

Name	Electoral Division	Address
ALEXANDER, Keith	Roblin	Roblin, Man.
BAIZLEY, Obie	Osborne	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
BJORNSON, Oscar F.	Lac du Bonnet	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
CAMPBELL, D. L.	Lakeside	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARROLL, Hon. J.B.	The Pas	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron	Portage la Prairie	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man.
CORBETT, A. H.	Swan River	Swan River, Man.
COWAN, James, Q.C.	Winnipeg Centre	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
DESJARDINS, Laurent	St. Boniface	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
DOW, E. I.	Turtle Mountain	Boissevain, Man.
EVANS, Hon. Gurney	Fort Rouge	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORBES, Mrs. Thelma	Cypress	Rathwell, Man.
FROESE, J. M.	Rhineland	Winkler, Man.
GRAY, Morris A.	Inkster	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
GROVES, Fred	St. Vital	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
GUTTORMSON, Elman	St. George	Lundar, Man.
HAMILTON, William Homer	Dufferin	Sperling, Man.
HARRIS, Lemuel	Logan	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
HARRISON, Hon. Abram W.	Rock Lake	Holmfield, Man.
HAWRYLUK, J. M.	Burrows	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C.	Selkirk	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C.	Ethelbert Plains	Ethelbert, Man.
HUTTON, Hon. George	Rockwood-Iberville	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
INGEBRIGTSON, J. E.	Churchill	Churchill, Man.
JEANNOTTE, J. E.	Rupertsland	Meadow Portage, Man.
JOHNSON, Hon. George	Gimli	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
JOHNSON, Geo. Wm.	Assiniboia	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
KLYM, Fred T.	Springfield	Beausejour, Man.
LISSAMAN, R. O.	Brandon	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C.	Fort Garry	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MARTIN, W. G.	St. Matthews	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
McKELLAR, M. E.	Souris-Lansdowne	Nesbitt, Man.
McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C.	Dauphin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MOLGAT, Gildas	Ste. Rose	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne	Pembina	Manitou, Man.
ORLIKOW, David	St. John's	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
PAULLEY, Russell	Radisson	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
PETERS, S.	Elmwood	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
PREFONTAINE, Edmond	Carillon	St. Pierre, Man.
REID, A. J.	Kildonan	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
ROBERTS, Stan	La Verendrye	Niverville, Man.
ROBLIN, Hon. Duff	Wolseley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SCARTH, W.B., Q.C.	River Heights	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
SCHREYER, E. R.	Brokenhead	Beausejour, Man.
SEABORN, Richard	Wellington	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
SHEWMAN, Harry P.	Morris	Morris, Man.
SHOEMAKER, Nelson	Gladstone	Neepawa, Man.
SMELLIE, Robert Gordon	Birtle-Russell	Russell, Man.
STANES, D. M.	St. James	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
STRICKLAND, B. P.	Hamiota	Hamiota, Man.
TANCHAK, John P.	Emerson	Ridgeville, Man.
THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C.	Virden	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WAGNER, Peter	Fisher	Fisher Branch, Man.
WATT, J. D.	Arthur	Reston, Man.
WEIR, Walter	Minnedosa	Minnedosa, Man.
WITNEY, Hon. Charles H.	Flin Flon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WRIGHT, Arthur E.	Seven Oaks	4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Monday, April 3rd, 1961.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're at 5 (e)....

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we passed 5 (c) or (d), because there were questions being raised in connection with the various conciliation boards and the Labour Relations Board. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I notice that my friends on my right of the Official Opposition cannot be very much interested in the proceedings of this committee because they seem to be noted by their absence on the question of labour. The Minister made a statement, I believe it was during his remarks on administration, in connection with the report of the Tritschler Commission which looked into the Brandon dispute. I should have, when I first rose, Mr. Chairman, said to the Minister that I appreciate very much the predicament that the government is in in respect of the tabling of the report. I think it's only fair to say to the members of the committee that there were discussions between the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition and myself, as representing this group, and members of the government as to how best to consider this situation in the light of court cases which are now being proceeded with. So I say, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the situation of my friend the Minister of Labour, and I join with him in regret that it is not possible for us at the present time to have before us the report of Mr. Justice Tritschler who is investigating into the causes and the whole situation in regard to the Brandon strike. I don't know of course, what is contained in the report. Speculation has it, Mr. Chairman, that there may be some recommendations to the government by His Honour in connection with the investigation which may affect labour legislation that's on the statute books of the Province of Manitoba at the present time. Of course that's purely speculative on the part of those who have made statements and indeed myself.

