

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 8, 1966

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, we have arrived at government business tonight and if I'm correct, the last debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains wasn't completed, that being private members business, therefore I wonder if you would consider it correct if we asked if someone would care to adjourn that debate before we turn to government business tonight.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Then perhaps, Madam Speaker, you would call the second reading of Public Bills on Page 11.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 7. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, oh I'm sorry those are

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 45. The Honourable the Member for Swan River.

MR. BJORNSON: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member from Swan River, may we have this stand please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 40. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 40, an Act respecting the Registration of Psychologists, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this act is designed to help the general public identify qualified private psychologists. It will not interfere in any way with the appointment or use of psychologists in governmental agencies, school systems or hospitals. Now at present the bill doesn't refer to hospitals, but in the Private Bills Committee it is proposed that hospitals be added in Subsection 2 of Section 12 so that Subsection 2 will then read as follows: "Nothing in Subsection 1 shall be construed as limiting the activities or services of or the use of the title psychologist by any person employed as a psychologist by the Government of Canada, the Government of Manitoba, the University of Manitoba or the Board of a School District or Division or any hospital or other like bodies or agencies thereof, while acting in the course of his employment." Also, it is proposed in the committee that two other amendments be made to the bill so that it will be more in line with similar bills, so that in Section 14, clause (c) will be deleted and Section 16 will be deleted, and there is one or two other smaller amendments as to form.

The purpose of the bill is to provide for a register of qualified psychologists which then could be made available to the public so that should the occasion arise they would be able to select, from this list, people who met the qualifications believed to be necessary for competent practice by both the American and Canadian Psychological Association. At present, anyone can establish an office - anyone - and say that he or she is a psychologist and hold himself out as being a qualified person. This is certainly not a very satisfactory state of affairs and this is one of the possibilities that this bill seeks to prevent. Generally speaking, the services provided by a private practising psychologist would include such things as vocational guidance, personnel counselling, industrial selection, learning problems in the school, or advice with respect to a career choice. The psychologist differs from a psychiatrist in that the psychologist is a non-medical person who deals with normal people whereas a psychiatrist is a medical person who deals with abnormal people.

MR. PAULLEY: Did you say he was a mental person?

MR. COWAN: A psychologist is not a doctor. He deals with normal people and a psychiatrist is a doctor who deals with abnormal people.

MR. PAULLEY: I thought you said one of them was a mental person, I wasn't sure which.

MR. COWAN: They are both dealing with mental problems to some extent. It is recognized that in some cases the psychologist will be dealing with abnormal persons, in which case there are provisions in the bill that he can work in association with a qualified medical doctor. The Act does not prohibit other individuals from providing services of a psychological nature,

(MR. COWAN cont'd.) but other people could not set them up in practice and call themselves psychologists if this bill passes. Acts such as the one proposed have been passed in both Ontario and Saskatchewan, and unless Manitoba establishes similar standards and passes a similar act, it is quite possible that unqualified people from these other provinces might set themselves up as being qualified people in Manitoba.

The profession of psychology is not a very old one. The Association in Manitoba was formed in 1957, and while there are now 18,000 members of the American Psychological Association there are only 79 members of the Association in Manitoba. Ten of them are student members who are doing post-graduate work at the University of Manitoba and most of the remaining 69 are employed by some educational or care organization in this province.

It is believed that it is important that those people providing information and advice to the public should represent the best possible training and should be qualified people, and it is for this reason that this bill is brought before this House.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I think that this bill requires the attention of the members of this House, not from the standpoint of the problem of psychologists alone but rather from the entire standpoint of the purpose of this type of Act and the powers given to the council, in this case of the psychologists.

You will note that the only purpose of this Act is to protect the name "psychologist." It is not designed to prevent anyone from practising the profession that is practised by a psychologist, or charging fees for it, or being qualified or otherwise. The only prohibition is that that person may not use the name or the title psychologist, and throughout the Act is a tremendous power of protection for that name. I don't for a moment suggest that it is not important that people should know that the person they are dealing with, who purports to have certain knowledge, wisdom, experience, is a person who is recognizable as having achieved certain qualifications, but I wonder if members could pay attention to this bill and read it through and see what impression they get as to the powers that this bill proposes to give to a group of people.

The psychologist group is designed to consist of a five-member council. These five members will hold office until their successors are elected and their term of office shall be for four years. The quorum is three members. This means that after this bill is passed, for the next four years there will be a group of five people of whom three are a quorum, who will have tremendous powers in controlling the membership to this organization. The qualifications are established here based on certain content of studies, and then goes on with recognition of lesser content of studies with greater professional experience to balance it out and in the end there is a general clause providing that applications may be received, and if in the opinion of the council the standards required for admission to practice in another province or country are equivalent to or higher than the standards required for registration here, then they may admit it.

Need I recall to members of this House the use to which this kind of power has been put in Ontario in connection with qualified doctors who came to practice in Ontario, put in their required internship at a time when they were informed - and now this is, what I'm stating now is hearsay of what I've read that these doctors themselves have said - that when they came to Ontario they were led to believe by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario that after completing a certain course of studies they would then be qualified for admission. And this too I think was admitted by the president. Then they reversed their position in regard to certain medical schools and said, "No, their standards are not good enough to qualify them to practice in Ontario."

There were similar controls exercised in Saskatchewan, especially in the case of admissions to hospital boards, and I think that we must look carefully at the powers that we are giving to professional groups to not only police themselves but to regulate themselves and to set their own qualifications. Now I'm not for a moment suggesting that they do not have the ability to do this, but I do say that by giving them this power, they are acquiring so much power that there is very little by way of appeal that can be brought in to challenge their decisions and regulations.

Now this bill, like so many other bills before us, gives power to the council to establish by-laws, rules, regulations, which will determine the method of admission; determine the discipline and control; and will give all the powers, some of which - all the powers set out here which are very broad - some of which I think ought to be in the Act. I think the Act ought to say something so that we who have the responsibility to the people whom the bill is designed

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) to protect, according to the mover, should know just what these regulations are.

Now the mover of this bill stated that the purpose of the bill is to protect the public so that the public will know that when a psychologist is needed, then by merely finding that a person is known as a psychologist they will know that the background of the person, the qualifications are such as to support their being entitled to practice in that fashion. That is the purpose. I'm sure that the mover of the bill would not say that the purpose here is to set up a protective society or a society for the protection of psychologists.

