

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 10, 1963

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

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

Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the second section on my right where there are seated some 24 Grade 5 students from Collicut School in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, and also in the first section of the gallery to my right where there are 30 Grade 8 students from Ste. Annes School with their teacher Mr. Desrosiers. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye. We are pleased that you have chosen to visit us this afternoon. It is our wish that your visit will be a pleasant one, that you will learn something about the procedure of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly as you watch the proceedings here this afternoon. Come back and visit us again.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, with your permission, could I say a few words in French to this class? I will be brief and I will talk slowly.

C'est un grand honneur pour moi de vous souhaiter ainsi qu'à votre instituteur la plus cordiale bienvenue. Vous verrez dans quelques instants la plus haute cour du Manitoba en action. Je suis sûr que vous apprécierez le fait que je puis m'adresser à vous en notre langue et j'espère que cela vous inspirera à bien apprendre les deux langues. J'espère aussi que vous jouirez de votre séjour ici et que vous reviendrez nous voir encore.

Translation: It is a great honour for me to warmly welcome you and your teacher here. In a few moments, you will see Manitoba's highest Court in action. I am sure that you are also appreciative of the fact that I can speak to you in our language and I hope this will prompt you to learn both languages well. I also hope you will enjoy your stay with us and that you will visit us again.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General and Minister of Public Utilities) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with. On the 15th day of March of this year, the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party moved for an Address for Papers with respect to the Nelson River Hydro development. Now, as my honourable friend will appreciate, this requires the consent of Ottawa; there is, however, the one document that we thought my honourable friend and the members of the House would like to have before that consent is obtained and the other material is available, and so with his permission, and if he wishes it, Madam Speaker, I should like to table a partial return to that Order, giving him the agreement which is in our possession on the understanding, of course, that the balance of the Order will be tabled when the approval is received.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): . . . thank the Honourable the Attorney-General, Madam Speaker. I can understand the delay in this particular matter due to the situation prevailing in the other government, and I trust and hope as a good Canadian that the matter will soon be resolved and we have stable parliament in Canada.

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask the Leader of the House to move a couple of changes in the Standing Committees. Madam Speaker, by leave I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, that the name of Mr. Hamilton, the Honourable Member from Dufferin, be removed from the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections and replaced by Mr. Fred Groves, the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and that the name of Mr. Froese, the Honourable Member for Rhineland, be added to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, we of this group have no objection to the changes.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I'm advised that the fees for angling licences have been increased. Could he tell us why this information was not passed on to the House?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources)(Flin Flon): Angling fees, Madam Speaker, are a matter of regulation which can be passed by the Cabinet. The fees have been increased to -- for resident angling fees \$2.25 for an annual fee, and the non-resident fees remain the same, but it is a matter of regulation and it was passed by the Cabinet.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, does this apply also to all of the other licences under the Game Branch, that is, the duck hunting licences, big game hunting and so on.

MR. WITNEY: Yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the House was sitting when these changes were made, shouldn't the House have been informed?

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, they are published in the Gazette and the House would know in that manner.

MR. G. E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture on water conservation. On March 11th there was a request for copies of correspondence -- I don't believe we got them -- to do with the agreements on the Winnipeg Floodway and the Assiniboine Diversion and the Shellmouth Dam. Can we expect to get them?

HON. G. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): We will make them available as soon as the file has been completed and as soon as we have received word from Ottawa -- or as soon as we have received the consent of Ottawa to the tabling of the documents.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 19. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

HON. S. E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education)(Dauphin): Madam Speaker, if this may stand, in accordance with our previous request . . . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Labour. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I speak to this Bill out of a feeling of general interest rather than having any specific interest or involvement in the matter. I listened with interest to the previous speakers speaking on this motion, and particularly did I listen to the Member for Brandon and the lady Member from Pembina. Both seemed to take the stand that the Fair Wage Act is overly rigid and that there is need for flexibility being injected by way of amendments into the Act, and as such I suppose one could agree that flexibility is desirable, but if you take flexibility to an extreme flexibility becomes sort of a vacuous mush and you are left in a situation, or with a situation, where the working people of a community are left without any kind of safeguard or any kind of protection of their conditions -- working conditions and their living conditions.

Of course, it's obvious to all here who are at all acquainted with rural Manitoba and the towns of Manitoba, that the working people in the small towns are working more or less without any kind of bargaining power or rights. Trade unions as such are virtually impossible to organize; and this all adds up to a situation where working people in the small towns very often are working at wages not just understandably a little lower, but at wage levels that are considerably lower than that which would be considered to be adequate to maintain a decent standard of living. I could cite cases here with which I am personally familiar, in which working men in small towns working 48, 50, 54-hour weeks, working at wage rates in the order of \$200.00, \$205.00, \$210.00 a month. When you consider that alongside of the facts or the situation where they might have six, seven or eight dependents in their family to support, you can understand that this is a situation that is less than desirable.

Now the Fair Wage Act, as I understand it, applies only to the construction trades and therefore it wouldn't affect in any case those people who are working in the service industry or straight labour, but it does have this effect in that, if at least one segment of labour in a

(Mr. Schreyer, Cont'd.) . . . community is getting a fair wage, it is bound to pull up at least a little the wages of those who are not engaged in construction trades, and for that reason I can only come to the conclusion that if we are to nullify the Fair Wage Act insofar as towns of 2,000 to 5,000 are concerned, it is going to have a depressant or depressing effect on the wages of those even in other than the construction trade categories, and as I say, workers in small towns and communities in our province do not have any kind of bargaining power in the absence of trade unions, and I would consider it unfortunate if we were to do something here, overtly to do something here that would have a depressing effect on an already low level of wages. The Minimum Wage Act might as well not exist insofar as adult males are concerned who are working and who have to support families. So far as they are concerned a minimum wage of 66 cents an hour just does not enter into the picture.

So, in the absence of bargaining power through trade unions, in the absence of a viable living minimum wage standard in this province, what kind of protection do working men in small towns have? Not very much! There's a little bit of help that they do get insofar as the Fair Wage Act helps to buoy up, to a certain extent at least, the construction trade workers.

Now, I have given you in broad outline the situation which I'm afraid exists in all too many communities in this province of ours in which adults, breadwinners in the family, are working long-hour weeks, 50, 54-hour weeks, and getting very, very low wages — \$200, \$205, \$210.00 a month. I repeat for the third time -- it bears reiteration — if we take away the provisions of the Fair Wage Act from these communities it will have a depressing effect on the wage levels, not only of those in the construction trade but of working people generally in these communities.

Now, I heard the Member for Pembina say that it is harmful to the economy of a small town if by virtue of the fact that the town reaches and passes the 2,000 population mark, all of a sudden, as she put it, the wages were to double. It's not that drastic, but taking such a situation I suppose it would be harmful, but certainly the provisions of the Act would not have the effect of doubling the wages in the construction trades overnight. Furthermore, I think that one could argue with equal force and emphasis from the other tack, that is to say, that the economy of a community depends in large part upon the purchasing power of its peoples that go to make up the community, and pretty well since 1936 economists -- people who have any interest in economics -- have subscribed to the theory that an economy depends upon aggregate demand, and if the wage levels in a community are increased, bearing other factors in mind, it has a bouying up effect on aggregate demand in the community, and therefore it contributes to the sales and the general prosperity of the area. So I don't think that the argument that wages have to be kept low in order to enable some of these enterprises to continue to function -- I don't think that that is particularly realistic in view of the fact that that is only one side of the coin. The other side of the coin is that a community, unless it's reactionary in terms of economics and social justice, must also concern itself with the aggregate demand or purchasing power of its peoples, its working people -- and please let us not do anything here to depress further an already low level of wages throughout rural Manitoba. It is not something that is, of course, desperately low, but I think it could stand improvement and we seem to be going in the opposite direction.

So I suggest, Madam Speaker, that no matter from what angle or perspective you view this particular bill, no matter how you slice it, or how you wedge it, or cube it, or boil it, or bake it, it is still a piece of reactionary legislation we have before us.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, may I respectfully remind the House, not many have been in this Legislature at that time, who are present now, during the depression years the unemployed family, or the head of the family, was allowed to earn \$10.00 a month in addition to his relief allowance -- I'm not going to discuss now how low it was -- and then many employers have taken advantage of the heads of the Unemployment Relief, or those who were on relief, and as the recipient of relief was very anxious to have a dime or a dollar earned, they have occupied positions as caretakers, and other ones, for \$10.00 a month, in other words, the amount they were allowed to earn. If they would give themselves, offer their services for more money, this would have been deducted from the Unemployment Relief Allowance. This was with the permission of City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba at that time, who were participating in the situation of relief. Then the province in their wisdom made

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . a minimum wage of 25¢ an hour and the minimum wage became the maximum in many instances at 25¢ an hour, because they were not committing any offence -- that was the minimum wage. What I'm afraid of is that if this bill is passed the public will take the minimum.

Now they have 2,000 in a certain village and it could be increased to 5,000, and then the government, the governor-in-council could, in my opinion -- if I'm wrong I could be corrected -- act on the wages of the 2,000 because the 2,000 and 5,000 is not a law. It is in the administration the right to treat those towns, villages who have a population of 2,000 the same as five, and they could increase it even to ten. With this example which I have recited here I don't think that the bill is in the interest, not only of the workers, but the interest of the families who live in the small communities.

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I am one who has spoken many times on this Fair Wage Act and have shown where it needs to be amended. The government now proposes an amendment that in my estimation is a backward step.

