

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, Monday, April 13th, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills
Orders of the Day
Committee of the Whole House

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of Bills No. 100 and 76.

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

Sections 1 to 32 of Bill No. 76 were read clause by clause and passed.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move an amendment, that Section 32 of the Bill be amended by adding thereto immediately after clause (i) thereof the following clause (j): "Prescribing certificates or other means of identification by inspectors."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment -- all agreed? Pass.

Section 32 (j) to Section 34 (2) of Bill No. 76 was read clause by clause and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: amendment in that?

MR. HUTTON: That subsection 2 of Section 34 of the Bill be amended by adding thereto immediately after the word "kind" in the first line thereof, the words "and upon presentation of a certificate or other means of identification as prescribed in the regulation."

The remainder of Bill No. 76 was read clause by clause and passed.

Sections 1 to 24 (2) of Bill No. 100 were read clause by clause and passed.

MR. LYON: move, seconded by the Minister of Welfare that it be amended by striking out the words "provincial forests" in the first line and substituting therefor the words "all Crown lands within a provincial forest" as per the sheet that was distributed two or three days ago.

Sections 25 and 26 (1) of Bill No. 100 were read clause by clause and passed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, again, following from the sheet that was distributed to the House -- three amendments -- by striking out the figure (1) in the first line of Section 26; second, by striking out the figure (2) in the first line of subsection (2) of 26 and substituting therefor the figure (27); and thirdly, by striking out the word and figure "subsection (1)" in the second line of subsection (2) of 26 and substituting therefor the word and figure "Section 26."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Section 27.

MR. LYON: Section 27 be deleted?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 27 deleted? Agreed. Passed. Section 28.

MR. LYON: Section 28, Mr. Chairman. I move, seconded by the Minister of Welfare we strike out the words "portion of" in the first and second lines of Section 28, and substitute therefor the words "Crown lands within."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Passed.

Sections 28 to 30 of Bill No. 100 were read clause by clause and passed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I move -- coming to Section 31 I move that Section 31 to 35 both inclusive be struck out and that the sections shown on the amending sheet be substituted therefor. I'll have those ready into the record, or

MR. CHAIRMAN: All agreed.

MR. LYON: Do you wish to have them read into the record? -- (Interjection) -- Agreed.

MR. M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): That's all inclusive. (1) to -- only with one -- I'd like to make a comment on 32 (3) if I may, Mr. Chairman. The second last line

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)...there makes it possible to make a seizure under the Act and not take any action by way of prosecution for a period of six months. Now we can envisage a case where a man who has quite a bit of equipment -- quite a bit of equipment and he could have this tied up for six months being absolutely innocent of any offence and there isn't a thing he can do about it. I would suggest to the Honourable Minister, if he'll go along with this suggestion, that I think that prosecution should be taken within 30 days; that is, merely for them to prosecute, if they can't make up their minds in 30 days whether they have a cause of action. I don't think they have it.

MR. LYON: I was aware of that section, Mr. Chairman. I was about to suggest 90 days. My honourable friend suggests 30. Perhaps we have room for compromise in 60.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: It's immaterial to me, Mr. Chairman, as to whether you make it three months or what you make it, but we shouldn't give too much time, because there's a tendency to put things off when you've got time to do it in. It could be very important to an operator to know whether he's being prosecuted or is not, so he could have his equipment free. They should make up their minds in 30 days whether they have grounds for prosecution.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is so compelling in his argument I'm willing to accept that and move, seconded by him I take it, that subsection (3) of the amendment be changed -- the words be changed -- the words read "and the Crown within 30 days fails to commence prosecution." Change the words "the same period" to "30 days."

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Wouldn't you want to put in there "Within 30 days from the date of seizure" because I don't think it would read right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Within 30 days of the date of seizure" instead of "Six months" as you have it in the form that is upon your desk. All agreed? Agreed. 33,34, 35, 36 as in

MR. LYON:which I distributed to members tonight by adding thereto immediately after the word "timber" in the first line of subsection 1 of Section 36, the words "Whether or not."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 36 (1) passed. -- (Interjection) -- We haven't got We haven't it here butit was distributed. Agreed.

Remainder of Bill read to Section 46 and passed.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman before the Bill is passed could I get clarification again on what you have in the amendment for 32 (3)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where anything is seized under this Act the owner is unknown or cannot be found within thirty days from the time of seizure.

MR. CHERNIACK:is the error. It seemed to me that you, Mr. Chairman, didn't quite catch the amendment which comes actually in the sixth line, not the second as you have....

MR. CHAIRMAN:the second last line again. Let me read it, then: but where the owner is known and the Crown within 30 days from the time of seizure fails to commence prosecution for an offence under the Act. Thirty days of the date of seizure.

MR. LYON: The amendment Mr. Chairman is in the sixth line of subsection 3 of Section 32. I sent over a copy of it.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll read subsection 3 of Section 32, the new section -- where anything is seized under this Act and the owner is unknown or cannot be found within six months of the seizure the Minister may direct that it be disposed of in such manner as he may specify; where the owner is known and the Crown within thirty days of the date of seizure fails to commence prosecution for an offence under this Act it shall be returned to him. Agreed. Bill be reported. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the following Bills No. 100 as amended, No. 76 as amended and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield the report of the Committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Bill No. 100 was read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that Bill No. 76, an Act respecting the transportation, storage, selling and marketing of natural products by the producers thereof be now read a third time and passed.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, when I spoke on this Bill a matter of ten days or thereabouts ago I mentioned to the House that I expected to deal with some other matters on the other livestock resolution that is before the House, that one dealing with the livestock committee report. However, due to a variety of circumstances it just happens that this bill has progressed a little more quickly than the resolution I speak of mainly due to the absence this afternoon of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, and inasmuch as my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, who spoke subsequent to my few remarks on this bill had some very definite criticisms to make of some of the things that I said, I thought that this would be a good occasion for me to reply to some of those criticisms and once again deal with certain aspects of this Bill which I consider to be an important one.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture spent some time and some effort, a couple of paragraphs of Hansard, in commenting on the fact that I had mentioned the Canadian Wheat Board and my honourable friend waxed quite eloquent in asking if I didn't realize the difference between wheat as a marketable commodity and hogs and he gave me quite a little lecture on the fact that you couldn't consider hogs that were ready to market as a non-perishable product. Madam Speaker, I mentioned the Canadian Wheat Board in one regard alone and that was on the matter of compulsion. I made no effort whatever to draw a parallel between it and a hog marketing board in any respect that whatever but that both were compulsory. My honourable friend had dwelt with such eloquence on the fact that he was opposed to compulsion that I simply asked him the question: Was not the Canadian Wheat Board also compulsory? And my honourable friend tried to draw several red herrings across the track by suggesting that I didn't recognize the differences between the job that the Wheat Board had in marketing their product and the position of a hog marketing board.

Well now if my honourable friend is so devoid of arguments in support of this Bill that he has to spend the time doing that I -- to use his phrase -- it leaves me pretty cold. And then he dwelt also I think at equal length on the question of the one sow farmer and he suggested that if I stayed with the proposal that I had made that I would not give in a compulsory hog marketing board a vote to the one sow farmer because I thought it was not an integral part of his farming operations, it was not a particularly important part of his livelihood, my honourable friend said that would cut out 50 percent of the hog producers and he based that on the fact that he said that a one sow farmer would, on the average, in Manitoba, would market 15 hogs. Well now I don't know from where my honourable friend gets these statistics but I would venture to say that there's not one percent of the one sow owners that market 15 hogs. He's in an entirely different position, generally speaking, from what the commercial hog raiser is and I would say quite definitely that I would stake my reputation such as it is on the fact that he can't find one percent of the one sow farmers marketing 15 hogs. And he used that term in that connection, that arguments like that left him pretty cold. So I was interested to watch very carefully what the practical livestock men who addressed the committee said about it and Don Marshall -- I believe he was the Manitoba Hog Producers Association -- Don Marshall said that instead of the \$500 that was in the Bill that should be raised to \$1,000 which according to my honourable friend's figuring would weed out something in the neighbourhood of 80 percent of the farmers and Mr. Royden Ridell who I believe comes from my honourable friend's constituency, suggested that the amount should be \$2,500. I didn't get the figures from my honourable friend as to how many that would weed out, but these were the suggestions of these practical farmers, and even if my remarks on the matter left my honourable friend pretty cold -- and certainly I misjudged him because I thought he was pretty hot when he was speaking about what I was saying, rather than cold -- but I don't know what the percentage would be that would be left out under those figures but those were the suggestions that were made by the very practical men who came before the committee.

Then my honourable friend the Minister said that he figured that they were suggesting in their proposal of a vote after two years approximately the same thing that our government had done in our time with the coarse grain vote. He said that I had commented favourably upon the procedure that we had adopted at that time and yet that I had said that it was all wrong when they were doing it. The difference is, Madam Speaker, that we did not have at that time an active group of people who had been carrying on a campaign for years as the Farm Union and the Federation of Agriculture have been doing -- carrying on a campaign for years to get

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)... a vote and if we had had a group of people or two groups of people such as those at that time carrying on a campaign I'm sure that we would have at that time done it the other way and had the vote first. I still suggest to my honourable friend that because of the interest that has been taken by these farm organizations because of the fact that they have been working on this literally for years and have been recently holding meetings -- partly because of what's going on in the Province of Saskatchewan I admit -- but this is a poor time for my honourable friend and the government to simply fly in the face of an organized effort of that kind and say we're going to put in something else. I do not say that a hog marketing board is the proper answer in the Province of Manitoba. I don't know whether it is or isn't. I'm not saying that the suggestion of my honourable friend is wrong. I am saying that because of the work that's been done here because of the fact that these people have asked for this, that it is not in the order of things I would think that we should put in an alternative scheme rather than that scheme that they're talking about without a vote. I admit the power of the government to do it; if they've decided to do it I think it is not the right way. And that's the difference between what we did in our time and what they are doing now.

Then my honourable friend wanted to know if anybody over here had read the Act, the one that he has before the House now and the act that we put in in our time that this one is going to replace. He wanted to know how many of us had read the Act, how many had read the regulations. Well I've been reading those particular acts and the regulations for quite a long time and I thought that I would just check up on some of them again, because here's my honourable friend who says that he's so definitely against the proposal of compulsion and he doesn't think that it should be invoked except as a last resort. But here's what he did, what this government has done since it came into office in the matter of regulations, and this of course is not the only thing they've done but with regard to the vote, the regulation that we had set up in our time was one that was in keeping with the principal that I've enunciated here every time that I've spoken on this matter, and that is that we should keep the qualifications high for who would be eligible to vote and also keep the proportion of the vote high. We had the regulations regarding votes on the compulsory marketing plan, we had something there that the farm groups were not fond of, particularly the Manitoba Farmer's Union -- we had that before a proposal of this kind could carry that at least 51 percent of the eligible voters must vote. Now that's rather unusual regulations or legislation but we had put it in for this very purpose because we realized that this was drastic legislation, and then in addition to that that 60 percent of those voting must be in favour. What did my honourable friends do after they came in? They eliminated the 51 percent, if I recall correctly at the behest of the Manitoba Farmers Union. They eliminated that -- and I must say in fairness to them that they put the percentage still higher, they put it up to 66 percent -- but they eliminated the thing that guaranteed a good vote before it could pass, and in that way my honourable friends, in my opinion, made it much easier for a compulsory board to pass than the way we had it. So if my honourable friend wants to know about the question of regulations that's one that I think is worthy of serious consideration. And just to illustrate, if it turned out that there were 10,000 hog producers eligible to vote under our regulations, at least 5,100 of them would have to get out and vote, and I think that's beneficial in anything that's as drastic as this legislation admittedly is, I think that's beneficial, that you've got to sell it to the extent that at least half the people, and a little margin, get out to vote, and then there'd have had to be 60 percent of that 5,100 would have had to vote in favour, which would mean I think that something like 3,600 would have to vote in favour. Goodness knows it seems to me that that's low enough with 10,000 eligible voters that at least 3,600 people would have to be convinced that this drastic measure was in the interests of their industry before they voted for it. Under the present proposal -- now I must admit that if approximately half of the people turned out to vote then the qualification is higher now that it was in our time but on the other hand if the number that turned out was only similar to what has turned out on the other votes that have been held or it was the same proposition as the number of people who voted on Mr. Juba's Metro bill the other day, I think you would find that 1,600 people-odd could speak for 10,000 and put them into a compulsory marketing act. Now that's on the subject of regulations, and I say that in that regard, Madam Speaker, that the Act that we had was admittedly a compulsory act but we always took the position that it had to be well sold before anything as drastic as this should be put into effect and so we had those safeguards and they were made in the regulations.

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

My honourable friend says that this Act is an entirely new concept. Well it is new. It's new in the fact that this appoints or places the government appointed board in the position to do a good many of the things that the producer board did under our Act. But what in my honourable friend's opinion, what really made the 1939 Act repugnant and offensive -- what made people like Mr. Dick Hunter who came before the committee copy the Minister's words and say that that Act was repugnant and offensive -- and he indicated that so was the present one by the way -- but what caused my honourable friend to use those terms. It was simply the drastic provisions that that bill contained -- and don't for a minute fool yourselves and think that this bill doesn't contain them too -- it was the drastic provisions that that bill contained for compulsion and regulation and regimentation. That's why my honourable friend said that he said he had some satisfaction in introducing this Act. Madam Speaker, let me be very very explicit in what I say now. There was not a single power in that Act that my honourable friend found so repugnant and offensive, not one single power that is not available under this Act -- every power every drastic thing, every mode and method of compulsion at every level is available under this act that was available under the other, with the one possible exception -- and I'm not sure it's an exception -- of the retail price.

In another debate my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture said that my honourable colleague from La Verendrye had glossed over the fact -- when he presented his amendment to the other resolution -- he had glossed over the fact that this was a compulsory board that was being talked about. Of course these are compulsory boards that are being talked about. Everybody that knows anything about this kind of marketing legislation knows that these are compulsory boards, and of course this is a compulsory board, and my honourable friend seems to make some point of the fact -- that word compulsion that he's talking about. But Madam Speaker, if you want an example of glossing over the fact we've got one right in the Honourable Minister's speech, because the Honourable Minister when he explained his bill on second reading he purported to give the highlights of that bill, and he told about what Part 1 did, Part 2 did, Part 3 did, about the marketing board, about the producer board, and about the marketing commission, and then he came to Part 4, the general part -- and I'm not trying to give his words exactly -- but when he came to explaining that he said, and part of this is a quote, "Part 4 of the Act, the general part, provides among other things for the definition of who may vote on the plebiscite." That's the end of the quote, but then he did go on to say, he had a paragraph on this subject about who may vote -- but he dealt with nothing but the vote at that time. Then he mentioned the power of pooling and the power to appoint inspectors, and in a later statement he said -- this was when he spoke the second time, I guess in reply to me and in reply to others who had spoken -- the second time he said, and I'm quoting now: "Part 4 deals with the general powers that are required, and I cannot see how it detracts from the operation or effectiveness of the producer marketing boards." That's the end of the quote. Again he reviews the voting qualifications at length, but nothing else.

This is the Minister's explanation of what Part 4 of the Act means. Madam Speaker, I say that if you want an outstanding example of glossing over the fact, you don't need to go any further than that statement, because the reason that I said that this bill contained all the drastic powers that were contained in the bill that it replaces, is because of Part 4. In Part 4 all the powers are there, but they're exercisable here by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. And I'm not trying to pretend Madam Speaker, I'm not trying to pretend that we didn't have in the other Bill drastic powers. I'm not trying to pretend that we didn't take authority to pass them on to the producer board, I'm not trying to pretend that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council didn't have wide powers under our Act too. But I certainly am not pretending, I'm stating, that when it comes to glossing over what Part 4 really means the Minister is a past master. Here's what Part 4 says Look at Clause 32. For the purpose of carrying out the intention of this act we'll go back at this stage to section 3 of the act, section 3 of the act says this: "The purpose of this act is to provide for the promotion, control and regulation in any and all respects of the marketing by the producers thereof of natural products grown, raised, harvested or caught within the province." That's the purpose. And they start again on section 32: "for the purpose of carrying out the intention of this act, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make such regulations and orders as are deemed advisable, and every regulation or order made under this section has the force of law." Madam Speaker, under that

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)... section the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can do anything that we could do under our act that he takes such objection to -- with the possible exception of the retail price. And it's true, it's true of course, that this section goes on to say:" and without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations for A, B, C, D, up to G, H and I" -- and I believe there was a new one added tonight -- but that does not restrict the generality of the first clause, and under that first clause the Lieutenant-Governor can make any of these regulations. They can set up a marketing board without a vote whatever. No vote. They don't need a vote at all. They can set up a marketing board. They can run a marketing board if they want to do it. But about setting up a marketing board, here's one of the powers that they're given "without restricting the generality of the foregoing, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations (b), establishing producer boards and marketing commissions to administer regulations and vesting in those boards and commissions any powers or rights deemed necessary or advisable to enable the boards or commissions to administer the regulations effectively. They can set up, they can give compulsory powers to that board. I repeat Madam Speaker, they can do anything, by order-in-council, and they can set up a board that is not subject to the appeal that my honourable friend is so enamoured of. They can set up under that section a board to which the appeal clause does not apply. Then my honourable friend tells us that our act was drastic. It was, no question about it. I've never tried to hide the fact that this is drastic legislation, and I agree with the Honourable Minister that it should be invoked only after there is the clearest indication, after the fullest education that can be carried on, and after a vote with high qualifications and a high percentage of the vote.

