

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
9:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 16, 1964.

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  
Orders of the Day

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, perhaps we could go right on to the resolutions.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I am only going to be very brief in keeping with my usual practice. I think the members opposite should not think that there is any reflection on the government with the introduction of a resolution of this kind, even though it was not introduced by our particular group. I think last year we introduced one of a similar nature or probably it was two years ago, so naturally we intend to support the one that is before us at this time.

Now the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre indicated when he spoke a week or so ago that we did really not need an official Ombudsman inasmuch as we already had 57 of them. Now I agree with him in this regard, in fact I maintain that I am kept pretty busy in my constituency serving as Ombudsman. I just yesterday went to Mr. Waite and got my usual supply of stationery which I hope will do me for the next 12 months. I don't know whether it will or not. It didn't last time and that consisted of 500 sheets of paper and 500 envelopes. Now I have written as many as 900 letters in a year, an average of about three a day, and I'm not suggesting that an Ombudsman, an official Ombudsman would relieve me of all this work.

Now I appreciate too, Madam Speaker, that by reason of the fact that our insurance and real estate office is right on the main street in Neepawa that it's pretty handy for the constituents to drop in and see me, say hello and spend a couple of hours. Now I am not suggesting, Madam Speaker, that I should be paid any additional fee for this. I'm quite satisfied with the indemnity that we get now, and as my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface says, because we get free stationery it helps a little in this regard.

The most recent duty or chore that I was asked to perform as Ombudsman in my constituency occurred on Sunday night last, and I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that you as well as all other members of this House have got phone calls on Sunday afternoon and in the middle of the night and every day of the week asking you to do something. But the most recent one I got was Sunday night about midnight and I -- where is the Minister of Public Works gone to because I want him to hear this -- I wonder if his deputy will take notes because I do want him to hear this if he's around. Maybe I could talk about something else for awhile just until he comes back in the House.

Well I guess I could talk about it and then we'll send him a copy of Hansard. But this fellow's name is William Boyko, and it's spelt B-o-y-k-o -- not the Minister, my constituent, and he lives in Eden, Manitoba on the west half of 27-16-15 west of the first. He has had a problem for more years than this government has been in office I think, but he only asked me to do something about it naturally since I became a member of the opposition. His beef is this, that when No. 5 Highway was put through on its present site, he claims that it altered the course of the natural water runways and that as such his land, particularly the south half of the south-west quarter, is continually flooded and it has caused a runway through his land and it has deteriorated it considerably. I know it is a fact. He claims that there is an easy solution to it by blocking one culvert in the highway and running the water down the west side of the highway into Eden Creek. The engineers in Brandon disagree with him and they have suggested to him that he sue the municipality. He says why should I sue the municipality? If anyone needs to be sued it's the government. I don't know who's right and who's wrong, but surely somebody can do something about it. Now this has been going on -- he has been referring this

(Mr. Shoemaker cont'd) . . . . problem to me for the last five years and nothing has been done about it yet. Now if it is a fact that the government engineers have suggested that he sue the municipality, I think this is wrong and I think it should not be necessary for him to do it.

Now, Madam Speaker, I have just cited this as one of the reasons that I think that we should have an Ombudsman. Sooner or later, and probably sooner that we think, we will likely be in the government. It happens now and again in history if you check up. It happened in Ottawa not too long ago much to the surprise of many people, and if the legislation was implemented to introduce an Ombudsman, and if it was a bad thing and if we were in the government we would be stuck with it, and I'm suggesting that regardless of what party is in the government it is a good thing to have.

Now, Madam Speaker, as I said earlier, I do not intend to speak long. I have spoken about 10 minutes which is my usual time, and I hope that I have convinced some of the people, most of the members that are here that we need an Ombudsman and hope that they will all vote with us on this one.

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

A MEMBER: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Patrick, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Beard, Bilton, Carroll, Cowan, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 17, Nays 28.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, this resolution has to do with fair play, and it's fair play that stands at the base, the foundation of parliamentary democracy. I think it needs no apology the fact that I've introduced this resolution because there is a principle involved here, namely, that there should be some special recognition given, not only in terms of speaking time but in terms of monetary allowance for leaders of opposition parties.

The Premier when he spoke to this resolution made, in my opinion, a very fair and dispassionate analysis of this situation but he seemed to be bounded somewhat too much by immediate past practice here in this country. He is very interested in what is transpiring in other provinces in this regard and I can tell him that in the Province of Ontario they are there making very adequate provision in terms of extra emolument for the leaders of the other parties. For example, the Leader of the New Democratic Party in Ontario, Donald C. McDonald, receives in addition to his MIA's indemnity -- has received in addition to that an allowance of \$6,000 per year. This was not actually paid to him but paid on his behalf for office secretarial expense, and so on. Not only that, Madam Speaker, but as of this year I have it on good authority that this allowance is going to be increased from six to \$15,000, and this to a leader of a party seven in number in a House of very close to 100. It seems therefore that in a House of 57 a leader of a party of seven should be entitled to something -- I'm not suggesting an amount anywhere near what is being paid in Ontario -- perhaps the scale of work involved is greater, and so on. But I stand fast by the principle that has been enunciated in this resolution and I feel that when members in this House come around to give a few more minutes thought to what is involved when we talk about fair play in parliamentary government, they will see fit to support this resolution.

I realize that to speak longer would be in many ways a waste of time, but I do want to take the opportunity to say that I did not expect that the Member for Lakeside would, instead of supporting this resolution, actually use it to turn the tables and take away what few recognitions we in this group get in this Assembly. I think I should have known better because if anyone can turn tables it's the Member for Lakeside and I find it a matter of amusement in some ways.

(Mr. Schreyer cont'd) . . . .

So let me close then, Madam Speaker, by reciting a little old verse which goes as follows -- and I have used some poetic license -- "Breathes here the man with soul so dead, who never to himself hath said, that leaders of opposition parties have extra work to do, this should be acknowledged lest fair play be forgotten or be put askew."

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, may I ask the honourable member who has just spoken a question? When my honourable friend refers to turning tables, would my honourable friend not agree that if it is a fact that some mistake has been made in implementing the report of the committee on rules that that mistake should be rectified?

MR. SCHREYER: . . . . Madam Speaker. What I did find amusing was that the Member for Lakeside spotted the error.

MR. CAMPBELL: Why would my honourable friend find that amusing?

MR. SCHREYER: . . . . immense satisfaction in pointing the error out.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Official Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the question is put I would like to ask your advice on a point of order. It would appear to me on reading the resolution that I might be unable to vote under Rule 12 of the Rule Book which states that a member shall not vote upon any question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and the votes of any members so interested shall be disallowed. It would appear to me that reading this resolution leaders of opposition parties would be covered in the present sum provided for myself and on that basis I doubt that I have the right to vote. But I ask for your advice on the matter.

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . . ask the advice of the House on this . . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I would suggest that under the circumstances that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition should not vote.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed that the Leader of the Opposition should not vote on this? Agreed.

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

A MEMBER: Same division, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Same division. Agreed.

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave of the House to withdraw this resolution? The member who was to be the seconder, the Honourable Member for Pembina is in complete agreement as we feel that this resolution should have a thorough discussion in the House and at this late date this is unlikely. So if the House would grant leave.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the amendment proposed by the Minister of Public Utilities in this regard is simply patting the government on the back for a policy of according to the . . . . reducing such differentials as exist. This doesn't seem to me to suit the needs of the area in question in Northern Manitoba, and particularly it gives no indication as to when the government will act to give full equalization. I'm not going to go over the debate of the other day, Madam Speaker. I want to just point out again that the private corporation that services the Town of Flin Flon has seen fit to reduce the rates to bring them in line with southern Manitoba. I understand that the areas not now equalized are the ones serviced by the government utility and I suggest that this should be done at the earliest possible opportunity. This amendment does not provide any such time or date by which this should be done. And I therefore move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the amendment be further amended by adding at the end thereof the following words: "And be it further resolved that this House requests the Government of Manitoba to speed up the policy of reducing differentials so as to bring about equality of rates for all areas serviced by the Manitoba Hydro at the earliest possible opportunity and in any case no later than December 31st, 1964."

