



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 74 8:00 p.m. Thursday, April 19, 1962.

5th Session, 26th Legislature



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, April 19th, 1962.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 61 -- Item 1 -- passed. Item 2 -- pass?

MR. MOLGAT: We are still on 1, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of the department wasn't even in his chair, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we are on No. 2. We passed 1.

MR. MOLGAT: No. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, we have not passed 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh yes, it is passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I object completely to the way this is operated. The Minister isn't even in his seat and you're calling numbers. What goes on in this House?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We passed Item 1.

MR. MOLGAT: We certainly have not passed No. 1.

MR. ROBLIN: ..... on the part of honourable members to discuss Item 1 further, I for one would be quite happy to have them do so.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, we're not asking for any special privileges from the First Minister. The fact is No. 1 was never passed and we don't need him to give us privileges. We merely want our rights in this House.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't dream of insulting my honourable friend by offering him any special privileges.

MR. MOLGAT: We don't need your assistance.

MR. ROBLIN: All right. I'm entitled to have my say though. My honourable friend is not in charge.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we are not passing items just because you say "passed". When someone rises to speak, whether you hear that person or not, the item is still open. The Honourable Member for St. George was on his feet. The Minister was not yet in the House -- or just on his way through the door. The Honourable the First Minister was about the same distance in the House. It's not the right way to try to pass an item in that manner, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm .....

MR. CAMPBELL: I beg your pardon? -- (Interjection) -- I'm telling the Chairman that that's not the way to get the estimates passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I say the way to do the business is when you call the item -- you call it many times and it hasn't been passed -- and I've always been ready not to pass it when I see someone on his feet. Well after the long debate this afternoon, then we called Resolution 61, Item 1, and I said "passed". There was an interval and I called No. 2, and that was when the Member for Lakeside got up.

MR. LYON: Through inadvertence, Mr. Chairman, just as the House arose at 5:30, a question was asked about Point du Bois or Slave Falls. Through inadvertence, I said Point du Bois. I'd like to correct the record. It is Slave Falls, of course.

MR. CAMPBELL: On that point, I think that the lease with regard to that plant has already expired. Is that correct?

MR. LYON: No. That is the plant with which we are in communication with the City of Winnipeg at the present time.

MR. CAMPBELL: But isn't it just the case that there are extensions being granted? That the lease already had expired -- the original one -- and that it's just .....

MR. LYON: Yes, an extension that is being given.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, last July I received a letter which I presume all members of this Legislature received. It was dated July 24th, 1961. It was signed by Walter C. Boggiss, patent attorney, who goes into some great detail -- who talks about some mistake that was made by the Manitoba Telephone System. I presume the Minister has got a copy of this letter. Could he tell us what happened and what action the Telephone Company took?

-- (Interjection) -- I'm speaking on No. 1, Mr. Chairman. I'm speaking on No. 1 -- (Interjection) -- That's what he's supposed to have questioned.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): I understood that No. 1 passed. That was my understanding, but I trust the members who say it didn't. I intend to say a word on No. 2, but seeing that

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . . we are still on No. 1, I don't think it will be out of order now if I say something about Hydro. I was . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . called 2.

MR. GRAY: Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are one or two members wish to say something on No. 1, but if not, we passed it. Item 1 -- passed.

MR. GRAY: Then I'll speak on No. 1, I may not have a chance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to go on 2?

MR. GRAY: I want to speak on the Hydro and Telephone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. GRAY: Still On No. 1. I was very pleased today to hear the Honourable Member for Lakeside praising the administration, particularly those in charge of the power plants, which I agree with him 100%. They are the angels watching over us, particularly during the night in case of a break. But I do want to congratulate him on something else. The first time that I -- maybe he mentioned it before but I don't remember it -- that he wholeheartedly approved public ownership. I remember year after year when he felt that public ownership is not in the best interest of the people of the province. Here we have a public ownership for which he fought for a long time and finally it was introduced by the previous government, which is doing a tremendous job -- a good job -- and provides electricity to the people at a very low rate. I still remember when the rate of electricity was 20¢ a kilowatt hour, and then when the Hydro -- City Hydro -- a public ownership enterprise reduced it to about less than 1¢ today. I still feel that, as I already mentioned once, that electrification in the rural districts is one of the main reasons to stop the so-called exodus from the farm, although we haven't stopped it altogether. I just want to tell my honourable friend that our tradition and our belief in public ownership, particularly when it affects all the people, was, and it's true now, is a very, very good thing and I'm very happy that he is being converted; and I could tell him now that there is an application form waiting for him in the New Democratic Party room.

MR. CAMPBELL: Are you talking about me?

MR. GRAY: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Or the Attorney-General?

MR. GRAY: No, about you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Me?

MR. GRAY: Yes. I know you were interested because I remember years ago you used to come in and listen to the caucus meeting of the Independent Labour Party because you wanted to learn something. I feel the same way and I want to congratulate him and I think the more we get into public ownership, particularly on essential utilities, the better it is. So I'm very, very pleased to join him in congratulating those in charge of this and also the members who opposed the same idea for years to come. As far as the Hydro is concerned, I think it's a success and the success is due to the people in charge of the Hydro administration in all its branches.

Now with regard to telephones, I'd like to suggest something which I did for a couple of years, and it was rejected usually, and naturally, and this is some time ago we had for years a book published "Who is Who". In other words, we had a telephone number and then the name. Sometimes people phone in for the telephone number only. We don't know who they are and it was a very, very useful book for the business people -- a very useful book. The cost of printing it is quite small and I think that this should be reconsidered again. Although it was rejected for two or three years, to reconsider again to have this book published, either in the same book -- in the same telephone directory -- or a separate directory. If you have to make a charge of it, I'm sure that the people would be very happy to pay for it. Although it comes from this side of the House, I would appreciate it very much if the Honourable Minister would take it up with his administration, with his advisors in the telephone system, and have it re-introduced.

No. 2. When the telephone directory is being printed, before two or three months of use, most of the pages fall out and the numbers on the right side -- on the left side -- I don't know how to describe it -- the telephone numbers say at the end cannot be found out, because they're all in the binding. The same thing applies, say on this page here, and on the other page also close to the binding. It's annoying and many figures have been lost. I have complaints

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . . from many people that they have got to go back and get a new directory. It's a nuisance and I don't think it would cost more if the man that's printing it would take a little bit more care. One thing certain is you cannot get another printer to do it for the same price as the present one, because he has most of the names down there and perhaps he keeps the type for a year and then uses the same type. I think this should be taken into consideration. It's a small thing to the big debate this afternoon, but anyway, once we discuss it, it may be small but it may be important to others.

Now I would suggest something else if at all possible. There are many people, particularly our charming ladies, go on the telephone and stay an hour or an hour and a half on the telephone. Sometimes it's very important. I have to send sometimes a wire home for my wife to get off the phone. Whether something could be done limiting them to 10 minutes or 15 minutes, sometimes there's an emergency and their conversation, I assure you, is not too important. First of all, no one listens to it except one person, so we don't get the benefit of the gossip and it's annoying. Whether it's possible to have some kind of mechanism, to give them a ring to get off the phone -- and I'm serious about it because I know where there are very urgent matters, a matter of life and death, and they could not get the phone, particularly in the joint telephone -- what do you call it -- the party lines. They had to call a doctor; they are begging the other party to get off the phone and they don't do it; and some times they get insults. I know it can be very, very dangerous. Six people had to be taken to the hospital; they couldn't call an ambulance and they couldn't call a doctor. So try and discuss it with your braintrust and see whether anything can be done, or make an appeal to the people -- "On the telephone, please be brief."

There's another utility -- public utility -- where there's no objection by the private enterprise believers which works good; has developed nicely; the service is good; and I want to call the attention of the Member for St. James that this is not a private enterprise but a public enterprise. I want you to believe when we come to something which is in the interests of the people and we advocate to have it, don't worry about that the other people will be ruined. God help the private enterprise if they would be in charge of electricity. They would pay many times as much. Remember the days when they had one single light in a house because we didn't want to pay the high cost of electricity? Now they have electric stuff; they have electric machinery; everything is done electrically at a very, very nominal price because the average cost to a small home for the stove and hot water and light and everything else, a radio and television and what have you, is approximately \$8.00 a month. For God's sake -- \$8.00 a month! If it wouldn't have been controlled by public ownership, this would cost ten times as much. This is the only remarks that I can make at this time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I really had the feeling at first that my honourable friend was referring to the Attorney-General rather than to me, and I was sitting here quite relaxed until I found that he was accusing me of being a "Johnny Come Lately" in support of the public ownership of telephones and hydro. I'm afraid my honourable friend has not read my political history at all closely before making this, because I can tell him that the political platform on which I ran, exactly 40 years ago next month, was one which endorsed the public ownership of telephones and electrical services. I have never deviated from that position in the interval, and I think one of the best examples of the fact that I was a rather staunch supporter of the Hydro and willing to support public ownership was the fact that during the time of our administration we were the ones who bought out the private company. I must say though -- I must say that there is one point on which we do differ from my honourable friend because that is, that just because we believe in and have practised public ownership in these utilities, we don't, because of that, argue to the general position that public ownership is necessarily a good thing in all walks of life. That is the big difference between the honourable gentleman and me.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before you pass the item of administration. I didn't intend any omission but we went rather rapidly into a debate on the question of an occurrence that happened a year or two ago and I'm certainly, Mr. Chairman, not going to revive that, but it had been my intention previously at the outset of considering the estimates of the Department of Public Utilities to pay a tribute to the members of the staff in the telephone, the Hydro Commission, and the Hydro Board. I want to use this opportunity, Mr. Chairman,

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . just before you pass the administration, to express my personal thanks to those boards and commissions which I've had dealings with for their courtesy, for their promptness in answering correspondence that I have had with them pertaining to different matters. In this department, as in most others, it is indeed appreciated by myself and my colleagues in this House of the courtesy and co-operation that we have received from the department. From time to time we have problems, so far as the Power Commission, the Telephone Commission and the other commissions, and I want to express our appreciation for their co-operation in assisting us and, in general, arriving at satisfactory conclusions for all concerned. I did not, Mr. Chairman, want to pass the administration without, on behalf of myself and my group, expressing my appreciation and their appreciation. If, because of the desire of some of us sometimes to get into something that we figure we should get into immediately, I want to assure the staff of the respective departments that it was not a deliberate omission, if indeed it was an omission at the time. We appreciate the services that they render to the people of Manitoba and to us as members of this Legislature.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to, if I may, on behalf of the staff -- because they don't have a voice in the House -- on behalf of the boards and executive officers and staff members express their, I'm sure, heartfelt appreciation to my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party and to the other members of the House who have been kind and generous enough to make comment on the service that all of us get from the staff of the various utilities which are operated by the government. I think these tributes are well deserved and, as I have said before in the debate on this matter, that certainly we feel that we have first-class staffs and I take this brief opportunity to express their thanks to the members who have been kind enough and generous enough to make mention of this matter.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we pass this item, I certainly agree completely with the comments that have been made in this regard. Those of us who represent country constituencies possibly run into negotiations with the utilities even more frequently than the city members, and the co-operation that we get is certainly much appreciated at all times. I can say to the House that a rather interesting incident came up just a few days ago when one of the Ambassadors of one of our foreign countries was in Winnipeg. He remarked to me, in conversation, that he was amazed at the telephone systems that we have in Canada, and at the moment he was speaking of our own telephone system here. He had had occasion to call his office in Ottawa and had instantaneous communication; and he commented that he wished that they had as good service in their own native country, so I would pass that on.

One small point, Mr. Chairman, on the matter of the telephone system -- I think the Minister has been approached in this regard before -- and that is the possibility of putting on the zone number in the City of Winnipeg in the phone book. I appreciate the problem with the phone book, the question that it gets constantly larger and, as you add more information in it, the problems grow. However, every year the federal government exhort the citizens to use zone numbers, and I think it's fair to say that the majority of citizens check addresses from the phone book. This is the basic address system in the City of Winnipeg and, if it would be possible for the commission to put in the zone number in some small way in there, I think it would facilitate the work of people who want to use the zone number and thereby facilitate the work of the federal government and the post office department. I wonder if the Minister could indicate something on this. I think he's been approached on this before, has he not?

MR. LYON: The question has been raised before. I don't know -- I can't recall if with myself or with my predecessor, but I recall having seen paper on it. I'm unfortunately not in a position to indicate just what the view immediately is of the MTS concerning this, but I know that certainly the idea, when I first heard it and now hearing it repeated by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, appears, at first brush in any case, to have considerable merit to it. If I can give any more concrete answer before the estimates are through I certainly shall.

The point raised by the Honourable Member for St. George with respect to Mr. Boggiss, I recall receiving a letter as well. We have quite a thick file on that. I've asked for it to be sent up. I wouldn't want to give the honourable members the present position without having it in front of me -- that is try to do it from memory -- but when that arrives I can give him that.

