

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 17th, 1963

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motions
Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the first section on my right where there are 20 4-H Club members from Garson, under the direction of Mrs. Kotchon. Garson is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. We are pleased that you have chosen to visit with us this afternoon. We hope that you have enjoyed your tour of the building and that what you see and hear this afternoon in this Manitoba's Legislative Assembly will be helpful and inspiring to you. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I have a short announcement that I would like to make on behalf of the Liquor Control Commission. There was some interest evidenced in this subject, I believe by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface recently, and I am happy to announce that the Liquor Control Commission have advised that they will be re-establishing the prices of imported liquor at the levels based on the pre-surcharge rate effective May 20, 1963, at which time the present stocks will have been exhausted on which the higher surcharge has been paid. For the particular benefit of those who may be interested in the prices, I can tell the honourable members of the House, Madam Speaker, that in these following categories the price changes will be as follows: Scotch whiskey, which is presently selling for \$5.90 will sell for \$5.60; imported gins selling presently for \$5.00 will sell at \$4.80; imported rums in the price range of \$5.25 at the present time will sell for \$5.00; French wines in the price range of \$2.35 will sell for \$2.20; and French champagnes in the price range of \$6.30 will sell for \$5.65. I thought the honourable members of the House should be the first to have this information, Madam Speaker.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Chairman, I want to ask two questions. How will it affect the budget? To what extent will it affect the budget? My second question is: Why cater to the rich? We don't drink champagne.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, may I ask a question to the Minister on his statement. Is this a return to the prices as they were prior to the surcharge in all cases?

MR. LYON: No, it's not a return to the price prior to the surcharge, because of course at that time an adjustment was made to take into account the devaluation of the Canadian dollar to 92 1/2 cents, but it does represent a reduction in price to account in full for the amount of the surcharge which will not be paid in the future.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, if I may -- if the Canadian dollar is returned to its par value of 100 cents, will the price be reduced again?

MR. LYON: I can appreciate my honourable friend's vital personal concern of this, Madam Speaker, but I'm afraid I couldn't answer his question.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, during the presentation of my estimates in the House, I was requested to make available to the members of the committee a paper presented by Manitoba to the Federal-Provincial Agriculture Conference on November 20, 1962 regarding the proposition of reinsurance. I am now prepared to ask the page boys to distribute this paper.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Minister for the statement which, I believe, was at my request.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to make an announcement in connection with the Private Bills Committee. Each member of that committee has received a notice, and it has been printed in the Votes and Proceedings of a meeting next

(Mr. Groves, cont'd) Monday, the 22nd. I would like to announce that this committee will now meet on Tuesday, the 23rd, rather than Monday the 22nd, but in order to avoid any conflict with the sittings of the Committee on Public Utilities, we will not make a firm decision on this until Friday. If it appears on Friday that there will be no conflict with the Public Utilities Committee, the Private Bills Committee will meet next Tuesday morning, and I would ask the Clerk of the House if he would notify the solicitor concerned with these bills on Friday when the final decision has been made.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 89. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, by leave, I would request this item to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate when this bill was proposed for second reading for two or three reasons, one being that I have taken for a good many years a particular interest in Watershed Control and Conservation, and I wanted to do a little bit of checking on the progress that had been made. The second reason was because I wanted to make some representations at this time that the Minister could easily reply to when he closes the debate, or prepare to reply to when the bill is considered in committee, because I suppose it is a feeling of all members of the House that this bill should go to committee. Certainly I am of that view because I think we should be doing everything that we can to expedite the work of these water conservation districts.

Another reason that I was anxious to say a few words on this matter was because of the fact that following a lot of consideration by the former government, we had proposed a bill to this Legislative Assembly and it had been passed in the session of 1958. Certain action was taken under that bill by the incoming administration, but a year later the present government decided that they would amend that bill -- not amend the bill, but they would actually introduce a changed bill. The Minister at that time stated that they had kept the best features of the former act and had put in some new and, in their opinion, improved features. Well we had some discussion at that time, and if my memory serves me correctly, it was the Honourable the First Minister who characterized the former bill as a "dog's breakfast". Well I had had a good bit to do with that former bill and I had personal interest in it. It had evolved from discussions that had taken place over a considerable period of time.

I checked up on some of the background information and found that in December of 1957, a very impressive committee had convened in order to discuss this matter. In addition to four representatives of the government, we had Dr. Murray Fisher; Dr. J. R. Bell; Sir J. A. Griffiths; Mr. Jack Parker; Mr. Poyser of the Soils and Crops Branch; from the Whitemud watershed area, Mr. Rogers, who was the president at that time -- the late Mr. Rogers; Mr. Harry Morton of Gladstone, president of their legislative committee; Mr. Young, the Reeve of Rosedale Rural Municipality; Mr. Ridley, the Reeve of North Cypress Rural Municipality; Mr. Single, the Reeve of Glenella Municipality; and from the Tobacco Creek watershed area, Mr. Mustard, the president; Reeve Kennedy of Thompson Municipality; Reeve Wakely of Roland Municipality; Mr. Cameron, the Secretary-Treasurer of Roland rural municipality; Mr. Murray, the Secretary-Treasurer of Thompson rural municipality.

I reviewed the discussion at that time and I looked over the bill to a considerable extent, and I came to the conclusion that this bill had followed very closely the representations that had been made by the municipal people, the watershed area people, and such experts in the field of municipal administration and finance as Mr. R. M. Fisher; such experts in the field of agriculture as Dr. J. R. Bell; and experts in the engineering and water field as Mr. Jack Griffiths; Soils and Crops, Mr. Parker and Mr. Poyser. So I have paid particular attention to the subsequent bill and the progress under it that has taken place since that time, and I must say that the 1959 legislation, a successor bill to ours, has set what seems to me to be a high-water mark in one regard at least, and that is the number of times and the quantity of amendments that have been made to it. It was passed in 1959; it was amended in 1960. I might mention in that connection that the amendment in 1960 replaced a wording that had been changed in the former bill, the former act that we had passed, and put it back to exactly the same as we

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) had it. In 1961, there were three pages of amendments; in 1962, if my information is correct, there were no amendments; but in '63 we are confronted with approximately five pages of amending sections. Now it's true that a great many of those refer only to the establishment of these sub-districts that the Honourable the Minister spoke of, but if it has set a record for amendments in so short a time, I think that the progress under it has left a great deal to be desired.

The Minister told us at the time that the 1959 Act was being passed that one watershed conservation area had already been set up. He informed the Member for Gladstone that he, the Member for Gladstone, was in a very fortunate position because of this watershed conservation district having been set up and then -- I should say even earlier than that. Largely the same people who had interviewed our administration on more than one occasion had been in touch with the then Minister of Agriculture, and I have before me a copy of a letter that the President of the Riding Mountain-Whitemud River Watershed Committee, Mr. J. F. Rogers, wrote to the Minister of Agriculture and I have the reply of the Minister where the Minister was very encouraging in his reply. The letter was written from Mr. Rogers on August 7th, 1958. That was pretty soon after the present administration had taken over the affairs of the province here, and Mr. Willis' reply was on September 11th, 1958. I do not intend to read it but I would be glad to make it available to anyone who wanted to see it, or I could table a copy if it were desired. But I would say it's a very encouraging letter, written to the president of this watershed area, who had been doing a great deal of work on this project of their own and on which Mr. Willis compliments them.

Mr. Rogers had sent in at that time resolutions from 13 municipalities that were included in the proposed watershed area, all of those resolutions asking that a program be set up. Then I have the -- Mr. Willis, by the way, acknowledges receipt of those resolutions. Then I have the minutes of the annual meeting of that watershed committee held at Gladstone on December 19th and a list of the visitors there, one of them being Mr. Willis himself. Mr. Willis had apparently taken the letter with him because the letter is read into the records of the minutes of the meeting and the letter is dated the same day as the meeting, namely December 19th, 1958, and I want to read that letter into the record here because I think that was rather quick action to deal with this watershed conservation district in that comparatively short time.

The letter is to Mr. Joseph F. Rogers, Chairman, Riding Mountain-Whitemud River Watershed Committee, Plumus, Manitoba - "Dear Mr. Rogers" -- I should make it plain to the Committee that I do not have this letter in front of me. I am reading from the minutes of the annual meeting of that Watershed Committee and they incorporated the letter in their minutes, saying that Mr. Rogers then received and read the following letter from Mr. E. F. Willis, Minister of Agriculture - "Dear Mr. Rogers: In accordance with my undertaking in the Legislature and also my subsequent conversation with Reeve McRae of Gladstone, I am pleased to advise you that in accordance with the terms of The Watershed and Soil Conservation Authorities Act, we will be pleased to have the Riding Mountain-Whitemud River Watershed Committee established as a watershed and soil conservation district and you will therefore become an authority, having the duty of promoting conservation of the soil and water resources within your district, and the other necessary steps as described in the Act will now be taken by this Department. I anticipate that during the coming year important steps will be taken by our government which will be helpful to your committee in carrying on its important and beneficial work. I thought it fitting that your committee should be formally accepted as an authority on the occasion of your annual meeting and have come to Gladstone today for that purpose. Yours faithfully, Errick F. Willis, Minister of Agriculture and Immigration." I was certainly inclined at that time, because I was at that meeting later on in the day myself, to give the Minister and the government credit for having acted so promptly in that regard.

On looking over the 1958 Act, and of course that was the Act under which Mr. Willis had to operate at that time because the new legislation had not been passed, I doubt very much that he could, according to the Act, establish that particular committee as the authority, but there is a saving clause in that Act that says that once the necessary Order-in-Council has been passed that practically all things done precedent to that time are validated, so to speak, and perhaps there's no technical difficulty in that regard.

Now I want to take just a minute, Madam Speaker, to mention that the steps that are

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) necessary in establishing one of these districts, that were necessary under the Act that Mr. Willis was working under at that time and to a very great extent it applies under the new Act as well, are something along this line, and I don't give these as being exhaustive but they're generally the procedure as I understand it. Incidentally, I would like to point out to the Minister, in case he would like to comment on this when he speaks or when we get to the Committee stage, that the 1958 Act had been I think at some pains to make it plain that this Act was watershed and soil conservation, tying the two in together -- watershed and soil conservation. I have searched the '59 Act very carefully and it seems to me to deal, if not exclusively, certainly mainly with water conservation rather than soil conservation. I know how intimately the two are connected and perhaps the intention is there, but I recall that when the 1959 Act was being passed through the House here, that in the discussion I took occasion to point out that the word "control" of water did not even exist in the aims and objects of the districts that were being set up. I said at that time, as I remember it, that I realized that conservation was very important but control was important too, and that I thought in the operative section of the Act that control as well as conservation should be specifically mentioned and that change was made in the Act as it was going through the House. But even so, it deals with water control and conservation without specifically mentioning soil control and soil conservation as the other Act had. But with that exception, the procedure is rather similar under the two Acts.