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas) Madam Speaker, I would like to

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . . . ask a question with respect to this. Does the Leader of the Opposition believe that the government has the power to implement this request?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I believe that they do.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

The question before the House, the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

A standing vote was taken with the results as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Patrick, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Beard, Bilton, Carroll, Cowan, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 19; Nays 29.

Madam Speaker declared the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion in amendment by the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. Are you ready for the question.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition as amended. Are you ready for the question?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Member for Springfield.

MR. F. T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, in rising to speak to the resolution introduced a few days ago by the Honourable Member for Emerson, I can't say that I'll be brief, as he habitually says himself, because the resolution which he introduced is a mighty one. At the same time the area that he spoke about is a long area, wide area, it is deep as it is tall, and I think if one wished to speak on it the sky would be the limit. And now when talking about the sky being the limit, last summer two young ladies happened to have been overheard at Falcon Lake as they were walking along, one said to the other, "What's the matter with the government anyway, only one bachelor astronaut in the whole space program?" However, I refuse to call that area, as introduced by the Honourable Member for Emerson as southeastern Manitoba. I like to call it eastern Manitoba and the development of that area is to be called the development of eastern Manitoba and not only southeastern Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I know something of the area, I've travelled quite a bit in it. Not through the area that he has sponsored in his resolution too much. I had a chance to walk through it away back in 1950 with a hunting expedition. I didn't like walking after I was through with it. At the same time, I must state in the first place, that if we want anything done which concerns two jurisdictions, and two widely separated jurisdictions such as that of the United States and that of Canada -- the State of Minnesota and Manitoba, it's much harder to come to any definite agreement. We in Manitoba could pretty well come to some definite agreement quickly or much quicker than Minnesota because anything that Minnesota would like to do has to be ratified in Washington, and that is the general procedure, we can't do very much about it. The honourable member mentioned the nice beautiful Mississippi River Parkway, but let us not forget that we in Manitoba, have a beautiful Red River winding parkway, with wonderful 75 highway on the west side and 59 on the east. That is a beautiful scenic route if one wishes to take it slow and travel through it by looking around himself.

He also mentioned the fact that there are too few entrances into Manitoba. Well Emerson is one -- I'm not going to mention the one at the International Peace Gardens because it is a little further west -- but we have one at Emerson. The next one of course from 59 highway straight south and the next one at Middleboro leading into highway 12. That brings the American tourists trying to see more of Manitoba before they get to Falcon Lake and the White-shell. However, as I have mentioned previously this is a broad area, a fine area; but it is also

(Mr. Klym cont'd) . . . .swampy; it is sandy and the sand is of such variety that spreads very quickly and a great deal of hard work has to be done.

I know that that highway is very essential and as time progresses it will be built. We in Manitoba at present have a great development in the eastern part, especially the Whiteshell. You take the Whiteshell development all over. What about Grand Beach? Would any of the members remember how it looked in 1961? We weren't able to get through anywhere. We had to leave our cars about two miles away and had to walk and I know on one occasion myself and a few other government members had to get a truck to get to the bathing beach. That was really wonderful, because the ruts were just about a foot deep and they were rocky. Go in there today and see what a difference it is. And there is a difference, a wonderful difference when the present government took over and made a wonderful job of it; and still doing it; it isn't complete. Neither is the rest of the Whiteshell. Let's not think only of development anywhere but the roads that have to be built to lead into those areas. First things come first; and when completed in that area to the satisfaction of all the tourists we will then proceed to do justice to that great area up around the northwest angle and we know very well that the State of Minnesota will come with her part.

The honourable member when introducing the resolution mentioned something about skepticism and so forth. I do not blame anybody for having delayed that program through that area. I would not go to work and say anything against the former administration or the present one, because a great deal of work had to be done in order to find out just where the development would have to be and where the good road would have to be placed; but we know very well that as time goes on and in a very short time probably, that particular road will become a reality.

You know the old man river, as the Mississippi is known, and the beautiful parkway that has been built, that area serves about 53 million people. That's far more than all of Canada has. And look at the small population in Manitoba; we could not expect those things in a hurry; but we'll get there.

As I mentioned awhile ago, Minnesota is ready and willing, the bill is before the Congress right now and has passed second reading, waiting further developments. The bill has been introduced in February 1964, therefore we could not expect it to die on the Order Paper over there at all. When Minnesota will be able to throw its chest wide open and say here we are, Manitoba do your part; Manitoba will then of course come along with it.

We all know that the highway will travers a terrible, swampy area, rocky area, and so forth. It will take millions of dollars to build but when agreement is finally reached, it could be done I think with a great deal of incentive and a great deal of money thrown in by both Manitoba and Minnesota. The highway I understand will cost around the neighborhood of \$5 million in the first place, and that fairly well divided -- and all the rest of the lines that lead into the agreement will be then affixed and we'll go along with it. Now however, Madam Speaker, I did not intend to speak too long, because probably nobody is interested in it right now as much as myself and the Honourable Member for Emerson, but I'll guarantee him that when the time comes for that particular development it will come and it will be done.

As I spoke awhile ago where there is more than one jurisdiction it is generally a little harder to get around, and the Honourable Member for Emerson probably has had the same experience around the neighbor's fence or something like that -- when a joint boundary has to be put up it takes a little bit of negotiating, and sometimes that negotiating takes a little longer time than he could possible envision.

Madam Speaker, we all know that there is a great demand for that highway and a great deal of time will be required to get it into shape. Manitoba will be ready at any time Minnesota is. Therefore without saying any too much more, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain -- that was my speech -- I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that the resolution be amended by deleting everything after the first "Whereas" and substituting therefor, "Manitoba offers a great tourist attraction potential; and whereas Manitoba statistics indicate ever-increasing United States and local tourist travel; and whereas more recreational facilities are being developed in Manitoba; and whereas the agreement called for the Government of the United States to provide Minnesota's share of the cost; and whereas Bill S2521 has been presented to the second session of the 88th Congress

(Mr. Klym cont'd) ... of the United States to provide the funds for Minnesota's share, and has received first and second reading; and whereas Manitoba has taken the necessary steps to enable a start on this access road when the terms of the agreement have been met; and whereas this House welcomes the indication that the State of Minnesota may soon be in a position to co-operate in this subject; therefore be it resolved that this House request the Government to consider the advisability of proceeding with construction of the extension of the Mississippi Parkway consistent with the terms of the Minnesota-Manitoba agreement.

MADAM SPEAKER:..... the Honourable the Member for Springfield, order please, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain .....

MR. MOLGAT: ..... order, ..... would this resolution be in order? It seems to me that it says basically the same things as the original resolution and therefore is not an amendment.

MR. ROBLIN: ..... had a copy in front of him he would see that it does not say the same thing. It does not call for the establishment of this inter-provincial international park for example, that is asked for in the main motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: ..... Whereas Manitoba offers great tourist attraction potential; and whereas Manitoba statistics indicate ever-increasing United States and local tourist travel; and whereas more recreational facilities are being developed in Manitoba; and whereas an agreement was signed between Minnesota and Manitoba on February 2, 1962, to provide access to the Northwest Angle of the State of Minnesota through Manitoba; and whereas the agreement calls for the Government of the United States to provide Minnesota's share of the cost; and whereas Bill S2521 has been presented to the second session of the 88th Congress of the United States to provide the funds for Minnesota's share, and has received first and second reading; and, whereas Manitoba has taken the necessary steps to enable a start on this access road when the terms of the agreement have been met; and whereas this House welcomes the indication that the State of Minnesota may soon be in a position to co-operate in this subject; therefore be it resolved that this House requests the Government to consider the advisability of proceeding with construction of the extension of the Mississippi River Parkway consistent with the terms of the Minnesota-Manitoba agreement.

Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I think I could support both the original resolution and also the amendment. I don't see too much difference just from listening to it. I don't know, if I had a copy before me I might note the difference more readily. But I would heartily endorse this matter because I feel that the people of south central Manitoba, especially along the southern border, would appreciate having this come about, and as already mentioned it has been under consideration by the State across the line, and if they're giving approval I think we should follow suit and do the same.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm very disappointed that the government has seen fit to remove from the original resolution the matter of an international inter-provincial park in that area of Manitoba. It seems to me that with the developing parks program that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources brought in in his estimates that this was a most desirable area in which to take some such action -- desirable insofar as the people of Manitoba and desirable insofar as our tourist industry. I think the member for Emerson made an excellent presentation of the possibilities in that area when he gave to all the members of the House this map of the area. I think it showed that the possibility is there for such a park.

Now I have checked, Madam Speaker, with the federal authorities insofar as the establishment of national parks. It's my understanding that they are interested in seeing more national parks in Canada. They have produced, for example, this publication called "Requirements of the National Park" and it outlines there that at the moment there are, I believe, 17 national parks in Canada, but that this isn't enough and does not service the people of Canada adequately. Particularly with our growing population and the fact that many of the areas that would be suitable for national parks are now becoming populated or taken up by permanent residents, it seems to me now is the time when action should be taken on this. Now the federal people say that to be considered as a potential national park an area must be worthy of preservation, and this means that it should first be an outstanding example of the best scenery in the province. Well, it seems to me that this area does cover exactly that part, Madam Speaker. Anyone who has been down along Lake of the Woods in the Manitoba section there or



(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . . around Moose Lake knows that this is some of the best scenery in the Province of Manitoba. Secondly, it should have "unique scenic, geographical or geological features of national interest, or have outstanding examples of flora and fauna of national interest, or provide outstanding opportunities for enjoying appropriate non-urban forms of outdoor recreation amidst superb surroundings," and so on.

Now it seems to me, Madam Speaker, that this area fits exactly into what the federal people would consider as a potential national park. I find out as well that at the moment there is no national park in what is known as the Precambrian shield. This is, I was saying, from the Federal people as well, that the national park system does not presently include a representative sample of the Canadian shield and that this particular area might well fill that sort of a gap. Now Manitoba has pioneered in the International Peace Gardens, a project there that is known in many parts of the world, a project that has gained the acclaim of many people; a most desirable sort of an approach to neighbourly relations with the United States. Here it seems to me is another example, Madam Speaker, where we could take a forward step, tie in this particular area of Minnesota which by a freak of geography happens to be part of the United States but really most intimately connected with Manitoba. It's presently a state forest in any case, for the Minnesota state. Our own area is at present not overly-developed. I think we could do something here that would be highly desirable, that would fit in to some of the steps Manitoba has taken in the past, that would be a great tourist attraction for the province.

Now I believe that the steps, if something is going to be done in this regard, must come first of all from the province. The federal government will not step in and take action towards the establishment of a national park unless there is a request from the province itself, and the resolution proposed simply was suggesting that the Manitoba Government take the lead in the approach to Minnesota, to Ontario -- who are connection with this -- and to the federal government to see if we couldn't in this area, while there is still time, while the land is available, proceed with a major development of an international nature. I'm sure that this would be very favourably received by the people of the United States. We already have a large tourist volume from that area and I think this would, in the same way as the Peace Gardens, be a point of interest to all Americans; it would be something different, something that does not exist I believe in other areas of Canada, and attract them here.

Now insofar as the Mississippi Parkway, Madam Speaker, it seems to me that we could be proceeding with it at a more rapid pace than we are. Certainly in the United States there has been a good deal of action in this. The last speaker indicated that Minnesota, if I gathered correctly, was the one holding the matter up. But it seems to me, Madam Speaker, that all the way down the line the Americans have taken a much more active interest in the development of this road than we have in Manitoba, and I might say that the Province of Ontario has taken, in my opinion, more active steps as well. The Province of Ontario, in fact the Kenora Bureau have a permanent individual on the committee; the road in Ontario from Fort Frances to Kenora is marked as the Great River Road; there's a marker east of Kenora where it joins the Trans-Canada Highway; it's used in the advertising published in the Kenora area. In fact, if you write to the Kenora Tourist Bureau at the moment for information you will receive from them this pamphlet -- and I'll be glad to give some out to the members of the House. I have a few extras. I wonder if the page boy -- indicating their interest in this Great River Road. Now the resolution proposed by the Member for Emerson did not criticize the government in this regard. It was simply encouraging the government to speed up the process; to show more interest in what the Americans seem to be ready to do and see if we couldn't get this matter settled. It will bring American money into Manitoba. The State of Minnesota was prepared to participate in the cost of the highway from the border to service North West Angle, and it would at the same time develop the Province of Manitoba.

I understand that just recently -- I believe on the 10th of April -- there was a Parkway meeting in Wisconsin and I would like to know, for example, whether the Province of Manitoba was represented. Did we send someone to this meeting? Why do we not, like Kenora, have someone on the Board? I think if we showed this interest that we would be helping the Americans, if there is some problems in their own legislature in getting this through, and we would be helping the Province of Manitoba. We would be developing a long-term project from a

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . . . highway standpoint and a potential great tourist attraction for the Province of Manitoba. We would be reserving an area which has a good deal of geographical interest. I might say that it has considerable historical interest, Madam Speaker, because if the gentlemen of the House will look at the map provided to them they will see that the Fort St. Charles, which is one of the early forts of the La Verendrye explorers coming through from eastern Canada by the Great Lakes system, is located in this area. I think the Manitoba Historical Society has at times made trips to this area. There is here a real possibility of an interesting development for the benefit of Manitobans and as well of the Province of Ontario and the American States.

MR. ROBLIN: This is an interesting topic and I think I will take advantage of the occasion to say a few words about it myself, because I think that it must be the end of the session that has got hold of my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, or perhaps he would have given us some of the other facts in connection with this proposition that is before us now, which have to be weighed before one brings in a resolution of this kind. I, in my opinion, would like to say that insofar as building the road is concerned from the border, the international part, the resolution is superfluous, just superfluous, because it is common knowledge, public knowledge, known to all here, that the Government of Manitoba has signed agreements with the State of Minnesota and with other appropriate authorities, I understand, to proceed with this road "when". And what is holding it up, what is the "when"? The "when" is when the American Government decides to appropriate the money. Now it's as simple as that. Why do we waste our time beating this dead horse when everybody knows perfectly well it's a stated policy, that when the United States Government provides the money for their share of the road, their half, a million and three-quarters, then we will proceed with our half of a million and three-quarters, to build this road into the North West Angle. Now it's just as simple as that. So why stand up and make these Chamber of Commerce speeches about this particular road when the facts are what they are?

