

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 29th, 1963.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The Petition of The Garment Manufacturers and Employees Fund, Praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Garment Manufacturers and Employees Fund.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 73, an Act to amend The Land Surveyors Act; and Bill No. 78, an Act to validate By-law No. 44/62/B of The City of West Kildonan, By-law No. 689 of The Rural Municipality of Old Kildonan, and By-law No. 427 of The Rural Municipality of West St. Paul.

MR. CLERK: His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

MADAM SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly in Manitoba in Session assembled, approach your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills: No. 59, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1964; and No. 69, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1963.

MR. CLERK: His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to these bills in Her Majesty's name.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George) introduced Bill No. 77, an Act respecting The Rural Municipality of Coldwell.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 80, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 27, an Act for the relief of Clifford Junghans, Henry Junghans, Albert Chezick and Harvey Chezick.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution standing in my name.

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

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Wheat Board Money Trust Act by providing, among other matters, that the moneys in The Co-operative Promotion Trust Account may be used to promote the general welfare of producers of natural products, to assist consumers, producers of natural products, and persons involved in marketing natural products, and to make grants to, and to guarantee repayment of moneys borrowed by, certain co-operative organizations.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I think most of the members in the House are familiar with the legislation that is being amended. It provides for the utilization of moneys of which some \$128,000 originally was Manitoba's share of the wheat pool. The legislation established a Co-operative Promotion Board and provided that the moneys should be held in trust and used for the promotion of agricultural co-operatives in the Province of Manitoba and for the promotion of agricultural matters. The amendments to the Act enlarge the scope of the work of the Co-operative Promotion Board and it will allow them to assist the co-operative organizations of producers of natural products, and consumers and persons concerned in marketing the

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... natural products.

I think that the members in the House are aware of the work that has been done in the northern areas in Manitoba amongst the Indian and Metis. The Co-operative Promotion Board has co-operated with the Government -- or can we put it the other way around -- in assisting the Indian and Metis to establish co-ops, fishermen's co-ops, pulpwood co-ops and consumer's co-ops, and through this co-operation between the government and the co-operative movement and the Indian and Metis people, a very useful program has been developed. We are amending the Act in order that this work can go on and that the work of the Co-operative Promotion Board can be wider in scope than it has in the past.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, my recollection of this Act is that the funds that are made available are limited to the interest that is gained from the investment of this original sum. Is that correct? Is that going to be continued, or is the proposal now that the capital sum itself shall be made available for the purposes enumerated here.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, as much as I can gather, investments have been made in co-operatives from this fund. However, I notice that there is still quite a lot of money on hand invested in bonds. I'm just wondering whether there is a lack of application for the use of these funds, or why is it invested in government bonds?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson):Mr. Chairman, and the last sentence says: "and to guarantee repayment of moneys borrowed by certain co-operative organizations." Will these certain co-operative organizations be spelled out in the Act or is this just normal phraseology?

MR. HUTTON: To answer the last question first, this is normal phraseology. The certain co-operatives will not be spelled out except in broad terms. As a matter of fact, it is only because we wanted to make certain that the Co-op Promotion Board was not operating beyond its authority of the present legislation, that we are amending it to make it perfectly clear that they have a legitimate right to do the thing that they have been doing in the last year or two. That is the present wording of the Act. It might be interpreted as giving them the right, but we wanted to make it clear that the new program that we are embarked upon is properly covered in that there can be no doubt about it.

The Act restricts the kinds of investment that the Co-op Promotion Board can make and, in my first year in the Legislature, a special Act was introduced in the House to enable the Co-op Promotion Board to invest in the bonds of one of the canning companies in Manitoba. In order to do so, the Provincial Government guaranteed the loan, and it has been the policy of the Provincial Government in carrying on this program with the Indian and Metis, to underwrite the guarantees that the Co-op Promotion Board is making so that there is no danger of losses to the Co-op Promotion Board of these monies. We feel, and I think there's some merit in the point of view, that we accomplish more and establish a broader understanding of the work that is going on by working through the Co-op Promotion Board rather than directly with the people in the field, and so we have chosen to develop the program along these lines.

I think I have answered the Honourable Member for Lakeside as well, in that moneys cannot be loaned by the Co-op Promotion Board out of the principal fund unless the government guarantees those loans. However, there is now some \$145,000 in principal, and the restrictions on the lending of these monies by the Co-op Promotion Board only applied to the original principal amount of \$128,000.00. For the information of the committee, I can tell you that the principal invested at the present time is \$145,000, and the bank account stands at something between \$12,000 and \$13,000.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I had rather thought that perhaps they were kept in two separate accounts, but I gather that any surplus has been added to the original principal. Is it general legislation now that money can be loaned from the principal provided there is a government guarantee? The second matter I wanted to check, Mr. Chairman, was I notice in the resolution that one of the purposes of the Bill that will be introduced is to assist consumers-- that seems to stand by itself -- "to assist consumers". The first purpose appears to be that the Co-operative Promotion Trust Account may be used to promote the general welfare of producers of natural products, then comma, to assist consumers. I'd like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, what is proposed in the way of consumer assistance?

MR. HUTTON: Well, the co-operative organizations there -- you have your consumer co-operatives in the north as well as your producer co-ops, and I think that they are not being

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... any more specific in saying "consumer" than they are in referring to producer marketing co-ops, because most of your co-ops fall into one or the other category. Was there another question that you asked?

MR. CAMPBELL: Is it a fact that moneys from the principal account can be granted or loaned only if there is -- or loaned rather -- only if there is a guarantee by the government?

MR. HUTTON: I believe so and I believe that it has to be by an Act of the Legislature.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, then so far as the phrase that I'm mentioning, "to assist consumers", this is really meant to be "to assist consumer co-operatives", is it?

MR. HUTTON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted a certain resolution, directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. HUTTON introduced Bill No. 43, an Act to amend The Wheat Board Money Trust Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Utilities. I see on the desk today where we are notified that the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources is going to be convened on Tuesday morning. Could he indicate at this time what matters will be discussed at that committee?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, the Committee will be convened on Tuesday morning. The general manager of Manitoba Hydro and any other officials necessary will be there at that time to deal with the question of the water-haulage contract to Grand Rapids.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I have an Order for Return that hasn't been tabled yet in connection with this matter, and I think this committee should not discuss this matter until I have the Order tabled.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I tabled an Order for Return yesterday with respect to the water-haulage contract.

MR. GUTTORMSON: This is correct, but there were two Orders. The Minister asked me to amend my original Order, which I did, and then he suggested if I had some other material which I wanted, to submit a second order, which I did following that. I enquired about it the other day and the Minister of Public Works -- I asked him about it and he said it would be tabled shortly, and I still haven't got it.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I think that the material required is not very extensive for this other Order and I expect it will be tabled Monday.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, that doesn't give us very much time to look through papers, if it is tabled Monday and they call the committee Tuesday morning. There may be certain witnesses that I wish to subpoena to this committee and it doesn't give me any opportunity to do so. I think that if the First Minister is anxious to have this matter dealt with in full, that we should be given an opportunity to present our case as well.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, if I may be allowed to reply, I would agree with my honourable friend and say that he'll receive ample opportunity.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, if I may get in this, the material that we received yesterday is very substantial as the Minister knows. It can only be read by one person at a time. All the members of our group on the committee naturally want to read the material and we certainly won't have been able to do this before the Committee meets on Tuesday.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for Return.

MR. MOLGAT: No, Madam we're still on the Orders of the Day. Before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of the very extensive rise in the price of sugar, is this government planning on any appeals to the Federal Government or to any agencies of the Federal Government such as the Combines Investigation Commission?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I hesitate to answer for my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, but I can say that the whole question of the sugar combine was thoroughly investigated by the Combines Investigation Branch by the Federal Government not long ago, and certain action was taken by them in that respect. I doubt that it would be profitable to re-open the matter at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: Is the government planning any representations then to the government on this subject to see if the increase can be contained?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, if the government makes any representations, the House will be informed.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Attorney-General. In view of the fact that much concern has been shown in the past and also in view of the remarks made recently by a respected magistrate of the Province on the law regulating liquor sales to minors; Madam Speaker, with your permission, I would like to read from a report of the Tribune of yesterday. The article is entitled: "Liquor Sales to Minors. The Unwary Gets no Help from the Law." "Manitoba has a law that punishes even the innocent. It concerns -- and irritates -- the beverage rooms and beer and liquor companies that sell their merchandise to minors. For the law indicates they must be punished even if it is obvious they are not guilty. It's a law that police magistrates don't like, Winnipeg policemen ignore when they can, the Manitoba Liquor Commission is silent about, and the Provincial Hotel Association is out to eliminate. 'It's unfair', Winnipeg Police Magistrate Isaac Rice said Wednesday in City Magistrate Court as he applied this law to the O'Keefe Brewing Company. The law, a subsection of Section 170 of The Manitoba Liquor Act, says persons who sell liquor to those under 21 years of age are guilty of an offence punishable by a fine of not more than \$50.00."

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, on a point of Order, I wonder if my honourable friend would mind getting to the question. I've read the article.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I believe that I have asked your permission and there might be others who haven't had a chance to know what I'm talking about. The Article is not too long, if I might continue, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: You may continue.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you. " 'With horses', said Magistrate Rice, 'you can tell how old they are by looking at their teeth. With humans you can't.' The Magistrate had before him one of Canada's largest breweries. Last year the brewery in one of its Winnipeg outlets sold a 17 year old youth two cases of beer. The problem was, maintained Defence Counsel Rees Brock, the youth is 6 foot 3 inches tall and doesn't look anything like a minor. Magistrate Rice agreed, but said the law gave him no alternative. The company was fined \$25.00 and costs. However, the case didn't end there. The magistrate suggested the Liquor Act should provide him with the power to decide whether the beverage room or company that sold to a minor could be expected to be aware the youth, by his appearance, was not 21. 'It's an unfair law the way it stands,' says Bert Fraser, Managing Director of the Manitoba Hotel Association and Secretary of the Hotel Association of Canada. 'They should let the magistrate decide whether there has or has not been an honest mistake made,' he said. Mr. Fraser said that in a recent case in County Court when the Waldorf Hotel was appealing a conviction under the disputed law, senior Judge C.B. Philp indicated he was only dismissing the appeal because his hands were tied. 'In my opinion,' Judge Philp was quoted as saying, 'the youth looks 21.' Magistrate Rice said it would be better if a section was included in The Liquor Act similar to Section 111 of The Highway Traffic Act. That section gives a magistrate the power, if evidence shows the offence occurred under circumstances not attributable to the fault of the accused, to make not just one choice -- conviction -- but two others: acquittal or reprimand. Winnipeg police on many occasions will not charge a beverage room or liquor company with selling to minors if the youth looks over 21. 'They realize the problem of this law,' said Mr. Fraser. 'They are most co-operative.' In British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario, the law has been amended, as Mr. Fraser puts it, 'in one form or another.' The Hotel Association early this year appealed to the Provincial Government to rectify the situation."

