

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
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 7th, 1964.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. MARTIN: I was going to ask a question just as you called it 5:30. I was curious to know whether the Member for St. John's subscribes to the terms of his resolution that a marriage counselling certificate shall be mandatory before the issuing of a marriage licence.

MR. CHERNIACK: I must answer this question by pointing out that one of the first things I said today on this resolution was that I felt, although I may have appeared to be unkind, I felt that the Honourable Member from St. Matthews had not heard or read my speech. I am now compelled to say that he has apparently failed to read the resolution, which makes no reference to a mandatory counselling certificate.

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

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

A MEMBER:stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. P. J. McDONALD (Turtle Mountain): Madam Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the members for allowing this to stand for so long. When I asked to stand to start with, I planned on talking to a few farmers throughout the community that I live in, but unfortunately we didn't get a chance to talk two weeks ago, so I did have another opportunity to speak to quite a number of farmers at the Brandon Exhibition. I must say, as a farmer and interested in the farming community, that I for one would be very, very interested to see if there is anything we could do in this particular line to help out the farmers, but I do not think that the honourable member probably has given just too much thought to the resolution that has been placed before us, because I don't feel that he has probably given any consideration at all to the small farmer, the 40-acre farmer or the less than a quarter section, and in many cases these farmers make quite a contribution. They have a concentration of grow-crop work and what have you, and they probably use their truck probably as much as somebody with a section of land. Now I think maybe one other thing I should probably mention, that there is nothing in this resolution to suggest anything for the cattle farmer. In many cases we have cattle farmers in this province that have a small acreage that is owned or operated by them, but they lease hay land and probably have their cattle pastured out, but yet they use their truck 12 months of the year hauling grain, hauling hay and so on, and I don't think that this would be a fair way. Yet we can take farmers that have eight, or five or six sections of land, whatever you might say, they could probably get enough gasoline tax free under this resolution probably to supply part of their town friends. I do know that I talked to one farmer in Brandon and he said that he could certainly supply his neighbors and run his car under the same program. I don't say this in the form of criticism. I appreciate the gentleman's thinking when he brought this resolution in. I feel that we would be defeating our purpose when we are trying to promote the cattle industry. We are trying to suggest to the farmers that we should have more concentration on the farm rather than large farms, and this would not encourage for to get additional tax free gas according to their production. It would be depending on how much land they had. Now you take -- I know in parts of my area and in the northern part, Swan River here, they could probably be driving back to the Legislative Assembly on tax free gas.

What about our beet farmers where their trucks are out in the field all day long? There is no consideration given to them at all, and also a few of the other row-crop industries. With a few ideas put before the Assembly tonight I would like to make it very clear that I am very, very interested if we could come up with a plan that would work, but I don't feel that this plan can work at all because it just -- there's not enough thought put into it, and with this in mind, I -- well, one man says what does it weigh. The Honourable Member from Gladstone he weighs some of his material. Well, I couldn't get the Post Office to weigh mine, but I would like at this time to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River, that the proposed resolution by Mr. Vielfaure, whereas farming is still the basic industry in

(Mr. McDonald, cont'd)...the province of Manitoba, and whereas the basic purpose of The Gasoline Tax Act is to provide revenue for the construction and maintenance of public roads and highways, and whereas a farm truck travels many miles per year on the farm property in the performance of essential farm work, therefore be it resolved that the Government give consideration to the advisability of amending The Gasoline Tax Act to allow a bona fide farmer who has a farm truck licence 100 gallons of tax-exempt gasoline for every quarter section of land, be it not now read a second time but read a second time six months hence.

MR. MOLGAT:on a point of order, if I may. I realize that this procedure is perfectly proper where it's a bill that's to be passed. I wonder, however, if it's a proper procedure where it's a resolution that's before the House which is not something that's to be read either now or at a later date. It's a resolution that the House either must decide upon or vote against.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, perhaps you could take this point under advisement and if the wording is faulty it could be corrected if the House is willing to do that.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will take the resolution under consideration and I will give my ruling at a later date. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Dufferin, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. I have had this motion under consideration. I find that it is in order and anyone wishing to speak may do so.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: The yeas and nays, Madam Speaker, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

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

NAYS: Messrs: Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Klym, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Stanes, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 18; nays, 28.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Dufferin.

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

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: The proposal in this resolution for the establishment of the office of the Public Protector or Ombudsman has attracted considerable interest in recent years. However, the fact that this office was established in Sweden in 1809 and was not introduced into any other country until Finland established one in 1919, 110 years later, seems to indicate that it may not be such a wonderful idea. Except for a military ombudsman appointed in Norway and West Germany, the only other countries which have an ombudsman are Denmark and New Zealand, where they have only been in existence since 1954 and since 1962, respectively. When only four countries have appointed a regular ombudsman in the last 155 years since the office was first established, the proposal evidently hasn't been very highly regarded by very many nations.

Furthermore, since the NDP and the Liberals think it is such a wonderful idea, one would expect that the CCF Government in Saskatchewan and the Liberal Government at Ottawa and in New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Quebec, would have appointed ombudsmen, but we have no ombudsman appointed in Canada as yet. If the idea is so good, one would think that the opposition members would be able to persuade their colleagues in government to adopt this proposal. I think their colleagues must realize that we are better off without a provincial ombudsman in Canada. It may be that we need an ombudsman for the Federal Government

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd)...because an MP represents a comparatively large area compared with a provincial MLA, and because an MP is in Ottawa for very many months of the year. In Manitoba we have many persons to do the work of the ombudsman and who will help citizens to investigate claims where they have been unjustly treated whether by government officials or boards or by private companies and individuals. In Manitoba we have 57 MLA's, many mayors, reeves, councillors, aldermen and school trustees also. I have found that elected representatives are usually quite willing to investigate complaints or alleged injustices that are brought to their attention and usually the party against whom the complaint is made is quite willing to give their side of the story. If one elected representative thinks the complaint is unjustified, or refuses to investigate, or is slow at investigating, the party who complains is free to appeal to another elected representative for assistance. This new person may be at another level of government or may be of another political party. Almost anyone who has a complaint against a government official, or department, can have it investigated at no cost by one or more of the elected representatives. There are numerous opportunities for appeal. These complaints enable MLA's to keep in touch with problems facing their constituents and to think of changes in regulations and laws which they might propose.

If complaints were not dealt with by elected representatives and others but were all referred to the ombudsman, the complainants would perhaps have no one else to whom they could make an appeal for there is no appeal from the decision of the ombudsman. If MLA's and others simply referred complaints to the ombudsman, the complainant would have only one person to decide whether or not the complaint was justified. Instead of having all complaints funnelled to one person or to one office, a person today has a greater chance of achieving justice as he has an opportunity to approach many persons for assistance. If the office of ombudsman was established we would all likely refer a complaint to that office and would feel that we had done our job by making the reference. Furthermore we would place on someone else the job of looking after the interests of our constituents. We should be willing to do the job which we undertook when we stood for election to this House. We have 57 ombudsmen in this House. It is worthy of note that these four nations which have regular ombudsmen only have national and local governments. The extra level of a provincial government which we have in Canada gives everyone in Canada another elected representative at a third level of government to whom to appeal for help. Compared to an MP, an MLA in Manitoba has a comparatively small constituency and is easier to approach than a federal MP with his large constituency and who is in Ottawa for a great part of the year.

As a matter of fact in Greater Winnipeg there is a fourth level of government, we have elected Metro councillors to whom citizens can appeal for assistance. If an ombudsman office were established in Manitoba the office would likely be located in Winnipeg, far from many of our citizens who live in distant parts of the province. I am sure that those far from Winnipeg would be better served by their local MLA's than by an ombudsman in Winnipeg.

It is interesting to note that in those countries where they have an ombudsman, only about a third of the complaints are investigated and in a comparatively few cases is action taken. For instance, in Finland in 1960, the office handled 1,084 new cases and in 1,000 cases no action was necessary. In Denmark, of the new cases about 300 cases are investigated a year. About 10 or 15 percent of the cases reported require correction. The Danish ombudsman has a staff of 10, of whom five are lawyers. In Finland because the ombudsman can investigate government department heads, the investigators are paid more than the department heads. This is understandable. Establishing an office of Ombudsman will result in an unnecessary additional burden to our taxpayers. The job is being done now by the elected representatives and others.

Then there is the danger that the ombudsman may not be as independent as one would wish. No such danger exists if the ombudsman was appointed by the present government, or the present Legislature, but in the very far distant future we may have another government in this province and that government might not be, it might not appoint an ombudsman who would be independent. This problem came to the fore in 1960 in Finland when upon the retirement of an ombudsman, the new appointee was the man who was Minister of Justice in the government prior to the appointment. The one who retired was nominated by opposition parties to run against the President in the next election. In Finland the duties of the ombudsman are divided

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd)...between two officials and the person whom I have mentioned was the one known as the Chancellor. It is hard to imagine that the new Chancellor would be exactly independent when dealing with problems which involve his former colleagues in the Cabinet.

Not only can elected representatives in Manitoba usually investigate complaints, but in the Legislature they can bring forth almost any grievance and they can obtain documents, correspondence and information on most matters. Items can be brought up during estimates, during the question period, during the Throne Speech, or on considering resolutions, or going into Supply, or many other occasions. There is ample opportunity for complaints to be investigated. Not only can people seek assistance from local MLA's but they can usually bring their complaints to a Cabinet Minister or to a Party Leader.

There are others besides elected representatives who try to insure that individuals obtain justice. This group includes the press, which often through publicity is able to have an injustice corrected. This group also includes lawyers in this province. Sometimes when a person comes to a lawyer with a complaint and an investigation is started, one finds that three or four lawyers have already made an investigation for the purpose of trying to right an alleged wrong without being paid for their services. The Law Society, too, has a Legal Aid Committee which meets once a week and provides free legal assistance for those who cannot afford to pay for it with respect to civil matters. Also free legal counsel are available in criminal cases for those who cannot pay for counsel.

Then we have other organizations which seek to help people obtain justice in other fields. These include the full time representative provided by the Royal Canadian Legion to assist veterans and their dependents with their problems; the Pension Advocate of the Department of Veterans' Affairs who assists veterans with pension problems; the counsellors of the Juvenile and Family Court; the Family Bureau; the clergymen of this province; the disciplining committees set up by most of the professional societies existing in this province; the John Howard Society; the AA's; the Alcoholism Foundation, and many others. Perhaps one of the most unique and one of the most praiseworthy of those offering assistance to those who need it is found in Portage la Prairie. A retired businessman of that city Mr. H.G. Pryor is willing to assist anyone he can who needs help of almost any kind; nor does he limit his assistance to helping around the Portage area for if someone needs to come to Winnipeg for medical aid he will drive them here.