The Manitoba Government is to be congratulated on the strength of their vision of the development of the north. The Nelson River project, for instance, will be a source of perpetual income for the province when completed. Other projects such as Grand Rapids, Thompson, Kelsey, have provided much-needed employment for the people in Manitoba. No-one will deny this, but also it cannot be denied that these people were working and being paid as second-class citizens. Although the cost of living in these points is much higher than which exists in the City of Winnipeg, the workers of these projects are paid lower wages. In many cases, to make a living wage these workers must put in as much as 90 hours a week with no overtime pay. There is something radically wrong with a system which allows this type of discrimination to operate. It is reminiscent of the Chinese coolie labour used to build the CPR. This was bad enough in itself but the situation in Manitoba is worse. These people are Canadian citizens, Manitobans ostensibly entitled to the same right and privileges as any other Canadians. But the Fair Wage Act denies this, denies its name and places the pioneers of our northland in an inferior position to the city dweller.

A similar situation exists in the areas outside the 30 mile limit of Winnipeg. It has been proven statistically that living costs are much higher outside of Winnipeg with its main lines of transportation. The further from Winnipeg the higher the cost because of transportation difficulties. Even the Department of Welfare recognizes this fact by allowing a 25 percent increase to the welfare recipients in northern areas. But the Manitoba Government is apparently willing to let the worker suffer from under a so-called Fair Wage Act which sets out one scale of wages for the city worker and another for the rural and northern worker. It not only allows this disparity but is prepared to extend it, a rise in the population necessary to operate under The Fair Wage Act from 2,000 to 5,000. This means that few rural towns will have even the dubious protection of this Act, and will be at the mercy of unscrupulous operators who can pay any wage they like.

The first duty of a member of the Legislature is to look after the interests of his constituents. In our Legislature we have an inverse situation, where the interests of the rural members are taken care of before that of their constituents. I am referring to the \$10.00 a day allowance that is made to the rural members over and above their indemnities while the House is in session. This is to cover the extra costs incurred for obvious reasons. Now I agree with that wholeheartedly, because each man is coming in here to do a job, but I say the people in the country need to be protected too -- and why don't we do it? Are we just looking after ourselves? Surely, gentlemen, we should do something for these people in the country. As my friend from Brokenhead said, these people in the city are protected. Why? Because they have unions to protect them. They have various means to protect them. But these people in the country, have they any protection whatsoever? No, Sir! So surely, I think that this Act now the way that it is going is very reactionary, and I am quite disturbed about it. With that gentlemen, I'll sit down. Thank you!

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I, too, wish to make a few comments on this Act which is to amend the Fair Wage Act. It seems to me that the existing legislation is and has been presenting a problem during the last while. Especially so in the rural communities where you have centres which are now over the 2,000 figure and therefore the

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . legislation would apply; and also those that are under the 2,000 population figure so that the business would carry on as heretofore. For some centres this could mean, if this legislation would continue as it is on the books, it would mean that there would be a dislocation of businesses in these smaller centres, because we have a number of firms who are in the construction building business and who build houses, and they build them in the towns and then sell them and move them out to the various farms and communities. Now we also have some firms who are operating just outside the town limits, and therefore they would not be -- the legislation would not be applicable, and difficulties naturally would develop because of this.

Then there's also the other matter of better income for the construction workers. I'm sure that no one in this House does begrudge any worker a higher income if they can get it. But it presents the problem of whether you're employed or unemployed, and I am sure that the people in these rural areas would rather work than be unemployed because of such a situation. And I am fully in accord with the bill. I feel that that is the proper step to take, and that it should receive the support of this House. No doubt you can build up arguments on both sides of this legislation, and that you can argue your point, but still I think the main issue is whether we are able to keep our construction workers employed backhome in the towns, in the bigger centres, as well as in the rural communities.

MR. OBIE BAZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Madam Speaker, to close the debate on this particular item, I'd like to take the opportunity to thank my colleagues, the Honourable Member from Brandon and the Honourable Member from Pembina, for their contribution to this debate.

It is once again obvious that the honourable members of the New Democratic Party feel that they are the only ones who are concerned about wages and life of a working man in a community.

MR. PAULLEY: This is bordering somewhat on an accusation that is not correct, and I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Labour would reconsider his remarks because we, in this party have never considered that we are the sole champions of labour.

MR. BAZLEY: Madam Speaker, after hearing those remarks from my honourable friend, I will withdraw mine. Thank you.

I might say that I do think it is regrettable that the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party would refer to these particular measures as retrogressive. I believe the honourable members should know that the Fair Wage Board met in several communities in the province and held public hearings to determine the situations that existed in these communities. I might say that they were large public meetings and that it was the unanimous request that the Fair Wage Board would take or recommend the necessary steps to have this Fair Wage Act amended. Now the Fair Wage Board made a unanimous recommendation -- this includes labour -- for the honourable member's information the Fair Wage Board is composed of two members of Employers Association, two members of Labour, with an impartial chairman, and their unanimous recommendation was that these measures should be taken; that they were necessary measures for the economic life and employment factors in their communities. I might say that I would agree with the Honourable Member from Elmwood when he reports out of the COM Future Report that it is necessary for a strong tripartite between Labour, Government and Management, to encourage faster growth and high levels of employment in the community, and this is what we are thinking about when we are bringing in these measures at this time for these communities that are affected.

The Honourable Member from Selkirk enquired about the Inquiry Committee, headed by Dr. Blake. This committee is set up to study all aspects of the construction industry, including the Fair Wage Act. I might say that this committee is holding meetings and I don't expect that there would be an interim report for some time.

You must remember that with this unanimous recommendation, facts that were disclosed at the public meetings indicated that it was necessary to bring in these measures at this time, and I would urge the members to give this amendment its full support.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . the Honourable the Minister of Labour will be prepared to table the report that he referred to of the Fair Wage Board?

MR. BAZLEY: I'd be pleased to, Madam Speaker.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 36; Nays, 19.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce & Provincial Secretary) (Fort Rouge) presented Bill No. 7, An Act to validate Order-in-Council 1566 of 1962 for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, this Act is to validate an Order-in-Council No. 1566 of 1962, the purpose of which was to provide a superannuation allowance for Mr. James Downie Walker, with respect to a period of employment in the Department of Public Works from 1922 to 1932. Mr. Walker left the Civil Service at that time because of disability and before the pension scheme was installed in 1939. He was subsequently re-employed by the Manitoba Power Commission in 1942, and this is to make allowance for him to be paid for the earlier period of service in the Department of Public Works.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I rise to support the Bill and to the principle which is embodied in the Bill, but I would urge upon the Honourable Provincial Secretary that he introduce similar legislation to take care of these older civil servants of this province whose retirement allowance is based upon salaries earned during the depression. I understand there's about 350 of these employees involved, and I think that since the Honourable Minister has accepted the principle which is embodied in this Bill, namely, that this man had to retire from the service due to causes beyond his control, namely ill-health, that I think on an equal footing you could consider that these civil servants whose pensions were based upon depression salaries, something over which they had no control, that similar legislation should be brought in to bring their pensions up to what their pensions would have been had they been paid a decent living wage.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I rise not to oppose the subject matter of the Bill -- I agree with the remarks that have been just made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk -- but this Bill gives me, I think, Madam Speaker, an opportunity of having clarified or explained to me something dealing with the whole question of Orders-in-Council. Members will note, Madam Speaker, that this Bill will require the majority approval of this House before the Order-in-Council is validated. When one takes a look at the schedules of the Bill, we note that there were only five members of Cabinet present at the time of the passing of the Order-in-Council. One of the honourable members, namely the First Minister, was in the Chair. Which raises a question in my mind, Madam Speaker, as to Orders-in-Council in general. I looked in the Executive Council Act of the province. I can find no provision in there where a majority is necessary insofar as the passage of Orders-in-Council is concerned, and it appears to me that it's quite possible that Orders-in-Council may be passed which do not have to come before this Legislature for validation that might be passed by a considerable minority of the Executive Council of the province.

In this particular case, it appears to me that there were slightly less than a majority of the Executive Council present that passed this Order-in-Council, with which I have already stated that I'm in agreement with, but, as I say, Madam Speaker, it raises questions into my mind on a general principle of Orders-in-Council. This is only drawn to our attention because of the necessity of validation. Other Orders-in-Council, or government by Council, can be conducted in the Province of Manitoba that we're not aware of, and it could quite conceivably, as illustrated by this schedule on this Bill, be done by even a minority of Cabinet, which raises

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . in my mind the whole principle of government by Cabinet, and I wonder if the Honourable the Minister could enlighten me in this regard.

MR. EVANS: Any further questions? I am closing the debate, Madam Speaker. For my honourable friend from Selkirk I could tell him that this superannuation allowance is calculated on the rate of pay that Mr. Downie did earn at the time he was employed, and so there is no difference in calculating this particular superannuation allowance than any other. He has another point as to whether or not the superannuation allowance for any of the employees retiring now is sufficient, and that's a matter, of course, of continued discussion between the government and the Manitoba Government Employees Association.

With regard to the number of members of Cabinet required to pass an Order-in-Council. In December of 1962, if memory serves me, there were nine members of Council at that time, and five constituted more than a majority. In any event, the Council sets a quota — quorum I mean — a quorum of five. These matters are carefully checked by the Executive Council office, and my honourable friend, of course, can ascertain what ministers were present at any time with regard to an Order. This Order requires validation because there is no legislative authority for carrying it out. The legislative authority that we do have is to pay to anyone who continues in the Civil Service an augmented superannuation allowance based on earlier service which was not included in the superannuation plan before, if he continues in the central service. However, Mr. Downie retired from the central service and was employed by the Manitoba Power Commission, and the lawyers have informed us that it is necessary to have this particular Order-in-Council validated for that reason. If he had rejoined the central service, or if he had continued in employment of the central service, no further legislative authority would have been required, but since he joined one of the Crown corporations the further legislative Act is required.