My question, Madam Speaker, is it the intention of the Attorney-General to present an amendment to Section 170 of The Manitoba Liquor Act?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, the question is out of order because I, of course, can't

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)... give a reply to any advice that may subsequently be given to the Crown.

MR. DESJARDINS: May I ask another question then? Is it the intention to consider this, to look into this matter and try to bring something to rectify this?

MR. LYONS: Madam Speaker, as I think I advised my honourable friend, but perhaps I didn't during estimates, the matter is being considered at the present time.

MR. DESJARDINS:this answer wasn't given to me at the time.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the Table an Order for Return of the House on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) The number of Medicare cards in effect each month in 1962 where Medicare was the sole Social Allowance benefit. (2) The number of Medicare cards in effect each month in 1962. (3) The payments made by the province in 1962 to Manitoba Medical Services for Medicare Cards. (4) The payments made by the province in 1962 for health costs for Medicare card holders: (a) dental, (b) drugs, and (c) optical.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Madam Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The names and addresses of the printing firms in Manitoba, which have done printing work for the various departments of the Government of Manitoba. And here, Madam Speaker, I'd like to get permission of the House to add three words; "calendar year 1962," (2) The volume of printing work done by each of the printing firms mentioned in (1). (3) The names and addresses of printing firms outside of Manitoba, if any, which have done printing work for any of the various departments of the Government of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce in whose department this matter lies, is away today unfortunately and would like the matter to stand as he says he wishes to clarify some points with the honourable mover.

MR. GRAY:with me, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: The per diem rates charged by each of the hospitals in the Province of Manitoba for the years 1958 to 1962, inclusive.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I believe all this is in the Annual Report but, if not, I'll make arrangements for same.

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Names and locations of the 41 new manufacturing plants established in Manitoba in 1961, as stated in the Annual Report of the Department of Industry and Commerce for the year ending March 31, 1962. (2) Breakdown by industries of the \$8,240,000 capital investment made by these new industries, as stated in the Report. (3) Breakdown by industries of the \$4 million spent on expansion of existing plants. (4) How many new manufacturing plants were established in Manitoba in 1962, giving names, locations and capital investment of each.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that, by leave, Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 39.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 39, Section 1 --

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the Honourable the First Minister in making the motion that took us into Committee asked for the leave of the House and there was no objection. A technical matter, though, I was wondering how it came that this appeared in this place on the Order Paper, this being government business?

MR. ROBLIN: I believe, Mr. Chairman, subject to confirmation by the authorities, that the Committee of the Whole stage does enjoy this precedence. Ordinarily other government business does not, but Committee of the Whole stage does. Now I'm going on my memory and I think perhaps the matter could be referred to the Clerk for the citation on it, but that's my recollection. If it's out of order, it certainly is not intentionally so.

MR. CAMPBELL: My recollection was, and I haven't checked the rules at all, but my recollection was that that applied to third readings but not to Committee of the Whole. If the Clerk says it's right, I'd take his word for it because he's a better authority on these matters than I. However, we're in the Committee so I suppose we ...

MR. PAULLEY: I might say, Mr. Chairman, I thought that's why the First Minister asked for leave in order that this may be done, so that there wasn't any question about it.

Bill No. 39 was read section by section and passed.

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

Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 39, asked me to report the same without amendment and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that, by leave, Bill No. 39, an Act to Amend the Legislative Assembly Act, be now read a third time and passed.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, if I say "no", I'm not objecting to the "by leave", I'm simply saying "no" as regards to the Bill.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. MARK C. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I again want to bring to the attention of this House that serious consideration should be given to combining the existing Old Age Pension with a satisfactory contributory plan, and this should be made available to all. A national pension plan of this kind can be arranged so that people can get a reasonable pension at the age of 65. All other pension schemes that are in existence now could be and should be made fully portable and consolidated into the national pension plan. This is a constructive and practical approach to the financing of old age security on a realistic and on an actuarially sound basis. This plan will give progressively higher pensions which will be in direct proportion to the increase in the economic growth of our country. This plan would once and for all eliminate the continual competition in which some political parties have engaged in reference to the increase in the old age pension.

In January of this year, in the Federal Government's Throne Speech, there was some vague reference to a contributory scheme which was to be negotiated with the provinces, but this approach would still leave pensions at the mercy of the governments and subject to election politics. Cost and benefits of pensions no longer seem to be the concern of a government that is obsessed only with the election. This will completely divorce and remove pensions from the control of the four-year auction block of politics.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the Resolution be amended by striking out the words after the words "That this House", and adding thereto the following words; "The Government of Canada to establish a national pension plan to which the individual contributes, and from this fund pay to all old age and blind pensioners in the province a further \$10.00 per month in addition to the \$65.00 which they presently receive, and pay to those who will retire after having contributed to the fund an additional monthly amount based on

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd)... their contribution to the fund."

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to say that I think that this amendment applies to the main motion rather than to the amendment thereto, and I would like to ask the House if they think it is in order.

Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, pardon me, is the amendment in order or what? I couldn't hear you.

MR. LYON: On the point of order that you have raised, Madam Speaker, I wonder if we might suggest to Your Honour that you perhaps, in view of your first opinion on it, might wish to take the matter under advisement and have the amendment stand until such time as you are able to formulate an opinion as to the validity of the amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will do that then. Instead of asking the House to decide, I will take it under consideration.

The adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, notwithstanding the exact wording of this resolution, I am going to assume that it deals with the problem of handicapped children of all types and kinds in this province. The question of handicapped children is indeed a problem, and I feel that it must be faced in its entirety objectively and without thought of partisanship. It is a problem which will not be solved by oratory, rhetoric, or emotionalism. It's a problem which will require, for its solution, well co-ordinated total community planning; and one of the greatest errors which we can make in facing or approaching this problem is in over-simplifying it. I feel that all members of this House, in common with all citizens of this province, accept the concept that all children are entitled to equal educational opportunities, which in effect means that every child in Manitoba is entitled by right to be educated to the full extent of that child's capabilities and potentialities. Our goal and objective must be to so educate and train all of those children within our midst to the end and intent that, notwithstanding their handicap, they will so far as we can humanly, physically and mentally achieve that end, they will take their place in society eventually as useful citizens. I appreciate, Madam that such an end and such an objective will be impossible in certain instances, but just because there will be an impossibility of achieving that end in these instances, I do not think that it is any reason why we should not try and use all of our efforts towards the obtaining of that objective.

Madam, I take the stand that we in this House are laymen and that we are not competent nor qualified to deal with this subject in the manner in which it should be dealt. I feel that this is a problem which must, in its finality insofar as the education of these children is concerned, be left to experts, but I do not exclude from the solution of this problem the help and assistance of every available agency in this province. We are very fortunate in Manitoba today to have organizations such as The Manitoba Association of Retarded Children which has established branches in many towns and villages and hamlets throughout this province. We are also very fortunate in having this Manitoba Division of the CNIB; The Association for Crippled Children; and various other organizations that have unselfishly and in a dedicated way given of their time, energy, sympathy and comfort to the solution of the problems of our handicapped children.

As I say, we are only laymen in this House and we must be guided by the advice of experts. One of the greatest problems which the experts have to solve is in the matter of the education of these children. I was fortunate enough to be furnished with a copy of The Manitoba School Journal of November, 1962, wherein there's an article by Dr. Samuel R. Laycock on the educational needs of handicapped children. Dr. Laycock, in discussing this question of the educational needs of these children, says: "Their education should be based on four basic principles, these being: (1) That the education of the handicapped child can be most effective only when it is conceived on a broad basis as the interacting of the physical, intellectual, social, emotional and spiritual aspects of his growth and development. (2) That the education of the handicapped must not be confined to the years normally devoted to school attendance, but that it should be extended down into the entire pre-school period and continue upwards into adult years. (3) That the education of a handicapped child is always a partnership affair in which the active partners include his parents and age mates, various types of his community teachers,

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd)... such as the church, health and welfare services and recreational agencies and therapists and medical specialists, as well as school teachers and educational administrators. (4) That special education for the handicapped is an integral part of society's obligation to provide for every child, no matter what his capacities, an equal -- and I mean equal, not the same -- opportunities to develop towards his maximum potential in the commonly accepted areas of educational objectives. These are self-realization, human relationships, occupational competence and responsibility for others in home and community." I think these basic principles are well worth bearing in mind in considering this resolution, and I would commend to the members of this House the reading of that article by Dr. Laycock, as I find it to be one of the most comprehensive articles that I have ever read on that subject.

As I said in the beginning, Madam, we have in this province a number of well-intentioned associations, associations which are doing a tremendous job for our unfortunate children. We are also fortunate, too, in having a Minister of Health who has shown a keen and sympathetic interest towards the problem of these children here. I feel that there should be some committee set up of these agencies with inter-departmental committees of the government, so that this problem can be looked at in its entirety. I think that we must, sooner or later, and the sooner the better, lay down a blueprint by which we are going to be guided in dealing with this problem in its entirety. I know from my association with the Selkirk district of the handicapped children and from meetings that I've had with the Minister, that that is one of the big problems with which we are faced today; and my suggestion is that that problem can best be solved, not by the government alone, because this is a problem which does not affect one department of the government. It's a problem which affects many departments of the government. It's a problem which affects health, welfare, education and labour, because if these children can be trained, we must find occupations for them. I also say, too, that it is not a problem which is confined to any segment of our economy. It's a general problem in which we all must take our part, put our shoulders to the wheel and try to solve it.