In addition to those mentioned, many of the people in the government departments will do their best to help people who come to them for assistance. If one is not satisfied with the decision of the man across the counter, then one can appeal to his superior and to the department heads and to the Committee of Council, and to the Council itself, or to a Cabinet Minister as the case may be. Then, of course, one can bring one's complaints to the attention of the public which may result in redress by writing letters to the editor of the newspapers, or by taking part in radio programs such as "Beefs and Bouquets." Many Acts of the Legislature make provision for appeals from decisions of department personnel and boards. These include appeals in respect of social allowances, suspension of drivers for driving while drunk or impaired, and so on. There are many avenues of redress open to those who have complaints in Manitoba at the present time and there is no need for the Office of Ombudsman in this province.

It is of interest to note that this proposal for an ombudsman was brought before the Legislature of Nova Scotia this year. As a result a special committee of seven MLA's Conservatives and Liberals, studied the question and tabled its 14 page report in the Legislature last month, on March 13th, to be precise. The committee invited certain prominent citizens of the province with varying backgrounds and professional knowledge to discuss the various aspects of and the need for an ombudsman in Nova Scotia. They also studied a number of articles and books on the subject. The members of the committee unanimously recommended against the appointment of an ombudsman for Nova Scotia. Here are some of the comments: "The overall benefit to the province might be greater by increasing the concern of the representative for his constituency. The growth and depth of this concern might better be served by increasing his expense allowance than by the appointment of another official such as a parliamentary official or ombudsman. In the final analysis the member of the legislature is the person who should be able to investigate, assess and represent the constituents no matter

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd)...what the problem of relationship between the administrative body and the individual. It was submitted that the appointment of a parliamentary commissioner type of official would commence a process of erosion which would greatly affect two aspects of present-day government in Nova Scotia, the first of which has already been mentioned, the degree of intimate contact between the legislator and his constituents; and secondly, the frequency of contact between the legislator and the members of the executive council. As your committee continued to meet with various officials, it became increasingly clear that the object of insuring the continuation of a citizen's right could be achieved if, in legislation and regulation governing the various departments which intimately affect the control of the rights of the individual -- example, Public Welfare in the field of allowance; Workmen's Compensation in the field of entitlement; the Field of Decisions with regards to rewards for lands expropriated by the Department of Highways; and individual rights and liberties curbed by other departments -- the duties and perogatives of each department, division or board could be carefully examined. Such an examination could be carried out by existing authorities. The result of the examination would be to recommend amendments to the various statutes providing for additional safeguards and reviews. And it was not felt that the wrong person would necessarily consider an appeal to a parliamentary commissioner type of official any more than he would appeal to any other authority which in essence is that the individual's rights would not be further protected by the duplication of the authority to which the individual might appeal.

Your committee finds no particular aspect of provincial government administrative functions which presently and generally prejudice the rights and interests of the citizen. Your committee was very much impressed by the candor of the witnesses appearing before it, and commends those in the government service for their evident concern for human rights as their rights are affected by the operation of the department."

There may be some merit in the suggestion made by Lord Hewitt that a Committee of the House of Assembly be formed for the purpose of observing whether and in what respect each bill may have the effect of increasing the power of bureaucracy; and whether and by what contrivance that power's use is made irresponsible. Other committees and other individuals examine and consider every bill from various other special and particular points of view, but it seems to be at once highly desirable, and by no means impractical, that from the members of the House a standing committee should be selected who would ask themselves with reference to each new measure: 1. Does it confer expressly or by implication such powers upon the bureaucracy? 2. If so, how does it seek to obtain that end? 3. Is the method, or is the probable result of such a kind that the fresh powers may evade either the control of the assembly or the jurisdiction of the court and in some measure curb human rights? In conclusion, it is also suggested that such a committee would regularly and of right review regulations made under the various powers delegated by the legislature, which seem now to be subjected only to review by the Minister proposing the regulation and his official and not in each case by the executive council.

In Manitoba, our Committee on Rules and Regulations already does what is recommended in the concluding paragraph of the Nova Scotia report. I would think that this House could very well give to this committee the job of reviewing each proposed statute as suggested by Lord Hewitt, and as endorsed by the Nova Scotia Committee, and that we could forget about the proposal to appoint a new unnecessary ombudsman or public protector and staff in this province.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre? Will he permit a question? You have been kind enough and taken the trouble to travel through world to obtain and secure arguments why you are opposed to the resolution. Can you tell me as a layman, why did you not look for the good of the resolution, and what harm will it be if this resolution is carried in spite of the fact that you think it's not necessary?

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I think I answered that question in my speech, but it simply is this that we have 57 MLA's who can do the job better in Manitoba; that we represent a comparatively small constituency to what a federal member would represent; and in those four countries where they have a regular ombudsman, they only have local governments and national governments and they have no provincial members who represent a comparatively small area. When we have MLA's doing the job if a person isn't getting redress for his grievance from one MLA he can go to another, and to another, and to the cabinet minister, and

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd)...to the party leader, whereas there is no appeal from the decision of the ombudsman. If we all referred the questions to the ombudsman as we would be tempted to do, then there would be no appeal from that man's decision and we would take the ombudsman's decision as being it, because it's the final court of appeal for complaints.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre would permit another question. I wonder if my honourable friend was reading a statement of government policy.

MR. COWAN: No, Madam Speaker.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well then, I wonder, Madam Speaker, if he would permit one further question? He did suggest that rather than of going to a ombudsman or a public protector, that it might be better to pay each and every one of the 57 members an additional stipend to compensate them in some small way for their services as ombudsman. I wonder if he would care to recommend to the House exactly the amount that we should receive for this particular position.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member evidently wasn't listening. This was just an expense allowance for additional expenses that was suggested by the Nova Scotia Committee, not for any additional stipend or legislative fee. Maybe make additional money available for some expenses for perhaps men who have to travel around the constituency, or have a large constituency like the Member for Swan River.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Madam Speaker, on a

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SHOEMAKER:to follow through on this then, my honourable.....

MR. ROBLIN:quite rightly. If my honourable friend wants to make a speech, that's fine, but I don't think we should allow any more speeches in the guise of questions.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well then, Madam Speaker, you can call it a speech if you like. I want to speak....

MR. MOLGAT: Before the honourable member speaks in that case, I would like to ask a question of the member. He gave us some information on the Nova Scotia Committee. Could he give the House the make-up of that committee? That is, who was on that committee? How many of them were members of the Legislature? And how many of them were members of the government party in that Legislature?

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, there were seven members of the Legislature formed that committee. One-quarter of the Liberal Members of the House were on that committee, that's one person.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I take it then that there were six government members and one opposition member on that committee. Is that correct?

MR. COWAN: The report was unanimous.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: I would like also to ask a question of the Member from Winnipeg Centre. I'd like to ask him if he has had any experience as a member of the Legislative Assembly sitting in the opposition.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. SCHREYER: Therefore, Madam Speaker, could I ask the member how he can speak with so much authority when he says the members can obtain redress of grievance. He doesn't know about opposition members acting up to

MR. COWAN: Well, they certainly, they can obtain redress of grievances many times, and if they can't, the person who is applying for redress can apply to someone else, and eventually if his case is justified, if his case is justified, I am sure that in most cases he will get justice done, and you can bring this up to the House, you can bring it before the House.

MR. PAULLEY:Madam Speaker, I'm not going to ask a question, but I do want to make a few comments in respect of the address of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. I'm most intrigued with the study that my honourable friend has given to this very important question. I suggest to him that there are only, as I listened to him, only two bodies that he didn't make reference to to whom an appeal might be made was the Courts of Appeal, the Courts of Queen's Bench, and the Supreme Court -- (Interjection) -- or the WCTU. He did have the AA's in there, I notice. He did have the Canadian Legion. I don't know if he had the Legion of Frontiersmen or the Commissionaires. My honourable friend pretty well covered the waterfront but I suggest to him that he didn't cover the basic points contained in the resolution that is before us this evening, and I certainly cannot accept and do not accept the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)...arguments of my honourable friend. He made reference to a committee that sat in Nova Scotia, comprised of Liberals and Conservatives. Liberals and Conservatives have brought in a report that's rejected the ombudsman. He chastised we in the New Democratic group because no New Democratic or CCF Government has introduced legislation to provide an officer, but I noted -- possibly it was because of the lack of knowledge -- but I did note that my honourable friend made no reference to the fact that a committee was set up in the Province of Saskatchewan at their session this year to investigate this matter in that province, which has been, is now, and will in the future be governed by a CCF Government. And I would suggest to my honourable friend that I am willing to make a little wager with him that there is great possibility that the committee will make a recommendation for such an officer of Saskatchewan and if the government is returned that such an officer will be set up. My honourable friend -- I believe it was the Minister of Agriculture -- said that such an officer will be needed. Well, Madam Speaker, I'm prepared to agree with my honourable friend providing the Government of Saskatchewan conducts itself in the same manner as the Government of Manitoba does at the present time. I certainly hope that they do not. The Member for Winnipeg Centre, when he was speaking a few moments ago, said that we have 57 ombudsmen here in the Province of Manitoba, the MLA's that can take up grievances in an effort to obtain redress insofar as their constituencies and their constituents are concerned, and then he said if one little Indian isn't enough get two little Indians, and if two aren't enough, well get three, and then if three little Indians or three little MLA's are not enough then go and see the chief or the leader of one of the parties and they'll look after you. I want to say to my honourable friend that I believe he's been living in the woods. My colleague from Brokenhead I think hit the nail on the head when he asked the honourable member opposite has he ever sat in opposition and attempted to obtain information. Of course he hasn't, and I'm sure Madam Speaker that if he had he would be taking a different viewpoint and a different attitude as to the need of someone who in the terms of the resolution had access to governmental and departmental files in order to obtain information.