The questions raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster, the "Who Called Me" book

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . has been out of print now for a number of years. I don't believe there are any present intentions of reviving it. The quality of the paper and the binding in the telephone books have improved. The honourable member will notice when he gets his new telephone book this spring that there is a lighter paper being used and there will be less weight but, we hope, the same wearability and substance to the new book when he gets it. I think he will find the binding is also better. The MTS were quite aware of this and have taken steps to try to improve that situation. He raises a generic problem among males -- that is what to do when females get on the phone. We've all had this problem. I've tried this device and I certainly don't give this in any technological sense; I give it in a lay sense. This is what I've tried to do. I occasionally have phoned the operator when I couldn't get through and have said, "Would you mind finding out if my line is out of order because somebody is on it", and nine times out of ten the operator will report back, "No, your line is working and there's a lady talking on the line." So whether or not this advice is any help to the honourable member, I don't know, but this is a technique that I have used personally. Now I don't know if MTS will agree that this should be done, but this is the way I try to find out.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, one more question. Is there a possibility of doing away with the party line? This is the biggest tragedy.

MR. LYON: Pardon?

MR. GRAY: Doing away with the party-line.

MR. LYON: Well of course we've been talking about re-grading. As I mentioned at the outset of the estimates, there was re-grading of two-party lines to the extent of approximately 25% done over the past year. For those lines which have more than two parties on them, this is a subject that is currently receiving consideration in the Greater Winnipeg area by the Manitoba Telephone System. This is always a constant problem, of re-grading; trying to service as many persons as want it on a single party line. The experience is, of course, occasionally, that a number of applications come in for single party service. When this single party service is available, however, the experience of the telephone system has been that sometimes as high as half don't wish to take it then, because there is, of course, an extra charge for the single line service. But by and large, the re-grading continues year after year to try to meet the legitimate and reasonable demands that those who want single party service.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, going on to the Hydro Commission, I think we in Manitoba can be proud of our record in the matter of, not only the distribution of power, but also the production of power. We have never experienced either a shortage or even as much as a dim-out or a brownout as did the neighbouring provinces, and this has been the result of long-range planning and good planning. At the moment, the government is on the Grand Rapids stage and we are not experiencing any shortage of power. I wonder if the Minister could tell us when Grand Rapids will be producing power and how long it is expected that that site will be sufficient for the needs of Manitoba; and then, beyond that, what are the next stages of development planning?

MR. LYON: If there are no other questions on that point, I can answer the honourable member. The Grand Rapids, as I mentioned at the outset, is proceeding on schedule at the present time. The Hydro Board is already studying alternatives available in order to determine the most economical next source of power following Grand Rapids. This new source will be required, as members will adjudge from the statement made by the Honourable the First Minister with respect to the Nelson River, some time in the late 1960's depending, of course, on the extent of the load growth in the next few years. That, needless to say, is under very active consideration at the present time by the Hydro Board and by the Government of Manitoba with respect to the potential on the Nelson River.

Now with respect to Grand Rapids, the construction schedule calls for two units to be completed in the latter part of 1964 and we hope, producing; and the third in 1965. That's the present schedule for Grand Rapids. Notwithstanding that, as I mentioned earlier, toward the end of this decade it will probably be necessary, in the light of the continuation of demand, to look for alternative sources. But, as I say, this problem is receiving the most intensive consideration and we hope that the Nelson River development, with which we are all familiar, will certainly be part of that consideration. We hope as well, of course, that we can develop it, not only for Manitoba but develop it as part of a national grid program, and have an export

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . market available for the tremendous amounts of power that can be generated from that river.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, earlier during the course of the session the First Minister, of course, had made a statement to the House on the possibility of the use of Nelson power for export and tying in with the grid. I wonder if the Minister at this time could tell us what check has been done and what calculations have been done insofar as the cost of producing that power; the costs of transporting that power; how we would fit it into the grid system; how our competitive situation would be in this regard by comparison to, say the power produced in the centres in Eastern Canada or in other areas; and exactly how we would fit this in.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my honourable friend would allow me to answer some of the questions he's raised here, because the Minister and I have both been taking particular interest in this. The situation is that we are at the stage where we are getting the answers to questions that my honourable friend asks. We have had certain preliminary figures given to us by the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board, but they are not of the nature that I think would be advantageous at the present time to give them to the Committee, because they are preliminary and not strictly factual and, therefore, might be interpreted outside for reasons which would not help our cause perhaps.

The situation is roughly this, that we have had the meeting of Ministers in Ottawa, as my honourable friend knows, and very shortly we expect that there will be a meeting of the technicians that was decided upon at that meeting of Ministers. Our people in the Hydro Board are preparing their material for that meeting, most of which is of pretty rough estimate because there's a lot of engineering work to be done before we can be certain about it, but they haven't presented their, what you might call, refined "guesstimates" to us in this respect so we have no particular information that we can give the House in that regard.

I do want, however, to make a sort of general appreciation of the situation, which I think perhaps might meet my honourable friend's purpose. As far as we can tell at the present time, the indications are that we can lay Nelson River's power down in, say Toronto, at a price that is competitive with alternative sources of power in that area. Now that's just our opinion. That's the statement that we have made in respect of the matter and we believe it to be correct. But we have to acknowledge that the data we have needs to be considerably refined before we could stand on such a statement as being completely factual. Then, of course, we also have to have further consultations with the prospective customers in Ontario to find out just what they think of the figures we have and what figures they have that they will be matching with them. My own feeling is that while the national grid, as such, is something that I think we will see developed in the future, I would very much hope that we can expand and strengthen the regional interconnection that we have with the Province of Ontario. At the present time this is only with Northwestern Ontario and, of course, with Saskatchewan. But I would hope, and one of the things we're going to suggest is that we shouldn't allow any problems or difficulties that might arise in connection with the national grid from coast-to-coast to deter us from seeing how far we can proceed with a regional grid between the Province of Manitoba and the Province of Ontario.

I can say to the Committee that the information, or the preliminary guesstimates -- I think that is about as far as I'd like to go in describing them -- the preliminary guesstimates given to us by the engineers in the Hydro indicate that this is a business-like proposition and we're working on that assumption, but I would like to withhold any detailed statement until I have more facts from the Hydro Board. They simply haven't given us the detailed calculations, that we will have to discuss with Ontario and others, at the present time. As I say, it is expected it will be ready rather soon because we're hoping that the meeting of technicians will not be long delayed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, when the First Minister made the statement in the House here earlier this year about the possibilities of Nelson power, I think all the members of the House were enthused at the information that he gave the House. We were all reasonably familiar of the fact that there was a great potential there and, of course, it's that type of an asset that, until you've harnessed it, it is of no value to the province -- the water is flowing down every day and every year on the Hudson's Bay and being of no immediate value to the Province of Manitoba. Once harnessed, it becomes a useful asset. Certainly all the members, I'm sure,



(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . . were very pleased at his statement. As far as I was concerned however, Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat disappointed after the news of the meeting in Ottawa came back to us because it seemed that, what appeared in the initial stages as a great possibility of development, was actually a very premature situation and there was nothing, in fact nothing close to being firm, and it was still in the very hypothetical stages. It seems to me, however, that the First Minister, before making the statement that he made here to the House, surely must have had some fairly close figures on the possibilities of exporting power from the province. I don't think that he would get up and make a speech in this House the way he did, indicating the possibilities, without having some reasonably close figures on the possibility that this could be realized.

The very important aspect of course is the cost aspect, because while we may have the asset there, until such time as you develop it, and you find a market, and to have the market you must meet the price, until that happens then all the talk doesn't produce anything. I think he probably has a great deal more information and a much closer estimate of costs than we have heard so far, and this is very important to the province. He speaks now of developing our grid with the neighbouring provinces, Ontario and Saskatchewan, which grid has been in operation for some time now. Of course the possibilities there of great sales are not too good. Both those areas have their own production at this time and it is not likely in the immediate future they'll become very large customers. The great possibilities of sales are in the heavy populated and the heavy industrial regions of eastern Canada.

I wonder if the Minister could tell us what his preliminary negotiations or preliminary figures indicate insofar as our landed costs of power in eastern Canada by comparison with their present sources, because this is vital to the discussion. Unless we're reasonably close, then this is purely dreaming.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, of course that's absolutely correct, that we have to get a business-like proposition, or one at least that will attract the support of those people who are interested in the development of power. I've never made any secret of that. In fact, one of the things that I remember so clearly saying when I made my statement in the House, that while we were accepting the invitation to go down to Ottawa; and while we had what we thought was a nucleus of a workable plan; that there was a great deal yet to be done before one could be satisfied that it was a workable proposition and that it would become a reality. And that's a fact -- I make no bones about that -- I said it at the very beginning. My first statement in the House included that warning to members and I think, if my memory is right, I used the word "warning" to underline the problems that are involved. Now it is true that the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board has given us what they think is a possible lay-down price for our product in Toronto, but that is a matter which we have not yet discussed with the people in Ottawa, or the Province of Ontario, because we know that we have to produce technical studies to make sure that our calculations are satisfactory and, as I say, while the preliminary work has been done, it has not reached the stage where I, for one, would care to make public the negotiating figure that we might be working on in connection with this matter.

I think, on reflection, that members will agree that it would not be wise, even though they may be curious, for me to say much more about it than I'm saying at the present time. I want to reiterate that we have no reason to lose any of our enthusiasm for the possibilities that are implicit in the Nelson River, and I would certainly regard it as a tremendous achievement in the Province of Manitoba if we are able to bring this to fruition. But I repeat now, in almost the same language as I used when I first spoke about it, that this is a matter which will require considerable and perhaps prolonged technical investigation before one can be sure that the hazards of the problem have been overcome.

It's not only a question of price. Let's be very clear about that. It's not only a question of price. There are rather serious problems of a technical nature that have to be solved before one can be satisfied that the transmission over this long distance of about 1,000 miles is going to be suitable. There are questions in connection with alternating and direct current which are very germane to this problem and which have an effect on price, and depending on which one of those two methods is used for the transmission of power, you receive different answers. It is this kind of technical question that the power officials are struggling with -- I guess that's the right word -- are struggling to solve at the present time because of their flexibility and their

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . difficulty. I think I would be well advised to say nothing more than I said in my original statement in the House, and, incidentally, which I repeated pretty largely in the discussions that we had at Ottawa with respect to the facts as we see them here in the Province of Manitoba.

The gist of it is that the Hydro Electric Board believe that -- and they're pretty cautious men as my honourable friend will know -- they believe that they can overcome the technical difficulties and they can produce this power at a price that will appeal to the people of Ontario. Now that will be our first effort, to try and get those facts nailed down to the satisfaction of the customer and see how close we can come to the problem that faces us. The Hydro Board have given me no reason to be anything but hopeful and optimistic about it, and I remain that way to-night.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his statement. It seems to me that, in the light of this though, that his statement here in the House was a little premature. If he didn't have any closer figures than those he's giving now, I think he was a little ahead of his time in making the great glowing statement he made to us about the Nelson power. I'm just as hopeful as he is that it will be developed, but since he made his statement I have tried to obtain some information on it myself, and the Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba Board when they made their report, I think some two years ago, produced some figures themselves at that time on the Nelson. Taking the various projects that they listed there, taking the one, for example the Long Spruce Rapids which was the second lowest estimated cost one -- \$234 per kilowatt construction cost with 386 megawatt production -- the Lake Manitoba Board at that time indicated that this would probably be one of the better sites because it presented no difficult construction problems. It was the last site in downstream direction with granite foundation. Due to its location, it was also the closest one to the heavy centres of population and industry down east. Taking that one, and working out the costs that the Lake Manitoba Board listed, we find that it would involve a cost of construction of some \$90 million. Transportation of the power from there would be roughly some 1,200 miles. Based on the figures I've been able to obtain, this would mean a cost of transmission of some \$95 million. Then you would have your terminal stations and whatever other equipment is needed at the other end, and you'd probably end up with a net cost of some 220 to \$250 million for that block of power delivered, say at Toronto. Now working this out on the basis of carrying charges and normal efficiency, you'd end up with something in the order of 6 or 6.5 mills per kilowatt hour at Toronto.

Now it seems to me that subsequent to the discussions in Ottawa, there was some indication that the eastern people were talking about some figure substantially below that, if I recall correctly some of the material I read, they were talking of something in the order of five mills, and possibly a little less. I understand that the Ontario Hydro are now building thermal stations, I believe of some 300 megawatt size and they are considering some 500, and their estimating cost is below five mills. I understand that in New York State they are thinking of larger installations than this and they are thinking they can get their cost below this. Saskatchewan, I believe, has offered, through their low-cost coal, to produce at somewhat below this. It seems to me, in the light of this, that the First Minister's statement that he made to the House here, while most enthusiastic, was, to say the least premature.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I really don't expect my honourable friend to agree with me, but I don't think that his aversions about my statement are really well-founded. Members will remember that some time ago, the proposal was advanced that there should be a federal-provincial conference on the question of the national grid. We took that proposal seriously, so seriously that I asked the members of the Hydro Electric Board to proceed at once, on the assumption that there would be such a conference and that we would be asked to attend it, and to prepare for me some position papers with respect to the possibilities in the Province of Manitoba. That's what they did and the statement that I made in the House was in anticipation of an invitation which was received shortly afterwards, as I recall, to attend such a conference.

