurrence and approval, and do you know we've never been able to collect -- we've never been able to collect a five cent piece; not a plugged nickel. We couldn't

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.).....get a nickel on it. We couldn't get a nickel on this, and do you know, if we had gotten the Federal Government to share these costs, it would have saved the Provincial Government something like \$600,000. We tried.....

MR. PREFONTAINE:kindly keep the speaker to the point.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier here on debate on this subject earlier, said it all depends on whose office is being gored. This remark is most appropriate at this time. If we were to follow, and I said this before in the debate on this subject, woe be to the people of Manitoba if we had followed the example of the previous administration in our policies, in carrying out our policies, because that was a big loss and we felt badly about losing \$600,000. After all, it just meant that the taxpayers of this province had to pay more. That's what it meant and it meant that the Province of Manitoba had to find a half a million or \$600,000 which could have been used in some other program for the benefit of these people that went into there because we hadn't made adequate provision and gotten a thorough understanding with the Federal Government on this program before we went ahead with it. Of course the present administration cannot take any responsibility for that because the commitment had been made and it had just gone too far by the time that this present administration took over at the end of June in 1958. But I want to sum up. We have a total program for Manitoba and there's no use hitting at the floodway and saying that this shouldn't be built. You've got to advocate that none of this should be done.

At the present time we have a group of people in south central Manitoba who have a very keen interest, more than a keen interest, they've got a stake in the future of the development of the Pembina River, and from preliminary studies -- (Interjection) -- this is part of the total picture. It isn't the way you wanted to do it, but we don't do the things the way you want to do them. This is related to the floodway. It's all part of the floodway. We're talking about water control and flood control in Manitoba -- (Interjection) -- Sure, the Pembina flows into the Red. I have to take it for granted that he does know something about flood control. This is going to be a very costly project. There's no doubt about it, even the preliminary investigations that have been carried out indicate that it's going to be a costly project, but it is an investment in the Province of Manitoba. It's critical and crucial to the welfare of the people down in that area and we have people along the Assiniboine who want flood protection. We have people along the Assiniboine who want water conservation. We have programs, other programs throughout the Province of Manitoba that are all related to this overall problem that we have to solve, and there's no use attacking the floodway and saying that it isn't a good paying proposition. The best authorities, the best brains, the best trained men that your government could lay their hands on -- the best trained men that your government could lay their hands on studies this problem and this is what they came up with. These are the recommendations that they made. It wasn't our commission, it was your commission -- (Interjection) -- Never mind about Jack McDowell. This is a principle. I'll talk about Jack McDowell; I'll talk about him because I know what he thinks about this. It's all a question of how much protection that you want to give to the area. If you're willing to give protection up to say a 1950 flood, then you can dredge the river -- then you can dredge the river. If you want to just give 1950 flood protection you can put up your sand bags and take a chance that they won't wear away. It's a question of how much protection you want to give.

Now this government has said that we want to give a level of protection against 169 cubic foot flow in the Red River, and if you're going to do that you'll have to build a floodway. Some people say -- (Interjection) -- the perimeter road won't give you protection. It will, according to the engineer from the constituency of Carillon, but according to the authoritative sources it won't. According to the authoritative sources it won't. But the point hinges on this: How much protection are you going to give? If you read that report, and I think you should read it again -- we've been reading it over here for two years; you have read it for a week. You have read it for a week, and maybe you should read it again. The whole argument hinges on this: How much protection are you going to give to the people of Greater Winnipeg? If you're going to give them something worthwhile, you have to go to the floodway. This is what the Commission said. They said if you want to dredge the river through Greater Winnipeg and give them the same protection as the floodway, it will cost you twice as much. It will cost you \$122 million instead of 64 - 65 million. This is the argument, and this is where it all hinges -- the