I wonder if my honourable friend does not recall that already in this session the Honourable Minister of Public Works has refused information desired by members of Opposition insofar as traffic counts are concerned, and not only that, Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Public Works also admitted in this House that when an MLA -- and I presume this applies particularly to MLAs on this side of the House -- requested services or information from members of the staff of the Public Works, the request was rejected because the MLA hadn't written to him personally. I wonder if my honourable friend remembers that. I wonder if my honourable friend, the Member for Winnipeg Centre, who says that if we can't get this information -- and he was aided and abetted in this by the First Minister -- then we'll ask the question in the House, seeking the information. I need not say, Madam Speaker, that on numerous occasions, particularly since the present government took office in Manitoba, that information sought by members of opposition has been rejected by the government simply because of a whim on the part of government that in their opinion it was not desirable to reveal this information to the House. An ombudsman would have the rights to make these enquiries on behalf of an individual. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture has been asked for three consecutive sessions of this House to produce information for the Member for Brokenhead respecting a transaction of a few years ago, and he's still playing around with it, notwithstanding numerous.....

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville):if there were ten ombudsmen in Manitoba at the present time they couldn't have done more to find the information, and I object to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition implying that my department and myself have not attempted to find the information requested by the honourable member.

MR. PAULLEY: I simply said, Madam Speaker -- you know I wish I only had as many loud clappers on my side of the fence as there is opposite because I could make a lot of hollow noises as well as they. I did not say my honourable friend did not get it. I said that he had been trying for three years, or my friend and colleague had been trying for three years to obtain it, and I suggest that if we had an officer who could have had full access to the files, we might have known three years ago whether or not the information was available instead of continuously having to ask for it over this period of time.

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

This afternoon one of the members -- I believe it was the Member for Lac du Bonnet -- in an address on the question of the establishment of a sugar factory co-operatively operated, as proposed by my colleague from Inkster, made quite a speech. In the course of that speech he referred to the fact that he had obtained certain information from the Department of Co-operatives and proceeded in his speech to read out information. Now, it might be that this particular department would have made that information available to members of this side of the House as well, but Madam Speaker, if the same thing holds true in the Department of Agriculture as holds true in the Department of Public Works, as established by the Minister, I doubt very much whether we would have been able to get that information that was revealed here this afternoon, so I say to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that while his address was very attractive, gave evidence of depth of investigation in substance there was practically speaking nothing to warrant opposition to the resolution that has been proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I'm somewhat amazed, and on the other hand I'm somewhat delighted, to know that there is such a decisive and a definite definition between right and wrong as the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre wants us to believe. Because there were 14 stages of a study made in Nova Scotia is certainly no proof, and also because of the fact that in the last 155 years we have only had four countries supporting the principle of Public Protector is no argument why we should not have one in Manitoba. I am not interested in what goes on in Saskatchewan. I am not interested in what goes on in Nova Scotia, and I'm certainly not interested in what goes on in Ottawa, but I am interested in what goes on in Manitoba. This is my province, and I'm an elected representative in this House, and I am interested in Manitoba. Consequently, there are certain areas that do come up that have to be arbitrated, and I think that my honourable friend from Winnipeg Centre cannot deny this fact. As long as you have human nature, as long as you have the right and wrong, you have something in between which has to be arbitrated and this is where the public protector comes in.

To make light of the matter that it has been studied by other countries is of no consequence. An example -- and whether this is right or wrong I'm in no position to make that decision -- recently we've had a certain amount of disagreement and a matter of opinion on both sides of this House as to what was done in the Attorney-General's Department. Whether it was right or wrong, I again am in no position to make that decision, but I do think that a disinterested neutral party could have quite legitimately and quite honestly come up with an arbitration which could have served the purposes of both opposing parties, and that you cannot deny. That you cannot deny in the normal democratic way of our life. That you cannot deny on the very basic principle on which this very House is established. How can you say that because it's in effect in only four countries that this is not practical in Manitoba? I agree that no one individual should make the final decision, but I do believe that there are some injustices that are done through the method of the Civil Service and our government of the day, that we as MLAs would prefer not to pass judgment.

Who are we to sit in judgment of our fellow men? Am I a judge? Am I qualified to sit in judgment of my fellow men? I certainly am not. Many a time I see an individual come forth with a complaint that is a legitimate complaint, and I can see where he might have erred, where he might be at fault; but the better judgment in my own inside dictates to me that this man might have erred through no fault of his own, and I would prefer to leave it to the arbitrator, a public protector, to make that decision, rather than have me make the decision on my own.

It is true the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre said that there are stereotype examples and that the results of this study conducted by others -- why not a study conducted by us? Who are we to take the lead from others? Who are we to take the -- should we follow the principle of others? Let us decide on those bases which our own mind and our own heart are going to dictate to us, and only decide on that which is fair. It is not unlike the blind men that had their first encounter with the elephant, and I need not repeat this story to the House, but

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd) . . . you know what the results were. There were seven blind men and each one came up with a different verdict. Why? Because they could not see. And maybe at times when we get the legal interpretation of what is right and wrong, even these legal minds, these legal judges can still be blind; and let us admit this, because they have been in the past, they have been in the present, and they will be in the future, because this is human nature and let us not forget this. I do believe that a public protector has got a position in our democratic way of life. He has got a public function to perform which all the citizens of Manitoba can avail themselves of this service without having to run to their MLAs or to the leaders of the various political groups, because this certainly is not the proper way to do things, and I think that there are many people as your constituents, as my constituents, and as constituents of every 57 members in this House, that will not approach you with their troubles but will approach a public protector.

Madam Speaker, I only wish to say this: Justice can be done in this province. Justice can be administered in this province without having to go to the magistrate, or the judge, or whatever courts we may have in the province, where an individual can go and lay his complaint in the layman's language of everyday circumstances, and lay his complaint, whether it be in broken English, whether it be in improper grammar, but where somebody is going to recognize the honest feeling, the sincere effort of that individual that he has been wrongly worked against, or that he may have erred, that he can air his case and in that way have the privilege of being heard in such a way that if he has a legitimate complaint it can be taken further along the line of having to resolve that complaint, to rectify it and find out which is right and wrong. And I, for one, and I think that I could quite honestly speak for the majority of us in this House, that I would want to consider, and consider very very sincerely, whether I should sit in judgment of my fellowmen, and with that I am convinced, Madam Speaker, that we do need a public protector in the Province of Manitoba. There's a need for one. There's a place for one, and he can perform a proper function. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Madam Speaker, I had no intention of getting into this discussion but in view of everything that's been said, I feel that I ought to. I listened with a great deal of interest to the Member for Winnipeg Centre, and I compliment him for his efforts. Compliment him because he gave a great deal of thought. He covered the whole waterfront, as it were, in order to fully inform the House, as he saw it, the situation in other nations. I'm sure the Leader of the NDP Party when he was speaking in reply had his tongue in his cheek, as he often does. He couldn't think of anything to question the government on but traffic counts. It may be important insofar as what he had in mind, but it would seem to me that on such an important discussion of this kind that he might have touched on more important things insofar as it affects the public and the thinking that he had in mind.

Sitting in this House somewhat as a new member, and questions that have been asked of the front benches, questions that have been asked in writing of letters and that sort of thing that has gone on before in public business, it seems to me that the government has never refused to give anything that has been legitimate and right in the public interest, and I fail to see where they have any objection to what has gone on in my short sojourn in this House. It may be that I'm on the government side but personally I try to be level-headed about these things, and from what I have seen and noticed I don't think they've got a complaint in the world. Anything they've asked for they've been given within reason, and I'm sure that attitude will continue.

The Minister of Agriculture was taken to task, and whilst he can speak for himself without any words from me whatsoever, I think the Leader of the NDP was being somewhat critical in the attitude that he took. He knows perfectly well -- three years, he says, it's taken to get a reply. I don't know the subject he was talking on but it seems rather foreign to me that if it was in the public interest that they wouldn't have got it long before three years had expired.

The Member for Burrows has made a great issue. He said that why should he stand in judgment of his fellow man. He's not expected to stand in judgment but he is expected to be the protector of the people that send him here. He's interested in Manitoba -- we're all interested in Manitoba or we wouldn't be here. Many of us give of our time, our efforts, not necessarily our life's blood but I think we would if we had to, to protect that which is right for the people.

(Mr. Bilton, cont'd)... of Manitoba.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre has been condemned for bringing in the opinion on this subject that took place in Nova Scotia. There's nothing wrong with that as I see it. It came to his hand and he acquainted the House with it. Had he not done so I think then we should have complained. He didn't argue one way or the other. He just accepted the opinion that was given and as such he acquainted the House with it.

I need no protector for the people that I represent, Madam Speaker. I feel that I'm here as their protector. I'm here in their interests, and if I cannot take care of their interests, Madam Speaker, I should not be occupying the seat as I sit here, and therefore I will not vote for that resolution.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this particular time, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, in view of the previous resolution that we were just discussing by the Member for Brokenhead, and the fact that it covers reasonably the points that I have in mind, I will not proceed with this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave of the House to withdraw his resolution? Agreed.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, after the extremely high plane on which the preceding discussion has been carried on I feel almost embarrassed by proceeding to talk about such a mundane subject as "a wee bit o' money" and I take it that that's what is really involved in this resolution. However, it can never be said, I think, Madam Speaker, that I am insensible to the importance of even a small amount of money, even though it's a part of a very large budget. But I think I have a better reason than that for opposing the resolution of my honourable friend from Brokenhead, and that reason I can state very, very briefly. I know that at this time of the session a member does not increase his popularity by making long speeches, so I shall simply content myself with saying that I still hold to the view -- I think it is the correct view -- that regardless of the number of parties that may elect members to the House, there still is only one Official Opposition. That Official Opposition is the alternative government. Under our system, the British system, and I think the best democratic system that has yet been devised, this is the program that we carry on and I think it's the proper one. Now I am aware of the fact it has been stated by others who have spoken in this debate that there are in fact in this House honourable members who have secured election who do not support either of the traditional parties, and certainly they have the right to be here, having been elected by their constituents, and I'm not suggesting that either or both of those parties should join with either of the major parties. That's up to them. It's up to their constituents whether they send them here or not. But I still think, Madam Speaker, that the right method for us to continue here is to recognize only one Official Opposition. We could quote many authorities to support this point of view but I'm certainly not going to attempt to do that tonight, and I state my position very briefly that I'm not in favour of that part of the resolution.