Now the first thing is that a municipality which is wholly or partly in the proposed watershed -- and I am dealing with the 1958 Act which called it watershed and soil conservation district and it's the same as I understand it in the present Act dealing with water conservation -- must pass a resolution setting forth a plan. Now a municipality which is wholly or partly in the proposed area must pass a resolution setting forth a plan. Now certainly that had been done with what we'll now call the Whitemud area, because that I believe is the name that it has subsequently acquired. Certainly those 13 resolutions had been sent in to the Minister and the committee, not wholly municipal men by any means but still an active and energetic committee, had been working definitely on this project for some time.

Then the Minister -- this applies under both Acts -- a resolution having been received from one municipality, any municipality proposing a plan, the Minister must then submit that plan to the Commission. The Commission is set up a little differently under the 1959 Act to what it was under our Act, but I think the difference is not too significant. The Minister must submit the plan to the Commission for approval or disapproval and I assume that this must have been done at that time because the Minister's letter of December 19th said that the authority was established. Then if the Commission approves the plan, the Minister must submit it for approval or disapproval by the Council of each municipality. I understand that this watershed, although the resolutions came in from 13 municipal councils, this watershed now I believe takes in all or part of 17 municipalities. My guess is -- I have no way of knowing and I'd like the Minister to tell me if he's in a position to do so, either now or at the Committee stage, if that was done; if this was submitted to each and every one of the municipal councils before Mr. Willis' letter saying that the authority had been set up.

Then in both the former Act and the present one an obligation is placed upon the Municipal Council that they must consider the plan and must, by by-law approve or disapprove of it within 60 days and immediately notify the Minister of their decision. So there isn't to be too much waste time in that regard. Then when the necessary by-law has been passed by the council of every one of these municipalities, the Minister may submit the question of the establishment of the district to the Cabinet and the Cabinet may establish the district. This is where the amendment came in, where in the 1959, the reversion was made to the 1958 language. In 1958 we had put in this wording: "The Minister may submit the question of establishment to the Cabinet Council and the Cabinet Council may establish the district." But with the enthusiasm of a new government, I suppose, in the 1959 Act this had been put in as: "The Minister shall submit the question of establishment to the Council and the Council shall establish the district and the authority having jurisdiction regarding it." Now according to the Act as I have studied it up to this point, it would appear that all of those above steps should have been taken prior to the December 19th, 1958 letter that the Minister conveyed to the meeting at Gladstone. I'd be interested to know whether they had. But I must admit that even if they

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) hadn't, there is a saving clause in both the '58 and the '59 Act that makes the passage of the Order-in-Council itself rectify any omissions of that kind. When the Cabinet has established the district, the Minister must give written notice to the council of all the municipalities wholly or partly in the district.

Now, Madam Speaker, this is a procedure that I think is rather difficult and has probably proved to be difficult in the event of the large areas that properly should be made into these watershed conservation district, but at least in this area it seems that negotiations moved pretty quickly up to that time. But since that time, and that's December 1958, since that time there has been little if any progress that I can find to report.

Now I think that one difference that we can find in the two Acts is with regard to the financing of the costs of the operation, and perhaps it's on the question of financing and the method of raising the money that these plans have come a cropper. I understood the Minister to say when moving second reading of this bill that there are now two watershed areas established, and I'd be interested to know what progress has been made in either of them up to this time. But when we come to the present bill, the Minister has mentioned that he thinks the centralization that is necessary under the present Act has probably delayed the acceptance of this program by some of the councils concerned, and so the proposal now is to make allowance for sub-districts. Formerly in the 1959 Act, provision was made for wards, and now that is changed to sub-districts I believe.

I can see, because I agree with the Minister, that the whole watershed area is a proper basis on which to found the establishment of this program; but I can also see, and it's most evident in the lack of progress that's been made in this connection, that it's a major undertaking to get the agreement that is necessary from all of the municipalities. I am inclined to think that with the substitution of these sub-districts instead of wards that there'll perhaps be no great change in that regard. The number of people that will be required, supposing there are an average of only five, let us say, per municipality, the number of people that will be required to sit on those various committees would, I think, result in almost inevitable differences of opinion as to what programs should be carried on. It's true that the district board will have the opportunity to approve or disapprove of the programs that are presented to them. However, I agree that it's proper that we should try again, with some more amendments, to make this program work, because it apparently has not been working up to date. Since December 19th, when that first district was set up, so far as I know -- some of this area is in my constituency -- so far as I know, no work whatever has been done under the authority of the watershed district itself. If that is wrong, I'd be glad to be corrected in that connection.

Now, Madam Speaker, I know that it is not usual to discuss individual clauses of the bill on second reading. On the other hand, it is correct procedure I believe to deal with the matter of principle, and I think there's a second principle here. In addition to the question of making provision for the sub-districts and their committees, there's a second principle that is contained in Section 9 of the amending bill. I suggest to the Minister that Section 9(2)(a)(b), which reads as follows, "promote and encourage proper land use and good conservation practices within a sub-district", that that clause should be looked at as being out of context with the parent Act. These of course are the responsibilities of the sub-districts that are being enumerated, and the first one is to study the conservation requirements of a sub-district and make recommendations to the board in respect of projects to satisfy the requirements. The second one is the one that I read, "promote and encourage proper land use and good conservation practices within a sub-district".

Now I am of the opinion that that is a very desirable responsibility to lay upon the sub-district committee, but I'm equally of the opinion that the Act itself does not make provision for that being done, because as I interpret the Act itself, and this has been one of my complaints regarding it, it does not deal directly with soil conservation. I'm reading now from the 1959 Watershed Conservation District -- you'll notice that even the name is Watershed Conservation District -- and the long title, "An Act to Provide for the Establishment of Watershed Conservation Districts to Conserve the Water Resources of the Province." Reading from Section 14 of the present Act where we have the aims and objects of the board, we find this: "The aims and objects of the board of a district are to promote the conservation and control of the water resources within the district" -- the water resources within the district -- "and for that purpose

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) it shall, subject to subsection (3)" etcetera. It's true that in (b) of subsection (1) that it mentions the land, forest, wildlife and recreation resources within the district, but that's predicated on "as may be necessary or incidental to the achievement of those aims and objects." I mentioned the aims and objects.

Now my reason for mentioning this at this time, Madam Speaker, is simply to apprise the Minister of my own point of view in this connection and to suggest to him that he perhaps should consider having an amendment prepared for the committee stage where the aims and objects would be, as outlined in Section 14 of the parent Act, would be widened to accommodate the clause that I have mentioned in the present amending bill, because I still think, Madam Speaker, that this is a very important piece of legislation. It's not easy to get a lot of municipalities to act in concert in the way that either control or conservation of water or soil conservation programs should be carried on, and for that reason the municipal people, when they met with us and I'm sure when they have met with my honourable friend and his predecessor, have made it plain that they were willing to lose some of their municipal authority in order to lay out a program that could be effective in these regards. That eminent municipal man, Dr. Murray Fisher, who I think all of you would agree is not only an authority on municipal Acts and law, but is a great defender of the rights of the municipal people themselves and of individuals where possible, he too agreed that this legislation should be broad enough that the municipal councils would be overridden in their authority where matters of water conservation and control were concerned.

So I say it is tremendously important legislation. We need to get the very best Act that we can and we need, I think, to give consideration as to methods of making it workable. That is my charge against the present government, that having started off in high gear with regard to getting at least this pilot watershed area set up, I think moving very quickly on it, well the gears have simply gone out of the machine, and if the ones that we are able to place back in the machine will make it work better, then I'm all for it. But I seriously suggest these considerations to the Minister so that we may follow them up either here or in the committee.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, the Minister indicated earlier in the session, probably two or three weeks ago when we were dealing with the Estimates of Agriculture, that it was his intention to bring forward a bill to amend The Watershed Conservation Districts Act. I suppose that this is the bill. When he made that statement he indicated, anyway to me, that it would provide measures that would alleviate or tend to alleviate many of the inherent problems that are present in the Act today. Now I don't think he did elaborate on that on the introduction of the bill. I wonder if he would do that when he closes the debate.

Then I have another question here. The number of sub-districts that are envisaged, say in the Riding Mountain-Whitemud River Watershed, I suppose are equal to the number of wards that are present there today. I'm not certain of that. Then I would like to know the total number of members of the entire authority, that is the total number of members of each sub-committee and the total number of sub-committees in a committee, and what would be the total body in numbers.

Another question. It may not be pertinent to this bill, but I wonder in any of the bills that we have on this subject matter, is the grant formula spelled out? Now, Madam Speaker, at a meeting at Gladstone, and it may have been the same one that the Honourable Member for Lakeside mentioned, I do know that the Honourable Minister did present at that meeting a grant formula. I would like to know, has it changed in any way, shape or form, or should it not be included in the legislation somewhere? In talking to one of the men at Neepawa who is vitally concerned about this matter, he seemed to think that one of the problems of the watershed was that it needed some unscrambling. I don't know whether he has read this bill, but he indicated to me that it might tend to scramble it worse than it was originally. I think he was suggesting that the more men that become involved in it, that is with sub-committees and so on, the more problems that you might have.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I wouldn't refer to the original bill, or the 1958 bill, as a dog's breakfast. I would suggest that the people who drafted this legislation were like a man who built a motor car and neglected to provide any fuel for it to go anywhere. There just

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) was no means for getting the Act any farther than accepted by the municipalities, because the acceptance of the municipality, in the original Act, did not impose any obligation upon them to support projects recommended by the central board. The initiative was left entirely to the local municipalities as to whether they would contribute anything. Section 13 of the 1950 Act says, "And for the purpose of making an annual contribution to the authority of a district, an included municipality may, by by-law, annually levy and collect as a special rate a watershed and soil conservation district tax on the assessed value of the lands or other rateable property, or both," and it goes on. So that you could have a watershed endorsed by your member municipalities, or area municipalities, and that would be as far as it ever got.