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.).....argument that we're having. We say on this side of the House we want to give adequate, substantial protection to the City of Winnipeg and you advocate that we should give them the protection of 1950. Well the footwear of the day, the footwear of the day in 1950 was a high-topped boot. Now is that what the people of Greater Winnipeg are supposed to expect whenever there's high water on the Red, that they revert to the high-topped boot? This is what you're advocating.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that the Honourable Member for Carillon is two years late in getting into this matter. He should have started to read and he should have started to show some concern two years ago. He is just two years late. He's missed the boat on this, Mr. Speaker. He's missed the boat. He's two years late and he's made it absolutely obvious to everybody that he has nothing more than a superficial interest in it. He didn't even bother to read the report -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, there was. There was a report available for two years which you didn't take the trouble to read. Mr. Speaker, I must reject this resolution. I must reject this resolution on the basis of fact, the very fact that there has been this close association and close collaboration between the Federal and Provincial Governments on the construction and the planning and moving forward to construction. I must reject his argument that unless the Federal Government is willing to contribute 75 percent we shouldn't go ahead with it. I think his argument is not in the best interests of Manitoba. Every one of us over here wants to get every dollar out of Ottawa that we can on this project, but the argument that the honourable member uses, that unless the people of Canada pay for this thing it doesn't pay the people of Manitoba to go ahead with it, just won't hold water. It's just not sound. It's ridiculous. It's nonsense. It's typical of the arguments that are being put forward by the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at this Session.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture has just spoken for a couple of minutes as usual. He talks about the wonderful government in Ottawa with their eyes open. They're not worried about the deal on the Floodway. What about the Fairford Dam last year after the tenders closed? He didn't dare issue a contract. Why? Because he was afraid if they issued the contract before he got a deal with Ottawa they wouldn't participate to one cent, and he knows this is a fact. He talks about that we're opposing all the floodway programs in the province. This is nonsense. We oppose the floodway -- I do at least, because the floodway around Winnipeg is not practical. I don't oppose water conservation around the Pembina or the Assiniboine because those projects are far more economical and they are much more worthwhile, but the floodway around Winnipeg is not. He knows it and nobody is more concerned than the government today, but they're stuck and they don't know how to get out of it. He can laugh and snicker, but he knows full well that today the people of Manitoba are not very happy with the way the Roblin Government is handling the finances of this province. Just the other day a very prominent citizen of this city, whose first remarks were: "I'm a Conservative, but I'll never support them as long as that Roblin's running them and gone money crazy."

He talks about the three to one benefit that Winnipeg's going to get from the floodway. Where did he get this? -- (Interjection) -- I've read the report. You hadn't read the report until this House opened and you know it. He talks about, well we're going ahead with the floodway because the Royal Commission recommended it. We had a Commission which recommended that margarine be colored. I don't agree with that Commission nor does he, so why should we take stock in that report? We had a report on education that this government hasn't seen fit to say yes or no whether they agree with it. But this one, we have a report on the floodway which is a minority report, and "oh yes it's fine, we'll accept it." -- (Interjections) -- The floodway was a minority report. The First Minister told me earlier in the debate that he had discussed the floodway with Mr. Jack McDowell who presented it. I contacted Mr. McDowell and asked him about this, whether he had discussed this floodway with the First Minister. He advised me he had no recollection of ever discussing it with him.

MR. ROBLIN: I have.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I wasn't there. I'm just telling what the gentleman told me. He talked about the three to one. I challenge him to show me. Just because an economist pulls a figure out of the air, they're going to accept it. You can get 20 economists and none of them will agree. The floodways in Manitoba they said would cost 1.6 million, and the flood damage, the cost of preparing the diversion was roughly half a million, but here you're going to involve

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.)....the province in a project which may reach \$300 million. Oh, the Minister of Agriculture talks about 64 maybe 100 million. He talks about people being naive. What about the interest rate that they're going to pay over the next 50 years on this project? He forgets to tell the people about that. He talks about the inconvenience of people that might be flooded. What about all the people you're inconveniencing out around Winnipeg whose homes you're destroying with this floodway? -- (Interjections)-- You may think so. I said earlier in this debate I'm opposed to the floodway. I'm still opposed to it and the people of Manitoba are opposed to it. The First Minister said, "Take it to the people of Manitoba." I challenge him here and now to go to the people of Manitoba on the floodway around Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item, I frankly cannot sit here and listen to what the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture had to say on the issue without saying something. He has brought into this matter a whole lot of factors that are not in the least bit involved with the resolution that was presented here this afternoon. He has dragged in virtually every aspect of his agricultural program. Just about everything that he could on water conservation all over the province. He did his very best -- he loves making speeches in this House. It seems that the longer the speech he can make, the better the cause he is presenting in his opinion. Well now, I don't think I can be accused of making long speeches in this House. I certainly don't think that is the case. If my honourable friends feel that if the hat fits him he can accept it, but in this case he has brought in all the matters of water conservation, the Fairford Dam, the Assiniboine and all the rest. They have nothing to do with the resolution that was presented. The resolution that was presented speaks strictly of one matter -- the Red River Floodway. That's all that that resolution talks about. I intend to support the resolution that's presented. That doesn't mean, as he's trying to pretend, that I'm not in favour of some works on the Assiniboine; some works on Lake Manitoba. When he says that because we're opposing one aspect under the present circumstances we're opposing all the rest of it, he is just dragging in a red herring and he knows it. Nothing else.