I therefore feel, Madam, that the time has come when we must approach this problem in a sensible, objective way; that we must set in motion the necessary machinery for establishing a base from which we can move forward; and I feel that the best way that that can be achieved is by the House adopting an amendment which I have prepared to the resolution of the member from Inkster.

So therefore, Madam, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "whereas" as it appears in the first paragraph of the preamble and substituting therefore the following -- and the resolution would then read: "Whereas no survey has ever been made of the number, types or kinds of handicapped children in Manitoba; and whereas this problem must be approached objectively and studied in its entirety, with a view to setting up the necessary schools, acquiring the necessary specialized help and teachers to deal with the problem effectively and intelligently; and whereas this problem comes within the jurisdiction of many departments of government; and whereas many associations and organizations have been set up, constituted and formed to deal with the problem, training, education and welfare of handicapped children; therefore be it resolved that the government consider the advisability of setting up a committee composed of representatives of the relevant departments of government and of such associations for the following purposes, namely: (1) To make a survey of the number, types and kinds of handicapped children in Manitoba; (2) To separate the number into age groups; (3) To separate the number into the various types and kinds and into their geographical locations; (4) To recommend and suggest the best types of schools and training for the various classes and kinds, with a view to the rehabilitation of these handicapped children as useful citizens; and (5) That such committee submit its report and recommendations to the next session of this Legislature." Madam, I so move that the resolution be amended accordingly.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead -- oh, he's not in his seat -- Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Leader of the

(Madam Speaker, cont'd)... New Democratic Party. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition was called to the phone, but if anyone else wishes to speak there is no objection here.

MADAM SPEAKER: Leave it stand?

MR. LYON:Madam Speaker, to have this matter put down to the bottom of the Order Paper in order to accommodate the Leader of the Opposition. I'm sure, Madam Speaker, we would all be in agreement, if he'd like to later on this afternoon.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON: In the absence of the Minister of Education, can I ask the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order stand. The adjourned debate on the proposed

MR. CAMPBELL:would like to have this put down to the bottom of the Order Paper so he could deal with it later on?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Education is answering a phone call, in Dauphin I think it is.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's taking no chances.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Dufferin in amendment thereto, and the amendment of the Honourable Member for Gladstone to the amendment. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Could I personally ask that mine be allowed to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order stand. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland in amendment thereto. On Tuesday, March 26th, the Honourable Member for Rhineland submitted a sub-amendment which, by leave of the House, was to be corrected as to the form of presentation. The Honourable Member now feels that he would rather not proceed. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, in view of that, I have nothing further to add of any substance and therefore I would like to leave the matter.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, this is an important resolution, I feel, and no one from our group has spoken to it. I feel at this time I would like to make some contribution to debate on this topic.

I would like to start off by commending the member for St. Boniface on what I feel to be a very accurate analysis of the situation regarding bilingualism in the paragraphs of the resolution. I believe that every paragraph of the resolution states the fact as it actually exists here in our province and in most other provinces of this Dominion. I think also that the resolution is timely, inasmuch as in a few years -- four years from now we shall be celebrating our centenary, and if at that time we want to show evidence that in the 100 years of Confederation we have kept faith with the principle of bilingualism in this country, then we have to put on a little extra effort in the next few years to show that we have, in fact, kept such faith. Up to now I regret to say -- I feel that it can't really be argued -- that in many provinces this has been forgotten over the course of the years since 1867.

I believe that the Member for St. Boniface is entirely correct when he states that psychologists, education psychologists maintain that the best time to teach a child any language is when they are below the age of 10, and this is more or less an accepted fact. There are very few arguments opposed against it among most people engaged in the field of education. As a matter of fact, those people who are what you would call "fluently bilingual" are almost invariably those people who learned the languages in their very early years. I think that up to now in our public school system in Manitoba we have really not done a proper job in the teaching of languages -- any languages for that matter -- and particularly in the teaching of French. The Member for St. Boniface said when he introduced this resolution on March 14th last, that there are many teachers, or at least a good number of teachers of French in this province who find it necessary to take courses in Conversational French in order to enable them to teach the subject they are slated to teach. He said that this is amusing if it were not so tragic, and I

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd).... would simply add the rider that it is amusing if it were not so tragic and also so true. I believe this is precisely the case in all too many instances and this does not reflect on the teachers but rather it reflects on the system of which they are a product, and I, standing right here and speaking to you today, am a perfect example of that.

The member for St. Boniface pointed out that there are many who took a foreign language for six or seven years and find it difficult to converse in that language. Perhaps it has something to do with my intelligence quotient, I don't know, but I have taken French, almost precisely as he said for six years, and I still find it difficult, very difficult, to carry on the most simple kind of conversation in the French language. I don't think that it has anything to do with conceit when I say that I believe it is not me so much as the system of teaching the language where the emphasis is on the grammar, on teaching for exams rather than teaching for conversation. Well this is not to say that in the past few years, at least seven or eight years in Winnipeg, there have been some improvements along that line, inasmuch as some of the larger high schools now provide pretty extensive and pretty expensive laboratory equipment, language laboratory equipment where emphasis is put on the spoken word, on the oral and oral approach-- audio approach to the language -- and I think it is paying off. Well we can proceed further along that line in rural Manitoba where they haven't got this equipment, but I think that it would be much cheaper and much more effective to commence teaching of the language at the age of about six or seven, almost as soon as they enter school -- much cheaper and more effective.

Now some may say, but should a foreign language have such priority that it goes on the curriculum for a young pupil as soon as he enters school, and I suggest that the answer is "yes". If we are to call ourselves a country that is bilingual and if we want to keep faith with the undertaking that was given at the time of Confederation, those are historical reasons for putting French on the syllabus from Grade I up. But there is even another reason which has nothing so much to do with our history. It has more to do with general worthwhileness, and I suggest that it is worthwhile that every young Manitoban from the time they start school in Grade I be given that opportunity to learn French in the proper manner, so that by the time they finish their high school they are polished and fluent in the use of a second language. Wouldn't that be something to be proud of? I submit it would. But we shall not, no matter how many platitudes we utter about improving the teaching of French in high school-- I know we always keep talking about that, it would be nice to improve the methods of teaching French in the high schools-- these are platitudes -- not until we start in Grade I will we really be approaching the problem with any kind of determination and emphasis.

The Member for Rhineland had proposed an amendment which would have made provision for the teaching of German which would have complicated discussion, because in that connection I'm not so sure it would be easy to get a consensus of opinion as to whether there should be a special kind of provision made for the teaching of German. I myself would rather like to see it, but I certainly realize that if we did, we would have to make provision for other foreign languages as well, and maybe we should. In any case, this is not in the resolution before us and so I shall not digress any more except to say that I am convinced, whatever the language is that we are trying to teach our young people, it should be started at an early age. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, education psychologists of the present, and some of our pioneers in the field of education, like Montaigne and Pestalozzi, argued over a hundred years ago, so that there can be no doubt that for maximum effectiveness to learn a language, start at an early age.

Mr. Schreyer spoke briefly in French. Translation will appear in Monday's Hansard.

Madam Speaker, I think after having heard those words, the Member for St. Boniface has adequate proof that the way we have been teaching French now in our schools has been almost-- well in my own case, horrible -- and if we want to do something about making Canada bilingual, or approaching that ideal, we have to start doing something a little better. So I suggest that his resolution should pass, but it has been somewhat complicated now by the amendment that has been made to it by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. The amendment doesn't exactly negate the spirit of the original motion but it seems to take the entire question and put it in the hands of the Education Advisory Board and seems to pat the government on the back. Now this is no time for recrimination of that kind, but I do feel that here's a matter of broad important policy. It doesn't require experts, therefore the appropriate body to deal with it

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)... is this Assembly and not any commission or committee appointed by the government. Therefore, I suggest, and I suggest that we pass the resolution in the form that the member for St. Boniface has proposed it. I could not bring myself to vote against the amendment if I thought that as a result of that the entire thing would be defeated, so I suppose we shall support it if there is no other alternative, but I simply point out that we would be much happier with the original motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: I didn't get the seconder.

MR. GROVES: Winnipeg Centre.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Proposed resolution. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone; Whereas this government froze the sale of Crown Lands in most areas of the province some four years ago; and whereas this government discontinued the practice of giving long-term leases some four years ago; and whereas it is necessary for ranchers and farmers to have security of tenure if they are to improve their land holdings and develop the livestock industry; therefore be it resolved that this government immediately institute a program for the sale and long-term leasing of Crown lands with due regard to the protection of the present short-term lease-holders and of the local residents in the areas concerned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, if I might arise on a point of Order, I'm wondering, as I look at this resolution now, realizing as I do that it has been on the Order Paper for some time, I wonder about the problem in which the House finds itself with the statement on this matter having been made by the Minister of Mines and Resources; and, in fact, the debate presumably on the very subject matter of this resolution will take place later today when the House resolves itself into Committee to consider the estimates of the Department of Mines. I'm afraid I don't come to you, Madam Speaker, with any firm advice on the situation. I merely raise the point to indicate that it seems unusual that we should be debating two matters at the same time. This, of course, is not usually permissible. I don't know the answer to it. I'm not suggesting that my honourable friend's resolution was anticipatory, although there were indications given that a statement would be made later on with respect to government policy. It appears that the timing has been such that the two matters are now debatable, presumably, if we allow this to go ahead at the same time and this, I suggest with the greatest deference, is not a happy situation.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, although this matter can be discussed during the Estimates, I submit that it is still in order for me to discuss it on the resolution.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may, speaking to the Order, may I respectfully suggest that the resolution is in order and proper before the House. It's rather unusual for the Attorney-General to be so frank to say that he hasn't very much substantiation for his stand. The fact that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources made reference to the question of releasing of Crown lands in his statement, I don't think obviates the properness of this resolution before the House.

