

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

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, March 2nd, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Winnipeg Bible Institute and College of Theology, praying for the passage of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Winnipeg Bible Institute and College of Theology.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The petition of North West Drug Company praying for the passage of an Act respecting North West Drug Company. The petition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Veterans in Canada, the Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Provincial Command, praying for the passage of an Act to authorize the petitioner to acquire and dispose of real property in Manitoba.

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

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) introduced Bill No. 66, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 67, an Act to amend The St. James Charter.

MR. STANES introduced Bill No. 68, an Act to validate By-Law No. 3783/64 of the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia, and By-Law No. 9859 of the City of St. James, and, an agreement between the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia and the City of St. James, executed pursuant to the by-laws.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George), in the absence of the Member for St. Boniface, introduced Bill No. 65, an Act to incorporate Association d'Education des Canadiens-Francais du Manitoba.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name and the name of others, as indicated on the Order Paper.

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

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, the honourable administrator of the government of the Province of Manitoba, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act by providing, among other matters, (a) for removing the restriction on the amount of money that the Workmen's Compensation Board may use in each year for vocational training of injured workmen; (b) for increases in the amount of compensation that may be payable for funeral expenses in cases of the death of a workman; (c) for excluding the amount paid for burial lot from the calculation of the maximum periodic compensation that may be paid upon the death of a workman; (d) for increasing the minimum compensation payable to workmen with respect to permanent total disability or permanent partial disability arising out of injuries that occurred prior to 5th day of August, 1959; and (e) for increases in the compensation that may be paid the Workmen's Compensation Board in respect of permanent total disability and permanent partial disability. Are you ready for the question?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, as an explanation, I would read (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e), to the honourable members at this time. I think that it's customary to give an explanation in principle of the proposed legislation at second reading. I think if the honourable members will just go over the parts of the resolution that really it is self-explanatory, this resolution.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, and that is in connection with (e). Is there a misprint there? -- "for increases in the compensation that may be paid the Workmen's Compensation Board?"

MR. BAIZLEY: Paid by.

MR. HILLHOUSE: It makes a big differencé.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a question or two. Is this all the amendments that are going to be forthcoming at this session for the Workmen's Compensation Board, because the resolution is couched in the normal terms among other matters, and then the listing of (a), (b), (c) and (d). I'm sure that Labour will be disappointed. They had thought, I'm sure, from remarks that had been passed since we last met, that there was consideration being given to increasing the basic amount upon which compensation is being paid. I believe it is \$5,000 at the present time, and in view of the increased earnings of labour these days in common with many other increases to management and others, Labour were looking forward to seeing the minimum raised at least to \$6,000 on which to base compensation. I'm sure I'm speaking for many at least, when I say that there will be keen disappointment that this forward-looking government is still dragging its heels in this respect once again. Yes -- so-called forwarding-looking government is still dragging its heels. Oh, I guess maybe we'll have to wait before another election for other changes along that line. I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister the significance of in (d), the date there, the 5th day of August, 1959. I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that I didn't look up past history of compensation to have it explained or find out as to the significance of the 5th day of August, '59, and while the Minister is correct that much of this will be revealed on second reading of the Bill, and the principle of the Bill, I think that it would be well for us if we had the significance of this date.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is concerning the awards to the totally permanent disabled, and to the permanently partially disabled workmen prior to the date of August 5, '59.

MR. PAULLEY: Of course -- do I take it that those that have received compensation in respect of any injury past August 5th will not be receiving any increase at all?

MR. BAIZLEY: No, Mr. Chairman, there will be provisions that the lesser amount, which possibly would be actual earnings, would be paid as compensation after that date.

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

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): The resolution

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, pardon me.

MR. ROBLIN: if you please, Mr. Chairman, next having to do with the Attorney-General's

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Municipal Boundaries Act by providing, among other matters, for the creation of a new judicial district in the northern part of the provinces and as a consequence of which additional court facilities and officers may have to be provided therein.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, last year a Bill on this subject was introduced, considered and passed. It was found that some corrections were necessary in order to ensure that the boundaries of the judicial districts coincided with the boundaries of municipalities. In considering the matter it was felt that rather than bring in amendments to the Act passed a year ago, that it would be more business-like to repeal the statute of last year and to re-enact the Bill with the correct boundaries. There is no change in principle, and this is only for the purpose of ensuring that the boundaries coincide with municipal boundaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Passed. Resolution No. 3. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the registration of real estate brokers and real estate salesmen, and providing, among other matters, for the cost of the administration of the Act to be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Mr. Chairman, this is a new Act, designed really to replace the old one and to make some major administrative changes, particularly in the field of regulating real estate salesmen and real estate brokers. It is intended to change the rules on advertising, the maintenance of trust funds, and in general, matters concerning collateral guarantees and many other details in connection with the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Adopted?

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Might I ask the Honourable Minister if it is

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . . intended to broaden the scope of the Act beyond what we now know as real estate agents and brokers?

MR. STEINKOPF: No, not intended to broaden the scope of the present Act, but to tighten it up a little bit. There'll be another Act that will have to do with real estate, that'll be The Mortgage Brokers Act, which will broaden the scope of the operation of real estate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Passed. Resolution No. 4 -- Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Blind Persons' Allowance Act by providing for the making of retroactive regulations respecting the payment of allowances under that Act, as a consequence of which the amount payable from and out of Consolidated Fund for those purposes may be increased.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, the resolution is pretty well self-explanatory. The Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations discovered that certain retroactive regulations were made under The Blind Persons Allowance Act, The Disability Allowances Act, and Old Age Assistance Act, and we're proposing these bills to rectify that error. We've also found -- and the next resolution deals with this -- that the same kind of a change will be required under our Child Welfare Act to provide for retroactive regulations with respect to payments to children's aid societies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Passed. Resolution No. 5. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Child Welfare Act by providing, among other matters, for the making of retroactive orders by the welfare advisory committee respecting the amount that may be paid in respect of each child in the charge of, or committed to the care and custody of, a children's aid society for each day that charge or care or custody continues, as a consequence of which the amount payable from and out of Consolidated Fund for those purposes may be increased. Resolution be adopted? Passed. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. BAIZLEY introduced Bill No. 58, an Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 63, an Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries' Act(2).

MR. STEINKOPF introduced Bill No. 40, an Act requiring the registration of real estate brokers and real estate salesmen.

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 69, an Act to amend The Blind Persons' Allowances Act.

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 70, an Act to amend The Child Welfare Act, and that the same be now received and read a first time.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to attract your attention to the gallery, where there are seated some 76 Grade 6 students from Regent Park School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Moffat, Mr. Vermeulin and Miss Allbright. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

There are also some 54, Grade 7 and 8 students from St. John's High School under the direction of their teacher, Miss Grosser. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again. Orders of

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker

MADAM SPEAKER: The Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. STEINKOPF: Before the Orders of the Day, I believe it to be in the public interest if I might be granted permission to make a short statement for the information of members of the Legislature, in the nature of a progress report on Manitoba's centennial program, with particular reference to the Manitoba Arts Centre. Members will know that last year the House approved the creation of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation, and was informed in a general

(Mr. Steinkopf, cont'd.) . . . way of the government's intentions to recommend public funds for the purposes of the Centennial Corporation. Public statements have since been made outlining in general terms the program envisaged. Members will note that it was not until last January that we received a decision from the federal government to make available \$ 2-1/2 million on a matching basis for a centennial project preferably located in the provincial capital. This decision coincided with the plans previously in mind for a Manitoba Arts Centre as one of our major centennial projects. Since the federal announcement, I have been holding consultations with representatives of the Metro municipalities in order to secure their provincial support for the Arts Centre, as well as to consider other individual programs of their own. While decisions have not yet been reached with respect to local municipal participation in the Arts Centre, I believe the matter is receiving serious consideration by all concerned.

As you are also aware, it is hoped that substantial sums will be raised by public subscription to supplement public funds. Members will understand that until the financial structure within which the project will proceed had been reasonably well defined, it was not practical to proceed with the very important consultations with interested groups of citizens and with the other operative policies that called for action. However, in the interim, the government has secured on behalf of the Centennial Corporation, properties situated on the east side of Main Street opposite the City Hall as an initial step. The total amount paid for the property in question was \$590,000, and the parcels included the Birt Saddlery building, the H. L. Perry building, the Paul Moore building, a parking lot on James Street, and certain stores on Main street. The owners of these properties were informed of the reason for the government purchase, and believe that they were obtained at a very fair valuation when one considers rising real estate prices in this area. The National Trust Company acted as the government's agent in the purchase and management of these properties.

The Manitoba Association of Architects and others have been urging on the government the appointment of architects for the various centennial projects so that they might proceed expeditiously. A consortium of three leading firms has been appointed. These three firms are Green Blankstein Russell Associates, winners of the National Gallery and the Winnipeg City Hall contest, as well as the firms of Moody, Moore and Partners, and Smith Carter Searle Associates, who also have distinguished records. This action has been endorsed by the Manitoba Association of Architects in a letter which I'm glad to table herewith. In addition, the Manitoba Centennial Corporation has appointed Ward and Macdonald as architects for the Brandon Centennial project, and Blankstein Coop Gillmor & Hanna for the International Peach Garden project. Now that these preliminary steps have been taken, the government wishes the widest possible consultation with the several bodies in our province who have for many years rendered distinguished public service in the field of the arts. We want to make sure that in the construction phase full advantage is taken of the experience and interest of interested bodies and citizens. Some of these bodies have already met with the Corporation for preliminary discussions, and I trust that others will do so in the very near future.