I think the purpose of the bill will have to be to protect the public, but I think, and I'm not saying - I don't want for a moment to be misunderstood - I am in favour of second reading; I think we should take a careful look at all the powers that are provided in this Act; we should end up by passing an Act; but I think that we must be very careful in realizing what we are doing in delegating powers to bodies that may have special vested interests in maintaining their profession's standards as being high but at the same time giving them the power to control admissions and expand their membership - and I refer again in passing to what has happened in Ontario.

So that I would suggest that members do take the trouble to read it through and question in their own mind whether it is proper that powers of this type should be given, should be delegated to professional groups, and lest anyone think that I'm talking about psychologists, I am not alone speaking of psychologists. I would like to see members sit down and read The Law Society Act or any other professional act which delegates powers, and start thinking in terms of whether the granting of wide powers such of this type - I mean wide powers of regulation as to admission, as to penalty and expulsion, should be left entirely within each particular profession.

I raise this because I propose during the Session to bring the general question up in the form of a resolution so that we can review in our own minds whether the licensing procedures of old should continue to be the licensing procedures of today, and I am using this bill, not in attacking the bill or the group of psychologists but in bringing to the attention of the House the points that I have made in the hope and expectation that they will review this bill only as an example of other Acts that we already have, and think about what I am suggesting now as being something worthy of consideration in the general question of professional societies.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, may I speak just briefly to the principle of the bill. May I ask the sponsor of the bill: if I were a qualified psychiatrist but did not for some reason or other wish to join the association, would I be permitted to practice in this province - with your amendments that you are bringing in?

MR. COWAN: May I answer this question without closing the debate?

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak?

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): I should like to ask a question as well, so possibly if he answers the honourable member, will I be permitted to ask a question then?

MR. EVANS: I think, Madam Speaker, that we should observe the form of a second reading debate, that when the proposer speaks a second time he closes the debate. I think that there may be occasions at the end of a speech when a question can be entertained and answered in an informal manner as we often do. I think however any wide latitude in popping up and down and answering debates on second reading would convert this into a committee, and my suggestion would be that we might well ask the principal speaker to gather his questions and answer them in his final address.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: I'll speak to the bill, Madam Speaker. I'd like to more or less question the matter of qualification. I think that this bill may have a useful purpose, but I think that there should be a more definite definition as to what truly constitutes a qualified member, the reason being that in this bill you mention the fact that an individual who has a Master's Degree will be admitted as a qualified member. I think that it may do injustice to those people who will qualify under the system of an Honours Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science Degree, who may have in their under-graduate work taken a great deal of subjects that may end up in terms of hours of credit far in excess of that individual who will have taken an ordinary Bachelor of Arts Degree and may specialize in this field in terms of his post-graduate work which he may, quite conveniently, acquire his Master's Degree in a period of one year.

Now to me there is a definite difference in the number of years that are required to fulfill the membership requirements under a Master's Degree and one who would be equally as qualified from the academic standard and yet not necessarily be the holder of a Master's Degree. I think

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd.) . . . that this should be well looked into because it is a rather unfair qualification in terms of the member, or rather a prospective member might have more qualifications than a holder of a Master's Degree, and yet on the one hand we have an individual that is not as highly qualified, but because he holds a Master's Degree, can become a member; and one who is more highly qualified, because he doesn't hold a Master's Degree, can find it rather difficult to become a member of this organization. I think that by the same token there is possibly too much emphasis placed on the words of the educational institution as approved by the University of Manitoba.

Now this again brings to our attention what happened in the Department of Education where you may have a Master of Arts from some University in the United States that will not be a recognized university by the University of Manitoba. This I think should be clarified, because this is something that would lead to a great deal of difficulty and then the council or this organization would have to make some arbitrary rulings in that direction. I think that it would be most advisable to clarify this point and get it into far more specific terms rather than leave it in an ambiguous position.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

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 Honourable Minister of Agriculture, 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.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, could I be permitted the privilege of the House of making a comment without being charged with speaking to the motion before the House? The comment I wish to make, Madam Speaker, is that today was private members' day, and until the hour of 5:00 o'clock, the whole of the day was taken up by government business due to the statement of the Honourable - the Deputy Premier, I presume - and other governmental business accompanying that. I just want to point this out to the House in order that the time allotted for private members' resolutions would be given greater consideration, if need be, at the latter part of the Session.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, on the point raised by my honourable friend, we have always, I think on every occasion that I remember, made a practice of allowing private members to complete their resolutions and I am sure there is no change in the government's intention.

MR. PAULLEY: That's fine, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to establish it here this evening.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 16. (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) --

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, under (c), we have a Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement there for \$124,000. Would the Minister tell us the terms of this particular agreement and what it covers, and the work under it?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): This is the ground water study program. We have undertaken surveys of the ground water potential in the Melita area, in the Carberry area, and in the Greater Winnipeg area, and the cost of these programs is shared under the ARDA program. Specifically, in this \$124,000, we have ground water availability studies. The estimated cost is \$52,000. The purpose of these studies is to outline the sources of ground water that exist in each area and to evaluate the quantity and quality of water available from each source. Areas included in these studies are the Melita area, the Carberry area, and the Ethelbert area.

Ground water development studies - the estimated cost is \$32,000. The purpose of these studies is to improve the methods used to develop ground water supplies, that is the best way to develop a good well. Projects include studies of both flowing wells and the control of flowing

(MR. HUTTON cont'd.) wells, and experimental wells.

Then there's another study on ground water management, and the purpose of these studies is to establish instrumentation that will allow monitoring the effects of the utilization of our ground water resources and guard against any development that may be detrimental.

So that is made up of three studies of \$52,000, \$32,000, and \$20,000 respectively.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, is there any report yet available? If there is a report, could the members of the House have it? I think that at least some of the ground water surveys have been going on for two years have they not?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we're in a position where we want to make a report as yet. It's true that these surveys have been going on for two years. There are certain indications that are pretty convincing at this stage, but I think in fairness to the engineers and those carrying out the research projects, we should wait until they have arrived at firm conclusions and are willing to take a stand on the subject.

For instance, the investigations to date in the Melita area on ground water and the availability of this water for the use in irrigation is very promising - very promising - but even though the investigations to date indicate that the possibility of irrigating from these dugouts is promising, I don't think the engineers are prepared yet to categorically and unqualifiedly say, "Now this is the way to irrigate in this part of the country."