Now we've got a different kind of a vehicle. We've got one that's hard to start, but we think that if we ever do get the darn thing running we know we've got the fuel there to keep her running. Maybe it won't always go so fast but there is provision there for them getting some fuel each year to keep this thing moving along. I'm not going to deny at all that we have failed miserably up to this point in selling this concept, not so much the concept but selling the financial responsibility that goes with this concept, and we are trying to frame this legislation and to amend it in an effort to make it more acceptable to the municipalities.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside said that there was nothing in the new Act about conservation, it was water control, and he compared this with the different concept in the original Act. Well I don't think that there is any --

MR. CAMPBELL: Soil conservation.

MR. HUTTON: Yes, even soil conservation, because in the description or definition of terms, it says in the new Act that "a water control works means works for the conservation, control, disposal, protection, distribution, drainage, storage or use of water; or for the protection of land or other property from damage by water; or for all or some of these purposes, and includes any other work necessary or convenient for the use, operation or maintenance of a work to which sub-clause (i) or (ii) applies." There is nothing in this that inhibits or restricts the board of a watershed conservation district from carrying out a comprehensive program on water conservation and associated soil conservation projects. In some cases they will carry out the water conservation projects to protect the land; in other cases they will have to carry out land conservation projects to protect the water conservation project. I don't think that you can distinguish between these projects in that sense.

Now on the question of increasing the numbers of representatives. When I was in Montreal at the Resources for Tomorrow Conference, I listened to a writer -- I believe his last name was Gray, as I recall -- who addressed us -- pardon me, not the Resources for Tomorrow Conference but the Resources Ministers' Council Meeting -- who gave us an address on the need for public relations in the development of our natural resources, and he emphasized the great necessity of spreading the gospel of conservation and the multiple use of our natural resources. It seems to me that in this amendment that we are taking a step towards spreading the gospel by including more people in the planning of the use of these resources, and far from inhibiting action on these projects, I hope that it will tend to create a better understanding amidst a much larger group of the general public of what the aims and goals are of the boards that are working in the district, and that they will be able to recruit public support for their projects. That is why we say that there shall be two members appointed to these sub-committees from each municipality and only one may be a member of the municipal council, because we would like to see wildlife people on here; we would like to see recreation people. These people may not be available if the appointments come entirely from municipal bodies. There may be some very well-qualified people in the field of wildlife conservation and recreation and all the other interests that are associated with the development of our water and soil resources, or the utilization of our water and soil resources. We want to get them involved and we want them to feel that they have a stake, and to give them an opportunity to help give direction to the development of these resources as they take place.

Now there will be two members from each area municipality within a sub-watershed district. Now if you had only one municipality, I guess you'd have two people; if you had three municipalities, you'd have six. There will be one representative -- the chairman of that sub-committee or sub-district committee will be the representative on the central board, so there is not going to be any undue proliferation of representatives on the committee. I do believe

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) that it will help us in gaining the public support that we're going to need, even after we get them established, because they will have to sell the people on the advantages and the benefits of these various projects that they will want to carry out and which will cost money. I'm not going to make any claims about the success of these amendments. We did consult the Whitemud watershed committee and we discussed in principle the amendments we intended to make to see what they thought about it, and they felt that it would be an advantage and supported the principle involved. I can just hope, along with other members in the Legislature, that we can get this darn thing started, because I think we can keep it going if we ever get it started.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I think two of the main objections that I have heard from people belonging to a certain trade regarding this particular bill are: "Why don't you deal with the banks?" 2. "Why don't you do something about the mortgages?"

Well, I think the answers to these two questions is quite simple. We have no jurisdiction over banks and as far as the mortgages are concerned, I think that problem has been very well handled in the present Interest Act where the mortgage companies, or any mortgage where the payment of principal and interest is blended, has got to disclose in the body of the mortgage the amount of the principal, the rate of interest and the basis of computation, which must not be in advance.

I don't know how many members of this House have read one of these conditional sales contracts which is in fairly general use by most people who sell articles on time in Manitoba, but if there are any among the members of this House who have not read it, I would suggest that they do so, and if there are any doubts in their mind after reading it for the necessity of this bill, I'm quite satisfied that these doubts will be removed. I'm also satisfied that after reading that document, I think they will come to the conclusion that in Manitoba a statute of fraud is much more needed than a Bill of Rights.

Before dealing with certain suggestions that I have to make regarding some provision that should be in this bill, I think it is only right to take as an example a contract, say where the principal amount owing under it is \$2,000, where the rate of interest is payable in advance at six percent, and the finance charges are based on say \$7.00 per hundred per year. Now that contract is payable over 24 months. Now according to my computations, the interest on that contract computed in advance would amount to \$240; the finance charges on that contract computed for a period of two years at \$7.00 per hundred per year would amount of \$280.00. You would have a contract where the charges amounted to \$520 on a principal amount of \$2,000.00. Now there's no provision in that contract, at least the present contract or any contracts I have seen, giving to the borrower the privilege of prepayment, and the borrower cannot insist upon a rebate of charges unless there is a prepayment clause in that contract.

Now I suggest that we should, in this Act, put a provision therein giving to a borrower the right to prepay the contract and the right to a rebate on the unearned finance and interest charges. Under The Small Loans Act, which is a Federal Act dealing with money lenders, and I think the limit under that Act is \$1,500, there is that provision in the Act giving to a borrower the right to prepay and setting out a formula for determining the amount of earned charges to the date of prepayment. I also feel too that in our Act we should have provisions against forfeiture and acceleration.

Now what I have in mind is this, take for instance the contract that I have just mentioned which is payable over a period of 24 months. Supposing that borrower has had that money for a period of three months and he falls in default. Action is commenced against that borrower; the acceleration clause in the contract is invoked; and if that borrower is sued, he is sued for the full balance which is owing, but included in that balance are unearned finance and interest charges. Now I suggest that we should have a provision in our Act whereby if an action of that nature is taken, that all that the plaintive can claim would be interest charges up to the date of the action plus finance charges up to the same time.

There's another provision too which I think should be inserted in that Act and that is

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd) . . . this. Take the case where a borrower is in default, say he's in default a month or two months in respect of his payments, and he is served with a notice of sale by the finance company or whoever is holding the paper and they invoke the acceleration clause there too -- they claim the full balance which is owing. Now I think that borrower should be given the privilege of paying up his arrears and thus putting the contract back into good standing. Under our Real Property Act in Manitoba where a foreclosure is started on a mortgage, it's true that when you register your notice of exercising power of sale you do invoke the acceleration clause and claim the full amount which would be payable under the mortgage by virtue of that invocation of that clause, but nevertheless there is a provision in our Real Property Act whereby as long as the mortgage owner pays up these arrears and costs, his mortgage can be placed in good standing. I therefore feel that in respect of this legislation we should have a similar provision.

Now it's true that I felt quite strongly about including the rate of interest and the method of computation of interest in our legislation, but I find too that that can be very, very misleading. I find that a contract, say at six percent per annum and a contract at ten percent per annum, depending upon the method of the computation of interest, the contract which provides for the six percent might result in a higher yield than the contract at ten percent. Although I do feel this way, Madam, that if we are going to put into this legislation a prepayment clause, we'll have to know something about how these finance charges are arrived at and the rate of interest before we could adopt a formula for rebates.

I intend to vote for this bill on second reading. I believe in the principle of the bill; I believe that it is good legislation and I believe it is time that Manitoba had legislation of this nature; but I do reserve the right in Committee to bring forward any amendments that I feel would help to clear up these situations that I have just mentioned.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I have since cleared any objection I was going to raise in private conversation with the Honourable Minister, therefore, I would apologize for holding it over this extra day. If anyone else wishes to speak I stand down.

Madam Speaker: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I am just going to ask a question of the Honourable Minister. I'd like to know if the Minister discussed some of these with the municipalities affected. I have in mind especially No. 5, the amendment which will have the effect of having all municipal elections on the same date. I wonder if this has been discussed with the municipality of the City of St. Boniface?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Minister closes the debate on this, as he indicated, it's rather difficult to discuss any principle in this bill when there are so many clauses and sections, and I certainly am not going to oppose its going to second reading because I may object to one particular item here or there. We can do that once we reach the Committee stage. I do wonder, however, Madam Speaker, about Section 11 for example, where now under this Act the province says to every town, city, suburban municipality and every village having a population of 500 or more that they shall appoint a chief constable and so on. It seems to me that this is the type of legislation that is not needed. Surely the councils of these areas can determine on their own whether they require constables or whether they don't, and for the province to step in and tell them that you must do this, seems to me rather odd legislation. Possibly the Minister has an explanation for it, but I certainly don't see that the province should make this a mandatory clause. I believe that the municipalities can make that decision on their own. If the government is going to make this mandatory, then I suggest the government is responsible for the next step, and that is the payment for these constables that they insist be appointed by municipal councils. Now I noticed nothing in the bill which will provide for any additional revenue to the municipalities in order to permit them to do this.

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)

Under Section 18, I note that we are repealing the authority of the Municipal Board to assess damages in municipal flooding questions, and I would wonder there, Madam Speaker, if the government is proposing to establish any other authority to do this or whether there simply will not be a possibility of assessment by a party outside of the municipality itself. As I said, I'm not going to cover all of the items of the bill. I just want to point out that while I'm voting for the bill in general principle to get it to the Committee stage, I reserve the right on some of these sections to possibly propose amendments, or at least have a clear discussion and explanation by the Minister.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, in connection with the police constable for the villages, I suggested at one stage I believe during this session that it might be a good idea to look into the possibility of having the RCMP detachments, where they are stationed in villages, to look after the policing of these villages. Now I'm quite sure that some financial arrangement could be entered into satisfactory to both the government here and the villages that are concerned with this matter.

I'm in agreement with my Honourable Leader in that it's an imposition on the villages to enforce the idea of having a chief constable in the village. In the first place, none of them are in a position to pay the kind of a salary that would attract what I would suggest to be the right type of personnel. You are asking the villages to give a very responsible position to a person, immaterial as to whether that person is eligible for that job or not. Now we know that we are having difficulties in getting the proper types of persons to take the training with our Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and if we are having difficulty with the type of salaries we are paying, it gives us a fairly good idea of what can be expected when we insist that the villages do find suitable people to fill this particular position. I think that the matter of having these agreements with the villages as to RCMP personnel doing the policing is a far better approach than the one that's suggested here.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, one question, though it is also on a section, but an impressionable one. Under Section 2, does it apply for that particular purpose only, or giving the municipalities a change in all matters of the administration of allowing the electors to decide and not the ratepayers. In other words, does it apply to any other matter except the ones mentioned in Section 2?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. ROBERT SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, I'll try to deal with some of the points raised by the honourable members in the order in which they came up. The Honourable Member for Selkirk dealt with Section 16 and this is the section, or the part of this bill which deals with the allowing of the municipalities to make a special levy for the purposes of centennial. He suggested that they should be allowed to make levies for the purposes of capital costs of any centennial celebration or some work erected in their municipality for the purpose of that celebration. We are taking a look at this question and I would be quite happy if he would raise it again in committee.