The Centennial Corporation proposes a building committee with Mr. Rod McIsaac as Chairman, assisted by Dr. Frank Mathewson, Mr. George Aitken, Mr. Sol Kanee and Mr. Justice Monnin, to have all responsibility for the plan of the Manitoba Arts Centre. The Design Committee will be composed of Mr. John Hirsch, Mr. Victor Feldbrill, Dr. Ferdinand Eckhardt, Mr. Leonard Stone, Mr. A. K. Gee and other leading professionals to advise the Building Committee on the functional planning. Mr. Gordon C. Smith, who is the Chairman of the Monarch Life Building Committee, has agreed to be the chairman of the committee responsible for construction supervision. I stress my desire to have full consultation with interested groups. The challenging brief presented to me last Saturday by the Manitoba Museum Association illustrates the great help that such groups can give, and the work that they have already done in preparation for this development. The Corporation will be most pleased to hear as well from other bodies, so that we may have the advantage of their knowledge, their interest and their enthusiasm. We also look forward to the help of the municipal governments in the area, and we appreciate the fact that the Chairman of the Metro Corporation also visited with us to listen in on the various discussions. I expect the developments in this field will now proceed at a rapid pace, and I will do my best to keep the Legislature informed of developments as they occur.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I rise on a matter of privileges of the House. On Tuesday the 18th of February, I brought to the attention of the government and of the House certain actions by this government in proceeding to release information outside of this House before giving the information to the House itself in a period in which the House is in session. This is not, Madam Speaker, when the House is not in session, at which time I recognize that statements are made, but when the House is in session this sort of a situation is absolutely intolerable. I at that time pointed out, Madam Speaker, three different items in one newspaper in one day. The Leader of the House on that day, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, after I had pointed out to him, shown him the matter, said this to the House, "I think the Leader of the Opposition has every right to raise in the way he did any question that appears to infringe the privileges of the House, and no one would for a moment suggest that he shouldn't do so. Confronted with this at this moment it's impossible for me to make a reply. I think the point that he has raised must be considered and will be considered, and at the first convenient opportunity some comment will be made on his remarks today."

Madam Speaker, this is now some two weeks ago. Nothing has been heard from the government but what do we find? That this same situation is continuing and the statement made by the Minister right now is an example of this situation, because this information was in large part given out last Wednesday -- or at least it was reported in the newspapers on Wednesday, February 26th -- giving a map indicating where the Arts Centre is going to go, details of moneys to be spent and so on. And now we get a statement in the House today. Yesterday, or rather Saturday, what did we hear on the air, Madam Speaker? That the social allowances for the Province of Manitoba are going to be raised as of March 1st. Saturday's newspaper, "Social Aid up Sunday. Modest increase will help meet higher cost. The provincial cabinet has set March 1st as the date on which a new and higher scale of payments will go into effect for 18,000 Manitobans on social assistance" and so on.

Madam Speaker, these statements should be made in this House, not by press release or interviews outside of this House. The government has been warned about this; they have done nothing; they have persisted in this procedure. Madam Speaker, I refer the House to Beauchesne, citation 113, page 102, which states -- "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy. There are privileges of the House as well as of members individually.

Madam Speaker, based on the warning given to the government, the persistence in this matter, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Ethelbert Plains, that in view of the continuing contempt of the House by the government through making public announcements on policy and / or administration before they have been announced in the House, that this House censure the government.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I take it that you are considering the point of order raised by my honourable friend as to whether or not his motion is in order, and I appreciate that it is difficult to deal with this on the spur of the moment but I am just wondering whether there is any matter of privilege in connection with this which bars you from imposing the rule of notice with respect to resolutions that are presented to the House. In first reading of the Section 113 that my honourable friend has referred to, it occurs to me that the question of notice is not escaped by the clause that he has read and that it would be necessary to give notice. If that should be the case we'll be happy to debate it when it comes up in its due course or if you should rule that it's in order at the moment we're happy to debate it now, but I just raise this question as from first glance at the section I would take it that notice is still required despite the fact that it is a matter of privilege.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, it was not a point of order that I was making. I was making a motion according to the rules. I would refer you then, in view of the statements of the First Minister, which is now a point of order, to page 95 of Beauchesne, citation 104, and there are a number of clauses there, all of which, Madam Speaker, specify clearly that a matter of privilege must be taken as soon as is possible. In fact it says, for example, in No. 4, or let's take No. 3 -- "A matter of privilege which claims precedence over other points of public business should be a subject which has arisen recently." Now, No. 4: "Certain urgent

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . matters, such as assaults upon or insults to members, if they should occur during a sitting of the House, may be raised at once in spite of the interruption of a debate or of the proceedings, except a division in progress." In other words, you can even stop a debate. No 5: "As a motion taken at the time for matters of privilege is thereby given precedence over the prearranged program of public business, the Speaker requires to be satisfied both that there is a prima-facie case, that a breach of privilege has been committed, and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity."

Madam Speaker, this statement on the matter of social allowances was made over the weekend. This is the earliest opportunity that I have to bring this forward and I suggest that under item 5, all you have to be satisfied of is whether there is a prima-facie case and whether I have brought it up at the earliest opportunity.

MADAM SPEAKER: I think that the Leader of the Opposition has brought up a point here, a point of privilege, maybe include a motion of which no notice is required, and I refer you to Beauchesne, 4th Edition, citation 104, page 44, and also refer you to May 16th Edition, page 382. I believe that the case of urgency -- it has brought two points to mind here. The case of urgency in the latter point could be brought up under discussion at another time in the House under the discussion in the Department of Welfare. Therefore I do not believe that this motion is in order.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would refer you, with all deference, to page 95, section 104. The statement is very clear that a motion on matters of privilege must be brought up at the earliest opportunity. Well surely this is the case. I have brought it up before the Orders of the Day at the earliest opportunity when I could. There can be no argument on that score. Secondly, that you have to be satisfied that there is a case of breach of privilege. Those are the two matters under which, under that rule, you have to make a decision. It's not a question of urgency. I didn't move the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. This is a motion as indicated must be done on matters of privilege, done at the earliest opportunity; the question then is whether you believe that there is breach of privilege of the House or not. I submit that there is.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I must say, if I may speak to the same Order, that I agree with my honourable friend that it is necessary for you to decide whether there is a prima-facie breach of privilege. I'd be happy to make a statement of my own on the subject, in reply to his statement, before you rule if you wish me to do so, but I do agree that if you rule that there is prima-facie breach of privilege then it is in order for the resolution to be received, but you have to make that decision. Perhaps I might make a statement myself however, since my honourable friend has done so, dealing with the question as to whether or not there is privilege and

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, on a point of order, is my honourable friend, is he speaking on the motion and is that -- then on what is he speaking?

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition has alleged a breach of the privileges of the House. I'm prepared to speak in reply to his statement if I should be allowed to do so, but I leave it to the Speaker to decide.

MR. MOLGAT: Well I think the Speaker must first

MADAM SPEAKER: the ruling on this that I believe that the motion is in order, but I do not think that this is a question of urgency. The matter can be brought up in the ordinary routine of business. This is my ruling.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, might I just -- with regard to this ruling, might I just point out that this is not a question where urgency is involved. Urgency has to do with the question of moving the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. There is no urgency here. Might I refer to our own rule. I always try to keep to our own rules. On page 12, rule 25, you will find: "When a matter of privilege arises it shall be taken into consideration immediately." The matter of urgency is dealt with in our own rules. We are compelled to deal with it immediately and this is a question under privilege.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, it's a question, I think, of you having to make up your mind as to whether the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition does constitute a breach of the privileges of the House. If it does, in your opinion, constitute a breach of the privilege then I think the motion is in order. If, in your opinion, it does not constitute a breach of

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . privilege then it is not in order, but I think that is the decision which is for you to make at the moment.

MADAM SPEAKER: I agree that the point of privilege is well taken and that the motion is in order.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend I presume has spoken to the motion, introducing it, and he now expects some reply from me. Well I'm rather glad of the opportunity. I was afraid for a moment I wouldn't get this chance to deal with his question of privilege because it is an interesting matter to study.

I took note of the exchange that took place some time ago between the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, with respect to the Winnipeg Free Press of February 13th in which certain complaints with respect to privilege were made, and on reading the article complained of I think that the people who should be exposed for criticism in my honourable friend's resolution is not the government but it's the press, in the sense that it is the press that wrote the stories and what their sources of information are I can't tell. I can -- just a minute. Members say "Oh" but I'm not accusing the press of anything, but I'm going to give this simple fact that if the press have enough intelligence to read the Manitoba Gazette they can get the story on government increases in old age pensions, and if my honourable friend has enough intelligence to read the Manitoba Gazette, which reaches him I'm sure as a matter of courtesy, he could have found the regulations behind the story on old age pensions right in there. Now that arose from an Order-in-Council that was passed some time ago before this House was in session, and in accordance with the Order-in-Council the matter concerned is reported in the Manitoba Gazette. Anyone that wants to read the Manitoba Gazette can get the details of the changes. And that certainly is the basis of the story that appeared in the press. Now, how that constituted a breach of the privileges of the House I'm at a loss to say.

But I want to say, Madam Chairman, one or two other things on this. My honourable friend complained the other day that certain stories were in the press respecting a bill on mortgage licences, and various other matters that are, in fact, matters of government policy and matters that we intend to introduce into the House on which we have given notice, so I should like to tell the House -- and I think that if Members will think a minute they will see -- that it isn't necessary for the government to be making these statements to the press for the press to receive the information, because on most of these matters, including the question about the Centennial which my honourable friend, we have of necessity to consult a great many other people who are not within the government ranks. How many dozens of folks were consulted, for example, on the mortgage licence bill? We told the House frankly that we had a committee of dozens of people set up to study this and other measures that we are embarked upon. And how likely it is that information as to what those committees are doing become available to the press, and they have as much intelligence as the next person and they write their stories accordingly; and so it is with these other matters that are complained of. We can't bring the business of the government to a grinding halt because the Legislature happens to be in session. We have to continue with the work that we have in hand, which calls for the consultation with a considerable body of other people, and it's quite probable that stories about government intentions, or what the press believe to be government intentions, are printed in the newspapers. I recall reading before my Budget Speech was delivered, a very eloquent statement in one of the papers about what would be in it. It talked about the sales tax. It discussed the question as to how much money would be spent -- I think they got within \$1 million of the total that was actually in the budget statement itself -- and a great many other facts before the budget came before this House were printed in the press. At that time they were assumptions that the press made with respect to what we're going to do, and they were correct assumptions. And yet I hope no one will say that because that was the case that I disclosed to the press facts that were to be contained in the budget speech itself.