MR. LYON: Speaking on the point of order, and having as usual, Madam Speaker, to correct a misunderstanding by my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP, I didn't say I had no substantiation; I merely say that the situation exists, which should not exist, that the same subject matter is being discussed under two separate items on the Order Paper and this should not exist. Now what the answer to it is I don't know. This I concede. All I know is that there is an answer. Perhaps somebody will have to take it under advisement, Madam Speaker, to consider what the answer is. I don't suggest the answer yet.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, it's not unusual for the House to discuss resolutions pertaining to education or other matters while estimates are being discussed on perhaps the same subject later in the day. I've seen this happen numerous times during the past few years and I don't see why there should be an objection to me speaking on this resolution at this time.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I think that the matter could be quite easily resolved if the Honourable Minister would stand up in his place and advise the House that he intended to bring in legislation to cover the very point of the resolution. That would dispose of the whole matter.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I'm getting to the point where I'm going to remind my honourable friends that the Minister had, in fact, made a statement last evening which, if one reads it, pretty well answers what the resolution says.

MADAM SPEAKER: My decision here is that the resolution will stay on the Order Paper.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This resolution, Madam Speaker, is almost self-explanatory. For the past several years the policy of this government, which has been to freeze the sale of Crown lands and prohibit or prevent the farmers from obtaining long-term leases of Crown lands, has seriously hampered the expansion of farming operations in many parts of the province. As we all know, in this day and age in order for farmers to make their farming operations successful they must expand their operations, and in order to do this they require more land. I know in my particular constituency this is a very big problem. For the last few years, many of the farmers have been constantly trying to purchase Crown lands; they have been trying to obtain long-term leases; and they have been refused. The House can readily understand that no farmer is going to improve Crown lands that he's obtained a short term lease on by putting on dug-outs, fencing, buildings, wells, if he has no security that this land will remain his for several years. Consequently, these farmers who obtain only short-term leases are just reluctant and refuse to put any improvements on the land in question.

We in the Interlake have felt for some time, and our contention has been supported by the Minister of Agriculture, that cattle is the coming thing and the Interlake is an ideal area to expand the cattle operations, but under the present set-up these farmers are unable to do so because they can't obtain the land required to make their farming operations -- or unable to do so because they haven't got the land to operate with. So I would suggest that the House support this resolution in its entirety so that the farmers in these particular areas where Crown land is so vital, they can obtain it and make their farming operations larger, and they can improve their industries to a larger extent. Every week I receive letters from people in the area complaining that they are unable to expand their operations; and if this resolution is adopted by the House, this situation will be resolved and everyone will be better off for it.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I agree with the Leader of the NDP that since we have just had an election it is advisable to review The Election Act. Like every election, there are many people left off the Voters List and one of our biggest problems is to try and obtain a complete Voters List for election day. We have amended the Act from time to time with that object in view, but we have not been successful in getting a very complete list as yet.

I would like to put forward two or three suggestions in that regard. Firstly, when the enumerator types out his copies of the list, that he type six copies, one copy for the printer; one copy for the returning officer; and one copy for each of the candidates. If there is no candidate nominated, then the copy that would otherwise go to the candidate would go to the political party that had candidates in the last election. If the four copies aren't enough for the number of candidates, then the returning officer would be required to make an additional copy, which isn't too hard today with modern photostatic methods of making copies. In this way, the candidate or the party would have a copy of the Voters List from between 24 and 28 days before the election. That would give the candidate lots of time to send out that copy of the Voters List to each poll worker -- a worker in each poll -- to check on the Voters List, so that by the time the Court of Revision comes along many people would have been checked upon and many corrections would be able to be made at the time of the Court of Revision. It would be quite an advantage to all workers to have the list in their hands 24 to 28 days before election. This is similar to a requirement in the Quebec Election Act, but in Quebec the returning officer is only

(Mr. Cowan cont'd) required to send one typewritten copy to the government party and one typewritten copy to the official opposition party.

Then instead of the Court taking place the fourth and fifth days before nomination day, I think it would be better if it took place on the first and second days after nomination day, because at that time there is greater interest in the election and the people know exactly who are in the field. Furthermore, under The Election Act now, the printed copies only have to be ready the day before the Court of Revision, and if you're going to get as many printed copies out to your workers, you haven't got time to get them out before the Court of Revision and you haven't got time for many people to check on the list. If the Court of Revision was the first and second day after nomination day, then there would be about six days from the time that the list was printed before the Court of Revision was actually held. In Nova Scotia, I might mention, the Court of Revision is held on the second and third days after nomination day. Nomination day there is 14 days before election day, just like in Manitoba.

Another suggestion is that under the present Act the returning officers are required, in Greater Winnipeg, St. Boniface and Brandon, to put a notice in the papers and to put a notice over the radio stations between two and six days before the date of the Court of Revision. Not very many people, if they want to notify people of something that's going to happen -- we'll say on a certain day -- they don't generally notify them two to six days beforehand, they advertise their intentions the night before. If a person has something to sell he advertises it in the paper the night before the sale, and so I would suggest that instead of this notice being given out two to six days before the Court of Revision, that it be given out the day before the Court of Revision; the first day of the Court of Revision and the second day of the Court of Revision. And in this notice we would just have one notice perhaps for the whole province instead of one for each constituency -- one notice in each daily paper, advising the people that if they haven't received a slip from an enumerator they've been left off of the list and they better get on the list the next day, not two days from now or six days from now. I suggest further that this announcement should be put, not only to the press but over the TV, and in this way we would get a very complete voting list and we wouldn't have the troubles and the criticisms that we have had in the past.

One other matter that I think is very important is the requirement in our Election Act that a person must be a resident of the constituency for three months prior to the date of the issue of the Writ of Election. That meant that for the election last December one had to be a resident of the constituency since the previous August 9th. It so happens that September 30th is a very busy moving day in Winnipeg, particularly among apartment dwellers, and we have thousands of those in the city, so that as a result there were thousands of people that were not legally entitled to be on the Voters List of the constituency in which they resided at the time the election was called. Thousands and thousands were not legally entitled to be on the list. There is no way set down in The Election Act whereby they can be put on the list at the last place where they previously had three months residence, so for all practical purposes these people didn't vote. It is quite true they could have gone back to their former constituency and got on the list at the Court of Revision, but not many did so. They formerly had a requirement similar to that in Nova Scotia but they did away with that last year, and in Nova Scotia, like the Federal Elections, they now require only that the person be a resident of the constituency on the date that the Writ of Election is issued. If we made that change, we would be conforming to the requirement of the Federal Act and we would be giving many many people a chance to vote in the place they resided who sometimes don't have that chance now, having moved within the previous five months.

In Quebec, I might say, they have a similar requirement excepting that they take the residence of the person on the day that enumeration commences. I suggest, too, that some mistakes might be eliminated if the enumerator wasn't required to copy his list into that green covered book. It is unnecessary; it is not a requirement in respect to federal election campaigns; and it just makes for one more opportunity for a mistake being made. Furthermore, we require that the voter's slip be made in triplicate. In the federal election campaign it is only required in duplicate, and duplicate is certainly enough. There's no need for three copies of that voter's slip.

There's another smaller item I would like to mention. Section 26 (2) sets out the

(Mr. Cowan cont'd) requirements for a person to be vouched for at the Court of Revision and it refers to a certain form to be used, and that form sets out requirements that aren't required by the Act. The form should be changed so that it meets with the requirements of the Act.

One other matter that I think would help to simplify matters and help to draw people's attention to what is going on is if we had a proclamation that wasn't as wordy as the proclamation that we use now. It starts off for instance with these words: "Public Notice is Hereby given that in obedience to Her Majesty's Writ to me, directed and bearing the date the 9th day of November, 1962, I require the presence of voters at " -- and it goes on and on and ends up with -- "of which all persons are hereby required to take notice and govern themselves accordingly. God Save The Queen" -- and so on. In Nova Scotia, they did away with this great long wordy proclamation which not very many read, and instead of setting out the various matters as set out in our proclamation, they simply set out the following statement: "And further take notice that the following are fixed pursuant to The Election Act, " and they enumerate one under the other: Nomination day; and in the second column, "date"; and the third column, "hours"; and the fourth column, "place". And so they have Nomination Day; underneath that, Advanced Polling Days; underneath that, Ordinary Polling Day; underneath that, Official Addition Day, or the might have the Court of Revision. And so they have a simple statement, one item under another, with one date under another, and the hours and places one under another. It is quite clear and quite short and we don't have the long wording that we have in our Proclamations.

The hospital voting, too, I think could be improved upon. We found in the last election that we find on the outside of the envelopes, we'll say the name "Mary Smith at 222 Carlton Street" or something like that, and when they went through the list there was no Mary Smith living at 222 Carlton Street but there was a Mrs. John Smith, and because they couldn't identify a "Mary Smith" with "Mrs. John Smith" in any way, they didn't count that ballot. I think we could require that on the outside of the envelope that we put in the case of married women, not only their christian names but also the name of their husband, so that their ballots could be counted. Also in connection with the hospital vote, sometimes the hospital returning officer said that the envelope belonged in Elmwood whereas it actually belonged in East Kildonan. The envelope went to Elmwood and of course that person wasn't on the Elmwood list so that person's vote wasn't counted. We should have some way of checking a little bit further to make sure that that envelope goes to the right constituency so that that person's vote is counted and not lost.

We have had before us some alleged irregularities by the Leader of the NDP, in which he accused the member for Wellington of doing something that was wrong, but I think that the member from Wellington should be commended for his energy and his drive and the help of his workers in getting so many people on the voters list that had been left off by the enumerators.

The resolution, in the second "whereas", refers to it as a fact, "and whereas it appears that there may have been irregularities and so on", and I submit for your consideration a short amendment to correct that and make it "allegations", because we have not any proof. We have not any certainty yet that there have been any irregularities. I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the resolution be amended by striking out the word "appears" in the third line and substituting therefor the words "is alleged".