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

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health)(Gimli) presented Bill No. 54, An Act to amend The Hospitals Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, about two years ago we initiated the Tissue Committees throughout the Province of Manitoba. This means that all tissues removed in hospitals from patients are sent in for pathological and proper examination, and this is paid for through the insurance program. Last year we amended The Hospitals Act permitting the Minister to set up the Tissue Committees and call for reports of these committees. During the first year and a half now of operation of this program throughout the province, it is the expressed wish, and we concur and the Commission concurs, from the physicians and College of Physicians and Surgeons that they would be willing to take on the job of the continued secretarial work and costs of operating this program from the administration point of view, on a regional basis with boundaries coterminous with the various medical society boundaries throughout the province, on their own, rather than the Minister setting this up as we have it in the Hospital Act; and therefore this Act is expressing the statement that the Minister may direct that this be carried out under the aegis of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province, and I think it is a very good alteration and would recommend it to the House.

MR. S. CHERNIACK (St. John's): Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Minister did not mention, I think, that the use of a Tissue Committee is for the purpose of maintaining and even improving the high standard of medical care which is offered in the hospitals, and it seems to me at first blush that this amendment is one which is only proper, and puts into the hands of the College of Physicians where it belongs the problem of establishing the Tissue Committees in the various areas, so that the College could, by its committees, inspect and approve of the work that is being done in hospitals. I am aware that Tissue Committees are a method of determining whether individual doctors are maintaining the high standard of the profession, and that the conclusions of the Tissue Committees may determine the continued use by a doctor of hospital facilities, and I would expect that the Minister would agree with me in my statement if I'm right. That being the case, I am wondering whether the Honourable Minister could explain to us the procedures by which the Tissue Committees would operate in this disciplinary form of action, and if they give powers to hospitals to deny or admit doctors on the basis of conclusions reached, whether there is — the method by which it is done, and what appeal or

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . . review provisions there are for the individual doctors affected.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I have no objection to the intention of the legislation, but I arise only to make a point that I have made on other occasions; that is that in principle I object to the tendency that we have had recently of allowing the Minister to make these decisions. I notice that the excuse or reason that is given for that by members of the government is that a lot of these matters coming before Cabinet Council will occupy considerable time. I always take the position, and I think it's valid, that if they are of such a nature that there's an inclination to leave them to the Minister, then surely the Minister's word at Cabinet Council will be accepted with very little question, and that little time will be consumed. I think it's a mistake to have our legislation making a Minister responsible for these decisions. It's true that in this case he is asking the College of Physicians and Surgeons themselves to set up the committee, but the very fact of leaving it to the Minister to make the request gives people who wish to raise such a point the argument that there's a certain amount of bureaucracy and dictatorial attitude, and I think that the possibilities of misunderstanding far outweigh any advantage in the alleged time that is saved to Cabinet Council. So I would once again suggest to the Minister in this case, who is one in whom I have more confidence than I have in the most of his colleagues, that he should consider mending his own legislation and making it the responsibility of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I think that's a proper move and I think that nothing but good can come of keeping to an absolute minimum the number of cases where we leave jurisdiction, authority or responsibility completely on the head of the Minister. I know that it is not often abused, and certainly I'm not expecting that it could be in this case, because it's just a case of other people taking over the ultimate responsibility, but I think the argument for leaving these decisions with the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council rather than the Minister, far outweighs the adverse arguments.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. R. SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell) presented Bill No. 34, An Act to provide for the Observance of Official Time in the Province, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, this is not a new question which is before us, but one which has plagued mankind for a long time. I refer to the problem of uniform time. The problems of time, the measurement of time and its standardization, has been with us for a considerable period. About 100 years ago people obtained their time from the church clock or from the village hall. Each community had its own local time. Essentially communities on the same north and south line had similar times but there was great variation. So many different local times became exceedingly inconvenient and confusing as travel became more common, and as people moved from one community to another more easily. The inconvenience of running railway trains through town after town separated by only a few miles but on different times, became such that the adoption of a system of standard time zones was advocated. England overcame the local time problem by adopting a uniform time throughout the whole of that country, and that time was the time observed at the Greenwich Observatory. In 1878 Sir Sanford Fleming advocated the use of what was called Standard Time zones throughout the world. His suggestions were adopted at a world conference held in Washington in 1884, and it was agreed that all countries of the world would be urged to use standard time zones. This system of Standard Time zones was a compromise between the intolerable confusion of a multitude of local times and the apparently impractical idea of a single universal time with all clocks marking the same time irrespective of their location. It was proposed that the number of times in the world be reduced to 24, and that each time zone extend over approximately 1/24th of the circumference of the earth. The time to be used in each zone was the local time at the central meridian of that zone. The first zone, or the zero zone, was, of course, that at Greenwich in the United Kingdom.

Almost all of the large countries in the world have adopted the use of standard times, differing by a certain number of hours from the local time at Greenwich. But many smaller countries and localities use an adopted time that differs from this system, and, for example, we have the Province of Newfoundland which has a time three hours and thirty minutes later



(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.) . . . than Greenwich time.

In Canada, practical difficulties have prevented us from establishing our time zones along exact meridians, but in general each province has adopted times to suit the provincial area. The railways had already adopted time zones in some places with divisional points where they change from one time to another, and in many cases this, too, has had to be taken into consideration.

In Manitoba, the Interpretation Act provides for Central Standard Time as the time to which reference is made in the Province of Manitoba. This time is the local mean time at the 90th degree of longitude and is six hours behind Greenwich time.

It wasn't long after standard time zones were adopted in Canada that there was considerable agitation for Daylight Saving Time, particularly in the long summer months. This agitation continued until some time during the first World War. An Act of Parliament in 1916 legalized the use of Daylight Saving Time in Great Britain, and since that time it has been generally maintained there. The United States adopted Daylight Saving Time over the entire country in 1918, and since 1919 the use of Daylight Saving Time has been fairly general in the United States. Some of the individual states have continued by legislation since that time to provide for Daylight Saving Time on a state-wide basis; in other states it is permissive for cities or municipalities to establish Daylight Saving Time on their own. In Canada, the Dominion Government passed the Daylight Saving Time Act of 1918, adopting Daylight Saving Time in that year, but this statute lapsed in 1918.

During World War II the Dominion Government effected Daylight Saving Time by Order-in-Council. The first was an Order-in-Council passed on the 20th of September, 1940, directing that Daylight Saving Time continue to be observed until the Governor-in-Council might otherwise order, except in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, or rather only in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, that all persons, firms and corporations resident or carrying on business there had to observe Daylight Saving Time. On the 26th of January, 1942, by another Order-in-Council this was extended without exception across the Dominion of Canada. In September, 1945, these Orders-in-Council were revoked. At the present time we have some provinces controlling time by legislation, and in other provinces we have the adoption by certain municipalities of Daylight Saving Time.

The Province of Saskatchewan enacted legislation which placed the entire province on Central Standard Time in the summer months and on Mountain Standard Time during the winter months. The effective dates for the change of time in Saskatchewan were the last Sunday in April and the last Sunday in September.

The Province of Quebec. The Daylight Saving Act passed in 1941 provides for the establishment of daylight saving by Order-in-Council, whenever a municipality requests it.

The Province of Nova Scotia has legislation which is similar, and it enables the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council by proclamation published in the Gazette to prescribe the use of Daylight Saving Time for certain periods of the year.

The Province of Prince Edward Island has a similar means of instituting Daylight Saving Time.

The Province of Newfoundland by statute observes Daylight Saving Time in each year between midnight of the last Sunday in April and midnight on the last Sunday of September.

Although Central Standard Time is the time to which reference is made in this province, several municipalities have observed Daylight Saving Time for a number of years. In October 1946 the City of Winnipeg submitted a referendum to the electors on the matter of Daylight Saving Time, and this referendum carried by roughly 46,000 to 20,000. Since 1947, quite a number of municipalities, particularly in the Greater Winnipeg area, have observed Daylight Saving Time, and some other urban municipalities have tried it from time to time.

This haphazard use of Daylight Saving Time throughout the province has created a situation which is remarkably similar to that before the adoption of Standard Time zones -- and the confusion has bothered quite a number of people. In 1961 the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association each requested the enactment of legislation providing for the adoption of uniform time. Well, this matter was debated in this Chamber at considerable length last year, and honourable members will remember that on April 3rd last year the following resolution was passed by this House: "Whereas for many years some areas

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.) . . . of the Province of Manitoba have instituted Daylight Saving Time for varying periods of the year while other areas of the province retained Standard Time; and whereas the desirability of uniform time throughout the province is self-evident; and whereas authority to deal with this matter has for some time been exercised by the municipalities which can by general consent establish uniform time; therefore be it resolved that this House request the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association to give consideration to the problem of uniform time at the first convenient opportunity; and be it further resolved that these two organizations be requested to place their joint recommendation on this matter before the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and if Daylight Saving Time is recommended, the period in which it should be in effect."

The membership of these two municipal bodies have since had the opportunity to discuss this question and they have tendered their resolutions. The Union of Manitoba Municipalities in their 59th Annual Convention held in Winnipeg in November of 1962, passed the following resolution: "Whereas at the present time there are two different times being observed in the Province of Manitoba, causing various confusion; therefore be it resolved that the Council of the RM of Rosser petition the Provincial Government to enact legislation making a uniform time in the Province of Manitoba mandatory; and further, that a copy of the resolution be sent to the Honourable Duff Roblin and a copy to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities." And this resolution was carried by that convention. The Manitoba Urban Association in their convention held in the City of St. James in September of 1962, passed the following resolution: "That the Manitoba Urban Association urge the Provincial Government to institute Daylight Saving Time on a provincial basis."

Recently, the Manitoba Farmers Union presented a brief to the government and to the other caucuses represented in this House, and in that brief there was a section which read as follows dealing with Daylight Saving Time: "We wish to express our disappointment that the Government of Manitoba did not show appropriate leadership during the recent election by holding a province-wide plebiscite on Daylight Saving Time in conjunction with the election." They went on to say, "We are quite confident that the people of this province, including the majority in our urban centres, are dissatisfied with Daylight Saving Time for such long periods each year. We have stated on many occasions that farmers generally are opposed to it entirely; however, as outlined in our submissions during the past couple of years, we are prepared to compromise by going along with Daylight Saving Time for the summer holiday period."