The fact of the matter is that we cannot prevent speculation on these issues, and with a press gallery of the calibre we have, if I may be allowed to say so, we can't prevent them from being able to put two and two together as well as the next man, and those are written in stories and the stories are written in such a way that they appear to be authoritative statements. And that is the root of a great deal of the difficulties that plague my honourable friend

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . and make him unhappy about this. But with respect to this matter of social allowances, which is the matter that he had before him today, I point out to him that the newspapers of two or three weeks ago carried almost the identical story that he is complaining about in the Saturday papers, and I tell him that the facts in connection with this matter were disclosed in the Manitoba Gazette where all could see them and where they could be interpreted by the press as well as by anybody else.

Now I want to assure my honourable friend that the government does not make a practice of deliberately infringing upon the desire and the privileges of the members to hear government policy from government spokesmen. We do not deliberately infringe on that matter at all. Where information is available from other sources it's only reasonable to expect that comment is made on it from time to time, but we do our best to make sure that matters of policy are disclosed in the Legislature to the members of the House. But we must reserve the right to continue to carry on the business of government where we speak with a great many people on the various subjects that we have under negotiation and development, and in that case it is possible that information is made available that appears in the press in a way that might not appeal to some members of the Legislature, but we try to take the reasonable steps that we can to make sure that the regular privileges of the House are not infringed upon in any way.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, the First Minister is very adept at confusing any issue and he has certainly confused this one. Instead of taking the censure as he should have, he is passing the buck on to the press. In either one of these articles that were referred to by my Honourable Leader, it states quite plainly as to where the information came from. This was not a matter of speculation, as the Honourable the First Minister would lead us to believe. On looking at the Tribune for February 26, regarding the Arts Centre, here is how it reads: "Provincial Secretary Maitland Steinkopf said Tuesday night a meeting will be held Thursday with Metro municipalities to find out how much they will contribute to the planned Manitoba Arts Centre. Mr. Steinkopf said in an interview that the Centennial Corporation of which he is head, hopes that the municipalities will agree to provide" so forth and so on. And then again, Mr. Steinkopf said that the following Thursday night meeting between the Corporation and the municipalities, and he is quoted. It was no matter of speculation -- he's quoted; and here's what he said: "And once we know exactly how much money is forthcoming we will hold a public meeting and will invite all cultural groups to attend to discuss the Centre." And then further on in the same article, Mr. Steinkopf said he was standing by his decision. What is the Honourable the First Minister trying to tell the members of this House? That the press has been speculating, or has found out from some other source as to where this information came from? I don't think that is a fair argument. I think it ill behoves the First Minister to use that kind of an argument on the floor of this House. I think he should have a little more respect for the intelligence of the Members of this House. And we can go a little further. On this second item -- is this speculation? Now, let's see what it has to say. "The Provincial Cabinet has set March 1st as the date on which a new and higher scale of payments will go into effect for 18,000 Manitobans on social assistance." All right, where did this information come from? "However, Welfare Minister J. B. Carroll said in an interview" Is the Honourable the First Minister trying to tell us that the press would go so far as to . . . (Interjection) . . . well, that's far enough -- did you say . . . (Interjection) . . . all right, just one moment. Did you say more than that?

MR. CARROLL: I didn't say that.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well, what did you say?

MR. CARROLL: Read on.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: But did you say something?

MR. CARROLL: Read on.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well, the Honourable Minister, the Honourable Minister admits that he did say something. And the Honourable First Minister tells us that the press obtained this information from some other source. Here's an admission by the Minister himself, and Madam Speaker, I think that most of what has been said by the First Minister this afternoon should be withdrawn by him, and I think that this House on the statement made by the First Minister, the government certainly deserves the censure that is contained in that motion.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, I just want to say a word or two about the contribution

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . that I had toward the events that have been raised in the House here today. A few weeks ago, one of the members of the press gallery approached me after having looked at the Throne Speech, and asked for certain information respecting what increases might be expected under the Social Allowances Act, and I refused to give him information with respect to what the government was proposing, even though the Order-in-Council which established the rates under the Social Allowances Act had been passed prior to the sitting of this House, and were made public subsequently in the Manitoba Gazette. A few days ago, one of the reporters from the press gallery approached me with a copy of that Gazette in his hand, and asked me at that stage if this was the proposal that had been forecast in the Speech from the Throne, and what this meant in terms of percentage increases and so on -- what it meant in terms of the estimates for the Department of Welfare -- and I refused to give him that information. However, he did have the information respecting the increases in food allowances, in clothing allowances, under certain conditions increases in fuel and utilities allowances, and wondered if I might put some figure on this with respect to percentages, and of course he, having the figures, was speculating that it might be five percent or something higher, and I said that in my opinion it was likely closer to three percent, and this is the only contribution I made -- a question of judgement based on information that was already public information and available to every member of this House, and I resent the fact that we're charged now with a breach of the privileges of the House on this ground.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, being the other one charged in this action, I was quite surprised that the member for Ethelbert, who is a lawyer, doesn't realize the full implication of that press report. First of all, the statement that the Manitoba Centennial Corporation would be responsible for the erection of an Arts Centre is clearly outlined in the Manitoba Centennial Act, and to the extent of a considerable amount of detail. The fact that the federal government contribute \$ 2-1/2 million towards a specific federal project was made public knowledge by the federal government itself, and the condition of the grant of \$ 2-1/2 million was quite clearly stated in the press releases from Ottawa that it was to be matched by the provincial government. The interview that is referred to, I presume, is the interview that I had on the television with the reporter in question being one of the interviewers, and the knowledge of where the Arts Centre was going to be located had been public knowledge for well over a year -- that is, on the east side of Main Street. For the magnificent sum of 50 cents anyone can search in the Land Titles Office and not only find out where the land is -- it doesn't take very long to find it out -- but also to find out how much was paid for the land; and I presume that that is where the information was also obtained from, that was released in the newspapers last week as to the actual cost of the land in question. It's impossible to negotiate for the land without negotiating with another party and thus making the matter public knowledge. Every effort was made to not publicize it too soon in order to keep the values reasonable in the buying of this land. The rest of the interview, the picture in the paper showing the location of the Arts Centre, was most confusing. I had two or three members in the House giving me different versions of actually what was purchased, particularly on the other side. After they did see the picture in the paper, they thought it was only the first part of the property up to the lane. Another one suggested that it didn't include the Birt Saddlery Building; and I frankly have been very, very hard on the press when they've come to me for information, to the point where we have received, I think, very unfavourable press relations for the whole project, and the Arts Centre could suffer, the development of it could be delayed to the extent that it might not even be finished by 1967 for that very reason. It's most difficult in the field of business -- and which this is at this stage, and that is the raising of the money -- to withhold this information from the press. One cannot negotiate with a number of municipalities for a grant without making that public information so I don't see, just as an ordinary layman, where any privilege has been abused in this House.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I feel that I should say a word or two in connection with the resolution that's before the House at the present time, although I must frankly admit I am not fully conversant with the actual wording of the resolution but I understand the intent is that the government should be censured because of the fact that it disclosed information outside of the House while we are in session that should properly have been disclosed here in the House. I believe that, Madam Speaker, is the general intention.

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)

Now I'm not going to debate on the question of the social assistance allowances. I believe that the government could make a case in that there was prior announcement through the media of the Gazette of increases in certain allowances. That part of the argument, Madam Speaker, I'm going to set aside. But I do think that the Leader of the Opposition raises a very valid point when he suggests that censure should be made upon the government for disclosing information outside of this House in respect of the Centennial celebrations and the Arts Centre. I've just read the portion of the speech that His Honour was pleased to deliver to us on February 6th which outlined the plans, or the program, of Her Majesty's Government, and if one takes a look at that, Madam Speaker, one will find on the last page that "my Ministers will propose a provincial program aggregating \$8 million over the years of the celebrations." It did mention the fact -- well, I'll read the whole part: "You will be asked to approve expenditures for the celebration of the centenaries of 1967 and 1970. In addition to the federal grant of \$1.00 per capita and the special federal grant of \$2-1/2 million for the Manitoba Arts Centre, my Ministers will propose a provincial program aggregating \$8 million over the years of the celebrations."

Now I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, because of the fact that this was contained in the epistle that was delivered by his Honour to us here at the commencement of this session, then we surely were entitled in this House to receive what information that could be given to us before such information was given outside of the House. Now the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities, in his capacity as Provincial Secretary, has just broadly outlined to us the question of negotiations with property holders and how it would have been ill advisable to have any information insofar as these are concerned for the fear that somebody might attempt to speculate insofar as prices and the like of this is concerned, but Madam Speaker, is it not a fact, however, that insofar as the general location of the proposed Arts Centre, that this was talked about at the time that a decision was made in respect of the location of the new City of Winnipeg City Hall? And if there was to be speculation and if owners of property were going to hold back for speculative reasons negotiations in respect of price for buildings, they've had at least a two-year period in order to do this. So I can't quite accept the arguments of my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary in respect of this. I will admit -- I will admit possibly the owners of the location of Birt Saddlery may not have known that that was the particular location that might be purchased in connection with the Arts Centre, but they were in the general location as are indeed many others. I would respectfully suggest that had it gone the other way, over toward the James Street side, further over, the others would have been in the same predicament as the Birt Saddlery is insofar as being potential sellers of property for this, and I suggest, in all due respect, Madam Speaker, that the government has not substantiated, at least in the arguments of the First Minister or those of the Provincial Secretary in respect of the disclosure of the information in respect of the Arts Centre and therefore I feel obligated to support at least this portion of the contention of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. There was no reason at all -- no justifiable reason at all that I can conceive as to why we were not given this information before the press, and I would take issue with my honourable friend the First Minister in his reference to the press. While I get chastised by the press just as much if even more so than by others, I don't join him in his adverse remarks so far as the press is concerned.