Now I have to admit, Mr. Chairman, quite frankly, that although as we discussed this afternoon, I'm taking the responsibility for any statements that I make and no doubt about that, I have to admit that I didn't prepare the statement that I made in the House. That was prepared for me by the Chairman and members of the Hydro Electric Board, as one would naturally expect, because after all they're the people who know far more about this topic than I did. The

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . caution, the warning that was included in what I said represented my own comments. That part of it was my warning to the House because I thought it was only right that I should issue that warning, but the bulk of the statement, which members will recall I read at the time, was prepared by the officials of the Hydro Electric Board. And people who know them, as the honourable member knows the Chairman of the Board, will realize that he is an exceedingly realistic and down-to-earth person. He's not given to flights of fancy and he's not really given either to putting forward, as projects worthy of investigation, matters which might prove to be quite unsuitable or unfeasible as time goes on. He is in the habit of putting forward propositions which he believes will turn out to be sound and I place great reliance in his judgment. I admit that I made the statement regardless of the background, and I stand by it and I make myself responsible for it, but seeing my friend has challenged the basis of it, I think it only fair to tell him the way in which it was arrived at.

I'll say something more though. I'll say that if he's saying it's going to cost us six mills to produce power to send it down to Toronto that we're above the market, I'm going to agree with him heartily because we are. We must get a better price than that. In fact, we'll have to be sharpening our pencils very much indeed. We'll have to be getting a price below five mills, in my estimation, because members of the House should be under no illusion about the fact that we may have an asset in the north here that nobody else has got, or that they have to come to us and get it if they want it. Nothing could be further from the fact. We are in the most brisk and energetic competition, not only with Hydro Electric plants in other parts of this continent, and one is the Grand Falls in Labrador which is no farther from Toronto than we are -- that's competition to us; we're in competition with the Coal Fields of Ohio and of Kentucky where most of the coal comes from that fires the Ontario thermal-stations; and we're in contest with Chalk River-- we're in competition with Chalk River, where the latest atomic electrical development processes are being considered. So I want to say, what I'm sure I said before, that this is not an open and shut proposition by any manner of means. We are in the most brisk competition with other forms of electrical generation; thermal, by which one means coal or perhaps even gas, and certainly with some other hydro sites as well and with atomic energy. This is going to be a race. This is going to be a race between us and them as to who can develop a proposition at an economic price first. I think we haven't got any elbowroom at all. We have no time to waste. We must do our best to keep these negotiations active and developing, because if we wait three or four or five years before we are able to come to grips with this matter, I greatly fear that the technological advances in other forms of power generation will be so great as to make ours an uneconomic proposition; and the whole effort of the government in this connection, Mr. Chairman, is to try and secure the development of our proposition and its consideration by those who might purchase this power at the earliest possible moment and without delay.

But I want to say to the Chamber, Sir, that I don't think anyone can guarantee success. I wouldn't say that for one second. We just don't know whether we're going to succeed or not. All we can say is that we have done our best to seize the occasion by the forelock; we've done our best to provoke the holding of this conference -- we encouraged that; we have done preliminary studies of the nature that I've mentioned; and our experts are working as hard as they know how in the more detailed and intensive technical developments that have to be pursued before we can really nail down a price that we know, beyond peradventure of a doubt, is ~~some~~ thing that we can live with, rather than the estimates, no matter how well qualified the estimators may be, that we are dealing with at the present time. So I want to make this quite clear, that this is not an open and shut proposition; that I do not guarantee success; that I realize, and I think all concerned around in Manitoba realize, the nature of the problem and the extreme pressure that we should be under -- feel ourselves under -- to get our proposition ready in time.

Now that's the way we looked at it. We have the full support of the Hydro Electric Board in the proposition that we're trying to develop. They, I think, are qualified advisors in this field and we are going to press on with this just as fast as we possibly can. It would be my hope, and I can't make any positive announcement here because I'm not authorized to do so, but I am hopeful that the technicians will meet sometime in the month of May. I have been pressing for the earliest possible meeting of the technicians, at which time we'll be able to come a little closer to grips with this problem. But I tell members that it's a matter of urgency; we're

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . going to have to work hard and sharpen our pencils if we expect to have a proposition that we can sell.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister has given the House a very realistic statement and I certainly agree with him so far as the statements made by the Hydro Electric Board. As I said at the outset of my comments, they have done an excellent job in the past in planning power development in the Province of Manitoba and I'm quite sure that they will not be leading us astray now. I agree completely with the Minister on the urgency of this because, if we wait, then it is quite possible that our asset will be by-passed and other methods, other forms of producing the power will be developed and we'll no longer be able to do this. So I'm quite along with him.

Yesterday, or I should say today in the newspaper, there were some comments made regarding the export of power. Now this is a field which may yield for the Province of Manitoba some interesting possibilities. There are in the northern states some larger blocks of population than Manitoba itself. Is the government proposing at this stage to consider export of power to the United States?

MR. ROBBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I read the same report of the speech by Mr. W.D. Fallis, the general manager of the Manitoba Hydro Board, that I believe my honourable friend refers to, and he is obviously speaking as a technician in the conference that's down there and is giving expression to what may be technically and perhaps economically possible, but I think members will recognize that he is not giving any expression of policy insofar as the government is concerned.

I think that the way that we would approach the problem is this, that at the present time the absorptive capacity of the Ontario market is really enormous. The quantities of power they require are enormous and I believe that they represent a bigger market than those United States markets which might be within the same distance from our source of supply as they are. Therefore, our policy would be to explore, to the full, the possibilities of that particular market before we even consider any alternatives. I think that the information that we gather in exploring the Toronto or Ontario possibility will certainly stand us in good stead if that should turn out to be an uneconomic proposition, but we are not giving consideration to export of power at the present time because we believe that our first step should be to examine the possibilities with the people of Ontario and others to see whether we have a sound economic proposition as far as they're concerned. Because if we could transport it 1,000 miles and sell it profitably in Ontario, I think we would prefer to do that rather than send it 1,000 miles and sell it profitably some place else, because it's the distance which regulates the prices that you could expect at the end of the line wherever it went.

But I think one important factor to bear in mind that influences us very strongly in our decision to do all we can to send this power into Ontario is the fact that it will take very large quantities of power, all we can produce on the Nelson River -- and there's a lot of it there -- in a relatively short period of time. Members will appreciate that the rate in which power can be absorbed from a plant is critical to cost and critical to prices. If you build your plant and it comes into existence, the supply is available like that; somebody turns the switch and lo and behold the whole thing's there. Our problem is that if you have a very large development, Manitoba can't use it because our annual increment for the need for new power is relatively small compared to the size; and, therefore, if we do that kind of thing on our own on the kind of scale contemplated on the Nelson River, we get a power price which is out of this world, because the users of that initial batch of power have to pay enough -- or have to pay perhaps not enough to cover the entire cost over the life of the plant -- but they certainly pay a very large price for power indeed. If, on the other hand, when you turn that switch on and your plant comes into use, and you have a customer who can take all of it or most of it or extremely large blocks of it within a relatively short period of time, that's the customer you want, because that's the man who is going to reduce your entire power costs to the lowest possible level. Our information is that the Ontario market provides that kind of a customer and that's why we are so keen about it among other things, so that our policy is to concentrate on that Ontario development.

I've seen Mr. Fallis' speech; it's very interesting; I hope to have him explain his theory to me when he sees me; but it is not part of our policy at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the government then is not contemplating nor recommending the export of power to the United States?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't wish to make any advance over what I've said, Mr. Chairman, as I think it's quite clear.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, at the moment we're building Grand Rapids. I'm correct in saying that there is no federal participation in that project, am I not? This is purely a provincial project?

Insofar as the other Nelson power projects which would tie in with the grid, following on our honourable friend's trip to Ottawa, is there consideration of federal participation in the construction of these plants?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, we would very much hope that there would be. Now again I must frankly say that I'm speaking for myself, but we have proposed to the federal authorities that when we come to consider these grids between the provinces, whether it's a regional grid or a national grid, that some arrangement similar to the Atlantic Provinces Hydro Electric Development plan would be suitable for us here. Members will realize that the present Government of Canada greatly assisted the economy of the Atlantic provinces by participating in the financial situation with respect to the development of power in those Atlantic provinces. Beechwood is one, and very substantial aid was given to those provinces, and I think quite properly in respect of that particular matter; and indeed, as far as the developments on the South Saskatchewan River are concerned, there has been a federal contribution of a million dollars or so -- I think that's the amount -- to the building of the Penstocks in the South Saskatchewan Dam with regard to hydro electric power. You get two arguments as to why this is so. The federal government maintain they really have accepted the argument advanced by the Government of Saskatchewan, that because of the fact that the dam is not being constructed primarily for hydro electric purposes but for other purposes, that the Penstocks are a little more expensive than they would be if it was for normal hydro electric purposes, so the federal government has contributed I think something in the nature of a million dollars towards the price of the Penstocks for the hydro electric development of Saskatchewan on the grounds that they have increased the costs of those Penstocks over what they would have been under normal circumstances. They have not contributed to any other aspect of the cost of building those hydro dams in Saskatchewan, and that's as may be.

But we feel that for us it would be more advantageous to have some arrangement such as the Atlantic provinces hydro electric development proposition whereby the federal government did accept a very large share of the capital costs in the financing of those structures, and we would certainly do our best to point out the desirability of similar federal co-operation should the Province of Manitoba and the Province of Ontario otherwise find that they have a proposition which seems satisfactory to them. That's the position that we have put forward and I think it is one that we would like to develop as the circumstances arise.

MR. MOLGAT: There is no assistance, however, from the federal government on Grand Rapids is there? Did the federal government indicate that they were prepared to consider to give assistance on the Nelson development?

MR. ROBLIN: The federal government indicated that they would be prepared to consider it, subject to the technical considerations being satisfactorily developed in the way that I've mentioned. And again, although I must repeat that I am not authorized, nor have I any right to make any firm commitments to the House or statements on behalf of another government, I can only say that my impression is, from the first reactions to our proposal with respect to the proposition as a whole and also with our suggestion that there should be federal participation in this, encourages me to keep on trying in this respect; because I think that we can develop a sound case and that we can reasonably expect to have that considered, and I trust favourably, by the federal government when we have the facts that we require from a technical and economic standpoint.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, did the federal government make a commitment in principle?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think I can say that, Mr. Chairman. I wouldn't like to say that at the present time and I have to be very careful here because I don't want to mislead members into thinking that there is some firm arrangement where there is not. All I can say is, and I

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . think I should go no farther than this, that preliminary explorations of the topic are very encouraging and we intend to pursue them.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, this has been a very interesting discussion as to the question of the development of power and I would like to -- I don't want to throw any wet blankets on the ardour of the Honourable the First Minister and his desire for the development at Nelson River, but I think possibly it would only be proper for me to suggest to him -- and possibly the Power Board have these matters under consideration at the present time. Of course I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, you will appreciate the fact that I'm not as close to the power commission as my honourable friend and the Manitoba Hydro Power Board.

It does appear to me that science, fortunately, has one of the characteristics of advancing as the years go on. A few years ago, and not so very long ago, the question of development of hydro electric power from -- not hydro electric power -- electrical energy from atomic energy facilities was a thing unheard. It is my understanding that over in the Old Country, the United Kingdom, there was established the first plant using atomic energy for the development of electrical energy, and I would like to suggest to my honourable friend this, that as far as I have read at the present time, this is rather expensive -- expensive by comparison with hydro power. But just as penicillin was expensive medically when it was first introduced and discovered, so the price rapidly was reduced.

Now I would imagine that with the development at Nelson River, the cost today of the development of the installation at Nelson River would be rather expensive; and the cost of transmission, with it's accompanying reduced amount of power over the miles of transmission being reduced into Ontario or even down to us here in the Winnipeg area, would make this a rather costly proposition; and so I say, Mr. Chairman, in all due respect to the ardour of my honourable friend, that, as of today, this might seem to be one of the few answers at the present time. But I sincerely trust and hope that both the present government of Manitoba and the Hydro Board itself are keeping a wary eye on the possibilities of reductions in the cost of generating power from other sources.

Now it's been my understanding that whereas even on the railroads, where today it appears as though the use of power generated through diesel engines was more economical than the former steam engine with its coal, that advances are even being made in that particular field of industry by a return to the use of coal pulverized with different types of maltha, that a steam locomotive, as we used to know it, generated by some different mechanisms than we knew at that time will, in turn, prove to be more economical than even the diesel fuel that is being used today. So I say to my honourable friend that the picture of the development and the costs of the development, say at Nelson River today, must be analyzed with some caution at least, taking into consideration the rapid development in the field of science, the provision of alternative sources of energy.