When he says that the project is good -- I'm quite prepared to admit that the Royal Commission, four members of the Royal Commission recommends the project. That's true. No doubt about it, but I'm suggesting to him that unless we do get a substantial amount of federal money in this, that I think it is not necessarily wise for the Province of Manitoba to proceed with it. It's desirable, true, but there are many things that are desirable and we can't always afford them. There are many things that should be done in the Province of Manitoba but we can't do them all overnight. We have to proceed on a business-like basis and I submit that's how he operates on his own farm. I don't doubt that there are many projects on his farm that should be proceeded with, but he can't do them overnight, and the same thing applies to us in the Province of Manitoba. In this case there is certainly, in my opinion, no reason for the Federal Government not to be contributing up to 75 percent. I can see no reason why they shouldn't. The procedure that this government has undertaken has not been the right procedure to get that 75 percent, and I certainly agree with the proposition that unless we get that money we should not be proceeding with this work. I am prepared to admit it's desirable, but I say that it's beyond the financial ability of the Province of Manitoba at this time and that we must have a federal contribution of 75 percent. It's owing to us; it's perfectly legitimate. This Red River problem isn't just a problem of the City of Winnipeg or just a problem of the Province of Manitoba. It involves the Province of Saskatchewan; it involves the northern states of the United States; and there is no reason that this province should be made to bear the full cost.

MR. LYON: I think that my honourable friend made this speech at rather an important juncture in his life; namely, some ten days after he announced that he was not running for the leadership of the Liberal Party. I dare say that had he announced that he was running for the leadership of the Liberal Party, he wouldn't have stood up in the House and made the speech that he did today.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I would like to tell the Honourable the Attorney-General that I will get up and speak my mind any time, regardless of what I am running for. He needn't worry about that.

MR. LYON: I just point out that rather significant fact, Mr. Speaker, because I know

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....that our friends opposite are going to have a conclave with open ears and I hope that they will listen to some of the probably sparse delegates that they will get from the City of Winnipeg and from some of the suburbs of Greater Winnipeg, because then they will find out that they must speak in this House with a voice for all Manitoba and not just with a voice that they think is going to garner them some votes in a parochial way in their own area. That's the voice that my honourable friend from Carillon speaks with; that's the voice that my honourable friend from St. George speaks with; and that constituency has been burdened with him for three years.

MR. PREFONTAINE: That's an insinuation that's most unfair. The honourable gentleman should know better.

MR. LYON: I'm just saying, Mr. Speaker.....

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition)(Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I put it on a basis different to unfair. I raise the point of order. My honourable friend would be the first to object if anyone here said that about any Minister on his side. He is not allowed to impute such motives to a member of this House. He should apologize.

MR. LYON: I'll not impute any motive. I'll just say this.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, it's not a question of imputing any more. I ask him to withdraw that one.

MR. LYON: I said I would not impute any motive if it seems to offend my honourable friends' sensibilities. I'll withdraw what I have said if that offends their sensibilities. I merely say that I admonish them this way: that we are here to speak for all of the people of Manitoba. And we are here -- (Interjection) -- and I'm not going to try to shut up my honourable friend from St. Boniface because I'm looking forward, Mr. Speaker, to the vote on this resolution. I'm looking forward to it right now because for once the Liberal Party is going to be put on the spot and vote either for or against the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. My honourable friend from St. Boniface, who represents a constituency that is going to benefit from the Greater Winnipeg Floodway, is going to have to stand on his feet, if he can haul himself to his feet, he's going to have to stand on his feet and indicate to the people of Manitoba and to his own constituents whether or not he is in favour of this project which is going to protect Greater Winnipeg. It's quite clear -- it's quite clear, Mr. Speaker, what we have to vote on. I merely point this out to my honourable friends in case they haven't thought of it before they brought this resolution before the House. All that has been said about the Floodway by the Honourable Member from Carillon was demolished into fine pieces many, many weeks ago. I don't know why he keeps repeating it here. I merely do give him friendly advice, and very friendly advice, that when he goes to his convention in another two weeks, let him listen to the people of Greater Winnipeg; let him listen to the people from the Assiniboine Valley; let him listen to the people from the Seine Valley, because there is nothing wrong with the Seine diversion, nothing wrong with it at all. But that, of course, we don't have to harrow over that old ground. If it's being built in the right area, why that's all right. I merely point this out and say that we look forward with a great deal of interest, as indeed will all of the people of Manitoba, look forward with a great deal of interest to the vote that's about to be taken on this resolution moved by the Honourable Member for Carillon. Because we'll find out once and for all, we'll find out who is for protecting Greater Winnipeg; who is for protecting the Assiniboine Valley; who is for protecting the rest of Manitoba covered in this Provincial Floodway Plan; and who's against it. We'll see that very shortly and we'll look forward to it, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of relish.