MR. CAMPBELL: The articles that I am going to mention did not I think originate with the Department of Agriculture, but some periodicals and newspapers carried very interesting articles a couple of years ago that dealt with what they termed an underground river, that different articles placed it in various locations but in general it seemed to flow from somewhere in the Carberry area and traverse the plains and keep to the south end of Lake Manitoba and then go off into the Interlake. Have any of these studies that have been conducted, or surveys, have they tended to either establish the correctness of those old surmises or to indicate that they have not yet been found, or has any information been developed in that regard?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the studies that are being undertaken today would serve to establish that we have in existence what amounts to an underground river. What they do establish, however, is that in areas along that alleged underground riverbed we have substantial supplies of water. I have never heard the engineers challenge - what would we call it, a theory or concept - that we have an underground river. I think that probably available information would tend at this stage to support that contention, but on the other hand I can't say that any studies have been undertaken to date to prove it, except the studies that have been undertaken for specific purposes in the Melita and Carberry area. The knowledge we have of the occurrence of artesian wells, etc., in the Gimli and Interlake area would indicate that possibly there is something in this contention that has been proposed from time to time that indeed an underground river exists.

I should note that the studies under which we are sharing or getting cost-sharing with ARDA are those in the rural areas for the Melita area and the Ethelbert area and the Carberry area. We have quite an extensive program that's proceeding in the metropolitan area but we don't get any ARDA sharing costs on that program.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think this is the last item where we have ARDA under the agricultural department in our estimates. I previously asked the Minister what the total amount was that we had spent under ARDA on the Interlake area. I was at that time referred to a pamphlet that was distributed a little later, which is "ARDA's Program in Manitoba - 1962-66." My question was the total amount that was spent from its very beginning. I think it started in 1960, if I'm right. If the Minister could give me that information, I would appreciate it.

Then since we are talking on water supply, I suppose the Water Supply Board would come under discussion in this item, is this correct? A year ago we discussed the matter of averaging or having the same rate for water at the different points in Manitoba same as we have Hydro. The Minister commented at that time, but I would like to know from him whether any further consideration has been given to this item because we know that the various towns and villages have different rates.

For instance, Morden has the cannery out there and they get their water for 16 cents whereas the cannery in Winkler, I think, has to pay somewhere close to a dollar and the people in Altona they pay almost \$2.00. So I think there is a certain inequity here, and certainly when it comes to the matter of attracting industry that this is definitely a very large liability for those towns that have a high cost water rate. I think something should be done in this

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) connection, either the province should subsidize some of these areas that have a very high water rate so that they would not be put into such a position of not being able to compete. At least at this time, I would like to know from the Minister whether any further consideration has been given to this matter and whether we can expect anything in this line.

I also asked the Minister some time ago - this was not when we discussed the estimates - in connection with the Pembilier Dam, whether any decision has been made by the International Joint Commission. We were told at that time that it had not reached a decision, but I would like to know from him whether any work is being done in the meantime. On the matter of the Pembilier Dam, is there any further studies being made, or what is the situation? Is it lying dormant or will it remain dormant for the year, because I don't see anything in the estimates to provide monies to spend under the item. What is the situation?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of equalization of water rates, this matter has continued to be under study by the department but there is some very real problems. As the Honourable Member for Rhineland has pointed out, we put through a bill in the Legislature here ratifying an agreement between the Town of Morden and one of the canning plants whereby they could offer water to the canning plant at 16 cents per thousand gallons. By comparison, the charge made to the Town of Winkler for water is 65 cents. In the case of Altona, the initial charge is \$2.00, and after a certain consumption - volume of consumption - the rate drops to about a dollar or 95 cents.

If you equalize the rates on water in Manitoba, it means that those communities because of natural advantages, that is the existence of an adequate supply of water at the edge of the community, these communities are going to lose the advantage that they have at the present time. You might make the people of Altona very happy if you equalize the rates and you lowered their initial rate somewhat, but let me assure the Honourable Member for Rhineland that the community of Winkler and the community of Morden would be extremely unhappy if we set aside what they consider to be, at this time at least, a natural advantage in being able to offer low cost water to heavy water-consuming industries, or what we refer to as wet industry.

The whole question of equalization is a very knotty problem. Unfortunately I think that we would have to raise the rates of the towns or communities enjoying cheap water at the present time - we'd have to raise them very substantially in order to effect a meaningful reduction for those communities that are paying a relatively high rate. I don't know whether you are going to do any good to the overall economic welfare of the province if by equalizing your water rates you merely put all the communities out of reach of catering to a wet industry.

In other words, where now towns like Morden and even Winkler enjoy a water rate which allows them to attract and service a wet industry, if you raise their rates in order to lower the high rates, you are going to be in a position where even with the rates lowered somewhat the communities you're trying to assist will still be relatively ineffective in attracting wet industries, and at the same time you're going to nullify the advantages that the communities with a cheap water supply have at the present time and make it difficult for them to attract a wet industry. It's not a simple black and white thing at all. It's a very complicated and vexatious problem that we face in trying to equalize opportunities for development through equalized water rates.

In respect to your question about the ARDA program in 1965-66, that is the current year, we had the Norquay Floodway, the Hespeler Floodway, the Grassmere drain, Fish Lake and Oak Lake under the ARDA program for the current year. Now due to a very unfavourable construction season and due to the fact that our planning and design section in the Water Control and Conservation Branch were tied up in selling the idea of provincial waterways to the municipal people they were tied up in the preparation of maps which demonstrated by picture what the relative responsibilities would be for the Provincial Government and the municipalities in respect to drainage - and because they were tied up in this exercise, some of our design work lagged badly and, therefore, this combined with the very unfavourable construction season, we weren't able to expend all the monies that were authorized by the Legislature at the last sitting in 1965.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) passed. Resolution 16 - passed. Resolution 17 - passed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, are we on 16 or where are we at?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on 17.

MR. SHOEMAKER: 17, and we're going to pass a million and a quarter dollars just by pass, passing here. We're on 17? Well, that's the one I wanted to talk about.