I know what my own opinion is of what the government intends to do. I think it intends to set up a marketing commission. I don't think it intends to make that commission compulsory because the talk has all been about a voluntary marketing commission, but I say that under this section they could set up a compulsory marketing commission if they took the notion to. It doesn't have to be voluntary under this act. The marketing commission or the producer board, either one, can be compulsory if the government takes the notion. So my reason for speaking at his time -- and perhaps I'll not under these circumstances have to speak on the other motion, and perhaps I will too according to how the debate's going -- my reason for speaking was to once again say to my honourable friend who has criticized the old act that he has put in here all the powers that the old act has and he has left upon the shoulders of the Lieutenant-Governor itself to decide what's going to be done in that regard. I'm sure they'll tell us that they don't intend to make these boards compulsory, but if they didn't intend to make the marketing board compulsory, if they meant it to be a voluntary board they could have easily said so in here -- and this act does not say so.

Madam Speaker, I know this isn't easy legislation to deal with. I know it's a controversial subject. I am still of the opinion that the better way to do it is to let the farmers themselves, the producers themselves decide, and I wouldn't do that, until there was a thorough campaign of education carried on. I would say to it that if the government took the authority that is given to it under this act to be sure that there is a vote held and a very thorough educational program carried on first, that they're being very wise to be sure that the utmost in education is secured; but having done that, I'd leave it to the producers themselves to decide. So you may have gathered, Madam Speaker, that I do not share the satisfaction that the Honourable Minister expresses with this bill, and in fact because of the things that have been said and the distance that the performance seems to be from the promises that were made, I do not intend to support it.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I'd like to say a word or two in connection with the bill that we have before us. When the bill was before us for second reading, I appealed to the Honourable Minister at that time to withdraw the bill or to hold it until such time as there had been further consideration given to it by the producers in the province and elsewhere. I appealed to him at that particular time to do this in view of the fact that this whole matter of the marketing of natural products was under survey in the provinces from Ontario to the western boundaries at least of the Province of Alberta. It seems as though the Minister has not taken that under consideration. Much that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has said here this evening, Madam Speaker, I agree with, and the more that one reads this act as has been so adequately pointed out by my honourable friend

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd)... from Lakeside, vests in the government almost supreme control over the marketing of natural products here in the Province of Manitoba.

What are some of these regulations under Part 4 as referred to briefly by the Honourable Member for Lakeside? "Provide for the submission of a plan for the control and regulation of marketing under the control of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Exempting from the purposes of a regulation or the purposes of the act those whose income through sale of natural products exceeds \$500.00. Exempting from any regulation producers of any regulated product or any class, variety or grade thereof, or any class of such producers." And then a little further on: "a regulation or order or directive made under this act may be made to apply (a) to the whole of the province or any part of the province, and (b) to any grade, class or variety of a regulated profit." Madam Speaker this gives to the Minister or to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council so vast power that it seems to me inconceivable that even the government of the Province of Manitoba would wish to take on to itself such responsibility.

But I think Madam Speaker, that there is even a more important, possibly, feature of the bill that we have before us. It is well known, at least through the media of the press today, that in Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and possibly other provinces as well, they are trying to bring about more or less uniformity of the marketing of livestock produce in at least the four provinces that I'm referring to, in order to give to the livestock producer a better deal for his product. We give lip service in this legislature and in other legislatures I suggest as well Madam Speaker, to the desirability of maintaining the family farm in order that the small producer may receive an adequate income as the result of his labour. I've heard members on all sides of this House condemn contract farming whereby the products that the farmer produces are under the direct control of large packing houses in other provinces. We don't like this, we think that we should have in Manitoba and elsewhere, generally speaking, more cognizance of the family farm, and I suggest to the Honourable Minister tonight as I did on the other occasion that this matter is of such vital concern that more study should be given to the bill that we have before us. I know my honourable friend can't stand up and criticize me, a railroader from the City of Transcona as not being too conversant with the details, manipulations, and operations of farms or the livestock industry -- and with this I have no quarrel at all, Madam Speaker. But I do suggest this that notwithstanding the fact that I may not know of the detailed operations of the industry that we have under consideration in this bill, I do know that it is most important that the producers of the product should be entitled to receive a fair share for their product. I do suggest once again, Madam Speaker, that there's no reason at all for haste in regard to this bill; that there hasn't been enough consideration given to the bill by the Honourable Minister or the government today. I appreciate the fact that my honourable friend has given considerable amount of study. I appreciate the fact that representations have been made by the Shewman Commission and also by the committee, but I suggest Madam Speaker, that this is still not enough. So therefore, Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster that Bill 76 be not now read a third time but read a third time six months hence.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words in connection with Bill 76. I spoke on the bill when it was introduced on second reading and I expressed my opposition to it at that time. I have not changed my mind to date. I object to the compulsory features of the bill and I feel that the powers that are contained in this bill should not be delegated at all. I think they are too large, too large powers that we're delegating to these boards, and that is one reason I prefer commissions. The bill has three different sections, one with producer boards, one with the provincial marketing board and one in connection with commissions. In fact I prefer the commission section because here the government makes the appointments and therefore the government is responsible and we can hold it responsible for any actions that are made, so if a bill should go into law I feel that I prefer that to actually producer marketing boards. I feel that this bill is giving too large powers to these boards because they deal with such vital matters as the sale of a producers product and also the amount that he will be able to sell and the time that he will be able to sell these goods. All these things will be told to him and he will have to govern himself accordingly. We are taking too much too many of the freedoms of the individual away through this legislation and

(Mr. Froese, cont'd)... through the regulations that are to follow this bill.

I agree some improvements have been made in committee. I might point out that the \$500 limit as far as the people who will be able to vote under the bill, I think it's a better one than what was proposed by the organizations appearing before committee where they suggested-- some suggested \$1,200, others \$2,500.00. I think it was far too much and that the \$500 is much more reasonable because as I pointed out in committee the producers of Prairie Cannery which I know, they are restricted in the acreage that they can produce to 20 acres per individual. This roughly gives them probably 5, 6 or 700 dollars worth of produce and therefore had they acted on those recommendations that were recommended to them this would have meant that all these people would have been disenfranchised. Therefore I feel that the act, if it does go into law will have at least some protection for those producers out there. I also feel that it would be a good idea to place that in the act and not leave that to regulations so that the producers know where they stand in this matter.

I also wish to thank the Minister at least when he amended the Act on third reading in connection with the inspectors' credentials. I think that this is a very important matter and that is worthy of comment. However, as a whole I am, as I pointed out, I'm opposed to the compulsory features and I will vote against the bill.

MADAM SPEAKER: All those in . . .

MR. HUTTON: I wanted to say a few words about the bill at this time because I think that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has created the wrong impression, or tried to create a wrong impression when he said all the powers that were in the old act are in the new act. They certainly are not. The reason for this bill is that the present government of Manitoba was just not prepared to delegate the kind of powers that were provided for under the old act. Under the old act, Madam Speaker, the power was given to the producer marketing board to fix the price or prices, the maximum price or prices, the minimum price or prices, or both, at which the regulated product or any grade or class thereof, could be bought or sold in the province by anyone.

Under the new act, under Bill 76, the power to set prices is restricted to the producer or to the producer level. The new act reads, by comparison, "subject to the approval of the Manitoba board, a producer board may make regulations, fixing minimum prices or maximum prices, or both, or both maximum prices and minimum prices at which a regulated product under its jurisdiction or any variety, class or grade thereof may be sold by the producer thereof." Now there is a tremendous difference. Under the old act the producer board had the power to dictate the price at which Safeway for instance might sell the regulated product to the public. There are jurisdictions in Canada where the producer board has this power, and it is not unknown in those jurisdictions to have the producer board walk into a retail store and confiscate the regulated product that was being offered for sale in that store if it happens to be in violation of a regulation of the producer board. We just don't think, Madam Speaker, that the people of Manitoba would countenance a representative of the producer board walking in to Safeway or the little corner grocery, the little private corner grocery, and having the power to seize and carry off the product because he happened to be selling for instance at a price below what they had dictated. So the power to determine price in the new act is limited to the power of the producer board to fix the price at which the producer shall sell his product. Once he has sold it or his representative producer board has sold it, it is no longer under control. Under the old act, Madam Speaker, a producer board could have the power to require the person in charge of any vehicle in which the regulated product could be transported, to permit any member, any member or employee of the board, to search the vehicle. Just any member or employee could search the vehicle. Now I can imagine in a jurisdiction where you had six or ten boards -- it's possible -- you might have half a dozen boards or even ten boards -- regulating different products, each one with its inspectors, with the power to stop vehicles.

I have been told, Madam Speaker -- and of course one must be careful about relating what he has been told -- but I have been told that in the Province of British Columbia they have had the experience where people coming out of the potato growing belt on a Sunday afternoon have been stopped, their trunks, cars examined for contraband product, relieved of the product, it's been stacked up beside the road taken away and disposed of, some times at a real loss to the owner. I just can't see us in Manitoba with representatives of any number of producer boards all running around with the authority to stop and search vehicles, to enter

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... premises and so forth. In the Bill 76, I think, quite properly, the powers of inspection are confined to a representative of the Manitoba marketing board who after showing his credentials does have the power to search and does have the power to detain for purposes of evidence, where he finds a regulated product that is in violation of a regulation. Under the old act they had the power to seize, remove and dispose of any of the regulated products shipped, transported, packed, stored, or marketed, in violation of any order of the board and retain or otherwise dispose of the proceeds thereof. Now, that's a pretty sweeping power. The Government of Manitoba just wasn't prepared to extend that kind of power to a producer board. It wasn't even prepared to extend it to the Manitoba Marketing Board. It had to give the Manitoba Marketing Board the power to detain for purposes of evidence, but to seize and dispose of, or retain it, do what they liked with it really — a terrible power. And if I may say so Madam Speaker, a clear invitation to abuse -- a clear invitation to abuse. Now, I want to say a word about Part 4, General, where it has been claimed that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is given such wide and sweeping power. I know that the Honourable Member for Lakeside knows that the powers that are set out in Part 4 are limited by the intent of the act and the specific powers that are set out in Parts 1, 2 and 3, and that when it says the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations providing for the control and regulation within the province to the marketing of any natural product grown, raised, harvested or cropped within the province by the producers thereof, that it means that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations within the intent and purpose of the earlier sections of the act and that this just doesn't delegate to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the power and the right to make any kind of regulations it deems are necessary. There is, of course, a necessity for taking certain powers if you're going to have compulsory marketing boards. That's the thing about compulsory marketing boards. There's no half-way measures..... If they have benefits for the producers, they are at a price. And there's no use talking about a compulsory marketing board unless you're going to take enough power so that you can enforce a compulsory marketing board, but the question arises, who is to enforce this act? Should it rest with the producers thereof, or should the powers rest with the government and a government-appointed board? Surely we all know whereof the power must derive from in the first instance. It can't come from any other place than the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Today in Manitoba for every person who is operating a farm, we probably have somewhere between 5 and 10 people depending upon what he does for their livelihood. I submit to you that if a producer marketing board decided to limit the production of meat products in Manitoba, it would affect the workers in the packing plants over here. They would be out of a job. They didn't have any vote as to whether there would be a producer marketing board established or not, but they're affected by the decisions that that board may make; and I suggest to you that when it comes to such powers as the setting of prices, fixing minimum and maximum prices, when it comes to such powers as establishing quantities that will be marketed which can affect and influence production, which influence of production can influence jobs of people who are only associated with the business of agriculture and the production of any particular products, I say to you that the only way that these people who depend on what the producers do, but have no say in it, their only voice is through the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Their only representative is the government that they can elect or defeat; and I say when you consider the sweeping powers that are necessary and when you consider the wide-ranging ramifications not just on the producers -- have you forgotten what happens to the producers and what the producers do affects every one of us here in this Province of Manitoba? In a province where the Provincial Treasurer will tell you that between 50 and 60 percent of all the economic activity in this province arises one way or another out of the great agricultural-industrial complex. Now, if over half of our economic activity depends on agriculture and if there are only 40,000 farms left in the Province of Manitoba, then it must be abundantly clear to everybody here that for every producer affected there are going to be 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 other people affected by what these producers do -- and the Honourable Member for Elmwood wasn't in his seat before -- that what the producers decided through their board could determine whether his colleagues at work had a job or not. Now, they don't have a vote on any of these plans, and yet they're affected by them, and it seems to me that this is the strongest argument in the world, Madam Speaker, for vesting these powers in a public utility type board, an

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... independent board -- independent of influence -- which can make these very difficult and knotty decisions that must be made in the interests of all of the people in Manitoba.

There are some real changes in Bill No. 76. It provides for greater representation on the Manitoba Marketing Board, which is an important thing, and pointed out by Mr. Hunter of the Agriculture Committee. He recommended that it should be a larger board, and reflect the broad interests of the community at large. This is possible under the new act; whereas the old act said 3, this one says "not limited." We have every intention of expanding the representation on that board. I don't know as there is too much more that I can add to this. I want to say this though, once again, Madam Speaker, that we didn't introduce Bill 76 in order to implement the recommendations of the Shewman Report. Unfortunately, this connotation has been put upon our actions, but this isn't true. It wasn't necessary. We could have established an agency under the old act. Under the old act, you know, you don't have to go to the people for a vote. It doesn't say that. It doesn't say that. It says the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may establish it. You don't have to go to the people for a vote, but you can be sure that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council isn't going to establish anything unless there was the gravest need for it and that where a compulsory marketing board is concerned, we'd have to be in real trouble before a government would establish a compulsory marketing board without any reference to producers. The government of this province has indicated that it intends to establish a voluntary central selling agency under the provisions of this act, but it could have done it under the other one; and there is no connection here. All the powers that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council has under Bill 76, they had under the old bill only they had more, because the Legislature had given the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the power to give the producer boards the power to seize and dispose of, the power to name any number of employees or members to run around carrying out inspections to stop and so forth. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council has given the producer boards the right to determine the price at the retail levels and to seize and dispose of the products if the little corner grocer decided that he couldn't sell at that price. That's the kind of powers that the old act provided for. I'm not saying or trying to kid anybody that the present Bill 76 hasn't got lots of power in it but I have been attacked personally and this government has been attacked by one group because Bill 76 purports to destroy all the powers of the producer boards to the point where they'll be ineffective. On the other hand we are attacked because Bill 76 provides greater powers -- even greater powers some say than the old act. Now both charges can't be true. It isn't true that Bill 76 provides greater powers than the old act. They have been limited. They have been limited and curtailed in the interests of the general public and in line with our concepts -- I think popular concepts -- of personal and property rights. I believe there is still plenty of power in this but unfortunately, as I said, if you're going to provide for compulsory marketing boards at all you have to be prepared to swallow the kinds of powers that are required to make them effective.

I think a lot of the argument that had been put forward, and it makes it difficult to answer them, had been put forward because of this confusion of Bill 76 with a recommendation from the special committee of the Legislature on all phases of livestock marketing in Manitoba. At the present time this government has an application before it from the potato producers in Manitoba asking that a vote be taken on the question of a marketing board for marketing table potatoes in the Province of Manitoba. I have said this before. I repeat it now. We are not prepared to approve a plan under the old act providing for the kind of powers that it provides for. We are prepared to permit a vote on potato marketing in Manitoba under the new act because we believe that under the new act, insofar as you can protect the interests of the general public, we have done so and when this act is approved and passed and becomes a Statute we intend to authorize a vote be taken on a potato marketing scheme. As I said before, we don't need Bill 76 to establish a voluntary marketing agency and of course never is a long time but I can say to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that when he suggests that the government is putting through this bill in order that it can implement a compulsory hog marketing that he is dreaming--it's the dream of a dreamer who dreamed that he was dreaming--(interjection) -- Yes. Because this government had no intention of using this act to foist any compulsory hog marketing board or any compulsory potato marketing board on the producers of this province. We will use the act, as we would have used the old act, to establish a central selling agency for hogs which the farmers can use on a voluntary basis. True according to the proposals of the Livestock Marketing Committee it has compulsory aspects insofar as the levy is concerned, the universal levy, but that scheme does retain for the producer the right to make the final decision as to how his product is going to be disposed of. I think that's all I have to say on the subject.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister who attacked this Bill saying that it contains greater powers than the old Act? I'm sure I didn't. I said it contained as great ones and I admitted that the old Act contained wide powers too. The only place that I attacked my honourable friend was in saying that he glossed over the fact that Part 4 contained these powers. I applied to him exactly the language that he applied to my honourable friend for La Verendrye and he did gloss it over because those powers are there. Now my honourable friend says that there is a difference between this Act and the present Act that's on the Statute books. That is true. I have not denied that. Of course it's true. There is a difference, but the power that is left to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is just as great as it ever was under the old Act and under the power that is given to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council it can give those powers just as wide as were given directly in the old Act by regulation. There's no question about that, Madam Speaker, in my mind. It's true that this Bill as written appears to cut down the powers of the producer board. It definitely does. No question about that, but the authority granted under the general clauses is so great that they could give those powers right back to the producer board and my honourable friend is wrong when he says that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is specifically limited to these sub-clauses. That, Madam Speaker, is just not correct.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I didn't say that the Lieutenant-Governor was specifically limited. I said the powers of the Lieutenant-Governor under Part 4, General, were limited to the intent of the Act and the specific sections referring That's different.