MR. MOLGAT: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. LYON: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Does the resolution say anything at all about other flood projects in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. LYON: I've read the resolution but, Mr. Speaker, it's a pretty hard one to ferret your way through. If my honourable friends say that they're opposing only the Floodway, I'm quite happy. I'm quite happy to hear that. Let them get up and vote for that.

MR. MOLGAT: Does the resolution not say that we oppose the floodway on the basis of the financial system that my honourable friends are following? Does it not clearly say that?

MR. LYON: A distinction without a difference.

MR. MOLGAT: The distinction is very clear if you can read English.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I think that for the benefit of the Honourable the Attorney-General that somebody should interpret the amendment for him; also for the benefit of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. Both of them have tried to draw what my honourable friend has correctly characterized as a red herring across this discussion. This is not dealing with any item in the resolution that is now before us, except the Red River Floodway. The amendment is specific. What it's criticizing here is the fact that the Government of Manitoba is apparently proceeding without an arrangement being made with the Federal Government. Now let me ask the Honourable the Minister this, or anyone who wishes to answer, why is it that we have not had a report on the negotiations with the Federal Government? Why can't they tell us? We've read it. It doesn't tell us. The announcement that is supposed to have been made by one of the federal ministers has not told us. Why are we not entitled to know? Why do my honourable friends try to pretend that there is something in this amendment that's not contained there. We're dealing here with the one main item in this particular resolution -- one item only -- the floodway. Have the Government of Manitoba got a commitment or haven't they? And what is it? We should know. In the meantime, the First Minister of this province, by his statement in the House, has committed the Province of Manitoba to proceeding with it. We say that's unwise. We want to put that on record, and that's what we're doing here.

My honourable friend the Attorney-General doesn't need to stand up and tell us, give us any advice about what will happen at the convention next week. I would be quite willing to guess that the convention would support the view that this government is very, very careless with the taxpayers' money. I would be inclined to suggest that they would be critical of a government that on an expenditure of this amount where the long term cost is in the neighbourhood of \$200 million. I know that's not the usual way in which to talk about these costs. You talk about them on the basis of the first cost, the one that you see. But when you, as the report suggests, amortize this over a 50 - year period and when you take into consideration the interest rates that are prevailing in the Province of Manitoba now, the sum is astronomical. We say that it is, and I don't like using the same terms as my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation delights in of anything that doesn't agree with his point of view, saying that it's nonsense. I don't think that's the type of debate that we need in this Chamber. If anybody wants to point out an example of nonsense, then it's to compare a project -- yes, of the Seine River size if you wish to -- to compare a project of that size with the one that we're talking about here. Nobody is more anxious than I to see to it that we get the proper assistance from Ottawa. Like my honourable friend from Carillon, I'm anxious to see that we do, now that we appear to be committed to this proposal, and we are entitled to it in my opinion. We're entitled to it on the basis mentioned by my two colleagues, or three colleagues who have spoken, because this is not only an inter-provincial, it's an international situation. Both the Assiniboine River and the Red River are inter-provincial, and international as far as the latter is concerned; and the former is both inter-provincial and international. The water comes here, and we have a right to ask the Federal Government on that basis alone; but we have a stronger right, I think, in the fact of what we know the Federal Government is doing in other provinces.