Now at the present time our thermal generating power plants are more expensive than hydro, but it could conceivably be, in the not too distant future, that there may be a levelling off as to the relative costs of the two. It may seem today that by harnessing the Nelson River and by exporting, or the hopes of exporting power to Ontario -- I'm not talking of exporting across the boundary -- it may seem a good proposition for the Province of Manitoba and a development from which we in the Province of Manitoba may derive revenue. I just want to inject a little bit of caution, without attempting in any way, shape or form, Mr. Chairman, to knock the propositions of the Honourable First Minister, but the caution that I would suggest to him is that there is the possibility, through the expansion of other types or sources of the development of energy, that we might possibly, unless we can use the energy developed within our own province, that if we are going to enter into large expenditure with the thought in mind of exporting to other provinces or even to across the line, that these export markets may be cut off from us due to the advancement in the field of science and the development of electrical energy from other sources.

So again I say, Mr. Chairman, although I'm not attempting in any way, shape or form to throw a wet blanket on my honourable friend the First Minister or even the Leader of the Opposition, from what little I know, and I frankly confess that it is little, but I have done some reading and some studying on the production of energy, that there is a likelihood or the possibility of other sources of energy that might eventually offset the costs of the development of

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . plants in remote areas such as the Nelson River.

I ask my honourable friend the First Minister not to answer me at this time, but to make sure -- and I think that they are -- that the board who are taking these developments under consideration do not lose sight of the fact, and it's a fact of the history of the development of the production of electrical energy that these factors must be taken into active consideration when we're talking about the developments of our far north in electrical energy for export purposes. I would suggest that if it was for the development within the area itself, that it's a horse of a different colour. But we must take into consideration these cost factors, or possible cost factors for the future if we are attempting, insofar as the province itself is concerned, to use these far northern areas for the development of energy for export purposes into other areas in the anticipation of receiving additional revenue for the Province of Manitoba itself.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't regard my honourable friend's statement as being of the wet blanket character at all. I think it's a very realistic statement and I quite agree with him. I also agree with him when he says one has to be sure that there is a market there that will be sufficient to amortize the cost of the assessment before one can go into it, and I want to assure him that we'll certainly not lose sight of that fact.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask this question. How long has it been the policy of this government to have Ministers, where Ministers have been writing -- sending copies of letters written to MLA's, sending the copies to defeated candidates? Mr. Chairman, this is very disturbing to me. I've had reason to believe that this has been going on and now I have a copy of a letter which was sent to a defeated candidate in a constituency who had nothing to do with the correspondence at hand.

You may wonder why I raise this question at this particular time. It is because it involves the Minister of Utilities, but not the present Minister of Utilities. Last fall, the Member for Gladstone had occasion to write the Minister of Utilities in connection with a matter regarding something that he wanted done -- a suggestion of a constituent. The Minister replied; sent the letter to the constituent; sent a copy of the letter to the member and with a note under it "c. c. Earl Murray". Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why this practice is going on. I don't think it's a good practice. I know where I read and heard of this practice going on with the former Duplessis government in Quebec. It was considered in very bad taste and now we have evidence of this thing going on in Manitoba. I have a copy of the letter here with the Minister's signature, and it says on it, "c. c. Mr. Earl Murray". Mr. Chairman, I can't condone this type of practice; I don't think it should go on. After all, the member was elected by those people. I think that the correspondence he has with the Minister is his business and I don't think that copies should be sent to a defeated candidate. Had the defeated candidate been concerned, involved in the discussions, I would say that was perfectly in order; but a check has been made and the subject matter in hand was never discussed with him. It was strictly a matter between the Minister and the member, and yet this copy was sent to the defeated candidate.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, if you could tell me the subject matter of the letter, it might give . . . . .

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'll be very happy to do that. It says: "Mr. Nelson Shoemaker has passed along the suggestion from you regarding the carrying of unpackaged loads in open trucks on our highways." Do you want me to read further?

MR. MOLGAT: Maybe we'll get a statement from the government on what this is all about, and find what their policy is.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think any statement is required. I think that if the Minister wants to send copies of his correspondence to somebody else, he's perfectly at liberty to do so. I know that some of the letters that we write wind up in the newspapers, and going from memory, I think one or two that were written to Mr. Shoemaker in Gladstone wound up in the Gladstone Paper. Well, that's all right, no complaint about that. These are all public matters; there is nothing secret about them; and I don't really think the particular instance in question is one that need concern us.

MR. MOLGAT: The government accepts as proper and standard procedure that when a member of this House representing a constituency, duly elected, writes to the government, that this government should send copies of that information and everything else pertaining to it

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . . to their defeated candidate in that constituency. That's the policy of this government?

MR. ROBLIN: The Ministers are at liberty to write copies to whoever they like, whenever they like. Mr. Earl Murray, don't forget, is a man who is considerably interested and has some experience in connection with the use of trucks on the highway. The question of this matter, which I gather from hearing part of the letter has to do with the loss of grain from trucks when driving over the highways -- and I'd like to tell my honourable friend that we have been in correspondence with dozens of people on that particular point. We've consulted Mr. Earl Murray because, as my honourable friend may recall, he is the president, or has been the president and I think still is, of the Manitoba Motor Dealers Association. We have had conferences with Mr. Earl Murray and other representatives of the Manitoba Motor Dealers Association, some of whom are not defeated candidates, on this very point. As a matter of fact, we gave serious consideration as to whether we should take steps by law to deal with this particular problem. So I find it not at all strange that Mr. Earl Murray should have been receiving information with respect to this particular point because it is one in which the association, which he heads and which he represents officially with us, that we have been discussing with him, and I don't think there's anything strange about it at all.

MR. CARROLL: I'd just like to add a word, Mr. Chairman, that it was never my policy when I headed the Department of Public Utilities to keep defeated candidates informed of correspondence that was going out to that constituency. In this particular case, I really don't recall the circumstances. This may have been the explanation, I'm not sure. But it certainly wasn't my policy to do that and the particular circumstances there, I'll be glad to investigate.

MR. ROBLIN: I can imagine, Mr. Chairman, that with "copy to Mr. Earl Murray" on the front, it's pretty obvious that we're not trying to hide it from anybody.

MR. MOLGAT: I suggest that it's rather accidental that it happened to appear on this copy. It doesn't appear on all the copies that we receive.

MR. CARROLL: I'd like to tell the Leader of the Opposition that it wasn't my policy. Now if he doesn't accept that explanation that's entirely his affair, but I want him to know right now that it wasn't the policy. If he doesn't believe that, it's up to him.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a little bit to the Committee. I'm always happy, or would be happy if the government would disclose to my opponents, either for the Conservative Party or the Liberal Party, copies of the letters that I send to the government, because it would indicate that I'm on the job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 -- passed. Item 2 -- passed. Item 3 --

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say a few words on the Censor Board. I don't want to take the time of the Committee to open up the whole question of censorship, because that involves the whole field of human taste in literature, movies, etcetera. The question isn't whether to censor or not to censor -- that's not what I'm getting at -- but rather I would like to point out to the Attorney-General, for his consideration in the course of the next 12-months' period, to have a look at the technique with which movies are being censored here in this province. About five years ago the board adopted a new method of classification of movies. They brought in the extra category of "restricted" and, because this was brought in, they felt it possible to loosen up on the censorship. I suppose that this would be all well and good, but in fact the adoption, the use of the category "restricted" is leading us into a false sense of accomplishment. We think we're accomplishing something, that we're accomplishing some degree of censorship by this use of the category "restricted", when in fact we are not. I made it a point -- not that I'm a busybody -- but I made it a point to check various theatres in the city during the course of the last few months when restricted movies were playing, and the number of young people there was alarming. It seems to have had the opposite effect. Now the category "restricted" is supposed to mean "adult-adult" sort of thing, and there's where you have a preponderance of teen-agers in attendance. Now, as I say, I don't want to open up the whole question of censorship but I would like to see something done, at least some thought given to the adequacy of the classification system or method.

I, without mentioning theatres, would say that in at least two cases, the movies showing, there were all sorts of -- well the picture was demented; it was depraved; there was a lot of



(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . . perversion in it; and if this is supposed to be fare for adult viewing, I have no comment on that. If it seems we're going to liberalize censorship, I have no comment at all. But I want to emphasize that the use of the classification "restricted" is having no effect -- if any, it's having the opposite effect from what it is intended. Surely there must be some kind of enforcement, and if there is, it's not being applied. Without trying to get into a protracted debate, I would point that out to the Minister.

MR. GRAY: May I ask the Honourable Minister the names and approximately the ages of the members of the board?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, two of the members of the Censor Board are ladies. I don't think my honourable friend on learning that would want me to answer with respect to the ladies, even if I knew, but I'll sit down and let him tell me if he wants to know the ages of the ladies.

MR. GRAY: I have a point of knowing it for this reason. -- (Interjection) -- I know. I'm not applying for it. Sometime they will probably prevent a film being shown because they may apply their age psychology to the film.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies, would he tell us -- I believe he's been asked the names of the members of the board. Could he tell us the salaries paid to these members please?

MR. LYON: The members of the board, Mr. Chairman, are Mrs. M. McMullen, whose salary is \$3,840; Mrs. A. Bilton, \$4,110; and Mr. H.B. Scott, \$3,615.00. The ladies are quite young -- as all ladies are.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I notice that there's a provision for an increase in the number of the staff in the estimates with the information that I have before me from three to four. I wonder if the Minister would explain that.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister explain to us the method of enforcement of the categories of the theatres?

MR. GUTTORMSON: When the Minister replies, could he explain the difference in salaries? I believe the gentleman on the -- Hank Scott was getting \$3,600; one lady was getting \$3,800 I think he said; and one was \$4,100.00. Is there a reason for the differential?

MR. LYON: The length of service, so far as I can recall, is the only reason for any differential. The new position is with respect to Mr. Scott who was appointed to the Board on May 1st, 1961.

With respect to the question put by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, of course this whole question of censorship is one which I'm sure he and probably some members in the gallery who look down upon us would like us to get into a prolonged debate upon. The part of The Amusements Act that deals with it, sets forth the principles, the very general ones which are to guide the Censorship Board, and from that point on you're pretty well dependent upon the good common sense of the people who are viewing the films in their determination as to how these films should be classified. The enforcement procedure with respect to the classifications laid down in the regulations is also provided there. It escapes just for the moment although I can find out the penalties that are provided in the Act for enforcement procedures; for instances, not listing a film according to its classification and so on.

By way of more general information, I can tell the honourable members that during the year ending December 31st, 1961, of the 321 full-length features reviewed by the board, 146 were classified Adult; 154 General; 13 Restricted; 4 were rejected; and 37 features required elimination. The rejected films this year, none of which I have seen and I don't imagine any members of the House have seen them, were -- and the titles perhaps indicate why they were rejected -- "Flesh is Weak", "The Private Lives of Adam & Eve", "The Victim" and "Cold Winds in August". Now the Swedish film, "Virgin Spring", went to an Appeal Board after the distributor appealed the Board's decision to eliminate a portion of a rape scene and the Appeal Board upheld the decision of the Board of Censors. A restricted category was approved by regulation and made to read "Restricted to persons 18 years and under, unless accompanied by a parent or guardian at theatres or drive-ins". Unless I'm mistaken, the film, "The Victim", which dealt with homosexuality -- and I'm going now just by memory and I can confirm this -- there was an appeal taken subsequent to the year end and I believe it was with respect to that film, and the Appeal Board, as I recall in that instance, allowed the appeal and quashed the

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . decision of the Censor Board with respect to that one film.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, at what age does an adult become an adult?

MR. LYON: Again I'm going just from memory, I believe it's 16, but I'd have to have the regulation in front of me. It depends -- for the purposes of censoring it's one age; for the purposes of voting it is another age; for the purpose of driving it's another age.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The Minister mentioned that if a film agency objects to the decision of the Censor Board it goes to an Appeal Board. Where is this Appeal Board and who are the members of it? Is it in Manitoba or is it somewhere else?

MR. LYON: This is a provision that has always been in the Act. I shouldn't say always, it's been in the Act at least so long as I've had any familiarity with the provisions of the Act, and it's not a permanent Appeal Board. It provides that, as I recall, that when an appeal comes up, the Minister shall have a list of approximately 20 people -- and again I'm going just by recollection -- from whom may be selected five persons to be on an Appeal Board for a particular appeal that might arise. These people who are on the list are not persons who are paid any regular amount for having their names on the list. They indicate rather that they are available to sit on an Appeal Board as and when an Appeal Board is required. This list is drawn up from representatives of a large number of organizations: The Council of Women, The Women's Institutes, The University of Manitoba, Chamber of Commerce -- these are the ones that come quickly to mind, but that will give you a sampling of the type of representation that is on this list.