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker

MADAM SPEAKER: The member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wished to adjourn, unless you want to speak.

MR. SCHREYER: I wanted to ask a question of the last speaker, if he would permit me. I would like to ask him if a sworn statement -- a statement that is attested to by, not Notary Public but Commissioner of Oaths, if it is attested to and contains names of people not living in a riding, and despite that is still attested to by a Commissioner of Oaths, is not an alleged irregularity?

MR. COWAN: I wouldn't say it was an irregularity; it was a false statement.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.
MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Wellington, The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order stand.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I was prepared to speak on this. I wonder if I may be permitted.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I read the resolution with interest and I listened and again read the speech by the mover of the resolution in Hansard, and I am struck by the fact that there is a good deal of vagueness about just what it is that the mover of the resolution expects to accomplish by same. In one portion of his speech he did mention the fact that there is a subtle advertising campaign which is recruiting 2,500 new customers each year in Winnipeg, and he says, and I quote from page 675 of Hansard; "What can actually be done in this field I really don't know, but I think if the manufacturers could be led to realize that we are concerned and even prepared to do something about it, they would be dissuaded from continuing their present trend of advertising." Now that, to me, is a threat or an implied threat if ever there was one -- that we are concerned and even prepared to do something about it. And I thought well now, this is action; this is strength. Of course I understand on reading further that the mover of the resolution is strongly in favour of free enterprise and the right of free enterprise in industry and commerce to continue and do as it likes in attempting to sell its products, and he does conclude further by making the statement that he is opposed to censorship. He does not believe one can legislate morals and therefore expresses the hope that the manufacturers would reveal some sense of responsibility and not encourage our young to smoke.

Well, Madam Speaker, I think that's wishful thinking. I think it's nice. I think it would be very desirable if manufacturers of cigarettes who have tremendous investments in the smoking habits of the nation would give up their desire to make a profit out of these smoking habits and would voluntarily say, "well we realize now that what we have is a most dangerous weapon, a most dangerous threat to the youth of the country, and we will now attempt to do something not to persuade the young or the old to smoke." Well I just can't conceive of it being done. I just can't conceive -- well they've never even admitted that there is the possibility of cancer and other respiratory ailments and coronary diseases that could come as a result of smoking, and since they don't admit it and since we can't expect them to admit it, I don't see what the government will do once this motion is passed. Yes, there is a request to the Minister of Health to investigate ways and means and there is that one positive approach which the mover of the motion made, and that is that there should be a program of education. I think that's most desirable.

I fully agree with the suggestion that we should match the adverse advertising which appears, and much of it appears on the publicly-owned television facility of this country, and possibly as soon as we have an advertisement with a young girl and a young boy sharing a cigarette we should immediately flash on after that, "don't be fooled; don't forget that you are being invited to participate in the most dangerous enterprise; and do not pay attention to the advertisement which we have just shown you and for which we have charged so many and so many dollars in order to produce revenues for the television station or indeed the television industry." Nevertheless, there should be an intensification of the educational efforts, I don't want what I have said -- in indicating that this resolution says little and has no teeth in it -- I don't want to indicate for a moment that it should not have been brought. I do believe that it is a matter of the utmost importance. I am glad it was brought before us and I am certainly not critical in any way of what has been said so far in this subject.

I would suggest, however, that one of the matters that should be dealt with with much greater consideration is the use, or the possibility of the use of the Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Government which does take an interest and should take an interest in, not only the quality of the product but also the manner in which the products are exploited and the manner in which the allegations of the manufacturer or merchandiser measures up to the truth. We know that the Food and Drug Administration does do that in relation to certain patent

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) medicines. I would hope that this government will do what it can to encourage the Federal Government in enabling the Food and Drug Administration to do even more of looking into the field of actually controlling the nature of the advertising which is used by the companies that derive profits from the sale of cigarettes.

In line with what government can do, I think it only fair to indicate to the House what the medical association is thinking about it. We had the report from the Honourable Minister on the recognition of the problem by the medical profession and fortunately this morning, or this afternoon, I received a copy of an editorial printed in the Canadian Medical Association Journal dated March 23rd, 1963. The editorial deals with the misleading advertising in the aspects of the cigarette problem and I think, Madam Speaker, it might be of interest to all of us if we read just a portion of this for the edification of those who do not normally see the Medical Journal.

The editorial deals with evidence which was taken before the United States House of Representatives Sub-committee in 1957 dealing with false and misleading advertising, in this case dealing with filter tip cigarette advertising, and it quotes a statement made at the hearing by Mr. Roy Norr, one of the founding fathers of the modern advertising industry, who delivered this penetrating commentary. "The printed press advertising is relatively cold and lifeless puffery. Besides, the great newspapers of the nation have broken their former silence. What the public knows of the menace of intemperate smoking it has learned from the press. But look at the television screen. The peoples' air has been handed over to the cigarette huckster. His weapon is the tainted testimonial. His targets are children and adolescents. The glamour girls who just love that cigarette; the smirking announcers who blow clouds of fragrant smoke into the home; the baseball heroes who now train on "ciggies" not wheaties are not directing their fire at grandpa and grandma, they're shooting at children and youth. They are even training lisping babies to repeat their singing commercials and you can't shut off a child as you can your television set." And in the editorial, speaking as an editorial, states that "it is obvious that laissez faire is no longer a permissible policy. Of all the actions that might be taken in response to this situation, a revision by the tobacco industry of cigarette advertising policies to conform with their fundamental responsibilities to the consumer would be desirable and practical. In any event, an enquiry into the response necessary on the part of the medical profession on this difficult situation is presently being conducted by the members of the Committees of Cancer, Public Health and Public Relations of the Canadian Medical Association, but every physician has the special responsibility that his professional status and knowledge carries with it." I think, Madam -- that's the end of the quotation -- of the editorial rather.

I think, Madam Speaker, that one should commend the medical profession for taking the time to deal with this important aspect of the problem which concerns all of us. I think that we should recognize that in their efforts to work on behalf of the children and the people of Canada in this particular respect, they should be encouraged by forceful, immediate and positive action taken by government with a look to deal more effectively than by mouthing of wishful hopes that the business of tobacco production and merchandising will voluntarily give up so so much of its potential income and profits.

MR. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (River Heights): Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. John's apparently is concerned that the resolution doesn't have any teeth. For a while I thought he was talking on the denture matter that we had disposed of last evening. I think the resolution packs a punch a little stronger than he even realizes because I heard this morning that a report was released in California that has caused the market prices of the cigarette stocks to go down so much today, that if it continues there will be little left for the cigarette companies to have for further advertising, and I think this must be a direct tribute to the resolution that is on the books.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Member for Brandon, we wish that the order stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order stand, Second Reading of Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. BJORNSON presented Bill No. 38, An Act to incorporate Pine Falls General

(Mr. Bjornson cont'd) Hospital, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. BJORNSON: The main purpose of the Bill is to consolidate into a separate corporation a proposed amalgamation of hospital operations in Pine Falls. I might explain by saying the Indian Affairs Hospital, which is operated by the Federal Government, is at a location adjacent to the existing Pine Falls Hospital. It is being discontinued and a new wing for the Pine Falls General Hospital is to be constructed to take its place. With the substantial contributions of property involved and the fact that money is going to be made available from three different sources, that is, Manitoba Paper Company will be participating, so will the Manitoba Government and the Federal Government, that it seems logical and businesslike that the hospital assets should be helped by a separate corporate entity. The Manitoba Hospital Commission have advised those interested that this is the method that they should seek their incorporation.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I realize this isn't the time to deal with the specifics of the Bill and I shall not refer to any specific clause, but somewhere in that Bill there is reference made to the effect that admission to this particular hospital shall not be -- there shall be no discrimination as to colour, race, creed and so on. I think the member is aware that this is a pretty unusual provision inasmuch as I don't think you will find it contained in any other Bills, Acts of incorporation of Hospitals, so I think it is worth the minute or two it might take to explain why it was seen fit to include that provision. If the member isn't aware of it now, perhaps he'd like to get the information by the time this gets to Committee.

MR. BJORNSON: I can't say that I've been particularly aware of this in the Bill. I don't think that anyone has ever been refused admittance to the Pine Falls General Hospital in the past and I think it carries on.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I certainly didn't want to convey the -- I suppose I'm out of order here -- but the last thing I wanted was to convey the impression that there was discrimination, far from it, but I'm curious to know why it's in there and hope the member will undertake to get us that information for Committee.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Bill No. 29, The Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 29, An Act respecting Associates Mortgage Credit Limited, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this Bill is simply for the purpose of allowing this company to carry on business in Manitoba.

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

MR. PAULLEY:

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Madam Speaker, but I would like it recorded that the second reading was granted on Division.

. continued on next page.

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

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Madam Chairman, may I

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mines and Natural Resources, Department 9, (1) Administration.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Inkster wished to say something and he didn't get in before Madam Speaker could hear him.

MR. GRAY: Mine is a very selfish motive. This is and I thought perhaps the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources have about three or four hours to reply to all the criticism or praise that we have given him last night. So I thought perhaps we could get an extra hour tonight. That's exactly what I had in mind to say. Now I'm appealing to you, Sir.

MR. PAULLEY: What my honourable friend was about to suggest to Madam Speaker was seeing as it's 4:30, could we call it 5:30 in order to give the Minister a few extra minutes to consider the replies. At least that's my understanding.

MR. LYON: I'm sure the Honourable Minister appreciates that consideration, but I'm sure he's also ready.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Flin Flon): I'd like to reply to some of the questions that were asked of me last night during consideration of the estimates. Dealing first with those questions that were asked by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains: He referred to fire-killed timber and asked if the Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company could not take some of this timber. Due to a quality control problem at the Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company over the past two or three years where they've had to improve the quality of their product in order to maintain their competitive status with other products, they are not able to use fire-killed timber, or indeed scar-killed timber. But the member might be interested to note that during the year 1962 they did purchase off their company limits some 31.9 percent cordwood or some 26,400 from outside of their limits.