We know what contribution they're making to the South Saskatchewan, a power project and irrigation project, and water conservation project. An important undertaking no doubt. We know something about the Beechwood, I think is the name of the development in the Province of New Brunswick. We know what the Federal Government is doing and they're doing it on the basis that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation has mentioned, as a public interest. That's the basis on which the government should operate -- both federal and provincial -- and I'm not challenging their motives in these. But when they do it in these provinces they should do it in the Province of Manitoba too. We've got every reason for asking it. That's what this resolution is based upon, and this resolution deals with one matter only and that's the Greater Winnipeg Floodway.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, we've listened to quite a bit of debate this afternoon on the Floodway and I will say now that had the previous government acted to the good interests of the people of Manitoba, which they should have acted in 1950, we could have saved this time and this debate. -- (Interjection) -- Sit down small fry, sit down. You

(Mr. Shewman, cont'd.)....weren't in the House. I'll tell you a story about Morris later on.-- (Interjection) -- I'll tell you another story about Emerson -- a better one yet. We would have had 75 percent of the cost of the floodway, 75 percent of the cost of all flood protection for the Province of Manitoba. It's all right for the Honourable Member from Carillon to stand up in this House and say what we should do now. Where was he in 1950 when I pleaded with him to give help? -- (Interjection) -- Sit down, sit down, sit down. You'll have your chance to speak again if you want to. Where was the First Minister of those days? Where was he in getting help for the people of Manitoba? Just as he's doing now. Sitting down, talking, saying nothing. The voice of wisdom -- the voice of wisdom. But where were they? Here's a speech that the First Minister made in this House in 1950 about what he said he was going to do for the people of Manitoba. He said here it would take three to five years before we had an understanding and could move to help the people of Manitoba. We waited five years, and what did we get after he was offered 75 percent of the cost of flood protection for Manitoba?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I have denied....

MR. SHEWMAN: Sit down, wait a minute.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, this is a point of order. This is a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have denied in this House before that that offer was made. My honourable friend made that same statement before. I denied it here. It is not true. My honourable friend cannot say that that offer was made. He has never produced any proof. I say it is untrue and he cannot continue to make that statement.

MR. SHEWMAN: Smear -- Yes, we've heard a lot of smear in the last couple of days. I'd be proud if I was sitting where you were. We've heard a lot of smear, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'm wrong. If I thought I was wrong, I would apologize. -- (Interjection) -- All right, you just read a little bit more here. Here's another thing too, Mr. Speaker, that's a fact. He can't get away from this. He has a great habit of trying to wiggle out of things. He has as long as I've been in the House. And how does he do it? With smear and unkind words. "We already have an entirely separate agreement between the Federal Government and the province by which Canada guarantees 75 percent of the cost of these dikes, which will amount in total of something in the order of \$5 million. This means that the Federal Government will pay upwards of \$3,750,000, and the balance is divided equally between the province and the municipalities concerned." Now we read on here, Mr. Speaker, about what he said in this speech of his, this wonderful speech that he made here. He said that he had talked with the Prime Minister then of Canada and the Prime Minister of Canada had told him that they would give him, the Province of Manitoba, the same deal as they gave the people in British Columbia. I would like the Honourable Member from Lakeside to tell us what deal they gave them in B. C. He said that the Prime Minister of Canada told our then Minister, the First Minister of Manitoba, that he would give Manitoba the same deal as they gave in British Columbia. The deal that they gave in British Columbia, the Federal Government had put 83 percent of the cost of building bridges, flood protection, road construction and such things as that. So I say again, if the Honourable Member for Lakeside had had the interest of the people of Manitoba ten years ago as far as flood protection is concerned, that he's got today, criticizing this government for not getting 75 percent, he would certainly be proud.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, our rule says that the only time that a member of the House can speak a second time is if he has been misquoted or misunderstood. In this case I have the two strings to my bow. I have both been misquoted and evidently, by my honourable friend, misunderstood. The 75 percent or 83 percent, as he mentioned as being the amount that the Federal Government contributed in B.C., was for flood-fighting and the losses of the flood. It did not cover the work after that. As far as we were concerned, it's true that we got 75 percent from the Federal Government of the building of the dikes, the cost of the building of these dikes. That's correct. As far as the flood fighting and the losses, not the ones down in the valley because the members of the House will know that that was taken care of by public donation -- that is the losses in addition to buildings was taken care of by public donations-- but as far as the rest was concerned, we got 75 percent on that. The point where my honourable friend has misquoted me is the fact that he said that we had the same offer for a floodway or for other flood protection works, and that is not the case.

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have only got the speech that the Minister made here

(Mr. Shewman, cont'd.)....in the House in 1950. As he mentioned I just....as to quote what he said. "Early in May, Prime Minister St. Laurent stated in the House of Commons....

MR. CAMPBELL: Could the honourable gentleman give the date of that speech, please?

MR. SHEWMAN: Yes, I'd love to. November, 1950.