MR. CAMPBELL: If my friend will go back and look at what he says when it appears in Hansard he will also find, unless I misunderstood him, that they are limited to these powers that are enumerated. Now of course he was right in saying that they are limited to the purpose of the Act and this is what clause 32 says: for the purpose of carrying out the intention of this Act the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make such regulations and so on -- unlimited -- unlimited, and the purpose of the Act in Section 3 is to provide for the promotion, control and regulation in any and all respects of the marketing of products and so on. This is unlimited and under it Madam Speaker, I see you are

MADAM SPEAKER: There has been considerable discussion. I wondered if you were asking a question here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I am speaking on the amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. CAMPBELL: So long as they stay with the purpose of the Act set out in 3 they can have unlimited powers of regulation and under those powers of regulation they can give these powers right back to the producer board that my honourable friend's talking about. If my honourable friend says we don't intend to do this, I believe him. I'm not saying that they're going to do it. I didn't say that I thought they were going to establish a compulsory marketing commission. I don't think they are. I said that under these powers they could do so and that is correct. That is correct. My honourable friend said that this government is not prepared to approve a plan under the old Act. Well if they're not prepared to approve a plan under the old Act, if they don't want all these powers, why did they take them in the general provision? This is my whole question. The powers are there and I defy anyone learned in the law to disagree with that.

MADAM SPEAKER: All those in favour please

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): The Honourable Minister of Agriculture has suggested that there really is no connection whatever between the Shewman Commission Report and Bill 76 and I'm glad that he made that statement because I'm sure the public and I'm sure the House, in light of the discussion that has taken place in the last two or three weeks, does place a connection or relationship between the two. I'm certain that when the interested farmers read Bill 76 they said to themselves, "Well this is the legislation that provides for the setting up of a marketing commission that will enable them to establish a fee for marketing, and enable them to collect and all the enabling legislation to implement that section of the report that deals with hogs in particular. I'm certain that the farmers thought that and most of the members of the House thought that.

Now the fact that there has been so much debate on this particular Bill and several

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . amendments and the fact that it is still being discussed is certainly evident that it's a controversial Bill and certainly evident that not everybody knows what they're talking about when they compare this Bill to the old one. I think my friend the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is quite correct when he says that he questions the number of people in and out of the House that are thoroughly familiar with the old marketing Bill and thoroughly familiar with this one. I think that was an understatement perhaps. I don't question but that he knows it and I don't question but that the Honourable Member for Lakeside knows it. They both are quite familiar with agriculture, the Member for Lakeside being the Minister of Agriculture for many years and no doubt had a great deal to do with drafting the old Marketing Bill.

Now I rather like the proposal made by my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP for one reason only, and that is that if we do give it the six months hoist there is a possibility -- there's a possibility that we will be sitting six months hence. Maybe before that, but there's a possibility that we may be sitting here and there's a possibility that it may be read then. We may still be sitting, some member says, but it will give all of the members of the House and all of the farmers that are really interested in the legislation, it will give them six months in which to further acquaint themselves with the old legislation and the new, and give them time to decide exactly what they want.

Now I do not intend to speak further on this particular bill. I will have something to say when we come to the other motion that is before us to receive what is referred to as the Shewman Report -- naturally I'll have something to say on that. But I just want to make it clear that I intend to support -- I don't know how our group -- I'm not speaking for our group, Madam Speaker, but I intend to support the Honourable Leader of the NDP on this one.

MADAM SPEAKER: All those in favour please say Aye.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): the position of my group in this regard seeing that the last speaker was speaking for himself personally. I think the Minister made clear tonight in his remarks at long last the real reason behind this bill, and the Minister in effect said to the farmers of Manitoba, "We don't trust you." The Minister in effect said to them, "We don't trust you as producers to run your own affairs. We, the Government of Manitoba, know better than you do and we are going to remove from you the powers that existed under the previous producers' Bill and vest them in the hands of the government." That is an analysis, Madam Speaker, of the statements by the Minister this evening, because he says that the powers are the same with the exception of the retail price, but the rest of the powers are roughly the same but they're no longer in the hands of the producers' board, they're now in the hands of the government, because he doesn't think that the producers should have that kind of power. And he went on further and said, Madam Speaker, saying to the Member for Elmwood, "This would affect you. A vote like this could affect your employment." In other words, Madam Speaker, the Minister is saying the government should make all the decisions. Insofar as the Member from Elmwood, if his Union decides to go on a strike using the same sort of reasoning, the government should say, "No, you're not allowed to go on strike; we will make that decision." Similarly with an employer, if an employer should decide that he wants to raise his prices, by following the same logic the Minister would say, "No, you won't be allowed to do that; we, the government know better than you do."

Madam Speaker, I completely refute that philosophy. As far as I'm concerned I would leave that responsibility insofar as the producers' board in the hands of the producers themselves. Let the government here put down the laws and the rules and regulations within which they are to operate; let us settle on whatever we think is reasonable and fair; but then, having done that, give them the responsibility and the right to run their own affairs. I deny that government knows better than the people themselves what's good for them and how things should be run, particularly this government, and I say to him, let the producers run their own show. If they break the rules, if they don't obey the law, then let the government step in. Until then, let them have their own way and I certainly do not intend to support this bill, and I will vote in favour of the six-months hoist.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): I had not intended to get in on this debate. I was forced into it. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture said if the producers decided to do something, that myself and my colleagues with whom I work in my ordinary work would be out of a job. If

(Mr. Peters, Cont'd.) . . . he will take a look at the records for the past three or four years of what's been happening with hog production in this province, and I mentioned it earlier in this session. Last year into this province alone, not into all of Canada, into this province alone there was 11 million pounds of pork imported from the United States. I wasn't put out of a job, neither were my colleagues, because if they don't get the hogs to process here they're going to go to the United States and buy them, so don't start telling me I'm going to lose my job because the farmer or the hog producer is going to do something. You go out and help the farmer, educate him, let him produce his hogs cheaper than he can now, but if we don't get the farmers to produce the hogs right here in Manitoba we're going to go to the United States again next year like we have for the last two or three years.

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

A MEMBER: The Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. . . . be not now read a third time but read a third time six months hence.

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas 17, Nays 34.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The motion before the House, the third reading of Bill No. 76.

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

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): . . . we'd really better have it because it is reversed . . . so if we want a recorded vote I'd suggest that we ask for it and have it. Otherwise we'll declare it passed on division.

MADAM SPEAKER: On division? Agreed?

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Minister of Public Utilities)(River Heights) presented Bill No. 118, an Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: . . . Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker there are a few amendments in this Act, the more important ones being the dropping of the charge of careless driving and resorting to the charge of exceeding the speed limit. Members of this House will recall that in 1962 an amendment was made to the Act providing for a charge of driving contrary to the statutes but that that Act was never proclaimed.

Another amendment provides that the suspension term for furious driving be increased from 30 days to six months in keeping with other sentences of a similar nature. The practice of impoundment has completely been dropped from the Act. This hasn't been found to be a very effective method of operating. In the last year there were only two cases in which the impoundment helped the other party to collect damages and there were over 1,700 impoundments so that it has been decided that that would be dropped. There is a new feature in the method of providing for those who have not obtained public liability insurance in that a fee of \$25.00 will be required and this will be placed in the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. There are approximately 90 percent of the drivers in Manitoba that are now insured, and a similar provision is in the Ontario Act, and there about 98 percent are insured, so that it is anticipated that this extra charge of \$25.00 will encourage most of the drivers to take out the public liability insurance.

There is a provision that will give us the authority to pay members of the Highway Traffic Co-ordination Board a remuneration. The work of this board has increased immeasurably over the years and it has been thought advisable to consider the possibility of paying them a salary.

These are the major amendments in the Act which we are putting forward at this time.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, I'm sorry. I didn't have the opportunity to compare these amendments with the Act, with the bill just laid before us this afternoon, but from a hurried glance through it it would appear to me that in this particular portion of the bill that

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, Cont'd.) . . . the Honourable Minister referred to, that they've dropped the wording "A person shall be deemed to be driving carelessly when he is driving" and replacing it with the words "no person shall drive" is one of those things that we discussed before this House quite fully at one time, but I don't think that he entirely disposes of the objection that there was to this particular wording, because in section 107 of this bill, 107 (1) and 107 (2), the words appear there and the section reads "it is sufficient to charge an accused person with driving carelessly." Now if I'm correct in interpreting this particular section, I think it is more objectionable than the old provision was, because a person can be charged under 107 (1) or (2), no offence shown in the charge, and the man will appear before the court for driving carelessly without knowing what the charge actually is, because the section further reads that "it is sufficient if it sets forth that the accused did drive carelessly" without saying anything more, and according to (2) the same thing applies and the court can find the accused guilty of the charge without specifying what he was guilty of, and I think that's wrong in principle. I think that 107 is worse than the old one was. Then so far as 100, in sub-section (1) where you have all these arrests without warrant, I haven't had a chance to check the offences covered by all these sections but there seem to be quite a number of them and I'm not so sure that I'd agree with that until I had a chance to study the Act and see how this bill affects us as a whole. I'm not going to oppose the second reading of it but I do think that the sections that I pointed to need a close look at, and I would also refer to one more, in the impoundment section, under 15 (5). I don't see where the garagekeeper is protected under the Garagekeepers Act insofar as his bill for repairs are concerned. I can't see -- this may, this may have the effects of doing away with his rights under the Garagekeepers Act. I'm not sure because I haven't had a chance to crosscheck it, but I think that one should be taken a look at so that we can discuss that matter when the bill get to the committee stage.

MR. MOLGAT:with a fairly lengthy bill here which unfortunately did not come on our desks until 3:00 o'clock this afternoon so we will obviously not have had an occasion to -- I beg your pardon?

MR. ROBLIN:

MR. MOLGAT: Yes but tomorrow morning we meet at 9:30, Madam Speaker, so

MR. ROBLIN: I think my honourable friend has a good point, and if he'd like more time to look at the bill, just adjourn the debate and we'll see that he gets more time. We don't have to proceed with it in committee tomorrow morning. No rush on it.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Before my Leader does adjourn it, if he does intend to adjourn it, there's one suggestion, Madam, that I would make to the Honourable Minister and that is this, that in view of the fact that we only received this bill this afternoon at 3:00 o'clock and in view of the further fact that it's extremely difficult to read this bill without having the consolidated Act before you, I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to let the members of the committee -- furnish each member of the committee with a copy of the consolidated Highway Traffic Act and then we could take a look at the amendments and we would be able to understand them intelligently.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I don't want to speak at any length on the bill but I would like to have certain points clarified by my honourable friend if I could. Did I understand him to say that under "furious driving" it was now an automatic six months' suspension? Perhaps that has always been so -- (Interjection) -- it was 30 days and it's now six months, is that right? Now under the impoundment section of it, a year or two ago I made what I thought was a rather strong point for a change in this section to enable a person who had his vehicle impounded to sell it immediately and deposit all of the money with the registrar. The purpose, Madam Speaker, was to save depreciation, if any. We had a case at Neepawa where a new car, a practically new car was impounded and remained impounded for two years at least, and it depreciated about \$1,000 in value, and I recommended that and I can't see any reason why arrangements could not be made that where a person wished to do this that it be sold and the bill of sale be produced and the money deposited with the registrar and thereby save some money.

Now as regards the \$25.00 deposit that must be produced if you fail to produce evidence of insurance on application for your license, I believe this is similar in nature to what they've had in Ontario for some time. I believe in Ontario it's \$20.00 -- \$25.00 proposed here. I do not know from my own experience but I have been told by a senior executive of one of the

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . largest insurance companies in Canada that they are running into a problem in Ontario in this regard, that particularly the teen age crowd, where their insurance premium would likely be \$100 more, will go down to their insurance agent, make application for insurance, get his pink card or the card, that is certificate that is necessary to produce when they are applying for their licence, they won't give them a five-cent deposit for their insurance premium, the insurance agent cancels it the next week for non-payment of premium. He satisfies the Motor Vehicle Branch because he's been able to produce the certificate, but there's nothing in the Act to guarantee that the certificate will be maintained. Now in effect this would be a proof of financial responsibility certificate. I'm wondering if there's provision in this bill to make certain the certificate of insurance produced to obtain your licence is maintained, because if it isn't maintained, if it's only going to be maintained until the fellow gets his license and he reaches the office, it's serving no purpose at all.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . a word in connection with the bill. While I too like others have just had the bill before us for a comparatively short period of time, there is one particular section of the Bill that is a new section in the Highway Traffic Act of the Province of Manitoba that I wish to comment on, and that is the section dealing with the proposal of a \$25.00 fee on registration if financial responsibility is not shown by way of insurance. I don't think I need to draw to the attention of the House, Madam Speaker, that we of the New Democratic Party have had resolutions before this House for a considerable number of years, asking that the Province of Manitoba follow the lead of the Province of Saskatchewan in having a compulsory government-operated insurance plan for Manitoba. I know that in particular the Honourable Member for Selkirk has opposed the compulsory features or the government-owned features in respect of our resolutions in the past, and has pointed out to us that in the State of Massachusetts they also have a compulsory scheme and the premiums there are terrifically high. Of course my rebuttal to him on that occasion, as it would be even on this, is the fact that the compulsory scheme in Massachusetts is operated by private enterprise whereas the one that we have been advocating is that under public ownership.

Now actually, Madam Speaker, I suggest that all the Government of Manitoba is attempting to do in the amendment that we have before us at the present time, is to recognize at least to a degree the justification of the resolutions that we have been proposing from this group in the past that everyone should carry automobile insurance to show financial responsibility as a condition of operating a motor vehicle. Because in essence, Madam Speaker, this is exactly what the legislation that we have before us is attempting to set, because the section itself states in a word that where financial responsibility is not shown by virtue of an insurance card, then not necessarily, but this is the intent -- then the individual concerned as a condition of taking out the license will have to pay the sum of \$25.00 into an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund or some other fund, as a condition -- as a condition of operating a motor vehicle in the Province of Manitoba. And we have contended, Madam Speaker, and we contend now, that before any individual is privileged to operate a motor vehicle on the highways of Manitoba that as a condition of doing so they should show full financial responsibility; and I suggest that while the proposition as suggested in this legislation is coming along a little more, it is certainly not going to achieve the desired effect.

The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities in introducing this Bill a few moments ago said, if I recall correctly, that at the present time about 90 percent of the motor vehicle operators in the Province of Manitoba are covered by automobile insurance. Then I think he went on to say, if memory serves me correctly, that it has been the experience in the province to the east of us in Ontario that by virtue of a similar clause in their Highway Traffic Act, namely \$25.00 fee on obtaining a license, that the number of people there covered by auto insurance has risen to 98 percent as the result, mind you Madam Speaker, of the proposition that the Minister is laying before us this evening. He recognizes the fact that by virtue of this penalty of \$25.00 in Ontario, that there is an increase in the total number covered by automobile insurance in the province. Now, I ask him, and I ask this House that if the desire or if the objective which will be reached by this imposition of a \$25.00 additional to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund as a condition of putting a motor vehicle on the highway, why not go whole hog and get in the other 2 percent as well, so that everyone is covered and everyone is making their contribution to the safety on our highways and making sure -- making sure that those poor

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.) . . . unfortunate victims of an accident on our highways are adequately covered and protected through automobile insurance. Of course, Madam Speaker, it isn't desirable and I'm not suggesting that you just simply have to make provision for a recompense in the event of injury with the other aspects as well that we've got to continue to bring to the fore; but I do say to the honourable member, using his percentage of 90 percent being covered at the present time, that as the result of the \$25.00 fee, or call it what you will, in the Province of Ontario, that the coverage there by automobile insurance, outside of the fund itself, was increased to 98 percent, then I'd suggest to him and to the Government of Manitoba, that if you're going to go forward at all let us go fully forward completely and have full coverage insofar as automobile insurance in the Province of Manitoba, which we're not going to have under the proposition that we have from the Minister.

Now, I was pleased at the earlier part of the session when the Honourable the First Minister, in dealing with his estimates, drew to the attention of the House that at least a partial result of some of the suggestions that had been made in this quarter in respect of automobile insurance, that at least that some companies had adopted a policy of no mid-term cancellations, which I think is good and I appreciate it very much. So I hope, Madam Speaker, and I appeal to the Honourable the First Minister to convince, if he has to convince the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities, that the Member for Radisson is not crying in the wilderness any longer, that the government will accept fully and completely the contentions of the New Democratic Party and that they will change their approach insofar as this particular section is concerned, because I am not too concerned and I'm inclined to agree with the Honourable Minister that maybe as the result of this \$25.00 imposition we will get 98 percent covering in the Province of Manitoba, so I say to him if this is the objective then let's make it 100 percent and let's make it as a condition of operating a motor vehicle in the Province of Manitoba that you must show full financial responsibility before you are privileged to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: All those in

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. MOLGAT: Did I understand that the Minister would supply us with the Consolidated Highway Traffic Act, and when might we get them?

MR. STEINKOPF: First thing in the morning?

MR. MOLGAT: Fine.

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

MR. JOHNSON presented Bill No. 120, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2), for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I'll be brief. These -- (Interjection) -- My colleagues, Madam Speaker, always jump for joy when I say that. We have dissolutions -- the various principles here. First of all, I think that the first one is self-explanatory. We have dissolutions where some lands are not included in any district. This amendment provides that the municipalities must state in the by-law what happens to the net assets and liabilities of portions of lands when they dissolve -- that the dissolved school district not transfer to any other district. This is when districts break up and form new districts in cases where a by-law has not stated what happened to these net assets and liabilities. The other principle involved here is to prevent school boards from setting a for teachers with less than 65 and amendments are contained here to have this carried out by area boards, districts and divisions. It was mentioned three times in the Bill before you. Section 104 of the Act, The Public Schools Act, provides for the number of trustees in a town or village district not divided into wards. This is the section of the Act wherein the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council sets up districts, and never before has there been a proposal to consolidate a city school district and some rural districts, and this amendment provides for this.