In the case of the most recent appeal with which I have connection -- I believe there's only been two, probably three, since this government came to office -- in this particular case we selected five persons from this list to act as the Appeal Board, and I think for their services they received a nominal remuneration of \$5.00. The practise then is that the Appeal Board, the five persons who are selected from the list, go down and view the picture. In the case of the recent appeal, what I did was to give them the appeal from the distributor setting forth his arguments. We tried to naturally conduct it on a legal basis, and then the letter from the Censor Board explaining why they had rejected the film. They had this documentary evidence in front of them, then they sat and saw the film; and after seeing the film they then made a report back to me as Minister saying that they had rejected the decision of the Board and were allowing the appeal. That is what happened and I then communicated this information immediately to the distributor. The members of that Appeal Board, as I recall, were a professor from the University of Manitoba -- I could try to name names -- I can remember the names of two or three of them -- Mr. Hugh Benham, who is connected with the Winnipeg Foundation -- I'm sorry I really haven't got their names, but what I'm trying to indicate to the members of the Committee is that this is a representative appeal board. I believe there were two ladies on the Board and three gentlemen if memory serves me. That is the function that they serve; that's the function that's provided under the Act.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister obliged to view the condemned films?

MR. LYON: Thank Heaven, no!

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, again without entering into the debate on the general field of censorship, I want to make it clear that it's not the innovation of the use of the category "Restricted" that I object to, it's rather the loose observance or enforcement of it. All I'm asking is that the Minister and his department take perhaps a greater degree of interest in seeing that this distinction is being observed by the theatre owners in the city.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister, was no report of the Censor Board given to the members this year?

MR. LYON: The report of the Censor Board was given to me, Mr. Chairman. It's not required to be tabled by statute. If honourable members would like to have a copy of it I can arrange for them to have it. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- I don't know that it was done regularly. I have a copy of it in my hand and I'm quite happy to read it right into the record. It's "285 Colony Street, December 31st, 1961. Honourable Sterling Lyon, Q. C., Minister, Department of Public Utilities, Room 104, Legislative Building, Winnipeg 1. Sir: The Board of Motion Picture Censors have the honour to submit to you its report for the year ending December 31st, 1961. Of the 321 full-length features reviewed, 146 were "Adult"; 154 "General"; 13 "Restricted"; 4 "Rejected"; and 37 features required eliminations. Rejected

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . films this year were: "Flesh is Weak"; "The Private Lives of Adam and Eve"; "The Victim"; and "Cold Winds in August". The Swedish film, "Virgin Spring", went to an Appeal Board after the distributor appealed the Board's decision to eliminate a portion of a rape scene. The Appeal Board upheld the decision of the Board of Censors. "That's not the appeal to which I made reference.

"A restricted category was approved by regulation in May to read "Restricted to Persons 18 years and under unless accompanied by a parent or guardian for theatres and drive-ins. A guide to parents has been advertised in 66 Manitoba weeklies and local papers with a change this year to include the restricted category. The Board approved 349 theatre advertisements, cut four in part, and rejected three.

"This year the Motion Picture Boards of Review held their conference in Regina in September, with every province represented. Next conference will be held in Quebec in May, 1963. The Manitoba Censor Board wishes to convey to the distributors and exhibitors its sincere thanks for the gratifying way in which they have co-operated during the past year. Respectfully submitted, M. B. Newton, Chairman; A. Bilton, Censor; P. McMullen, Censor; H. B. Scott, Censor."

I would be quite happy to send this over to my honourable friends.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I say only this, that if our mutual friend Hank Scott had a hand in that report, that he has cultivated the habit of brevity since he left the Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3 -- passed. Item 4 -- Motor Vehicle Branch.

MR. PAULLEY: In dealing with Item 4, we dealt once or twice during the estimates of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities with court cases. I want to draw to his attention a court case or a legal case which did not reach the newspapers. I must apologize, Mr. Chairman, that I haven't got a transcript of the evidence, but I do want to bring it to the attention of this Committee and officially to the attention of the Minister of Public Utilities, because it has to do with what I think is an undesirable feature of our Highway Traffic Act at the present time.

Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, I'll outline the circumstances under which the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party was given a ticket for a breach of The Highway Traffic Act. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that it is the first time since I was granted a license to operate a motor vehicle in the Province of Manitoba -- and I haven't one for anywhere else -- that I did receive a ticket for a violation of our laws.

MR. ROBLIN: I want to report to my honourable friend if he starts on his personal reminiscences, he might start all of us doing the same thing. All of us are probably in the same boat.

MR. PAULLEY: It's true. The circumstance was, Mr. Chairman, that I was coming back from a picnic at Lynch's Point, just the other side of Portage la Prairie, on a Sunday evening. I was following -- (Interjection) -- no, as a matter of fact we didn't even have anything as strong as root beer -- it was a New Democratic Party picnic. I was following a long line of traffic and coming through the great city of Portage la Prairie, the home constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, and as I was coming down Saskatchewan Avenue, paying attention as much as I could to traffic lights, I noticed that the light was green ahead of me, and then as I approached close to the light it turned to amber and then subsequently to red -- (Interjection) -- They all do that. But the point, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to draw to the attention of the Minister and to the committee is this, that we are used here in the City of Winnipeg, with one or two exceptions and indeed almost all over the Province of Manitoba, that our traffic signals are on the far side of an intersection. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the revised edition of the handbook which is given to beginners in respect of obtaining a license to drive a vehicle, but in the old handbook it indicates that the amber light is a signal of a change of light and the terminology within that handbook was: "Proceed through the intersection".

Now then in this particular case, Mr. Chairman, the light -- and this is at the corner, I believe, 18th street in the City of Portage la Prairie -- is on the near side of the intersection. The reason for me drawing this to the attention of the committee and to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is because I want to impress upon him what I think is necessary -- not for the Leader

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . of the New Democratic Party or for any member of this House -- the desirability, or indeed I think the necessity, of having uniformity in our traffic installations in the province, because after all, and I do understand, Mr. Chairman, there are a few intersections even in the City of Winnipeg where the traffic signal is on the near side of the intersection. I think that we should have absolute uniformity of the placing of our traffic signals, because I don't think that it's fair -- I don't think that it is fair to the motorists, and may I say in particular to the motorists who are coming from outside of our jurisdiction, to be placed in a position of where they don't know whether the lights are on the approach to the intersection or the far side.

I was determined, Mr. Chairman, that this matter -- I could have quite easily just gone before the secretary of the court and paid a fine for this offence, but I wanted it to go before a duly authorized magistrate in order to point out to him what I thought was a bad feature of our traffic regulations here in the Province of Manitoba. I pleaded guilty, because after going back and taking a look at the intersection -- and I might say that I did have a bit of an argument with the constable who was rather -- I shouldn't say that he was stationed there for this purpose, and I won't say that -- but he was conveniently close by when I went through this particular intersection. I argued the point with him because I had been used, as most of us are here in the Greater Winnipeg area, of the traffic signal being on the far side of the highway. I couldn't conceive of him stopping me because I thought that this was a normal thing. However, I was determined that I would take this matter before a magistrate of the Province of Manitoba. He found me guilty, because after I had gone back and surveyed the situation I realized that the constable was correct, but I might say I was reprimanded because I had gone through this particular red light, quite innocently. I'm not pleading innocence to this committee, Mr. Chairman, for any other purpose than to drawing officially now as a member of this House, this could have happened and undoubtedly has happened, and I think it would be interesting to know how many people have been in the same circumstance as I was at the corner of 18th and Saskatchewan Avenue in the City of Portage la Prairie; or in those instances here where I understand -- (Interjection) -- Oh, you be quiet -- or as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, in some localities here in the City of Winnipeg.

I want, Mr. Chairman, and I'm using this and making this frank confession to this House of my own violation, I want to appeal to the Minister in charge of the Highway Traffic Department and of the installation of the signals, particularly on our own highways, because after all even though this does go through the City of Portage la Prairie it is on the Trans-Canada Highway, I want to appeal to him to take under consideration -- I know that he's got a number of amendments to The Highway Traffic Act before this session, but I want him to take under consideration, what I think is advisable for all those that are driving motor vehicles here in the Province of Manitoba, to have firmly established uniformity of traffic signals in order that everyone knows what the situation is. Because quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, this could cause a number of accidents on the highway, because as one becomes educated into having the traffic signal on the far side of the street and expects when they are approaching a traffic signal that they are still going through an intersection -- and in the case that I mention of -- when they're going at the amber light figure that they're only going through the intersection or past the start of the intersection -- which in my case I had -- there could conceivably be others, who are well aware of the signal being where it is, attempt to cross the highway at the same time as I was attempting to proceed, in accordance with the handbook, through the intersection on the amber light.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this is an important enough situation to make a frank confession to the committee of being guilty of a traffic violation. But I raise this in order that the Minister and the department concerned with the operation of the Motor Vehicle Branch -- The Highway Traffic Act -- and take this point under consideration, not because I happened to go through a red light, but I am sure that it could conceivably be the cause of accidents, because of the fact that people are, generally speaking, educated, particularly here in the Greater Winnipeg area, of the fact of the signals being on the far side of the intersection.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights): The moral of this story is, don't go through a red light when there's a policeman standing there.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder why the policeman was there?

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): I'd like to mention at the same intersection, I didn't go through the red light but I stopped about 80 to 100 feet before I got to the light and found I was obstructing the traffic between the two blocks on that same cursed light there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4 --

MR. LYON: On the point raised by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, notwithstanding his personal involvement, but because of his personal involvement, I think is worthy of some comment. These lights, even though this is a public trunk highway as it passes through the City of Portage la Prairie, these lights were erected and are placed there by the city. I enquired after my honourable friend was kind enough to tell me of this incident. They're erected and maintained by the City of Portage la Prairie, not by any provincial authority. In fact, I think one will find varying shades of opinion from Manitoba travellers who have occasion to pass through my old home town, and the home town of the Minister of Welfare, about the number of the lights that one has to ferret his way through when he goes through that very fair city. I'm afraid I can't offer him any redress. I think the Justice of the Peace showed him, or showed proper dispensation of justice, when he reprimanded him, having regard to the circumstances of the case, rather than fining him. I will endeavour, as I'm sure my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare who's been listening over my shoulder, to see if this situation can be brought to the attention of the City of Portage la Prairie to see if they can remedy it, because I have some familiarity with the intersection he speaks of. I know of the situation there and one should never admit weaknesses, but I think I could be bamboozled probably just the same as he was at the particular intersection, but certainly that can be brought to the attention of the City of Portage la Prairie.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, for my own edification, is not the jurisdiction of the Trans-Canada Highway, irrespective of the fact of it passing through a city, under the first jurisdiction of the province, under The Highway Traffic Act insofar as the placing of signs are concerned? Has not the city got to obtain the permission of the Department of Public Works before they can place signs? That's my impression. Now I think this is true in other jurisdictions other than cities. I'm not sure whether it is also true in the likes of the City of Portage la Prairie. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that if the Honourable the Minister of Welfare who resides in Portage la Prairie and the Honourable the Attorney-General who apparently comes from Portage la Prairie are not able to take any action in having this particular sign moved, I must then appeal -- it must then appeal to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable Member for Lakeside to see if they might be able to use their influence on the Mayor of Portage la Prairie to have this moved.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know why my Leader was reprimanded instead of fined?

MR. LYON: You better ask your Leader, Mr. Chairman.

..... Continued on next page

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this is the correct place to discuss traffic conditions. Is it? I thought maybe Public Works was a better one. I'm aware that the Law Amendments Committee sits quite frequently to consider these matters. However, I think there's one point where I can agree wholeheartedly with my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and that is on the desirability of uniformity. I would not admit to his weaknesses and I suppose that those of us who come from in or near Portage la Prairie would be quite willing to point out to him that being an especially select community there that we have become accustomed to have the police watch rather carefully for undesirables and that they maybe swoop down on them and no doubt were maybe on the watch if that kind of a meeting was being held in Lakeside constituency that day. However, on the matter of uniformity I agree with the honourable gentleman completely. I would think that in some of these cases, even though we would like to give the municipalities the utmost in leeway, that highway safety in these days of so many motor cars requires that we should enforce uniformity so far as the laws are concerned, and I, in that connection, would like to point out another lack of uniformity. I'm not an expert on this question. I don't know which is the better -- I have my own opinion -- I don't pretend to be an expert in it. Two great cities, Portage la Prairie and Brandon, both allow turning right on the red light after a full stop. The City of Winnipeg does not. -- Pardon?

MR. LYON: . . . . . they don't permit it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, but it's not allowed in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. LYON: No, no.

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't know which is proper. I certainly like the Brandon-Portage la Prairie system better, as far as I'm concerned, and I think most of the people do and I have the feeling that it aids traffic. But I do say this, that as in a great many other things I don't know that the difference between one or the other is anything like as important as the question of having them uniform. I certainly say, get on all fours in this thing and if it's necessary for the province to enter into the field of legislation on this and take away authority from the municipalities, then maybe we should do it. I have my own preference but I'd accept either if it's made uniform.