So I say, Madam Speaker, I find myself sort of on a little bit of a teeter-totter. I can agree -- and I'm not deliberately attempting this at all -- I can find some justification insofar as the government is concerned in respect to social allowances and the publicity on that, but I certainly, in all honesty, cannot find any justification whatsoever for the Honourable the Provincial Secretary disclosing the price. Now I'd like to know -- I did notice in the press in respect to the details, that there was a company set up in connection with the sale of this property -- the Honourable the Provincial Secretary mentioned some sum of I believe it was a half million or \$600,000 for the property or something of that nature . . . (Interjection) . . . Yes, through National Trust, but if memory serves me correctly, in the disclosures it made reference to a sale by a corporation or a land agency, and I would like to hear more details; and may I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, that if this had been properly handled inside of the House and not outside of the House, we may have been able to give some real good advice

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd). . . to the Honourable the Provincial -- interjection -- Pardon? No I didn't ask a question. I said that "if" such and such a thing had of taken place we'd have been in a position to do this.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion has not yet been put to the House and I believe everyone has already spoken. The motion. Moved by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable the Member from Ethelbert Plains that in view of the continuing contempt of the House by the government to making public announcements on policy and/or administration before they have been announced in the House, that this House censure the government. From Beauchesne, page 94, citation 104, clause 2: "It has often been laid down that the Speaker's function in ruling on a claim of breach of privilege does not extend to deciding the question of substance whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed, a question which can only be decided by the House itself." I now ask you, are you ready for the question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, now that the motion is properly before the House I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q.C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, on a point of order, under rule 26 of this House: "Subject to rule 27 a motion to adjourn the House shall not be made until the Orders of the Day have been entered upon." If my honourable friend wishes to speak to this question he should do so now.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, the rule to which my honourable friend refers is an adjournment of the House, not of the debate.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I don't think we'd be prepared to agree to an adjournment of this debate. Let's settle it now. It's supposed to be an urgent matter; well, let's settle it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, if you don't mind. This isn't a matter of urgency. I see the First Minister has raised that red herring again.

MR. MOLGAT: Is the government denying an adjournment of this motion? Is that correct?

MR. ROBLIN: reading from rule 25, when a matter of privilege arises it should be taken into consideration immediately. I think that's what we are doing and I think we ought to finish it off.

MADAM SPEAKER: I rule on this -- Order please -- I rule on this that according to our rule No. 25 when a matter of privilege arises it shall be taken into consideration immediately.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I submit that it's under consideration. It was under consideration -- it doesn't say it has to be voted on immediately.

MADAM SPEAKER: All those in favour please say aye.

MR. MOLGAT: Well Madam Speaker in that case I will close the debate. Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the facts are evident here. The Ministers skated around this and accused the press of misquoting them and all the rest. This is the normal technique -- accuse someone else for your own mistakes; but in many of these statements, Madam Speaker, it is clearly stated, "The Minister, in an interview, said." Now I don't see how you can get around that and say it's the press misquoting or that they're cooking up stories. I suggest that the facts are that this government is so concerned with publicity, Madam Chairman, that they will jump at any opportunity to proceed and make statements to try and get for themselves the publicity rather than to do the proper thing and give the information to this House as they should. There's no need, when this House is in session, to be going around making public statements outside of the House on matters of importance to this House and that should be properly decided by this House. The fact that the Minister admits that is shown by the fact that the Provincial Secretary gets up here today and makes a statement on the Arts Centre, a statement that he should have made here a week ago before he was making his statements out in public; and he has admitted today, late however, that this should have been done in this House. And the other Ministers are proceeding with the same things. They are riding rough-shod, Madam Speaker, over the rights of this House. This is the typical action of an arrogant government.

MADAM SPEAKER: All those in favour please say aye. All those opposed please say nay. In my opinion the nays have it and I

MR. MOLGAT: The yeas and nays Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

(Madam Speaker, cont'd.) . . . That in view of the continuing contempt of the House by the government to making public announcements on policy and / or administration before they have been announced in the House, that this House censure the government.

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

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; Nays, 34.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, may I address a question to the Provincial Secretary, which I wanted to address about half an hour ago? I understand from press reports, Madam Speaker, that the Metropolitan Corporation Planning Authority has not yet been involved in formally being asked as to its opinion of the location of the Arts Centre, and if the reports are correct, does that mean that the government, or that this Corporation that we speak of looking after the Arts Centre, is committed now to the location described by the Honourable Minister, or is it not committed and will it still consult with the Planning Authority?

MR. STEINKOPF: Well, the way we understand it is that the Planning Authority is responsible for the streets and for the access to the property in matters relating -- similar kinds of matters, but not actually to the construction of a building, or the suitability of a particular piece of land for any particular project. The Corporation is a corporation in the true sense of the word, owns the land and can, if it sees fit, put a building or buildings on it, provided it doesn't break any of the Metro regulations. But just to put your fears at ease, there have been discussions with Mr. Rich and members of the Planning Board of the Metro council for this specific purpose, and the architects have also had meetings with Mr. Rich and his committee and as the plan, the concept evolves, why they will work even closer with Mr. Rich, because nothing can be built on there of that size without working with Metro on matters of layout of streets, access, matters of that type. But to ask them whether or not we can build a specific building on that piece of property or not, I don't think that that comes within their sphere of jurisdiction.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, in the first place might I, instead of ask, rather request the Honourable Minister to read carefully the Metropolitan Corporation Act, and probably the speeches made by members of his government in terms of recognition of the responsibility and need for an overall planning authority for Metropolitan Winnipeg and the function it can perform, not only in dealing with streets and engineering problems, but also in terms of making this City one which is well-planned as a service to the community. Might I also point out, or again ask the Honourable Minister if he has answered my question as to whether or not the government or this corporation has an opportunity to change its mind as to the location, based on a decision or recommendation of the Metropolitan Corporation.

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe -- order please -- I believe the Honourable Member should come to the point of his question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I thought I had done so, Madam Speaker, three words before you stopped me.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the question is not in order as it asks the government what its policy is going to be in the future. Well, we don't deal with questions like that on Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Provincial Secretary. Could he indicate when the meetings that he spoke about were held with Mr. Rich, the gentleman in charge of Metropolitan planning?

MR. STEINKOPF: Oh, within the last thirty days.

MR. MOLGAT: In other words, all the planning until that time had been conducted completely without reference to the Planning Commission.

MR. STEINKOPF: All the planning that was done up to that time was to find out where we were going to get the money, and in that part I don't think Mr. Rich would have been much help to us.

MR. PAULLEY: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer or the Minister of Municipal Affairs, whichever one may be the competent Minister to answer this question. Is it correct as I gather from newspaper articles, that there is an endeavour being made, or a suggestion being made, of a further imposition on the taxpayers of the municipality irrespective of ability to pay, in order to raise funds for the Arts Centre in the Greater Winnipeg area?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm not sure what my honourable friend's question means. If he means whether the municipalities have been asked to make a contribution toward the Manitoba Centennial Centre, he is right. They have been asked to make a contribution. Whether they do so or not will be a matter for them to decide.

MR. PAULLEY: The point I'm attempting to arrive at Madam Speaker, if I may, is -- will this be on a mill rate basis to the taxpayer within the municipality without them having any say as to whether or not this shall be collected? And I think this is vital to the taxpayer of Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think that is a matter for the municipality concerned to decide.

MR. PAULLEY: I think, Madam Speaker, it'll be necessary for this government to give approval for this to be done before it is done at the municipal level, if my past experience is standing me in my stead at the present time.

MR. ROBLIN: We've had no requests for any such authority, and I don't believe any will be forthcoming.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker I'd like to have a subsequent question to the Provincial Secretary in view of his reply that consultations were held with Mr. Rich within the last thirty days and that until then their only concern was financial. Is the House to understand that there had been no planning of location and no planning of purchase of property until the last thirty days?

MR. STEINKOPF: The property was purchased almost two years ago.

MR. P. J. McDONALD (Turtle Mountain): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to take this privilege of laying on the desk of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne this helmet and we congratulate Malcolm Junior, a potential member for this House, and it's signed by all members in this Assembly.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might be allowed to join in the general congratulations which are being offered to the wife of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, and also our feelings of goodwill toward him. May I say that I smoke about one cigar a day, and I haven't bought one myself for the past year, so I'm relying on members to make sure that I don't run into difficulties in this connection.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I certainly would want to be associated and all those of our group with the congratulations that are in order today. I think many members of the House will recall Mrs. McKellar when she was a civil servant here in the Buildings; she's well known to a good number of us here, and we wish her and Malcolm the very best. It's unfortunate that the entry of Malcolm in this House should have come upon an opportunity like today where we've had some discord to begin with, Madam Speaker, but I'm sure won't mar his way through life and we wish him the very best.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I would like to join and associate my group with these congratulations to our fellow legislator and his good lady, and I'm happy to do this in the spirit of unanimity in this House. We do reach this now and then. I was pleased to note that Junior is the recipient of a helmet -- I don't know if that's really a blue and gold one or not. We'll welcome him in a few years hence back into the Greater Winnipeg area. I would like to make a slight donation to the new infant, Madam Speaker. In order that he may start out in life properly, I have a great pleasure in presenting to him on behalf of the New Democratic Party of Manitoba, an outline of our program so that he doesn't fall into the error of the ways of his illustrious father. We wish you the best.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I have just one complaint to launch in connection with

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . the item of business that's now under consideration, and that is that I understand that the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne and others were guilty of mentioning this matter publicly before it was mentioned in the House. I think that any event of such great importance as this should first be announced in this House when it is sitting, and I completely absolve our Honourable Member's better half in this case, and put all the censure upon him for not -- well, he has been keeping us pretty well informed as a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, so I'll withdraw the motion. With regard to the material that the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party has just sent over to the young man, I would say that quite probably for the next year or two he might fall for that, but by the time he's 18 I'm sure I know what party he'll be supporting.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, well this is one occasion -- when I came into the seat here six years ago that I never thought that I would ever have the privilege, but my family has tripled since I first took this seat, and time will tell what will happen from here on. But after -- I'm going to be very brief, Madam Speaker, so if you would care to sit down . . . I've had many interesting nights in my life during my single blessedness but I never had a night when I went to bed three times in one night and got up twice. Well that very thing happened on Friday night. I would like to say that both Malcolm and Lois are in excellent health and I can't tell you whether the baby is going to be a politician in the future, but in any case I think I will let him decide for himself. I will promise the Leader of the NDP party that I will present this and put it in his files for the future, and he in turn will decide. The Honourable Member for Lakeside mentioned his eighteenth birthday. Having been born on the 29th of February, I think he will have plenty of time to decide for himself what's right and what's wrong. I don't think there is much else I have to say other than that I will convey to Lois and Malcolm the best wishes of the members of the Legislature.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to table the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for 1963.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 5 dated February 14 in the name of the member for Elmwood.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to ask the First Minister who is ever looking after the conduct of the House, are all of the reports that are required by statutory regulations now in?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'll check the information. I trust, though, the Clerk keeps a pretty good record of them and if he thinks we're delinquent he gives us a good prod. If there are any that are not before the House I will certainly do my best to expedite them.