Also, there's a section here which gives school districts power to make joint use of facilities and/or staff with other districts or divisions. This permits not only the attendance of children, but service such as music teachers, PT teachers and so on which can be shared and permit the school districts to enter into an agreement with the federal government. At present there are, I understand, about 12 agreements between school districts and federal

(Mr. Johnson, Cont'd.) . . . authorities such as air bases and so on, and there really is no authority for these agreements at the present time. Also, they require the use of the flag by schools, of the Canadian Red Ensign with the Canadian Coat of Arms. This of course doesn't pre-empt the question of the Canadian national flag, but suggests that this be done at this time.

A raise of the maximum salary of Secretary-Treasurers of the one-room schools from 50 to 75 and of districts which employ 2, 3 or 4 teachers, but not including municipal or consolidated school districts, from 100 to 150 per year -- that's per annum.

The next change is requiring the books of the city, town, village or municipal school districts be audited by the municipal auditors at the same time and in the same manner as the books of the municipality, if the Secretary-Treasurer of the district is also the Secretary-Treasurer of any municipality. This is suggested to us by the Municipal Board. Also it is proposed that another section dealing with the raising of the salaries of Secretary-Treasurers be retroactive to the first of this year, as also the section dealing with Municipal Auditors, if the committee so wish. That's really all that's involved in these amendments.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . the bill, I'll be quite happy to have it go to Committee. I'm just a little curious, though, about one of the sections here where the Department now is going to make it I understand from this compulsory that the flag be the Canadian Red Ensign and in view of the discussions presently at hand with the national flag I wondered whether this was the opportune time to do this or whether we should simply sit it out until the matter of a national flag is settled, because I understand that it's now going to be settled, but I would -- a further query in this matter, Madam Speaker, that is the matter of the Manitoba provincial flag, because my honourable friend the Leader of the House also promised the provincial flag for Manitoba some years ago, and I'm waiting its appearance and I wondered that the Minister did not include it in this bill.

MR. PAULLEY: I have no objections to the bill going to second reading, but I am intrigued by the reference in the bill to the establishing here in the Province of Manitoba for school purposes of what we commonly call the Red Ensign in place of the Union Jack. Now the Honourable the Minister in his remarks said this does not the question of this being our adoption in view of the discussions that are going on in Ottawa in connection with a national flag for Canada. However, I do note from the Legionary, Madam Speaker, that the Canadian Legion, the Royal Canadian Legion has suggested that the Red Ensign should be the official flag of Canada, by a considerable majority, and I'm wondering whether or not because of the fact it appears that the Honourable the Minister of Education has suggested in this legislation that the Red Ensign should be the flag to be flown over the schools in the Province of Manitoba, that he is in agreement, that the government is in agreement with the Royal Canadian Legion, that the Red Ensign should be the flag of Canada. I ask this question, Madam Speaker, because I'm not satisfied, I'm not at all satisfied with the suggestion that maybe we should hold this off, and when we have a -- if we ever do -- a different flag, Canada's flag, then we'll have to be in the position of changing it once again. If a change is going to be made insofar as the schools of the Province of Manitoba are concerned, then may I suggest respectfully that this intimates at least some agreement with the contention of the Royal Canadian Legion to which I personally have no objection. Now then, in addition to that Madam Speaker, now that we have got down to the basis of a change of flag, namely the change from the Union Jack to that of the Red Ensign insofar as schools are concerned, does that mean, Madam Speaker, that the Union Jacks which are in evidence here in this Chamber will likewise be supplanted by the Red Ensign? Does this mean that insofar as this Chamber is concerned -- and we note Madam that there's an absolute absence of the Red Ensign within the confines of this Chamber -- if we're going to change it insofar as the schools are concerned, are we going to at least exhibit the Red Ensign here in this Chamber as being a recognition of a change of thinking as to what should be the flag which is flown on public buildings here in the Province of Manitoba? I would like to hear from the Minister comments in connection with this. Again I say I have no objections to the Bill being given second reading. My basic question of course is, is this recognition of the fight of the Royal Canadian Legion to have the Red Ensign recognized as the flag of Canada?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think perhaps it would be appropriate if I said a word because both Leaders of the other parties have raised this interesting question, and I think it's

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . just as well that we should try and define our position in this respect because it is a matter of no small importance. I think I should begin by quoting to the House from an order of His Excellency, the Governor-General-in-Council or rather the minutes of a meeting of the Committee of the Council approved by His Excellency, the Governor-General on the 26th day of January, 1924, and the quotation is as follows: "The Prime Minister considers that this purpose," that is the Canadian flag, "could be served by the employment in this connection of the Red Ensign with the Canadian Coat of Arms in the . . . which though originally authorized by the Admiralty to be flown over vessels in the Canadian Mercantile Marine, has come to serve a wider application, having been displayed in times past from the government buildings in Ottawa and quite generally throughout the country where it is still often spoken of as the Canadian flag meaning thereby it is a distinctive emblem of Canada," and there's more to the same effect but the general point that I try to make here is that on this occasion the federal government intimated that for the purposes of a distinctive Canadian flag that the Canadian Ensign, as we've come to call it, could be looked upon as being that flag.

Then in addition to the Order-in-Council PC 134 of the 26th day of January, 1924, when the display of the Canadian Red Ensign was authorized from "all buildings owned and occupied by the Government of Canada situated without Canada" we have another Order-in-Council. On September 5th, 1945, Privy Council #5888 was issued as follows: "That until such time as action be taken by parliament for the formal adoption of a national flag, it is desirable to authorize the flying of the Canadian Red Ensign on federal government buildings within as well as without Canada, and to remove any doubt as to the propriety of flying the Canadian Red Ensign wherever place or occasion makes it desirable to fly a distinctive Canadian flag, therefore His Excellency the Governor-General-in-Council on the recommendation of the Prime Minister is pleased to order and doth hereby order that the Red Ensign with the shield of the Coat-of-Arms of Canada in . . . hereafter referred to as the Canadian Red Ensign, may be flown on buildings owned and occupied by the federal government within and without Canada," and there's more to the same effect but I think members get the general impression.

So we see that from 1924 and again confirmed in 1945, the Canadian Red Ensign has been officially recognized by the Government of Canada by means of Order-in-Council as being a distinctive Canadian flag where it was thought necessary to fly such a flag whether within or without Canada, and it would seem to us that there is no more place where it would be appropriate to fly a flag that is known as a distinctive Canadian flag, than on the schools of this province. Heretofore they have been flying the Union Jack. Now I have a great respect for the Union Jack because it epitomizes all that we regard as best and truest in the tradition of the British races, which is part of our inheritance. But it is not the flag of this country, and if we are to seek for a flag of this country I think the best thing we can do at the present time is to take the advice of the Government of Canada in flying the Canadian Red Ensign. Members who are observant may have noticed that that is the practice we have followed for some time ourselves with respect to provincial government buildings as distinct from schools, and it is thought desirable that we should now make this the regulation with respect to schools.

Now I do not think that any province should try to pre-empt for itself the right to take action in this field of a Canadian national flag. This is the responsibility of the federal government. I don't wish to contract out of this responsibility in any way. It's theirs. I think that's where it should properly remain, and I suppose that all of us hope that in due course a distinctive Canadian flag will be settled and agreed upon, but until that happens -- and we know from our experience it takes some time -- I think we can do no better than to follow the example of the federal government itself, as authorized in these Orders-in-Council, in flying the Canadian Red Ensign on the schools of Manitoba, and also on the public buildings in this province, and that is the policy that we propose to recommend to this House. I don't think from that that anyone should assume that we are trying to overstep the bounds of our jurisdiction in prescribing for the nation what the national flag should be. You take note naturally of other people's views. We take note of the views of the Royal Canadian Legion. I think that I can say that they do not object to the action that we are taking in this respect, but I fully recognize the right of the federal government to proscribe the rules in this matter, and I do not think that it is any part of our duty here to proceed further in this matter than we have done. However, I do believe that having a distinctive national flag, identified in the way it has been by federal

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . Privy Council orders, that it is the proper thing that this should be flown on the schools of this province at the present time.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, just a few remarks. I notice in the bill here that from here on the School Board will have the say in retirement of a teacher. I'm not sure just what the situation was before this. From this apparently if a teacher is a good teacher and wants to, he can go on teaching indefinitely if the School Board goes along with it. Is that the intention of this amendment?

And I thought I should make one comment in connection with the increase of the remuneration to the Secretary-Treasurers. This is a 50 percent increase which percentage is a large increase, but in actual money it doesn't amount to much, but I'm so happy that they're at least recognizing their work and that they're increasing it by the amount that they are.

MR. MOLGAT: Minister, would it be the intention then that all schools will now have to scrap whatever flags they have and buy new Canadian Red Ensigns, and if so has an estimate been made of the cost to the school districts of Manitoba?

MR. JOHNSON: I understand -- I imagine this will be necessary. The flags are \$8.00 I believe -- the Red Ensigns -- and can be purchased and supplied through our Textbook Bureau.

With respect to the Member from Rhineland -- this is to enable school boards to enable the teacher to get the maximum pension at the retirement age of 65. This was a matter which I could share with the Committee. I discussed with the Trustees Association and the Manitoba Teachers' Society, and as the Honourable Member from Rhineland may know, until '57 for example the Winnipeg School Board had a compulsory retirement age of 60 for female teachers, and when the Winnipeg Pension Plan and the Teachers' Retirement Fund were amalgamated in that year, this was abolished and many teachers retired on a pension between 60 and 65 which leaves them on somewhat less of a pension than if they had carried on to 65, and it was thought desirable to bring in a measure of this kind.

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

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 121, an Act respecting the Registration of Business Names and Partnerships for second reading.

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

MR. ROBLIN: of the bill that goes to the Committee on Statutory Rules and Regulations and it should be so recorded.

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 123, an Act respecting the Law of Partnership, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, it's intended that this bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may I now ask you to call Bill No. 119, standing in the name of the Honourable Member from St. John's?

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 119, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1) for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I know nothing more really about this bill than appears in the explanatory note which reads: "These amendments would leave the institution of religious teaching in the public schools entirely to the discretion of the Board of Trustees of the District." I received a request, Madam Speaker, from the Winnipeg School Board, of which I am an alumnus, that I sponsor this bill in order to have the Winnipeg School Board be put in a position to be able to come down and speak to the Committee on the bill and explain its reasoning and its desire for these amendments. On the surface I do not agree with the proposal that each Board of Trustees shall have discretionary rights, but I do feel that a School Division which represents as it does some 25 percent of the population of this province should be given an opportunity to be heard when it requests an amendment, and when I was informed that the School Division was under the impression -- a pretty accurate impression I believe -- that it could not get this bill introduced to this House by the person that it felt normally and regularly introduced amendments of this type, when they asked that I do it to make sure that the opportunity be given to them I agreed that I would do it as a matter of courtesy to the Board

(Mr. Cherniack, Cont'd.) . . . and respect for the wishes, as I say, of a Board of the size of the Winnipeg School Division. So that reserving, as I obviously do, the right to disagree when this matter comes before committee, I feel that it is only proper that we pay the Board the courtesy to send it on for second reading where we can then hear the representations from the Board and deal with them.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would now be good enough to call the . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . the Honourable the First Minister rise, I assumed that he wanted to call for a roll call. It appears to me that that ought to be the request to be made, and I make it as a private member, I presume.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the second reading of Bill No. 119.

A standing vote was taken with the following results:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Guttormson, Harris, Paulley, Peters, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Vielfaure, Weir and Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 6; Nays, 42.

MR. ROBLIN: We've been notified that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead could not be here this evening, and no one wished to speak on that resolution this afternoon. I wonder if we should bother calling it. Does anyone want to speak on it? Otherwise I'll just suggest that that motion should stand. That's the motion on the Shewman report. No takers? And then we have the one on shared services. I'm not sure whether the Leader of the New Democratic Party wishes to speak tonight or wishes to hold it over until tomorrow. Perhaps he could indicate. Speak now? In that case Madam, would you please call the shared services motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I feel that I might as well make my contribution this evening to this very interesting debate, and place on the record if indeed this is the reason for speaking on this resolution, where I stand on the question. At the offset in taking part in this debate may I compliment the members who have spoken. I would in particular compliment the Honourable Member for La Verendrye for his contribution the other day. This is the type of contribution that I trust will be made by others in this House, and Madam Speaker, the debates and contributions today were of that nature as well. And while the Honourable Member for La Verendrye clearly stated his viewpoint, he recognized others may differ with him and he stated that they had a right to do so. Once or twice during the debate it appeared as though emotion would prevail over wisdom, but this was only for a moment, or two during the debate.

At the offset, Madam Speaker, I want to make it clear that I am speaking not as the Leader of the New Democratic Party, but as a private member in this House. Our party has the whole question of the relationship of the private school to the public school, and also the relationship of the private school to the public treasury, under review. When this review is completed, the party may or may not adopt a policy in respect of aid to private and parochial schools. In the meantime, Madam Speaker, each member of the New Democratic Party in this House is free to speak as his conscience and reasoning guide him. I think that this is a fair position for our party to take at this time. I noted that the Leader of the Opposition, speaking the other day, said that he expressed regret that the Premier had committed the government to a partisan stand on the question of public aid to parochial and private schools. The Leader of the Liberal Party declared that insofar as the Liberals were concerned they were free to vote as they pleased.

However, I cannot help but note the present position of the Liberal leader is slightly different from that of the previous leader of the Liberal party who declared according to a press report in January of 1961, that the government must take a party stand while others vote as they please. I refer to a clipping, Madam Speaker, from the Winnipeg Free Press of

(Mr. Pauley, Cont'd.) . . . January of 61 when the heading of the article states "Must Take a Stand On Private School Aid Campbell Tells Liberal Leader won't let government declare a free vote on it." I have always taken the stand, Madam Speaker, that I would be prepared to allow a truly free vote in this House regarding this matter. I would be prepared to allow a Minister of the Crown to introduce a money bill calling for support for parochial and private schools, and after the introduction I would be prepared to accept a free vote and on the defeat of the resolution, if such would be its fate, I would not call for the resignation of the government. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that this is the only fair and reasonable method by which this matter could be dealt with on a non-partisan basis, for I cannot agree with the contention that I can stand up here as a member of my particular party and say that we can vote four ways of the wind but say to members opposite that you haven't this same privilege, when we're dealing with the question of the like that we have before us, on the question of whether or not aid should be granted to private and parochial schools.

I have observed on reviewing the debate thus far that in each of the three major parties represented in this House members have had different viewpoints. These differences are even evident as to whether or not the proposed committee on shared services should be set up. I note that members of the government have stated they support the resolution before but reserve their opinions as to their final stand pending the report of the committee. So here we have, Madam Speaker, members of this House of the government side who have stated that they're prepared to support the resolution of the setting up of the committee but, unlike the suggestion of my honourable friend the Leader of the Official Opposition, they are making their reservations as to whether or not they're going to support the principle of shared services if and when the committee makes its report, and I would refer, Madam Speaker, the honourable members of this House to read the contribution that was made by the Honourable Member for St. Vital and also the contribution of the Honourable Member for Brandon, both of whom stated their willingness to support the formation of the committee but both were equally vigorous in stating that they reserved the right to not support the principle of shared services if this was to be their opinion after the deliberation of the committee. For myself, I am prepared to support the resolution setting up the committee, and indeed I am prepared if selected to be a member of that committee. I take this stand because I am prepared to see whether or not it is possible through a method of shared services for us to bring about a fuller and better relationship between the pupils of our private and parochial schools and those attending public schools. I believe that only through a thorough investigation into the proposals will be revealed the feasibility or otherwise of the proposal. The committee, I suggest Madam Speaker, will have to investigate the question of additional finances required, the availability of accommodation, the availability of teachers and many other matters. I am not convinced that the plan as suggested will work. I am prepared however to look into it.

Madam Speaker, earlier in this session it was suggested that each and every member of the House should stand up and be counted as to where he or she stood regarding the question of aid to private and parochial schools. I have no hesitation in stating that I could not support the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education headed by Mr. MacFarlane in respect of aid to private and parochial schools. As a matter of fact, it was reported in the Winnipeg Free Press of January 17, 1961, that the Leader of the then CCF Party, myself, was the first member of the Legislature to state his views publicly. I did this at a meeting of the Knights of Columbus in Transcona whereat I made the statement that I was opposed to the recommendations of the Commission, however that I would give consideration to any scheme of assistance that would not damage the public school system or lead to a major extension in private schools. I further stated at that time that I had seen no proposals that would do this and I frankly state today, Madam Speaker, that I have still seen no proposal whereby we would be able to grant aid to private or parochial schools without damage to the public school system in Manitoba. One of my main objections to the Royal Commission recommendation was that by giving aid to any qualified private or parochial school that this would bring about considerable segregation among our youth of school age. I rejected then and I reject now aid that will bring about divisiveness in education in Manitoba.

I regret, Madam Speaker, very much that even the clergy of the Anglican fraternity have stated recently that they are in favour of some aid to parochial schools including their

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.) . . . own. An Anglican myself, Madam Speaker, I cannot accept this viewpoint as expressed by the clergy of my faith. If this type of viewpoint were to prevail in Manitoba then each and every religious denomination, the agnostics and the atheists, would surely be entitled to similar aid from the state.

During the debate some have mentioned that we should set up a system of aid to private and parochial schools such as has been done in every other province with the exception of British Columbia. May I suggest, Madam Speaker, that no province in Canada has a system whereby every minority group is treated equally regarding education. I note Madam Speaker, that even in the province of Quebec, which is referred to by some as having an ideal system of education, there is only recognition for those of Roman Catholic faith and those who are not. While I appreciate the difficulties in bringing about the so-called true freedom in education, none is in effect I suggest, Madam Speaker, in Canada.