In April of this year the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce in convention assembled in the City of St. James, passed the following resolution: "Whereas there is considerable confusion and inconvenience created by Daylight Saving Time when certain areas of our province change over to Daylight Saving Time for the summer months and other areas of the province stay on Standard Time; and whereas all indications are that Daylight Saving Time is here to stay; therefore be it resolved that Daylight Saving Time be introduced on a province-wide basis to eliminate this confusion by an Act of the Legislature if necessary."

Madam Speaker, the members will observe that while both the municipal organizations passed resolutions dealing with the subject of uniform time, neither of these resolutions contained any recommendations to this House as to what period of time should be devoted to Daylight Saving Time, and it would appear from the resolutions that there are before us, that there is a wide divergency of opinion on this subject. The provisions of this bill on Daylight Saving Time are in many respects a compromise. It is similar to the recommendations which gave rise to the adoption of our present system of Standard Time. We hope that it may provide an acceptable solution to a time situation which has become increasingly troublesome.

The only thing that is evident is that at the present time the people of Manitoba desire some uniformity in the time that is adopted for the people of this province. While the government is presenting this bill, we have no intention of forcing this bill upon the people of Manitoba if this is not the desire of a large proportion of them, and this bill will not be treated as an expression of confidence in the government -- we do not intend to force it through. It is my hope that by presenting this bill we will provide the opportunity for wide discussion of the question, and the opportunity will be given to all the people of Manitoba to express their opinions. When the next sitting of the Law Amendments Committee is determined -- and I would request that this bill go to Law Amendments Committee if the principle is approved by the House --

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.) . . . then we will ask the members of the press to give wide publicity to the fact that this bill will be before this committee in the hope that the people of the province through their various organizations may give expression to their various opinions.

We do know that there are many who hold different views as to the length of time that we should have Daylight Saving Time in the Province of Manitoba. There are those who believe we should have it for only a period of two months; to others the period expressed in the Bill is more satisfactory. The people in the television industry would like to have it for a period of six months, and there are those who would advocate Daylight Saving Time the year around so that we don't have any change of time in the spring and the fall. I have no strong views on the matter, Madam Speaker, and I'm quite prepared to amend the bill in Committee if this would appear to suit the desires of the majority of the people of this province.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Minister. Is he in favour of the bill or is he not?

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I am in favour of the bill.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, would the Honourable the Minister answer another question? He has given the House an approximate result of the referendum that was held in the metropolitan area on Daylight Saving Time some years ago. Could he inform the House as to the vote in these various municipalities that voted thereon?

MR. SMELLIE: I don't have that information here, Madam Speaker.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would undertake to check that matter, because I'm sure it will be close to his sources of information, and find out if my recollection is correct, that two of the municipalities voted against Daylight Saving.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of the Honourable Member from Inkster. I don't know very much about the history of time, but I do know one thing, that centuries ago, my people were only interested when to go to the synagogue to pray, and in the morning they went at sunrise and in the evening at sunset, and the same tradition is still carried on. Our holidays begin the day before at sunset. Naturally, at that time there were very few football teams and baseball teams, and golf was not known, so naturally they went by the old time. Now we are coming into reality. I feel that I cannot help, though probably reluctantly, to support this present bill, introduced by the Honourable Minister, but I feel personally that the bill is a good one providing it's uniform, but the time -- when the clock could be changed after the summer months -- is a little bit in my opinion too late. After all, we've got to worry not for ourselves, although all sports are important -- golf is important -- but also for our children. While Winnipeg has in their referendum supported Daylight Saving, the children and the mothers were not in favour of it even at that time, because we have complaints all the time that the children are not getting their normal life, but at the same time, we cannot ignore the wish of the people of Greater Winnipeg particularly, and they wanted it; they'll have it. At the proper time -- I don't know when; I don't think it will be in order now -- I shall move an amendment that the time changes at the end of August on the first day of school, so it will not interfere very much with the children at the beginning of their school term, although May and June -- of course they'll have to accept the best compromise that we can give them -- so many have different opinions. So I feel this way, that we'll have the bill go to Law Amendments Committee and I don't think I can make an amendment now, but I'm giving notice that I shall amend the bill to terminate Daylight Saving at the end of August, or at the beginning of the new school term.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister a question or two -- (Interjection) -- I can't ask him a question? Well I will make . . . (Interjection) -- Okay then.

Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Minister referred to a resolution that was passed at this House a year ago, relative to uniform time. He suggested that the Union of Municipalities, the Urban Association and other organizations should consider this resolution and bring back recommendations to the government, and part of the resolution, I believe, instructed them in their recommendations to state the length of Daylight Saving Time that they wanted. I believe that the Minister in his speech today did not state whether or not these two bodies had made a recommendation relative to the length of time. He did state, however, that the Farmers Union made a recommendation in this regard. I wanted to know whether the other two bodies did.

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.)

Then in addition to that, Madam Speaker, I gather from the comments made by my honourable friend that he intends to vote for the resolution without amendments, but I'm not very clear on that. I would like to know, does that apply to all of the members on the other side of the House? I take from his remarks that he is leaving this one free for all members to vote as they please on it. And I'm not clear on this one. Of course, we on this side of the House do have that opportunity, as was indicated earlier today, of not voting together. I would take from what my honourable friend said, that in this one the members opposite vote as they please.

MR. L. A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Interpretation Act.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: I believe the provisions of this Bill, Madam Speaker, are self-explanatory. There is a new definition of "Court of Queen's Bench" which is slightly shorter than the one that used to obtain; a new definition for "Proclamation" somewhat fuller than the previous definition; and the other section that is involved makes it clear that all the definitions contained in the Act apply to all enactments. This is recommended by the Legislative Counsel.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, could I ask a question of the Honourable the Minister? Is this bill somewhat like the one that we just had before this? Does the government feel the same, or do they intend to shove this one through?

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

MR. BAZLEY presented Bill No. 63, an Act to amend The Labour Relations Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. BAZLEY: Madam Speaker, this amendment would exclude agrologists and registered nurses from the provisions of the Act. I might say that other professions already have this privilege and to my knowledge there has been no objection raised to excluding these professions from the Act, and this is being put forth at the request of the professional bodies concerned. There is an extension of limitations here from six months to one year for the purpose of prosecution. This is found necessary in cases where considerable time is required to get evidence or to provide time for the Department of Labour to investigate these matters carefully and thoroughly so that they make every effort to have adequate remedial measures taken. I don't think that there would be any other point in this explanation that would be necessary. I appreciate the last time I got up to explain a bill that there were things lacking.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I have no objection to this bill going through second reading on the understanding that the request for being excluded from the Act does in fact come from the two bodies involved. On that basis I'm prepared to vote in favour of second reading.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . . I, too, feel that it will be important to hear the reactions of the bodies involved, and not only reactions, but reasons. I'm not really aware of the advisability of excluding these two groups, and I am not too sure that even if they have formally requested it that we must fully accept their request or accede to it without a full exploration of the reasons that could be advanced. I know little about the field of agrology, but I do believe that the question of the nursing profession being excluded is one which may exclude a very substantial and important segment of our economic community. Might I also suggest, not entirely facetiously, that the legal profession should be consulted, because I interpret this bill to take the legal profession out of the exclusion and put it right under the Act. Now it may be that my reading is faulty, but I do read that it will now exclude legal agrologists, and once it takes in legal agrologists, it just automatically takes out the legal profession from the Act, and as I say I'm not entirely facetious about it. I think my reading is correct.

The other aspect, the extension of time for limitations, Madam Speaker, is one which is most essential and was proven essential, I think, in a specific case to which I need not refer by name, only to say that it would appear from this occasion that a violation had occurred on November 17, 1961. An Enquiry Commission was set up on May 18, 1962, which is six months and a day after the violation -- or the alleged violation -- and the report was made December 18, 1962, which I read to be 13 months and one day after the alleged violation took place. I

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . . don't want at this stage — at second reading — to debate the exact length of time, but I would earnestly urge the Honourable Minister to be prepared to justify one year when he thinks that he is enlarging matters — enlarging the time sufficiently to take care of the problem. The case to which I refer could not have taken place in that one year, if my reading is correct, and 13 months and one day hurts just as much as they would hurt if the bill were extended to this time by one year, rather than by a longer period of time.

The reason that I understand, Madam Speaker, for putting a limitation on an action, is so as not to injuriously affect the person who may be a defendant to an action, and I think it needs pretty good reasoning to indicate why one year is sufficient time. I would suggest that the question of witnesses — the availability of witnesses — may be a problem; the question of being unable to bring to the court sufficient defence to an action is a problem, but I don't see that it applies in this case, and where six months were inadequate under the present Act, I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that a year, too, may be inadequate, and I think that he ought to be in a position to justify limiting it to one year, rather than claim that there are benefits to be derived by extending it by a further six months.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Bill No. 89, the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I'm going to ask leave of the House to allow this Bill to stand and also the Bills on the Export Corporation and the Research Council and the Consultative Bill until we have them all, and then I'd like to introduce them in a particular order, so if I have leave, Madam Speaker, I would ask this item to stand.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . I think that's an excellent idea and I thank the Minister for following that course.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, 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. PAULLEY: Before the question is put, I wish to rise on a matter, I think that is of public importance to the province, to this Legislature, and in particular to students attending or about to attend the University of Manitoba. I note, Madam Speaker, in the Press of yesterday evening that the University has announced that beginning next September a special fee surcharge, amounting to one-third of the regular year's tuition fee will be passed on to any repeater in his year, and I respectfully suggest that the Minister of Education look into this matter. In saying this, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the setting of the fees in the University, or at the University, is the prerogative of the University itself, but I think, Madam, because of the fact that it has this effect on the whole educational system, at least at the University level, in the Province of Manitoba, that the Honourable the Minister should look into this matter.