The other evening I said that it would be most helpful if my honourable friend the Minister would get up and say that he endorsed the proposals of Dr. Gilson and Menzies or said that they were all wet, and my honourable friend seemed to take exception to this and he got up and said, "My name is not Alvin Hamilton and it is not Dr. Menzies and it is not Dr. Gilson, but it's George Hutton." Well, that's all fine and dandy to know what my honourable friend's name is, but I still say that in this whole field of ARDA it is pretty important to know in what direction we are going, and to have Dr. Gilson and Dr. Menzies come out with their proposals -- and I know that they have no authority. They are recognized economists and recognized authorities on this whole subject of poverty in Canada, and particularly on the farm. They are making certain recommendations that apparently have been endorsed by the federal ARDA authorities, and it seems to tie in with the program that has been outlined in Ottawa to cover from the period 1965 to 1970, and while it is quite true that Alvin Hamilton said the whole purpose of ARDA was not to remove one single farmer but to operate within the concept of the family farm and so on, it now appears that the federal ARDA program is designed to do something to rehabilitate probably up to 50 percent of the farmers. On Page 6 of *The Poverty in Canada* by Dr. Menzies, in his ten observations on poverty on the farm he lists as his No. 1 observation, "redundancy of the farmers" and states that approximately 50 percent of the farmers in the study area, if provided with suitable alternative employment and the training required for it, could leave the agricultural industry to the benefit of themselves and to the net gain of the remaining farm community and the national economy; and then he sets up proposals to do just that.

Now, I'm not here to say I agree with this, but I am saying that here is what a real recognized authority has to say, and then I suppose that my honourable friend receives in the mail, as I do, a - oh, I don't know whether it's a monthly bulletin; I think it is - from the federal Minister of Natural Resources. The one that I refer to at the moment is Volume No. 2 -- No. 9, October 65 - that's not very long ago; and it outlines, oh, very briefly, the new agreement that has now been signed by ten provincial governments. The agreement, details of which were worked out at a Federal-Provincial meeting in Montreal last November, covers the period 1965 to 1970; and then it goes on to say, "The new agreement includes a number of important changes to the original. Generally, it places heavier emphasis on the alleviation of poverty in rural areas by means of diverse resource development programs, land use adjustment and farm consolidation, community development and rehabilitation of the people. There is increased emphasis on programs to assist rural people to re-establish in new employment or resettle in areas where opportunity may be better. For provinces which desire it, a new system of administration is possible whereby provincial ARDA programs will be examined on a yearly program basis rather than the Federal Government reviewing each province individually as was done in the past."

Then it goes on to say, "Among the first provinces to act under the new agreement was Nova Scotia. It has announced a \$3,332,000 five-year program in farm enlargement and consolidation designed to increase the size of Nova Scotia farms to a point where they would provide the operators with an adequate income."

Now my point is, Mr. Chairman, that this ties in exactly with what Menzies and Gilson have been saying, and it looks to me that somewhere along the line, in order to get the most benefits that are available out of ARDA, we have to find out where we are going in this whole field of poverty. So this is what prompted me three or four days ago to ask my honourable friend just in what direction we were heading.

Now, the people in the Gladstone-Neepawa area are wondering too where we are heading in this whole field of water conservation and run-off, because, as my honourable friend knows very well, this area was the first area in the whole province to conceive the watershed approach, and the water and soil conservation, to designate an area. And it is interesting to note that on December 19th, 1958, the then Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable Errick F. Willis, made a special trip to Gladstone to pronounce the area as the first watershed in the Province of Manitoba. I don't know whether my honourable friend is familiar with this letter or not, but I would be delighted to read it to him if he has lost his copy. (Interjection) Read it? Don't read it. You know it. Well then, my honourable friend is pleading with me to not read it, so my

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . guess is that he knows all about it. He knows all about it. Anyway, the then Minister of Agriculture eight years ago made a special trip to Gladstone to declare the Riding Mountain-Whitemud River Watershed as an authority.

Well, we haven't had much action up there in the last eight years and the people are still wondering when they can expect some. I am told that a rather prominent farmer in the Woodside area wrote to my honourable friend the Minister on October 30th last year, October 30th, 1965, and said something like this: "Dear George, if you're going by my farm, would you please drop in and see me, and I will arrange to have a half a dozen farmers in the area discuss their problems with you." And three weeks after, he got a letter from the Chief Engineer, completely ignoring that kind invitation that was extended to my honourable friend, and saying that they are quite aware of all of the problems but it's going to take time to get around to doing something about them. I have a copy of the letter written by the Chief Engineer.

Well, after eight years, it is little wonder that the people in that area are wondering when they can expect some action, and so Mr. Chairman, I hope that my honourable friend will be able to put the minds of these people at rest and tell them that he has some major programs that will be a great relief to the people in this area, and then perhaps when he is at it he might elaborate on this new five-year ARDA agreement that he signed some -- well, I suppose in October or whenever it was that they met in Montreal, on this new five-year ARDA agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 17--passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, this is the largest of the ARDA appropriations in the Department of Agriculture and Conservation. I've been asking about several of the others. I would like to hear from the Minister what this large appropriation envisages. Is it for the type of thing that my honourable friend from Gladstone was discussing? I say so little about it compared to what the Honourable Member for Gladstone does, that maybe the committee is not aware of the fact that part of this troubled zone is in my constituency as well, and I know how badly those people have been suffering periodically from flooding.

Now, if this is the right appropriation to deal with that type of thing, I would like to find out particularly from the Minister what is planned for the lower reaches of the Whitemud River, which of course, according to the program, and properly I think, envisages the whole watershed. It's been not only a headache, it's been a catastrophe to a lot of the farmers there for years on end, and I really think that it deserves the very highest priority on my honourable friend's list. If this is not the proper place to discuss this one, then I'd like to know what is the program under this large appropriation.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, the program for the construction season of 1966 is as follows: The Norquay Floodway, a minor expenditure; the Hespeler Floodway, a major expenditure; Dennis Lake, a major expenditure; Tobacco Creek, you might say a major expenditure -- I mean something in the neighbourhood of a quarter of a million dollars. Tobacco Creek; the Long Lake Drain which starts in St. Francis -- the municipality extends almost to Portage la Prairie; Sturgeon Creek drain; the Fisher River in the northern Interlake; the Rockwood-Stonewall drain.

Specifically, we're making provision for \$5,000 on the Norquay Floodway; \$270,000 on the Hespeler Floodway; \$220,000 on Dennis Lake; \$250,000 on Tobacco Creek; \$180,000 on the Long Lake Drain; \$150,000 on the Sturgeon Creek Drain; \$25,000 on the Fisher River; \$140,000 on the Rockwood-Stonewall Drain.

Now, it is true that the major projects on the Whitemud, that is the enlargement of the outlet channels, is not included in the program, but under the \$1,690,000, there are monies there for maintenance and construction, and I'm sure that a portion of these monies will be expended in that area, which is one of the most troublesome in Manitoba.