I note on reading Hansard and also from press reports, that some of the members of this House have stated that they would be in favour of granting aid without saying in particular to whom, if such aid was not harmful to the public school system. I have grave doubts that this is possible. I also note, Madam Speaker, that some members say that if any aid were to be given it would only be given in the larger urban areas. I ask, is this not going contrary to the primary argument of equality in education, irrespective of religious leanings, for if aid is given at all on a matter of principle should not this principle also be extended all across the province? How can those who justify either shared services or aid to private and parochial schools do this only in certain areas within the province? I suggest, Madam Speaker, that if it is right to give aid or to give shared services in the urban centres, then it is equally right for rural areas as well. I suggest that this is in keeping with the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Education which was adopted and which has made it possible for most of the students in our schools throughout the province to obtain higher education. As members well know, this was the principle that was invoked insofar as setting up our high school divisions across the province.

Much more could be said on this question but it is not my purpose to do so at present. May I sum up by saying: Firstly, we have no partisan stand at the present time. Secondly, I am opposed to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education dealing with aid to private and parochial schools. Third, I am prepared to support and even sit on a committee to investigate possible shared services. Fourth, I reserve my rights as an individual member of the House to concur in or reject any or all of the recommendations if any are forthcoming from such a committee on shared services.

One point I wish to make in connection with any possible legislation resulting from committee investigation is that any proposal from the committee, or any subsequent legislation, we should make adequately sure that changes in our educational system or grants to shared services should only be made by this Assembly. I would object most strenuously to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or to any Minister having power by regulation to interpret any legislation.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I trust and I hope that further investigations into this matter will be made in the same tenor as evidenced by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and I appreciate that in this question we have a grave problem, and I am prepared to accept as I said at the opening of my remarks, my responsibility if chosen to do so as a member of the committee to investigate this whole matter which is of prime concern and of prime importance to Manitoba.

I would just like to make one additional remark, Madam Speaker. I refer to being at a meeting of the Knights of Columbus in Transcona back in 1961 where I publicly made my stand insofar as the regulations were concerned. I heard a remark this afternoon of one of the members in the House talking about the Christian approach to the question of aid to parochial schools, and laid emphasis on the question of a Christian approach. Why I mention the meeting that was held in 1961, Madam Speaker, is because of the similarity at that particular time; as a matter of fact, the only time I lost my . . . to use the term in the vernacular, during that meeting, and the meeting incidentally was of about three hours' duration, when I was accused because of the fact that I was not in favour of granting aid that I and my children were not following through the dictates of what a Christian should do or should be. I want it clearly understood, Madam Speaker, and I'm sure this would apply to most of the members in this

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.) . . . House at least, that whether we agree to aid to private and parochial schools or whether we do not, we're not on the auction block as to whether or not we are Christians, because I have considered myself as being a true Christian and have brought my children up in the true Christian faith as I see it, in the public school system of Manitoba, and I reject any indication that I may not be, because of the stand I take on this question.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department 9 (1), Administration, passed.

MR. MOLGAT: to go over some of the items in Lands Branch at this time, or whether he prefers to leave those to the item itself. It doesn't make that much difference to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: item 3 passed.

MR. MOLGAT: you're not calling whole sections at one time surely, Mr. Chairman. We went into that last week, and I think it was agreed that it would be called

MR. CHAIRMAN: The forestry Branch was second. Where are we now? 1. The Administration passed. 2. The Forestry Branch passed. -- (Interjection) -- All right. (a) passed, (b) passed, (c) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under Construction and Maintenance, does that cover the road construction in the forest areas, or is this for other items?

MR. LYON: It's an improvement, Mr. Chairman, of existing forest access roads . . . and fire guards, docks, telephone lines and lookout towers, but not including recreational facilities.

MR. MOLGAT: this item then, Mr. Chairman, where the road system for example in the southeast part of the province is covered, in the Sandilands Reserve and so on?

MR. LYON: As far as maintenance is concerned; the other roads would come under the last item, chargeable to Capital.

MR. SHOEMAKER: We are now on 2?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)

MR. SHOEMAKER: Construction and Maintenance.

MR. A. VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Would the Minister tell me if the road from Marchand to Woodridge is under the Forestry or the Department of Public Works. I was under the understanding it was under the Department of Public Works.

MR. LYON: Public Works.

MR. VIELFAURE: Thank you!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) passed, (d) passed, (e) passed, (f) passed . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Minister the other evening, Friday evening, told us of his proposed plan to spend something like \$3 million on three new major developments in the province. Now, I'm one of those fellows that on a weekend likes to get away from it all and am not particularly interested in going some place where there's 25,000 other people; and I believe that I speak for quite a number of people in the province, or I should say I think that quite a number of people in the province and out of the province share my views on this particular subject.

When we were dealing with the Industry and Commerce estimates the other evening, the Minister of that department pointed out the fact that people have taken to camping and picnicking and the like and he suggested that this accounted for the fact that while we had increasing number of tourists in the province in the last two or three years, that they actually spent less money because they were not paying for expensive accommodation. Now, I agree that that is

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . a fact. Now, what I am attempting to say, Mr. Chairman, is this, that it is fine and dandy and I'm quite in accord with developing all of these huge picnic and recreational areas, but I say that if we only have a limited amount of money to spend, then in my opinion it might be better to spend say, \$10,000 on 50 different smaller recreational areas in the province than it would be to spend huge sums on one particular area, because we have in this province in my estimation -- and my honourable friend will agree I know -- literally hundreds and hundreds of lovely small recreational areas. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains pointed this out the other day, and that in these spots that people like to get away from the mad rush of everyday living.

When the Cabinet met for the first time outside of the City of Winnipeg you may recall, because it certainly received a lot of publicity at that time, they met in Neepawa in 1961, in the fall I believe of 1961 -- no, in June, pardon me, it was in June 1961. Yes, there was lots of publicity given to this and to the fact that they had broken new grounds -- this was the first time in the history of this province that the Cabinet had met outside of Winnipeg. Now, they met with the council members of the Town of Neepawa, and they met with certain council members for the RM of Rosedale. I am not certain that the entire council met with the First Minister and the Cabinet, but I am certain of one request that was made by the Rural Municipality of Rosedale, because I have before me a letter, a follow-up letter addressed to the then Minister of Mines and Natural Resources; and I would like to read it because it's only a short one, and it points up what I would like to elaborate on. No, pardon me, Mr. Chairman, this letter is from the Minister addressed to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Rural Municipality of Rosedale. I am not certain that I have the letter from the RM of Rosedale to the Minister, but here is the Minister's reply, addressed to Miss Nora K. Benson, Secretary-Treasurer of the Rural Municipality of Rosedale, Neepawa, Manitoba. "Dear Miss Benson: On June 15th" -- this is November 13, 1961 -- "On June 15th, the Rural Municipality of Rosedale, when the Cabinet convened in Neepawa, requested development of a park and picnic area at Kerr's Lake. As Minister of the Department concerned I advised that I would study the request and personally visit the area. This I have done and regret to advise that we are unable to comply with the request. While I appreciate the pride of the local people in the area, the department must consider the provincial picture as a whole. We are now spreading our roadside park development along other major routes in the province, following the concentration on the Trans-Canada Highway." Signed by C. H. Witney. Now this was three years ago and I had hoped that the government since that time would have developed a new policy and program in regard to this.

Now I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that later on the reeve of the RM of Rosedale made a recommendation to the department, and they made a request as well. They said, if my memory serves me correctly, you give us a grant of \$10,000 and we -- that is the RM of Rosedale -- will develop a beach area and we will develop a picnic site here. The RM of Rosedale are fortunate in that they have a lot of heavy equipment and they are in a position to do this. I am certain that several businessmen in Neepawa anticipated that something would be done at Kerr's Lake when last year they went in and built at least \$25,000 worth of very modern cabins on the lake shore. I am sure that they would not have gone in if they had not envisaged that something would be done here. The five or six or seven people in Neepawa who built cottages there had to obtain permission from the department to trespass on certain crown land, that is they built their cottages on some private land that they acquired on the lake but in order to get to it had to go through certain crown land and they got permission to do that. The fact that last year five or six beautiful cabins have been built -- I saw them myself, went last fall and inspected them with the reeve of the municipality -- is evident that further development will take place with a little bit of encouragement and I suggest that for the sake of \$10,000 -- this is the request that the RM of Rosedale are making -- that here is a spot that would attract hundreds of people every Sunday, not only Sunday but in particular on Sunday.

In a recent issue -- and when I say recent, Mr. Chairman, I am referring to the one on January 9, 1964 -- there's a full page headed "Discoveries in Manitoba" in a Saskatchewan paper -- the Western Producer, and two very fine pictures here, one of the St. Mary's Ukrainian Catholic Church at Mountain Road, Manitoba, and the other one the St. Elizabeth Church in Polonia, Manitoba. Now Kerr's Lake as my honourable friend knows, certainly the present Minister of Health knows where it is because I know that he personally inspected the lake or he

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . said he did, maybe he flew over it with an airplane, I'm not certain, but I think maybe he did visit it -- and here is a beautiful spot that I would like to see developed. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the department offer, offer to renegotiate with the RM of Rosedale, see if they can't come to some meeting of minds on the development of this. Now I don't know whether the government intends to purchase back certain crown lands around the area. They presently own one quarter section I believe there, and I would like to see them renegotiate and see if we cannot come to some meeting of minds on this beauty spot in the province.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other area I have not checked recently but I know there was a problem here a year or two ago, and that is in the vicinity of Langruth almost immediately east -- well, two or three miles north of the town of Langruth and then straight east on the lakeshore of Lake Manitoba. I think the Chamber of Commerce and the townspeople of Langruth made a request of the government to establish -- well I suppose they were really asking for a survey -- the establishment of lots, a registered plan of some kind so that citizens, not only of Langruth but any citizen in the Province of Manitoba that desired to build a cabin could make application for a site and thereby establish himself. No doubt there are other areas in the province where they are running into problems of this nature. Now I would like to Mr. Chairman have some assurance from my honourable friend that he is prepared to negotiate with these people with the hope of coming up with some kind of a solution to their problems.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I have already commended the Honourable Minister of the beautiful panorama he painted for us the other night as to the government's intention to create recreation facilities in Manitoba on a very large basis. I'm all for it. The only thing I want to remind him now is when plans are being made not to neglect or destroy facilities we have had here for many years not far from the city where the people that cannot afford to build cottages, they could only go out in their car or by bus on Sundays and usually at times there were at least 15 to 20,000 visitors from the city where their families and the children could enjoy at least one day during the week and they haven't neither the time or the money to go to those recreation grounds which are now being planned or anywhere else. The place that's so popular that even the government built one of the fine roads to this -- and I refer to the Winnipeg Beach. At the present time those cottages around Boundary Park around Gimii have facilities, some of them even have private swimming pools, but the beach itself I think is gone entirely and that particular playground will likely disappear entirely if help would not come from the province and do something about it. Even those concessions which the CPR sold to private people are planning to close up on account of there's no beach, you cannot swim there and the place until recently of course the sanitation was bad, it's built now. I understand the government was kind enough to make a contribution towards this but at the same time as I said, well I'm all for the other plans but I think the one that's closest to Winnipeg should not be neglected, and something should be done and should be done immediately to investigate how to maintain the interest with so many people who cannot afford to go to any other finer places could have their family out at least one day a week or evenings. I want to call this to the attention of the Honourable Minister. If he doesn't listen now he'll probably read it in the Hansard tomorrow morning and would appreciate very much to give some comment to it.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): to tell the Minister of an experience I had last summer and as this involves a little criticism I don't want it to be construed that I am criticizing the people who are working at the Park entrances. Far be it because I believe most of them are doing a very good job, but I had occasion one day last summer, we had friends visiting from Alberta, and I did want to show them our Whiteshell district. We went down the old road, No. 4, and as we approached the cutoff where you pay your park fees at Brereton Lake there, I guess talking -- my boy was driving -- we failed to see a sign that said detour to the Park and the boy seeing that the other car was following close, he didn't want to brake the car so he ran into the old road, that is followed the hardtop There's no danger to the thing or anything like that and we went a couple of hundred feet farther and stopped at the stop sign, took a right hand turn and went over to the Park entrance. I got out and paid the fee for the two cars and apologized to the attendant there for having been so careless and he reminded me of course how stupid I was and did I not know how to read. I said,

(Mr. Wright, cont'd)... "Look, I admit the mistake, I am very very sorry. We didn't want to have an accident and we simply took the road because after all it's not very well defined. It's a gravel road, it's on a bend and the sign wasn't far enough back in my opinion." "However, I'm not trying to argue out of it" I said. Well he wouldn't let me go, and you can imagine my embarrassment because the car from Alberta was immediately behind me and listened to all this conversation. He leaned on the car so we couldn't proceed and he proceeded to tell me once again about how bad my eyesight was, how stupid I was, and the gentleman behind me he started to laugh, he thought it was funny. This was sort of a poor greeting for people from -- he could see the Alberta licence plate. I began to get a little vexed and I said, "Look would you mind giving me your name please. If I've done anything wrong please give me a ticket. I want to visit this place today not next week. If I warrant a ticket or summons anybody you like but let me proceed. Don't subject me to all this embarrassment." Well he kept it up for another five minutes. My wife by the way made a note of his name -- I can give it to you privately, and I do this without any bitterness but simply that this could happen to someone else too, This could happen to visitors and because the other gentlemen are doing such a good job I think that it should be drawn to the attention of the people who hire these fellows for the summer because this could result in certainly giving a bad impression to people that go down there. I don't think I want to say any more than that except to relate the experience. We had a good day in spite of it all because we laughed it off. We weren't in the mood for any argument but the gentleman from Alberta was very upset about the whole thing. He said, "Why didn't you tell him you were a member of the Legislature." I said, "If this could happen to me" he saw the sticker on the car, "it could happen to anybody." If you wish the name I can give it to you.

MR. LYON: indeed I would appreciate it very much if he would let me have that name because I certainly agree with him that he was improperly treated from the manner in which he has related the story to us and certainly this is the kind of thing that we do not like to see happening in the department because what happened to him could happen to others. I appreciate him bringing it to our attention. We would like to put a stop to that kind of thing if it does go on and certainly I appreciate him mentioning it to us tonight.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I just want to give a warning to the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, to be very careful this summer in his travels because now we are going to have on our statutes an Act which permits arrest without warrant by exactly that type of personnel.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, there's only one item I'd like to bring to the attention of the Minister and this deals with the entrance into Parks too. This was brought to my attention. The fellow had paid his three dollars, stuck the sticker on his windshield, then traded his car in on a new car, and he wanted another sticker and they told him well, if you've got the receipt we'll give you another sticker. Well, I've paid my three dollars for the last two years. I've not received a receipt yet. Is this on demand or are they supposed to give you a receipt?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, whilst the answer is on its way could I ask the Minister to give us a breakdown of what was actually spent last year on this item, 2 (f), and the general location in which it was spent.

MR. PAULLEY: like to say a word or two on this particular section. I've had a number of complaints directed to me from people in summer resorts, particularly in the Whiteshell, that are paying all of the necessary fees for the privileges of being in the camp, and their taxes or grants in lieu of taxes to the government -- just waiting for the Minister to catch up. . . . Are you working on it? Oh, okay. I just didn't want you to miss out on this one. I've had a number of complaints directed toward me from people who have campsites particularly in the Whiteshell, who in addition to having to pay for their fees instead of taxes and the likes of this in the area, in addition to that have to pay for the entrance fee into the Park. Now some of them have complained because they don't think that they should pay the annual fee for the sticker on their car in addition to the fees that they are paying for the rights to have their campsite; but, even worse than this, some of them -- not too affluent -- happen to have two cars, and there's a problem that they have in that they have to obtain a sticker for both cars. Now I've been requested to see whether or not it might be possible for some arrangement -- and I can appreciate there may be some difficulties in this -- where the party is a renter shall I say of a campsite that more consideration might be given to them in

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... respect of their first car and then if they're going to have to buy a sticker for their second car then this might be a proper charge. I can appreciate the fact that if you're going to charge them for the first car then they come along with a second car it's going to be difficult to be able to work, but if on the payment of their grant -- and I'm not suggesting an increase in the rent to take up the slack on the fee -- I suggest that this should be given complimentary to their fees, and then if perchance they have a second car then the second car be charged the fee for entrance to the Park and I ask the Minister to take this under consideration.

Also, while we're dealing with the question of recreation operation and maintenance, I note that on page 72 in the book, although this is dealing actually with land acquisition, there is reference on page 72, Mr. Chairman to the effect that a certain amount of property was purchased for recreational purposes, namely 45 acres of valuable property was acquired from the Motor Country Club adjoining the Federal Historical Site of Lower Fort Garry for future park development on behalf of the people of Manitoba. Now if memory serves me correctly, the price was recorded in the papers at that particular time, it seemed to me to be a rather high price, and I'm wondering whether or not -- I'm asking the Minister this, in view of the fact that the federal government have taken over the Fort as an historical site surely to goodness for park purposes it shouldn't have cost the taxpayer of Manitoba an extra amount for acquiring a park adjoining the site of a federal historical site. If it's going to be a historical site at all surely to goodness we shouldn't here in the Province of Manitoba have had to pay -- and I believe it was quite a considerable sum of money. The Minister I guess will have the figure. I think it almost approached \$100,000 or it may not have, but it was to me as I read it at that particular time quite a fantastic amount of money simply for the Province of Manitoba to have a parksite next to a federal parksite or historical monument. I think this should have been the responsibility of the federal government and not that of the provincial government.