The Leader of the NDP raised a very interesting question concerning the fact that if mayors and reeves would no longer be justices of the peace, would they still have the right to administer oaths within this province. We've had a look at this matter and I would suggest to the Honourable Leader of the NDP that this question has not been raised through any fear on the part of the legal profession of unemployment, but rather as a matter of the practical feeling with the administration of justice in this province. His fears that this power to administer oaths might be taken away from mayors and reeves may be laid to rest if he will read Section 58, subsection (1) of The Manitoba Evidence Act. In that section it is provided that any affidavit, affirmation or statutory declaration for use in the province may be sworn, affirmed or declared within the province before any of the following persons; the mayor, reeve or clerk of any municipality; the resident administrator of any local government district; or the secretary-treasurer of any school district, school area or school division established under The Public Schools Act.

The Honourable Member for Burrows indicated that he would like to see more adequate provision in this Act for the protection of dug-outs, and in particular he suggested that boats and life-preservers should be provided -- this sort of thing. The principle involved in this

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd) amendment would allow the municipalities to make whatever regulations they deem necessary within their own boundaries, and if they feel that they need boats and life preservers, this would be entirely up to the municipal council.

The Honourable Member for Portage need make no apology for having adjourned this debate. I hope that the honourable member is satisfied that his business will be looked after in due course.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface raises the question as to whether or not the individual municipalities have been contacted. I would advise him that I have not personally contacted the City of St. Boniface, but that prior to my taking this office contact was made with the City of St. Boniface and they have objected to this provision. However, I feel that it is absolutely essential that we do have a uniform date for nominations and elections, particularly within the metropolitan area, and that the City of St. Boniface have sort of taken the attitude that they would like to maintain this for reasons of their own which are not clear to us. They have advanced no adequate reason why they should be different and hold their nominations and elections on a different date than Metro, or than all the other municipalities in the Province of Manitoba. I must confess that this amendment is aimed particularly at the City of St. Boniface because they are the only municipal corporation in the Province of Manitoba which has a different date for nominations and elections.

The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party refers to the appointing of magistrates, or rather chief constables, by towns and villages with a population over 500. This was also referred to by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. I would suggest to the honourable members that the reason for this is that during the term of office of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains as the Attorney-General, an agreement was signed with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to act as the provincial police force in Manitoba, and under that agreement they refused to accept responsibility for any town or village having a population in excess of 500. This question has been raised on many occasions since that time, and indeed I have made representations to the government myself on a previous occasion on behalf of a village in my own constituency which had a particular policing problem, and I took the same stand as the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. However, we have approached the RCMP in this connection and they have refused to vary the agreement.

It is still possible for towns and villages to make an agreement with the RCMP to do the policing in that town or village and they can appoint an officer of the RCMP stationed in that town or village as their chief constable if they wish, from time to time, provided they can make the agreement; but the cost in general of these agreements has been raised by the RCMP to the point where most towns and villages find that they can no longer afford this type of police protection. This is something over which the Province of Manitoba has no control, as the honourable member will appreciate. At the present time the Act is permissive, and it says that a village or a municipal corporation may, having a population over 500, may appoint a chief constable. In some cases the municipal corporations have taken the attitude that as this is permissive they don't feel that they should and it should be looked after under the provincial policing arrangements. This amendment is intended to make it perfectly clear that this is their own responsibility.

The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party suggests that if it is made mandatory the province should pay the cost of the chief constables. I don't think that he is serious in this suggestion, because it is mandatory for municipal corporations to have certain other officers and no suggestion has ever been made that the province should pay them.

The Honourable Member for Inkster raises the question as to whether or not the elections of councillors in municipal corporations should be by the ratepayers rather than by the electors.

MR. GRAY: applies in all matters, take for spending money, or building a bridge, or drilling a hole, or something, or does this apply only in this particular case? In other words, I mean for the electors not for the ratepayers, and I think it's a very progressive section.

MR. SMELLIE: I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, I misunderstood the honourable member. This section deals only with the meetings of the electors in a municipal corporation for their annual report from council and for the nominations of persons for office in that municipality.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, if I might be allowed before taking a vote, I wonder if I could suggest to the Honourable Minister that somebody in his department would notify the City of St. Boniface, when there's time to make representation, in view of the fact that they have signified their intention.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 21. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. WITNEY presented Bill No. 21, an Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, we have at the present time on the statutes of the province The Game and Fisheries Act, and as I mentioned in the Committee the other day when we brought in first reading of The Wildlife Act, that we will be separating wildlife into its own separate Act. The Bill that you have before you now, No. 21, repeals Part I of The Game and Fisheries Act which dealt with game alone, and we will be left then with a Fisheries Act which is Part II of the present Game and Fisheries Act as it stands at the present time. The Bill here, No. 21, removes from The Game and Fisheries Act all the references to game and to the hunting of game, so that we will be left with Part II, fish and fisheries of the old Act, in a new Act now to be called The Fisheries Act.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, I haven't anything against the Act as a whole but this Bill does a little more than what the Minister has said. It has brought in some new provisions into it that don't appear in the present Act. I am particularly interested in Section 7, 99 (a) 5, which reads as follows: "A person who fishes and does not have on his person a licence to fish issued under this part is guilty of an offence." I can't agree with that particular provision. I think we're going too far. It's all right to have a provision in the Act where a person who does not hold a fishing licence is guilty of an offence, but this covers a person who holds a fishing licence but doesn't happen to have it on his person. I'm sure there must be some other way of approaching this problem than to make that person guilty of an offence without even giving him an opportunity to produce a licence.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, when I first looked at this Bill I thought it was the one that the Minister introduced the other day, but I take it then from his comments that he is coming in with a further Bill later on in the Session. I would suggest in that case, Madam Speaker, that if we pass this for second reading today that it be held in Committee for discussion at the same time as the other Bill, because I would imagine that there will be representations made to the Bill, possibly by the Game and Fish Federation or other interested parties in the province, and if the two were considered together I think it would be advantageous. I agree with the comments of the Member for Ethelbert Plains. There seems to be somewhat more here than just the striking out of any material pertaining to game. There are, it appears to me, some additions and we will expect of course, in Committee, the explanation of the Minister as to the reasons for these additions.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 44. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON presented Bill no. 44, an Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: This Act makes two provisions. One is, as the explanatory note in the Act says, the amendments provide for the killing of dogs found annoying or injuring turkeys. Prior to these amendments the Act provided for the killing of dogs annoying, injuring or giving tongue to sheep. There have been quite a number of instances brought to the attention of the department where dogs have created havoc in turkey flocks and it is felt that the provisions presently in the Act regarding the control of dogs in sheep flocks should be extended to cover these turkey producers.

The second principle involved in the Act covers the procedure whereby grants which are made to the owner of calves being vaccinated for Brucellosis can be paid over to the veterinarian on the proof of the assignment of the farmer of this grant to the veterinarian. It was the opinion

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)...of Legislative Counsel that we should clarify this procedure when we were making this amendment to The Animal Husbandry Act.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, I agree with the Minister that those are two of the provisions of this particular Bill but I think he has overlooked one very important provision. Under the present Act the fees for certain licences, etc., under the Act are prescribed in the Act. This particular Bill does away with those provisions and gives the right to set these fees by way of regulations, and from what we have seen in this House and the actions of this government in the past few years, we know that these fees are sure to jump considerably. I wonder whether the Honourable Minister can give us any indication what he intends to do with these fees. Does he intend to leave them at the present rates as outlined in the statute, or what is he going to do with them?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I was going to raise the same point as the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains has raised in connection with the question of fees. I requested earlier in the Session an Order for Return stating fees that have been changed over a period of years, without success, on the grounds that this information was readily available to me, or equally available to me as it was to the government. I protested because it, in my opinion, wasn't. The reason of my protest at that time was because of the fact that the change of fees are by regulation and it's quite conceivable that the regulations can be changed half a dozen times during a year, upwards or downwards, but as the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains has pointed out, they're always upwards. I think Madam Speaker, that it's time that, rather than the trend as suggested by the Honourable Minister in this Bill of removing from our statutes a definite fee, that it's about time the trend reversed back to including them in the statutes so that we as members of the legislature and others know quite readily and quite handily, without having to refer back over page after page of the Manitoba Gazette and the regulations to find out what the costs of services that are being provided here in the Province of Manitoba are.

It might be argued that if it is left in the statutes as it is at the present time we would have to have amendments to the Acts in order to do so. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that that is a far better way of changing the costs of services to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba than the present method of regulations. I think the whole basic concept of what I am trying to say, that the government through Order-in-Council or the Ministers -- respective Ministers -- by regulation are changing too much, in effect, the charges and fees and statutes -- not the statutes, but charges and fees and other considerations in respect of the Acts that we have on the statutes of Manitoba, too much.--(Interjection) -- Services in general, yes. I would respectfully suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he show an example to the rest of his colleagues over there by withdrawing these sections from his Bill so that the livestock industry and those concerned with animal husbandry in the Province of Manitoba know what they have to pay without having to find it out thumbing through the pages of the Manitoba Gazette.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I saw the Minister looking at me when he was talking about turkeys, so that prompted me to get up -- (Interjection) -- No, the Minister, not the turkeys. I'm not the turkey either. I had nothing to do personally with the request to have this Bill incorporated but I know that the Turkey Association did, and as far as the Bill is concerned itself I think it's a good Bill. I wonder if the Humane Society had anything to say about it.