MADAM SPEAKER: At the risk of changing the mood of this House, I would like to announce that a seminar will be held in the Speaker's Room at 10 a.m. March 10th, for those members who would like to learn something about the rules of this Assembly.

Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 37, the Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Chairman, it's kind of nice to get back to normal procedure, and coming back to this bill, first of all I believe that one of the great dangers of our time is that we may go or set up too many huge government corporations. But while we have to admit that some are necessary, I think it is necessary that all of us are very careful that we discharge our duties to the people of this province in the most direct and responsible way possible. But I was rather disturbed when we heard the Honourable Minister say the other day -- I believe it was the 20th of February or so -- that part of the intention of Bill No. 37 was, and I will read it in part: "that the board would be expected to hold themselves completely accountable to the Legislature for the exercise of those powers and for the discharge of the responsibilities entrusted to them," and he goes on to say that their concern is -- in a different paragraph -- "not really one of principle but rather one of mechanics."

I certainly agree with the thought that the government now uses too little control over the operations of its own utilities, but I do not see the point that they do not have this right. Surely they can report to the Utilities Standing Committee. Unless I misunderstand the present Act, I feel the government has the right now. How else could we have had the board members appear on the now famous Hydro discussions of last year? So to me it seems that the principle

(Mr. Barkman cont'd) is really involved and not the mechanics, because the mechanical end of it seems favourable to all concerned. If at any time the government wishes to have these boards report, I think we would have to agree they may report. Therefore the principle is really involved. How can we expect to question the Honourable Minister of Utilities about policies or operations of government-owned corporations when the Minister of Utilities, when the Honourable Minister goes on to say, and I quote again: "In harmony with this thinking and with these proposals in effect it will not be the intention of the Ministers henceforth to attempt answers to questions pertaining to matters, which, by the terms of the statutes, have been delegated to the boards of the utility corporations. Madam Speaker, is this not an evasion of responsibility?"

Another point that I would like to bring up is this. I respect the member for Morris of this Legislature representing the Telephone Utilities, and appreciate the fact that an MLA is on this board to kind of keep a close look on and watch on things that take place during the year. I am all in favour of this, and I must say here that I have the highest confidence in the present boards. However, is it not possible that pretty soon this MLA, or a board member, might have to answer some questions put forward from this Assembly, and thereby be more responsible to the people of Manitoba than the Minister himself? Madam Speaker, I may be too concerned about this bill, but when it says in the proposed bill that the report of the commission stands permanently referred to the standing committee on public utilities and natural resources of the Legislative Assembly, if Bills 37 and -- I possibly should not mention 38, but it's similar -- go through, and I suspect they might, what department will be next? The Manitoba Farm Credit Corporation? The Education Advisory Board? The Manitoba Liquor Commission? And how many others for that matter? What, Madam Speaker, is going to happen. If this is the thinking of the government, could we not go one step further and eliminate all MLA's, and all the Ministers, and just have these various boards report to the people, direct, and thereby eliminate a lot of expense and responsibility which is now our duty and desire to fulfill? Therefore, it is still my understanding that the government has the right now, and if this is true I don't really see the need for this bill. It is my belief and understanding that it is the government's responsibility to determine policy for these utilities, and the Minister must be prepared to answer to this House on government policy. I do not say this sarcastically, but it is still time, not too late, to stop this bill. I sincerely feel that this bill is not good for the welfare of the people of Manitoba, and for that matter not even good for the board members involved.

MR. STEINKOPF: I beg to move, seconded by

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, if the honourable member has made that motion it would close the debate.

MR. STEINKOPF: I want to -- I was going to adjourn the

MR. CAMPBELL: It would still close the debate, Madam Speaker, so I will move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk that the debate be adjourned.

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

..... continued next page.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 38, the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, the more I study and think about this bill, the less I like it and I'm certainly very much concerned with this little piece of legislation. I think in order to appreciate the impact of this particular amendment we have to look at the Act and find out how the board is composed, how it's constituted, what its powers are, and how it acts, and under whose authority. And I'd like first to refer to section 5 (1), which reads as follows: "The affairs of the corporation shall be administered by a board which shall consist of not more than seven members who will be appointed by order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council." In other words, the board is appointed by the government. Then if we look at subsection 3, "The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall designate one of the members to be chairman and another to be vice-chairman of the board, and then section 8 states, "Notwithstanding the Legislative Assembly Act, a member of the Legislative Assembly who may also be a member of the Executive Council, may be a member of the board." In other words, all the key positions, Madam Speaker, are filled by appointees of this government. Now just because they are filled by appointees of this government does not, of necessity, mean that they are not going to be free to do as they please, or do as they think is right and proper. But the Act specifically states that they do not have this freedom and I would refer you, Madam Speaker, to section 16 of the Act, which states as follows: "With the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the corporation may (a) acquire by purchase, lease, license or otherwise (i) any power project, power site, power plant; (ii) that part of the undertaking property in essence including works of any person relating to or used in the generation, distribution or supply of power." I'm not going to read all of these, I'll just read one more: "(d) With such territorial or other limits as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may from time to time prescribe, control and regulate the development, generation, transformation, transmission, distribution and supply of power in Manitoba," etcetera, and so forth. In other words, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is actually running that Crown corporation, and if such is the case why should the Crown corporation be answerable to the Legislature and not the government? I think, Madam Speaker, that actually the board is responsible to the government and the government of the day is responsible to the people of this province through this Legislative Assembly.

Now what about the bill itself, Madam Speaker? If we look at section 46 of this Act it reads as follows: "The board shall annually, within four months after the end of the fiscal year of the corporation, make a report to the Minister upon all the transactions of the corporation during its last preceding fiscal year, and the report shall include an audited balance sheet of the corporation and an audited statement of its operating revenues and expenditures, together with such other information as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may require." Now section 47: "The Minister shall lay a copy of the report" -- the report that is mentioned in 46-- "before the Legislative Assembly forthwith if it is then in session and, if not, then within fifteen days of the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof." Now what does this bill do? This bill adds another sub-section to section 47 and states that "this report shall be permanently referred to the standing committee on public utilities."

Now, Madam Speaker, let's take a look at the report itself. What is this report? Just what report are we talking about in this particular bill? And I have here before me the 12th annual report which is the report that is referred to in the bill, and if we look at that particular report, Madam Speaker, we see nothing about details how the board operates or what it did in the past year, but we do see almost entirely the report covers the financial position of the board. It gives us the balance sheet, it gives us the assets and liabilities, a statement of consolidated contingencies and general reserves, statement of consolidated income and expenditure, notes of the consolidated financial statements, schedule of sinking fund investments, schedule of other investments held by the Provincial Treasury of the Province of Manitoba, schedule of other investments, schedule of funded debt, and Madam Speaker, is that what we want the board to be answerable for? Are we to go to the board in connection with the financial structure of the Hydro Electric System, when we all know that it is the Provincial Treasurer, who in this case is the First Minister, is the person who decides all these pertinent questions and not the members of the board? He is the man that raises the money. It is only recently that he went to New York, if my information is correct, to obtain \$28 million for the Hydro

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)... Electric Board. Why should the board be answerable for these debts? It looks to me that there is something drastically wrong with the thinking behind this bill, because the board is not responsible for the financial structure of that corporation. It is the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council through the Provincial Treasurer that raises all the money. What it could be is that the board would never take upon itself to raise the rates -- the Hydro rates -- without the direction and consent of the government, but if the board should raise them and this bill passes this House then the government can say to us, "Well we had nothing to do with raising the rates. This was the board's decision," and pass on the responsibility to the board; and I say Madam Speaker, that the government is responsible for anything and everything that this board does, and it's improper and dangerous to pass on responsibility of this nature to a Crown corporation instead of letting it lie where it belongs, right in the hands of the government. And I know that the back benchers of the government have no other choice but vote for this bill, but what I would suggest Madam Speaker is this, that this bill be taken back to caucus where the honourable Conservative back benchers have a say as to whether this bill should be presented or not, and use every effort to have the government -- the Minister -- withdraw the bill.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 44, an Act to amend The Real Property Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, this amendment -- the provisions of this bill have to do with the procedure that is followed in the event of a mortgage sale which affects property upon which there has been filed a *lis pendens*. All of the members will be aware that "*lis pendens*" is Latin for pending litigation, and there is a procedure under which litigation that affects a parcel of land, a certificate is filed in the Land Titles office. The question has arisen as to what the proper procedure is if, in the case of land on which such a certificate has been filed, is also involved in mortgage sale proceedings. The Registrar-General discussed the problem with the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench and they have recommended that the legislation which is before us in the form of this bill might be considered by the House, and it simply is to provide the procedure and to state the situation where these facts are in effect and we would be glad to discuss the details of it when the bill is before the committee.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would call the debate on the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means for the convenience of my honourable friend from Brokenhead.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): I would ask to have it stand once more please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3, Agriculture (c) Extension Service Branch. Passed?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture & Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, before we proceed I have a little information here that was asked for during the consideration of the estimates for Agriculture. In respect to the relative consumption of butter and margarine in Manitoba, the only information that I have for Manitoba specifically is for the years 1961, '62 and '63. In 1961 the per capita consumption of butter in Manitoba was 19 pounds; '62 - 20.6 pounds; in 1963 it was 20 pounds. The consumption of margarine during the same period -- for '61 it was 9.1 pounds; '62 - 8.1 pounds; 1963 - 7.7 pounds.

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

I think also I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that we have with us today a group of the Diploma students in Agriculture from the University of Manitoba, and I imagine they've come down here to see in what hands the agricultural industry is in and to gather from the debate of these estimates what the future of this industry holds for them. I would like to say through you, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that through these young men is the hope for the agricultural industry in Manitoba.....

MR. CAMPBELL:that we include the young women of the same age and then I'd agree with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN:.....to visit us from the various schools of the City, the public and high schools. May we pass the same greeting on to you young people and as we look at you there we feel somewhat confident in our own minds I'm very sure that the agricultural conservation interests of Manitoba will be well taken care of when you arrive to take your place and manage things.