I'd like to say a word about the concept that this is the first watershed approach in Manitoba. A good many sincere and honest and hard-working people in the Whitemud watershed expended a great deal of time and energy in trying to establish the Whitemud watershed area, the first organized watershed area in Manitoba. And I can't agree with the Honourable Member for Gladstone that it ever came to pass, because a vote was held of the municipalities within that watershed, and there was not sufficient support amongst the municipalities contributing to that watershed to justify the establishment of such an organization. However, of all the meetings that I attended with respect to provincial waterways, I never got a better reception than I did at Neepawa on the occasion that we met with the councils in the Whitemud River watershed and told them of the details of the take-over of the major waterways by the Provincial Government, and I certainly look forward with as much anticipation and enthusiasm to the time when we can undertake some

(MR. HUTTON cont'd). . . of these major works in that area which will alleviate what has been a very long-standing problem; but to be absolutely fair about it, I must say to you that there are areas in Manitoba which would be much worse off than the area drained by the Whitemud River and its tributaries if they had not assumed the responsibility for sharing what at times must have been a fairly onerous financial load in order to build their drains, and I think that when one considers the equitability of programming, that there are some areas in Manitoba where over the years the local people assumed what I say was an onerous burden in improving their drainage. And I think that they are entitled, even though their drainage is of a higher calibre than that in the Whitemud River watershed, that they are entitled to some programming in their area as well as the people in the Whitemud River watershed. But this was one of the areas that we had in mind when we said that the establishment of this new policy of the province becoming 100% responsible for major trunk drains, this was one of the areas where we believed that it would really be effective and help the local people in solving some long-standing problems. I still believe that, and I still look forward to the time in the very near future when we can satisfy the demands of the people in that area by undertaking major construction works in their watershed, which will tend to eliminate the flooding that they have been subjected to over the years.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Minister, has the investigation with regard to that particular stream, the Whitemud River, and its headwaters, have the investigations proceeded to the extent that the Minister can give us an outline of what the long-term proposal is? This I think would be most helpful to the people who are so concerned. As a matter of fact, the Honourable Member for Gladstone, the Mayor of Portage la Prairie, and I, attended a meeting during the course of 1965. I don't recall the date with any accuracy at all, but it was a well-attended meeting, and the drainage problems of that particular area were certainly a reason for holding the meeting. There was quite a bit of criticism of the situation as it existed at the time, and as a matter of fact Mayor Henderson, who is a self-confessed authority on drainage matters in that area, was proposing some pretty radical solutions to the situation, and the late Reeve McRae, who was present at the meeting of course too, at that juncture stepped in and made a strong plea for restraint and co-operation with the Minister's plan. He explained to the meeting the proposal that had been made because he had recently attended some conference with the department officials, and he explained to the meeting the plan about the streams that had a certain number of tributaries to them being taken over by the province, and he seemed to convince the meeting that that was one that certainly qualified for the provincial category, and that something would be forthcoming, and I know that the correspondence that my honourable friend has referred to is to some extent an outgrowth of that meeting. I know, because I, too, have been in touch with some of the people there that the situation has not changed greatly in the meantime, and it would be most helpful, I think, if the Minister could give us an outline of what is proposed, even though it is still apparently in the future, but to know at least that a plan is being discussed and has some finality to it would certainly be appreciated by the people of that area.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, an article that I read recently - and incidentally from the Neepawa Press, and I haven't mentioned that paper for some time - but Friday, November 26th, 1965 says that "ARDA, The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act, has conducted a study of such problems on the south side of the Riding Mountain area. A report on the study is scheduled for publication on the first of the year. It should make interesting reading for the people of the Watershed Committee." Is this a fact? Has the study been completed and has a report been made?

MR. HUTTON: I can't answer the last question categorically. I don't know whether it's available yet or not. It may be I have not been made aware of it. I think there's no doubt -- to answer the Member for Lakeside, there can be no doubt that the approach to the problem of water control in the Whitemud River watershed, must be a two-fold approach. Certainly there will have to be improvements to existing channels, the Whitemud River itself, and its major tributaries for which the province is responsible. In addition to this, there is at least one major reservoir in the upper watershed of the Whitemud which is under consideration. I think the engineers on the basis of the studies that have been done to date, and this probably will oversimplify the situation, but I think there can be no doubt the capacity of the Whitemud River itself must be increased, either through a clean-out of the river or by a diversion, and the capacity of the tributaries, some of the tributaries of the Whitemud, will have to also be enlarged.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No.17-passed. No. 18-passed....

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a few questions. This has to do with the pool, or the reservoir that will be formed by the diversion dam on the Assiniboine River West of Portage. Last year, I had occasion to make an inquiry on behalf of a constituent who wanted to know if his land, which was on the Assiniboine River at that point in the vicinity of the pool, he wanted to know if his land would be affected in any way, or would it have any potential as a summer resort area if there were to be a good-sized lake. So when I made the enquiry of the engineer I was told quite definitely that there would not be any pool or lake of any consequence. As a matter of fact he was quite emphatic in pointing out that it would be barely noticeable. Now, the people on whose behalf I made the enquiry had a different picture painted last summer when the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources were out to Portage, and in an interview this is what was said about the size of the lake there: "The Premier, " - and this is a quotation of the Daily Graphic of August 28, 1965 - "The Premier and Mr. Lyon also revealed Friday afternoon that Portage la Prairie will have a new lake in its vicinity when the control structure for the diversion dam of the Assiniboine River is completed. The structure will provide a brand new lake some 11 miles long, west of Portage, Mr. Roblin said, and in addition to stockpiling water, it will have real potential for recreational development."

Now the question I would like the Minister to clear up is, which is the correct information? Was there a change in the plan from a year ago up until last August 28th, or -- well, which is the correct piece of information here so that these people will know? On one hand they were told -- I was told quite definitely that there would be a very small pool, quite unnoticeable, and then in this article we are told that it's a lake 11 miles long. If he could clear that point up.

The other question I have to put to the Minister is regarding -- and I believe it's three pieces of land, or three landowners have been served expropriation notices along with the Totogan Farms people. This makes four. Now two of the other three, as recently as a month ago told me that they had not had an offer for their land, and according to my information the expropriation notice was served by the Minister of Agriculture on June 17th, 1965. They have a feeling that their offer is being held back because of the Totogan Farms investigation. Now if this was so, perhaps the Minister could clarify this, and if this is the reason, to acknowledge it; if not, perhaps he could tell the committee why a firm offer has not been made to these people. I understand one of the three have had an offer, but two of the three have not. This was my information as about a month ago. So I would be interested to hear the answers to these two questions.