There are a couple of other observations that should be made. The Government of Manitoba has not been holding back on this. We signed the agreement, we signed it two years ago. We are sitting here waiting ready to go, but it's stupid for us to build our west half of the road and they are not ready to build their east half of the road. When they are ready to build it, we'll build our half. The road will be built. That's clear. It's on the record. There's no dispute. But I would like to say though that this road is really a gesture of international amity as far as the province is concerned, because our chances of getting any material benefit of a significant size out of this road, our chances are limited, because this road goes from the United States border when it is built, to the North West Angle. The Northwest Angle is completely isolated from any other part of the Province of Manitoba as far as a major highway is concerned. In other words, tourists coming up from the United States will merely pass through Canada for 30 or 40 miles, I forget what it is, and find themselves in American territory at the North West Angle. That's presumably what they'll be coming for, to look at the North West Angle in American territory. But the road as presently envisaged doesn't lead anywhere else. They have to come back to the American frontier to where highway 12 will cut in, somewhere long that, to then proceed to other parts of Manitoba if they want to. So that if we are looking at this road from Manitoba's point of view as it stands, there isn't going to be much in it for us except a gesture of friendship to our American neighbours which we are happy to make.

If we want to make this road into a tourist road for Manitoba then we are going to have to spend another \$5 million to connect up the North West Angle road with No. 1 highway. Maybe we'll have to do that. But I want members of the House to be perfectly clear that they're not talking about small potatoes here. They're talking about a 5 or 6 or 7 million dollar investment in highways, if this road is to connect through from the United States highway to No. 1 -- and it may have to do that if it's going to be of any real value to us -- so let's not get carried away on "flights of eloquence" about the value of this road to Canada or to Manitoba as such. It hasn't got very much as presently envisaged. It has got a considerable value as a gesture of goodwill to the people of United States and in that I think we can take some satisfaction.

Now if my honourable friend is so pleased about the provisions for a national park, I'm happy about that. I certainly would not object to the federal government undertaking to establish

(Mr. Roblin cont'd) . . . . a national park in this vicinity if they want to. I've nothing against that. But I think it is very, well unusual, after a government has just announced a five million dollar park development program in the province that is going to serve our people throughout the province to come along and say oh well we want something more -- or is it just a little bit of local log rolling? I'm inclined to think there may be some element of that in it. But it must be clear that we can't do all the suggestions no matter how desirable they may seem. We have to choose and select and have a system of priority. And that's what we've done and the priorities are before the House and I think generally the priorities are sound and meet with public approval.

Well now, all that we can do is take these suggestions for another provincial park or inter-provincial park or national park, whatever you want to call it -- all we can do is take these suggestions and look them over and give them consideration and there may be a time that we are able to do them; but I cannot undertake that it will be in the near future. And I point out that insofar as this resolution is proposed, and the highways is concerned, it's simply a matter of the United States Congress appropriating the money. We are bound by our word, our signed undertaking to build that road as soon as that money is available and the whole situation boils down to that simple proposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if I might ask a question of the last speaker. Did I understand him correctly to say that he would have no objection to the federal government coming in and establishing a national park in that area? Well then Madam Speaker, I wonder if he would refer back to what I said, that the federal government will not come in and establish a national park unless there is a request first of all from the province. This is exactly what our resolution was asking Madam Speaker, the province take the step. Now is the First Minister prepared to take that step, to request the federal government to come in?

MR. ROBLIN: The resolution does not say that. The resolution speaks of an inter-provincial park as well as a national park. The two ideas are combined in one and I simply have to take it as I read it. I give no undertaking whatsoever what the Government of Manitoba will do about this park. We certainly will consider all suggestions that are made to us as we usually do. If we find they have any merit we will do something about them. I'm in no position to say whether my honourable friend's suggestion has any merit at the present time.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, I agree with the Honourable First Minister that to make the best use of this suggestion it will be necessary to carry that highway through to No. 1, but I think that the First Minister has overlooked something that is very pertinent to the whole proposition and that is, the possibility of the federal government coming in with a contribution towards the construction of the road from No. 1 to the Park. Insofar as Manitoba is concerned, if and when this road reaches No. 1 it will be a tremendous boost to the City of Winnipeg because the people coming in from across the line will not only come in to the park and back out again, while they are here in the Province of Manitoba, there'll be an inclination to come straight on into the City of Winnipeg, the biggest city in the Province. And I would suggest to the Honourable the First Minister, in his absence, that the matter be taken up with the federal government and there is the possibility that he may be able to even obtain financial assistance from the road starting at the boundary. There is that possibility, if the federal government comes into the park idea and I believe they will, since they are most concerned with the fact that our parks cannot accommodate the people that go in to them now, and that they are searching for satisfactory areas, there's every possibility that the federal government may come in and make a contribution not only from the park to No. 1 but they may be ready to give some assistance to the province in the construction of the road from the boundary to No. 1 and I'd suggest that that possibility should be looked into very carefully.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): . . . add just a word or two to the remarks of the last speaker where he indicates that this matter has been overlooked. I don't think that it's fair to say that it has been overlooked because it has been considered. One of the difficulties we are having at the moment is getting the federal government in a position where they are prepared to talk road-sharing of any kind. And I don't say this critically because Manitoba has taken the attitude, and I think correctly, that while we are interested in discussing shared costs of highways, that shared costs of highways should be considered in

(Mr. Weir cont'd) . . . . . the light of all of the other priorities that Canada and the provinces have and that they should be looked at together. I think that the opportunity is going to come probably in the not too distant future for us to discuss these matters with the federal government and the possibility of a federal contribution at some stage of this development I think is entirely possible. The indication has been given by Manitoba that they are prepared to pay 50 percent of the cost of the road to the Northwest Angle at that time and if the United States puts up Minnesota's share of the money it wouldn't surprise me but what an effort is made to suggest to Canada that they might pick up a portion of Manitoba's share of the money. Right now we are sitting waiting, hoping, anticipating that the bill that has been introduced by Mr. Humphreys will be passed and become law in the United States and the development may over a period of time take place north from that area.

Now I don't think Madam Speaker, that I want to carry on at any greater length, except, I don't want the impression left that these things haven't been considered because there has been consideration given to them and they are a long way from being dead. The first step of the development I think would be to go to the Angle. I think it can be anticipated that if the Government of the United States, through the State of Minnesota are prepared to spend their share of the price of this road, that their thoughts have come to the point where they are considering a great deal more development in the Angle than they presently have, because the development that they have in the Angle at the present time wouldn't warrant the expenditure of that amount of money by them or by us and I think that that goes without saying, that they would have some developments in mind. Now once this start is made and progress takes place, then I think we are in a position where we can look at the advantages of connections with the No. 1 highway and also the completion of the loop which would connect Manitoba and Ontario around the top of the Lake of the Woods. Thank you Madam Speaker.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Doesn't the Honourable Minister think that at the moment when the federal government is interested in opening up the resources that this is the time to see them and not delay the matter?

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, we've made requests to the federal government indicating our desire to discuss roads to resources and federal contributions to highway networks. Our replies have been that in due course these discussions will take place. I take them at their word. I think that they will and we would be quite happy to discuss it as soon as possible.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson, as amended. All those in favour please say aye . . . . .

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak I'll close the debate. I am disappointed and I think that the Honourable Member from Springfield replied to me as if it was the answer from the government and subsequently two speakers spoke so I take it that they are in agreement with it. I think it's a shame that the government saw fit to reject B part of my resolution. However, I'm very happy that the government is willing to accept the A part of this resolution. Actually the Honourable Member for Springfield, I don't see that he made any substantial change in his amendment except to reject the B part of it. In fact, he used some of the exact wording in this resolution. It seems also that the government is not willing to accept any resolution even if it's a good resolution unless it's sponsored by one on the government side. I think it should not be so.

The Honourable Member for Springfield evidently does not believe that a national park would be desirable in southeastern Manitoba because he rejected that part. I hope that the people that he represents hear of this because I know that they would be very much in favour. And I'm also surprised that the government does not accept this, especially so since indications are that the federal government is willing to co-operate. All they're waiting is for the Manitoba government to suggest to them that they're willing to make a national park in this area. The Honourable Member for Springfield says that there are 53 million people along the Mississippi River Parkway. I think it is high time that we did start developing southeastern Manitoba -- and I'll still insist that it is southeastern Manitoba -- because if the honourable member looks at the map he'll note that the greater part of eastern Manitoba going north is completely undeveloped as far as roads and resources. So I consider this part from the United States border and on past the No. 1 as the southeastern part of Manitoba. And he lives there.