Now the Minister did indicate to the committee, if I recall correctly, that if in the event of no case being established before the preliminary hearing into the affairs of Brandon Packers, then the report would be tabled forthwith or made public. I believe he used the words: "the report would be made public." Then he went on I believe, Mr. Chairman, to say that, if as a result of the preliminary inquiry into the charges which arise as the result of the situation at Brandon, that if charges or the case carries on; if there are substantiating evidences indicating a trial; then at the conclusion of that trial the report will be made public.

I have two questions I would like to direct to the Minister in connection with this, Mr. Chairman. He may be in a position to give me an answer; he may not. I'll leave it to his discretion as to whether he can or whether he can't. There seems to be no likelihood, judging by the progress that is being made in the preliminary trial, or preliminary inquiry I think is the proper term to use rather than trial, there seems to be no likelihood of that inquiry reaching a conclusion before there is a likelihood of we rising as far as this House is concerned. Following that I would like -- the Minister may comment as to whether, in his opinion, there is a likelihood or not. Following that, I wonder whether the report will be tabled if we're not in session -- whether copies of the report will be sent to the members of the House at their homes or addresses following the conclusion of a trial, if indeed there is a trial, for the perusal of the members of the assembly. And thirdly, does the term "trial" and the tabling of this report or the transmission of this report to the members and to the public mean just the trial, which may be the result of the preliminary inquiry; or does it mean that if, as a result of the trial and possible conviction of otherwise, the case is appealed, either by the Attorney-General's department or the defence, whether we would have to wait until after the conclusion of any appeal from the judgment of the trial court before we were in receipt of the report itself.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, the report was fairly specific with respect to these points and I'll just read out the parts that applies: "that the report will be made public and placed in the hands of members either immediately upon the conclusion of the pending preliminary inquiry if the accused are not committed for trial; or immediately upon the conclusion of the trial if the accused are committed for trial." This would be immediately at the conclusion of the trial. Whether or not there is an appeal wouldn't matter. It could be tabled at that time. That's the advice that we get and that's the way in which we would propose to handle it if that meets the wishes of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Thanks.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the Minister informed the House that he had made no assurance to the Union that if the strike was settled that he would drop the inquiry. Could he tell us at this time why the government took two weeks after the strike was settled to tell the public that the inquiry was going to go on?

MR. CARROLL: Well I think to begin with, the morning that they met for the hearing, the Inquiry Commissioner, Mr. Justice Tritschler, adjourned for two weeks at the request of both the union and the company who acquainted him with the fact that they had arrived at a settlement. I think there was no undue delay on our part in considering the implications of the action that we were contemplating. We were, at the same time of course, under some pressure from some people to call this commission off, and of course we wanted just a short while in order to consider our position and I think there was no unnecessary delay. I don't recall a two-week period. There may have been two weeks but I don't believe it was anything like that length of time at all. I think it was just a matter of a few days for us to make up our minds and to decide on the course of action which was taken.

MR. GUTTORMSON: In the Winnipeg Free Press on September 2nd, 1960, Mr. Roblin is quoted as saying it would probably be a week or two weeks before the Provincial Cabinet decides whether to continue this inquiry.

MR. CARROLL: I have no comment to make on it except that it did take a short period of time in which to decide the course of action. There was no unnecessary delay. I think there was no problem. I think it was a reasonable length of time if it had been two weeks.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this matter, I have a news clipping and I know sometimes they are used and sometimes they don't give us the sense that people mean them to give. This one deals with talks that the Honourable the Minister of Labour gave to the Women's Progressive Conservative Association of South Centre and St. James. The news report is of January 17th, 1961. The first sentence is of interest to me, Mr. Chairman, which reads as follows: "The Minister of Labour Monday revealed some Union leaders were opposed to the Brandon Strike Inquiry Commission being set up: of fearing some of its recommendations would affect labour legislation." I'd like to ask my honourable friend the Minister of Labour whether he was in consultation with leaders of labour organizations prior to making this statement or whether it was simply a statement of his own thoughts?