MR. LYON: The point raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside is certainly well taken. I don't have the Highway Traffic Act in front of me and I'm going only by memory, but when we put the new rules of the road in, approximately two years ago, I was under the impression personally that the new rules of the road prohibited turns on a red light. There is a provision there that municipalities may make by-laws which are not inconsistent with the meaning of the Act. Now I haven't had this situation brought to my attention to determine whether or not -- in fact that's why I rose to ask the honourable member if they were still permitting it because I was under the impression that it had stopped. I don't know if those by-laws have been interpreted as being within this proviso which permits municipalities to make alterations that are not inconsistent but are a furtherance of the provisions of the Act. Fortunately we do still have the Highway Traffic Act in the Law Amendments Committee and before we process it out of there I'll enquire further on the point because I certainly agree with the Honourable Member for Lakeside that uniformity one way or the other is desirable, because it leads to misleading situations for travellers, for the travelling public generally, and there should be uniformity.

In that connection, with respect to uniformity of speed limits and the power of the provincial government now to bring uniformity into this field, the honourable members will be aware, Mr. Chairman, of the existence of the Highway Traffic and Co-ordination Board, which is trying to look at all of these matters of highway speeds, reduced speed zones, and so on throughout the province now, and I think under the capable chairmanship of Mr. Ray Tallin who succeeded Mr. R. B. Bailey, are making a real inroad into this problem in Manitoba. They have conducted extensive hearings across the province. Honourable members will note from time to time in the paper the applications that they receive for generally increasing from 30 to 40, or from 40 to 50 zones in tertiary areas just on the outskirts where really the traffic is travelling at those speeds in any case -- mostly in defiance of existing 30-mile speed zone signs.

I think generally the statement can be made that this program which has been started by this board -- and it's a very desirable program -- is meeting with general acceptance right across the province. Occasionally they find municipalities objecting for one reason or another

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd) . . . . .of local conditions that might obtain, and they give the fullest hearing to all of these objections. But generally they are trying to build up their speed zones and build up their general traffic safety devices and so on, on provincial trunk highways, which are uniform and which will be in the long run of benefit to the travelling public of this province.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Honourable the Attorney-General and the Minister in this respect. He also mentioned the question of the new handbook. I haven't seen the new handbook that is being issued now, but I wonder if he'd be kind enough to check to see whether or not there was a page -- if I recall correctly -- in the old handbook, the last handbook, which showed traffic signals, red, yellow and green for illustrative purposes and I checked this in the old one, and I think I'm correct in stating, where it shows the amber light, underneath that description it says: "Proceed through intersection." Now I wonder if my friend -- as I say, I haven't seen one -- I wonder if he would check to see whether that same illustration is being used in the new, because this is misleading to the travelling public, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if it is in there that he take every step as soon as possible, unless we're going to have uniformity actually of signs, that this instruction to proceed through the intersection on the amber light is deleted or some explanation of "watch though in case the light is -- before you approach an intersection" -- and I think this is important to the travelling public.

MR. LYON: I'll be happy to supply copies of the handbook to my honourable friend and to any other members. In fact I think a general distribution to the House might be desirable, and I can arrange to have them distributed.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to tell the Honourable Minister that he's quite right that the turn on the red light I believe was prohibited a couple of years ago, but at that time we were informed that if an arrow, a green arrow were shown, that the turn could be made on the right, and the traffic actually stopped turning on the red light, the right hand turn in Brandon, till they had placed, not a green light but an arrow inside the red light, which apparently satisfies the law . . . . . turn right.

I might say that where there's heavy cross traffic it doesn't speed up traffic at all, but where the cross traffic is light and you can get into that aisle, it does speed up the traffic quite considerably through a town.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister say that Mr. Bailey had been succeeded by Mr. Tallin as the Registrar of Motor Vehicles?

MR. LYON: No, as Chairman of the Highway Traffic and Co-ordination Board. That is the board that looks after the speed-zones and so on.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Thank you. About how long ago was that? Recently?

MR. LYON: Oh, I don't have the exact date. It was some time before I took over responsibility for the department. Mr. Bailey had many other duties which -- and this actually has proved to be a very heavy board in terms of obligations. A lot of travelling has been involved by the board.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, if this is the item where we discuss uniformity of speed zones, I'd like to point out to the Minister that there seems to be still lingering some inconsistency regarding speed zones and proper traffic signs, etc. Some time ago the school district board, local school district board, asked the Highway Traffic Authority for the provision of playground signs in lieu of school, in lieu of the school sign -- this is along Highway No. 4. Now you might not think that there's really that much difference, and I don't know, but I do know that there's inconsistency because I do see some schools -- for example, New Rosewell School and one other along Highway 59, where they have playground signs in addition to, or in lieu of school signs. And at Ashfield which is near the junction of 59 and No. 4, the traffic is almost as heavy, and higher speed I daresay, the board there asked for playground signs -- they were turned down. Now the Highway Traffic Authority Board in their wisdom may have seen fit to do this but there does seem to be an inconsistency in the ruling. If one school board can have their request acceded to and the traffic density and pattern is pretty well the same, it should have been made available to the other. I could give the Minister more details if he thinks it merits looking into.

MR. LYON: I'm not familiar with the particular case but I would be quite happy to put the honourable member in touch with the Chairman of the Board and he could perhaps explain

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd) ..... at first hand the reason of the Board in that case.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I've been getting a lot of complaints about these small strips on the license plates. In fact, I've had two or three letters from people complaining that they've either been stolen off their cars or lost. They have to proceed and go and buy another one. Is the government planning to continue the use of the strips or to go back to annual plates; or permanent plates, or are there any planned changes? I'm sure the Minister must have received complaints himself.

MR. LYON: It's possibly because I haven't been Minister too long that I haven't received any complaints that I can recall just at the moment. But I can tell my honourable friend that the present intention is to continue with the validation strips for the time being. As he will appreciate there is a considerable saving in cost on these strips. When I was in Alberta in December I found out there they had a very novel scheme whereby they produced their license plates in one of their provincial institutions, that is, one of their correctional institutions. There they have the annual plates but they can turn them out very cheaply. Needless to say I'm very interested in this operation and have got some material from them on it. But there's no present plan to change the validation strip procedure that is presently being followed.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, they tell me there's a certain amount of wear and tear on license plates. If you happen to be one of these goodhearted souls who will give the other fellow a push in the wintertime, I suggest that after all there must be some reasonable limit beyond which -- you can't go on issuing license plates -- I think it was 1952, was it, the last time that we had a license? Surely, we're not expected to go for ..... How long does the Minister feel that a set of plates will last?

MR. LYON: I don't have the exact date, Mr. Chairman. I can check on that. I would advise honourable members if they're interested in increasing the revenues of the Province of Manitoba that they can obtain new plates for a very reasonable amount, I'm told, if they feel that their present ones are bashed up too badly. Of course, then there's the added spur in the Highway Traffic Act that you should do this because if your plate is mutilated to the point where the police can't read what the license number is, you can be charged for having a plate that is not capable of being read. So if my honourable friend's plate is getting in that condition, I will give him a little free legal advice and suggest that he spend a dollar and perhaps get a new one.

MR. MOLGAT: ..... I think the Minister was going to get the information regarding the power lines in the floodway. Has he got that yet?

MR. LYON: ..... on that Mr. Chairman. No I just got one .....

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, if he hasn't got it now, I can do it under Capital when we come to that. I presume there will be a capital appropriation.

MR. LYON: I have that item -- I had the note on the top of my material when I came in tonight -- and if I find it I'll either give it a little later or give it under Capital.

MR. MOLGAT: ..... give it under capital, fine.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Chairman, I believe I'll ask the last question, whether the Minister of the government is contemplating to reduce farmers' truck licenses to a standard fee, say of \$10.00, which are ten years old or

MR. LYON: A short answer I think is "no."

MR. WAGNER: Pardon.

MR. LYON: A short answer is "no." I'm making a short answer because I'm sure my honourable friend will be much more interested in listening to the Minister of Public Works than he is in listening to the Minister of Utilities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That completes the vote for the department. Department of Public Works No. XI.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Acting Minister of Public Works)(Minnedosa): Well, Mr. Chairman, after having waited for some six weeks, I have developed, I would say, probably some mixed emotions as to how I would feel in presenting my first set of estimates to the Committee. I might say that at this stage of the game I still haven't made up my mind as to what I might expect, but I would presume before not too many days go by I will have had a reasonable indication.

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I think that I would like to take a minute or two to express



(Mr. Weir, cont'd) . . . . my sincere appreciation to the staff of the Department of Public Works. Through circumstances which happened through illness of my good colleague John Thompson, it was not only hard for John Thompson but it was hard for the Department of Public Works, because getting well on into the year they had a new Minister thrust upon them and I'm sure that it wasn't easy. I will give them credit, they have taken fairly sound advice. I think that they maybe took a pattern from the Honourable George Johnson, the Minister of Health, because it appears to me that they were trying this process of osmosis on me to try and make some of the workings of the department rub off. I hope that in some way, shape or form that they have had a least a degree of success, and I will endeavour to provide the members of the Committee with whatever answers I have at my disposal or in my head. When we get to those that I haven't got the answers I'm sure that there are those that can help me provide them for you, and I'll be only too happy to do so.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that to expedite the workings of the committee and to help me bring out some of the things that I have, I hope, managed to get into my head, it would be possibly best if the House would agree if we had maybe two opportunities for general remarks on the department, one at the beginning with regard to Items 1 and 2 or Resolutions 65 and 66, the Administration, and the Operation and Maintenance of Government Buildings, and possibly the same opportunity again when we start on the Highways Branch. I think at this time that there's no further remarks that I have for the moment except to say again, I will do my best to provide whatever information I can to the Committee.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I will follow the fine example given by the Minister in this matter and my own comments will be very brief at this stage. I shall reserve my other comments on the Highways Branch until we reach that particular item at which time I expect the Minister will give us the normal forms detailing the various programs that he has in mind.

I want to welcome the new Minister in this post, Mr. Chairman. We had some comments on the opening of the Throne Speech Debate, but now that we reach his estimates, I want to tell him that we naturally will be seeking some information. However I am sure that he will be most co-operative and we'll look forward to getting all the details from him. I agree with him completely in his comments about his staff. Here again, those who are like myself in country constituencies have to work very closely with the Department of Public Works. It's probably one of those, next to education, that affects us the most, and I can certainly say that the co-operation we get at all times, in my own case from the district office with which I deal, is most satisfactory, and I agree with him in his comments regarding the staff.

The main items now, Mr. Chairman, are under this particular heading, the administration in general and the government buildings. I have no further comments to make in that regard. I trust that under the Highways Branch, we will also have an opportunity to discuss the general administration of the highways operation as such. So I wish the Minister well in his work, Mr. Chairman. It's unfortunate that due to life in politics he will not be enjoying that position for too, too long, however, during his stay there I can assure him that we are happy to see him

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, at the start of the investigation into the estimates of the Department of Public Works, may I, too, add my personal congratulations and that of my party to the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. I sincerely trust and hope and I believe that our associations of the past will continue now that he has reached the exalted stage of being a member of the Cabinet. I wish him the very best. I'm sure that he has the qualifications and the capabilities of rendering good service to the Province of Manitoba, and while I am congratulating him Mr. Chairman, may I also say to those who work underneath him how much we appreciate the co-operation we have received from the various district engineers, the deputy minister and others in the Department of Public Works.

Now I have no general criticism to offer, particularly under the item of Administration of the Department of Public Works. I do have some criticisms and I've already vented them, of the making of first class highways by Order-in-Council. I'm not going to repeat that at this particular stage. I want to assure the Honourable the Minister of Public Works that we are not going to move a motion to reduce his salary to \$1.00 this year. Unless the Honourable the First Minister carries through one of the statements he made this afternoon, we anticipate that there will be a session next year and we will await with great interest how

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . . . .the Honourable Mr. Weir conducts himself in office. With no justification at this time, Mr. Chairman, for a reduction of his salary, he can be assured that as far as we're concerned, he's welcome to the \$10,000 that is provided in the estimates. We'll do our utmost, Mr. Chairman, to make sure that he earns it. So to you Sir, the very best of luck from the New Democratic Party of the Province of Manitoba, the next government of Manitoba.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the expressions of goodwill that have been tendered to the new Minister. I think he succeeds in this position another man whom all the House would want to say is a real gentleman, and I'm sure that under the present Ministership that that situation will not be changed.

A little earlier this evening I mentioned the fact that the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, the Honourable the Attorney-General and I, all came from the Portage la Prairie district. I'm sorry that at that time I neglected to mention another equally distinguished son. I'm sure that my honourable friend must have, because he also is a product of the Portage Plains. As a matter of fact I think that he and I share a slight advantage over the other two because we belong to the rural district; they come from the bailiwick of Lloyd Henderson.

A MEMBER: Is that bad?