But I've been tremendously interested in this resolution for another reason, because when I first looked at it, I read the first line: "Whereas our 'Rules of Procedure' of this Legislature" -- I should have said the first paragraph -- "give formal recognition to leaders of opposition parties in this Assembly." And here I would like to speak particularly to those members who sat upon our most recent Rules Revision Committee, because I looked at this paragraph and I said to myself, "That's not in our rules, is it?" and then I took a look at our rules and yes, here it was. And, Madam Speaker, I want to say to the honourable member that I think that rule is there by mistake -- this rule is here by mistake. I am convinced of that. We had a Rules Committee two or three years ago -- 1960 actually when the report was received. I'm positive that we did not change that rule. No, we did not -- (Interjection) -- you were on the committee but so was I and I don't know whether my honourable friend did or not but I kept the minutes of the committee; and I go back to the 1951 Rule Book, which was the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)...one we were working on at that time, and I find that Rule 33 in the 1951 Rule Book reads as follows: "No member excepting the Premier or the Leader of the Opposition Party or a Minister making out government order, or a member making a motion of no confidence in the government, or Minister replying thereto, etc." We did not have at that time the part that refers to the leaders of recognized groups in the House, and I ask the Chairman of that Committee who is the Honourable Minister without Portfolio, the former Attorney-General, or anyone else who was on the committee, to check the record as to what we did with that particular section, to refresh their memory, and I think you will find that this section got in here by mistake. How it would get in I have no explanation in the world, but I suggest that the check be made because it was not that way in 1951. I'm positive we did not reinstate the rule that had existed before.

Now this, of course, doesn't invalidate my honourable friend's suggestion because even if that rule by some error slipped into our Rule Book it doesn't invalidate my honourable friend's argument that the leaders of other groups or another group should receive some special remuneration, so I'm mentioning that as something that should be looked at to find out if my assessment of the situation is correct, if it's correct make an effort to change it, and then we go on from there. It just seems, Madam Speaker, that I am sort of fated to be talking about the rules here a lot of the time, and I'm always having to apologize for the fact that I do not wish to be technical about these matters and I confess that I had not noticed this rule in there until it was brought to my attention by the motion of the Honourable Member for Broken-head. But there it is. It's been changed, but I don't think we changed it in that committee.

Now, as the Honourable the First Minister mentioned when he spoke in this debate, it is rather interesting to notice the history of what has happened in this Chamber, and I could say in other Chambers so far as I know. Once again, I don't want to appear to be cynical about government but it is a matter of fact as far as I am concerned in my experience that the concession to recognize groups other than the Official Opposition has invariably been made when there was a minority government. You can take from that what you wish but that is my experience. This change was made in 1939 when there was a minority government. I don't quite -- honestly I don't know why it was delayed that long, because the minority government became a fact in 1936, and 1937 I suppose was the first session after the minority government. This didn't come in until 1939. The same thing is true at Ottawa; I believe that this has come in since there has been a minority government there. Now I think it is not a correct concession to make. It was made here in our time; it's been made in Ottawa. I don't think it is correct to make the concession either with regard to placing the leaders of other groups in the same position as the Leader of the Opposition in the order of precedence in speaking or in the length of speeches, or in the matter of an extra remuneration.

I wanted in this connection, as I've been very interested in the subject -- the subject of minority government -- to quote something that a recent author has said, dealing with the Government of Manitoba. This is a book fairly recently published by our own professor of the University of Manitoba, Murray Donnelly, now I believe Dean Donnelly, "The Government of Manitoba," and when I was reading this recently published book I was struck by the fact that he paid considerable attention to this fact of minority governments as they have existed in Manitoba, and Murray Donnelly has a sentence in here that I would like to correct just for the record. It's not of too much significance but I think it should be corrected some way because I'm sure he didn't intend any discourtesy to a former premier of this province, Mr. Bracken, but there seems to me to be an implied criticism here, whether it's intentional or not. Murray Donnelly, on page 64 of this book, is referring to the time that the Bracken Government came back in 1936 in a minority position, and he tells about the offer that was made at the time for coalition. He goes on to say on page 64: "The Conservatives declined the invitation and the seven CCF members refused to give the government any assurance of support in the House. Astonishingly enough, the five Social Credit members stepped into the breach and agreed to give their support. Their decision was promptly repudiated by the Manitoba Social Credit League. However the question was referred to Premier William Aberhart of Alberta who issued a statement saying that he "approved the Manitoba Social Credit members co-operating with the Bracken Government, especially in measures leading to monetary reform." Then this sentence: "Negotiations between Bracken and the Social Credit group were allowed to

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)...lapse when, through victories in both the deferred elections, the government obtained a majority of one." Because Mr. Donnelly has previously mentioned that there had been two deferred elections.

The suggestion in this book is that because the government of that day won the two deferred elections, that the negotiations with the five Social Credit members were allowed to lapse and that the government had a majority of one. This only goes to show how even the most careful of authors, writing completely objectively on a subject of this kind, can be led into error, and to me it implies a discourtesy to Mr. Bracken suggesting that he had been in some way attempting to get the support of the five Social Credit members as long as he needed them but as soon as he didn't need them that the negotiations were allowed to lapse. The fact is, Madam Speaker, that that government continued to be a minority government right up until 1940 when the coalition was actually effected, and through the whole time the five Social Credit members continued to support that government and their support was necessary. There was no time when it was not necessary, because at their greatest strength that government until coalition had only 25 members in a House of fifty-five. I mention that only to try and justify the position of Mr. Bracken if any justification is necessary, because I'm afraid there's an implied discourtesy there.

If my honourable friend, the Social Credit Party, were in the House at the moment I would say for his benefit that I thought they adopted a very wise course at that time and they certainly sustained the government of that time until coalition was effected in 1940. Incidentally, I would commend this book to honourable members, particularly the part of it -- I don't find all of it completely accurate, but one part I do find completely accurate and agree with very greatly, because the author goes out of his way to pay a compliment to the present Premier of the province in finding such a capable candidate as Dr. George Johnson in Gimli and says that he turned out to be an ornament to this House, and personally I'm sure we would all agree with that.

Now I take this time to mention the question of minority government, as Professor Donnelly does, because I hold the view that we can't blame the electorate for anything that they do. A minority government is placed in a difficult position about many things and I think that if you will search the records you will find that these encouragements, that I call concessions, have invariably been given when there has been a minority government, and while I don't want to appear to suggest any discourtesy, you usually find that once the majority position has been obtained that they disappear again, and this is what happened in Manitoba, both this section and the payment to other party leaders in the House in addition to the Official Opposition came in during the minority government time and the situation was changed once a majority government came in. I can't prophesy about what will happen in Ottawa but I would guess that perhaps the same thing would be done then. At any rate my submission, Madam Speaker, is that we do not change the system here. I think it is better to leave it this way and I perhaps would not have spoken in this debate at all but for the fact that in perusing my honourable friend's resolution I was struck by the fact that this section in some manner that I can't explain has crept into our Rule Book and I do want to give public notice of it and to ask the chairman of that committee, the Honourable Minister without Portfolio, to check the matter with whatever of his colleagues he cares to do, and I think he will find that we did not so recommend. If this is the case then I would suggest further that we should reconstitute a committee in order to once again review the situation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brandon. Agreed?

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

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside that whereas the Government of the Province of Manitoba is responsible through the Manitoba Hydro for the development and distribution of almost all electrical energy outside of the City of Winnipeg; and whereas the principle of rate equalization was fundamental to the carrying out of this responsibility; and whereas there are areas in Northern Manitoba namely The Pas, Cranberry Portage, Bakers Narrows, Churchill, Grand Rapids and Norway House where this principle is not being applied; Therefore be it resolved that this House request the government to equalize rates throughout Manitoba to provide these areas with the same rates as in the remainder of the province.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I think it is important to point out that when Manitoba Hydro undertook to service the majority of the Province of Manitoba this matter of the one rate outside the City of Winnipeg was a fundamental proposition at that time, so that today, someone who may happen to have a farm right next say to the Pine Falls development, or the Seven Sisters, pays exactly the same amount for the electricity he consumes as someone who has a farm at the very far end of the line, say at Mafeking or Birch River. There is one rate for all these areas for similar types of consumers. There is however, outside of this area served by shall we call it "Line Distribution" a few points presently served by mainly diesel operation, belonging now to the Manitoba Hydro, but where they have to pay a very substantial increase in rates, compared to those in the southern part of the province. I want in that regard Madam Speaker to refer to some of the presentations made by people in those areas -- and I'm quoting now from a presentation made by The Pas District Farmers Association in February of this year, and the speaker at that time says as follows: "I have here the Manitoba Hydro bill received by my neighbour for one month's service. The gross bill is \$61.77. This is a recent bill and I think the latest he has received. The total kilowatts consumed amount to 2,746." He then goes on to point out that this is a dairy farm, but by no means what would be termed a large dairy farm -- just an average sized dairy farm. Now, the bill then for this dairy farmer in The Pas area was \$61.77. The speaker goes on to say: "using the same number of kilowatts, under the Winnipeg area suburban residential rates the bill would be \$25.97. In southern Manitoba under the existing rural rate a total of \$28.76, which surely is too big a differential from our gross bill of \$61.77." Now he goes on to say that he is not using this as an exceptional case, but he feels and knows that there are many comparable cases in that whole area. So this would mean then Madam Speaker that in this particular case, a farmer in The Pas area would have to pay for this amount of consumption \$61.77, whereas a farmer just a few miles to the south in the Mafeking, Birch River, Swan River area served by the "Line System" would pay as little as \$28.76.

Similarly taking four other areas, and this is a presentation Madam Speaker by the Town of The Pas where they made a calculation on residential use of electricity and this is quoting from their presentation also on February 2, 1964. The speaker says: "The comparisons are based on the average consumption for the past 21 months of a good home in The Pas which uses all the modern electrical conveniences, consumption 857 kilowatt hours per month. I point out Madam Speaker this is over a 21-month period so it should represent a good averaging. It's not selecting a certain period either winter or summer, it's over the 21 month period. Now the rates as calculated here would indicate as follows, that using this amount of electricity in suburban residential lighting, that is in the Winnipeg area, the consumer would pay \$8.97. In the rural southern residential, that is outside of the City of Winnipeg, for the same consumption it would be \$11.76; and going on to The Pas, that particular area, rural northern the same bill would be \$19.03. Going on to Churchill the same bill would be \$23.10. In Cranberry Portage, Grand Rapids, and Norway House the same bill would be \$19.48. This is a variation of rates Madam Speaker. They did calculate at that time one further rate, that is for Flin Flon under the Northern Manitoba Power Commission rate which they calculate at \$16.55. Now I have to point out that since that time I understand effective on the 1st of March the Flin Flon rates have been reduced by the company down to the same level as the southern Manitoba rural rate. But there are the fluctuations Madam Speaker for the same amount of consumption. In Winnipeg

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) \$8.97; outside of Winnipeg in the area served by "line service" \$11.76; in The Pas \$19.03; Churchill \$23.10, and in the other three points Cranberry, Grand and Norway House \$19.48.