Now as far as the damage done to turkeys, I don't think that any of the turkey men begrudge any stray dog or neighbour's dog one turkey if you have a few thousand, but the trouble is that when the dog enters into the flock of turkeys he may take one and kill one but the rest of the turkeys are stampeded and they pile up, and in thousands of turkeys it would only take about five or ten minutes before you lose say 1,000 or 1,500 turkeys. They stampede and hide their heads under their like an ostrich. They believe if they can't see the enemy the enemy doesn't see them, therefore they suffocate. So I think it is a very good law. As far as the good progressive turkey-raisers in my area, around Ridgeville, they're not bothered too much with dogs because, as I said, they're progressive and they have them properly fenced. And there's another thing. I think that we'll make it law now because most of these turkey-raisers practised the law of self-preservation in the past and I don't think they spared any dogs who happened to come among the turkeys. Now it's going to be legal.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HUTTON: In reply to the question raised with respect to the provision for establishing the fees by regulation, some of the fees are established by regulation at the present time and others are not. This makes it uniform. There will be a revision upwards in the fees due to the fact that they have not been revised for many many years, and if it were feasible ten or fifteen years ago to charge \$1.00 for a fee in recognition of the cost of administration at the government level, surely it is reasonable today to follow the same principle and to charge something that is relative to the costs of today in administration.

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

Continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 51. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 51, an Act to control and regulate the distribution and use of Pesticides, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: I think I did all the explaining the other day in committee. I could only reiterate what I said at that time.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I guess I was just getting a little bit too impatient. I don't think or believe that the Minister of Agriculture really explained the bill and its implication and I think this might be partly due to the fact that the Department of Agriculture is maybe not fully aware of what is taking place in this particular field. I was particularly interested in finding out if this covered all chemicals and apparently it does. Now in the growing of potatoes, when you are trying to hasten the ripening of potatoes you normally remove the tops of these potatoes by what is known as roto beating the tops or you may leave the tops of the potatoes in their present stand or the original stand and you will spray them with one of the arsenic salts -- this is the present method -- and you will use either arsenics such as the arsenates or the arsenides. Now this is not a pesticide and this is not an insecticide. This is a chemical that's used to hasten the ripening of potatoes, and yet it is equally as objectionable; it is equally as dangerous and it is equally as serious as the use of pesticides, because the same chemical is used in the field of pesticides. Now, my particular question is, that last year there was a company from Winnipeg developed the use of spraying sulfuric acid in order to dehydrate the potato foliage and in this way you remove from it the entire possibility of arsenic, arsenate or arsenide in contaminating those potatoes that are exposed in a potato field. Not only that but the use of acid in killing the potato tops develops a firm protective coat on the potato from three to four days earlier, can be harvested earlier, with a smaller percentage of bruised potatoes; and above all, if the soil is of an alkaline nature the acid has a tendency to neutralize this and of course the following year you will produce a potato that is a more desirable potato in that it will have less scabs on its coat.

Now, last year, the same firm from Winnipeg pioneered in this application and they sprayed something in excess of 10,000 acres south of the border. This year they are going to spray something in excess of 35,000 acres and they will be spraying in Manitoba something between three to four thousand acres in the Carberry, Portage and Altona area. This chemical is used specifically to hasten the ripening of crops, and this can be used in the onion crops as well as other small crops. I would therefore request that consideration be given by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that the sulfuric acid chemical that is used for the ripening be specifically excluded under the terms of this Act, and I would therefore assume that because in the bill it says specifically as a pesticide for the killing of insects, fungus, bacterial organisms, virus weeds, rodents or other plant or animal pests, and this is going to create a great deal of misunderstanding because, quite frankly, I feel that in a matter of about another year there will be very wide application in the use of sulfuric acid to hasten the ripening of most of our small crops, and in particular potatoes. I think there should be a clarification in this direction because as the bill stands now it is very confusing and it will lead to misunderstanding.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, I must admit that I haven't had too much time to look into this bill in the manner that I'd like to, but we've been pretty busy in the last couple of days, and the bills have been coming in thick and fast. It almost appears as if the opposition here didn't have any responsibilities to fulfill, that once the bill is placed it's supposed to be passed without us being given an opportunity to study it properly. In this particular bill I note that there's no definition of farmer or field crop. Now that definition may be found in some other statute that will apply to this particular Act, but unless we have a definition we can run into a lot of trouble.

Now for example, say somebody has half a lot of strawberries that he sells to his neighbours, and say that he is a farmer by occupation, would this Act apply to that particular plot of strawberries? What is a field crop? Would that include little small patches of the different kind of berries that are held by gardeners and sold to people that come in and pick them up from the roadway, and so forth?

(Mr. Hryhorczuk cont'd)

Then again, I notice here that anybody that comes in and buys any of the pesticides referred to here from an unlicensed dealer is subject to a fine of not less than \$100.00. Now I think that is justly unfair and I don't think that too much thought has been given to this particular penalty. For some time to come the farmers who have dealt with storekeepers and so forth, and obtain their supplies from them, won't think of asking for a licence, and any one of these could go in there and buy a pint or a quart of pesticide and he's subject to a fine of not less than \$100.00. I would think that we should look into both section 6 which makes it an offense and section 7 as to the fine of not less than \$100.00. I don't think there should be a minimum set there, should leave that to the discretion of the justice of the peace, or the magistrate or whatever court official is going to hear that particular charge, because you can see where for a two-bit purchase of some pesticide a person is liable to a fine of not less than \$100 in court. He'd be guilty whether he bought a pint or he bought ten gallons or 100 gallons.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the comments that have been made so far on this bill are very very pertinent to the whole thing. We are not going to object to the second reading of the bill and letting it go to the committee stage, but it seems to us that in the drafting there will have to be some substantial changes otherwise we may end up by making innocent people guilty and also by making the whole handling of pesticides virtually impossible. There are many areas in the province where very small retailers who are busily engaged in many other activities apart from this and who would not be too familiar with the Act and who could find themselves in trouble. I'll admit that insofar as the wholesaling end it's not too difficult there because you're dealing with a lesser number of firms, but I think that before we give final approval to this bill that the Minister should make a very careful enquiry into its effects once into operation and that possibly we should give this more time before it's taken up at the committee stage so that we are absolutely certain that we're not going to end up in a position during the course of next summer where either people who want to buy pesticides can't buy them or people who do buy them get themselves into difficulty.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, there is just one comment I would make. I await with keen interest the definition of a farmer would be broad enough to include market gardeners because I'm wondering what effect the -- whether or not the legislation would have its fullest effect if it excluded controls over pesticides in respect of market gardens and the likes of that. As I say I await the definition of a farmer to see whether this other branch of agriculture which uses pesticides is also under control.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I too haven't had too much time to look at the various bills that have been passed for second reading today, but this one seems very stiff to me, some of the sections I looked at especially section 2, part 2 under section 5. I think a second look should be taken at these provisions in this bill and I would certainly reserve my right to amend the bill in committee.

MR. HUTTON: This is a tough bill; this is a tough business. Human life is precious. The health of human beings is precious; the well being of our agricultural economy and the sense of confidence on the part of the consumers in the products that they're buying is an important business. If we're going to talk about softening up here, in case we hurt somebody, we might as well throw the bill out. A hundred dollars sounds like a tough fine. How much is human life worth? How much is a man's or a woman's or a child's health worth? How much is the confidence of the consuming public in the farm industry in this province worth? It's worth a lot more than \$100.00. --(Interjection) -- Well, yes, but, I suggest that if you're going to reduce the penalty very much you're going to make it economically advantageous for people to flout this law, because they'll find the penalty is cheaper than the costs of abiding by it. I think that you have to give credit to those who administer these laws to exercise some discretion, some reason in the exercise or the administration; but I suggest also, Madam Speaker, to this Assembly, that this is a serious business and we've got to make clear to the people in Manitoba that we mean business, that we are concerned for the health of our people and for the welfare of this province.

The control extends over anyone who produces food for human consumption, whether it be off a half-acre of strawberries or whether it's off a thousand acres of grazing land, or a thousand acres of wheat. The controls applies to everybody who is engaged in producing food

(Mr. Hutton cont'd) for human consumption. I know that there are going to be people who are going to be put out because they've got to get a license, because we're going to require them to avail themselves of training classes that have been carried on in the past and will continue to be carried on, so that they can qualify as distributors of these products. But we can't have the "blind leading the blind", having people distribute this chemical to farmers who haven't had the experience or have had no way except maybe reading the fine print on a can, of knowing just what they are dealing with, or handling, and the consequences of its misuse, and we do hope that we will be able to attain a trade or distribution by people who have had a minimum of instruction that they can pass on to the ultimate dispenser or user of this product. It requires that the distributors must deal through a licensed trade. In this way, in a sense it makes the trade somewhat self-disciplining, and this is essential I think, unless we're going to set up a whole police staff in the province to see that everybody is licensed. I'm not going to minimize on some of the problems that are going to be encountered in implementing this legislation. I don't think the department is too anxious to extend its field of regulations, but sometimes you have to. In this case, we have to, in the interests first of all of the health of our people, and secondly to protect our good name and the confidence of our consumers in our agricultural products. I think that that definition of pesticide is quite broad enough to include all products, chemicals used in the production of -- in agricultural production -- I'll check on it to make sure, because we don't want any loopholes. It may be that there should be an amendment there. This Act does not preclude anyone from using any type of chemical, but it is aimed at ensuring that they are properly used and used in such a way that the well-being of the consumers is safeguarded. I don't think I have more to add at this time.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: May I ask the Honourable Minister a question? Would in his opinion the definition of pesticide as it reads in this bill include flea powder and fly-tox?

MR. HUTTON: No.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 68. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS presented Bill No. 68, an Act to repeal the Acts of Incorporation of Certain Corporations, for second reading.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. EVANS. Well did the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition want some explanation? This bill -- sounds like our late friend from Rhineland -- this Bill No. 68 proposes the repeal of nine Acts that are at present on the statutes. These nine Acts refer to the incorporation of two corporations which have surrendered their charter and surrendered their registration. Therefore they are no longer corporations, but in order to remove their names from the list of statutes it's necessary to pass this Act.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the reason I asked for an explanation is there is a series there that I'm not particularly interested in -- the last two -- the Publicity Bureau of Winnipeg and Manitoba. Were these in any way connected with the government, or were these totally independent bodies?