It appears to me, Madam, that this is a retrograde step for the University to take. Many people at the present time are finding the cost of a university education burdensome, and while I appreciate the fact that it is desirable that students pass each year, I doubt whether this approach is a proper one. I think that it is a fact that this will hurt students in the low income group who unfortunately fail to pass in any given year. If the objective, Madam Speaker, of this contemplative surcharge is to eliminate students who are not concentrating on their studies, then I would suggest that they be requested to leave the university, unless they can establish acceptable reasons for their failure. On the other hand, Madam Speaker, students from more fortunate families — economically speaking — will still be able to continue, even with the punitive rates. I think that it is a fact that many of the failures in first year university, particularly, are due to the change in the type of teaching at university as compared with that in our public school system, and it would seem to me, Madam Speaker, to be unfair that this surcharge would be levied against students who are finding it difficult to adapt themselves to the new methodology of teaching, as compared at university with their public school system.

I appreciate the fact that the Boards of the University and affiliated colleges agree that an Appeal Board should be established to consider the cases of those students who may be subjected to this surcharge, and that this Appeal Board would consider factors over which the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . students had no control, which would result in their failure. But I would like to know, and have if it's possible, from the Minister, if not from the proper authorities, exactly what does this mean -- "factors over which the students had no control", which resulted in their failure. According to the Winnipeg Tribune of last evening, the President of the University is quoted as having said, and I quote: "This is a useful device to get a point across." I presume, Madam Speaker, that what the President has in mind -- the point to get across -- is the fact that the students have to buckle down and do their studies, and I appreciate that fact too; however, in my opinion there should be more consideration given to this matter, and if useful devices are required, certainly in my opinion the suggested device is not a proper one.

On reading the President's report as tabled in this House for the year 1961-62, on Page 5, we note some reference to students and the difficulties which some students have in our University, and I am going to quote, as I say, from Page 5 of the third paragraph there: "Studies carried on for some three years by Professor Broderson and a group of co-workers, have indicated very clearly that students who enter university or one of its affiliated colleges with a junior matriculation average of less than 60 percent, are likely to fail their year either at the first or second year level. Similar results have been found in other Canadian universities. A first reaction to these facts would suggest a merit of an entrance standard of 60 percent or better. This has been adopted in all our professional schools and in many other Canadian universities for all entering students." And in the fourth paragraph: "A group of my academic colleagues have been studying this question, particularly as it affects students entering courses in Arts and Science. One factor which has been given some serious consideration is that occasionally students entering with an average under 60 percent have been successful each year of their course, and others who may have failed once have recovered and gone on to graduation with a quite satisfactory record." And I suggest -- and that's the end of the quote, Madam Speaker -- and I suggest that this substantiates my point, particularly regarding students in their first year at university, that while they may fail in the first year, that they have buckled down; they have adapted themselves to the new type of methods of teaching in the university; and that they have gone on, as the president states, to graduation with a quite satisfactory record. And if this is so, then I suggest in all seriousness that the question of a punitive fee, of an additional third, or \$65.00 or whatever the fee amounts -- I believe insofar as the Faculty of Medicine is concerned, where the fee at the present time is \$500.00, that this would tack on an additional \$165.00 -- it's too much of a burden.

As I say, Madam Speaker, that the excerpts that I have read, as brief as they are, from the report of the President of the University, substantiates the fact that some students may fail in a year due to the difference in circumstances, and I respectfully suggest -- as I started my opening remarks, the Honourable the Minister of Education wasn't here. For his benefit I'll repeat that I do appreciate the fact that the setting of fees at the university are within the jurisdiction of the university itself, but because I feel that this may be another barrier to some students carrying on their studies at the university, that he use his good office to have this matter re-appraised by the authorities at the university.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I would just like to make one or two observations. The first is, as the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party has pointed out, that by law the University of Manitoba is an autonomous university and decides all matters, including the matter of fees, itself without -- they're not subject to any reference of these matters to the government or the Legislature. While at times this may appear to some of the members of this Legislature, and, indeed, on occasions some matters appear to myself as being rather troublesome in view of this autonomous position of the university, I do say that on reflection that I believe that this is right and proper, and that those who drafted the Act in the original instance acted wisely in this regard, and that under this system the university is better able to play the true role which it has in our province.

Therefore, the point I would want to make quite clear is that this is a matter over which the University of Manitoba -- those who are charged with its administration -- have complete control and I, for one, would not be in favour of any interference whatsoever in the exercise of the jurisdiction which they have in that regard.

The second point is that all of us are made aware frequently of what I understand to be a

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . serious problem, of numbers of students going to the University of Manitoba who do not make the best use of their time or the facilities which are provided at the university, and it is a common practice for people who wish to make an impassioned speech to say what all we should be doing with these university people who are taking the time of the university, taking the space provided by the public, and not working the way they should. And various methods of dealing with the problem are suggested. While this is a responsibility of the university to decide what should be done, I want to assure everyone that no matter what course of action were taken, naturally there would be those who would oppose it. And I only want to point this out, that this is one means by which the university has sought, I am sure, to bring home to the students concerned the fact that there's a penalty if they do not make good use of their time and the facilities that are provided for them. And I suppose that one would say there might be other methods -- and indeed I suppose there are. This, however, is a method which is pretty basic and one easily understood by students and parents and others, and I would think that if one were wanting to ensure the students would use their time to the best advantage, that this is one method which would certainly make the point abundantly clear right from the start and at all times. And after all, one must remember that the cure from the standpoint of the student is a very simple one. All he or she has to do is to get down to work, pass the examinations and there'll be no problem.

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

. . . . . Continued on next page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Agriculture and Conservation. Item 15 -- passed.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose) (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I think we were on 15 (b) were we not yesterday? I don't think we had gone on to .....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but we have been discussing (c) as well. We're on 15 anyway.

MR. MOLGAT: We're doing 15 as a whole lot, are we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Is there any contemplated change, Mr. Chairman, in the Drainage Maintenance Districts? I see a very slight drop in the grants. Is this indicative of a change in policy or is it a continuation?

MR. HUTTON: There is no change, but as the reconstruction program moves ahead under the capital program you'll have a reduction in the maintenance costs, which is beginning to be felt at the present time and which we hope will be continued to be reflected in the maintenance costs.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to ask the page boys to distribute a special edition entitled "Water for Tomorrow" which was prepared and distributed by the Manitoba Department of Agriculture and Conservation. I would like at this time to thank the weekly newspapers in Manitoba for carrying this special edition across the Province of Manitoba. I'm sure that you'll find it interesting reading and that it sets out the water control program and the importance of this program in quite a dramatic way.

I'd also like to just reply very briefly to a question or two that was raised by the Honourable Member for Burrows, and he was very concerned last night because a structure had been built in the Whiteshell which had not been adequate to the kind of run-off that was encountered last spring. And this, I suppose, is a dramatic illustration of the value of carrying on rather mundane everyday investigations and maintaining records. The fact is that we have very little in the way of records of annual run-off and so forth in the Whiteshell area as compared to waterways and lakes such as the Red and the Assiniboine and our Lakes Winnipeg, Manitoba and Winnipegosis, where our records go back some 50 years. So that when the engineers were designing the structure in the Whiteshell that the honourable member was referring to, they had nothing to go on but calculated "guesstimates" in respect to the conditions that they might be designing for. This is not the case, however, in our major rivers, streams and lakes, which we are concerned with in our Water Control program. And I would like to point out the alternative proposal that the Honourable Member for Burrows advocated last night for consideration, and I reiterate that it is one that has been looked at in the past, and the reason that it has not received too much consideration at this time is the fact that it is a very costly operation. To lift water from the Assiniboine and to put it into the Pipestone Creek and Oak Lake would require a list of some 250 feet. The normal water level of the Assiniboine River is 1,198 and the elevation -- the divide is 1,440 feet. Now this doesn't mean that this will never be done, but it means that it is a costly operation and that our Water Control program had not reached that measure of sophistication -- we might call it -- or development, where we are justified from an economic point of view in carrying out or considering such proposals. As long as we can move water by gravity, as long as we can make use of the water in a given watershed by storing it there and utilizing it, we shouldn't be contemplating moving water from one watershed to another. Some day this may happen but I doubt very much if I'll be around when it does.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the estimates the Minister said that the Fairford control structure was built and designed to handle the water coming in from the Portage Diversion. I think the Minister was way off base when he said this because at that time the Portage Diversion was not being considered when the Fairford Dam was being proposed and the plans and designs for it.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. George is incorrect. At the time the Fairford River Diversion was designed, it was designed to handle, not only the present inflow into Lake Manitoba but was designed with a capacity to accommodate any anticipated flows from the Assiniboine by way of the Portage Diversion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Could the minister indicate where the recommendation comes from?

MR. HUTTON: It was a part of the studies of the Red River Basin Commission. It was a part of the studies of the Royal Commission on Flood Cost-Benefit. It was a prerequisite to the construction of the Portage Diversion and the Portage Diversion was a recommendation of that



(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... Royal Commission.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, last evening we got into quite an argument as to what constituted an engineer and what authority he had and so on and so forth. I certainly do not profess to be an engineer but -- well I'm probably as good a one as quite a number of them around here -- but I would like to refer to a statement or several statements that were made in an address by the Honourable Walter Dinsdale, PC MP, at the inauguration of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway on Saturday, October 6th, 1962. I don't suppose my honourable friend will have his speech before him but I have a copy of it here, and on page 2 the Honourable Walter Dinsdale is speaking about the sharing of the cost of this project -- that is the Winnipeg Floodway -- and states: "This means the Federal Government is paying well over 50 percent of the costs of the project, to be exact, 58.5 percent. In terms closer to the pocket, this means that Ottawa is paying \$37 million of the \$63 million total cost. I mention this because it is important to point out the special nature of the project to those who claim that Manitoba is receiving preferred treatment by reason of the strong personal friendship of the heads of the two governments involved. Our neighbours in Saskatchewan, for example, claim that the Federal Government paid only 42 percent of the total cost of the South Saskatchewan Dam and reservoir." Now my question, Mr. Chairman, is this a fact? Did the Federal Government only pay 42 percent of the South Saskatchewan project as compared to 58.5 of the Winnipeg?