MR. SEABORN: Mr. Chairman, if I may I'd like to speak just for a moment on this subject of margarine seeing I was so instrumental in bringing it into the House so many times. I promise I won't take too long but I've been always amused at the inconsistencies of many members of this House when they'll stand up like they did last week and make wonderful protestations about being supporters of the free enterprise system. We have resolutions covering the matter of sugar in sympathy with the public reaction against the high prices of this product, and we have other resolutions regarding the rising cost of living and efforts to try and bring relief to this problem, but when we come to the dairy industry itself we seem to enter the holy of holies and we take our shoes off, and when the word butter is mentioned it is said with the most sacred adoration.

Well, I have every respect and concern for the dairy industry, for without it our economy would be tremendously that much the poorer, but I do not believe it is beyond reproach. Even the member from Brokenhead, the great protester of the exploitation of the masses by private industry, finds himself rising to question the right whether margarine should be packed in plain wax wrappers or not, apparently it being this divine right of the butter industry to do so; and we had the Minister telling us that because of the controversy over the subject of margarine, the prices and so on were affected, the consumption of it was affected. But I rose primarily to put on record the statements of the former Minister of Agriculture, Alvin Hamilton, who spoke last February, 1963, and warned a convention of dairy farmers that taxpayers were fast tiring of providing the funds to maintain farmers on a system of dole and, repeating what everyone knows, Mr. Hamilton said the increased amount of price support did bring about an increase in dairy farm income. It did encourage more production, he admitted, but it also brought consumer resistance-- which is a little bit contrary to what we heard in the House the other day -- to the purchase of butter, with the result that the annual per capita consumption of butter fell from 19.5 pounds to 15.75 pounds in less than four years, and he ended up his remark by saying, "As the program on the butter subsidy plan is working out, it's going to cost us considerably over \$1.00 for every additional pound of butter that we manage to get consumed." But I think you will agree that this is a pretty expensive way to bring about an increase in consumption, especially when the general taxpayer has to foot the bill. And I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that as long as the members in this House permit the dairy industry to accept competition under the discriminatory terms that they dictate while they exploit the consumer on the other hand by getting approximately \$1.60 a pound for their product, that any protestations on the behalf of the free enterprise or appeals for the relief against exploitation of our people sounds like tinkling brass to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) passed ...

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, before we pass item (c), I have two matters that I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister. One has to do with the farm labour report which is found on page 25 of the annual report, and it mentions a federal-provincial committee. I would like to know from the Minister who is serving on this committee, and just what are their duties? It seems to be that they have a very small amount allotted for this particular matter, and just what is being done to attract farm help from other areas? I notice we have had help come in from the United States, such as combines, trucks, and truck

(Mr. Froese, cont'd)... operators, and other men. What are these men being paid in Manitoba when they do come out and work in Manitoba?

And a further matter having to do with farm labour, does the government ever make representation to the federal government to get unemployment insurance coverage for farm workers? I feel that this is essential if we want to maintain qualified farm help on the farm. Today a good number of farmers do not have livestock and therefore cannot employ farm help the year round, but they do need them very badly during the spring, summer and fall, and they have to have them; so I feel that these workers are entitled to unemployment insurance just as well as any construction worker or fisherman, or so on, what-have-you. I feel that something should be done in this direction, and I wonder whether the Minister could inform us on the matter before us.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I was not present in the House on Friday evening but I gather that you are calling the items just by (a), (b), (c) and (d) and so on, not by (a) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are on (c) now.

MR. SHOEMAKER: So we can speak on any one of the 8 items on (c)? I would like to ask the Minister, would he prefer that we talk on ARDA under item (c), 7, or over on the next page? Item No. 16 isn't it?

MR. HUTTON: Yes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: ARDA agreement. Do you want to talk on it in both places or. . . .

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, there are different aspects of the ARDA program. It might be helpful if I were to deal with the items that are covered, or those aspects of the ARDA program that are covered under this appropriation, and then the members could comment on them. Before I do so, however, I would like to reply to the Honourable Member for Rhineland in respect to the farm labour report. Our involvement in placing farm labour is rather limited today, as compared to former years. For the information of the member for Rhineland I should say that this aspect of the department's work was very important in the days when we had the immigration of farm labour from Ontario for special periods of production such as harvesting, when they used to come up by the trainload and help harvest the wheat in Manitoba. But we do serve to some limited extent in placing farm labour, and to that extent we are assisted by the federal government, financially, and as far as I know the personnel representing Manitoba on this federal-provincial farm labour board are Mr. Muirhead, who is supervisor of the ag rep service in Manitoba and Mr. Joel Lafrance. I am not familiar with the federal government's representatives so I can't answer that part of his question.

I don't know what the charges would be or the wages paid for imported labour, say, from the United States that comes along with the harvesting equipment. I would expect that it would have to be competitive with what wages are here in the Province of Manitoba. Otherwise, I think we would have the development of this kind of service within the province.

I would like to say a word on the unemployment insurance. I share the Honourable Member's concern about unemployment insurance. I was very encouraged the other day to read in the newspaper where the prairie provinces' employment committee had made a strong recommendation to the federal government that farm labour should be included.

We have in the department just recently been organizing ourselves to promote the Workmen's Compensation for farm labourers. I know that it wouldn't be as helpful in recruiting farm labour as a benefit such as unemployment insurance, but let me say that I think that it is equally important, because farm work is recognized to be one of the most hazardous of all occupations, due to the many and varied machines that are used in the production of farm products. These men who go out and work on farms do so today largely without any form of protection, any insurance, in case of accident, and Workmen's Compensation is available on a voluntary basis to farmers, and we feel that we should encourage this and we are doing this. We are about this right now, of encouraging farmers to give their employees the protection of Workmen's Compensation. I might say that it costs \$2.50 per \$100 to cover these men, and I think it is a very practical benefit that can be extended because, in view of the hazards of the work, these men are entitled to some kind of insurance and protection. Now, oh, here I have the farm labour committee. It includes the deputy, Mr. Lafrance, Mr. Wood, Mr. Tully -- Mr. Wood and Mr. Tully are farmers -- Mr. Allen of the National Employment Service,

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... Mr. Nichol of the Department of Immigration, and Mr. Bissett of the Department of Immigration.

Now in respect to the ARDA programs in this appropriation -- this appropriation for \$44,920.00. It is proposed this year that two permanent members be appointed this coming summer -- May next -- one for the Interlake and the other for the central plains area which includes the Gladstone-Neepawa area. Their duties are to co-ordinate rural development research and other activities. They will work closely with agriculture representatives and home economists, other officials of the government, and community groups. Guidance and assistance in planning community, self-appraisal projects and interpreting results, analyzing regional research and other information, to provide background for action programs -- this will be provided by them. In this way, greater inter-area co-ordination will be achieved, in inter-agency and inter-group planning and action programs. Research consultant personnel will undertake research or surveys and studies of new programs that have been officially approved. Briefly, their work will be to determine the reasons for drop-out rates among youth from school and rural development areas, a rehabilitation study to determine to what extent such programs may be required, and to set up guide lines and techniques for rehabilitation programs and finally, to perform consultative services. This would be complementary to community self-surveys being carried out in the Interlake and central plains areas, and will provide guide lines for action programs to governmental and other agencies. Some attention will be devoted to training programs and special educational projects to bring about a greater appreciation and understanding about the potential of rural area development and its scope. This will also provide travelling expenses and other expenses incurred by such personnel.

I'd like to also mention the fact that the federal government Indian Affairs have been negotiating with us with a view to having an agricultural representative, who would be supported by federal government funds, attached to our ag rep staff, so that he would work with the Indians and Metis in the province where they have a potential for developing their agricultural holdings. He would be -- to date our discussions would indicate that he would be preoccupied with the development of the cattle industry on the Indian reservations.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Mr. Chairman, do I understand right, that the Minister said the rate for compensation was \$2.50 a hundred? That would place it in one of the higher categories, wouldn't it?

MR. HUTTON: Yes, it is one of the higher categories.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask one question of the Minister. Are any new community pastures planned in the Province of Manitoba, and if they are, where are they? Could we obtain the maps? There's generally a map handed out that gives you the information as to their location.

MR. HUTTON: make such a map available.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: plans for the Province of Manitoba in 1964?

MR. HUTTON: I can't say whether -- our construction program was retarded last year, and the pasture for instance at Narcisse that was scheduled for construction in 1963 could not be undertaken because of the extremely wet conditions in that area. It is being constructed in 1964, and there are other pastures which are proposed and under study at the present time. Now, whether any of these new pastures will get under construction or not, I can't say at this time, but I will inquire to get up-to-date information on it.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his statement and for the information that he volunteered. To me, the budget seems very small that we are devoting to farm labour. Should we have more serious shortage next year, it seems that the amount could be very inadequate. On the other hand, I too wish to thank the Minister for putting forward this matter of unemployment insurance for farm workers. I do hope and I urge the Minister to press for coverage for farm workers. We need this very badly in Manitoba, and since it's a federal matter, I still feel that the provincial government does have influence, and should use it to best advantage.

I have a further item that I wish to have some clarification on, and also information. It has to do with item 6, a grant to the Manitoba Development Fund re Winnipeg Gardeners' Co-operative. I would like to have a report from this Co-operative and see just what our money is doing. What are we supporting when we give this grant to them? When I take a look at the

(Mr. Froese, cont'd)... Manitoba Development Fund to which this money apparently is going, there is no mention of this in the report of it being received, or that it's a special item. The only income they mention is interest and investigation fees of \$441,000. So, Mr. Chairman, I feel that we should as a committee here have a report on this co-operative, what they are doing with the money that they receive.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on page 7 of the Manitoba Farm Outlook, 1964, last line in the third paragraph says that: "At this spring session of the legislature, we hope to introduce a major water research program that will give a shot in the arm to agriculture." Has the statement been made yet? -- interjection -- It hasn't been made yet. Thank you. But we can look forward to a shot in the arm before we rise, I take it? -- interjection -- Yes.