Now Madam Speaker, it seems to me that these people in the northern areas of the Province have a legitimate complaint and a legitimate request from the government when they ask for the equalization of rates. After all, they are living by and large in the area upon which we will depend for electrical production in the future. We are presently spending large sums at Grand Rapids for the development of electrical energy to service the Province of Manitoba as a whole. We are contemplating the development of the Nelson River. Again this will be done in large part by funds that will have to be raised by the people of Manitoba as a whole group and here we have these people sitting in the very area where this development is going on and paying a very substantial differential for their electrical power as compared to the remainder of the Province of Manitoba. Is it little wonder Madam Speaker, that they feel aggrieved and feel that the remainder of the province is not treating them fairly, because in all justice Madam Speaker, we cannot say surely that the cost of power to the hydro is the same delivered at Birch River as it is delivered let's say to a farm at Pine Falls.

There is an averaging that goes on as it is, within the province when we accept to serve all of the southern part of the province, all the area served by line on an even and averaged out basis, we are quite obviously charging less to the individuals at the far end of the line and we are charging more to those close to the source of production. So if we carry that principle through Madam Speaker, I think it's absolutely fair to average it throughout the province in those areas where the Manitoba Hydro has accepted the responsibility for service.

If the Manitoba Hydro of course is not responsible for the service then we cannot insist upon an equalization. Now obviously the reply I would expect from the government will be, well this would cost more money. Madam Speaker, I hasten to point out that this will make very little difference to the rates in the Province of Manitoba and I would refer the House to page 9 of the latest annual report, the 12th annual report of the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board. If you look at that page Madam Speaker, it gives the details of power generated and purchased by the Hydro Electric Board and it shows that the total amount of energy generated and purchased by the Hydro Electric Board in the year 1961-62 was 4,221 million kilowatt hours. The total production of the northern plants at that time, that is The Pas diesel units, the Churchill diesel, the Cranberry Portage diesel and the Grand Rapids diesel, which are the only ones listed for that year, their total production was 17 million kilowatt hours. In other words, less than one-half of one percent, 17 million kilowatts compared to 4,221 million kilowatts, less than one-half of one percent. The following year 1962-63 there has been an addition because Bakers Narrows then became serviced by diesel and they produced a bit more and also the substantial increase in production by diesel at Grand Rapids. So the proportion of northern power then does increase very slightly to exactly one-half of one percent. But again we must remember here that Grand Rapids diesel accounts for one-quarter of this total production and that as soon as that power development is in production, I understand that the diesel will no longer be used in that area, so that the total northern requirement by diesel will drop once again. So we are dealing Madam Speaker really with a very small amount of electrical production as compared to the total produced by the Hydro.

It seems to me that applying the principle that we have used in the remainder of Manitoba, remembering that as it is the people in northern Manitoba have additional costs of many kinds, costs of transportation, costs of food, the total cost of living is already higher than our own, we are going to depend upon their area for future production of power, I think it is eminently fair that they should be established on an equalized rate with the balance of the Province of Manitoba and that this can be done quite within the financial resources of the Hydro system as it is now, with no increase in rate necessary in the balance of the province, because in the final analysis this represents such an infinitesimal part of the total production.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): The principle of rate equalization is rather complex and I do not intend to get involved in it this evening, but I would rather limit my discussion on the more specific areas brought up in the resolution by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and those are the areas mentioned in the

(Mr. Steinkopf cont'd) resolution, namely, The Pas, Cranberry Portage, Bakers Narrows, Churchill, Grand Rapids and Norway House. These areas in northern Manitoba are now receiving their power by the diesel system and it is suggested that they receive the same rate as the remainder of the province. In other words, the same rate for diesel power as for the mine power.

At the moment the service to Churchill is being supplied in co-operation with the Federal Government, and at Cranberry Portage the service has just been taken over from the Federal Government by the Manitoba Hydro. In The Pas the rate has been reduced by about one-quarter and the bills that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition just referred to would now be reduced by approximately 25 percent. In other words, the case of the dairy farmer who paid a bill of \$61.77 recently would probably now be paying approximately \$46.00 for the same amount.

The matter of the equalization of rates is something of course that everyone is very sympathetic towards and the matter is receiving a lot of consideration from the Manitoba Hydro and at the moment they have a team up in the north making a survey of these particular areas and also the possibility of putting diesel equipment in some of the more remote areas being equipment that they recently purchased from the Federal Government, taken from the Dew Line, the mid-continent line. As the Honourable Leader of the Opposition stated the dieselization at Grand Rapids will be eliminated as soon as the power is turned on at Grand Rapids which we hope will be this fall and therefore the rate should be the same as it is in the southern areas, so that problem will be eliminated at that time.

I would think that it was a matter of time that the whole problem in the north will be rectified. It will be interesting to note that the total revenue that the Hydro receive from an area like The Pas which is the largest was approximately \$200,000 last year on which they lost the sum of \$75,000.00. It is possible that the loss this year if the consumption remains the same, will probably run around \$125,000 on a \$200,000 income, so there isn't really much involved and I must agree with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that it doesn't seem that we are talking about very much in all of these six areas that have been singled out, but again it is a matter of good business and economics and the Hydro being set up as it is, it is a matter of their judgment as to what the rates will be and how much subsidy they feel they should take. Therefore Madam Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the proposed resolution be amended by deleting the present resolution and adding the following: Whereas the Government of the Province of Manitoba is responsible through Manitoba Hydro for the development and distribution of electrical energy in the greater part of Manitoba outside of the City of Winnipeg; and whereas certain communities in the province are supplied with electrical service by Manitoba Hydro on isolated systems through local generation of power, such power not being otherwise available due to the separation of such communities from the main power utility network; and whereas rates charged for services supplied from local isolated systems are due to the economic factors involved, higher than those charged for comparable services in communities where lower cost power is available through the main power utility network; therefore be it resolved that this House request the government through its appropriate agencies to continue the policy of reducing such differentials as exist between the charges applicable to services supplied from isolated systems and the charges applicable to essentially similar services supplied from the main power network and in so doing to give appropriate consideration to the importance of maintaining favorable rates for all classes of services in all parts of the province as well as to the element of subsidy involved when any services are supplied below cost.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Did I hear dissent? Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question has not been put. The Honourable Member for Burrows:

MR. SMERCHANSKI: I only will take about five minutes of the time of this House, Madam Speaker. I would like to make this observation and urge the government that this is the only public utility that we have in the Province of Manitoba. Therefore why should isolated areas pay a premium for power? It is not enough to have the Honourable Minister of Public

(Mr. Smerchanski cont'd) Utilities make the statement that this government should continue to reduce and consider favorable power to the isolated areas. I think that the policy that this Government should adopt is one of the equalization because the amount of power that is consumed in these isolated areas is very very small compared to the total amount of power consumed in the province and the government is engaged in a public utility that nobody else is permitted to compete against the government. Therefore it should be recognized that these people living in isolated areas are being penalized not only by virtue of the power source, but by other means, such as transportation and living in isolated areas. They should have equalized power rates. You must also realize and I don't think that the average member in this House realizes this -- that places like Norway House, Bakers Narrows, The Pas, those people who work in the isolated areas of our northern sections of Manitoba look upon these areas as being civilized areas. In other words this is the contact, this is the hop off spot that we use in order to go into the isolated areas of northern Manitoba, so how can this government on the one hand say that we must develop the isolated areas of Manitoba, such as Island Lake, Gods Lake, Fox River, Red Sucker Lake and the Cobham. When we use Norway House and Bakers Narrows and The Pas, as our basis of operation why should we, who are pioneers in the development of these isolated areas, pay a premium for power in this area? I think that as mentioned by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party, this is an insignificant amount of cost for power for the province. Surely this government if it's looking forward to the development of our northern resources; to the helping and development of our Indian population in these areas, that we can dispense with that small infinitesimal differential in the cost of power. Surely we can give these people an equalized cost on power. I know the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities made a remark that there was \$75,000 of a loss last year; this year it might be \$125,000.00. But I'd like to bring to the attention of this House, Madam Speaker, that there are many small little aircraft operations out of The Pas, out of Bakers Narrows, out of Norway House that fly into Oxford Lake, into Red Sucker Lake, into the Beaver House Lake and these are contacts with civilization that the people in these isolated areas look upon as civilization, so why not subsidize these areas? It's not a large subsidy and these people in isolated areas honestly and truly sacrifice far more than just the cost of power and I think that this government should consider most seriously. When we hear the estimates brought down in the various departments of how anxious this government, how anxious we are in this House to help the Indians, help the isolated areas of northern Manitoba, I think that it is most unfair to the residents of the Berens River area, Norway House area, Bakers Narrows, The Pas and these other areas, like Ilford; and these other areas along the Hudsons Bay Railroad, and I think, as my honourable friend from Rupertsland will agree with me, that these people give a sufficient amount of sacrifice in their own setup that they permit themselves to live in these isolated areas, surely, surely the government could go to task and at least give them the equalized power rates that are prevalent across all of Manitoba, simply for the reason that there is only one agency and that is the Manitoba Hydro Commission and they should give them this support and that much more confidence in their own reason why they should live in these isolated areas. Thank you Madam Speaker.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, I really hadn't planned to speak in this debate but after hearing the remarks of the last speaker, I just can't contain myself, because before this government was elected, the former government didn't even know northern Manitoba existed. They didn't even know that there was a demand or a need for power in northern Manitoba and I know, because I lived there. And I know the difficulty that the people of The Pas had in even getting the former government to agree to take over their old worn out utility at that time, and I recall what they said, when we said, "Well what about the rate?" Because the people in The Pas were concerned about rates at that time and the rates were 12 cents, and they were 8 cents, and they were 4 cents, and the government, what did they say at that time? They said, "The same rates will prevail. We can give no assurance that there will be a reduction of rates when we take over this power utility." Well I must confess they made the gesture towards the Town of The Pas, but I'll say this, that there has been an extension of power, at least one new community a year ever since this government came into office, in Northern Manitoba and I think this is a great credit to the government that sits on this side of the House, because for the first time the people in Northern Manitoba know that

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) there is somebody thinking about the power needs of Northern Manitoba and we carried that forward into our thinking and philosophy with respect to the development of Hydro facilities because we know the feeling and the thinking of the people on that side of the House. When it came to trying to develop the northern rivers so that they could provide not only cheaper power for the people of the south but also to provide for the possible development of our large power-consuming industries in Northern Manitoba, I think the resolution as proposed by the present Minister is a very worthy one, aiming at the gradual reduction of rates towards equalization, and we're working too towards an amalgamation, an integration of hydro power between the north and the south, and this is indeed the long-range aim of this government and we certainly hope to see the day when it comes about. But certainly the last speaker could not have been travelling and working in Northern Manitoba prior to 1958 and still support that government. He seems to have just discovered that there's a need for power in Northern Manitoba. Has he not been aware of the steps that have been taken in recent years in power development in the north? He obviously hasn't. He doesn't know, for instance, that there are new private power utilities being opened up in some areas of the north. --(interjection) -- Pardon -- (interjection) --

The people on that side of the House have little concern for power consumers in Northern Manitoba, and I think the amendment to the resolution that's before the House now is a very good one and worthy of the support of all members of the House.