MR. CARROLL: I don't recall actually having made that precise statement. I do think that it would be fair to say that I did say that there were some union leaders who were opposed to this Inquiry Commission proceeding, and I certainly can't stand here and say what the motive behind their thinking was at that time. I read the press reports of that speech. I must confess that they left a great deal to be desired. There were two young ladies sitting at the back who were probably much better qualified to write the social columns rather than write on labour matters. I wasn't well pleased with the reporting although I must confess that there was a fair element of truth in it. I don't think they realized the implications of some of the things that I did say there and, as a result, they were slightly distorted.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm very glad to hear the Minister of Labour say that. I, too, like him was quite disturbed when I read this news report. There may be a little bit difference of the degree. I can appreciate the fact, and it is a truism, that I believe at the time that some members of labour organizations did express — as a matter of fact I did myself, to be frank, Mr. Chairman. In answer to a query posed to me by a staff reporter of one of the papers, I did express the opinion myself that the issue having been dissolved between management and labour, it didn't seem to me necessary to go into further investigation in respect of the matter. However, I am very glad to hear the Minister say that, in effect, the context of his remarks was not as published; and that he had not come to the conclusion that any opposition to the further inquiry into the matter of Brandon strike at Brandon Packers was not because of fear of labour legislation.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, in regards to labour leaders asking that this inquiry be stopped, it's too bad that I didn't save the story that was in the Tribune. It was a statement issued by Fred Dowling, the National Director of the United Packinghouse Workers' Union, and the reason that they didn't want this inquiry to go on was that they were afraid that old wounds would be opened up again and that the old issues would be rehashed. They thought that, having reached the settlement, that they should leave it at that and not rehash old wounds and

(Mr. Peters, cont'd.) keep harmony between the employers and employees.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, he did change his mind after making that statement and agreed, at a later date, that the commission should have gone on. Had they been better advised, they'd have been into it from the start. He thought there was a great deal of value in the Commission and the kind of facts that they were bringing to light. I think you'll agree that this was contained in the evidence which you've no doubt been scrutinizing the last few weeks.

MR. ORLIKOW: I read that statement, and I think that if you read that particular page of the 2,000, that you can probably reach that conclusion. But I think without being able to read Mr. Dowling's mind exactly, I think he's looking back on a month or more of constant harassment of his union and under these circumstances he's making the best of a bad job. I want to say now what I said this afternoon, that we're going to have a good deal to say about this at a later date and I think this should be very clear.

MR. CARROLL: He was pretty specific in his comments before the Commission with respect to his views on the Commission after it got started.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well I still say he's making the best of an unfortunate situation in which the Commission put him.

MR. CARROLL: You mean these aren't his views at this time.

MR. ORLIKOW: I mean that these are his views after the judge and the counsel have done a pretty good job of confusing the issue. This is the way I read the report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) and (e) - passed. Resolution 79 - passed. Item 6

MR. PAULLEY: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. We can't allow Resolution 79 to pass at this stage. The Honourable Minister of Labour gave us some indication this afternoon of the Government of Manitoba's participation into a program of winter works. He indicated to us that the program on winter works was less insofar as provincial participation this year than last year due to greater federal participation and due to, if I recall correctly, a change in the regulations of the Province of Manitoba. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned the fact that it seemed to me that, due to the fact of increased unemployment this year over last year, that there should have been far greater provincial participation than the Minister indicated. However, for the year ending March the 31st, 1960, Mr. Chairman, this committee in the Legislature approved of an estimated expenditure of \$275,000 in regards to a winter employment program. For the year ending March 31st last, an estimated expenditure of \$50,000 was approved by the Legislature. The Minister has indicated, as I mentioned, that the net provincial participation was less in '61 than that of 1960. We are now being asked to consider an estimated expenditure of \$220,000, an increase of \$170,000 over the amount which we appropriated last year. I would like the Minister to explain to us, why the increase of this amount of money for the fiscal year we have just entered into. Does he estimate that there will be greater requirements for a program of winter works in the year ending March 31st, 1962? I understand, if I heard the Minister's remarks correctly this afternoon, that insofar as the provincial program is concerned, that only those that would qualify were those that had exhausted their unemployment benefits and were on social allowance. Does this figure indicate that the Minister and the government contemplate a greater expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1962? They forecast that there will be more and more people who will be requiring some sort of a winter employment program as a result of exhausting their unemployment benefits and being on social assistance. I'd like the Minister to give the committee a full explanation as to why this figure has been increased so substantially when he admits that the government's participation directly in a winter works program is so much less for the year ending March 31st, 1961, to that of 1960.