MR. HUTTON: In respect to water levels behind the first structure, my information is that the crest of the structure will be 869 feet above sea level. My understanding is that some of the farm operators and vegetable operators in the valley will not be able to operate; their land will be flooded. Now, there might be an area for disagreement about whether the lake to be formed was of a significant size or not. I would think that it is of significant size in that it will be there through the whole summer, and we all know that at times the Assiniboine can get down to a bit of a trickle, especially if you have periods of light precipitation.

In the case of the expropriation, I believe there are five - four individuals and one organization which expropriation In the case of the individual where the expropriation notice was served last June, we have under the Act one year in which to make an offer to these people. I can assure the Honourable Member that the reason that they have or have not received an offer has nothing to do with the Totogan Farms situation. To give you a specific and categorical answer as to why the delay, I can't give that to you; I don't know. We have had some changes in the matter in which the acquisition of property for government purposes has changed with the establishment of a branch, Land Acquisition Branch in the Department of Public Works; also the fact that some of these negotiations that were entered into prior to the establishment of that branch are not handled by that branch. We have been rather unfortunate in the Water Control Branch in the fact that our director has been quite ill since the 1st of November, and without in any way reflecting on the other members of the staff, you don't remove a body at that stage in the hierarchy of command without having some complications, and maybe in some way this was connected with it. But I can assure the Honourable Member for Portage that the fact that these people have not received an offer has nothing to do with the acquisition of the property, or portion of the property, owned by Totogan Farms.

I can't give you a more accurate answer on the lake except that to my knowledge it is going to be something approaching fourteen miles in length, this lake, and it is going to compel us to buy out some of the farmlands in the Assiniboine Valley west of Portage. So I would think

MR. HUTTON cont'd). . . . that relative to what you have experienced as a flow of water in the Assiniboine River in the past, that this would be a pretty substantial body of water.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Minister to say that any negotiations for land that had started prior to the setting up of the Land Acquisition Branch will not be handled by them?

MR. HUTTON: Where expropriation proceedings were undertaken prior to the establishment of the Land Acquisition Branch, the respective departments are responsible for carrying those particular negotiations through to conclusion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Does this mean that the Land Appraisal Commission's arbitration that they offered to the people is not valid then, with the people who may wish to go to them?

MR. HUTTON: No, it doesn't mean that. The Review Committee was serving all departments; it was serving the Department of Agriculture and Conservation, Department of Mines and Resources, and the Department of Public Works. They still serve in respect to those matters of property acquisition for which we as departments are still responsible to conclude. Anything that was undertaken, any property acquisition which was undertaken after a specific date - I think it was the 1st of July, 1965 - was all undertaken by the new Land Acquisition Branch, and this Committee of Review has been serving the Land Acquisition Branch, but it's also been serving the specific departments who were left with the settlement of certain expropriations which were undertaken prior to the date when the new branch was established.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I take it we're dealing under 18, Resolution 18, are we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. FROESE: I would like to know from the Minister in connection with the Greater Winnipeg Floodway, just how much money has been spent to date on the floodway and how much more is there to go, and also how many years of work -- how long will it take until we have the floodway completed. And we note, we have an item here of \$4,977,000 in the estimates. Can we expect a further item under Capital, or is this the total amount that we are going to allot to the floodway this year? Some time ago the Honourable Member for St. John's had tried to figure out how much had been spent on the floodway and apparently he couldn't make out from Public Accounts as to the total amount. Maybe the Minister can give us these figures.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out with reference to the floodway, are the relocation of such things as the Hydro Electric Transmission Towers that were removed and had to be changed and relocated, and the relocation of the telephone lines, and some of the relocations of the roads and the bridge approaches, are these being charged to the floodway or are they being charged to the various departments? Because in the Public Accounts there seems to be a rather confused sort of a charge in that it is most difficult to know what truly belongs to the floodway and what belongs to a specific department. I'd like to know if these have been charged to the floodway or not.

The other question I have is this: In reference to those wells that have been disturbed in terms of the ground water supply in the vicinity of the floodway-- now, some of those wells I know that the department has had to deepen, some of these wells have had to be re-drilled, some of them have to be re-equipped with new pumps, and I'm wondering, is this service as well being charged to the floodway or does it come out of the department cost?

MR. HUTTON: All costs that have been mentioned by the Honourable Member for Burrows are charged to the floodway. In movement, any costs incurred in the disturbance of utilities, whether they be public or private, any cost such as railroad crossings, these are 100 percent the responsibility of the Provincial Government. The same is true where it is established that the existence or the construction of the floodway has contributed to the lowering of water levels or the water table, the cost incurred in restoring the wells of the people so affected, are all assumed as 100 percent charges to the floodway itself.

In the case of expenditures in the Red River Floodway, the expenditures to date from the inception to March 31, 1965, the actual expenditures were \$30,820,443. Estimated for this current year, beginning March 1965 through to March 1966, the estimate for that period is \$14,500,000, or a total estimated expenditure to March 31st of \$45,320,000. Ninety-four million cubic yards of excavation out of a total excavation of 100 million cubic yards have been left and so we still have, in terms of structures and excavations, an estimated expenditure over the next two years of something approximating \$18 million.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister, then, to clarify the matter which appears on Page 82 of our Public Accounts for 1964-65 year in connection

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd)... with the floodway. There we have the relocation of Highway No. 59 north, which had to be relocated because of the floodway. Its approaches, its right-of-ways had to be approved, and in this, on Page 82, we have the grading structure running to \$470,000. Then we have in the same category the acquisition of certain rights-of-way which were necessitated by the floodway and which were necessary to relocate this highway because of the floodway, of some \$131,000, and there are various additional charges all of which will total close to a million dollars that are in and around the floodway. Will the Minister please explain to this House as to just how we get about these charges, and how come that they are not truly a part of the floodway cost?