MR. LYON: the leader of the NDP first of all, there is certainly some merit in what he says about the Lower Fort property. I believe, as my predecessor mentioned last year, if he didn't I mention it this year, the province is in negotiation with the federal government with respect to the form of development at the Lower Fort. We really don't know at this stage what type of development it actually will be but the province you've got to remember owns as I recall the bulk of the land in the area outside of the actual fort itself, now, and these negotiations are underway have been underway for some considerable time with the federal people to try to work out some plan which will be the best having regard to the interests of the people and the value of this tremendous historic site to our province. I'm sorry I can't give my honourable friend more details on it right now because they are still under negotiation but -- (Interjection) -- That certainly is I think one of the alternatives, one of the matters that's being looked at and is under negotiation.

He talks about receiving complaints about stickers on cars of cottage owners. I want to tell him that he's not the only one who received complaints of that nature. I get them too. And this problem, I don't know that it's ever been resolved in the federal park. Those who are more familiar with Clear Lake perhaps than I am will be aware of the fact that federal park cottage owners as I understand have to buy entrance stickers the same as any other tourist going through the place. This is something that they become accustomed to in time, and I really can't see that there's any immediate amelioration forthcoming on that subject at all. The same applies to the one and the two cars. This is a bit of a sticky problem. I've heard complaints about the same type of thing but it's pretty hard to resolve it equitably. If a man can own two cars, well should he be able to afford stickers for the two, I don't know. This is the problem we're up against. I suppose we might refer to the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture where he said, "one pig, one vote," I suppose you might say in this instance "one car, one sticker," and that would apply right down the line.

The Member for St. John's was inquiring about the amount that was actually expended under this item, 9 (2) (m), and I can give him these figures very roughly. The largest item, Purchase of Land and/or Buildings, Wages and other assistance -- the revised estimates which are not completely final, but a revised estimate shows \$281,415 spent on that; and running down the total vote; automobiles operation, \$12,000; advertising and exhibits, \$150; books, newspapers, periodicals, \$150; construction contracts, \$400; fees, \$5,000; freight and express and

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)... cartage, \$5,000; furniture and furnishings, \$200; fuel, \$1,500; gasoline and lubricants, \$10,000; grants, nil; household requisites, \$6,000; light, power and water, \$14,000; machinery and equipment, \$26,000; materials and repairs, \$25,000; materials and other construction costs, \$6,500; medical services and supplies, \$500; miscellaneous, \$200; postage, telephone and telegraph, \$400; printing, stationery, office maintenance, etc., \$9,000; rentals, \$200; insurance, \$1,000; seed and/or garden supplies, \$1,500; travelling expenses, \$4,000; and then the final item, the one I mentioned at the beginning, \$281,000 for purchase of land. There was a total vote of \$468, 115 I believe the figure was last year -- \$468, 115 -- and the revised estimate of actual expenditures will be about \$5,000 more than that -- \$473, 115

.....
MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister gave a reply to the Member for Gladstone with regard to Kerrs Lake and I happen to be interested in that development as well. It's not a very large development, but it's one of those that can be developed at very little cost insofar as the province is concerned. I believe that the request from the municipalities concerned -- there were two of them, Rosedale and Clanwilliam was for assistance something in the order of \$10,000.00. This was largely for access and some slight development in the area. I would like to know from the Minister whether or not the province has plans for Kerrs Lake and when they may materialize. It seems to me as the Member for Gladstone says that this is one of these local things that does service a large number of people in the local area, but in addition to that has some tourist value, because many tourists now want to get off the heavy traffic areas into -- shall we say -- more quiet or backwoods regions and this is one of those -- it's a very quiet little area, very pretty, and does have I think, a real place in the tourist development.

MR. LYONS: I regret that I don't have any personal knowledge of the negotiations on Kerrs Lake, but I will certainly try to get up-to-date information and give it at a later time, either on these estimates or while we're in committee. That is about all I can say on that point at this time.

The honourable member also mentioned about the desirability of spending small amounts of money on smaller sites. Certainly this is commendable. We have to realize of course that there are three levels of government providing recreation areas and park services to the people of the province -- federal, provincial and municipal -- and people in the Neepawa-Minnedosa area for many, many years have had the enjoyment of what I consider to be one of the finest and nicest smaller national parks that we have, namely at Clear Lake. In addition to that there are some local lakes such as the honourable member has mentioned. Up to date, as I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition and the Member from Gladstone will realize, there has not been a program of assistance for municipal parks, or smaller parks or recreation areas. Under the new Centennial plans with which I am sure most members are familiar, there is provision for assistance for local parks and other projects on a one-third federal, one-third provincial, one-third municipal basis, and certainly some of the local projects of this nature might well fall under this new scheme. Notwithstanding this however, the province does out of its funds, I believe, totally support something like 240 -- I'll just check this figure, because it is rather an interesting figure -- 270 actual individual areas are maintained throughout the province. That's everything from wayside camps to provincial parks to campsites and so on; so we don't lose sight of what my honourable friend has mentioned, because what he says is so very true, a smaller lake or a smaller beauty spot in a local area certainly very often has very much local attraction, and where this is Crown land I think there has been an attempt in many of the cases to try to improve it and to make it a spot that people will come to for enjoyment. But I'm the first to admit that we haven't done all of the spots by any means. I think it's only fair to say to the honourable member that I don't think we will be doing all of the spots having regard to the fact that there are the three jurisdictions involved and that some of these are probably much better developed on a municipal or a local basis than they are on a provincial basis. We do try to spend our funds so that we will provide the greatest good for the greatest number as much as possible and it isn't always possible to get support or assistance to all of these smaller areas that might perhaps deserve some support. I will also try to get for the honourable member the information that he requested about Langruth. I don't have anything at hand on that.

MR. SHOEMAKER:subject matter, I have found now a letter dated September

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)... 24th last, 1963, from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and he says here, and I quote: "The Kerrs Lake area was assessed for recreational development and I visited the area over a year ago, that the at that time was against any recreational development by this department. The survey made this past year of recreational needs in the province, in particular the relationship between activity and potential in cities, towns and municipalities with that of a broad picture has been made through a questionnaire delivered to all affected and completed by our field personnel. The report has not been issued by the consultants who have studied these reports and made their own observations; thus the progress to date has been the collection and compilation of data only." Now I wonder at this date if there was a report tabled, or can my honourable friend enlighten me on this survey that was made, because -- and who received the questionnaires. This is a kind of a politically sounding paragraph to me that doesn't mean too much. I wonder if we could be enlightened on it.

MR. LYON: I don't have any information at hand on that survey. If there is anything further on it bearing on Kerrs Lake I will certainly be glad to inform my honourable friend.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): The Minister spoke about a program whereby municipalities could obtain funds for parks, as I understood on the -- this program would see the federal government pay one-third and the provincial government one-third. Did he mean to say the municipalities would pay the other one-third? There is some interest in my area in regard to this program. Could he indicate what procedure a municipality should take if they want to take part in this program that he spoke of?

MR. LYON: Well, my colleague, the Provincial Secretary could speak with more authority on this than me, Mr. Chairman, but I believe letters were sent from his office to all municipalities in the province -- and if he has an extra copy he may send it over to my honourable friend -- having to do with Manitoba's Centennial corporation and saying what are eligible projects and showing the participation. I'll be glad to get this over to my honourable friend so he can see it. It's self-explanatory; but it just sets forth really the one-third, one-third, one-third proposition on the local projects and parks.

MR. GUTTORMSON: the program go into effect. I mean when can we start working on it -- (Interjection) -- This year?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, a little earlier, can I ask the Minister about one in particular in southwest Manitoba, Williams Lake. Now I understand that he was approached quite some time ago for a special application to have a summer fresh air camp by a religious group who wanted to establish themselves on Williams Lake. I think they had approached the previous Minister who had turned down the request. The present Minister also turned down the request giving a number of explanations that the lake did not lend itself to this because it became rather odorous in the summertime, that there was limited beach area, that the lake so far had been kept free of private development in order to keep the beach area accessible to the public, and also that it was the only good trout lake in southwestern Manitoba and he expected the trout fishermen to object to a large camp being there. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to me what is the situation right now. Has he accepted and given -- has he granted the permission to build the camp there? And if not what are his plans?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, in that regard -- I don't recall this letter or who it was written to, but I remember having some correspondence with Mr. Dow about this matter. Since that time the persons seeking the camp on behalf of the Mennonite Brethren have been in touch with Mr. Danyluk of the Parks Branch to find out -- they never have been together -- just to find out what the requirements were and so on. We're looking at that proposition now -- re-looking at it, put it that way -- in the light of seeing if anything can be done. Now, this is an example of the type of conflict that arises in resource recreational use because although I haven't seen the resolution yet, I understand there's a resolution coming from the Federation of Game and Fish opposing the establishment of a fresh air camp on this lake for the reasons that are apparent -- this is one of the best trout lakes in southwest Manitoba. So the matter is being looked at by the Parks Branch at the present time with a view to determining whether or not they can fit this in at that lake. I think I'm safe in saying that they're looking at it quite sympathetically in the hope of trying to do something for them, and that's the latest advance that I have of it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman I understand of this camp are very anxious to have a decision on this, and that if the decision doesn't come soon that they may consider moving to some other lake altogether, possibly outside of the Province of Manitoba. I understand there is some concern in the area there because this would be a fairly important development for that region, it would involve some 15 or 16 hundred youngsters every summer, over the course of the summer in the period that they would be there. So I would suggest to the Minister that -- I think he's received resolutions from the towns and municipalities concerned and that a decision should be made one way or another so that these people can proceed.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate to the Committee if there has been any change in policy with regard to supplying lifeguards to the smaller swimming beaches where a charge is made. I'm referring in particular to Norquay Beach on No. 1 highway. As the Minister may well know there were, I believe it was three, very near drownings last summer. Now it's all very well to say that if the economic factor doesn't warrant it that lifeguards cannot be afforded, but I can't agree with that outlook in particular where there is a charge made and there is a shall we say a medium to heavy use made of the swimming facilities at the peak of the tourist season. Now the experience at Norquay last year that I know about within one week there were two people pulled from the water in both cases unconscious. They were pulled from under the water with just a matter of a few more minutes and it would have been a fatality in each case. It occurred in the evening during the busier hours, and because of the large number of people -- when I say a large number, I would suggest it was around fifty people, between fifty and a hundred people using the swimming facilities there at that time -- and it's not noticeable if anyone is in trouble or if someone has gone under and not reappeared again. I think that this should be given serious consideration where perhaps the economics of the situation do not indicate that there should be a lifeguard eight hours a day or two shifts a day. I think there should be a lifeguard put on duty at these places. I would suggest from four o'clock until eight o'clock or nine o'clock at night; and all day on Sunday. I think that qualified people can be found in particular for Norquay. There has been classes in Portage held at the Lion's pool, where there are qualified lifeguards there. They can be hired on a part-time basis. Could the Minister give us any indication that he might consider this.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I believe we filed an Order for Return on the question that my honourable friend speaks of. I don't have it in front of me. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition can pass it up to my honourable friend. I think it indicates there that later in the season -- now I'm going strictly from memory, he's got it in front of him. Doesn't it say later in the season that there was one there? I was under the impression from somewhere or another that at Norquay there was a lifeguard some time during the season. It may not show it there because it's a Provincial Park, but I'm getting the right signal indicating I'm on the right track that there was a lifeguard placed at Norquay Beach some time during last summer. I could get the dates if my honourable friend wishes them or can let him have them at a later time; but there was a lifeguard there during at least part of the summer and that I presume would be the last part of the summer.

MR. JOHNSTON: to the Minister if I could reply. If there was a lifeguard there, I didn't have the knowledge of it and I checked up on it. There were some scouts providing voluntary lifeguard work, but there was no lifeguard that I know of. Now I could be wrong, but the need is certainly there.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on that recreational development, it seemed to me that some two or three years ago, in fact approximately at the time when we were putting the highway through to Grand Rapids, that there had been some indications from the government, in fact I think a considerable amount of press publicity at the time about a park in the northern interlake section, somewhere along the route of the Gypsumville-Grand Rapids Highway. I may have missed it in the Minister's statement the other day but I don't recall him saying anything about it, and I don't see it on the map which was handed to us. Now this was I believe the subject of a considerable amount of publicity by my honourable friends, and I would like to know what has happened to that proposed park.

MR. LYON: I have something on that. I can't just put my hand on it but I'll find it and give it to my honourable friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: to proceed with this park.

MR. LYON: I'm going strictly from memory which I shouldn't do until I have the paper. Surveys have been made but from the standpoint I think of a recreational area rather than a provincial park, but I would have to check my exact notes when I can put my hand on it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, are the rates for entry and for services in the provincial parks, and recreation areas -- and when I speak of services I mean for example tenting permits, trailer permits -- are these the same throughout the province in all the areas?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the question of parks, I believe there was also some talk about either a wilderness area, or an area that would be out of bounds to flying trips and so out in the far northern part of Manitoba in the area of Lynn Lake had been contemplated. Is this still in planning? Have the government been thinking of such an area or has this been abandoned?

MR. LYON: the other day, Mr. Chairman, in introducing the estimates, there's a wilderness area of survey going on on the east side of Lake Winnipeg at the present time. I haven't any advance information on what is happening in the north, that is around the Lynn Lake area, but if there is anything doing there, I'll certainly get the information for my honourable friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g) passed; (h) passed. Resolution 56 passed. Item 3, Wildlife -- (a) passed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, are we at 3 (a) now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, 3 (a).

MR. GUTTORMSON: For the past few years when discussing this particular item of the estimates I expressed concern over the wildlife population and my concern hasn't changed. I am very much afraid that unless some drastic action is taken -- I don't mean on the provincial level, but on the North American level -- we're not going to have any game left for the next generation. I know the Minister hasn't been in the department very long and hasn't probably had an opportunity to attend any of the conferences, but could he indicate to the House at this time whether or not he knows of any plans to try to restore the wildlife population in North America. I know that I have advocated some pretty drastic steps such as perhaps banning the hunting of any wild ducks for perhaps a period of two years. I don't mean in Manitoba, I mean on the whole of North America. I realize that the province, this government can't do anything without the co-operation of the other jurisdictions, but I'm very much afraid that unless something drastic is done we won't have any wildlife for the generation in the next fifteen years. We only have to look at the passenger pigeon which numbered in the countless millions in North America and now they're extinct, and this is just what I'm afraid's going to happen to the duck. The redhead and the canvass back, their numbers have diminished very sharply over the past few years, as he knows, and I'm afraid that this is going to happen to the other species as well unless something is done. Could the Minister indicate if he has any knowledge of any steps to try to correct this situation. There's no use doing it after they are almost extinct.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, before this item is passed, I think the House should pay tribute to the work that's being done by the Fish & Game Associations. I wouldn't want to see it slip by without the tribute being paid because I've watched the work of this particular association since its inception and the number of members that it has is continually on the increase, and now I notice that we're going to have a Canadian Fish & Game Association which will co-ordinate the work of the different provinces. I know that the government doesn't always see eye to eye with the recommendation of the association, but I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the members of this association are the most conservation-minded group that we have. They are primarily concerned with conservation because it is good conservation practice that makes it possible for us to have the game and birdlife that we have in the Province of Manitoba. They're fully aware of this and they support every worthwhile project.

I'm not going to talk about the extraneous undertakings such as the young people's rifle clubs and so forth, but in the conservation field itself they are doing wonderful work. I do believe that since they are practical men who are right out in the field and know what they are talking about, that it pays to follow their lead oftener than not to, and I do want to pay tribute to them,

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)...to the executive that work so hard in forming the various branches throughout the province and keeping them alive as they have. I don't know what the total membership is now, but I know it's considerable and I know it's a very good cross-section of opinion of the Province of Manitoba. They're doing wonderful work and I think we should pay tribute to them for the work they are doing.

MR. LYON: I couldn't agree more with the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains concerning the work of the Game and Fish Associations throughout Manitoba -- the Manitoba Federation of Game and Fish -- and certainly the executive and their permanent secretary, Paul Murphy, and all of the people who do so much to make this organization what it is in Manitoba. I thank him for offering the tribute that he has and I join with him most wholeheartedly in it, because as he has quite properly mentioned, conservation is their by-word. They do more than perhaps any of us can do, members or government agencies can do to instill the ideas of conservation in their own children and in the other children, the youngsters that they teach through their Junior Rifle Club program and so on. This is invaluable work; it's work that no government agency could hope to do because we wouldn't have the numbers of people. Their membership is getting on close to 10,000 people in Manitoba and every one of those members really is a walking example of conservation and, I think as well, a walking propagandist for conservation in his own home, his own community, and with all people that he talks to. So the work they do is invaluable; it's work that -- people of Manitoba owe a great deal of credit to the Game and Fish Associations for this work, and certainly I too want to pay this tribute while we're at this item in the estimates.

I might just for a moment refer to an item that the Leader of the Opposition talked about, having regard to Grand Rapids. Grand Rapids area has been surveyed with respect to different recreational areas. There were fires up there of course not too long ago and a large area was burned over. We have indications that a number of recreational sites could be developed on areas such Long Point, Denby Point, Katimik, Kawinaw Lake, which have a very good potential as recreational sites. These are being looked at at the present time but not from the context of a provincial park but rather several recreational sites in that area.

While I'm on my feet, and to get this off the, the Member for Portage was enquiring about Norquay Beach. I was partially right in my recollection. There were lifeguards at Norway every week-end after there was some sign of the heavy usage at the beach and some sign of trouble. Every weekend I'm told there were lifeguards at Norquay Beach. By saying that I wouldn't want to indicate that it will be possible for us to have lifeguards at every recreation spot or provincial part in Manitoba because this would necessitate perhaps a battalion or getting on close maybe to a division of lifeguards for all of the various watering spots in Manitoba, but we do try, as the usage increases and where indications are that there is some potential area of danger, we do try to have lifeguards at the larger areas where the usage is so heavy.