Last night two or three of the members commented on the Manitoba Game and Fish Association and mentioned that the association was doing a good job in this province and, of course, I as the Minister who has had perhaps more to do with them than many of the members have here, have appreciated the manner in which the Game and Fish Association have grown and extended advice and assistance to the department in the problems of conservation which we have across Manitoba. I'm looking forward to being able to continue the association with them on the amicable basis that we have had up to now.

The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains referred to diseased moose last night, coming from the Duck Mountain. I learned that the moose are subject to a parasite, not only in this province but also in other provinces and that they are particularly subject to parasites but no more here than in any other area of Canada. Apparently the problem of parasites in moose has been discussed quite recently by biologists and all of them are trying to find some ways and means of handling this situation. With diseased deer, we had tests of 35 deer blood samples made by the Provincial Veterinarian Laboratory and all were found to be negative for burcelliosis, leptospirosis and vibriosis. The lungs and livers for 45 animals collected for the reproductive study were examined for parasitism and we do not believe that we have this problem too great in Manitoba.

The question was asked about the success of party hunting and the figures that we have indicate that the individual license holder for deer had about 65 percent success whereas the party licenses had close to 71 percent which we do not consider to be too significant in over-harvesting of deer. The question of party hunting for moose has been discussed; we did not consider going in for party hunting for moose as we felt we would be in the experimental stage with the party hunting of deer, but since so far the results with deer have been not too bad, we will take it under consideration for the coming year.

It was also mentioned last night that we should increase our sport angling plantation activities and we will have money in the estimates this year to improve the cold water supply to the Whiteshell Hatchery, which in turn will improve the efficiency of the production of the various

(Mr. Witney, cont'd) fish that we have in the mill there for distribution in the lakes in this province.

Reference was made to the loss of streams for spawning and it is right that we have lost a good number of streams for spawning, basically because of agricultural activities as they have moved close to the banks of the stream, but our tagging is beginning to show some indications that fish can adjust themselves and can actually form local populations within a larger lake. There is, of course, the problem of a competition from other species and this year in Lake of Manitoba we had a substantial increase of the suckers. As we are able to get the trawl net and the trap nets working to handle larger volumes of rough fish we should be able to remove them and take away some of the competitive value that they have and leave room for the other type of fish such as the whitefish, the pickerel, etcetera. There is some indication too that fishing pressure -- commercial fishing pressure -- can cause some harm on lakes and we are watching this point very carefully.

The Honourable Member for Inkster referred to the high cost of fish and I agree with him that the fish in some of the retail stores is high cost, but I regret that there is nothing that I can do about that particular phase of it. He referred to the fishermen who received about 2 1/2 million from 5 million. I'm sure he will realize that in the other 2 1/2 million, there must come the cost of processing and transportation and cold storage charges, etcetera. I think he will also realize that as the commercial fishermen in this province is becoming more independent, and as he is becoming more quality conscious and beginning to have a pride in his produce and as he is developing his producer co-operatives -- and as I mentioned there are three of them now -- I think he will find that he will be in a position where he himself will be able to demand better prices.

MR. GRAY: have one comment. Today, we purchase from a store pickerel at \$1.70 a pound. That's criminal.

MR. WITNEY: Last night the honourable member referred to reforestation of trees and we have in several areas of the province now established forest management of the sustained yield basis and in other areas where we haven't got it yet, such as in the Interlake country we are in the process of establishing such management plants. I can report to you that in the southeast corner of Manitoba we are now operating under the annual allowable cut and we have during this past year brought that area under sustained yield management.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks made a statement on conservation and I am pleased that he read it into the record, for I think these statements should be in the record of Hansard where people can read them. He referred to the pothole program under ARDA and as far as my information is concerned it is still being considered by the Federal Government. I understand that there was a meeting in Saskatoon just a month or so ago when the plan was discussed again by biologists from across the provinces and that the subject will be on the agenda of a Resources Ministers Council for Canada a few months later on in the year.

He mentioned infra-red. Infra-red is used, I understand, basically to see through smoke in combating forest fires and that to date they have not been able to bring it to a practical level of utilization and the experiments are continuing at the Dominion level. There was reference made last night to Mr. Kimball and some criticism of the fact that we went outside for the person from the United States. I think I should draw to the attention of this committee that Mr. Kimball is considered to be a man of experience and a man who is an expert on the subject and I believe it's safe to say that he has coped with hunting problems that we will not see for many years and we were able to obtain through him a considerable amount of experience and a considerable amount of actual know-how in the matter of hunter safety. I would like to suggest to them too that this matter of information and advice is a two-way street. We have our Director of Game and our senior biologist who are on committees of United States origin for their advice and their experience and I think we here in Canada and in the United States can benefit from this two-way street of exchange. In Saskatchewan, the game director there is also on a committee with respect to migratory birds for the advice and experience that he can offer.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks referred to the muskrat farms. I think we have two now, the Tom Lamb muskrat ranch in the Moose Lake area and one up on Lake Manitoba. There were several in the province a few years ago, but they appeared to have been

(Mr. Witney, cont'd) uneconomical for the private individual to operate and many of them have been taken over by the government, such as the Summerberry, the Whitewater Lake and the Libau and Netley marsh area and the government now manages them and distributes the trapping within these areas, particularly up in the Summerberry marsh. We do have a dearth of muskrat. I think it's principally due to the low water seasons which we have experienced over the past two years and the muskrat crop in the Summerberry is expected to be about 50 percent below normal.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks also referred to aluminum dust. It is used in the San Antonio Mines, other mines are using forced ventilation to prevent silicosis and in all the mines in this province the miners are X-rayed annually and before they are taken on staff. Manitoba has been relatively free of silicosis during the past few years.

The Honourable Member for Logan, I believe it is, referred to silicosis. It is taken care of by the Workmen's Compensation Board across Canada, and the particular item that he mentioned I believe is under consideration by the Department of Labour at the present time.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks referred to the St. Andrews bog. We did have the Surveys Branch make a survey of the land we would need in order to contain what we felt would be the desired water level. The Lands Branch are now — with that survey completed the Lands Branch are now attempting to purchase the necessary lands and we are considering that we should set up the St. Andrews bog as a bird sanctuary. We will have to watch for depredation if we are able to do this and with the knowledge that we have gained over the past two or three years we do not feel that any degree of difficulty will be occasioned by the farmers in the area.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface referred to the park entrance fees. We instituted the park entrance fees because we felt that it was right that the user of our parks should pay; we felt that the monies that are being expended in park and recreational developments across the province come from out of the pockets of all the people of Manitoba; some of them are unable to use the parks and recreational areas, and that it is quite a legitimate charge to make, to assess the 50 cents per day or the \$3.00 per season for those who do enjoy the parks. I do not feel that the cottagers are paying too much; but the cottagers present a small proportion of the number of people who are using our parks and provincial recreational areas and this fee is designed to be a legitimate assessment against the many people who use the park for day use.

I believe that the Crown has a duty to develop parks on land that it owns and that there is a role for municipalities in park development, but I think perhaps the Honourable Member for St. Boniface overlooked the fact that we in our estimates are providing money for a consultant to look over the whole picture of municipal and non-profit parks in the Province of Manitoba to see how we can weld them with our own activities. We are developing many parks around the Province for day use and in the Winnipeg area we have Patricia and Grand Beach and St. Ambrose Beach for people who wish to go out for the day or perhaps for the weekend.

In reference to the payment of school taxes on cottages I think it is a subject that he could draw to the attention of his municipality.

The Honourable Member for Logan asked for statistics with respect to the Potash Development. The drilling for potash along the Manitoba and Saskatchewan boundary has revealed an area about 14 square miles in area which is estimated to contain close to 200 million tons of potash ore of mineable grade; one-half of this lies within Manitoba. The grade average 25 percent potassium oxide and it is calculated that this should support an operation of 4,000 tons per day. Besides the potash underlying the area, drilling of widely spaced holes elsewhere along the inter-provincial boundary has indicated the presence of potash over a much larger area in Manitoba. In some holes the ore was of marginal grade, in others of economic grade and in still others of non-mineable grade. A rough estimate based on insufficient drilling information reveals potential reserves of some 600 million tons of 25 percent potash are in Manitoba and of this that contained in the 14 square mile area that's been referred to has been most thoroughly investigated.

The Honourable Member for St. John's referred to sanctuaries and I was pleased to note that he gave recognition to the bird watchers and those people in the province who are simply interested in observing nature. We do have sanctuaries in the province and to mention one or

(Mr. Witney, cont'd) two of them, we have the Alfred Hole Goose Sanctuary on No. 4 Highway; The Grant Lake Goose Sanctuary which is just northwest of Winnipeg; the one which we hope we may be able to establish in the St. Andrews Bog area; there's one just on the outskirts of Winnipeg here in St. Charles and we have others in mind in connection with the Grand Rapids Park which is being considered at the present time.

We do not control firearms or issue licenses with respect to firearms because we have felt up to now at any rate that that was a duty for the RCMP. We have had close co-operation and co-ordination with the RCMP. A particular type of firearm was drawn to our attention from Rivers last year and we were able to get some action through the RCMP in order to have the weapon taken off the list.

I think the Honourable Member for St. John's and the Honourable Member for Kildonan, I believe it is, referred to a method of "picking lots from hats" for the areas of the province. We have tried all types of disposition of lots and we feel that the present type of disposition that we have is the best one. I would not want the inference left that most of our lots are going at exceptionally high prices because many of the lots that have been sold in this province have gone for about \$50.00. I might suggest to them that in picking lots from a hat, the man may not get the lot that he wants and I also feel that as we recognize the different value between a back-tier lot and a front-tier lot that we should be able to recognize the individual merits of individual lots. The bidding system that we have allows us to do this and it also means that the man who bids and who is prepared to pay a bonus is generally the man who is going to build his own cottage for the enjoyment of himself and his family. I think the only place where we have had lots go at what you might call exceptional prices is in the Falcon Lake area.