Now on page 2 of Information Services Bulletin of March 15th, 1963, headed -- interjection-- just headed, "ARDA Agreement Gets Green Light. Hamilton and Hutton sign cross-sharing pact on 18 projects." Page 2, it says: "A study conducted over the past two or three years of rough fish processing as a means of supplying additional high protein foods and oils..." and so on. Now, this is under ARDA, according to this. I wonder if my honourable friend could tell us if this study that has lasted two or three years now -- have they concluded their study, and if so have they finalized on locations for a rough fish factory, or two or three of them?

And some member, I think the Honourable Member for Rhineland, touched on community pastures. Now I realize of course that this is a joint effort, similar in nature to ARDA in that respect. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that I receive a great number of complaints from farmers generally over the increase in the pasture fees and so on. I'm not suggesting that my honourable friend is 100 percent responsible for this one. I'm asking him if he has registered a complaint with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa, Mr. Hays. Of course, I believe the fees were raised before Mr. Hays went in there. But here is the complaint. Now I can understand, Mr. Chairman, that they would want the community pastures to be self-supporting. I can understand that part. But what the farmers are complaining to me about is this, that by reason of the fact they have lost local control, that is the local board of the various community pastures no longer seem to have the effective control over the purse strings like they used to have, and as such the costs have got out of hand. They have pointed up in two areas, the Langford community pasture, I believe they call it, and the one up near Langruth-Amaranth area. I don't know what the name of that one is, but they said that the government had built a \$5,000 bull pen -- just cited that as one example where a -- a \$5,000 one -- where a \$500 one would have been just as good; and similar things like this. And then of course the farmers who use the pasture have to pay for this kind of high cost. I hope that my honourable friend will attempt to do something in this regard, and if the farmers can save themselves money by further local participation in these various projects, I think it should be encouraged.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, on the question of Gardeners Sales, the Government of Manitoba felt about -- it was two or three years ago now -- that it was in the interests of the vegetable industry here -- I'm speaking of the industry in total -- that adequate plant facilities be provided, or be made available to the industry in this area, so that it could upgrade the industry in terms of the product it was turning out, and to support the growers who are, in the last analysis, responsible for the growth and the reputation that the industry attain. There were substantial grants available under federal legislation for vegetable warehousing and for refrigeration, and through the province participating in this program some very substantial monies were made available to the Gardeners' Sales Co-operative. Now I believe, if I remember correctly, that the -- I can give you the details of this -- the appropriation of \$14,746 required to meet the annual principal and interest on the project as detailed and amortized for twenty years with interest at 6 1/4 percent. The original principal was \$165,746, being Manitoba's share under the agreement. The vegetable industry has become of increased importance to the provincial economy. Likewise, modern facilities for grading, packaging and storage of vegetables to the retail trade are of paramount importance if Manitoba grown produce is to increase in consumer acceptance.

Gardeners' Sales, a grower organization, in 1960-61 completed construction of combined potato warehouse and cold storage plants. Financial assistance from Canada and the Manitoba governments for the construction of the potato warehouse has been granted under the Canada Government Regulations PC 2017, which authorizes Canada to make grants and loans to

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) ... co-operatives in the amount of 37 1/2 percent of the cost of the potato warehouse facilities, provided the province agrees to make available a like amount of assistance. The province agreed to match the Canada Government's contribution. Manitoba's share was provided initially through the Manitoba Development Fund, hence the Department of Agriculture must in turn pay to the Manitoba Development Fund, over a 20-year period, the annual sum of approximately \$14,746.00. The cost of the combined potato warehouse and cold storage plant amounted to \$611,905.56, of which amount \$555,339.56 was the cost of the potato warehouse. The province, by agreement, assumed construction costs up to but not exceeding \$331,490 of which the federal government provided 50 percent. Under the Canada Government's PC 2017, the co-operative must assume 25 percent of the total cost of the potato warehouse, and by an assessment on all produce handled through the warehouse, gradually pay back to the Government of Canada and Manitoba 50 percent of the amount which these two governments have paid into the cost of the building. When this 50 percent has been paid off by the co-operative the agreement made between the co-operative and the government is terminated. The co-operative is not required to make further payments. The balance which the two governments have invested in the warehouse becomes a grant to the co-operative. But I must say this in respect to the Manitoba government's grant, that we did so because the Gardeners' Sales Co-operative undertook to provide us with the facilities for grading and inspection of vegetables at a fee, and this facility was to be made available to all growers regardless of whether they were members of the Gardeners' Sales or not. This was the basis for that agreement, and I can say so far that Gardeners' Sales have met their commitments and I believe that this facility is an asset to the industry.

Now I would like to say this about PFRA management of community pastures. I have had complaints of the nature of those expressed by the Honourable Member for Gladstone. I have had other complaints too, and much more serious complaints. If you go back about a year the daily rate charged in the community pasture was 3 1/2 cents. We had complaints from municipalities that we were tying up land within the municipality from which they were getting no revenue and which lands were providing income to farmers residing beyond the boundaries of the municipality concerned; and so an agreement was reached between the municipalities and the PFRA board of directors, or administration, that a per capita levy would be made on all cattle taken into community pastures and this was a penny a day per head. And it seemed to be the answer to the municipalities in respect of revenue but of course it increased the cost to the producer. In addition, PFRA had not made any adjustment over their charges for their community pastures, and their charges were relatively the same as they had been when cattle were half the price. So it was deemed reasonable that there should be some revision in the charges. Now I read the various magazines of the cattle industry, and I have read of some pretty serious objections on the part of cattlemen about subsidized pasture rates, and the feeling that there is a discrimination here against the cattleman who doesn't use these government pastures. And I have seen it argued, and with some logic, if you could accept the figures that were given, that even at 6 cents a day per head, this still represented a subsidy over what it cost to establish grazing land, fencing, water supply, corrals, etcetera. Because not only does the farmer get the grazing and the water supply, he also gets a degree of management when he turns his cattle into a community pasture. But the complaint that concerns me a great deal more than that of the per diem charge is the one that I am receiving from cattlemen who find that, although they have been charter members in a pasture, they are given notice that they must reduce the numbers of cattle that they allocate to a given pasture or to any pasture; and the reason for this is that there has been such an increase in the demand for grazing that the PFRA have felt it necessary to reorganize the grazing rights and to try and serve the residents adjacent to the pasture rather than having cattle coming in from long distance away. Now in their reorganization of the services of the pasture and in a re-allocation of pasture rights so to speak, there have been quite a number of our long established cattlemen dislocated by this policy and the Department of Agriculture here is quite concerned about this because we want to increase our cattle numbers in the province and we certainly don't want to discourage our long established cattlemen in doing this. I think what it points up is that there must be more and more community pastures made available as we can make them available, and we are going to have to improve the carrying capacity of the existing pasture. It is encouraging to

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... note that the PFRA people are carrying on quite an encouraging program in Manitoba of increasing the carrying capacity within these pastures and I mention some of the work they were doing at Woodlands this winter. They are doing much the same work up at the pasture at Mulvihill, and I believe in other pastures throughout the province. I can't pinpoint them right at the minute. But we are going to have to increase the carrying capacity of these pastures. We're going to have to have more pastures if we're going to meet the demand, and although 6 cents a day is a very substantial increase over 3 1/2 cents a day, I think when you take into consideration the rights of the municipality in respect to getting some revenue from this land, and when you take into consideration the increased cost over the years, that a more serious consideration is of providing pasture to meet the need and the demand of the day, rather than the one that the charges are too high.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, if I may I'd just like to add a comment or two to what the Honourable Minister has said. Insofar as the compensation of the municipality is concerned, I'd like to point out, in addition to what we just heard, that the municipalities that are adjacent to these community pastures have been supplying roads to these areas for years in the past. It will continue to do. The expense of providing these roads I think will hardly be met by the 1 cent per head. I don't think it's a full compensation. I know that in one of our pastures adjacent to my constituency and one in the constituency, there are several miles of road that have to be maintained and kept to look after the needs of the pasture. The other point I would like to raise, Mr. Chairman, is the improvement of these pastures. When they are taken over they are fenced and they're just leased out in the raw. There is very little improvement being done on them in the way of seeding and so forth. Now in any of these pastures you could triple the carrying capacity if you made the necessary improvements, and I think that one of the policies that should be adopted is gradual improvement of these pastures in order to improve the carrying capacity of them.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I may have missed something that the Honourable Minister has said, but did you say that you reported on experiments of using fertilizer on community pastures in an attempt to double the carrying capacity? Was fertilizers mentioned at all? It strikes me that some of our better cattlemen in the province are doing just this. They have, after a certain amount of experimenting come up with fertilizers that are supposed to double the carrying capacity. I wonder if we should not be doing more of this kind of work.

Now on the same subject matter and I don't know whether to raise it here or in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources but it certainly touches on the same subject that we have been dealing with for half an hour or so, that is the leasing of land. There has been a new program for leasing of Crown lands in the province, I understand. I wonder if my honourable friend would like to comment on it because it does concern quite a number of people in my area around the provincial and the federal parks. My complaint at the moment is this, that everyone who has had Crown land leased in the past received a 6-page effort from the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. Now I know that I'm safe in saying that 90 percent of the farmers in my area that had leased land in the past are of Ukrainian or Polish descent and some of them can't read, and even if they could, they certainly could not comprehend everything that is in those six pages there. So what do they do, they take them probably to a lawyer and a lawyer will charge them four or five dollars to complete the affidavit and so on, for the application, to send back. I got about 99 percent of them in my area and I didn't charge them anything and I don't intend to. Now they are starting to come back with the -- Saturday I had the first contract back, and it has to be made out in triplicate and witnessed before a Commissioner of Oaths and all this, so they are starting to bring those in now. I noticed on the back without -- I was so busy on Saturday I didn't have time to go into it in detail, but on the back of the triplicate forms, a contract. That's what they are really. It sets out the formula for arriving at the fee to be charged, and it says you take A times B times C minus something else. Well, my gosh, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how to figure it out. I never tried to figure it out, but I'm certain that 99 percent of the people that have received these forms are not even going to try to figure them out. They outline here in some detail how they had arrived at a formula. If the price of beef cattle is anywhere from \$15 to \$20 a hundred, then the fee will be so much if they'll pasture so many head of cattle on it, and it's certainly a complicated thing. I wonder if my honourable friend or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in about two sentences

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)... could tell us what the formula is so that everybody could understand it.