MR. HUTTON: Well, some of the costs -- let's take the cost of the crossings. You have a four-lane highway where before you only had a two-lane highway, and naturally in our negotiations with Ottawa they're not going to, in building the Red River Diversion, have us end up with better highway systems than we started with, so a certain portion of the cost of the relocation of the highways were charged to the floodway. For instance, originally in our original design, we anticipated three bridges and we ended up with one, but it's a four-lane bridge. Now the Federal Government agreed to share the cost of this bridge because it approximated the original undertaking that they had made in the agreement, but other aspects of the road program which would provide a better network of roads or a better service than we had before, they were not willing to share as a legitimate cost of building the floodway. Now they did share in some of the roads that had to be constructed to tie in traffic on both sides of the floodway and steer it to the crossing, and for the most part they accepted them. But in the case of the 59 Highway they contributed what they agreed, for cost of restoring or maintaining existing highway services, and they were unwilling to consider anything above that as a legitimate cost that could be charged to the construction of the floodway.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would have very little quarrel with the Minister on some of these matters of shared costs, but definitely I have a difference with him in reference to the acquisition of right-of-way, because it doesn't make any difference whether you have a two-lane highway or a four-lane highway, the right-of-way is about the same. Therefore, when the new highway is relocated in a new position, the old position in which it existed should rightfully be charged to the cost of the floodway, and an equal amount of money would only be necessary to buy the same right-of-way in the same area, and if the acquisition of the new right-of-way was at a higher price, then it, in the same way, should be charged at the higher price to the cost of the floodway.

Now, I cannot break down the Public Accounts nor the Estimates under the floodway in some of these other matters such as approaches to the bridges, because this is rather difficult to analyze, but certainly in the acquisition of the right-of-way there simply is no reason why a sum should be charged into the Department of Public Works when rightfully it should belong to the cost of the floodway. And I simply, Mr. Chairman, cannot agree with the Minister, and I simply cannot understand why simply getting one right-of-way and exchanging it for what existed before in the same area in the same circumstances where land values are of a similar nature, as to why there should be this difference, and I am not satisfied with this explanation, and if the Minister feels that there is another explanation, I would like to hear it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): On the matter of the Winnipeg Floodway, could the Minister indicate exactly when it will be completed? What is the exact estimated date of completion? Coming back to the point of the Honourable Member for Burrows, I think the point here is that we have been given an estimated figure of the total cost of the floodway quite obviously by diverting costs into other departments. For example, if the Hydro is paying for the relocation of its lines directly, and not the floodway paying for it, then quite obviously the total cost of the floodway is less than its actual real cost. Similarly, in the case of bridges and any other factors where a change had to be made in some other operations from other departments by virtue of the floodway being built, that is, the reason for the change, then legitimately the charge should be to the floodway, not to the other departments. Only in this way can we have an actual true cost for the floodway itself.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, if we should get a flood, the floodway will be cheap at any cost.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, that isn't a satisfactory answer at all. Not in the least. My honourable friend is responsible to this House to give us the facts that we are asking him for. He's asking us now to pass some four million dollars or five million dollars. To get up and make that sort of a statement is simply no answer. I have asked him a legitimate question and I would like a legitimate answer.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I gave a legitimate answer, a very legitimate answer, to the Honourable Member for Burrows, but I love to see the Leader of the Opposition wiggle on a hook that he put himself on a number of years ago, and he's continued to wiggle on it; and he doesn't like it. And the fact that we've been able to build the floodway - and to date it looks as if we're going to be well within the estimates that were made many years ago about the cost - is hard to swallow. And so he has to try to establish with the people of Manitoba that really we're not going to get the floodway for the \$63 million that we said we could get it for; it really was going to cost more because we were charging legitimate costs of the floodway to other departments. This is his charge here tonight. No we're not. The fact is, if you've got a two-lane highway, if you've got a two-lane highway to start with and you end up with a four-lane highway, I think it's hardly fair to charge the extra benefits of that four-lane highway to the floodway. At least the Government of Canada says, "No, we won't do that. We were willing to replace two lanes; we were willing to give you a couple of bridges; but if you want a nice, broad, easy access to the City of Winnipeg or the Metropolitan Centre from the North and East to the City, we're not going to have you charge to the cost of that floodway what are legitimately the costs of undertaking and building your highway system in Manitoba." This is the position of the Federal Government, the exact opposite of the position that has been taken by the Honourable Member for Burrows and on which the Leader of the Opposition was so quick to jump. This is exactly the argument that Canada uses with us. They're not going to let us get away with charging costs to the floodway which aren't legitimate costs and which properly should be charged to the development of the highways system in Manitoba, and that's why you have these charges made; but in the case of the railways, in the case of the Hydro, in the case of the water, the aqueduct, wherever we disturbed or interfered, the cost of making the changes that were required were charged 100% to the construction of the floodway.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister, what was the difference in width of the right-of-way of the old No. 59 as against the new one? Was there any difference in the width of the right-of-way? This is a simple request.

MR. HUTTON: Yes, it takes a wider strip of land to build a four-lane highway than it does to build a two-lane highway. I can't give you the exact figures. I will undertake to get you the difference in the costs and the other matters relative to the reasons for extra width and extra costs. I don't have this specific information at hand.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: . . . it will be found that I'm not asking the width of a two-lane highway as against a four-lane highway. Naturally a four-lane highway is wider. But what I am asking about is the right-of-way, and I think that if the Honourable Minister checks into it, he will find that the right-of-way, the width of the right-of-way of the old road is approximately the same as the width of the right-of-way of the present new relocated highway.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get an answer out of the Minister, though, after his outburst, or included in his outburst, regarding when the floodway is going to be completed.

MR. HUTTON: . . . will be ready for operation in the spring of 1968, Deo volente.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm always intrigued during the discussions that take place in this House, on the matter of the floodway, and as to whether or not the costs are allocated properly to the Department of Highways, the Department of Agriculture, Education or even Social Welfare. I do not forget, some years ago - I think I would be correct in saying some 16 years ago - when the whole of the Greater Winnipeg area was in the throes of a possibility of being inundated by the flooding of the Assiniboine and the Red Rivers. I'll never forget as long as I live the attitude of the then government of Manitoba, the "Don't worry about it; the problem will be dissipated; The Lord will cause the sun to shine greatly upon us, and take unto the sun the excess waters that may be pouring down upon us from the south or from the west." I'll never forget a cartoon that I saw in the paper I believe at that particular time, (the cartoonist was a chap by the name of Arch Dale, who got nation-side if not international renown) of a cartoon of a farmhouse from somewhere down around the constituency of Morris, flowing down the Red River with a farmer and his family perched upon the rooftop of the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... farmhouse, and the then Premier of the Province of Manitoba asking the question, "What flood? What are you talking about? There is no flood in Manitoba." My criticism of the present government is because of the fact that today, in the year 1966, we are faced with a possible threat of another similar circumstance, a repetition of the events of 1950 and '51, but the floodway is not completed. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture a moment or two ago said that we hope that the floodway, or expect that the floodway will be completed in the year 1968, or two years hence. The Honourable Member for Burrows is worried whether the charges are appropriate to the Department of Highways or some other department. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, in view of what we have been hearing over the last few days, however, the citizens of Greater Winnipeg and the citizens of Manitoba are not concerned with the carpings of the Member for Burrows, the sniping of the Leader of the official Opposition in respect of the floodway. They are concerned, however, as to the consequences of what is likely to happen here in the Greater Winnipeg area. I think that the Honourable Member for Morris is more concerned with what is likely to happen in his constituency as the result of the floodway not being built, or some provision of relief. I hear some carping from behind me from the Honourable Member for Emerson, and this is quite typical, but I recall, Mr. Chairman, that the then Honourable Member for Emerson - and I'm going back to 1950 and 1951, because I was then interested in the problem, not being a member of this Legislature but as an ordinary citizen, one interested in public affairs in Manitoba; but the then Member for Emerson was interested and concerned about what was to be done to alleviate the possible suffering of the people from Emerson. I don't think he was the carping type of an individual. He was realistically concerned