Then I notice too in this address that was given by our honourable friend that no mention whatever is made of the Portage Diversion, but he says on page 3, and I want to quote again, "The Winnipeg Floodway is only part of this great water control program. Another important aspect is the Great Shellmouth Reservoir to be built in the western part of the program. This will provide flood control all along the Assiniboine River." Now if it is a fact that the Shellmouth Reservoir will provide flood control all along the Assiniboine River as is indicated by Mr. Dinsdale, then why is it so necessary to have the Portage Diversion, or why then did Mr. Dinsdale not refer to the Portage Diversion? He is apparently covering the waterfront here; he's opening the Winnipeg Floodway; he mentions the Shellmouth Reservoir; makes no reference whatever to the Portage Diversion, but states that the Shellmouth will control all the flooding on the Assiniboine.

Then on page 4 he says that: "There is still another important feature of this floodway and that is the impact that it will have on the economy of this region. This is of particular concern to the bread-earners and the businessmen of the area. During the construction period of the project, which is scheduled to be finished in 1967, there will be needed 10 million man-hours of labour. In a peak year this would mean that up to 100,000 employees would be required on the project." -- (Interjection) -- It is a misprint? Well I would think it would be, because 100,000 employees -- you would think they'd all be digging it by shovels, if that was so. Then he goes on to say, and my honourable friend the Leader of the ND Party will be interested in this, he says that: "While unemployment is no problem here in thriving Manitoba, the creation of a hundred thousand jobs is still an important economic by-product."

A MEMBER: Is that a misprint?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well that's what I would like to know, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, on the 100,000, if he was referring there to all of the jobs that would be created, both on and off the floodway proper, he might not be quite so far off, although I still believe that that's a misprint. I think I was right in the first instance. I would say it's a misprint. However, in addition to the 10 millions of man-hours on the floodway proper, there are going to be millions of man-hours of labour created in the steel mills; in all the related activities that are related to construction. I wouldn't want to try to calculate it off the top of my head here, but it would run into many thousands of jobs, I would say, at the peak of construction, both on and off the project itself. We tried here for two or three sessions -- two sessions I believe, and to no avail -- to indicate to the members of the opposition that the deal that we had negotiated with Ottawa was a pretty good deal and that it was comparable to the deal that they got in Saskatchewan. Nobody believed us. I'm glad to see that the Honourable Member for Gladstone has been persuaded by the speech of the Honourable the Minister of Northern Affairs. Yes, we did make a pretty good deal, just as good as the Province of Saskatchewan got.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, .....convinced that it's a better deal than Saskatchewan got. The question was, is it a fact that Saskatchewan only got 42 percent of the

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd) . . . cost of the South Saskatchewan Dam? Now this report says that Saskatchewan got 42 as compared to 58.5 in Manitoba. Did Saskatchewan get 58.5? Did they get 42? Or what did they get?

MR. HUTTON: Well it all depends on how you calculate it. If you look at the excavation on the Greater Winnipeg Floodway, we got 75 percent of that phase of it, but the over-all contribution of the Federal Government is 58.5. If you take certain aspects of the South Saskatchewan Dam they did extremely well, but when you take the over-all project and take into account the Hydro-Electric power aspects of it, the Federal Government's participation drops substantially. So it all depends on the basis you want to calculate from, but on the basis of earth moving, Manitoba did every bit as well as the Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, does my honourable friend agree with the other statement then that the Great Shellmouth Reservoir will provide flood control all along the Assiniboine River?

MR. HUTTON: . . . . .diminishing extent. The farther you move away from the reservoir the less your protection, and when you get down in the area between Portage and Winnipeg the extent of protection becomes insignificant in relation to the danger of a potential flood. It is true that the effects of the Shellmouth Reservoir will be reflected in diminishing extent all the way to Winnipeg, but by the time they get to Portage, it's pretty well diminished and so therefore you have to compensate for that diminishing protection that they afford. But this statement is in fact true. It is technically true, but it's something that you might consult with the engineers in the Water Control Branch on. I think that they could explain to you just what happens as you move away from a large reservoir in terms of flood protection.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on Item 15 (b) we have the Pembina River Study and this year's allocation is only half as much as last year. I'm just wondering, is there a slow down on this or what would be responsible for that cut in the allocation?

I take it that we can discuss the Manitoba Water Supply Board under this item, and here I'd like to point out a few things. One is that on the Altona Rhineland operating unit that was set up under the Water Supply Board, I notice that the rates shown are \$1.98 per thousand for the minimum annual consumption and 90 cents per thousand gallons for any consumption over the annual minimum. Now I take it that this applies to industrial needs as well, and that this rate is quite high for industrial use. A year ago or so -- or was it two years -- we passed an Act here for the Town of Morden and Canadian Cannery whereby Canadian Cannery was getting water at 16 cents a thousand. Now there is a wide variance in these rates and I think it's clear enough for anyone to see that how can towns in these areas compete for industries when you have that big a variance in the cost of water supply. Certainly I feel there is room for improvement and I would like to know from the Minister whether the government has considered having an over-all general uniform rate for water across the province under The Manitoba Water Supply Board Act such as we enjoy in the matter of Hydro. This would put local towns and communities on a more equal footing to attract industry which require larger quantities of water.

I wonder if the Minister could inform us whether the consumption of water for that unit has met the expectations of the Water Supply Board or whether it is lower than they expected? I note that the town of Altona has now been using water for two years. However, Gretna only got the water January 10th, 1962, so that in the report that we received they only had two months in which they drew water from this unit. I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether they are meeting their expectations in the consumption or the amount of water that they buy from this unit?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, there is quite a bit of talk about having equalized rates across the province in respect to water supplies for municipal use. I think all the people who are paying the high rates would be in favour of such a scheme. I am quite certain that all of those who enjoy more favourable rates would be very much opposed to it. There is something that needs to be explained here. The Water Supply Board operates very much the same -- almost identically the same -- as your Hydro and your telephone. It is a self-supporting Crown Corporation. The Manitoba Government stands behind its finances. However, even though it is a self-supporting Crown Corporation, there is little hope that we are going to see a repayment of the capital moneys that have been invested in these water control works. By the time that these works have paid for themselves, it will require the reconstruction of all the

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd).... reservoirs and the pipelines and the water treatment plants and so forth. This is the way it is set up. The Water Supply Board charges a rate for the water that will retire the capital moneys over the life of the capital works, and so from the standpoint of capital investment, one might say that we can't foresee the day when these moneys will be returned to the government.

But there is a difference between the Hydro Electric people for instance and the Water Supply Board, and that is that the Hydro Electric people in Manitoba -- the Manitoba Hydro -- owns all the power that it generates and so it can equalize the rates and sell them across the province. In the case of water, if a town is situated beside a good water supply where only a short pipeline is required and where a minimum of water treatment is required, that town is going to get a more favourable rate than that of a town where the provision of an adequate water supply is a costly proposition. That town faces higher water rates. The only way that you could improve the situation for a town more unfavourably located would be to charge the town that had the advantages more for its water and reflect that increase in charge in a reduction to the other consumer. As I said at the outset, it might be very favourable, undoubtedly would be very welcome to the towns that face higher cost water, and it would be highly undesirable to the towns who have the advantages of natural location, etc.

MR. PAULLEY: .....but I was intrigued by the Minister. I heard some remarks in connection with the speech of the Honourable Walter Dinsdale when he was down helping the First Minister operate a power shovel at the opening of the floodway last October, and I note that the Minister, a moment ago in answer to the Honourable Member for Gladstone, mentioned a typographical error in this report which dealt with up to 100,000 employees would be required on the floodway. The Honourable Minister said it was a typographical error. It appears twice, the same typographical error, in the report from the Honourable Minister from the other place -- the other House.

But I note also in the report given, this sentence, "that during the construction period of the project, which is scheduled to be finished by 1967, there will be needed 10 million man-hours of labour." Now if we just take the 10 million man-hours of labour and we break that down into four years until the end of 1967, we'll find that this roughly comes out to about 2 1/2 million man-hours per year. If my calculations are correct, a man working for 52 weeks in the year, based on a 40 hour week -- and of course being a good trade unionist I think that the 40 hour week is an ideal week -- there may be some disagreement between the Honourable the Minister of Labour and myself on this point, however notwithstanding any differences, this amounts to just slightly over 2,000 man-hours per year.

Now of course we can't work or haven't been able to work in this climate for 52 weeks in the year on the floodway, but even if we could this would mean 1,000 men working throughout the whole year on the floodway. I would like to hear from the Minister exactly how many men have been working on the floodway since it started. I might say, too, that in the remarks of the Minister from Ottawa -- Natural Resources -- he mentions that this would be in a peak year, but then goes on to talk about the tremendous numbers of employees that would be required. The Committee is entitled to hear an expansion of the remarks of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation in reply to the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

There is another point in this epistle from Dinsdale that possibly the Minister might be able to elaborate, for my own information and I'm sure the people of Greater Winnipeg will be interested in -- oh before I go to this particular point, I might say another statement made by the Honourable Minister from Ottawa was that while unemployment is no problem here in thriving Manitoba, possibly it would be unfair for me to ask him whether or not the approximate 30,000 to 35,000 people who are walking the streets of Greater Winnipeg at the present time due to unemployment would agree with this statement of Walter Dinsdale. Maybe the Minister of Labour could answer this one a little later because he's certainly going to be asked it.