MR. HUTTON: The formula is five percent of the average gain, of the average carrying capacity times the average price of beef for that year. Very simple really. You take the average gain of an animal on this pasture's -- calculated in Manitoba it's calculated to be 225 pounds. The average price is determined by the average price of beef at St. Boniface stockyards -- that's not blue ribbon or red ribbon beef, but the average price of beef at the St. Boniface stockyards -- and the average carrying capacity of that particular piece of quarter section of land. It might be 10 cattle, it might be 30 cattle; and it's 5 percent of that. It's 5 percent of the earning capacity of that land; that's what it amounts to.

I don't want to comment too widely on this program, because it falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, but I would like to point out that the COMEF report made a very strong recommendation that we change our system of leasing Crown land in Manitoba and provide for security of tenure. Now, I think it's obvious that when you provide for security of tenure, which must perforce run to many years, that you have to provide for variations in the productive value of that land. You can't give this land in perpetuity to somebody and not protect the taxpayers' interest in what, I think, must inevitably be a very sharp and significant appreciation of the value of these lands in the coming years; and all this formula does is to guarantee to the tenant, to the leaseholder, what his commitments are going to be in the future to the taxpayers of the province, and at the same time to know that any efforts that he puts up for the improvement of these lands are going to be protected, and the benefits are going to accrue to him. And this in a nutshell is what these new leases do. And as I mentioned the other night, I think that the great interest that has been demonstrated in getting hold of these leases testifies to their attractiveness and their desirability to get such a contract with the government. I think that's about all I can say on the subject.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with most of what my honourable friend has said. The one question that still is unanswered as far as I'm concerned is, who determines the carrying capacity of a certain parcel of land, and does it vary from year to year if you sign a ten-year lease? Will the -- well number 1, who determines the carrying capacity and will it change with every succeeding year?

MR. HUTTON: The Lands Branch, through their soil specialists, appraise the carrying capacity of the land. It's not set at ten animals, it's set at eight to thirteen or something of this nature, and then it is re-appraised every so many years to take into account the fact that it may deteriorate, it may improve. These leases also provide for special concessions to the leaseholder who carries out improvement practices on the land to increase the carrying capacity thereof.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister whether we should discuss vegetables under this item, or whether we should discuss it under Research.

MR. HUTTON: Well, if he wants to talk about any vegetable industry outside of this particular building, I would say that we do it under either Soils or Crops or Research.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting to compliment the Minister. I thought it might be a change, and I always feel that I can compliment both the Minister and the department on the continuing good work that is carried on with regard to 4H clubs and their various activities. I have felt for a long time that this is one of the most important activities. Sometimes I think perhaps it is the most important activity that the Department of Agriculture carries on, because I think that with all the good work that various experts do in the field with practicing farmers, that once those farmers attain a certain age, they are less likely to follow the recommended lines than the young folks if you get them at the time of the 4H Club program. I have also said in the past, and I believe that it is correct, that the particular team, whether they be girls or boys or a boy and a girl, who win the provincial championship in their particular field of club work, go through the various judging and other contests in order to be chosen as a provincial representative; and then make that week's trip or more down to Toronto and there meet with and associate with and compete with, in a very friendly fashion, the similar winners from all the other provinces, have an experience and an education that is equally good with a year in University, and I think that we should never let the estimates of the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)... Department of Agriculture be concluded without a word about the 4H Club work.

This year, I am particularly interested -- well, I've always been interested, but I'm glad to note on page 21 of the annual report, and this of course is more than a year old now, the activities I speak of -- that the council also sponsors one 4H Club member from each province to attend National 4H Club Conference at Washington, D. C. The Manitoba delegate for 1962 was Jack Eddiger of High Bluff. When I mention that High Bluff is a metropolis that adjoins Flee Island, my honourable friend will recognize that I have a particular interest in the area and this young man. I'm sure he would be a very worthy representative. I see the Honourable Minister for Public Works looking at me, because he's a native of High Bluff, just as I am a native of Flee Island, and all I ask the honourable members to do is take a look at the two representatives of those areas and you'll see that it's very fertile country -- interjection -- Yeah. Raises good people. And this boy who went to Washington, D. C. is a young man who I'm sure would benefit greatly by this experience too.

But as far as the 4H Club work in total is concerned, I think we still should pay our respects to it every time that the Agricultural estimates are before the House, and not only to the ones who achieve national prominence by being picked out as the provincial winners, not only the one who gets this special recognition of going to Washington, D. C., but to all the youngsters who take part in it, because it's excellent work and it combines good citizenship along with agricultural education.

And then having mentioned the 4-H'ers who take part in the work directly, I think no one could properly comment on it without paying respect to the many many volunteer workers, unpaid workers in the different communities who act as leaders of these various clubs. So as one who has had a good deal to do with them through the years, I want to once again record my appreciation of the very good program that is carried on and my congratulations to the young people who show the initiative to get in and take advantage of that program and very heartily also to the leaders who assist the departmental personnel so well in carrying on this work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) --

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, just before we let this item go, it would be terribly remiss of me if I didn't, following the comments of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, remind all the members that the 4H movement started in Manitoba 50 years ago, and the celebration of the 50th, the golden anniversary of the 4H movement was marked in Manitoba this past summer. There was a ceremony out at Roland, Manitoba, and a cairn was set up commemorating the inception of the youth work in this province. It was from Manitoba that it spread right across Canada and is now a world-wide work. There were some 800 people that gathered on that Sunday afternoon to commemorate the beginnings of these works and it is I think something indeed to be proud of -- the fact that we have almost 10,000 young people enrolled in this work today in Manitoba.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, before we complete (c) I would like to check with the Minister. He gave a brief report regarding the ARDA agreement. Was he at this time reporting on the whole program or are the other items left for consideration later on? -- interjection -- Most of it is left so that, as far as we are concerned, we could leave our comments on the whole program until later on. I have some questions to ask with regard to ARDA but I'm quite willing to leave it 'till we reach the next page.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on 3, (c) (3), although this is a very small item under the agriculture estimates, the amount estimated seems to have even become smaller than last year. I'm interested in this field because we have a lot of honey produced in my constituency. I don't know, maybe that's why it is one of the sweeter constituencies, but anyway, the decrease -- I notice that there is a slight reduction number of bee keepers but I gather from the figures it's about a 20 percent cut or decrease. Is it strictly for inspections or why the decrease? It's an amount of 8,500 something. 3 (c) (3). It's on page 33.

MR. HUTTON: This is to cover inspections. It covers inspections and I expect that they must estimate the cost to be lower this coming year, maybe because there are larger operations and fewer of them. It's the only answer that I can give you.

MR. GRAY: Under the farm labour service, the amount is so small. Is it the intention not to proceed with this service or they are sure they won't be short of farm labour during

(Mr. Gray, cont'd)... harvest time? It is only \$5,000 I think or \$8,000.00 The bigger amount in previous years. My question is whether you feel sure that there will be more difficulty in getting labour during harvest time or before seeding time, or you, so that the requirements will not be there.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, during the past year we placed 1,473 males on farms, 110 females, 16 immigrants, 1,291 Indians in sugar beet and potato fields, and 59 harvesters from the USA. I think the reason why this seems to be a small amount is that the personnel within the department who do this work, it is only a part of their administrative responsibilities, and so we can allocate a relatively small amount of money to this and we seem to be able to meet all the demands that come to us and are able to accommodate all the available or potential employees.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Just to clear up one point as regards Workmen's Compensation for farm workers. No. 1, was this program available to the farmers in 1963 or has it become available for the first time in January 1st, 1964? 2. Will publicity be given to this and where can the farm laborers, fishermen, etcetera, if it is made available to them, receive application forms for more information on it.

MR. HUTTON: I can't really tell you how long this has been available to the farmers. I have had discussions with members of the board of the Workmen's Compensation, and I satisfied myself that it was available and brought it to the attention of the department and I might say that I took advantage of the opportunity to protect the men who work for me and we are going to give as much publicity as we can to this fact, and all a farmer would need to do would be to write to the Workmen's Compensation Board and they would send him the necessary application forms and the information regarding it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that a public notice -- I would suggest two things -- that the application forms be made available to all ag reps in the province, and in addition, a small supply be mailed to every municipal clerk in the province, and let it be known to all of the farmers in the area that application forms are available in these two places for this purpose. Now, Mr. Chairman, in addition to actual laborers on the farm, I suppose that the farmer's sons and/or daughters could qualify if they were actually on the payroll, couldn't they? And then the fishermen and trappers and the like, will they qualify in the same fashion?

MR. HUTTON: Now I believe that under certain circumstances members of the family can be covered, but there are special -- if I remember correctly -- there are special provisions covering this, and I wouldn't want to be quoted on it without making a second reference. I did read something about this, but I'm not familiar enough with it to comment on it. I don't know whether this benefit is available to -- I expect it would be available to fishermen. I don't know that. I do know that it is available to the farmer, that he can cover his farm labour. The department is preparing announcements and working with the Workmen's Compensation Board in this and I hope that we can publicize it and that the farmers will take advantage of it to protect these farm workers.

MR. PETERS: As I understand it, compensation has been available to farmers for quite some time but the cost was prohibitive and therefore many farmers did not take advantage of it, and with this new legislation that will be enacted the cost will be lower and probably more farmers will take advantage of this situation. Is this correct?

MR. HUTTON: Well I'm not aware, Mr. Chairman, that the cost will be lower to the farm sector, and I can't say just how long this has been available, but it came to my attention and we are now going to promote it. But it's on a voluntary basis.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, do I understand from the remarks of the Minister that farmers can get Workmen's Compensation?

MR. HUTTON: No. They can cover the men that work for them.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, can the Minister tell me how long this has been in effect. I mean, I'm sure that most people in my area certainly aren't aware of it.

MR. HUTTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, we're going to make them aware of it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have agreed to wait as far as the general discussion of ARDA is concerned until the next page but I would like to ask the Minister how much of the money that we appropriated for the present year has been spent and how much do they expect

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)... will be spent by the end of this month? We appropriated \$33,850.00. Can you tell us how much is being spent in this current year?

MR. HUTTON: It looks to me as if \$17,400 was spent under this appropriation.

MR. CHAIRMAN:passed. (d) passed.

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