MR. CAMPBELL: November, 1950.

MR. SHEWMAN: Yes, November 1950.

MR. CAMPBELL: November of what time 1950?

MR. SHEWMAN: Well I couldn't just state the date. Now surely he's not saying that I've lugged this into the House and him not knowing anything about it. It's word for word -- I'm just quoting word for word of what he said. Where was the honourable gentleman in 1950 if he don't remember this speech?

MR. CAMPBELL: I was here, Mr. Speaker, to....

MR. SHEWMAN: I know it too, I remember it quite well.

MR. CAMPBELL: I was asking him to identify the time. I want to look it up.

MR. SHEWMAN: During the special session in 1950 -- in November some time if I remember rightly. "Early in May, Prime Minister St. Laurent stated in the House of Commons that the province would receive for the Red River Valley the same financial treatment as accorded to British Columbia in the Fraser River flood of 1948. That's what I based my foundation of my remarks on, and they did repair the damage. They did repair the damage, that's quite true, but they gave them flood protection at the same time."

MR. CAMPBELL: They did here, Mr. Speaker, in the way of the dikes. The same-- exactly the same kind of work they did in B.C.

MR. SHEWMAN: But, Mr. Speaker, British Columbia got 75 percent or 83 percent of the cost of repairing those dikes for flood protection, which I said to start, that had the previous government, had his government and the Honourable Member for Lakeside, had he been doing what was right for the people of Manitoba, we wouldn't have had this argument or this debate that we have had today. We would already had our 75 percent of this.

MR. CAMPBELL: We got it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Member for Morris permit a question? Is he in favour of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway if the Province of Manitoba pays the whole cost?

MR. SHEWMAN: Well now, that's a fair question, but not a very intelligent one -- not a very intelligent one. He would like to see the people of Winnipeg flooded out according to that remark -- (Interjection) -- Sit down and wipe your chin off. I think you've got egg on your chin. Yes, I am in favour of protecting the City of Winnipeg -- you bet.

MR. MOLGAT:total provincial costs of the floodway?

MR. SHEWMAN: But you've got no proof it's the total cost. Why put that in? You've got no proof at all. That's just another red herring that you're trying -- maybe you should wipe your chin off too -- that you're trying to draw across the issue.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I had a reason to ask the Honourable Member that question because I have a subsequent question. He was quoted in the Voice of the Farmer on October 1st, 1957, as objecting at that time to expenditures that would help the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SHEWMAN: No.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, that's what the article says. He's objecting to Greater Winnipeg projects, including \$2 million for flood control in the Seine River, \$4 million for the perimeter highway system; and \$21 million of 1951 metropolitan flood. Has he changed his mind since 1957?

MR. SHEWMAN: I've changed my mind often. I always said Winnipeg should be helped. I've always stated that Winnipeg should be helped.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to say a few words and make my position clear. I am definitely in favour of any project in the way of water conservation, soil erosion and drainage project and even in the Pembina deal if that goes through. I would heartily endorse any program of that type, but I feel that I would have to support this resolution that is before us, because I too feel that this is a very large expenditure and that we should have some assurance as to what the Federal contribution will be

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.)....before we commit ourselves any further in this matter, and I would support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion defeated.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Carillon, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, while concurring in certain items of this resolution, the House regrets that with respect to flood control on the Red River, a navigable river approximately 80 percent of whose flood water originate outside the boundaries of Manitoba, the government on March 18th, 1959 committed this province to a huge expenditure of money towards a project about which it evidently had no prior official consultation with the Federal Government as to whether the Federal Government: (a) agreed that the project was economically sound; and (b) that it should be willing to pay 75 percent of the cost, a share established by precedence in similar projects; and further, this House regrets that after two years of supposedly active negotiations with the Federal Government since this province has been committed to the project, this government has not yet been able to show definite proof that the Federal Government considers the project economically sound and that it is willing to pay 75 percent of its cost.

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

YEAS: Messrs: Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Prefontaine, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hutton, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright, and Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 11, Nays, 37.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: (3) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for Capital Expenditures, \$3,669,350.

(4) Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for Capital Expenditures, \$5,500,000.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, it now being 5:30, I put myself in your hands. Is it customary to move a motion of adjournment at 5:30 on Wednesday afternoon?

MR. SPEAKER: You may if you wish.

MR. EVANS: In order to carry out the regular procedure then, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that we do not meet tomorrow?

MR. EVANS: The House do meet again on Friday at 2:30 p.m.

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