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) . . . . . If he doesn't know it it's time he did. So this southeastern Manitoba has a great potential.

But I'd like to come back to what I mentioned before, skepticism. That the government always seems to have that skepticism and the honourable member has the same, from Springfield, skepticism about the potential of southeastern Manitoba. And it is quite evident today that even now the government especially does not seem to realize that there is a great potential in this area, especially as the park is concerned.

Now the Honourable the First Minister with his usual eloquence -- and I can't measure up to him, he comes up with wonderful words, Chamber of Commerce speeches. I wonder why he calls them that, Chamber of Commerce speeches? Is that derogatory, Chamber of Commerce speeches? I don't see anything in that. There's nothing derogatory there. But I'd like to mention to him that he has made in the past some of these Chamber of Commerce speeches -- and I'll come to it pretty soon.

I have no quarrel with the Honourable Minister of Public Works. I don't think that he rejected the idea, he seemed to go along with it that the Mississippi Parkway is just waiting for the appropriation from the federal government and even he suggested that in time maybe the national park would be a good idea. But one thing he did mention and that is -- or it might have been the First Minister -- that we know that we are going to spend about \$5 million as a Centennial project, why should I bring this. At the time this resolution was introduced I knew nothing about the \$5 million project, so I think that was an unfair accusation at the time. And we know that the extension of the Mississippi River Parkway which the Minister says eventually will come about, coming into Manitoba through the Northwest Angle would provide a very attractive route from east Chicago, the Twin Cities into Manitoba and Winnipeg.

There's something that I'd like to refer -- when the Premier carried on and he calls it "small potatoes" speeches that we make. Well I'll throw that right back at him and call his speeches some "small potatoes". He must be talking with his tongue in the cheek at the time and he was carried away at the same time on the flight of eloquence that he has like to say. And here I have a quotation of what he had to say on October 4, 1958. It seems to me that some of the members and I may even say the speaker I'm referring to is sometimes concerned more about the welfare of the party, because certainly at the time, October 4, 1958, Premier Roblin announced at a meeting and I was there, at the Eastern Manitoba Development Board at Pine Falls and he had announced that "a new northward highway" -- and this is a direct quotation -- "in eastern Manitoba is to start from Falcon Beach and connect the Parkway northward through the Whiteshell". Now carried away on the flights of eloquence; he must have been carried away then. Now he thinks it's a huge expenditure. In 1958, October 4th -- at that time he was looking for votes. He was concerned with his party, the welfare of his party, and now he says we are carried away on a flight of eloquence. I don't think that was a fair accusation by the First Minister. I notice that he is out, because he doesn't like -- evidently he doesn't like to be criticized, but he's sure good at criticizing other people. If he doesn't like the idea of a national park, he just simply should have stood up there and said: "I don't like it. I didn't bring it in myself, it's not the government, but somebody from the opposition" -- and throw it out. But try to accuse the members on this side of -- carried away -- making eloquent speeches. I do not agree with that.

Now, when he did make that statement on October 4th, I was present and I really believe that he meant what he promised, but now I know that it was only a vote-catcher; and if this was realized what he had promised, one can't even imagine what benefits Manitoba would have derived from such a project. I know it's a huge project, but at one time he was talking about it. Now he thinks it's too much money. Maybe it is too much money, but it is being slipped over. (Interjection) -- That's just what I refer -- it was typical of his Chamber of Commerce speeches that we hear so often in here.

The extension of this parkway in Manitoba and connecting it north of Trans-Canada would really and truly in my opinion be considered "Happiness Highway", because it would serve a great area, and those tourists coming from the United States would not have to double back till they reached some of our good roads in the Province of Manitoba that the government likes to boast about. And southeastern Manitoba certainly hasn't got too many roads to boast about, because none of them are complete -- the Morden-Sprague and even the No. 12, which should

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) . . . . have been completed a long time. I would say -- (interjection) -- I would say that the government is dragging its feet as far as this is concerned; and dragging its feet as far as southeastern Manitoba is concerned.

We know that the recreational use of land -- and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, my leader, did mention it, it is high time that we reserved some of this land for future use for developing into resorts, summer resorts. It's sound investment and a sound policy to reserve some of these lands. We know that much of the family's leisure time is now spent in the automobile. In United States, and I have the quotation here -- "the national park service indicates that touring and sightseeing are Americans favorite forms of recreation." And this is the way they place it: picnicking, swimming, hunting, fishing, camping, hiking, boating, nature study, sports and games, horseback riding, in this order, appear to be the visitors' choice of leisure, and we should develop these resorts so as to give them that -- get them to come to Manitoba.

There are many reasons why a national mid-continent park is wanted in southeastern Manitoba. We know that our people, the Canadian people as well as the American people are all outdoor people. They no longer wish to sit down in a black horsehair sofa and rock back and forth, but they spend their time, annual vacations, in summer resorts among trees, green grass, where they can recuperate and rest from their weary workaday procedure. We know that the people of Manitoba have green in their eyes. They like to go out into summer resorts. This is demonstrated by thousands of shades of green which are present in this area, southeastern Manitoba; and these were created by the Great Creator for us to view. And certainly the proposed park area with its 15,000 islands in the lake would be a real attraction for tourists, not only from the United States but all the way as far as Vancouver. No one can imagine what potential there is unless he really took the time to travel through this 15,000 islands in the Lake of the Woods. And it's beautiful -- and I disagree with the Honourable Member from Springfield when he says that it is -- maybe he was right as far as building highways, that it is sandy and so on -- but it's a wonderful and beautiful spot in there.

And we know that our existing resorts, according to auto reports in Manitoba, are inadequate; that they're very overcrowded. Riding National Park last year -- I was there at one time and it was -- I would say it was a crime, it was so overcrowded that it ceased to be a pleasure. You couldn't enjoy yourself there. It was crowded as badly as Portage Avenue on a heavy business day. So there is room for expansion, and I'm deeply disappointed that the government is turning this resolution down -- the second part of it. We know that the tourists from United States came down the Mississippi River Parkway entered the triangle, then we had the extension to the No. 1, but why wouldn't stay there, especially the ladies. They would like to go out and shop in our Winnipeg, and Winnipeg would receive the benefit of the American dollars which are so badly needed by Canada and by Manitoba at the present time. We want those dollars. So let us go ahead with the work, build this national park, extend the highway as far as the Trans-Canada, improve our facilities, and we'll get this American money to come in here. The City of Winnipeg, I think, would be the greatest beneficiary of this parkway, the road, and also the national park, because traditionally this part of Manitoba, and even farther out into Ontario, has been serviced by the City of Winnipeg. That's where all the supplies come from and it seems that the trend will continue for many years.

I would just like to close this and would say that sometimes it has been said that little men cannot usually understand large motives -- and I'm not applying it to the government, not to the Minister -- but I'm just throwing this as an overall picture for anybody who does not think that there is a potential in the future for . . . . this is what I'd like to apply -- "little men cannot usually understand great motives." We would establish this national park -- we who would establish, must also realize that we as trustees of the present generation have a wonderful opportunity as well as an obligation to the future . . . . . folk. Let us preserve some of these areas in their natural state.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Burrows. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I adjourned the debate for the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I was away from the sitting of the Legislature last week when the Honourable Member for Burrows introduced the Resolution which I had on the Order Paper. I understand from the press report that considerable debate has taken place on this Resolution so I doubt very much that I can add anything to the debate at this stage. As a matter of fact, it's probably rather odd that we are debating this Resolution when there's no snow left and we probably won't have to worry about this topic for the next six or seven months. In fact it's more strange because when the Resolution first appeared on the Order Paper it was the day that we had the worst blizzard and snow storm that we ever had of the year, and I don't believe any amount of salt would have made the driving conditions any different in that particular storm.