MR. CARROLL: I think there is a little confusion here on this subject, Mr. Chairman. In quoting these figures I said that our provincial program, and by that I don't mean our contribution towards the federal municipal winter works program, I am thinking of the program that we have operating here in Manitoba on our own, which is separate altogether from the federal program which is limited pretty much this year to work done in schools and hospitals, and in that respect our contribution this year with respect to our own provincial program will be somewhat less than last year. Ninety-four thousand as compared to \$108,000 of last year. I must say that at the moment we really can't tell what our liability is with respect to our contribution towards the federal program, because that will depend upon the kind of people that are

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.)....employed to carry out these projects. Now a municipality applies to do a sewer and water project in January; he sends his application in; it's processed; goes through and is approved; but until we actually know how many people are employed on that project that qualify for a provincial contribution, then we don't know what our liability is with respect to it. But the bulk of this, as I understand it, this \$220,000 will be paid out later this year with respect to the work that's actually in progress at this time. Most of this money will be committed in the winter works programs that are now under way. And, of course, it is sufficient, too, for the commencement of next year's operation to tide us over until the 31st of March. So I think there is some confusion here. I rather suspect that we will be paying out more this year in total than what we paid last, but at this early stage I'm afraid I can't tell you how much more.

MR. PAULLEY: Can the Minister give us any indication of how we stand in respect of this \$50,000 that was voted on last year?

MR. CARROLL: I'm afraid maybe Treasury can; I'm not familiar with the details of that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with the fact that not only is our program singularly ineffective in putting the large number of people who are unemployed to work, but our program is singularly unimpressive as compared to the other two prairie provinces. I have with me, Mr. Chairman, a page from the magazine which I'm sure many members get, called "Civic Administration". In the February, 1961, issue on Page 41, they have a whole page on winter works ideas, a national survey, and they print a table showing what the various provinces are doing. Here's what they say for the year 1961, that is this year, and they note that this covers the period to January 6th of this year. The Province of Manitoba accepted 205 applications; Saskatchewan, 589 applications; Alberta, 569 applications. If you take it in terms of money, as they report it, Manitoba, \$6,000,000 -- I'm giving it in round figures, Mr. Chairman -- \$6,000,000; Saskatchewan, \$7,169,000; Alberta, \$14,994,000. The payroll cost: Manitoba, \$1,941,000; Saskatchewan, \$2,500,000; Alberta, \$5,226,000. In men hired: Manitoba, 2,739; Saskatchewan, 9,242; Alberta, 9,410. Man days' work: Manitoba, 144,881; Saskatchewan, 205,198, and Alberta, 379,762. So, Mr. Chairman, not only are we not doing a job for our people which is effective, but we are lagging far behind the other provinces. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could tell us how many people in the department are working on this winter works program. I'm given to understand that the department has one man who works on the winter works program, and if this is so, it's an indication to me of how important the government feels this task really is.

MR. CARROLL: We do just have the one man employed full-time on winter works. We do have the services of a great many people working on a voluntary public service basis who are an invaluable assistance to us in helping to organize and promote this program. The figures that are given are extremely interesting. It does appear that Saskatchewan have at least more projects accepted and under way. Time will tell whether their program is that much more effective than ours. It may well be. It may be that circumstances are different. I suppose there is a great deal more sewer and water work and things of that kind in Saskatchewan, I don't know. But I do think that we have had excellent response and really the bulk of the initiative for this comes from the municipalities themselves, and there's only so much the government can do in promoting it. We could hire a great many more people but still the initiative must come from the municipalities, and I think the municipalities in Manitoba are very well aware of the importance of the winter works program. I think they've been co-operating very well. I think certainly we're not satisfied with the work that we're doing, and we're always trying to improve it. I do think that it is a very acceptable program under the circumstances and I think that the results will bear us out on that.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister, I believe, indicated that one of the reasons for this increase was because of the fact that we are now estimating sums that will be for the payment of work that has already been started. Is this normal -- before approval is granted? It would appear to me if that is correct, that before approval is granted for participation in these works, that the government shouldn't know in the current year in which the commitment is made what the expenditure should be? Should it not be taken care of in supplemental for the year? For instance, the year just ended the other day?