MR. CAMPBELL: I guess they can live it down. But I say in all sincerity that I certainly feel this to be a pleasure to congratulate my honourable friend. He knows that I knew both his mother and father a long time before he knew them, and I consider them both to be very personal friends and if, being their son, he wasn't a fine fellow, there just wouldn't be anything in heredity at all. So I'm sure that, knowing the personality to which he is entitled by birth and tradition, he'll make the best job that is possible of looking after these estimates and of the position that he holds, handicapped as he is by some of his company. So like my friends who have spoken, it's a pleasure to extend our congratulations to him, and I wouldn't close these few remarks without saying that I can extend not all of those same things to the Deputy, because I haven't known the family in that connection the way I have known him, but I have known the Deputy Minister of Public Works for a great number of years. I've had the pleasure of working very closely with him. In fact he was one of my very closest associates during that desperately troublesome time of the famous 1950 flood, and I'll never forget the practical, hard-headed way in which George Collins went about doing the best that could be done under those circumstances. Like the rest of us, he hadn't expected the magnitude of the trouble that descended upon us, but I never heard a complaint out of George Collins, not one, and he worked with that cool-headed and industrious, rough and tumble, practical way for which he is famous, to get a lot of mileage under the most difficult circumstances. I consider George Collins to be one of the members of the Civil Service who never tries to get a lot of publicity. He's one that's content to work really in the background, and he sure does a lot of work.

I won't go through the other members of the department. My honourable friend has got a lot of other good men with him. I think it's a pretty good team. Now this doesn't mean, of course, that we're going to say pass to all the items. I would predict we will go through the early ones pretty quickly. As far as I'm concerned I have little or nothing to say until we reach the Item No. (g) Automobile Garage, then I will ask my customary question: "How many additions are there to the fleet?" I ask that every year, and what's the present number of personnel carrying automobiles? Up to that time, though, we don't usually have any difficulty and even that, it doesn't take long to get the answers. So that I would predict that my honourable friend will have a pretty quick passage right up till the middle of the next page. At that time the questions might get a little more intent.

It's a pleasure to welcome my honourable friend and to wish him well during his currency in this position.

MR. GRAY: I don't know Mr. Weir or the Minister of Public Works -- I only know him since he came to this House -- but will you permit me to say a word about George Collins. I worked with him since I came into this House, particularly during the hungry years of relief and the Rural Rehabilitation Commission, and I found him at all times fighting for the underdog, as far as the committee was concerned, helping the people in all its hardship during the relief years. He was the only one here in the House when McNamara who was in charge of it left for Ottawa, and he took over his job, which was a heavy job, and from the first day he

(Mr. Gray, cont'd) . . . . . he was a very, very useful man on the committee. I happened to be a member of the Unemployment Relief Committee and also a member representing the City on the provincial relief undertakings, and I really -- now he's getting bored, but I really want to pay a compliment -- I didn't have any other chance -- I think with Mr. Collins, the Minister's job will be a very easy one. And while I cannot say that much, I don't know about the Minister, because some of the members have already expressed their pleasure of having him here at this job, I as an individual want to pay a compliment to the man known as George Collins, previously in the Unemployment, in the Rural Rehabilitation Commission he was very active, and recently as Deputy Minister of Public Works.

MR. CORBETT: Mr. Chairman, this beautiful spirit of amity which has suddenly descended on the House, prompts me to get up and say a few words about certain things.

When you were congratulating Portage la Prairie, you overlooked two very important people -- one of them in the House -- who come from Portage la Prairie, Mr. Jim Cowan and my wife, but, of course, she doesn't stay in the House. But I would be very remiss, I felt, if I didn't express, after working for many years with George Collins and many of the other boys, that I should put in a good word for them along with -- I'm in a better position to judge than a lot of the other men because they only knew them superficially, but I knew them fairly down deep, and I wish to assure the whole House that George Collins and his staff are most dependable and most trustworthy -- in fact, I trained quite a lot of those boys so they couldn't help but be good -- but I just can't quite understand yet what sudden phenomena of the weather or something like that, has suddenly come into this House after listening to it all day today when the spirits that were floating around the House were more along the line of Dante's Inferno than the heavenly attitude which is at the present time -- but I hope it may continue for some time so that we will finally wind up the business of the House. Thank you.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not good in congratulations, and everybody knows that. However, I want to congratulate the Honourable Minister because I had the privilege of sitting with him on the Livestock Marketing Board for a -- not on the Livestock Marketing Board, on the Livestock Committee for a while and I know him from that experience that he is a very proud, a versed man, cool, understandable. However, I don't want to pat him on the back because I still want to see that No. 7 Highway come through from Fisher Branch to Hudson -- (interjection) -- However, I am sure -- we don't allow to put that here -- but I'm sure that I can back any member in this Legislature if the Public Works Department wants to go on record and say, "Who visited them more from the MLA if it isn't Peter Wanger?" I am pretty sure that they can say that, because if I am correct I am here in Winnipeg practically three times a month, and this is the department I visit. It's Public Works close to them. And I must admit that I get all the information, the assistance that's possible. And as I said before, I want to congratulate the Minister, the Deputy Minister and the whole works of the Public Works Department, because as far as I'm concerned -- oh yes, the Member from Swan River he likes to refer, "Poor old Fisher, no ditches, no bridges, no roads." That's so true. The Department of Public Works knows that I'm always coming for something. When they see me walking in the door, I don't know whether they shiver or not, but they are not afraid of me -- they assist me in every human way possible. However, at this point I'd like to direct a question to the Minister because as I said from the start I'm very interested in the highway and I don't see no highway program in front of me that I could analyze through Good Friday and Easter and come back on Monday and see if I can get any money out of the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) passed. (b) passed. (c) passed. (d) passed. (e) passed. Resolution 65 passed. Item 2 (a) passed.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, two years ago I rose and made some suggestions to the House in regard to certain things in this building, and I would like to just take a moment or two again because some of the suggestions I made were carried out and I appreciate them, and I think many other members do too.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to draw -- first of all we have a wonderful building here, and when we think that it was built so long ago, we should pause for a moment and think about it, because this is one of the finest buildings in the North American continent. Now sometimes the small things of life are the ones that cause us the most annoyance and it to these things I wish to draw the attention of the House.

(Mr. Wright (Cont'd)).... For instance, I notice in walking down Memorial Boulevard--the boulevard named after those who fell in the wars--that many people find it difficult here in the wintertime to reach this building, and I only hope that when we have our new \$700,000 park that some consideration will be given--and perhaps this will need some negotiating with the City of Winnipeg--to improve the sidewalk. The sidewalk is at least six inches too low. People walk from here, some of the office staff, down to Portage Avenue during the noon hour and it's almost impassable at times and I respectfully draw the attention of the Minister to this fact, that probably he will need to make some negotiation with the City of Winnipeg, but I think that this fine building certainly deserves a far better approach than that at the present time.

One of the things people notice when they come here especially in the summertime, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that they need a drink of cold water, and they have to go down the halls and look at the old-fashioned ones there. Now I don't know whether there's a system of cooling them, but I submit that one be placed in the very entrance to the building--especially when children are coming in here--and it can be electrically refrigerated. This is a modern approach and while I wouldn't want to do anything to spoil the architecture of the building, I think this could be considered.

And I also want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have been told--many of the teachers have said to me that the coat racks that were suggested before have been placed downstairs--these portable coat racks, and they are much appreciated.

And that leads me to say, Mr. Chairman, that in the sessions that we have in Law Amendment, I notice that people come in there--this last while we've had a considerable number of them--their coats and hats are piled on chairs and when a fellow pays \$10.00 for a hat and finds it ending up on the floor and somebody walking over it--I think we could do better than that. I think we could extend a little more hospitality to our people who are coming here to make presentations by having some facilities, even if it's only a bar with coat hangers so at least they could hang up their clothes.

Another thing, I'm very sensitive to this business of acoustics, and while this is truly a beautiful building I think that we could do much more to make it a more utilitarian building, and I would like to see a workshop for our Law Amendments Committee and our other committees. I would like to see one room set aside and properly acousticed, because it's very discomforting to me when I sit in Law Amendments Committee and I hear many of our citizens trying to make a presentation and all we seem to be able to say to them is, "Speak up, speak up; we can't hear you." I think we can do better than this. There is no building today that's made, whether it be school, or any other public building that has not acoustic tile on the ceiling. I don't think that this would run into a lot of money. I think that we owe this to people who come here and I say that I would like to ask the government to consider this. Now I notice here in this Chamber too, while the walls have been acousticed and I think it's something we can truly be proud of, I notice that two or three times various people have been tripping on our stairs, and those of them that walk across the back with hard heels make it rather annoying for those of us who are trying to listen. I would suggest that a runner, a suitable carpet runner be placed along the back in order to quieten the place.

I suggested two years ago, Mr. Chairman, that the inkwells, which are no longer used, could very, very cheaply be converted into ashtrays by simply putting a piece of pipe down here with a little recess on the top, and they could be cleaned out quite easily from the bottom, instead of having all these cigar butts and all this litter on the floor. I think that we could -- many times -- I'm a non-smoker, I turn around and I think the place is on fire. What I'm smelling is a cigarette butt burning into the wax on the floor, and I think that this is a condition that we could remedy.

I also wanted to say that I noticed the desks are all getting scratched and I'm one of these people that don't like to see furniture marked up. Mine has some initials carved in it. I don't know whether we had young parliament here or not -- but I have a remedy for that because I notice if we place the staples in Hansard reversely, that is the sharp side up, we would avoid this. We have Hansard on the desks and if you'll notice the staples, sometimes they're not properly bent over; we rub them around on the desk, and you can't avoid marring up the place. Now I think we're all proud of our Chamber and these are only small suggestions, but in view of the fact that the First Minister did consider what I had to say two years ago, I hope that

(Mr. Wright, cont'd) . . . . . perhaps again he will think of the things I'm mentioning here now.

MR. GRAY: One other suggestion. There is a lot of poor people still living a short distance from the grounds of this Legislature. They cannot afford in the first place -- and secondly to go to the parks, the city parks, and they also cannot afford the time and they usually come around here on a summer evening -- hot summer evenings we will find them sitting on the grounds -- they need some place where they can get a little bit of fresh air and sunshine, and the only place they can come is right here and there's only a couple of benches here. It costs so little to make them comfortable. True that they're building a new park, but I mentioned this 10 years ago and nothing has been done. I mentioned it three years ago and no attention was paid. I don't expect them to pay any more attention to the grounds than they pay attention to me in general, but nevertheless I'm speaking on behalf -- I have a car, I can go out to the park. They haven't and until the other park is going to be ready -- it may take a year or two, I don't know -- all we would have to do here, the grounds are kept beautifully, but people haven't got a way to sit down for an hour or two in the evening during the summer months. It's a duty for us having these beautiful grounds around here to give them a little bit more comfort at a very little cost, and I hope that the present Minister will not ignore my suggestion the same as the others did. Otherwise, he will follow the faults of the other ministers.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, while we're on suggestions as to how government buildings can be improved, I wonder if the department has made any survey of the hours time lost in the Norquay Building while employees try to reach their offices. I've spent some time there in the morning at 9:00 o'clock and other times at noon and at 1:00 o'clock, when employees were either coming to work or going for lunch or returning from lunch, and found a long line-up of employees waiting at the elevators to wait their turn to reach an elevator that happens to be going up or down. And I don't know who were the architects of the building or who was doing the thinking on the way of the construction of the building, but it seems very obvious to a layman like myself, that many, many, hundreds of hours are lost by government employees waiting to reach their floor, I don't know how many elevators there are as a matter of fact, but there certainly aren't nearly enough or they don't operate quickly enough to take the employees up and down at the particular time the employees are at a rush. I've seen times when there will be as many as 60 or 70 people waiting in the rotunda or lobby of the Norquay Building to get an elevator to go up. If they don't happen to be the aggressive type who push their way into an elevator they miss it and don't manage to get in, and they wait for another one and miss it, and this goes on for some considerable length of time, and I do think that this is quite important to those of us who are interested in the number of hours the civil servants put in, and put into useful time and effort for the Province of Manitoba, and I wonder if the Minister has ever made a survey or a study of this particular matter because there are hundreds of hours lost here in my opinion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps my question is really out of order on this item. I only want to ask the Minister when we're going to get the detailed road program. Tonight?

MR. WEIR: No. Monday, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister is answering some of these questions that are connected with the Legislative Building and grounds, perhaps he would deal with the program for the park across Broadway.

MR. WEIR: If there are no further questions on these particular items, I will do my best to comment on a few of them. With regard to the comments by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, I took particular note of his questions and we will look into them and see what we can do. With regard to the sidewalk it's quite possible that in fixing up the park something can be done to improve the situation. The other ones, I've made notes of them all and we'll have them checked.

With regard to the Honourable Member for Inkster, the benches in the park. I'm not too sure what the situation is there. I'll look into it. I wouldn't be surprised if the improvements in the park across the street will help considerably with the suggestion that you have.

With regard to the time being lost waiting on the elevators, again I'll have it checked. I know of no study that has been made, but we will certainly look and see if there's something that can be done to ease the situation.