But I would like to add a few things to this debate. I believe the people in Metro Winnipeg are greatly concerned about effects of salt on floors, broadloom and shoes, and we may correctly state that rust is eating away metal in cars while the car owner is simply not aware. Despite this continual process of metal degradation, the motorist has a good case when he complains about salt on streets. He has to decide on increased rates of deterioration for his car or the danger to life and limb on the streets in the winter season.

It is the feeling of most civic officials in municipalities that some mixture should be used with salt to reduce the corrosive action of salt on cars. It is hoped research would yield something that will be useful to mix with salt to restrict the corrosive action on cars. This Resolution does not ask to stop the usage of salt on our streets but only to make a study and research as to 100 percent or 10 percent, whatever it may be, and find out what the mixture should be and is most effective on our streets.

According to the newspapers during this past winter I believe we had--probably this topic was more controversial than anything else because we've had many experts and many speakers from various municipalities debate this issue and it seems that no one had an answer for it, so I feel that research would probably solve a lot of this controversy and would probably do some good.

I believe I have some news clippings here, probably somewhere around 25 or 50 from just the the last winter. I'm not going to read them all but I did get permission from the member for Neepawa to read one and it's February 28th, 1964, in the Tribune: "Mayors Ask Metro to Halt Use of Salt. The Greater Winnipeg Mayors and Reeves Association will ask Metro to stop using 100 percent salt on local streets until a study can be completed on the effect of this policy. The Association decided at the meeting Thursday night that the Corporation should be asked to adhere to the Winnipeg formula of using 10 percent salt with abrasives until this proposed study is finished. The action was taken in view of the apparent damage to cars, floors in public buildings, carpets in homes and clothing. The Association today had this for the press release."

And there's many more of the same type. There's one of the Tribune: "There is a quality of bullheadedness about Metro's determination to use salt on city streets that in a more worthy cause might earn admiration. Despite protests from municipal councils, without attention to all the evidence of damage done to engineering works presented recently to the Canadian Good Roads Association by a group of Ontario engineers, experts, disregarding the known corrosive effect of salt on motor vehicles, oblivious of the protests of building owners who report damage to floors and floor coverings from salt-impregnated dirt which is tracked by pedestrians, incentive to damage done personal clothing, Metro goes on blithely dumping salt with the excuse that a 50 percent mixture might do more harm than the 100 percent."

Madam Speaker, regardless of what Metro's attitude is to the use of 100 percent of salt on our streets, I believe the citizens of Metropolitan Winnipeg have the right to protest the use of 100 percent salt. This protest is not the use of salt as such but against the damage done to cars, floors, floor coverings and shoes and many other things, the damage done to cement and streets and highways. I wonder if the cost factor of salt was one of the contributing cost factors to the lack of snow cleaning of our boulevards this winter. One hundred percent salt may be effective in some areas where we are not subjected to such changes of temperature, the sudden melting and freezing of snow.

Madam Speaker, this also raises another question. What formula is used on the provincial highways? Has the department detected any corrosion in roads as a result of the use of

(Mr. Patrick, cont'd)

salt? Once again, I hope the members will see fit to support this Resolution because they would be doing the people a great service for the concern of added cost of clothes, deterioration and wear on cars.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, Whereas a recent application for provincial grants toward the construction of kindergarten classrooms was turned down by the Minister of Education; and whereas kindergartens are now in operation in several school districts and divisions in the Province with the full support of provincial grants; and whereas the Public Schools Act (Section 135 (1) (a) permits a school district or division to operate a kindergarten, or kindergartens; and whereas some private kindergartens are now operating in the Province without properly qualified teachers and without adequate supervision or inspection; and whereas instruction and training at the kindergarten level is recognized as being highly beneficial in preparing pupils for regular grade school work; and whereas in some areas where private kindergartens are now operating, parents must pay substantial fees with the result that these kindergartens are only available to those who can afford to pay the fees, thus creating educational inequality; therefore be it resolved that the Government consider the advisability of adopting a policy to encourage and to give financial assistance to the establishment of kindergarten classes in our public schools.

Madam Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to insert the word "some" after the fourth "whereas" which was inadvertently left out when I submitted the Resolution.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, the educational advantages of public school kindergarten will be lost if we accept wide variations in either teacher qualifications or classroom space in order to reduce or hide the cost of establishing a really productive public kindergarten system. Research shows that children who attend kindergarten have a definite advantage over those who do not when they begin Grade 1 work. They have more poise and confidence, learn to read and write more quickly, and carry this advantage throughout public school education. Public school kindergarten offers a comprehensive common background of experience for all children in games, music, vocabulary and general knowledge, ensuring more certain success in all subjects of the primary grades. If some school divisions have to make use of facilities in private homes, churches and community clubs, maintenance and supervision of such make-shift accommodation is difficult. The retention of qualified and capable teachers is much more difficult under such conditions. If public school kindergartens are to offer equality of opportunities for all pre-schoolers there must be proper legislation and grant structure with respect to kindergartens set up in the Province of Manitoba.

At the present time there are about 5,000 children enrolled in the public school kindergarten classes as compared with 21,000 pupils enrolled in Grade 1. Almost all of these are enrolled in Winnipeg schools. Ontario has 93,900 enrolled in kindergartens as compared with 152,000 in Grade 1. Nova Scotia has 17,500 enrolled in kindergarten as compared with 17,700 enrolled in Grade 1, and according to the U.S. Office of Education figures of November 1963, two out of three are enrolled in kindergarten. It is public knowledge that the City of Winnipeg for many years has had kindergarten classes in their public schools while other school districts have not. Winnipeg receives teacher grants for construction of kindergarten classrooms from the province under the normal grant structure. According to the information I have, the City of Brandon has followed Winnipeg's example and they too receive grants for teachers and construction for kindergartens. Last year the St. James school division decided to proceed to offer the same kindergarten education as Winnipeg and Brandon, and when they sought the required approval of the building projects committee of the Department of Education, they were refused on the grounds that such approval would start a wave of kindergarten construction.

Perhaps the Minister of Education can explain why Winnipeg and Brandon can obtain grants for kindergarten construction and the citizens of St. James cannot. I understand that there is a movement now under way to establish kindergartens in Fort Garry and West



(Mr. Patrick, cont'd)...Kildonan. This will be interesting to see what the new Minister will have to say.

Madam Speaker, may I repeat again that if there is to be equal opportunity in education in respect to kindergartens in the Province of Manitoba, this House must give financial assistance to the establishment of kindergarten classes in all our public schools where the school division boards ask for such assistance.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I speak to this resolution with some difficulty for I must confess I'm not too clear what the Honourable Member for Assiniboia had in his mind when he drafted it. For example, he refers to The Public School Act which, as he correctly points out, permits a school district to establish a kindergarten, but then the next three paragraphs refer specifically to privately operated kindergartens which I believe is not relative to the particular section of the Act which he states definitely refers to "a school district or a division."

I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that the honourable member apparently is not too clear about the present approach of this government to this question of kindergartens, for contrary to what he may believe, the Department of Education does provide operational grants which go towards teachers' salaries, maintenance, supplies, transportation and so on. To my knowledge, there has been no construction grants. I believe the honourable member knows that the establishment of a kindergarten is an optional service and really is not part of the fundamental educational program supported by this province.