MR. EVANS: If there are no further questions I'll close the debate. The Tourist and Convention Bureau of Winnipeg and Manitoba was originally incorporated under the name "The Publicity Bureau of Winnipeg and Manitoba" by Chapter 99 of the Statutes of Manitoba 1928, to promote tourist traffic and conventions. This corporation has not filed annual returns since 1940, but existence was maintained in case the government desired to make use of the charter. The government was advised that it is no longer necessary to maintain the charter as the Provincial Government Travel and Publicity Branch and The Manitoba Travel and Convention Association perform the bulk of the functions envisaged for this corporation. It is not officially connected with the government, and -- from memory, I believe that the original travel and convention charter was established partly by -- of course, my honourable friend from Lakeside will remember more about this than I do -- but there was some connection officially, I believe, when Colonel F. was the head of this Travel and Convention Bureau before the government took it over and opened its own branch. I'm sorry I can't answer from memory, but the honourable member shakes his head, and so I say there is no official connection -- there was no official connection with this corporation.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 91. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. WITNEY presented Bill No. 91, an Act to amend The Crown Lands Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, the Act before you, No. 91, provides that we may sell Crown lands, or school lands in the same manner that we sell Crown lands in the province. It also provides that the School Land Fund will be credited to the School Land Fund Account in the "Capital Division" of the Consolidated Fund, that is, the moneys that are obtained from the sale of these school lands; and it further provides that whereas we now collect a sum of money on hay and grazing permits, which we pay back to the municipal or local government or school district, that we may do the same with leases.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, we've had a brief discussion of this before, and I look forward to the committee stage to get further details on the bill. On the general principle of the sale of school lands I am in complete agreement. In the method of sale by tender, I think possibly we should be considering other methods, such as open auctions on more frequent basis, and I think we've had discussions on that subject with the Minister previously; possibly at committee stage we can get some more details.

I'm very interested in some of the sections here, and in particular Section 1 -- Section 2, which will make the payment of taxes applicable to grazing leases as well, and I would appreciate if when we reach the committee stage if the Minister would have for us the number of grazing leases that are in effect and that will be affected by this clause. I'm under the impression that there are actually very few. However, this may be of some importance, and the Minister could give us that information.

I'm intrigued, Madam Speaker, by Section 13, the commencement of the Act. This is certainly the most complicated commencement of any Act that I have so far seen in this legislature, and I wonder if the Minister could provide us with some explanation as to why there's such an involved procedure in this case.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, the question with respect to grazing licenses -- that information can be on hand at the time that we come to committee. With respect to the complication of the commencement of the Act, in Section 2 where we are dealing with the hay and grazing leases, these are generally renewed around about the first of October of the year and come into effect at the beginning of the new year. So, this section here would then come into force about January 1, 1964. With the other section, particularly the Sections 5, 6, 7, 8 and Section 9, since Section 9 is tied up with the payment of grants to the affiliated colleges, we wish to have it started the beginning of the year, and of course it was not known at the time that this Act was written, whether or not the Act would be passed prior to April or following April the 1st of this year.

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

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolsely): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works, 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: (... started to put the question)

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, before you put the question to go into the Committee of Supply

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker has to put the question first and then my honourable friend may

MR. TANCHAK: I thought she did. She hasn't done it?

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, before you put the question to go into Supply, on behalf of the people I represent I would like to lay before the House a serious grievance. The grievance is that -- and I propose to read this, I usually don't read my speeches, but I propose to read this word by word, because I want to be accurate, and then when I'm through I'll distribute it to the leaders of the parties. The grievance is that of a minority group residing in Emerson constituency in the Province of Manitoba who feel that their democratic right in a free country is being denied them by the persistent stand the Government of Manitoba is

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) adamantly taking, that is, withholding a portion of teacher grants to which this minority group is democratically entitled. Part of Emerson constituency contains the proposed boundary division the people of which have twice voted not to accept. The principle of the division plan was accepted by all; the rejection of the plan was simply a protest vote against the unrealistic boundary proposed. So we have a situation where the residents are willing to accept the plan but not the unrealistic boundary. It is the alleged aim and boast of this government that Manitoba provides an equal educational opportunity for all children in Manitoba, yet the government insists on penalizing this minority group by not providing the children in this area an equal opportunity, in fact, the government is discriminating against a minority group by imposing upon it a financial burden with which this group finds it most difficult to cope. The government is actually depriving the children in this proposed division with an equal opportunity for a better education; thus the government is penalizing those who never did have or do have any say in this matter. The government is further penalizing this group by making it most difficult for them to perpetuate the services of reliable teachers who feel that they are increasing the financial burden of the area by demanding a fair remuneration for their services. I'm sure that if a greater number of divisions had rejected the division plan the Honourable Minister would not have been so adamant. The Minister himself set a precedent by qualifying his own constituency for all division grants though they likewise rejected the division plans. The government should cease its discriminatory policy. The Minister should re-examine his stand with a view to removing the iniquities which aggravate the grievances of the electors of Emerson constituency.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3. Passed.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I understood from the Honourable Minister when he spoke of this magnificent looking plan which is in this chamber dealing with the north perimeter highway, that it was planned that all this work was to be completed within the next three years, and I assume from what I heard that it is planned that the bridge will be completed, the cloverleaf intersections, the graded highway. Before I go further with what I have to say, I wonder if the Minister could nod or shake his head so I'll know. He is nodding his head, so that I understood him correctly.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that this government showed considerable foresight in the plan which it's developed in relation to a perimeter highway. --(Interjection) -- Yes, I don't give credit to this particular government alone, I give credit to the foresightedness of the preceding government, preceding this year, let them accept the credit as they please. The foresight in planning a perimeter highway is that of seeing to it that as an urban area grows it will be properly serviced with this type of highway to take care of the problems of traffic which may arise in the future, and as one visualizes the perimeter highway one can see that 20 or 30 years from now this highway will become a most integral part of the traffic system in and around this metropolitan area. But I cannot justify in my own mind the urgency with which the government has proceeded with this perimeter highway. I would have been satisfied had the necessary work been done to secure the rights-of-way, to see to it that the land was reserved for construction at a time when the traffic would justify it; but I do not believe that the traffic today justifies the expenditure of the money today and in the next few years which is planned in this work. I wonder, and I'll make a categorical statement so that it can be challenged, I would suggest that not sufficient origin destination studies have been made, nor traffic counts taken to indicate a justification for the extensive work which is now planned for the immediate future. I believe that the bridge is justified, I believe it's necessary; I believe it is justified mainly because we don't have sufficient bridges south of that bridge and therefore since the government has announced that there would be a bridge there many of us feel that it is necessary that it be proceeded with; but I cannot justify in my mind the cost of the elaborate overpass which is planned with the cloverleaf highway on the west side of the bridge. I can't justify in my own mind, much of the elaborate work which is planned on the east side of the bridge, although I realize that there has to be because of the proximity of the highway to the river there must be an overpass planned, but I would think that use of a few traffic light intersections or

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) traffic lights at the intersections would take care of the needs that will arise for some time to come. I wonder at the haste of the government in planning to carry out this work in the light of the thought that I have that the money to be spent could be used much more beneficially for the people who travel in this general area if it were done closer into the center of the metropolitan area.

In mentioning the metropolitan area, I might say that I feel that the government has been unfair and has not properly assessed and contributed to the needs of the metropolitan area as exemplified by the requests which have been made by the metropolitan corporation for assistance in its road improvement, in its traffic improvement and in its bridge requirement plans. I must admit that it has occurred to me that the government may have thought in terms of the Metropolitan Corporation Act that a by-product of a benefit to the government might be to take these small suburban municipalities off the neck of the government and put it onto the metropolitan council. I believe that where the government was under pressure in the past, for assistance in road construction by the suburban municipalities, it said well we'll put you all into one big area called the metropolitan area and now you can start bothering the metropolitan council for this work, and I think that the government used this means to get out of certain of its prior commitments and used this means in order to pass onto the people of Greater Winnipeg an additional tax burden on their real property tax. It seems to me that in looking at the Red River from the Disraeli bridge north, one finds -- well looking south one finds the Louise bridge, which is a two-lane structure which has outlived its usefulness and which is a dangerous structure I believe. One looks north of the Disraeli bridge and one finds a bridge called the Redwood bridge -- which doesn't deserve the name of bridge at all -- it is a two-lane unsatisfactory structure which has outlived its usefulness. And then one finds a stretch of water from the Redwood bridge right up to Lockport. And if the excuse of the government is that the north perimeter bridge will take care of the problem, then I think it is naive and I don't think that that position that the government might take would be justified by origin destination studies and by traffic counts.

Now, with the plans to build this elaborate north perimeter intersection plan we find a very slow recognition on the part of the government of its responsibility to the construction of bridges in the metropolitan area of Greater Winnipeg. We find that when the Metropolitan Corporation was created and given responsibility by this government and by this House it was given this job in a large measure because the municipalities comprising Metro were incapable of solving the problems which are inter-municipal in nature, and the Metropolitan Corporation stepped in and started doing some work on planning for handling the traffic load and came along with the plan that it would have to do a great deal of work in connection with bridges. And after the government of this province reviewed the work it said, "Yes, you need some bridges, we're planning on three bridges for you, we'll commit ourselves to that. We can recognize the St. James bridge as being one of priority, but do not come back to us and ask us for money for any other bridge until you have finished with the St. James Bridge." And when the Metro Corporation said, "Well you're the bosses and we can't come back to ask for more money for other bridges until we've completed this." The Metro Corporation said that an integral part of the St. James bridge was the intersection problem on Portage Avenue at the north end of the bridge. The government said, "Wait a while, we'll handle the bridge first; this other problem we will assess in the future." Well it wasn't long before the government realized that it couldn't sit back and create the bottleneck that would be created by this St. James bridge without taking care that it would be handled once it reaches Portage Avenue and goes north of Portage Avenue, and finally after some number of petitions to the government it recognized the need for this overpass, intersection problem. But apparently there's no problem envisioned in the government finding money and going ahead with this elaborate structure on the north end of the perimeter. I've great difficulty in reconciling the attitude of the government within the metropolitan area and its plans for the perimeter on the other side.

Now while I'm dealing with this, I might again make a categorical statement, which is to the effect that I believe that there is a letter in the chairman of the metropolitan council's possession from the First Minister to the effect that, I think this is dated in the early days of Metro, that the province's assistance to the road work, to the street work in the metropolitan area on the metropolitan streets would not be less than had been done for the

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) municipalities that made up the area. Now the First Minister certainly knows better than I do what he said and I have no doubt that he will not hesitate to tell us what he did say. But I hope that what he said then in his letter will gibe with what has been done and what the history has shown in the next few years, excluding the problem of bridges which makes it confusing because the bridges have been helped so few and far between by any of the previous governments of this province that one can't really take them. It is my impression that there has been a decline in the contribution of the province for those streets which have been dealt with by the Metropolitan Corporation -- and I make that statement in that way advisedly so that it can be challenged and I could be corrected in my impression. In doing so I hope we will have figures given and an opportunity with them to debate the figures so as to make sure that there won't be any doubling up of figures due to the fact that work may not have been completed in one year and money set aside in two years in a row but not paid for the same work. I hope that we will be able to get figures to challenge my statement which will justify the government saying that it did not in any way go back on the letter which the Honourable the First Minister wrote to the Chairman and which I do not remember having seen, but if I saw it I don't remember its exact wording.