A MEMBER: Madam Speaker, on a matter of privilege, I wonder if the Honourable Member for Burrows would entertain a question?

MR. MOLGAT: He speaks of the steps taken by this government to supply power to the north. Could he indicate to me exactly what steps have been taken; what specific areas?

MR. CARROLL: Well, if my friend would just look at the resolution that he has proposed he'll see that those are the areas in which power has been taken to Northern Manitoba since this government has taken over. I think in the introduction of the amendment to this resolution there was some suggestion made that a substantial number of additional units were purchased from the Canada Line. I'm not in the position to know what the ultimate use of those facilities will be but I will say this that there is greater interest and concern in taking power to Northern Manitoba today than ever before in the history of this province.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if I just might get my honourable friend to answer specifically. He said that this government has taken a number of specific steps to service other areas. Now could he answer me this? Did this government take the steps to supply The Pas? Did this government take the steps to supply Cranberry Portage? Was this not in conjunction with the Federal Government? Did this government not take -- (interjection) -- well, my honourable friend made a specific statement which he's not prepared to back up.

MR. CARROLL: I understood it. Yes, I'll say this. Your government, the former government, made the gesture towards The Pas. They made the gesture. We've been talking about rates in this resolution. There was no commitment made at that time about the reduction of rates. When the power was taken in it was reduced by 50 percent. All right, Cranberry Portage, this government did take the steps. --(interjection) -- No, they didn't. This government took the steps. Well, you asked if this government had taken the steps. I'm telling you that this government did take the steps. We raised the question with the federal government. We were the ones who took the initiative and I know because I happened to have some responsibility for power at that particular time. We certainly took the steps with respect to Churchill. I was involved in the negotiations with Churchill at that time that provided an additional unit to the large power generating plant in Churchill which ultimately supplied the Town of Churchill. -- (interjection) -- We purchased the unit placed in their plant, made the arrangement. We're the ones that took the initiative. Oh, yes, oh yes. We're the ones that took the initiative with respect to Norway House. In fact I would like to say that the Member for Churchill, the Federal Member for Churchill and myself, together with others, had some thoughts about developing power generation facilities jointly with the Government of Canada. This is answering the question. This is answering the question. This was the policy that we implemented and we said this: Wherever the federal government, wherever the federal government have ideas of establishing a hospital or a large school that requires power, then we will enter into negotiations with them to try to persuade them to provide a unit larger than is necessary for their own

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) needs so that we can distribute power from that unit to supply the community. This is the policy that was developed. These are the steps that have been taken and the first step, the first concrete evidence of any interest in power in Northern Manitoba, in spite of the fact that the Member for Burrows has been travelling that country for many years and hasn't seen the difference that has taken place in the last four or five years.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I'd like to answer the Honourable Minister on a matter of privilege.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order, please.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: I'm asking for privilege, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order, please.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: On a matter of privilege I'm not permitted to make a reply?

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to clarify, I would like to have a clarification put on the record of the resolution received. I don't believe the wording at the first is correct, I think that the wording here should be that the proposed resolution be amended by deleting all the words after the "of" in the second line of the first paragraph and that the following words be substituted therefor: "electrical" and going on with your resolution -- "electrical energy in the greater part of Manitoba outside the City of Winnipeg" and the balance of the resolution should be added.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. Should not the amendment be ruled out of order on that account?

MADAM SPEAKER: The resolution is in order. I didn't read it when it came in. I apologize to the House for that. I would like to have it corrected so that it appears correct on the Votes and Proceedings.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: permitted to say as a matter of privilege in order to answer the Honourable Minister on his accusations which are wrong.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order. Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I presume the question is whether the debate's to be adjourned by myself.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside -- am I right? -- that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, Whereas south eastern Manitoba offers great tourist attraction potential; and whereas Manitoba statistics indicate ever-increasing United States and local tourist travel; and whereas more recreational facilities in Manitoba are desirable; and whereas the State of Minnesota has agreed to share 50/50 in the construction of the Mississippi River Parkway in Manitoba as far as the North West Angle Inlet; and whereas this government should take full advantage of this offer; therefore be it resolved that the Government consider the advisability of: (a) Taking whatever steps are necessary so that Manitoba will be ready to make an early start on this project as soon as Minnesota is ready to proceed. (b) Approaching the Governments of Canada, of the Province of Ontario, and of the State of Minnesota, in order to establish an Interprovincial-International Park in the vicinity of the Mississippi River Parkway as a Centennial Project.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, we all know that the mode of travel has changed greatly in the last few years. Motorized America, including Manitoba, now travels quite differently from pioneer America. Once men, our pioneers, searched for tributary river mouths to use as highways of transportation. Today men envision great highways; they plan them and foresee their completion. The vision of a great highway, the Mississippi River Parkway originated with the people in Minnesota, in the Mississippi River valley in the United States -- that's over 30 years ago -- and has since become not just a vision, a great vision, but a great highway extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the boundary of Canada through its connecting roads. Now this is a great scenic highway of exceeding attraction to the tourists of United States and also of

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) Canada. Our objective, therefore, should be to attract these tourists to visit the recreational resorts present and yet undeveloped south eastern Manitoba and this I'll deal with later.

Manitoba statistics, as presented to us here, indicate that tourist travel in the province is increasing every year, and that is as it should be. Where do these tourists come from? Most of them come from eastern United States and Eastern Canada because that's where the population is. Over 80 percent of the people of United States and Canada live east of a line drawn north-south through the centre of Winnipeg and we know from statistics that the number of tourists admitted yearly into Manitoba through Emerson is less than those admitted through Fort Frances in the same period in Ontario and I'm convinced that with proper roads, more and better facilities, our tourist travel would increase tremendously, for the benefit not only for southeastern Manitoba but for the city of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba as a whole and also for the benefit of Canada. Not only is it desirable to extend our recreational areas to attract these foreign tourists, or tourists from across the line, but it is also desirable for us to do so for the benefit of the people of Manitoba and one just has to visit some of the summer resorts in the Province of Manitoba on a hot summer's day to become convinced of what I am saying.

Now the Mississippi River Parkway, if and when completed, past the North West Angle to Falcon Beach would offer Manitoba the only big chance to draw any large new revenue from tourists. Our good neighbors to the south have been very fair in negotiating with Manitoba about this parkway. Now as I speak on about this, I would like to ask the pages to distribute some maps that I have here. It will be easier for the members to follow what I have to say. We have several maps of the area concerned. They come from Warroad -- Warroad, Minnesota -- some larger maps than that here in Manitoba, but these are quite compact. And I would also like the members to use their own Manitoba maps in conjunction with this to see the different connection and to more fully understand what I am proposing in this resolution. It is Manitoba's very good fortune that adjoining the south-eastern corner of our province, the North West Angle of Minnesota is one of the greatest undeveloped tourist attractions in North America that Canada shares with the United States. Many people in the United States and many more in Canada, and I would hazard a guess that quite a number of members presently sitting in this House, do not know that a part of the State of Minnesota lies about thirty miles by land north of the Canadian border along the eastern boundary of Manitoba. You'll notice that on the map. This part is known as the North West Angle. This juts out into the Lake of the Woods, and I am not qualified to say who made the mistake or whether it was a mistake, whether it was the politicians or the engineers who made the mistake, but there it is. Part of Minnesota has an elbow between the two provinces, Province of Manitoba and Ontario, and the only access by land to this angle is through Manitoba. This is the main reason that the people across the border wish to share in their expansion of construction of the Mississippi River Parkway in Manitoba. I believe that their estimated cost is in the neighborhood of \$3 million and this, the two, the State of Minnesota and Manitoba, have agreed to share fifty-fifty. This is the offer that I refer to in my resolution. The government, I say, should take full advantage of this offer as soon as the State of Minnesota is ready to proceed. Manitoba should be ready to do its job. There has been enough delay in this project. We know that this has been started many years ago, and I am not going to blame this government, or the previous government in this matter. I am not interested in the political aspect of it. I am convinced that this development is in the best interests of Manitoba and Canada, and that's why I brought this resolution in, and can only hope that I may convince the members of the Legislature, and I also hope that I may convince the Cabinet.

Now what about some of these delays? I mentioned that this was considered many, many years ago. Well, we could go back to the same problem that lies in the south eastern corner of Manitoba in everything, construction of roads, and any kind of development, and it is the problem of slow progress in development here in eastern Manitoba, especially Emerson constituency, and this dates back way prior to 1950. Why? Because the government of those days and even to a great extent the present government, fail, they have failed and do fail even now to recognize and accept the fact that south eastern Manitoba has a great deal to offer to the rest of Manitoba. There is always that skepticism towards the potential of this area, and as I have mentioned before, there is a great potential. In the west, along the Red River, which I consider

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) . . . south eastern Manitoba as well, has got the great grain farming areas in the Red River. The central part, the cattle industry. Now the eastern part is a mixed farming area and timber, also tourist attraction. I've mentioned that before, the value of the agricultural land in south eastern Manitoba, the extreme south eastern Manitoba, and when they talk of yields, yields in flax -- they talk in terms of twenty bushels or over; they are not happy unless they have twenty -- the yield is twenty bushels -- they talk in yields of oats, hundred bushels and over, and wheat -- they are not satisfied unless they get fifty bushels or over. That's in the extreme south eastern around Sprague and Middlebro. We know that even -- now here are some of the reasons for the delays and I must say that I am not blaming the government, but I would like to enumerate the delays and also enumerate the steps that we have gone through to make as much progress as we presently have.