This is not to imply, however, that the kindergarten classes are not of value, for there is no doubt that they are. But I think that we must realize that there are many fine educational services that are being offered over and above the basic program and the school boards have the difficult, enviable task of having to choose and provide those services they are persuaded will bring the greatest benefit to the greatest number of boys and girls, bearing in mind too that the local taxpayer will have to recognize and pay for the additional cost.

Relatively few school boards have elected to establish kindergarten classes even when they had the space available, because it is impossible to offer all the services which are available. There are certain activities that are becoming an integral part of our community, while not included in the basic program, nevertheless must be supported. I refer to such things as classes for the retarded emotionally disturbed and physically handicapped children; and there are all type of vocational education such as visual aids, music, physical education, drama, and many other things which are offered at both the elementary and secondary level to which this government contributes most generously. I agree that some of these may be more important than others, but the point I am trying to make is that all these services, along with kindergartens, are all a part of the great educational services which are offered on an optional basis in addition to the basic educational program with which we are familiar.

And because I feel it should be left at the discretion of the local school boards to choose the services which are of the greatest benefit to their community, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the resolution be amended by striking out everything after the first "whereas" and substituting: "Whereas school districts and divisions are free to offer a multiplicity of educational services over and above the foundation program; and whereas The Public Schools Act, Section 135 (1) subsection (a) permits a school district or division to operate a kindergarten on an optional basis to children under compulsory school age; and whereas although kindergarten classes are not part of the foundation program they do receive special provisional financial support, therefore be it resolved that kindergartens be left to a local initiative as at present."

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, my question to the mover of the amendment is to spell out actually in plain English the difference between the amendment and the original motion except from a party point of view. But from actual wording, what is the difference there?

MR. SEABORN: I don't quite understand your question, but I seem to have the impression from the Honourable Member of Assiniboia that he feels that kindergartens are a part of the basic fundamental school program that we have, whereas they are not. They

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd).....are a part of an optional service that is offered to the schools.

MR. PATRICK: May I ask a question of the honourable member that just spoke. Did he imply that there is no construction grants for kindergarten classrooms at the present time?

MR. SEABORN: To my knowledge there hasn't been any made.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Education can answer that?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): As the member from Wellington pointed out, kindergartens up until now have been and at the present time in the Act are an optional service to school divisions and districts to offer this service. The operational grants are paid; there has been no capital grants for the development of kindergarten classrooms as such. Throughout the province, as I recall from looking this up the other day, there are nine districts and divisions throughout the province, of course Winnipeg School Division being the largest, who do offer kindergarten classes. As the member from Wellington said, it is an optional service. Financial assistance by way of operational grant is paid, but no capital grants for kindergarten classrooms as such.

MR. TANCHAK: I would like to say a few words on this. I'm totally unprepared. I'm not going to say I didn't intend to speak, but along with the kindergarten, the school division was mentioned, and possibility of kindergartens in the school divisions if they so wish. There's so much talk about equal opportunity for every child in Manitoba, and I contend as far as rural Manitoba is concerned that is not true, and under the present system we cannot attain it. We know that the little red schoolhouse is fast becoming something of the past. It's outlived its usefulness. We would like to have kindergartens, and if I was to propose here that we have kindergartens established in the little red schoolhouse you'd laugh at me, and you'd be justified in doing that.

But it seems to me that at the time when the school divisions were organized, if the present government had foresight enough this could have been possible. Not immediately, but in the distant future. Now when I say that, I'll say again that I regret that the present government had scuttled our wonderful school division plan, and I said that in the past. What I'm driving at is this. I say that the little red schoolhouse has outlived its usefulness because it will not be long when most of these little red schoolhouses, the one-room elementary schools, will have to disappear, and we'll tend to centralize by consolidation. But what I think would have been a wonderful thing for the government, the present government--or maybe say in the distant future, as long as the base would have been laid there--would have been to centralize most of these schools, and eventually these little red schoolhouses would have disappeared. Then we could have integrated the elementary probably together with the school divisions and then it would have been possible for these school divisions to take advantage of kindergarten classes--the school divisions in the smaller schools--providing that they were large enough.

But as I said before, I think that is almost next to impossible unless we go ahead and scrap some of our existing schools which have recently been built at a great expense and centralize in this. It is almost impossible at the present time, and I regret the fact that we have--probably just because it was popular--we in Manitoba in our school divisions have seen fit, the government especially, to build so many high schools in a division instead of centralizing. Again I will say that the government did not have enough foresight when they acceded to the demand of the people, the popular wishes of the people, and broke up this centralization.

And there's that trouble now. We know that most of these schools cannot take advantage of the courses that they are being offered because we have--I would say 75 percent of the divisions are so in a position that they cannot accept the general course. There are too many small classrooms in the divisions and that does not give equal opportunity to all the children of Manitoba. The only way we could have realized equal opportunity in our schools would have been to centralize schools--the construction of schools in the divisions. And then I would say--I'm not an expert on it--that it probably would have been possible for these school divisions to actually accept the teaching of little children in the kindergarten classes.

But since, as I said before, there wasn't enough foresight and the school divisions saw fit to build five, six schools in a division, I think it's almost next to impossible. It would be

((Mr. Tanchak, cont'd)...possible at a great expense to the Province of Manitoba, to the people of Manitoba, because eventually I cannot see how we can continue in many divisions with the present system of so many schools in a division which are not centralized. I regret the fact that we are not centralized. These advantages in some ways could have been worked out if we were more centralized.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, our group is satisfied with the resolution as presented by the honourable member, but the Honourable Member for Wellington seemed to think that it was rather vague, and while I admit that in the resolved portion it could have been stated a little more clearly that the request was for capital grant, I think we understand that that's what he meant. We do know that while operation grants are received for kindergartens, there is no provision at the present time to assist the various school divisions with the capital cost of these rooms.

I speak also for the Seven Oaks School Division--that's one of the most progressive divisions I think in Manitoba--and there is continued pressure on our school boards now to establish kindergarten classes. I think that this is to be realized now in this day and age because people--just as I subscribe to the idea that children are far more mature and I sponsored the lowering of the voting age, I too think that children are perhaps better fitted to start school. Probably not all, but many children are able to go to kindergarten now at the age of five years and very very many parents wish them to do so. The Seven Oaks School Division have, I believe, some kindergarten classes and they are entirely successful. What they do want now is some assistance in establishing or getting primary grants toward the construction costs at least.

I thought the resolution was reasonable. The Honourable Member from Wellington seemed to think that it was entirely too vague. He pointed out that--he gave me the feeling that he thought the honourable member sponsoring the resolution didn't really know that these operational grants were obtainable at the present time, and in his amendment he wishes to leave it with the school boards. Now I submit, Madam Speaker, that the school boards are well up on the problem now. They simply want a little aid in the building of these additional rooms and I don't think there's any doubt from the school division that I represent that they intend to go ahead with kindergarten classes because the public want them. It's just a matter of the government recognizing the need at the lower age and I submit that there are many many children who are quite able and competent to attend classes, and I would like to speak against the amendment of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT:.....in order, but on the basis of information, would it be possible for me to ask a question of the Minister of Education? Is it not correct that at the moment certain school divisions have received capital grants? They request simply so many classes for construction and then can use the classrooms for whatever purpose they wish? Is this not happening now?

MR. JOHNSON: I think what has happened in practice in the department is for the approval of plans--the elementary requirements are worked out in the department as I understand it and approved for X number of classrooms, whatever the district or division are requesting, but there is no provision as such for capital grants for purely kindergarten space. The practice has been that the grants only apply to children above the compulsory school age as I understand it, and for that matter the resolution presented by the member for example of Assiniboia in his last paragraph says that "financial assistance be given to the establishment of kindergarten classes."