So that I would end -- after having made these statements and invited a reaction to them -- I would end by hoping that there would be some indication that the government's views on the needs of the metropolitan area are not limited to the periphery of the area by work on the perimeter road where I don't see any justification except for the bridge but not for the elaborate work that is planned on that table that is here, but the government would look much more closely into the needs of the metropolitan area itself and its traffic problems and take unto itself a fair share of that load.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Chairman, the other evening, when we were in this committee, the Honourable Leader of the ND Party made an impassioned appeal to the Minister for a piece of road in the constituency of the Honourable Member from Springfield and I'm sure that the Honourable Member from Springfield appreciated the support which the honourable member was giving him at that time, and since I've always believed in the saying that "one good turn deserves another," it's my intention at this time to make the same type of appeal to the Minister for a short piece of road in the constituency of the Honourable Leader of the NDP.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, before the honourable member goes further, just so that there's no mistaking -- the Honourable Member for Radisson was waiting for the next item, the proper item to raise this question, so I assure my honourable friend that it was in my mind to do so.

MR. GROVES: going to, later on in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, not try to embarrass the honourable member, but to say that I was merely wanting to support the efforts which he has made in the past and which he will no doubt do in this committee to get this bridge for the people in his constituency. But it does affect me partially. For some years now the City Council of St. Vital, since the end of the last war as a matter of fact, have been endeavouring to improve St. Mary's and St. Anne's Roads. They have done so largely with the help of this government, and its predecessor, firstly with the Trans-Canada Highway and with the financial assistance which they have received for the paving particularly of St. Mary's Road. This road is now paved out to the perimeter. There is, however, this short strip of highway between the perimeter road and the highway that leads out to southern Manitoba, Ste. Elizabeth, St. Adolphe, etcetera, and I do think that the government should this year take heed of the pleas of the City Council of St. Vital, and of the Honourable Member for Radisson, and try and do something about this piece of road. This piece of road has been described on various occasions as deplorable, almost classified as a dangerous highway, a bad road, practically impassible and a remark was once made by one of the members of the City Council, "I wonder that the residents don't do their shopping in Steinbach." Now early this year the Council of the City of St. Vital appealed to both the Honourable Member for Radisson and myself to make representations on their behalf to the Minister. We have, I understand, both done this and I would just like at this time to assure the Minister that I am 100 percent behind the Honourable Member for Radisson in anything that he does in order to try and facilitate this work.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a few words about a short road. This road is six miles long. It affords, I believe, more recreational riding for

(Mr. Wright cont'd) the people of Manitoba than any road that I know of. I refer to the six miles of river road that was taken over by the government some two or three years ago. I know that the government had a little difficulty in the acquisition of property with which to maintain this road in a safe condition; I know that they are still working on it. But I just want to say thanks. I think that we should -- or someone should express thanks to the government for seeing that this piece of road does afford a lot of pleasure for Manitobans because in a weekend -- I estimated last weekend, or last Sunday at least, 4,000 cars went over that piece of road, this six mile piece of road. I know that the Deputy Minister is aware of some of the things about it that are still not complete; for instance there's a hill six-tenths of a mile from Lockport which is a real hazard and he is well aware of that. The Deputy Minister is not only known as a good hard rock engineer but he has the esthetic qualities that make him able to appreciate the potential of this river drive. This summer, though, I do hope that calcium chloride will be sprayed on this road, or distributed on this road, because as I estimated Sunday, 4,000 cars went over that road -- you can well imagine the distress of the residents who have property on this six mile piece of road. I just wanted to rise briefly to say that I think a lot of people appreciate it; we hope that they will continue to put this road in the condition that I know the Deputy Minister wants it to be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, everyone who is presently sitting in this House that occupied a seat in 1958, I think it was, or '59, when the late Wally Miller got up and said something like this, "Millions for everybody and not a dime for Rhineland."

MR. ROBLIN: was "not a five cent piece for Rhineland."

MR. SHOEMAKER: A dime, I thought it was a dime. Well, Mr. Chairman, it applies to me; by looking over this program that we have before us I think I could safely say that there isn't one cent for Gladstone. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister a few questions. I would like to ask him, number one, what happened to the suggestions that I made to him on December 31st. I received a very prompt reply on January 3rd, as brief as his statement earlier the day before yesterday but he said he was pleased to have the information for his consideration. Apparently he did not consider them worthy of listing them on the program before us.

Now my main beef, Mr. Chairman, is this, that when the government proceeds to do work on a 100 percent road, that includes provincial trunk highways and others similar to the Carberry road -- it's now declared a 100 percent road; the Plumas road, a 100 percent road and there are others in the province -- and incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I would be interested to know how many miles of 100 percent roads there are -- that is roads that are paid for 100 percent by the province but not yet numbered -- when the government proceeds to build roads, or take over roads on a 100 percent basis, I think it is only good business to proceed to finish those roads as soon as it's humanly possible to do so. The letter that I referred to a little earlier in which I suggested three projects that should receive consideration, the Neepawa-Carberry road, the Gladstone to Austin road, PTH No. 34, and the Plumas-Waldersee road, all of these roads go over pretty light land in every case and when you start to build the grade you immediately stir up a lot of this very loose sandy light soil, and unless you get a top on it it deteriorates pretty rapidly with wind and weather and I think it's only good sense to put a permanent top on them very shortly after the grade has been built. My honourable friend indicated that I would likely note that there was no money for the Neepawa-Eden section of No. 5 highway. Here once again, Mr. Chairman, it strikes me every time I go up there that the maintenance cost on that ten mile piece of road must be immense. You can go up there pretty near any time during the summer months and you'll find a repair gang working on it, and if you consider what has been spent on maintenance since that road was built -- and I know that this government didn't build it, but two wrongs doesn't make a right, Mr. Chairman -- if you consider the maintenance money that has been spent on it it would seem to me that it would pay for a good hard surface on it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what the policy is at the present time for access roads. I have before me Hansard No. 29, dated July 20th, 1959 -- four years ago or nearly so. On page 1100 the then Minister of Public Works had this to say in regard to access roads: "We are now building into literally hundreds of towns and villages in Manitoba, access roads from

(Mr. Shoemaker cont'd) the highways, up to a total mileage of four miles, free of cost, so that they may have proper access to their towns and villages in general on the same basis as the highway which they left." Now four years ago the Minister then said that they had built into literally hundreds of towns and villages access roads at 100 percent cost to the government. I would like to know how many hundreds that they have built in the past four-year period because they had built hundreds four years ago. Now he says "up to four miles." The Budget Speech of 1962, speaking about access roads, talks about "four miles." I can't find the quote here at the moment, but it talks about four miles. Now what I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, is the number of miles of access roads that were built in 1962 and prior to that if it's possible, and is it four miles or is it five miles? We have here in one place four miles, that they are quite prepared to build an access road to any town or village within four miles, four years ago they said, and now it's five miles; and what constitutes a village, hamlet or town? I note in driving north on No. 5 -- and incidentally I drove up to Gilbert Plains last week -- I note that they have a very nice hard-top road into Norgate. Norgate, I believe now, has only one elevator, no store. I'm not certain whether there's a post office there -- I don't think there is -- and the elevator has now been shut down, I believe; but there we have an access road into Norgate, and there's nobody there, you might say. --(Interjection) -- No, it's in my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition. I understand that the R.M. of Rosedale made application for an access road into Eden and they were told, so I am informed, that the cost involved would not warrant the expenditure. I think the engineer quoted a figure of something like \$25,000 to build a road in there, and I understand they were turned down. So, Mr. Chairman, it's understandable that I would wonder why Norgate would qualify and Eden wouldn't, so I would appreciate very much if my honourable friend could bring us up-to-date on these access roads.

I would like to know, too, the amount of money -- probably the Minister gave us this -- the amount of money as of December 31st, 1962, the carry-over and unused authority. I have before me, and I guess every member has, an Order for Return dated March 6th -- it's number 10, and on the last sheet it lists the carry-over in cash and unused authority for '59, 60, 61 and 62 -- that is, January 31st, 1962, and as of January 31st, 1962 they show \$25,223,203.00. I understood my honourable friend to say there was now about \$4 million left in that. I would appreciate his reply to that.

I would like to know, too, Mr. Chairman, if the department has changed their formula as respects the paving grants -- probably that's the term they use -- to towns. Presently, I understand that every town, every incorporated town and every municipality receives a \$10,500 grant, and as I've said before, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the municipalities vary in size from four townships to 24, I believe, and in population from four or five hundred to ten thousand perhaps, and then the balanced assessment varies from two million to twenty million, that surely they could draft a new formula for grants of this nature -- for street and road grants. In the Town of Neepawa they, for a number of years, have run into this problem, that in order to qualify for paving grants I understand that the streets must lead directly from the highway to the business section of the town. Well sooner or later, and sooner in most of the towns, you have paved all of the streets that qualify under that formula. I wonder if it has been changed at all.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Mr. Chairman, I would like to join the Honourable Member for St. Vital and the Honourable Member for Radisson in asking for the rebuilding of St. Mary's to St. Adolphe. I am sure that with such a coalition the Minister could not refuse. You are aware, no doubt, that this road is used by mostly everyone situated alongside and as well as the Town of St. Adolphe. Most people there work in the City, and I would venture to say that this is one of the roughest roads for its amount of traffic.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of partly bridges and partly highways, and first of all I'd like to compliment the Honourable Minister on his action in starting to acquire rights-of-way from Headingley west, and I'd like to draw to his attention that some of the pressing needs there are for some quick action in getting this double-lane separated highway in, and I would like to quote to him a coroner's jury ruling and a recommendation. The jury recommended that the highway should be widened to four lanes from the present two, with a centre dividing strip. In other words, the last particular death on this highway, they feel, could have been avoided by separating the two-way traffic.