But anyway, the other question that I was going to ask as the result of this epistle, as I call it, on page 4 it states that the "recreational potential of the floodway is certainly worth mentioning in a city the size of Winnipeg, and even more so when considering the galloping rate of growth of Manitoba at this time." I would like to hear an expansion from my honourable friend who is a co-partner in this agreement. What is the recreational potential of the floodway which is so well worth mentioning in the city the size of Winnipeg? As far as I'm aware, from

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... everything that I have seen in connection with the floodway, the models that they have in connection with it, it doesn't seem to me that there is any recreational potential worth mentioning even in a report from a politician such as the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. But I would like to hear from the Minister in this House, who is responsible to this House, what are the recreational potentials of the floodway that are so well worth mentioning. I would like to hear from him a further expansion of the question of employment because it appears to me, from observations that I have made in the construction of the floodway at the present time, there was nowhere near the 1,000 men being employed, even on a part-time, let alone a year-round basis on the floodway in the Greater Winnipeg area.

MR. HUTTON: We anticipate that at the height of construction over 1,000 men will be employed on the floodway proper -- (Interjection) -- Yes, we have been working on construction all winter, various projects of bridge construction. It is true that in terms of earthwork and excavation, that the contractors were forced to close down in January, but even with the letting of the contracts at a relatively late date last fall, the Monarch Construction Company, I believe, moved some 700,000 yards of earth.

Maybe I should just review the contracts that were let and the dates they were awarded. An inlet pump station test was awarded September 11th, 1962. It was completed October, 1962. Excavation No.1 Reach awarded to the Monarch Construction, Riverton, Manitoba, September 17th; completion date is tentatively set for November 1st, 1964. A Floodway Pump Testing let to Pruden and Sons of Winnipeg in September 1962; to be completed April 15th, 1963. Excavation No.2, Simpson Construction Limited of Winnipeg, October 30th, 1962; to be completed November 1st, 1964. CPR Bridge, Lac du Bonnet subdivision, contract awarded November 21st, 1962; to be completed August, 1963. PTH 4 East Bridge excavation was awarded October 31st; completion date November 24th, 1962. CNR Bridge excavation, Victoria Beach Subdivision, Metcalfe Construction, Winnipeg -- well all of these were Winnipeg contractors, or Manitoba contractors -- this latter one to the Metcalfe Construction was let November 1st, 1962; to be completed June, 1963. The Outlet Control Works have now been let to the Bird Construction Company. The sub-structure of CNR bridge, Victoria Beach Subdivision, Bird Construction Company, January, 1963; to be completed in May, 1963. The super-structure of the CNR Bridge to Bridge and Tank (Western) Limited, January 9th, 1963; to be completed July, 1963. The sub-structure and deck of PTH 4 East Highway Bridge to the Poole Engineering Limited of Winnipeg, January 4th, 1963; to be completed September 30th, 1963. Miscellaneous Metal and Structural Steel, PTH 4 East Highway Bridge to the Manitoba Bridge and Engineering Works, January 4th, 1963; completion date August, 1963. Pre-cast pre-stress concrete beams PTH 4 East Highway Bridge awarded January 4th, 1963; to be completed in May, 1963. This is just a review of the work to date and there's a great deal more scheduled for this coming year. As stated, at the peak of construction we estimate there will be over a thousand people employed on the projects proper and you can see from just reading some of these tenders that there will be a good many jobs created or sustained -- I should say sustained-- by the activity generated by the construction of the floodway. I think that answers your question.

MR. PAULLEY: Partially, Mr. Chairman, and I can appreciate the fact that the Minister would not have on hand the number of individuals employed as a result of these contracts. I would like to know what he means by a peak year. When is this peak going to be reached that will be employing the 1,000 men? I think I could sense from what he said that at the present time he agrees with me that there's nowhere near the number of men referred to in the epistle from Dinsdale's report at the present time.

MR. HUTTON: It's a misprint twice.

MR. PAULLEY: Misprint twice. Is there also a misprint, Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Minister, where they're referring to the 10 million man-hours of labour because -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. HUTTON: That's a fact.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, this is a fact. Then I'm very pleased to hear this from the Minister because he admits then, unless he is going to prove me mathematically incorrect, that over the four-year period that there will be employed, not just at the -- well from October '62 to the end of '67 -- or by '67 as the statement of Walter Dinsdale says -- "during the construction period of the program which is scheduled to be finished by 1967." It doesn't say at the end of '67, it

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... says by '67. But even on the five-year basis it would mean that there is an average, if my calculation is correct, of 1,000 persons per year, 52 weeks in the year, and yet my honourable friend says that at the peak there would be 1,000. Now I want to know from my honourable friend how did he arrive at this? Because if at the peak we've only got 1,000 men working, and he has just made that statement, how are we going to substantiate the remarks of this -- and the Minister, Mr. Chairman, has just turned around and told us that this is correct, that we're going to have 10,000 or 10 million. Which reminds me of the late C.D.Howe and "What's a million?" But we have that same situation right here today, only we're dealing in the question of 10 million that the Minister has said is correct. And yet -- (Interjection) -- Well he says this is correct. He still says that we'll have 1,000 at the peak. How does he substantiate this?

Now my honourable friend says, "well I think I've answered my honourable friend." I dispute that. There was the question that I did pose to him, apart from the discussion on man hours, the question of the recreational potential of the floodway, which my honourable friend hasn't referred to. I have a few friends -- not too influential, just ordinary common people -- who are ready to invest a couple of bucks, if necessary, into recreational facilities on the floodway. I've had a number of people come to me and say: "Well now look Russ, you're a Member of the Legislature; you know all what's going on in the province; we want to set up a summer resort on the floodway; we want to set up some motels; we want to set up this, that or the other; exactly how can we do it? And now that the question is here before us -- (Interjection) -- No, they're not bribing me, Mr. Chairman, all they want to do is to get into this free enterprise system that we're operating here in the Province of Manitoba. I want to know from the Minister insofar as recreation is concerned, whether I can tell my friends and the people who are asking me, "Well the recreational potential of the floodway is so terrific that you better get your name in early in order to be able to get any of the gravy." I want to hear from the Minister what this recreational potential is. -- (Interjection) -- I have so little influence, I can't even get an answer from the Honourable Minister.

MR. HUTTON: Well, you know I suppose there are people you can't leave very much to their imagination. But anybody who lives out here on the prairies, especially here in the Red River Valley with our flat topography considers that here is being created an undulation in this otherwise flat area and who can't imagine the possibilities that may exist for the development of recreation along here, well I don't know whether I can do very much to help them or not. The fact is that this question of the development of the floodway for recreational purposes has been turned over to the Department of Mines and Natural Resources at the present time. There are some possibilities. Anybody who drives around Winnipeg during the winter -- just take a drive around our Perimeter Highway and note all the cars that are parked at every traffic interchange, and the cars jammed up and people out there trying to find a hill that they can do a little tobogganing on. You don't have to use your imagination very much to see what these same people would do if there was a development of this kind along the floodway that they could utilize. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Well, you can laugh if you like, but there are just as able people -- there may be a little abler people outside of this Legislature who are interested in this aspect. I'm not going to enlarge on the matter now, but it is receiving very careful and serious consideration by this government. We feel that there are some real possibilities for this type of development and we intend to see to it that they are developed for the benefit of the people in the Greater Winnipeg area. You can laugh now and we'll laugh later.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite intrigued by my honourable friend, and possibly the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who is going to be responsible for the recreational developments in connection with the Red River Floodway can come to the defence of my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. There was one suggestion, I think from my right here that -- or was it the Minister himself who said that it would make an admirable location for a toboggan slide. I had pictured quite frankly in my mind that some of the potential developers of the recreational facilities there may have had in mind being able to utilize the area for such passing sport -- and it's too bad or maybe it's because of my age it has become a passing sport -- that of canoeing in the moonlight. I said "canoeing", Mr. Chairman, not "canoodling", and it may be that it's a result of my advancing age that I'm no longer interested in this particular human endeavour.

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... But I note, Mr. Chairman, when the Honourable Walter Dinsdale is talking about the floodway on page 2, he tells us "that normally no water will flow through the floodway", so of course that scuttles that.

Now again -- well it could be a misprint -- but again, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, even though he's passed the ball over to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, has not given us any substantiation at all, despite the fact of the flowery language of my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation about "our government is actively looking into all aspects of this floodway". Now let's cut out the nonsense; let's get down and find out from the Minister, either the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation or the Minister of Natural Resources, what have they in mind with an open ditch that doesn't have any water in it insofar as recreation is concerned in the Province of Manitoba. My honourable friend mentioned the question of the Perimeter Highway and the fact that there's automobiles going down it. How ridiculous! Of course they're going down it. That's what we built it for. That to me is no answer.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I've been waiting for an opportunity to get back on the item here because we've been discussing matters which I think belong on 17 rather than 15, but inasmuch as I have a couple that are appropriate under this item, I thought I would raise them somewhat as an example perhaps. On page 92 of the Annual Report -- I'm aware of course that this deals with the year that ended March 31st, 1962 -- there's a description of the Lake Manitoba Control Project at Fairford which some of us are greatly interested in, and the statement is made that the Public Works Department, Highways Branch, paid 40 percent of the total cost of the combined bridge and control dam and the remainder was shared equally between Canada and Manitoba, which would make a 30 percent contribution by Canada of the combined bridge and control dam structure -- the cost. Now my question is, what percentage of the cost of the diversion channel did Canada pay in that connection?