There are operational grants that are paid on a half-day basis. That is, kindergarten classes are for half-day services and the usual operational grants are given on the half grant--the same basis as elementary only on the half-day basis, but no provision has been made by the department for this. It is significant that throughout the province nine divisions actually receive or have kindergarten classes. The rest of the divisions--where these divisions have space and so on, and many of them must have space in their schools--offer kindergarten services for which they would get operational grants, but I think it is somewhat significant that out of all the divisions nine offer these services on an optional basis.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder, Madam Speaker, if I may again ask a question of the

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... Minister. Would it not be correct then though that if some of these divisions are using space within the school for which they have received capital grants, that in effect the capital grants have applied to the kindergarten? I think this is the point of the resolution.

MR. JOHNSON: I have no doubt that that has been the case in the past.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for Wellington.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 31; Nays, 21.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia as amended.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I do not propose to proceed with this resolution at this time. I consider this...

MR. GRAY: .....thing the Opposition have done during the session.

MR. MOLGAT: I do not believe that it would get the consideration that I would like to have it receive at this particular moment and I will leave it for the next session.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I also will hold my resolution until the next session.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Again, Madam Speaker, I will take this resolution up at the next session.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I do not propose to proceed at this time with this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I do not propose to proceed at this time with this resolution, but will bring it back at the next session.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): I wonder, Madam Speaker, if members opposite in the front row would be prepared to answer a question --interjection--All right. I'll ask it privately. --Interjection--No, no. No more Paulley speeches. No. No. I don't think the answer would be right anyway.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, MADAM SPEAKER addressed His Honour in the following words:

May it please Your Honour: The Legislative Assembly, at its present session, passed several Bills, which, in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. CLERK:

No. 5 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.

(Mr. Clerk, cont'd):

- No. 17 - An Act to incorporate Tri-State Mortgage Corporation.
- No. 20 - An Act to amend The Transcona Charter.
- No. 25 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Winnipeg Bible Institute and College of Theology".
- No. 26 - An Act to assist Municipalities to Finance Capital Works.
- No. 29 - An Act respecting the Wages and Hours of Work of Persons employed in the Construction Industry.
- No. 30 - An Act to make uniform the Law respecting Wills.
- No. 32 - An Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act.
- No. 33 - An Act to incorporate Canadian Nazarene College.
- No. 37 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.
- No. 38 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act.
- No. 41 - An Act to incorporate Selkirk Savings and Investors Corporation.
- No. 42 - An Act respecting United Dominions Investments Limited.
- No. 43 - An Act respecting Traders Mortgage Company.
- No. 44 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act.
- No. 47 - An Act to incorporate Mutual Trust Company.
- No. 48 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1.
- No. 49 - An Act to incorporate The Red River Exhibition Association.
- No. 50 - An Act to provide for Certain Exceptions to the Lord's Day Act (Canada).
- No. 51 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Brandon Golf and Country Club.
- No. 52 - An Act to incorporate The Catholic Foundation of Manitoba or La Fondation Catholique du Manitoba.
- No. 57 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 18854, 18872, 18883 and 18884.
- No. 58 - An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.
- No. 59 - An Act to incorporate Investors Syndicate Limited.
- No. 60 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Investors Syndicate of Canada, Limited.
- No. 61 - An Act respecting the Holding of Real Property in Manitoba by The Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Provincial Command of the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada and Units of the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada.
- No. 62 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Trafalgar Savings Corporation.
- No. 63 - An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act (2).
- No. 64 - An Act for the Relief of Cyril Alvin Henry, Service Station Operator, Joseph Allen Bryant, Merchant, and Frances Adelaide Bryant, his wife, all of The City of St. James, in Manitoba.
- No. 65 - An Act to incorporate Association d'Education des Canadiens-Francais du Manitoba.
- No. 66 - An Act to amend The Brandon Charter.
- No. 67 - An Act to amend The St. James Charter.
- No. 68 - An Act to validate By-law No. 3783/64 of The Rural Municipality of Assiniboia and By-law No. 9859 of The City of St. James and an Agreement between The Rural Municipality of Assiniboia and The City of St. James executed pursuant to those By-laws.
- No. 69 - An Act to amend The Blind Persons' Allowances Act.
- No. 70 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.
- No. 71 - An Act to amend The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act.
- No. 72 - An Act to amend The Old Age Assistance Act.
- No. 73 - An Act respecting Union Centre.
- No. 74 - An Act to incorporate The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba.
- No. 75 - An Act respecting North West Trust Company.

(Mr. Clerk, cont'd):

- No. 76 - An Act respecting the Transportation, Storage, Selling and Marketing of Natural Products by Producers thereof.
- No. 77 - An Act respecting the City Savings & Trust Company.
- No. 78 - An Act to incorporate Riverview Golf & Country Club.
- No. 79 - An Act respecting York Trust and Savings Corporation.
- No. 81 - An Act respecting Montreal Trust Mortgage Corporation.
- No. 82 - An Act to incorporate The Wasagaming Foundation.
- No. 83 - An Act to incorporate Fort Garry Trust Company.
- No. 84 - An Act to incorporate Hamiota Golf Club.
- No. 85 - An Act respecting the Profession of Medicine.
- No. 87 - An Act respecting Wellington Credit Corporation Limited.
- No. 88 - An Act to incorporate Eden Mental Health Centre.
- No. 90 - An Act to incorporate The Winnipeg Hebrew School.
- No. 91 - An Act to amend The Law Society Act.
- No. 92 - An Act to amend The Expropriation Act.
- No. 93 - An Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act.
- No. 94 - An Act to amend An Act respecting the Town of Souris.
- No. 95 - An Act respecting business tax within The Rural Municipality of Fort Garry.
- No. 96 - An Act to validate By-law No. 405 of The Village of Shoal Lake and By-law No. 750 of The Rural Municipality of Shoal Lake.
- No. 97 - An Act to Establish Riverside Cemetery Board for the Operation of a Cemetery serving The Rural Municipality of Dauphin and The Town of Dauphin.
- No. 98 - An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.
- No. 99 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.
- No.100 - An Act respecting the Administration and Conservation of Forests in the Province.
- No.101 - An Act to amend The Devolution of Estates Act.
- No.102 - An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.
- No.105 - An Act respecting Assistance in providing Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Accommodation.
- No.106 - An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba), 1962.
- No.108 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (2).
- No.109 - An Act respecting The Town of Morden.
- No.110 - An Act to amend Certain Provisions of the Statute Law and to correct certain Typographical Errors in the Statutes.
- No.111 - An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2).
- No.112 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act (2).
- No.114 - An Act to repeal Certain Acts relating to Certain Corporations.
- No.115 - An Act to amend The County Courts Act (2).
- No.116 - An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.
- No.117 - An Act to provide for the Disbursement of Moneys held back under certain Contracts respecting Roadbuilding.
- No.118 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.
- No.120 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2).

In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills.

MADAM SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and begs for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills:

- No. 36 - An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

(Madam Speaker, cont'd):

- No. 53 - An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Various Capital Purposes and to authorize the Borrowing of the same (1).
- No. 54 - An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and to authorize the Raising of the same by way of loan (2).
- No. 55 - An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for the purpose of assisting Municipalities to Finance Public Works and to authorize the Raising of the same by way of loan.
- No. 56 - An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for the Capital Purposes of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board and to authorize the Raising of the same by way of loan.

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

HIS HONOUR ERRICK F. WILLIS (Lieutenant-Governor): Madam Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly: The work of the Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the Members for their faithful attention to their duties including many hours devoted to consideration of Bills and Estimates, both in the House and in Committees. I convey to you my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our Province.

I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of the government.

In relieving you now of your present duties and declaring the Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence, our Province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health, the happiness and the well-being of all our people.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (River Heights): Madam Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly: It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.