Now the Honourable Member from St. George raised a point that I suppose the two of us could talk about all night, when we talk about the conservation of existing wildlife and the increase in population of wildlife, not only in Manitoba but indeed on the North American continent. I'm presuming from what he says that he is referring first of all to birds, then perhaps onto big game. I could give him some general ideas of what the department is doing by making reference first of all to the statement I made I think this afternoon that the key, according to the experts, the key to this whole thing is preservation of proper habitat, and as much as possible the department tries to buy up habitat areas where there's a of these areas under public control, to try to maintain them and maintain conditions in them which are conducive to proper feeding and proper conditions for the propagation of the wildlife concerned.

Now the Canadian Wildlife Service -- the Canadian Wildlife Conference is not being held until I think it's sometime in June of this year, and if present plans materialize, I intend to attend that meeting because like the honourable member I am equally concerned that we do all that we can to preserve in Manitoba this tremendous heritage that we have had from years gone by of wildlife, both the animal and the bird variety, and to find out what we can from these experts meeting from all parts of Canada, with delegates as well I believe coming from the United States, experts from different fields, in order that we can develop further programs to those which have already been developed to attack this very problem.

The Delta Marsh program that I mentioned earlier on today is an example of the type of

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)...thing that the department is doing. It's not good enough just to buy the marsh and the land that goes with it, you then have to start into a marsh management plan and this we have a committee sitting on at the present time, a committee, may I say, on which government representation is about a third; there's representation from the university; representation from Ducks Unlimited; The Canadian Wildlife Service; representation from the Delta Waterfowl Station and so on. And arising out of this committee -- our Fisheries Branch as well on it -- arising out of this committee's work thus far has developed a pilot program this year for the control of carp, to see what effect carp has on aquatic vegetation which is one of the main forms of food, particularly for your puddlers, your divers, to see if the long held theory is true that carp destroy this aquatic vegetation thereby, in turn, render the area as an unsuitable either resting or nesting area for ducks.

Now that's only in one field and that only affects birds. In the other fields of course, in the big game fields, why of course we could go on to a long dissertation as to what can be done there. But you have these rather ironical things arising, for instance in the bird field where you have, as my honourable friend will probably know, tremendously good crops of geese coming down. We have, and I know from some experience chasing these honkers around, that we've had pretty good goose hunting in Manitoba over the last few years. The duck populations have cut off rather sharply. In the big game field, in the deer season this year we did not have a good deer season -- the populations were not up. I would have to consult with my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains about Moose and Elk. I didn't get up to partake in any of that shooting this year but the report that I have had indicated that it wasn't of the best, although he can perhaps tell me from first hand knowledge or participation just what it was like.

But this is a tremendous problem. This is really the main aim and driving force of the whole Wildlife Branch, to try to maintain our habitat and try to maintain these areas where propagation can be carried on. As I mentioned this afternoon, particularly having regard to fur-bearing animals, the main problem there is to have habitat to carry them over the winter, and this is an area in which we don't always have that degree of control that we might wish to have. You don't have this problem with the migrating birds because of course they find their winter habitat in areas to the south and their winter feed down there. So we're doing all we can, and if there are any specific areas of information that I could give to my honourable friend I'd be only too happy to mention them.

One aspect we haven't touched on was upland game birds. Well of course with your prairie chicken and so on you have the traditional cyclical change and we're in the peaks and the valleys -- as I understand it right now we're in one of the valleys -- and upland game birds I know from personal observation last fall were not as plentiful as they had been a year or two years before, and the experts, the biologists tell us that's because we're in one of the valleys. Now in my own experience, which perhaps isn't too long, I've seen us go through these periods of plenty and periods of want with upland birds. I'm only hoping that we'll be on the incline up to a peak again as the next two or three years goes by because it's one of the finest forms of hunting that we have in the province, but at the present time unfortunately we are in a valley and it's just one of these cyclical things that happen to this particular species.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the program being conducted by the government to buy land suitable for the breeding of the ducks. Unfortunately, as he well knows each year this particular type of land is being drained for agricultural purposes and, as well, our gun pressure is increasing enormously every year, consequently it seems that although the government may be taking steps to try to maintain some breeding grounds for the ducks, we are also destroying a lot in other areas. I believe last year, if my memory serves me correctly, we didn't have the early shoot in the grain area and we opened the season quite late in September. I think this was a good move because I think that we have too great a slaughter of the ducks, that many of them are not properly developed and they are easily slaughtered before they mature. I hope that the Minister will see fit to maintain this policy this year and perhaps even open the season just a little bit later, perhaps the beginning of October, to make sure that the young ducks have an opportunity to fully mature before we start shooting at them.

MR. LYON: About gun pressure, the number -- I'm just going from the annual report at Page 33 -- if the Honourable Member takes a look there he'll see that the waterfowl killed are
April 13th, 1964.

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)...down considerably. These are estimates you know taken from the licences and so on, and the licences have been down, they are down considerably from -- well they're down a bit from 1960. When the ducks aren't there the people just don't buy the licences and therefore in most cases you get declining gun pressure.

But the experts tell us that it's not really gun pressure so much as it is this habitat question that causes the problem with ducks. We're not providing the feed for them in the right places. I know from having some experience at the south end of Lake Manitoba that you don't get the mallards nesting over there the way you used to say 10, 15, 20 years ago, the huge flocks that would just fill the sky. They're not nesting there any more. They're not stopping there and we don't know what the answer is. We don't know whether it's the combination of lack of feed or whether it's different changes in the fly-ways or what it is. When we find this key, when we find the answer, we'll know considerably more than we do right now. We're certainly embarked upon this, trying to find out just what the answer is, but it's a vexed problem and we're certainly going to keep after it as much as we can.

MR. GUTTORMSON:they have undertaken a program whereby they have what they call these game farms. Has this government any policy with regard to game farms? Do they approve or disapprove of them?

MR. LYON: Game farms -- and if you mean by that term farms where you can go -- for instance in the field of pheasants you can go and pay so much to go into this private spot to shoot pheasants and then you pay the owner of the enterprise so much for every bird you shoot -- this is envisaged under The Wildlife Act. Unless I'm mistaken, I don't believe there has been exact regulations passed pursuant to this, but I know certainly it's permissible under the Act. I can't name the section on that.

MR. SHOEMAKER: On Page 36 of the annual report under the heading: "Wildlife Damage Control Projects," it points up here that the government has not found it necessary -- and I suppose this would be for the fall of '62 perhaps since the report was for the year ending March 31st, '63 -- but they did not find it necessary to operate duck feeding stations and apparently that they had introduced in place of duck feeding a duck scaring program. Thirty scaring permits were issued to farmers and certain machines were purchased for scaring the ducks and cranes and wildlife off of farmers' crops. I wonder if my honourable friend could tell us if they did not find the duck feeding station satisfactory? I thought they really served a purpose there a while ago, but this report suggests that they are replacing the duck feeding programs with one of a scaring program.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the duck feeding program is utilized where it's found necessary, but for the season just concluded, the 1963 season, there apparently was very little loss of grain due to duck depredation. The low duck population was perhaps the biggest factor contributing to this lack of loss. Some 50 zon exploders were sent to the field for use in control of the scaring of ducks. The Portage plains and the Delta marsh areas were visited by about 20,000 mallards which required special attention in order to protect cereal crops. I can add, as a personal observation, that by the time most of the birds were in flight -- they had gained their flight feathers -- a good proportion of the crop, particularly in that south end of Lake Manitoba, had been taken off, and if they were flying out they were flying out to harvest the fields, the stubble, and there was not that much grain left in the swaths so they could do damage. The ducks were kept on the move by the use of automatic exploders, scarecrows, shotguns, cracker shells and No. 9 shot shells in the hands of two of our field men. The farmers were very co-operative again in that they put up scarecrows and also manned some of the zon exploders.

The Gladstone-Plumas area, which my honourable friend would be particularly interested in, had from 3,000 to 6,000 sandhill cranes which caused some concern as in previous years. The Canadian Wildlife Service took on the responsibility of controlling the cranes. Their efforts appeared to be successful as no serious complaints were received at our Wildlife office about depredation by cranes. This was the second year in which cranes were controlled successfully. As in the previous year, the departmental staff with the help of field staff were able to handle the problem with automatic exploders. Very few shoot-to-kill permits were issued and most of these were for the Gladstone area where the RCMP were able to control the sandhill crane problem and very few birds were killed.

MR. MOLGAT: I've had a number of complaints about the deer season in the Province of Manitoba and I think last year in particular we had a very short season, particularly when you compare it to the Province of Ontario or the Province of Saskatchewan who follow another policy. Now if the short season happens to come at a time when there's no snow, I think the whole result is not satisfactory insofar as good game practices because inevitably wounded animals cannot be tracked and hunters simply, through no choice of their own, have to abandon them and go on and look for other animals. This is I think wasteful and certainly is not pleasant to the hunters themselves who dislike to see this happen. I realize the problem insofar as the department as they don't know when the snow is going to come, but I wonder if there could not be possibly more flexibility in consideration of having the season later on and trying to make sure that it does come at a time when there is snow cover; and secondly, whether we would be better off to return to a longer season and reduce the gun pressure that occurs when you are dealing with a very short season as we did last year.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition raises a very valid point, and I've heard some of these complaints myself about the short deer season. That season of course was predicated on the estimates of the department of the small population and the necessity -- or not the same necessity for harvesting as large a harvest as would be possible with larger population. The timing of it is an extremely difficult thing as my honourable friend points out, and certainly it's by far the most desirable to have the season occur, and I'm not an experienced big game hunter, but I can well imagine that it's desirable to have it occur when there is some snow cover on the ground, both from the standpoint of recovery of animals and for all other aspects of hunting. We'll certainly take that into mind.

I would say the thing that would motivate against the longer season though would be the population. The season is, so far as I'm aware, related pretty directly to the population, and if they have a longer season it's pretty hard to restrict. You'll have the same number of hunters going into the field, or perhaps more. I know that the week long season compresses all of your hunting into one week but then again that has an advantage from the standpoint of the deer. He only gets banded at for a week whereas with the longer season there's twice as much of a chance of being killed as there is otherwise. But certainly I appreciate his comments on that and if there's anything the department can do in this regard I'm sure it will be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed; (d) --

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get through quite saying what I had to say on (d) just before we adjourned. I do not understand the department's program or policy insofar as predator control is concerned. I think we have fallen down very badly in the last two years from my own personal observations through the areas that I've been in, but I am supported in that view by the report itself, and on Page 34 I'm going to quote a few lines just to emphasize the point I want to make, Mr. Chairman. Under "Timber wolves" we read the following: "The timber wolf population throughout the province is considered to be under control. To maintain this control it was necessary to set out 231 strychnine-treated baits. This was an increase of 140 sets over last year." Well to me that is an admission that the number of sets set out in the previous year were inadequate because they more than doubled the sets in the following year. I think, Mr. Chairman, if that's the type of predator control policy we're going to follow, we're going to let the predators get out of control because it's quite evident that when you have to double the amount of sets, you're doing that because of the increase in population which should have never occurred in the first instance if proper control measures were taken.

Now it refers further down in the report and I quote: "The Duck Mountain was a good example, where 22 baits were set and 40 timber wolves killed. The previous year no poison baits had been set." Again this points out that we do not have an effective predator control and, Mr. Chairman, I think that we must realize that the necessity for predator control is getting bigger by the year. At one time when we didn't have the hunters to reduce the herds, our big game animals, to within the limits of our browse, feed and habitat, then there was room for predators to roam and keep these numbers down, but now the predator is competing with the hunter and I'm quite sure that that isn't the intention of this government.

I mentioned before the dinner hour, Mr. Chairman, that I noticed up in the north country that there were very few fawn, if any. I can go a step further in that. In a particular area just north of Red Deer River we ran into -- oh, I'd say about five or six square miles where in one

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)...day our party shot four buck deer. During that day and during all the days we hunted we didn't see a single fawn or a single doe, but we ran into numerous timber wolf packs. So the only conclusion is that the timber wolves are killing off these deer.

The same applies to the moose, and for some reason or other our conservation officers are not doing the job. Whether the instructions are not coming from the top, or why, I do not know. Last year in the Duck Mountains we had a closed season for deer. I agree with that policy entirely. There are times we have to close the season, but what is the use of closing the season to hunters when you allow predators to grow in population? You are not helping matters at all.

I do not understand the bear program here at all. I understand the bear are now protected. Why they are protected I've never been able to find out, Mr. Chairman, because the bear -- if you look at page 35, the report states, "the field staff using live traps trapped 26 nuisance bears in recreation areas." To me that means only one thing, that we have an over-population of bears when you have to spend time and money to trap bears and move them. It doesn't make any difference where you move these bears, they're still going to be a nuisance. And not only that, I know that in my own area there's been considerable livestock killed by bears. Why the protection? -- (Interjection) -- Oh, that is the answer, so that we could have a season. Well, Mr. Chairman -- (Interjection) -- Well that's quite all right. That gives me the answer. I didn't know what the answer was; now I know.

Well what is more important, to give the odd hunter an opportunity to go out and shoot a bear, or is it more important to protect our livestock in these areas? If we let them grow in population, they not only will be a nuisance, they'll be dangerous. If they have to compete for food to any great degree and you have an over-population of bear, you're asking for trouble. The bear itself is a predator insofar as fawn are concerned, so far as young moose and elk are concerned. We've never had a shortage of bear up in our area. You could have had a hunting season for them every year, but the settlers themselves kept them down in order to protect their livestock, and I think it's about time we turned around and lifted this protection.

If we look at Page 36, we see where there's been 67 bounties paid on bears. Now there's a contradiction of effort here. On the one hand, we try to give them protection; on the other hand, we pay bounty on them; and I see that a total of 151 were killed in the province in the year covered by this report. I think there's something wrong with this policy. I would suggest to the Minister that he look at it again and withdraw those provisions in the Act that give the bear the protection that there is there at present.

MR. LYON: I appreciate my honourable friend's comments on the predator problem because it's one that always has been with us and I suppose long after my honourable friend and I are gone and forgotten there's still going to be talk about predator control in Manitoba. The latest I can give him on the statistics -- these in the report of course refer only up to the end of March 31st, 1963 -- my latest figures indicate the following: Total number of animals, predators taken in 1962-63 including the bounties paid and the funds extended under The Predator Control Act: timber wolves, 359, coyotes, 1,845; coyote pups, 347; bear, 151; bear cubs, 8; red fox, 180. These figures are inclusive of course of the 10-80 program.

Now I haven't any up-to-date information other than conversation with some of the officials concerning this timber wolf program. They point out that the timber wolf program is conducted, that is an extensive and intensive hunting program, is conducted I think once every two years, and that in their estimation -- and these are only estimates -- in their estimation, they feel that the timber wolf situation is under reasonable control. Now I'm not saying that to differ with my honourable friend at all because he's in an area where he can see these things from day to day, and certainly I'm impressed by the evidence that he calls from his own personal observation, but those in the Wildlife Branch feel the situation certainly is not in their terms at least, out of hand. Now some of these suggestions that my honourable friend has made are certainly worthwhile and I know that there are those here who have been listening to them along with me, and we'll take them into consideration.

I would like to tell him however that, so far as I'm aware, there's been no direction given from the offices in Winnipeg for conservation officers to take it easy on timber wolves or on bear or anything like that that I'm aware of. Certainly we'll look into it, and if he has any indications, or if he has any statements he can give us concerning areas where he thinks the

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd). . . control over the timber wolves is particularly lax, I'd appreciate him telling me any time of the year by a reverse call into the office and we'll do our best to pay some close attention to it. In fact the honourable member and myself -- perhaps I could hook up my 300 Savage and go up and visit with him and perhaps we could take care of a few timber wolves ourselves if the spirit moves us. But certainly it's -- I'm not trying to pass it off as being a problem of no concern. I only pass on to him what I am advised by the Wildlife people, that they feel that it's reasonably well under control. But if there are some specific areas where he feels that there hasn't been enough attention given to it, please let us know and we'll do our best to get after it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) -- passed; (e) -- passed; (f) -- passed. Resolution 57 -- passed. Item 4, Fisheries Branch -- (a) -- passed, (b) --

MR. GUTTORMSON: this pilot project that's under operation for rough fish along Lake Winnipeg. I missed some of his remarks, but I did hear him say that this plant was now in operation. I was pleased when I heard the government announce that this program was in effect. I have been advocating such a program for a number of years and I had hoped perhaps they might see fit to put one along the area of Lake Manitoba. I was wondering if he could give us any indication how well this plant has worked which he described as a pilot project along Lake Winnipeg, and whether those fishermen that fish at Lake Manitoba will have an opportunity to have a plant such as the one he has on Lake Winnipeg in their own area.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, during the past winter there was a trap net operation conducted through the ice on Lake Winnipeg for maria. I haven't got the -- at least I haven't put my hand on it immediately -- as to the weight of tonnage that were taken out, or the poundage that were taken out on this program, but I can get that figure if my honourable friend is interested. We are led to believe from different reports that we have and so on that we could take about 5 million pounds a year of rough fish out of Lake Winnipeg, and there might possibly be some commercial value in maria and other forms of rough fish that are encountered in that lake.