MR. CARROLL: The difficulties with a program of this kind is that we can give approval to all kinds of winter projects as we've done here, 274 of them; but we don't know what it's going to cost us or the Federal Government until we receive from the municipalities, and this year the returns don't have to be in until after the close of the program which is the 31st of May, so we likely won't be getting the returns from the municipalities until June, July or August, so that we really can't anticipate how much of this expenditure will actually be made. They may make 100 percent of it; they may make 90 percent of it; they may make only 85 during the winter months. So it's pretty hard to anticipate in advance the kind of response you're going to get to this program, at least with any degree of accuracy. But this, I understand, is the way the program has been handled in the past and it's my understanding the way it's being handled now, and I could be wrong on that point. This is something you would have to clear with Treasury people, but I understand that this is the normal procedure and the proper procedure for works of this kind.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm at a loss to follow the Minister. He was making reference to 274 projects, I believe it is, that is on the Federal basis. Now if I recall correctly his statement on the winter works program, when he mentioned these 274 projects he indicated an expenditure of some 7.2 million of Federal monies. I jotted that down. I also thought I heard him at that particular time mention the provincial contribution of, I believe it was 2 million something, I'm not sure. But the item that we're dealing with at the present time, it's my understanding, subject to correction, only deals with the provincial contributions to those programs for which the province is solely responsible, coming in to take care of those persons who have exhausted their unemployment benefits and are on social welfare. So it seems to me that there is a mix-up in the committee here or between the Minister and myself, and that's not unusual for we two, as to the purpose of this \$220,000.

MR. CARROLL: The \$220,000 is an estimate of the expenditure that we will make under our provincial program, the one which we run ourselves here in Manitoba and pay 50 percent of the labour costs; and our contribution towards the Federal-Municipal Winter Works Program, in which we pay 25 percent for those who are not eligible for unemployment insurance and to which we pay 50 percent for those who are on social assistance and have been for 90 days.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister what is the situation of the unemployed in this province right now, today?

MR. CARROLL: No, I'm afraid I can't oblige my honourable friend with those figures as of today. I think as of the 23rd of March there was a decrease in the province of over 500 from the week previously so I think that the trend is downward which, of course, leads us to be a little optimistic about the results of our winter works programs and as they pick up in business activity generally.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would give me the figure that he used when he was dealing with the federal participation and the provincial participation in respect of his 274 projects.

MR. CARROLL: Well the total costs of the federal and provincial projects -- federal projects, \$7,239,000; provincial projects, \$94,000. These are the total costs of the projects. The payroll costs were \$2,119,000; with respect to the federal projects; \$49,000 with respect to the provincial projects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e) - passed. Resolution 79 - passed. Item 6 (a) (b) (c) - passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, one further question on employment. Can the Minister indicate to us the type of projects that are covered by this? One of the things that bothers me, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, is this: that we're classifying, or it appears to me as though we're classifying many jobs now under the general terminology of the words "winter works programs" which would normally be done in any case. I wonder if the Minister could give us any indication of how many jobs that are being handled under a so-called winter works project that wouldn't normally be handled during the season, for which provincial or federal participation is being made.

MR. CARROLL: I think the definition under the federal program -- this is the municipal winter works incentive program -- I think the definition of a winter work is one that would not normally be done in the winter months. One which is either advanced and done at an earlier date or maybe delayed, I suppose, and done at a later date. Now the kinds of projects -- there

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) are four main kinds here. One is construction and major improvements of municipal roads, streets, sidewalks, bridges and underpasses. Now there's a great long sub-heading under this giving us a more exact description of the kind of works that would qualify. Now the second one is the construction and major improvement of municipal water, sewage and drainage facilities, and other sub-headings under that; and (c) construction and development of municipal parks and playgrounds. And then the fourth one is the construction and reconstruction of municipal buildings, and that's the large category that was added this year which has taken away some of the appeal of our provincial program. A lot of the municipalities were participating on public buildings under our municipal program, but when this change was made in the Federal Statute to bring this in, this of course is a much more appealing program and one which has attracted a great many of the projects that might normally have come to our program.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the Minister has a spare copy of that, to let me have it. I would also appreciate, if the Minister is in a position to, to give me a list or to give to the committee a list of specific projects that have been approved as winter works for the current period in which we're in in respect of winter works.