MR. TANCHAK: May I put the honourable member straight. I was not a member in 1951. My coming to this House

MR. PAULLEY: I didn't say you were.... I said the former member.

MR. TANCHAK: in 1957.

MR. PAULLEY: correct, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, I think I could say -- No. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, I shouldn't say it. No, maybe not -- that in 1950 and 1951, that the then member for the constituency of Emerson may have been more concerned with the problems of the constituency in respect of flooding than the present one. This I do not know. I leave it to the present member for Emerson to put me right or to prove me wrong.

MR. TANCHAK: Definitely.

MR. PAULLEY: He says to me, Mr. Chairman, that he is prepared to prove me wrong, and now he has added the word "definitely." I challenge him to do this. Why do I say this? Because I am sure that the member at that particular time was not concerned with the verification of costs but as to what would be done for the people in that particular constituency.

But apart from all of this, Mr. Chairman, we in my group have been critical of the present government in many of its programs, in many of its policies respecting the floodway and the ultimate costs. I listened with some interest, as indeed one must listen with some interest, to the comments of the Honourable Member for Burrows -- and I say "some" advisedly -- when he is concerned with the allocation of the cost of the floodway in relation to the building of the Perimeter Highway. I ask my honourable friend from Burrows, who was it that first proposed to the Assembly in Manitoba the building of a Perimeter Highway around the Province of Manitoba? The answer to that of course is obvious. The building of the Perimeter Highway around Winnipeg was envisioned - and I give them credit for it, as indeed on some occasions I am even forced to give credit to the former government of Manitoba for some of their activities - I give them credit. (Interjection) Yes, I'm being big-hearted. The Honourable Member for Selkirk is quite correct, Mr. Chairman, when he is saying that I give them credit for something; and I want to say to my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk, he should be well-satisfied that I, the member for Radisson, can give the Liberal Party of Manitoba credit for anything; and when I do this, Mr. Chairman, I'm going beyond all of reason in the light of what their contribution has been since they were the Government of Manitoba.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

But, Mr. Chairman, when the Honourable the Member for Burrows turns around and he says, now, because of the building of a floodway you have to make provision for the building of a four-lane instead of a two-lane highway over the floodway, he's forgetting, in my opinion, a very important factor. The former government, the Liberal Government, laid the basis for the Perimeter Highway, I'm not arguing as to whether this was proper or improper, but since that time, however, we have been faced with the question of flooding and as to what we are going to do with the flooding in Manitoba; and one follows on top of the other, that we have to provide for the extra facilities for one to accommodate the other.

Now I've had the opportunity in this House for some considerable period of time to hear criticisms. I have been accused on a number of occasions of standing up in this House and buttering up the Government of today as opposed to the Government of yesterday. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Yes, you'd better be talking to your friend instead of to me. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am feeling huffy, because, Mr. Chairman - and why am I feeling huffy? I say to my honourable friend the member for Selkirk that I am feeling huffy because here we are on the 8th of March in the year 1966, dealing with total estimates for the ensuing year approximating three hundred millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, and in the last week, or over a week, we've had nothing but destructive criticism from the official Opposition in this province. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I accept what the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has just said, that I wasn't listening, and I trust and hope, Mr. Chairman, that neither were the public or the voters of the Province of Manitoba, because if they were, if they were, they would be so ashamed of the process of democracy here in Manitoba that they might invite outsiders to come into our province and operate it for the benefit of the people. Also; also, Mr. Chairman, some members behind me - these are the carping, sniping members that I mentioned a moment or so ago - have suggested that I haven't been here. Another concession, Mr. Chairman. I haven't been here, not because of choice as to the desirability of being here, but because of some circumstance beyond my control, and this I think is very vital, very vital, because while I may have been prevented from being here because of circumstances of physical condition, during my absence the carping, sniping criticisms have been going on without any advantage or benefit to the people of the Province of Manitoba; and I say this as one of the reasons -- pardonnez-moi? Oh, the Honourable Member for Burrows said this is my opinion. Mr. Chairman, he's so right that this is my opinion. But I want to say to the Honourable Member for Burrows that fortunately now in the Province of Manitoba, despite the opposition of the party that he is a member of, we now have a provincial Hansard which records all the utterances of members of this House, and one of the -- oh, I was almost going to say more humorous. It's not humorous. One of the more diabolical tirades that I had listened to or read the other day was that given by the Honourable Member for Burrows when he was dealing with the question of industrialization of the Interlake area. Thank the Lord, thank the Lord, Mr. Chairman, that the government, over the objections of the official Opposition, did institute in the Province of Manitoba a provincial Hansard so that we weaklings, we sick and poor members of the Legislature at least would be able to catch up with the utterances of the likes of the Honourable Member for Burrows, who did such a, in my opinion, a disservice to the people of his constituency, to the people of the province. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Burrows said that the people of his constituency will make a decision at the next election. Mr. Chairman, I'm making a prediction that at the next convening of the Legislature of Manitoba, as the result of a provincial election, if the people of Burrows constituency have the opportunity of reading the contribution made the other day by the Honourable the Member for Burrows, he will not be with us in the next election. Mr. Chairman, I'll give him odds, and he's not the favourite insofar as the odds are concerned.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it a case that my honourable friend is betting or a smaller quantity than a case?

MR. EVANS: On that hopeful note, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee has considered certain resolutions and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, 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 would like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister for Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.