And the park. It actually comes under Item 5 on the estimates under Capital. If you want

(Mr. Weir, cont'd) .....me to answer it now, I can, but it is mixed up with the other capital improvements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: .... (a) passed?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on this matter, one of the difficult points of the Norquay Building as well, and sometimes around this building, is the question of parking. Has the government any further plans about facilities? Some time ago there was some discussion about the possibility of having underground parking in the park across the way. Has anything further been done in this regard?

MR. WEIR: Nothing concrete, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: Has the government got any plans to do anything about it?

MR. WEIR: .... the thing has been considered at various times, but I'm not in a position to say that there's going to be anything done with regard to parking in the immediate future.

MR. MOLGAT: The Norquay Building, presumably, is fully utilized now. I imagine it's probably more than fully utilized if I know what happens to offices in this building as well. Are there any further plans for government office construction. And any further plans for consolidation of other government offices that are located here in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. WEIR: Nothing concrete at the present time, Mr. Chairman. There are some possibilities but they're too far afield to think of at the moment.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, we're dealing with the Legislative Building, I understand. It was a treat to some degree at least when we returned for Session this year to note that there had been improvements made down in the cafeteria -- a lot brighter than it used to be. But I'm wondering -- I would like to make a comment in connection with the cafeteria downstairs, Mr. Chairman -- I'm wondering why the government when they were making such a -- I don't know what it cost and I'm sure the members would be interested to know the expenditure of the alterations, because I noticed it's either stainless steel or monel ovens and the likes of that down at the present time, which is of course a vast improvement over what it was before. But I would like to ask the Minister -- he may not be in a position to answer -- but why was it when they had made -- what I would suggest would be a fair amount of an expenditure, that there wasn't more attention given to air conditioning down in the cafeteria of some description at least? Despite the more attractive appearance and the general cleanliness appearance being raised, it's still quite hot down in the cafeteria itself. Now whether or not it wouldn't be possible to have better circulation of natural air, I wonder whether or not the Minister might consider putting in an air conditioning unit of some description down there. Because after all when we do go down there, and I'm sure I'm more concerned with the staff even than I am with ourselves, I note that it gets quite hot and quite stuffy down there, particularly when there's a crowd at the lunch hour. So I ask the Minister if he can give us a general idea of how much it cost for the alterations down there, and whether the matter of air conditioning was considered in connection with the improvements and if it wasn't at that time would he indicate that there will be consideration given to some type of air conditioning down in the cafeteria in this building?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Honourable the Leader of the NDP's comments on the cafeteria. I might say that I don't think that I have any list of the costs here because as far as the department is concerned the only costs that we were involved in were the few changes in partitioning, the lights and the decorative material. Everything else belongs to the CNIB and all of the equipment that is there is theirs, and I think that there was some provision made for some circulation of the air, but I think its effect is being felt mostly in the kitchen. I don't think that the odor and what not is as bad as it was. What was done about air conditioning I'm not in a position to say. I will look into it, although I can promise you no action on it at this particular time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if it is the result of the CNIB that the changes have been made down there with the exception, as the Minister says, of the partitions, may I take this opportunity of complimenting the Institute for the Blind for the job that they did. It surely is a very appreciated improvement over what it was before, and I do appeal to the Minister that while there maybe, as he states, some changes in the air conditioning or air system so far as the kitchen is concerned, I don't know whether that would be the responsibility of the CNIB or not. If it is the responsibility of the government I beseech him to bring some of the air conditioning into the larger area of the cafeteria.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, after having listened to the members of the Opposition for some time, I presume that my next comments will come as a surprise to the members on the far side, because we, I suppose, do sound very critical, but I want to say that insofar as spaces allocated to us in this building — I'm referring now to our group and the space allocated to myself as the Leader of the Opposition -- that I want to express my thanks to the government. The space in my opinion is good space and adequate for our group at this time. I'm quite happy with it and I thank them for the use of it. That doesn't mean of course, Mr. Chairman, that I will not keep on asking the First Minister for some staff to make better use of that space. However, the space that we have is good and I thank them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(b) — passed, (c) — passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Under 2(b), there was substantial renovations made to Government House in the past year. Could the Minister indicate the costs?

MR. WEIR: To start out with, Mr. Chairman, the first set of tenders that were received the first year, in '60, came in at \$85,585 and were rejected. There had been \$50,000 voted for this work and the cost of the addition as it was built during 1961 was \$48,417 and the figure includes the cost of work done by the contract as well as the cost of the electrical work and the painting that was done by our own staffs.

MR. MOLGAT: ..... any further expenditures contemplated on the buildings?

MR. WEIR: Not this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) — passed? (d) — passed?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I note that the figure is up slightly from last year. I wonder whether the Minister could tell us how many additional buildings other than the Norquay Building that we still have under rental. If I recall correctly we have the Maw Block and a few other blocks that we had anticipated with the building of the Norquay Building would no longer be required for governmental purposes. I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to just run down and tell us of any buildings outside of the Norquay Building and I believe the Milk Board Building and one or two others that is being used, and I also exclude the Manitoba Hospital Services Building. How many privately-owned buildings are being rented now for governmental purposes?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I think I can cover them here for you. 146 Pioneer Avenue .....

MR. PAULLEY: ..... Hospital Services.

MR. WEIR: I haven't got that here; I believe that's what it is though, Mr. Chairman. Then there's the Maw Block .....

MR. PAULLEY: Is it under lease? Is that why we're not out of it, because of a long-term lease? Do we own it?

MR. WEIR: Yes, there's no rent listed so we own it, I guess. — (Interjection) — Broadway and Colony over here, the Public Works. The Ingram and Bell Building we don't use any more and — (Interjection) — we're finished with that, and 545 Broadway Avenue; I'm not just sure, that's over here, I believe, too.

MR. PAULLEY: Milk Board Building, I presume.

MR. WEIR: I don't believe so. I think it's over on the other side opposite the Picardy Building there.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes.

MR. WEIR: — (Interjection) — Pardon?

MR. PAULLEY: Liquor Commission.

MR. WEIR: Yes, and the Crop Insurance Branch is in the Power Building and that's it other than the ones that we have ourselves, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: And the Minister did say there are no immediate plans for the consolidation of these?

MR. WEIR: No immediate plans, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) passed; (e) passed; (f) passed; (g) passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: This is the one, Mr. Chairman, where I check on .....

MR. WEIR: ..... questions again. Mr. Chairman, could I get the Honourable Member for Lakeside to repeat them?

MR. CAMPBELL: I have looked the report of the department over pretty carefully and right near the beginning of it we have the statement of the Central Provincial Garage, and I notice that as in former years, that a report is given on the additions to the fleet, and this, of course, is in the past year; we're a year behind this now. I would like to get the additions to the fleet in the year just closed, and then I would like to get the total number of personnel carrying vehicles belonging to the Central Government. I'm not asking at this time for those belonging to the Power Commission and the Telephones. On the other hand if they were available from the same source I'd be glad to have them also, but it's the ones for the government services that I'm particularly interested in.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on the same item, if I can ask a question also. A few years ago we brought in the suggestion of . . . . the government if there was any chance of going back to the PG plates again -- the licence plates -- and apparently at the time it was felt -- there was quite a debate in the House -- and it was felt that there was no reason for that; that there was no abuse or anything like that; everything was fine in this field, and just a few weeks ago or a month ago, there was some indication, a report in the newspaper, that the government was coming in with a new policy on government-owned cars. I personally have heard some people talking about that, some of the employees talking about that, and different comments and I wonder -- I don't know if the Honourable Minister has this information now, but I think this is something new, something that has been added since last year. If the Honourable Minister would be kind enough to give us the policy of the government on these publicly-owned cars and also if there's any indication that the government might go back to these PG plates to know where those cars are?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'll try and get the details of policy for the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. With regard to PG plates, in the length of time I've been here I've had no time to consider things like license plates, so I'm in no position to really give you an answer on that. Part of the policy falls under the Treasury Department now but in some way, shape or form I'll get you, I think, the answers that you want, and as far as the additions to the fleet I'll have to get them for the Honourable Member for Lakeside; I don't have them. I have the total number of cars which are 734; total number of trucks, 181; total number of jeeps, 5; but I'll have to -- do you want the total number for the commissions as well?

MR. CAMPBELL: If you have them.

MR. WEIR: 130 cars and 695 trucks, and I'll have to get you the other information.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you very much.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, earlier this year the federal government announced that they were going to install safety belts in all their vehicles in 1962 and any vehicles purchased after that. Has the provincial government considered any such rule for its autos?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, no. I must admit that that's another of the things that has escaped me to this point.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the policy on purchasing automobiles and trucks is by public tender; is that correct? Is the public tender open all over the province or is it done by sections, or what is the policy followed?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'm just not altogether clear on that. My understanding is that it varies. Some of the cars are within an area where the car is being used, others are pretty well all over Manitoba. I think possibly I could have this checked. I'm not too sure, but this is my understanding of it.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . . the Minister would check it, because I've had some complaints in this regard, that where autos are used in a specific district, let us take for example, say, a school inspector's car. The feeling was that if it could be restricted to the area where he operates, it would give the smaller dealer a chance to bid. I think this is the policy followed by certain of the departments, if I remember correctly. I believe some of the utilities, for example, do this. I wonder if the government has considered extending it to other areas as well so as to give the smaller dealers across the province a chance.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, there's no change in the policy in this respect. It's been the same for many, many years to the best of my knowledge, and that is we place tenders in the area in which the car is to be used. This allows a dozen or 18 dealers, however many there are in that general area to bid on those particular cars. Of course it does mean that



(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . most of the cars are headquartered, I suppose, in the Greater Winnipeg area, so you do get that, but if you have a car that's being operated by a nurse from Dauphin or something in that nature, then the dealers in that vicinity are invited to bid on it and the lowest tender is accepted.

MR. MOLGAT: I don't think that's being followed in all cases though, is it, because I've had a specific complaint and I think it was with matters of school inspector cars. It wasn't a complaint but it was a suggestion that if this was done by other departments it should be considered by this department as well. I understood it wasn't done there.

MR. ROBLIN: What I stated is the general practice, although on some cars there's a province-wide bid. For example, my own car was supplied by a dealer in Brandon and it was obviously on a province-wide bid of that sort so they do get a chance, not only on their local business, but also if they're interested in bidding, on others as well. But generally speaking, what I've told my honourable friend is the rule. There may have been the odd exception, I can't account for that; it's not the general practice.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, on the average, how many new cars are bought a year, my first question. And the second question is, how long do you keep a car or a truck before you decide to trade it in?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I can't tell my friend anything about how many were bought in a year offhand. I think probably if he put in a request for the information we could certainly get it for you quite simply. The average time of turn-over is two years. Members will recall that the Kellogg-Stevenson investigation into the Department of Public Works recommended among other things that things being what they are, namely no sales tax and no taxes, when we buy these cars that the best financial terms all around can be obtained if there is a turn-over roughly every two years. It means we keep the car two years, in some instances a little longer, but generally speaking it's a two-year term based on the recommendations of that report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g) -- (h) -- and (i) -- passed. (j)

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, . . . . . I'd like to know, all the hospitals have superintendents and if they need any repairs, do they have to apply to the Minister of Public Works or just notify them, because all other buildings I understand they have a staff to check it and make whatever alterations necessary. But when it comes to Mental Hospitals you have a superintendent there and he knows probably better what the requirements are. What is the procedure? Does he have to refer to the Minister of Public Works and then he approves it or does the Public Works Department check it himself? In other words, who is the boss for any alterations for the mental hospitals, the Minister of Public Works or the superintendent of the hospital?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I can't give you an answer on that. No superintendent of any building has approached me yet about any repairs to buildings so I've never had to find out what this policy is. I'll do my best to find out and let you know.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . by the point, Mr. Chairman, the usual procedure is for the superintendent of the building and his staff to make up a list of the repairs that they require, and that is submitted to the budget through the Minister of Health here, who gives his approval of it, and the Department of Public Works act as the contractor to carry it out, but the actual decision as to what should be done is ruled on by the Minister of Health. Because, after all, he, I think, should be the one that has the final say in those matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (j) -- (k) -- (l) -- and (m) -- passed. (n) --

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask one question, if I may, on (n). I notice under Government Grounds an item for salary and wages, some fifty-odd thousand dollars, and then when I look at the document that was tabled in connection with staff, I note that for the item Government Grounds for the year 1962-63, it only lists three as staff for this particular section of government grounds. I wonder if either the Minister or the First Minister could explain this just briefly with the number of staff being three and the salary and wages \$50,000.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is the balance of them are not members of the Civil Service but are time certificate employees, casual labour sort of thing. They're not members of the Civil Service.

MR. PAULLEY: ..... there's one less than there was the year previous, according to the records that I have.

MR. WEIR: That's right.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Chairman, is it contemplated that the Broadway site park will be completed this year?

MR. WEIR: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 66 -- passed?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, if that resolution is passed, it's 11:00 o'clock, and I think I would have the permission, the agreed consent of the Minister if I moved the Committee rise.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House I would just like to observe what I think most members know, that we will adjourn until 2:30 on Monday afternoon.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works, that the House do now adjourn.

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