MR. CARROLL: I wonder if the Leader of the CCF would be kind enough to meet with our Mr. Jarvis. I could arrange that and let him explain sometime during the week. I would be very pleased to do that, or any other members of your party or any members of the House who would like to meet with Mr. Jarvis. I'm sure it would be a wonderful opportunity to see actually what is being done under this winter works program.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate very much the invitation, Mr. Chairman. Subject only to other duties that are taking our time at the present time, I'd be glad to meet with Mr. Jarvis or anybody, but as the Minister is well aware, we're rather tied up for time these days what with incidental questions in connection with roads and other business. But if I can possibly do that I will, and I thank him for the invitation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XV - Salary Increases.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave the Minister of Labour, there isn't any vote, there isn't any appropriation on the question of fire prevention; but it does come within the Minister's jurisdiction and I think it's only proper to have from him an indication as to the expense that is taking place, if any, in the forces on fire protection and fire prevention. We know full well that there are, in the Greater Winnipeg area and throughout the province, a large undertaking in construction and there have been over the period of the last number of years. There has been created a considerable additional number of schools for instance. I understand that the inspection of schools is within the jurisdiction of the department. As a result of the new school division plan, there are schools being constructed and occupied in areas in the province that formerly didn't have them. I'd like to have the Minister indicate to the committee what steps the department is taking to make sure of adequate inspection of these buildings. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that there is only a very very slight increase in the number of salaries provided for -- I don't know the numbers. There's only an increase of some \$2,500, as I read the estimates, only an increase of some \$2,500 for salaries. I presume this is for the inspectors and, as I say, due to the expansion in our construction in our public buildings and our school buildings, I'd like to hear from the Minister what provisions the department is making to make sure that the safeguards are being attended to in respect to fire. I may be wrong but I'm also under the impression that on the construction of any new public building or alteration to it, that his department, the Fire Inspection Department must approve the construction insofar as safety regulations and precautions for injury or loss of life in respect of fire. I'd like to hear from the Minister on this.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that while there is a very small increase for the coming year the budget has expanded very substantially in the last couple of years. There was provision in the estimates during this current year for two new assistant fire commissioners who have just come on staff within the last month or two, and which now boosts the Fire Commissioner's staff very substantially to the point where I think they will be doing a very excellent job, a much better job than they have been able to do with the staff that the department has had in the past. For the benefit of the House, we have the Fire Commissioner himself; we have a senior Fire Commissioner; we have six Assistant Fire Commissioners

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) at the present time, with the last two which have been taken on within the last month or two; so we have had very substantial increases in this department. They're doing a terrific job and I think a very adequate job in this field of fire prevention. We do have to inspect the buildings for fire safety, examine plans, and things of that kind. One of the real problems we've got today is a lot of old warehouse buildings in the downtown area being converted to other uses, factory uses and things of that kind where the buildings were adequate for a very small number of staff with large storage facilities, and we're now having to insist on additional fire exits and things of that kind. I think that the staff is adequate to handle the job of the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XV, Resolution 89 - passed. Now back to the Department of Education -- Item 3 (c), Page 5 of the Estimates. The Minister's not here. The item was 3 (c) (3)

MR. PAULLEY: I recall, Mr. Chairman, that item was left pending as to whether or not the First Minister had some comment to make in respect to additional training facilities.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of what the First Minister might have had in mind there. He expects to be back in the House shortly, so perhaps we should leave that item still. Then with respect to the -- did you call the item on salary increases, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which one?

MR. EVANS: The Premier asked me if I would deal with that. This is on Page 30, No. XV -- Salary Increases.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it's passed.

MR. EVANS: Not the salary increases.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, the salary increases. That's right.

MR. EVANS: The increase is -- the explanation is quite simple. It's a one-step increase for all concerned with the civil service.

MR. PAULLEY: It's just an additional increment as established in the Civil Service "doo-hickey" or whatever the devil it is?

MR. EVANS: As the Honourable the Leader will know, each position is rated with a starting salary and then five steps increase. Each person will now receive one step in addition to whatever annual increase is also due.

MR. CAMPBELL: That applies does it, Mr. Chairman, all the way through the service, in every case?

MR. EVANS: Yes, it does.

MR. CAMPBELL: And they will get their annual increment? This simply jumps a year, so to speak?