We know that even if one member of the cabinet is not convinced of the desirability of a certain undertaking by the government, then it can be that the Premier may delay action for a certain time, and this applies to south eastern Manitoba. Quite a few people did not think that south eastern Manitoba had any potential and was of any value, and that has lasted for many years. We also know that changes in administration in both Manitoba and Minnesota resulted in a need to start negotiations and to start establishing the advisability or the desirability of the project all over again, and this did happen in Manitoba and it did happen in Minnesota.

In 1954, the first official report was made to Manitoba regarding the parkway, and no action was taken until 1955. In 1955, the then Premier, Premier Campbell, gave very enthusiastic response to this proposal. That's after tours have been taken by Cabinet and they've seen the potential, and they saw how these people in south eastern Manitoba did things for themselves, how they built their roads out of corduroy, how they went and hacked their way through the forest just to be able to get out, and the officials at that time realized that these people were working for a cause, and they were being recognized.

Now in 1956 some survey was made of the area, that area under consideration. Now I would like to read -- I mentioned before that Premier Campbell in 1955 gave enthusiastic response to this proposal, and I have a book here, Mississippi River Parkway Planning Commission, Illinois, and on page 25, I'll just read two paragraphs: "We are very pleased that the federal government" -- this is a quote from Mr. Campbell at this meeting. I'll read it again. "We are very pleased that the federal government, the states and the provinces of Canada have been incorporated into the Parkway program, and I want to thank Governor Freeman and his engineering staff for the co-operation received. It couldn't have been better. Minnesota has become a great neighbor and chief sponsor of the parkway, so I can't speak too highly of the fine co-operation. There is about sixty miles from the boundary to the Trans Canada highway. Some ground and aerial surveys have been made and there will be further mapping done this fall. We fully expect to begin construction during this coming year."

Now in the fall of 1957 -- I mentioned in 1956 there was some survey made. In the fall of 1957 Mr. Armour McKay who is considered the founder of Eastern Manitoba Development Board, acting under the direct personal authority of Premier Campbell, discovered the possibility that Minnesota may share cost of construction of the Mississippi River Parkway on a 50/50 basis, and I think I have a clipping here, Winnipeg Tribune, September 27th, 1957. I think there is another one -- I have the wrong one here. "Minnesota offers split road cost. Minnesota is willing to share cost of building of a highway in Manitoba, possibly on a 50/50 basis, leading from the Canadian border to the North West Angle, Premier D. L. Campbell told the Legislature Tuesday. The North West Angle, most northerly part of continental United States, is an elbow of land jutting into the Lake of the Woods from the southeast corner of the Manitoba-Ontario boundary. At the moment there is no road leading into it at all, either from Canada or the United States. To enable traffic from the United States to reach the Angle, United States authorities have proposed expanding the Mississippi Parkway which starts at New Orleans north of the Canadian border. Discussions have been held by Minnesota and Manitoba engineers as Premier Campbell reported, and they have decided construction of an extended highway in the area was both feasible and desirable." And then further on he goes on to say that Minnesota is willing to share 50/50.

The same year, that is in 1957, Mr. McKay negotiated this agreement with Minnesota on behalf of Premier Campbell of Manitoba. Mr. Campbell was quick to see a saving for

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) Manitoba of at least a million dollars at the time. I would like you to check the map, the area that is being considered. In February, 1958, a letter re this agreement was tabled in the Manitoba Legislature, and I have also from the Tribune, March 5th, 1958, "Mr. Campbell released a letter from Orville Freeman, Governor of Minnesota, dated February 27th, which stated an understanding that this highway will be extended to meet with the Trans Canada Highway, thus opening the Parkway loop around the Lake of the Woods because it has been proposed that this Mississippi Parkway would branch and one loop would go around the eastern part, east to Kenora, east of the Lake of the Woods, and the other loop on the other side; therefore making a complete loop around."

In February, 1958, that's the one I read -- the same year, engineers from both sides agreed on location, specifications and estimates. In 1958 -- that's where I come that there was some delay and I'm not blaming anybody now either -- in 1958, new administration in Manitoba took over, and again some Ministers were skeptical about the potential of south eastern Manitoba, although the then Minister, Minister of Public Works, the Honourable Erick Willis, was himself very enthusiastic about this Parkway, but evidently he had to start convincing his colleagues all over again. In the summer of 1958, the interim Legislative Commission of Minnesota approved the agreement in principle. This went through various stages until in September President Eisenhower signed the enabling Act. That was in September of the same year. From here on, there was some delay by both governments, from both sides of the boundary, and whether these delays were justified or not, I am not prepared at this time to argue. But I can say that Manitoba signed this agreement in February, and I think the present Minister will verify that it was sometime in February I believe -- if I'm not right I may be corrected -- of 1962. It was necessary for Minnesota to submit this proposal to Congress for approval and appropriations after this agreement was signed, it was necessary for Minnesota to do it. Now this bill was introduced by Senator Humphreys on February 19 of this year, 1964 -- introduced in Washington -- and we expect the bill to be passed soon, if it has not already been passed. I am not aware of that. When it is passed Manitoba is then free to proceed with this great project. That is why I say that it is imperative that Manitoba be ready to do its share as far as this great highway is concerned.

Now the (b) part of my resolution here deals with establishing parks. I will be very brief on that. If you look at the map you'll notice that the Lake of the Woods extends into Manitoba. Buffalo Bay could be developed into a very beautiful summer resort. To people who have travelled to Buffalo Bay it's a natural as a summer resort, very beautiful land. Birch Point and Moose Lake are already either fully or partially developed, therefore this could be included in an International-Interprovincial park and if an International-Interprovincial park was agreed upon this development could extend along the lake, along the Manitoba boundary as far as one desires, all the way probably to the Hudsons Bay, if necessary -- I'm not proposing this be at this time. The North West Angle would form the International part of this park, the American side. The area between the Lake of the Woods, the Shoal Lake and farther north would form Ontario's part of the said project. Now, the North West Angle, and the Lake of the Woods together have unique romantic appeal all over the North American continent. It is historical. It also has this very great historical significance. From their base at Fort St. Charles La Verendrye and his sons were the first white men to travel by water and by land to find their way west to the Red and Assiniboine and the Saskatchewan rivers. It has historical significance.

It would be in the interests of Manitoba to develop her full share of her greatest opportunity in tourist industry for this province; part of the greatest magnet for tourists that exists near the centre of the North American Continent and an international park in this area will have rare continent-wide interest. I believe this would be an appropriate Centennial project.

MR. Fred T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and in the absence of the Member for Assiniboia, that whereas the use

(Mr. Smerchanski cont'd)of salt on roads is known to have a corrosive effect on cars, concrete and clothing, and whereas the full effect and the extent of damage caused by salt is not known, therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba be requested to conduct a thorough study on the corrosive effects of salt, either on its own or in co-operation with municipal authorities, and be it further resolved that the Government contact other provinces that have used salt on their roads to find out what the experience of those provinces has been.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to refer members -- no motion can be moved except by the person in whose name it stands and I believe it's Beausnesne, No. 188.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, might I draw to your attention the matter of the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Johnston which stood in the name of Mr. Shewman earlier in the afternoon, and the Honourable Member for Springfield spoke in reference to it by leave of the House?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the Member for Assiniboia who originally put this resolution in is ill and may not be back in the House for several days. We don't know. He has been ill since last week so we have no means of knowing when he will be back and this is the problem we find ourselves in with this resolution which we would like to proceed.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think that the point that you take is well taken and I don't think it is in order for the honourable gentleman to move it unless by leave, but as far as we're concerned, we would certainly be prepared to grant leave, allow him to move the resolution and if he wishes to speak to it, go ahead. So I think your point is well taken but we're prepared to give leave.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I was going to stand to say exactly the same thing. I'm pretty sure that you are correct but as far as we're concerned we would grant leave to the honourable member to introduce the resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave to proceed with the motion? Agreed. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
Madam Speaker presented the motion.

..... continued on next page

MR. SMERCHANSKI: I see, Madam Speaker, I have had two strikes against me and one Madam Speaker, I would like to speak in reference to the corrosive condition of salt that is used on our streets and highways in Metropolitan Winnipeg as well as in the province. Most of the salt that is being used on the streets of Winnipeg is a combination of what we know as normal salt, which is common table salt, being sodium chloride, together with a mixture of calcium chloride which unfortunately when you have these two salts placed together do create a very corrosive reaction on the underbodies of cars. I think that research will show that if these salts are used individually and not as a mixture that you do not encounter the same corrosive action on your cars. In other words, the combination of both these salts has a catalytic reaction which hastens the deterioration of the underside of your cars. On the one hand we seem to be very much concerned and preach about the safety and hazards of the condition of the cars in reference to our traffic regulations and traffic on our roads, and on the other hand we unknowingly contribute and hasten the rusting away or deterioration of our cars. I would like to also draw to the attention of this House that it is not uncommon that your headlights of your car will fall off, or your bumpers or fenders will rust away in a matter of 18 months as against a normal deterioration factor of some six to seven years. In other words, the corrosive use of salt does hasten deterioration of your cars by some 400 to 500 percent and I think that if research is instituted -- which the Metropolitan Government has been rather hesitant in recommending -- I think that you will find, Madam Speaker, without any question, that this is the exact condition.

Another thing that does do harm to our traffic in winter is that because of our high snowfall, and because of our low temperature, the use of sodium chloride and calcium chloride has a tendency to create a greasy or a fluffy condition in the snow, and you will have noticed that whenever you have a large snowfall and by using the salt alone, you create a rather hazardous slippery condition and this is completely contrary to what we have experienced on the streets when we're driving when there is very little snow and we're encountering something more like icy conditions. Therefore it's important to be able to analyze and realize that you have got heavy snow conditions with the application of salt versus the very slippery surfaces that you encounter on asphalt and the application of salt. I feel that cities like St. Catharines and London in the southern part of Ontario find that the use of a mixture of salt is very desirable. But I do think that in Winnipeg it is far more desirable to use hot sand because this creates proper traction, this ties into your asphalt surface very effectively without having to use the beneficial results of salt, and I would like to go on record here that once the research is completed you will find without a doubt that salt is not the answer to slippery conditions but that hot sand is. And this, Madam Speaker, is a far less costly method of application, a far more practical method of application instead of using salt. I think that it's possible the lazy man's way out of a dilemma, or a lazy man's way out of a serious situation where you start to use salt.