(Mr. Johnston cont'd)

Now, I'd like to ask a few questions about a bridge that -- last winter I'd heard rumours about a new bridge across the Assiniboine River west of Portage la Prairie, so one nice Sunday afternoon two other carloads -- or two other families -- and my own family decided to go out and hunt down this bridge and take a look at it, and we found it okay. I don't know if it has a name or not but it's at the former Hertz Ferry crossing, and it appears at first glance that it might be a part of a program for a new highway because when one first looks at the location of this bridge one is inclined to wonder just why it was put at this particular location. There's a single track road leading up to it and I don't know if it's a double track road leading away from it on the other side or not, but on the occasion that we took on this particular Sunday afternoon last February to go and look at this bridge, at that particular time of day in the early afternoon, No. 1 Highway was jammed with Sunday traffic. It was a nice day and when we got down to the bridge we stayed there for about two hours -- the kids were tobogganing and sliding down the bank; the approaches to this bridge do make a wonderful toboggan slide -- but we were struck by the lack of traffic. In the two hours that we were at this bridge, in the middle of the day, our traffic count, and that is not counting ourselves who went there particularly to see this bridge, our traffic count for that two to two and a half hours that we were there was two -- two vehicles. As a matter of fact, the other people in the other two cars who were with me would substantiate this -- that we held our picnic in the middle of the road. The traffic count was that sparse.

Now, in relation to this, I would like to ask the Minister, when they plan bridges and highways and so on -- in this particular case, I'm talking about a particular bridge -- is there a prior traffic count taken if a bridge is going to replace a ferry, and if so, at Hertz Ferry was this done? And also, what is the traffic count there? Also, in reference to the green sheet of proposed work, I thought, well, perhaps they're going to build a highway in that area and the bridge was put there first, but I don't notice it in this next year and I'm just wondering if in the future there is going to be another highway go through there. Now, in my doubting the judgment -- I might as well be quite plain about it -- of this government's decision to put a bridge there, I consulted a 1963 traffic map for Manitoba and I notice from Brandon, going east from Brandon to Austin, there appears to be no bridges whatsoever, but there are three ferries; and in the general area south from No. 1 Highway in that area there are some fairly large important towns. I notice Wawanesa has no bridge going north over the Assiniboine, but there is a ferry in the area. However, from their point of view, they probably would appreciate a bridge. It would give them access to the business that might come to them from Shilo. And going further east again, I notice another good-sized and lively town, Glenboro, and they too are served by a ferry, that is, if they wish to go north. Then Cypress River -- and then we come to Austin, where there is a highway and a bridge connecting north-south. But then I noticed with my scale of mileage here -- and I worked it out -- that in the 25 miles from Portage going west on No. 1 Highway, counting this new bridge, there are three bridges I believe -- four bridges, if you count the one right at Portage. There's one at the Hood bridge, and then this new bridge that I don't know the name of, that I'll call Hertz Ferry bridge, is just a few miles west of that -- is it 10, I believe -- 8 or 10 -- and then comes the Austin bridge -- is that 4? Yes, I believe so.

Now, I thought while I was looking this over I would look it up in the Public Accounts to see what bridges are worth these days, so I found in the Public Accounts the figure of \$141,000, but then, being a new member I'm not too conversant on how one looks up these items, so I was scuffling around through other books too and I looked through the Annual Report of the Department of Public Works on this bridge, and I found the approaches listed for \$22,000, which seems fairly cheap for 7/10ths of a mile of approaches, but then I came across kind of an interesting thing and I was wondering if the Minister could give me an answer-- perhaps it's just a misprint, and I may attach too much importance to it. On page 117, I see this bridge is listed here and I presume that this report 1961-62 is money that has been spent, has been paid out; is that correct? Anyway on page 117 under work order No. 2793, Rossendale Road, and they say here, "Assiniboine River Bridge R.M. of South Norfolk, construction of a reinforced concrete and steel beam bridge \$141,082.98," and then I turn the page over to 118, and I find almost the same thing. Now, as I say, it could be put in in error twice, but I don't know, sometimes a person gets a little suspicious and we wonder maybe if the money

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd)... was spent twice; and it says again Rossendale Road, work order 2793, but there is a very minute difference in the wording of it. It says here, "reinforced concrete bridge over Assiniboine River R. M. of South Norfolk, construction of a reinforced concrete and steel beam bridge \$141,082.98," so this got me to wondering a little bit about the accounting methods used -- whether the figures on the right-hand side in this book are authentic, so I took it upon myself to have all these figures added up, and I notice the total given in the book for this work -- it's under Bridge and Other Structures, and there's a total given for all the work done that year of \$2,308,406.40, so when I added this figure up -- at least I didn't add it; a young lady in one of the business offices of my honourable friend from Burrows added it up with an adding machine -- with an adding machine she made the total out to be \$2,869,271.10, a difference of \$560,864.70. Now probably there's quite a reasonable explanation for this but it struck me as being rather odd. As a matter of fact I almost conjure up a vision in my mind of the Honourable Minister in his office with a big stack of money in one corner, and he just shovels it from one pile to another to make the totals come out.

However, I'd be very interested in hearing the reasoning for this particular bridge being planned and placed the way it was. It would appear on first look that a member from that area, or perhaps a former member from that constituency, did a very persuasive job in talking this administration into putting a bridge there for the convenience of the people who live in that area, and I'm sure that they do appreciate it there, although they're not a very heavily populated area. As a matter of fact one of the people in the area told me about it, and I'm sure he must have been joking because he said there's only seven people using that bridge with any degree of regularity.

So I would close my few remarks but I would be interested in the mathematics of the department, and also the reasoning and the planning of their bridges.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, not being in the House Monday night, I was unaware of the Highways Branch project schedule for 1963-64 was being distributed. I didn't get to see it until this afternoon. However, on going through it, I notice that the highways in which I was particularly interested and the people of my constituency are very interested are left off the schedule. Now, I was in to see the Minister last fall about a week before the election was called and discussed with him both the highways 32 and 14A, and I thought I received some encouragement at that time. Then again we had a delegation in to see him, I think, about a month ago or so, in connection with highway 32 and if any highway wants improvement it's highway 32, because of the heavy traffic that is on that road all the year round. It's not just the summertime, it's all the year round; and the shape that it is in today, the highway is completely ruined. It's not just one hole after another; the hardtop that was on it, the oiling, it's broken up and you've got holes after holes and just a matter of gravel in some places now.

This highway is a stretch of some 14 miles which takes you from No. 14 highway at the point just on this side of Winkler, and takes you right to the U.S. boundary, where you now have a new customs office being built on the U.S. or on the American side, and we have one just across the border on the Canadian side, so that a lot of people travel on this road and enter the U.S. and also U.S. citizens enter Canada via this road, so that I feel that this is a very important road, and we need it very badly for trucking the various commodities. After all, we have some industries out there. We have a canning factory at Winkler and one at Morden, and some of the natural product is being transported on this highway, but today we find that people are avoiding highway 32 and taking the dirt road because of the poor condition that it is in, and I think this is a shame. After all, we have an industrial area in that part of the province. We have industrial people out there who try to make things go, who risk capital for their industries and then to see that the government will do nothing in the case of roads in trying to make their industries successful.

The province is holding down progress through lack of proper roads; and this has not been the case for this year, it's been this way now for several years, ever since I came into the House, and nothing is being done about it. I notice from the schedule that some work is supposed to take place on highway 3 and 14 from Morden east to Winkler. However, it stops just one or two miles short of Rhineland constituency. This other portion happens to be in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina and also the Member for Dufferin. However, when it comes to the constituency of Rhineland it's left off. It's hard to deduct from

(Mr. Froese, cont'd).... these things that roads are not a political thing in Manitoba. I would like to know from the Minister, even though it's left off the schedule, whether any work is being contemplated on 32 at all. Some information that I got recently, although not authentic was that the one mile just opposite the town of Winkler was going to receive some attention. I was at onein the constituency of Dufferin, so there might be something to it.

Then, on previous occasions I've also mentioned highway 14A which is a stretch of road of 13 miles from Roland south, south to the international boundary, linking the towns of Altona and Gretna, and then the U.S. Border. There again, this road is a little better than the 32, but it's narrow and it needs widening, and if any of you members have travelled on that road you will find that it's very bumpy from Rosenfeld to close to Altona, because of the way it was constructed several years ago, so that here, too, improvement is very badly needed and I am amazed that nothing is in the schedule on both these roads. Certainly, if we want to see any progress in those areas, in those communities in the way of furthering special crops and new industries, something will have to be done. We just cannot let things go as they are, and I would like to hear from the Minister whether something is contemplated even though it's not on the record.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Are you going to call it 5:30, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: I think if I'm right this is Wednesday, is it not, and the House would naturally adjourn I think rather thanI believe my honourable friend the Attorney-General has something he would like to mention, if by leave of the committee he might mention it now. I don't know just what the subject is.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, there was one item arising out of the estimates of the Department of Public Utilities. On looking at Hansard, the Telephone System have advised me that there may have been some misunderstanding as a result of the question asked me by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to northern television service. Page — it's in Hansard of April 15th. I gave my reply on Page 1229, and the question was asked a few pages previous to that. The understanding of the Telephone System was that the honourable member was referring to the Trans Canada telephone network service when he enquired as to their participation in the northern service, and the answer I gave was predicated on that understanding. However, on re-reading his question I think it's apparent that he was referring to that northern telephone service as an integral service in itself, and not related to the Trans-Canada system, and he asked — at page 1229 -- I've lost my page in looking for the answer -- Page 1229, he said, "Insofar as northern services, the Telephone System has nothing to do with it at all?" My answer was: "That seems to be the substance of the information that has come to my hands," and that was it. But I think, on reading it over again, the answer would be this, that the Telephone System does provide CBC, on a rental basis, facilities to accommodate television at The Pas and Flin Flon, by permitting the location of the building on MTS property at Flin Flon and the use of the MTS microwave tower to instal their television transmitting antenna. The MTS picks up off the air the Flin Flon transmitter television program at the attic repeater site and carries both the video and audio programming to the CBC's TV transmitter at The Pas. The CBC's transmitter building is located on the MTS microwave site at The Pas. They use the MTS tower for their transmitting antenna. All of the above is contracted for by the CBC with rental rates computed on an at-cost basis. I wanted merely to get that correction on record so there would be no misunderstanding. The misunderstanding was on the part of MTS and myself rather than my honourable friend.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The House will now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Thursday afternoon.