One of the main purposes of the pilot program, that is the ice fishing, the trap net fishing through the ice and the small trawler operation that we hope to undertake this summer on Lake Winnipeg, we'll need to determine first of all how effectively we can conduct this weeding process and that's really in effect what it is. We're taking out some undesirable forms of fish life from the lake in the hopes that the vacuum will be filled up by more desirable fish. It's a fond hope perhaps. My honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains shakes his head, but I'm talking now particularly about maria. Having gone through this weeding process, you are then left with a pile of fish. Now one of the main purposes of this pilot program is to determine whether or not there are economic values in this form of rough fish that would interest private entrepreneurs to get into the business in a big way and start harvesting some of this 5 million crop off of Lake Winnipeg which we are told is there.

Now he mentions Lake Manitoba. I can't tell him of any plans immediately but we are looking very closely at the whole Lake Winnipeg operation, at this trawling operation and so on this summer to see just what fruit it does bear. The difference in the two lakes of course might obviate the possibility of having a trawling operation on Lake Manitoba. I don't think it would be too successful there but you can never tell, and this is why we're starting at it in this tentative way just to find out what we can about the total rough fish operation. I don't know that there's too much more I can tell my honourable friend at this time. We have the buildings at the end of the Matheson Island Road. There's no equipment in them yet; we're hopeful of getting ARDA participation on these buildings and on any equipment that may go into them, but beyond that it's at its beginning stages and we're hopeful that it will produce figures, statistics and information that will be most helpful to us in this whole field.

MR. PAULLEY: with this stage in connection with the Fishery Branch, I particularly draw the Minister's attention to the report of the branch itself. It appears to me as I read this section that the fishermen themselves do not appear to be receiving a reasonable share of their endeavours in a financial way. We look on Page 15 and note that the catch on Lake Winnipeg, the value to the fishermen was about \$1.7 million; the catch to the enterpriser who does the marketing however is \$2.8 million. If we go over to Lake Winnipegosis, there's a similar relationship; and if we go over to Page 18, we note that the value to the fishermen insofar as our northern lakes are concerned was \$1,254,000--odd and the value as marketed was

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)...\$2,697,000. This indicates to me that there is too great a spread between the value to the fishermen and the value of the product as marketed.

I'm particularly concerned with this insofar as the northern lakes are concerned because it does seem to me that, in general, most of the fishermen in our northern lakes are those of Indian and Metis origin, and it seems to me that the figures as produced here by the department itself indicate exploitation of the. -- (Interjection) -- No, the freight rates don't enter into this too much -- that it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there is too great an exploitation of the fishermen, particularly in the northern part of Manitoba.

It's my understanding that insofar as the marketing of fish is concerned in the Province of Manitoba that there are about three American firms who control the price that is being paid to the fishermen in Manitoba and also controls the price that the consumer is paying for the product, not only locally but elsewhere. It is my understanding that these three American firms -- I believe the headquarters is located in the City of Chicago -- controls almost absolutely the whole marketing of the fish that is caught here in the Province of Manitoba. Now I appreciate the fact that the Minister has told us -- I believe he said in his opening remarks of his department that an enquiry is going to be made into all of the aspects of marketing fish in the Province of Manitoba. I wish him every success, but I want to point out to him however that a similar suggestion was made ten or twelve years ago of an investigation into the fish market in an endeavour to receive for the fisherman a better return for his endeavours. So I'd like to hear any comments the Minister may make in respect of this. It does seem to me, judging from the report of the department itself, that the fisherman is getting the rotten end of the stick insofar as a return for value of his product.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the section of the report dealing with the Fisheries Branch, I would like the Minister to explain to me some of the figures that are contained in the report dealing with the number of men employed in the fishing in the Province of Manitoba. For instance, Mr. Chairman, on Lake Winnipeg, on Page 15 we note that for the summer of 1962 the number of men employed, 816; the fall of 1962, number of men employed, 816; the winter of 1962-63, number of men, 430; for a sum-total of 2,062.

Well, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these are figures like the Department of Industry and Commerce use to illustrate how many men are employed as the result of new industries coming into the Province of Manitoba, because surely to goodness, Mr. Chairman, the 816 that was employed in the summer and the 816 that were employed in the fall of the year of 1962 are pretty well the same individuals. So I think it's erroneous to report in the report itself when we're considering the over-all picture on Lake Winnipeg that there were 2,062 men employed in the fishing industry in Lake Winnipeg. I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that for the future he tells us that there were 816 employed in the summer; 816, the same men in the fall, and forget about trying to indicate in the report the total amount being that much greater.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, the same thing applies insofar as Lake Winnipegosis is concerned. The fall of 1962, 219; the winter of 62-63, 400; sum total of 619. I suggest there too that pretty well the same individuals are concerned for both seasons. The same applies to the northern lakes, Mr. Chairman, and I would suggest throughout the report. Well I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that in the future let us know how many are employed in the industry in the fall, how many in the winter, but don't try to add them up together to give the indication as the report does, that we have a considerable more men employed in the fishing industry than we have at the present time.

MR. LYON: I dare say, like my honourable friend, that there are a fair number of those 816 fishermen on Lake Winnipeg who also made up part of the fall fishing crew. With the greatest of respect, I don't think there is any intention there to indicate the number of men -- you know that the total is significant other than the fact that there were that total number of men fishing in the various seasons. Now I'm sure that the summer fishermen and the fall fishermen and at least half of the winter fishermen were probably one and the same person, sure, but the Federal Department of Fisheries has indicated in Manitoba that we have -- let's see, I'll give you the exact figures -- 5,150 fishermen in this province as of -- this is the average number -- 1960, 1962, and I think that figure is pretty close to the figures that our department has turned out. -- (Interjection) -- Well I don't think there is any overt attempt at manipulation. It's just

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)...that the figures are there and I think in applying common sense one would realize that there is some duplication, some of the same people fish in the summer and the fall and the winter. I won't argue with him at all.

Now on the market situation, all I can say in that regard is that rationalization of the marketing situation in the commercial fishing industry is certainly one of the big problems facing that industry, not only in Manitoba but in Saskatchewan, Alberta and the northwestern Ontario as well. One of the most hopeful outcomes of the Federal-Provincial Fisheries Conference was the fact that this prairie area was able to set up this committee that I spoke of earlier today, which has already met once and will be meeting again shortly to try to devise some means of regional marketing system for the production of our inland lakes. And with this type of control -- if this type of thing is found to be feasible at all, why then we can go on to meet what my honourable friend talks about as the situation that we find in Chicago, New York, and so on, where there is a certain degree of control exercised by a few of the major purchasers down there, sometimes with deleterious effects to the fellow back on the lake who after all is the one that he is concerned with and the one that we are concerned with in the department. And so we're placing, I hope not too much hope, but we're placing a considerable amount of effort and we hope, a justified hope in the outcome in the studies that are presently under way because market rationalization and reorganization is certainly one of the big things that the fishing industry needs in this province, and indeed in Western Canada.

MR. PAULLEY:on effort and less on hope. Now there's just one other thing dealing with the question of fishing. I had a complaint directed to me by a few individuals who take out a licence in order to fish, angle in the Province of Manitoba, who have been chased off of some of the dams at our Hydro plants, particularly down in the neighbourhood of McArthur Falls. Now I wonder if the Minister knows of any directive that has been issued, either by the Department of Public Utilities or his own department, in order to keep people off of the embankments and the dams in and around -- no, he's not there -- in and around -- here he comes now -- in and around the Hydro plants, because I might say, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well known to the Minister that this is a location which is an attraction for anglers in and around the dams and the likes of that. I've had a number of complaints directed to me that employees in around the area have chased them off of the adjacent properties where they've been fishing, and I don't know if the Minister or the Minister of Public Utilities might have any comment on this.

MR. LYON: I don't know of any departmental orders to that effect at all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GUTTORMSON:pilot project on Lake Winnipeg hasn't actually gone into effect yet?

MR. LYON: Yes, it's gone into effect, Mr. Chairman. I can give my honourable friend a little bit further detail. The building was constructed during the fall of 1963 at Islandview at a cost of about \$16,000. It is fully insulated. The department conducted its rough fish removal program on an experimental basis during this past winter season. Fifteen trap nets were set under the ice in the channel area, Dog Head, Matheson Island and Rabbit Point. A total of 125,000 pounds of marlins were taken from December 17th to March 15th. Informed biological opinion suggests that a large scale rough fish removal program may eventually improve the lake habitat--or will eventually improve the lake habitat for the desirable commercial species of fish. Now as I mentioned, in 64-65 we are including the summer operation with the trawlers, so the program is under way; it was underway in the ice this winter; and the trawler comes in next summer.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What did they do with the fish that they did catch? Did they make mink feed, or what other process.....

MR. LYON: Yes, it was sold to Manitoba mink ranchers.

MR. GUTTORMSON: All of it?

MR. LYON: Yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Did they experiment with other by-products?

MR. LYON: Not yet. That comes in the future. The building right now is used for storage but eventually under this ARDA program we may get equipment in there that will help us either with -- I'm not sure if the term is fish blocks, or other things of that nature, but we're looking at some equipment in that.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Minister correctly to say that fish were sold to the Manitoba mink ranchers? I have received a number of complaints that that is

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... not what is happening and that the fish is really sold to northern Minnesota mink ranchers and that the mink ranchers in the Province of Manitoba felt that what was happening in effect was that their money, as taxpayers in the province, was being used to subsidize a program of fish removal through the Provincial Government; and then when the product was sold, that instead of being sold to Manitoba mink ranchers here who had already contributed in part to it, that a good deal of it went into the northern United States, particularly in the area I believe around Warroad and that section where there is a large American mink ranching development.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, it is true that Americans did bid on some of this rough fish but they didn't -- our Manitoba boys matched the bid and were given the preference as soon as they did, and to the best of my information there hasn't been a pound of this fish go over the line at all.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Could the Minister indicate, does the government plan to carry on the domestic fishing licence program this year on Lake Manitoba? -- (Interjection) -- Yes, this is a program where fishermen for \$1.00 can set a net perhaps one day of the week.

MR. LYON: Oh, this is the Settlers Shoreline -- I'll have to check. I think they intend to carry it on. I'll have to check just to make sure.

MR. GUTTORMSON: When he does, would he indicate how this policy is conducted? I know it's very thorny. A lot of people wonder why certain individuals are getting it and others are not. A lot of people feel there is a lot of discrimination in the handing out of these licences. Perhaps when he gives me the answer he could outline just how they go about formulating this policy.

MR. MOLGAT:the matter of pollution at the southern end of Lake Winnipeg. I know it has engaged the department's attention and studies were conducted. I am told that the situation is such that there is now a very low production in the southern section of Lake Winnipeg because of this problem. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what were the results of surveys undertaken and if there are any steps in mind in the department to correct this situation.

MR. LYON: Surveys were continued, Mr. Chairman, on southern Lake Winnipeg in March and September, 1963, covering a regular grid worked by snowmobile and by boat, and in co-operation with the Department of Health. Coliform bacteria within 16 miles of the mouth of the Red River exceeded drinking water standards. A high number of mayfly nymphs was found in some western localities, perhaps related to the dilution effects of an increased flow in the Red River. Enumeration of the bottom fauna was completed, and a comprehensive collection of chemical and biological data is being built up. Oil and phenol levels in the lower Red River were checked four times during June at five stations and considerable variation was found in both substances from week to week with maxima above the desired level. Now that's all the information I have on Lake Winnipeg, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm interested in this particular aspect now from the fishing standpoint. The figures that were given to us by the department in the report are given for Lake Winnipeg as a whole and are not broken down I believe -- at least I don't find them -- by area on the lake. Now I believe it's the policy of the department to have very definite differentials between the different sections of the lake because they have different rules for various parts of the lake. The southern portion, if I'm correct, operates on the three inch mesh; -- what might be called the interlake section, the midlake is three and three quarters, I believe; then you get to the north end and I think you have a five inch mesh. Now has the department kept track of the production in the various areas? I would imagine that they would because if they have different rules it must be because their experience has shown that this is necessary in order to maintain production and maintain proper conservation practices. I wonder if the Minister could tell us what has been the experience in the southern section of the lake insofar as production. Can he give us those figures over the years? Is that area in fact declining, and are we faced with a serious situation for that section of the lake?

MR. LYON: I'd have to get figures from the branch on that particular area and I'll undertake to do so if they're available on a regional basis for the southern part of the lake.

MR. GUTTORMSON:the complaints from the fishing people regarding the Fairford Dam, that the fish are unable to get up the fishway in the dam on the Fairford, and I wonder if he'd look into the possibility of providing a means so the fish can get up into Lake Manitoba from downstream. I know the fishermen feel that the present set-up is inadequate and they feel

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd)...that a better set-up should be implemented on the dam to allow the fish to go back and forth.

MR. LYON: That is on the Fairford itself? We'll look into that. I've heard an enquiry about that but I don't know that we -- I'm sure I haven't any information here but will try to get it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I believe that one of the major problems that we've been faced with over the years in the whitefish production in Manitoba has been the question of parasites, and this is particularly so naturally with the American markets who are very strict in this regard. It is my understanding that there is no co-ordination between the provincial and the federal departments on the regulations and standards regarding whitefish and parasites. I wonder if this is correct, and if the Minister could indicate what co-ordination is attempted now to see to it that we establish one set of rules so that we can either export our fish or have value for what is produced in the province.

MR. LYON: my honourable friend there of course touches on a problem that has been a vexing one, as there are a number of these in the department, particularly in the Fisheries Branch. The classification and grading of fish is entirely a federal responsibility. In the past recent years there has been, I would say, very close co-operation by provincial departments, both with this administration and the previous administration. But the final authority, as I understand it, rests with the federal people and I think Section 52 in The Federal Fisheries Act is the one involved where they set the level of *Trienothorus* that they're willing to accept in the American market. I used to know the figure. We were talking about this in Ottawa with the Federal Minister of Fisheries and the figure that is acceptable, that is set down to them by the U. S. Food and Drugs, is the figure above which the U. S. Food and Drug will not accept whitefish for shipment into the United States.

The Canadian officials maintain that there is no such figure for Canadian consumption. That is, that there is no inter-provincial inspection for *Trienothorus* and certainly the European market indicates that they are not particularly concerned about the infestation in fish at all. So I wouldn't agree that there is a lack of co-ordination. I would say this, that the federal people to an extent are not masters of their own destiny in this field because they are dependent to a large extent, particularly with respect to the American market, on what the Americans say they will accept, and that then becomes the level for international levies for North American or U. S. export. Sometimes lakes in Manitoba will produce above this level; the fish are detained and if found to be above this level, they have to be filleted or otherwise used for domestic purposes. I really can't tell my honourable friend much more about the problem at the present time except to say that it's not a new one. I really don't think it's a matter of lack of co-ordination though so much as the Canadians in the U. S. export field just not being able to control the level that the Americans set for acceptable export.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I get considerable complaints every winter about the movements of fishermen. Now on Lake Manitoba for example, do the licences apply to a specific area or are they simply issued for Lake Manitoba as a whole?

MR. LYON: I couldn't honestly answer that. I think they're for the lake but I would have to double check with the branch to be certain.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the Minister would check that, Mr. Chairman, because this does present a problem on some of the lakes. Certainly on Lake Manitoba it's one of them because the northern end of the lake is much less populated than the southern end, and, as a result, the fishermen from the south end early in the season move up to the north end and there are a lot of complaints up there because there is an over-supply of fishermen for a period of time, which is usually the best fishing season, and the rest of the time they move down to the south end. So insofar as Lake Manitoba, I would like to know whether the licences apply for all of the lake or whether they are for certain specific areas. Similarly, on Lake Winnipeg whether -- and there I think it is a stricter control by stations, which is not the case in Lake Manitoba -- and what controls the department exercises on this movement. I appreciate the Minister may not have the information and I'll make a note of it and if he can give it to me tomorrow, that will be fine.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could indicate what the department means by other southern lakes on Page 19 in the report? It lists the production from all lakes, and then

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)...other southern lakes. Which are covered by these?

MR. LYON: I presume, and not having the detail in front of me I can only presume that refers to areas such as Lake St. Martin and other smaller areas which are contiguous to our larger southern lakes where some -- I know for instance in that area, and my honourable friend who comes from St. George will know of the sauger fishing that's done in that area, and so on. But I'll double check on that, and that's one of the lakes that comes to mind. There may be and probably are others. You will notice that the production shown there is -- well it's 611,000 pounds, so it's not heavy. I'll endeavour to find out just what lakes are categorized in that group.

MR. MOLGAT: The reason for my question, Mr. Chairman, was to find out whether there is commercial fishing conducted in what would normally be termed angling lakes in the southern part of the province. I know that in the Province of Ontario this is a matter of conflict constantly between the commercial interests and the angling interests, and I wondered if we were permitting commercial fishing in some of the lakes at the southern end which would normally be considered mainly for angling.

Could the Minister tell me what are the reciprocity arrangements on angling licences between the Provinces of Manitoba and our two neighbours, Ontario and Saskatchewan?

MR. LYON: From personal experience I can tell my honourable friend that I didn't have to buy a licence when I went into Ontario last spring. My Manitoba licence was good there and I understand the same reciprocal arrangement extends to Saskatchewan.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions on fisheries. If the Minister wants to call the committee now I'm prepared to continue tomorrow on it but I have a number of other things on fish.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): We might be able to finish the Fisheries Branch unless my honourable friend has a very great deal of material to deal with.

MR. MOLGAT: I have a number, Mr. Chairman..... in particular is one on mylon nets and I was in correspondence with the department and I have a fair amount of material on that, but I don't want to unduly hold up.

MR. EVANS: Well it seems to be then that possibly we should adjourn and I so move. Let the committee rise.

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

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

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

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 9:30 this morning.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Tuesday morning.