To add to this, your calcium chloride has a tendency to want to absorb moisture. It will dissolve itself into moisture that it will absorb either from the atmosphere -- if I were to take some calcium chloride and put it on a little dish in front of you, in about 30 minutes you would find that calcium salt dissolving itself completely in the moisture that it will attract from the atmosphere -- and this is the same condition why calcium chloride is used on the streets. It has a tendency to melt the ice, absorb the water from the ice, and leave what is considered to be a relatively dry surface for proper traction. But if you took hot sand -- and if you recall in the earlier days on the streets of Winnipeg we used nothing else but hot sand -- you will find that the hot sand adheres to the frozen surface just as effectively, and just as well, and it provides a natural traction and I think in my opinion you will find that the braking capacity of the hot sand on a slippery surface is far more effective than using calcium chloride. And what have you achieved? You have achieved the effect that you do not get the corrosive deterioration action on your cars and I think that everyone of you who has bought a car in the last six months or eight months, next time you wash your car or have your car washed, you go around the front end of the bumper and you're going to find that every little bit of your chrome on that bumper is pitted and you will notice small little rusty spots. You will notice around the fenders, around your wheels, that where the paint is off of it, it's also pitted and rusted, and this is due to the corrosive action of your sodium chloride and calcium chloride mixture, because inasmuch

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd)... as calcium chloride will absorb moisture from the outside and dissolve itself completely by adding sodium chloride, or common salt, the principle applied is that it should not dissolve itself as quickly in the free atmosphere and therefore be more effective over a longer period of time, but by the same token, you are creating -- by doing this very same thing you are also creating an extremely corrosive action, because the sodium chloride, the chlorine part of the sodium chloride has a most corrosive action on any part of metal, and you need only take and mix up an ordinary solution of calcium chloride and sodium chloride and put in a little bit of iron steel into it, and within 24 hours you will find that this piece of steel is completely corroded, and we don't need any research, we don't need any detailed studies on this. Try this yourself. This is a simple straightforward chemical reaction, and this has a very corrosive action on the underside of all our cars.

There is one other thing, Madam Speaker, that I think can be suggested and I think this -- there is a matter of urea. Urea happens to be a compound of ammonia that has not got that same corrosive action that potassium, calcium and sodium chloride have, and I was literally surprised to find that certain people in authority in our Metropolitan Municipal Government came out with a statement and made the statement that the urea salts are something in the vicinity of three or four hundred dollars per ton. I would like to go on record that I will be glad to sell them urea at something like \$90.00 a ton and still be able to contribute quite effectively to a source of supply that is far more beneficial than calcium chloride and far more effective. Therefore there are other alternatives, and I think that with the proper mixture of hot sand, and with the proper addition of urea which is a common known chemical which does not deteriorate the underpart of our cars, that a combination of both could be used satisfactorily on our streets, and with this, I'm just sorry that the Honourable Member for Elmwood is not in here, that possibly the bluffing member for Burrows at times might have something factual to present, which are possibly a little bit more in keeping than the remarks on the meat packing plant or some of the remarks that were made in reference to sulphuric fumes and sulphur fumes when they themselves don't know exactly what they mean, because they are a little bit befuddled themselves. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. WRIGHT:to speak on this subject, and after hearing the honourable member, I'm wondering why the resolution was proposed, because apparently he has all the answers. He admits that salt, as we already know, is a corrosive -- I knew that a long, long time ago. I don't profess to have the answers, Madam Speaker. I don't profess to have the answers, but I do have some experience in public works and I do have a tremendous admiration for some of our officials. I think that the City of Winnipeg has one of the most dedicated public servants in the person of our Director of Metro Streets and Traffic, Mr. McDonald, and I think that if all these things were so simple that these men would certainly have found the solution long ago, and my experience in public works, having been in charge of a department for a few years, is, did you ever try to sprinkle sand at 20 to 30 below zero and keep it hot? This sounds fine. I bought a new car last year and I'm concerned about my investment. I know that salt will deteriorate -- I don't have to have anybody tell me. I know that if I keep driving it on roads that are sprinkled with salt that it is certainly going to deteriorate, but I have a choice, Madam Speaker. I would rather drive my car safely, so I don't kill someone, and any person who is entrusted with the responsibility to keep our streets safe will tell you the same thing. They wish they knew how to keep our streets safe without using salt, but they don't, and because they are men of responsibility they always come back to the use of salt, and if I didn't want my car damaged to the extent of some people I would leave it at home. I would leave it home. But it doesn't bother me. It just seems to be a phobia with some people, because I believe that it's well worth it to be able to drive and this winter I think we did enjoy good roads.

When I was in the city of Montreal I found out there from interviewing public representatives, because I was interested at the time, that they could not move traffic at all in Montreal, in a normal winter in Montreal, without the use of salt, so we have our choice. I don't think that we have to argue the chemistry of the thing. I think we already know that it's going to destroy our automobiles. The question is, how are we going to keep our streets safe, and that in my estimation is of paramount importance.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, I would like to have a word or two to say. I'd like to thank the Honourable Member for Burrows for the technical discourse that we had from him. I would be the last one in the world to attempt to debate the type of argument that he used, because I recognize at the outset that I'm not capable with the knowledge that I have, to debate the resolution or debate it on that basis.

One thing that surprised me about the resolution when I first saw it, was the fact that the first "Whereas" indicates that it's known to have a corrosive effect on cars, concrete and clothing, and it continues on in the "Resolved" section, requests a thorough study on the corrosive effects. The point I think that is probably missing from the resolution if it was to have proper value, is the comparative effects of the cost on cars, concrete and clothing as opposed to the, you might say, advantageous effects that it might have with regard to speeding up traffic, allowing people to leave from home at a reasonable hour in the morning and expect to be at work within a reasonable time with regard to the time they would normally start work, and the same thing about when they go home; the fact that they would study what the safety features were, what effect it has on life and limb, and property damage to cars. I would assume that probably in moving a resolution that this was probably the intent of the resolution if it was carried out. On the other hand, from the standpoint of the Government of Manitoba and more particularly the Highways Department, I'm a little at a loss to see as to the particular responsibility of the department for a study of this sort, because it is not the policy of the government to use pure salt on our highways. I think that probably only on a very rough occasion -- I don't know of specific instances where any amount of salt has been used. We're in the habit of using a mixture of salt and sand in the neighborhood I think of a 10 percent mixture, and again, as far as the highways are concerned, the policy is to sand the curves, intersections, hills, places like that.

The weather has been indicated by certainly one speaker, if not two, and as I note in the press, has been mentioned by Mr. McDonald, the Director of Streets and Transit in the Winnipeg area as supposedly somewhat unique in the dryness and the temperatures that we have when being compared to the other major urban centers in not only the Dominion of Canada but the United States of America.

I was reading just a few days ago in the Financial Post where they had taken a survey I think of probably every major centre in the United States -- in the northern United States in any event -- and Canada, and that there were varying opinions as to whether or not salt should be used. The opinion in them all seemed to be that until a more satisfactory solution could be found that salt was the answer. Nobody liked the fact that they had to use it, but that for the time being this was the best answer.

I don't know where they got their information, but apparently a survey has been done by the City of Winnipeg, apparently prior to the Metropolitan Winnipeg time, in which accidents had been reduced by, I believe the figure was 80 percent. I don't have the article with me, but it was certainly a significant decrease in the amount of accidents and the speed-up of the traffic in the area.

As far as urban transportation problems are concerned, I am given to understand although I haven't any experience in other large centers in the wintertime, but I am led to believe that we in Winnipeg don't know what a traffic problem is compared to the larger centers throughout Canada and some sections of the States. In the most outlying parts of the City of Winnipeg even on extremely hazardous conditions, we can seem to find our way downtown to the center of the City in reasonable periods of time.

The Honourable Member from Burrows mentioned the use of, I think he implied 100 percent salt with a large snowfall, and he used the term "fluffy." I don't know whether he used it in terms of the snowfall itself or in the mixture of the salt and the snow. Well, I don't know where his information comes from. Any information that I have is that pure salt has not been used by the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg for any heavy snowfalls; that in fact, under normal Winnipeg conditions, it would be a mixture that is used, but there have been occasions this year and in years past, when normal conditions for Manitoba have not prevailed, and we have had rain and sleet and ice and the type of surface that he described so adequately. He suggests that it's the lazy man's way out of a dilemma. He talks about urea, which is a new one to me. There may be people within the department, technical people that know what he's

(Mr. Weir, cont'd)...talking about, but certainly it hasn't come to my attention.

Coming down to the point that he mentioned about Metro and the fact that they seem to have a little difficulty making up their minds, it certainly appears that way to me too, because it looked for a time in the newspaper as though there was going to be a study on the corrosive effects of salt, and then it seemed that the possibility of that study had disappeared, and the last notice that I say of it was that the study was on the horizon again and that the committee had referred the University study, a \$27,000 grant to the University -- was referring it back to Council and this was in the next week or so. It will be before Council again for further consideration. The time it was considered last, I understand that several of the councillors were called away and there was rather -- oh I guess probably about a quorum of the Council was there. I also am of the understanding that in view of what was anticipated to be a grant from Metropolitan Winnipeg, one of the professors at the University had already started his study, expecting the grant to take place, and had gone to the trouble of having a steel placed behind the mudguards of Metropolitan Winnipeg buses and other cars. He had anticipated, and from what I can see, will probably continue to use probably twenty vehicles in this particular study, in the course of his study, because I wouldn't be surprised if on reflection the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg went ahead with the study. But, under the circumstances, I must point out that it is not my intention to vote for the resolution, on the grounds that the people that I think should have the study is the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg, if it is their intention to proceed or to continue with the use of salt. If they have any doubt in their mind that the use of salt has less benefit to the pedestrians and the motorists than it has harm to the vehicles, the concrete and the clothing, then I think they are the ones that should institute the study that is being proposed here. So, Madam Speaker, it's my intention not to support this resolution.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

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