Then over on a later page, page 112 of the report, we deal with the same question that was raised by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, namely water supplies for towns, villages, etcetera, and two of these places that are mentioned are in the constituency of Lakeside and I've been particularly interested in them for some time, namely MacGregor and Austin. I would like to get a report from the Minister under this item as to how the projects are progressing in MacGregor and Austin. Then one other request I have at this time, Mr. Chairman, is that dealing with the Prairie Provinces Water Board, of which the director of this branch is a member. The statement is made that an annual report is issued by the board. Now I realize that that is not something that is normally laid on the table here, but because of the implications to Manitoba as a whole, I was wondering if we could get one copy -- I'm not asking for one for every member -- but one copy of that report laid on the Table because I'm sure it would be quite interesting reading and very useful in connection with this over-all water discussions.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, while the Honourable Minister was going to answer those questions posed to him, I have one or two of my own. In this broad sheet or news release that we have laid before us, on the back page referring again to the Fairford River outlet channel, it says here "completed in 1961". I'm presuming a little bit when I presume that it probably was started in 1960 or before that. Then I go back to a statement that was made earlier on today -- or was it made last night, I'm not too sure -- but there seemed to be some indirect way of tying in the Fairford River outlet channel, which says here is going to hold the level between 8.11 and 8.13, and the proposed Portage Diversion. Now I don't know if I misunderstood or not, but I understood that the Fairford outlet control was a part of the over-all plan. As I say, it would appear that it was started around 1960 or maybe even before that. Now the question I'd like to ask the Minister relates to this item that quotes the Honourable Minister of Agriculture in a speech he made on November 20th, 1960, to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. This is a newspaper reporter speaking here, I believe: "declared himself in favour of a dam at Holland, Manitoba, as a flood control and water conservation measure." And then it says, and this is the quote that is attributed to the Honourable Minister: "I am partial to the Holland Dam. The diversion would run off our water resources to Hudson's Bay. The dam and reservoir would conserve needed water as an investment in Manitoba's future." Now first of all, I'd like to ask if the Minister was correctly quoted. I realize now that two years and four month's time has elapsed and anybody's entitled to change their mind. If the

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd)... Minister has changed his mind as according to this short quote and according to the sales pitch he was giving us yesterday on the other way of doing this thing, I was wondering if he would explain to us his reasons for changing -- that is if he did change his mind.

MR. HUTTON: Yes, my mother told me that just fools and mules don't change their minds, and I don't want to be either. In the fall of 1960, the PFRA had not yet completed their study which we had asked for -- a further study of the prospects and possibilities for a dam on the Assiniboine River and I suppose that as a human being I'm just as subject to the frailties of human nature as anyone else. You know, being Minister of Agriculture it would have been nice to build a great big high level dam out at Holland and to have pointed in future years and said, "I was partly responsible for that." A reservoir appeals to me any time more than a canal. I think the Honourable Member for Lakeside has recognized that and at that time it appealed very much to me. You know all of us when we get in office, we like to build monuments you know that we can point to with some pride, and this huge structure rising, I believe some hundred feet above the river bed out there north of Holland, appealed to me at that time. I was a young and inexperienced Minister; I had been in office a year; I still don't know very much and I knew less then. To be very frank with you, all the members of the Cabinet here were hoping that we would get a favourable recommendation; the engineers in the PFRA were hoping that they would find that this matter would recommend itself; the engineers in the Manitoba department are just as human and suffer as much from the frailties of human nature as the rest of us and they were kind of hoping that they could recommend to the government that we would build this huge dam as a monument to the foresight and the conservation-mindedness of this generation. Yes, at that time we were all hoping that we could recommend it to the people of Manitoba.

But when the reports came in, the engineering reports, they weren't too good, and then on top of that, when we subjected the information that we had to the supervision or the examination from an economic point of view, there was no way to justify building this dam at this time at Holland. There were engineering problems associated with it, especially with the larger reservoirs, and one just couldn't justify spending the additional moneys at this time. Then when the engineers further pointed out to the ignorant farm boy that I am that Lake Manitoba could be utilized in this way as a reservoir -- even though the Honourable Member for Lakeside doesn't agree -- but when they pointed this out, then one could only come to a conclusion on the basis of facts. I can't, and neither can my colleagues, indulge ourselves in emotional appeals to the people. We are charged with the responsibility of doing what we believe, on the basis of available information, to be in the best interests of Manitoba and so there was only one road left open for us and we took it, and everybody knows it wasn't an easy one. Everybody in this House knows and most people in Manitoba know that it wasn't an easy decision to make, but it was the right decision to make because it was based on facts, the best facts that we could lay our hands on. Yes, I changed my mind, and if I live very long I guess I'll change it many times on many subjects, and if I don't I'll likely get myself into probably more trouble than I've managed to do so far.

On the cost of the excavation on the Fairford Channel, I hardly recall. The arrangement was -- in the first instance the arrangement was that Ottawa would pay 50 percent of the cost of the excavation and control structure. There was a ceiling on their contribution. I believe that we went slightly over that ceiling and that in that respect our share may be reflected -- our increased share may be reflected in the cost of excavation. Insofar as Austin and MacGregor are concerned -- I can't enlighten the honourable gentleman from Lakeside insofar as that community is concerned. Insofar as MacGregor -- this is getting to be a perennial question. We carried on negotiations with the CPR for a protracted period and we didn't make too much headway, and then when we seemed to be arriving at some solution with the CPR the people of MacGregor -- of the municipality -- felt that they could probably make a better deal, so we stepped aside. We were only too happy if they could make a better deal to let them negotiate. Since that time, and just speaking off the top of my head now, it appears that they may have some second thoughts about this. We are still prepared to move on the matter and to act on their behalf, and in anyway we can within the provisions of the legislation. However, this is something that I think I can probably give a very unsatisfactory answer to in respect to the Honourable Member for Lakeside. He is free at any time to interview me on this matter --

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... I'd welcome him -- or to interview the Chairman of the Water Supply Board. We'd be happy to bring him up-to-date on the state of negotiations, even if we don't agree on what happens in the case of evaporation. Maybe we can agree that when water evaporates it goes up.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have the most pleasant recollections of the visits that I have had to the Honourable Minister's office. He has been nothing but courteous and friendly, but MacGregor and Austin still haven't got water, and I must confess that much as I enjoy visiting my honourable friend I would rather see some progress. I'm afraid that the whole scheme may have gone where the water does off the surface of Lake Manitoba. It appears to be evaporating into thin air. However, I shall once again avail myself of the Minister's courteous invitation and see if we can work something out without having to inflict the discussion on other members of the House every year. I think it's only been about four years that we've been discussing it now, so for my honourable friend who prides himself on getting along with these things and mentions me as the evident and horrible example of delay and procrastination, I think perhaps we'll be a good team to work on this together.

Mr. Chairman, I followed the remarks of the Honourable the Minister with regard to the Holland Dam very carefully because I shared his enthusiasm for this project in the early days. I was equally disappointed as him at the unfavourable report that one of the engineers gave. I'm quite familiar with the Cooper report but I'm not as well acquainted with the PFRA Report. Am I correct in assuming that there was an actual report made by the PFRA people as well?

MR. HUTTON: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Would my honourable friend find me a copy of that report? I think I must have seen it but I have mislaid it if I have. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 15 -- passed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Honourable Minister to say that some of his engineering advice in the first instance was not altogether correct or was unreliable? The reason I ask this -- last evening, I believe, he got quite indignant that anybody else questioned any of this advice. I just wondered if I heard correctly.

MR. HUTTON: No, the engineering advice was not unreliable. The engineering advice at that time was -- there wasn't any engineering advice. They withheld their advice until they had conclusive evidence on which to base that advice, and when the further studies and investigations had been carried out, it only substantiated what the Royal Commission and the earlier studies had said about the situation, but we had hoped -- we had hoped that we might find that the engineers in the first instance had been wrong, but their further investigations only substantiated their original recommendations to proceed with the floodways, the Portage Diversion and the upstream reservoir.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is a fact that when the dam was built at Neepawa on the Whitemud or Boggy Creek, that it was paid for 100 percent by the Federal Government, and I think that also applies to the one at Rivers. Now if that is so, then why should not the one at Shellmouth Dam not be paid for 100 percent -- I mean what is the difference in thinking on that one? And then I would like to know too, Mr. Chairman, whether the figure of \$63 million for the Winnipeg floodway -- it has been used in the last two or three years; I think that's the figure that was quoted to us on so many occasions as being the cost of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway -- in light of the increased cost of carrying out any project today, has that figure changed? Is it higher today? My honourable friend should be able to tell us as they have let a lot of contracts. Would he think that the cost would exceed \$63 million, and if so, is the Federal Government prepared to pay the 58.2 percent of the cost regardless of the cost, or have they placed a ceiling on their contribution?

MR. HUTTON: Our experience to date has been very encouraging in the calling of contracts on the floodway. However, it is much too early to jump to any conclusions. When we're as close to being finished as we are to being started, then I'll answer the honourable gentleman's question. Well I'm Irish -- honestly too. Insofar as ceilings are concerned we have a provision in our agreement with Ottawa that should we encounter any unforeseen or uncontrolled increases -- things which couldn't be anticipated -- they have agreed to, or it provides for a meeting and a reconsideration of increased costs due to these reasons.

The Honourable Member asks why, if we get some reservoirs at a 100 percent cost to



(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... the Federal Government, why don't we get everything given to us. Well, I don't know whether I need to answer that. I think that if the Federal Government were to make all reservoirs and all of these projects available at 100 percent cost there'd be no limit to the demands upon them. Under the 1942 agreement they agreed to build reservoirs at 100 percent cost to themselves, but projects which they approved of, and so whether or not they approved of a project is an arbitrary matter and completely within their jurisdiction to decide. So I would suggest to you that in the case of smaller reservoirs which are built almost entirely for water conservation purposes, they will build them at 100 percent cost to themselves; however in multi-use reservoirs which to a large extent are being constructed for flood control purposes, that they would want to see the province contribute towards it. And one must remember that the -- at the present time -- the Shellmouth Reservoir, the proposed Shellmouth Reservoir, is justified, cost-benefit-wise, on the basis of its flood control aspects, and no value has been placed upon the water conservation benefits of that project.

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