The Honourable Member for Radisson, the Leader of the NDP, made an interesting address last night about the returns that we receive from our natural resources in the province, particularly the non-renewable natural resources. I would like to just point out to him some figures which he perhaps has not had because of the dates in which these reports are issued. In 1961 the total value of mineral production was \$101,400,000 in round figures and in 1962 that rose to \$159,038,000 in rough figures, and I should like to draw to his attention that these are gross figures and such matters as salaries, production costs and exploration must be taken from them. He also referred to a figure -- I think it was of \$88,000 in his speech last night, and in looking at the report that we have, the 1959-60 fiscal year compared with the 1960-61 fiscal year gave us an increase of \$82,025.00. But in the comparison of the fiscal year 1960-61 with 1961-62, he would have found that the increase was some \$312,098.00. And in royalty tax alone we are estimating for 1961, \$600,000; for 1962, \$945,000; and for 1963, and this is an estimate again, some \$1,025,000.00.

I would like to draw to his attention something which perhaps he neglected in his speech last night and that is the industrial townsites agreement which are entered into with the mining companies. Townsites of course, as he will realize, are an integral part of a mining operation, and in the Thompson Mining agreement alone, or townsite agreement, the International Nickel Company to the information I have, have expended some \$10 million in capital development of the Town of Thompson. Mining companies in Thompson, in Snow Lake and in Lynn Lake have been responsible for the capital development of schools, streets, lanes, water and sewer installation and also for hospitals. I believe that we are the only province in the Dominion that has this in operation at the present time and I might ask him to reflect on what could happen in -- or what did happen in Elliot Lake and what might happen in Fort Saskatchewan -- I beg your pardon, in Uranium City -- if the mine there were to close and the capital investments which were placed there by the province, I presume, were to simply fall back into the hands of the people. So in the \$10 million in the capital investment that the mining companies are paying on mining towns alone, it is a very substantial amount, in addition to the annual figure which they pay, the grants in lieu of taxes which are based on formulas that they are paying a little bit more than is indicated by the figures in the book.

I would also like to mention to him this consideration, that COMEF is stating that we need to find some 75,000 jobs in the few years to come, and I think he realizes that the operations of mines in the province provide a good many of these jobs. But I wonder if he realizes that the Province of Manitoba is in considerable competition for the exploration and the development monies that are available -- not only with the provinces that adjoin us or other provinces

(Mr. Witney, cont'd) in the Dominion, but also in the world -- and recently at the Prospectors Conference in Toronto a very interesting speech was given by the head of one of the largest exploration companies in Canada, who drew it to the attention of the prospector, that in many areas of the world there are some very attractive propositions being offered for the money that can be spent in exploration and in development. I'm sure that he wishes to see the natural resources whether they be renewable or non-renewable developed in this province and I'm sure that the people of the province want to see them developed; and I'm sure that they would feel very unhappy if we were to introduce any system or any increases which would make our competitive position such that development capital or exploration capital would leave the province. In over the period of years legislation that has been brought in that has been unduly restrictive in more than one province, has seen an exodus of such capital to the point where the legislators have had a change of mind, and revised their thinking, in order to get the capital back. We have some 25 companies operating in Manitoba at the present time and I trust that we will be able to keep them here.

The matter of what we are getting from our non-renewable resources has been uppermost in my mind since I became the Minister and I think it's safe to say that at least once every year and a half the question has been asked within the department as to whether or not we are receiving a fair return from the non-renewable resources, particularly in view of the point that the honourable member mentioned last night that we cannot replace them. We have had people, accountants from outside the department, assess our processes to see that we are getting what we should do; we have had committees with the Treasury Board and our own people to examine the whole picture. We have sent men into Ontario, and are continuing to do so, to keep a running brief on the situation and so far we feel that we are not in a position where the public of Manitoba is not getting a fair return. Not when you take into account the townsites that have been built and when you take into account the number of jobs that have been made available in this province and when you take into account the magnitude of development of these resources that we have at the present time and which I'm sure that this province wants. The Ontario formula; the Saskatchewan formula; the Manitoba formula have been compared, not only compared in the straight percentage rates, but also compared in the amount of monies that have been paid out in such matters as these townsites to which I refer.

I noted last night that the honourable member mentioned roads and I assume that he was classing the cost of developing a road in those areas as another charge to the people and tying it into the fact that we were not getting enough from our non-renewable resources. I have lived in a mining town when it did not have a road and when we were entirely dependent upon the railroad and I believe when we have a mining town of some substance that it is essential that a road be taken to it as soon as we possibly can, because the mining communities are always quite aware of the fact that they live on a non-renewable resource and the only way that they can combat that is to make use of the renewable resources that they have around them, for in most cases the mines are situated in areas of renewable resources. Roads, good communications, are one method that can be used to develop renewable resources and as these roads are developed as we have seen in the Flin Flon area, we have had the tourist industry begin to develop to a greater extent than ever before; lumbering begin to develop and fishing begin to develop and the road helps these people in not having to face that at the end of 10 or 20 or 30 years, that the ore has gone; what have we got left. It leaves the 10 or 20 or 30 years to build an economy on the natural resources or the renewable resources around about. So I feel that the road should be looked upon in that light, and if I interpreted the honourable member last night correctly, not in the light that he was looking on it.

I would just like in passing to say to him that in other non-renewable resources, particularly in oil, that for the size of the wells that we have here in Manitoba, we obtain 12 1/2 percent, whereas in other jurisdictions the equivalent is about five percent; and in the industrial minerals in comparing our figures with others in the various jurisdictions we find them to be about the same. I think, Mr. Chairman, that I have answered the questions that came to me last night but will be prepared to answer any more.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. There is quite a lot of information that he has just given to the committee that requires a study of his remarks before I would be in a position to discuss many points that

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) he raised. I want at the offset, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is under any misapprehension of my intents last night, respecting the building of the road to Thompson, let me assure him that I'm all in favour of the building of the road to Thompson, the only criticism that I would have is the length of time that it's taken to build the road. But apart from that, apart from that, I realize the necessity of the road and I can say to him -- make this confession albeit that I am a railroader -- I do appreciate the necessity of giving the people of Thompson another outlet into their community. So I don't think there is any difference of opinion in respect of the road that is being built to extend our highway system into Thompson, and indeed from there the road will have to be further developed.

The Honourable the Minister spoke at some considerable length of the cost of the development and the capital investments that are necessary in developing the likes of a community the size of Thompson. I appreciate this very much, that this is necessary, but I wonder whether or not the Minister would agree with me that there is returns on the capital investments of this nature in the townsite of Thompson going back to the corporation itself; because while it's nice to listen to the fact of an investment of \$10 million, I believe that was the figure that my honourable friend mentioned, I think that this, over a period of time, will be returned to the company by the charges that they are making in Thompson to those who are located there at the present time. So I think that while I appreciate the magnitude of the amount of money that's necessary in the development, I do think that it will be returned eventually to the company, as I say, by payments by those who are using the services and who are located in the Town of Thompson. So I think that's really no argument on the part of the Minister in refuting the fact, as I stated last night, that the taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba is not receiving sufficient return for the investment that they're making at the present time.

The Minister mentioned the fact of other areas which are under consideration by many of our mining investment companies that may -- and I think in his remarks attempted to establish to me or to the committee that because of this, it's necessary for us -- because of this competition, it's necessary for us here in the Province of Manitoba to grant concessions or keep our level of taxation, etcetera, lower in order to attract these investors at the present time. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether this is really a sound basis insofar as our renewable assets are concerned. I wonder whether or not that eventually if as a result of the depletion of our renewable assets in the Province of Manitoba, they become depleted, and in the process of being depleted the taxpayer of the province is not given an adequate return; because after all I think it is a truism, or it would be true to say, Mr. Chairman, that companies usually invest where they get the greater return. Now then, I think insofar as the other countries that the Minister -- or areas, he didn't specify where, and I can appreciate that -- that these resources will be there after ours have been depleted. Because after all, as I understand the situation, or in my viewpoint, will only develop as we require the minerals that are being developed, and if in the process we deplete the renewable assets or non-renewable assets of the Province of Manitoba by virtue of concessions, and the other areas still remain untouched, I wonder whether or not this is a fair deal for the people of Manitoba.

Now I appreciate the fact that the Minister has pointed out to me and to the committee that in the report of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future the necessity of the provision of jobs through the development of our natural resources, so many jobs have to be found for the Province of Manitoba and the workers and citizens of the Province of Manitoba. I wonder though whether he could give me the information as to the ratio of the employees in the Thompson area who were before that, prior to that development, residents of Manitoba. Because it's my understanding in conversation -- as I understand, in conversation with many, that a considerable number -- and I don't know the percentage and I don't know if my honourable friend does either -- were transient miners from other areas that came in. I raise this just simply to try and ascertain whether because of this transient nature of miners we are going to provide the jobs as recorded in the report of Manitoba's Economic Development for citizens of Manitoba. And I think that that is the prime job of the Committee considering the population increase between now and 1975 in the Province of Manitoba.

I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that there's anything further that I want to say at the present time because as I say, the Minister in his reply to me raised one or two matters and thoughts that I would like to read in Hansard in order that I might be able to assess the full significance

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) of what he said. But I still think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has not convinced me that I was not on firm ground yesterday when I stated that the taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba is not receiving a fair shake insofar as a return on the depletion of our non-renewable resources. I think he mentioned by inference another province and I will just make a brief reference to another province, where on their total estimated costs of expenditure for the fiscal year '63-'64 in respect of resource development they anticipate an expenditure of \$7,590,000, but on the other side of the picture they anticipate a revenue income of \$25,550,000, or somewhere a little in excess of three to one, expenditure as compared to revenue. Now there might be peculiar circumstances as to why this is so, but our relationship unless it's going to be changed in the estimates of revenue and expenditure that we will be receiving in due course in this House, I think I have established the fact from the Public Accounts that the balance is just the opposite here in the Province of Manitoba and that we're still expending about a million two, if I recall the figures correctly, more than we're receiving in return. It is on this point, Mr. Chairman, that I raised the points that I did last night. But again I say to the Minister, I will study his remarks of this afternoon and assess them.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I notice the government does intend to establish a rough fish processing plant, although I understand that no decision has yet been made in that connection. Now the Honourable Minister I think is aware of a fact that I have within my constituency a fish processing plant which has been in existence for over 20 years. It was started by an individual and he has perfected the process of processing fish to the point where he is now able to handle 4,500 pounds per hour. He uses offal and he uses rough fish. He estimates that during the months of April and May from Lake Winnipeg he will be able to process 100 tons of rough fish; from Lake Winnipegosis he will be able to process 270 tons. During the month of June he will process 54 tons from Lake Winnipeg; none from Lake Winnipegosis. July, 60 tons from Lake Winnipeg; 30 tons from Lake Winnipegosis. August, 60 tons from Lake Winnipeg; 240 tons from Lake Winnipegosis. September, 60 tons from Winnipeg and 225 tons from Winnipegosis, and October, 60 tons from Lake Winnipeg and none from Lake Winnipegosis. Which means a total during the present season, coming season, of 327 tons from Lake Winnipeg and 765 tons from Lake Winnipegosis. Now this young man is performing a service, not only to the fishermen, not only to the fishing industry but also to the farmers of this province because he processes the fish meal which is greatly in demand. Recently I said he perfected this plant, and I believe that he has one of the finest plants in Manitoba today -- in fact I think it is the only plant in Manitoba and the amount that he can process through that plant compares favourably with amounts processed through plants in British Columbia and other provinces in Canada where they have a big fish catch. Now I appreciate the fact that there may be some objection to the location of his plant, which is just west of Clandeboye. It may be argued on the part of the Minister that we should have plants nearer the big commercial areas, but I suggest to the Minister that this individual appears to have a pretty solid argument as to why the location of his plant could be made quite central.

Regarding, and I don't know if the Minister has considered it or not, but supposing for the sake of argument you decide to put on floating plants on Lake Winnipeg, or on any of the other commercial lakes, there's one thing you must take into consideration and that is the distance between the various fishing stations on these lakes. Some of these fishing stations are anywhere from 20 to 50 miles apart. Now the fishing seasons on Lakes Winnipeg, Manitoba and Winnipegosis are not long enough for a huge and costly reduction plant to operate economically. When the season closes on Lake Winnipeg for example, the floating plant on this lake would be unable to catch the season on Lake Manitoba. However, this plant that he has is situated centrally between Selkirk and Gimli and if the government would only find the means of freighting the rough fish either to Selkirk or to Gimli, this individual could use all the rough fish which the government could bring there. He suggests that if the government would pay a subsidy of two cents a pound on rough fish caught, which would allow the fishermen one cent for catching and one cent to the freighters, which would be used for transporting this fish either to Selkirk or Gimli, he would be prepared to pay the government one-half a cent a pound for that rough fish and the cost to the government would be one and a half cents a pound.

Now I think the government should take this into consideration because here is an individual who, on his own initiative, without getting any capital from the government, has started up

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd) a plant and he is making a success of it and I would hate to see the government, either alone or in partnership with anybody else, establish fish processing plants either on Lake Winnipeg, Lake Winnipegosis or any other lake from which this individual obtains his raw supply, because it would be most unfair competition. I feel that every encouragement in Manitoba should be given to individual initiative and I hope that the government will not subsidize or go into partnership with any other organization using public funds for the purpose of competing with an individual who has built up a successful business through his efforts and initiative.

I would ask the Honourable Minister to take into consideration the suggestion that you should subsidize the catch of raw fish. You could use your trawlers or your -- what are the nets, you call them now? -- troll nets or trap nets. You could use the commercial fishing freighters that are on Lake Winnipeg. These coarse fish could be transported on those freighters in tanks to either Selkirk or to Gimli, and I feel reasonably satisfied that if the government would investigate this suggestion that they would find that it has the answer to the problem of ridding Lake Winnipeg and Lake Winnipegosis of the rough fish. I don't think it is true that the rough fish are always found in the same locations and if you do establish plants on Lake Winnipeg of Lake Winnipegosis, you might find yourself in the position that you'd have greater difficulty in transporting the fish to these plants than you would have in transporting the fish to Selkirk or Gimli now. I do hope that the government will not do anything in connection with this problem without giving serious thought and consideration to making use of a plant which is already established and was established by private enterprise.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I take a great deal of exception to the statement of the Leader of the NDP Party, and you know it really amazes me when he will tell us that there's so much money to be made in the exploration and development of our natural resources and in particular our minerals. I think we're very fortunate in this province that we have a Thompson; and I think we're very fortunate in this province that we have the International Nickel Mine at Thompson. When you look back and see the amount of money that this company has spent on initial development and surveying, I think it's only fair that this company should be entitled to recapture this expenditure in the form of depreciation of its capital expenditure. When somebody speaks of \$42 million of mineral production, first of all you have to analyze and find out that you have a matter of costs, you have a matter of depreciation, and then when you come to the figure of net profit, this you're not permitted to keep because close to 51 percent of it goes back to the Federal Government in terms of taxes. So that it is most unfair to say that the people of Manitoba are not getting a fair return for their natural resources, because we are. We may not be getting it directly from the company, but we are getting it directly from our Federal Government by virtue of the fact that this operation does pay 50 percent of its net profit to the Dominion Government.

Something was said about Sherritt-Gordon in last night's remarks by the same member from Radisson and I would like to know the secret, that if you cannot show an operating profit in a mining operation after having paid for your labour, supplies, overhead, management, and when there's not enough money left to service the loans or the equity of the shareholders in this company, I would like to know how we can share something with the people of Manitoba when we have nothing to share.

Mining is not a matter of investing and making money. The word "investor" and the words "private investor" or a "mining company investment" is very far removed from the facts. The average individual who goes into the field of prospecting, developing mines, is a gambler of the first-rate, and I don't think there's anybody in this world that takes the biggest gamble than a prospector does when he goes out into the wilderness of northern Manitoba -- and the only reason he goes into the wilderness of northern Manitoba; and the only reason that he will go with these hardships is because he's always hopeful that at the end of the rainbow he will find and develop a mine which will give him some very substantial returns. But I want to tell my honourable friend that 99 properties go by the way for every one property that comes into production, and I think that it is very nice to say we should socialize these mines; and I think it's very nice to say that, we talk about depletion -- and I would like to point out one matter on depletion, depletion has a direct bearing on depending on what you're depleting. If you're going to apply depletion on ore that's worth \$100 a ton, on which your costs might be

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd) \$75.00, so you have a \$25.00 profit; but if your costs are \$75.00 a ton and your cost of operation and taking that ore out of the ground is going to be \$75.00, this ore becomes marginal and then there is no depletion to be taken. I think that we in this House must bear in mind that any such operation has to be encouraged; it has to be helped, if by building roads or in any way it can, because these mines do contribute in the way of giving labour to our people; they contribute to the unemployment insurance; they contribute to the income tax deduction; and then there are merchants in their area that sell to them; transporting companies that bring in freight to them; and hotel keepers in the area; families in the area.

I would like to mention to my honourable friend that I was associated with a mining operation for 20 years in northern Quebec and we closed it 10 years ago. Up to that time this mining operation produced over two and a half millions a year and it was a marginal operation. Since we closed it you can go in there today and you can buy twelve and fifteen thousand dollar homes for \$1.00 because nobody wants them.

So I mention this, Mr. Chairman, merely for the record, in that you hear so many unfair remarks about our International Nickel development at Thompson and I understand the problem and I only say that we should have more of them. I think that with the continued work that our Department of Mines through their survey are continuing to do, I think that we can predict quite safely that we will have maybe two or three other Thompson mines some place along the way from Thompson to The Pas, Flin Flon and then south into the Neepawa area, which seems to have opened an entirely new horizon for us, not unlike the Sudbury area and possibly the Kirkland Lake area in Ontario. I merely mentioned this, Mr. Chairman, for the record, and thank you very much.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I think that -- of course one could enter into a prolonged debate as to the proportion of royalty that should be charged, proportion to net receipts, net mineral production in the province -- one could get into a fairly long palemic in that sort of argument. But I think that the remarks made here last night and then again this afternoon by my Leader should not be so blatantly misconstrued. I think really what he was pointing out was that there should be always watchful cognizance taken of the responsibility that the government of this province has to see that the revenue which the people are getting from the depletion, the exploitation of the natural resources, bears a fair relationship to the total of the net mineral production taken out of the ground.

I think if you look on page 151 of the Annual Report, even though it is not really up-to-date, you will see that there is certainly room for, if not criticism, at least penetrating questioning, as to the reason for the government feeling complacent and satisfied that royalty and other revenues taken in equalling \$740,000 in 1960-'61, compare that with a total mineral production of \$101 million and you get a ratio, or relationship of .75 percent. Then for the following year, namely '61-'62, you will find that royalty tax and other mining revenues total very close to \$1 million. Compare that to a total mineral production value of \$159 million and you get a ratio of .66 percent; in other words, two-thirds of one percent. It is in this connection that I feel that we are justified in this group in asking this government, time and time again, if they feel that such a relationship of royalty to mineral production is really justified.

I, for one, understand, and I'm sure all members in this House understand the necessity of enabling private investment to gain a profit -- profit maximization is not exactly a dirty word -- I don't think that we should be accused of thinking along those lines. It is really up to the directors of corporate enterprise to attempt to make sure that their investment brings back a reasonable rate of return. It is equally the responsibility of government acting in the interests of the people of the province to negotiate as hard as they can to see that the revenue return, the royalty return, is up to minimal standards ratio-wise. And I am not sure myself that this is the case here in Manitoba, because -- and what other basis is there to go on but to compare total revenue by way of royalty and miscellaneous, comparing that to total mineral production -- what better basis is there of analysis, and when you make such an analysis Manitoba does not stand up well at all as compared with other jurisdictions -- and I don't have in mind Saskatchewan specifically or exclusively, although certainly in Saskatchewan they have always negotiated with a good deal of determination to see that royalty and miscellaneous revenue returns from mineral production were adequate. But were they so stringent that it scared away

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) investment? If that is the case, how does one explain the tremendous, tremendous advance made with regard to exploration of potash fields and the subsequent private investment of substantial sums of money in the development of the potash mines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.