MR. EVANS: This is a means of giving a salary increase and the amount in each case is one increment. I'm not aware that this applies equally to Deputy Ministers. That, I think, is not contained at the moment in this particular increase.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I might ask the Honourable the Provincial Secretary whether this applies, or how would it apply in respect of any hourly rated members of the Civil Service?

MR. EVANS: As far as I'm aware, this does not apply to the hourly rated people. I'm afraid you're thinking of the tradesmen who are engaged on hourly rates. They're not on this incremental basis of being paid and, as far as I'm aware, this does not apply to them.

MR. PAULLEY: Might I ask, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister whether there has been any consideration being given to those on an hourly rate, for an increase in the hourly rate to sort of compensate them or keep them in line with the additional increment allowable here?

MR. EVANS: Those rates are considered from time to time as undoubtedly the Leader of the CCF will know. Some -- was it 12 or 20 individual rates were adjusted last year? The fact that there is an increment of one step for each person now does not interfere with the adjustment of individual rates from time to time when they're found to be out of line. That is to -- what is the phrase they use for re-assessing a position to see whether the rate of pay is still appropriate or whether the duties have changed, increased or decreased -- those adjustments will still go on in the regular way. This is a means of giving an across the board increase in salary at the present time and adjustments, as required, can also be done in the regular way--

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . once a quarter I think it is.

MR. PETERS: This increase -- is it on a flat increase or is it on a percentage basis?

MR. EVANS: My honourable friend will know that each job is rated with a starting salary and a maximum -- a minimum and a maximum -- and then the interval in between is divided, I think, into five steps so that in the normal course of events there is one annual increase each year. Naturally with a position that calls for a salary of say two or three hundred dollars a year, the increments are smaller than for jobs that call for a salary of five or six thousand dollars a year. It's, I suppose, roughly percentage-wise, although I'm not aware that it's exactly a percentage increase.

MR. REID: Speaking of civil employees and increases and this and that, I'm quite interested, if the Minister could explain, why the civil employees aren't covered by unemployment insurance?

MR. EVANS: This is quite a different matter and I would think should have been brought up under the estimates of the Provincial Secretary when the Civil Service Commission was being considered. At the moment, I think it can be said that unemployment insurance is not generally provided in civil services such as ours because employment is relatively stable. Most of the positions in the Civil Service are permanent. There is so little likelihood of unemployment occurring, that it is not thought advisable to provide for unemployment insurance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 89 - passed. Capital Expenditures, Schedule "A".

MR. PAULLEY: Before you go on to Capital, did I not understand from the Provincial Secretary that we were holding that item on education pending the return of the First Minister to the House?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, there's notice of a resolution on the Order Paper today which covers that item, and I imagine that we'll have a pretty full debate on it then. My suggestion would be that we pass this item on education and have our debate on the resolution when it comes up on Wednesday, or whenever it is, and we can have a vote and record our views.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

MR. PAULLEY: I have one question -- I think it's a proper one. I believe the amount is \$45,000 in the estimates under the item under consideration at the present time. Could the First Minister indicate as to whether that is the full extent of the purpose of the resolution?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, that's the full sum. In fact it may not be that we spend that amount. When I give my explanation, it will appear that that's the maximum sum.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am not in favour of passing it in this way because it seems to me that it's getting the cart before the horse to pass the item and then have the resolution. I think it should be the other way around. On the other hand, I have no wish to hold up the estimates unduly and if it could be said, as far as I'm concerned and I think there'll be other members that would feel the same way, that we're passing this without prejudice whatever to the resolution. I would want also to ask the First Minister, is it expected that this will be a yearly contribution or is it a one-shot gift?

MR. ROBLIN: It's a two-year proposition at the present time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to put in the reservation that if we're passing it, that it's with full authority to disagree when it comes to the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just want to take a little bit different view from my honourable friend. I know that sometimes we've criticized the administration, including his administration, for adopting resolutions and then finding that there's nothing in the estimates for them; but this time it's just the reverse. We, too, have reservations so far as the resolution itself is concerned that will be discussed at that particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 25 -- passed. Capital Expenditures

MR. CAMPBELL: Resolution 25 -- that's the one we're dealing with?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Capital Expenditures, Schedule "A" -- 1 - passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, Mr. Chairman, I think we should have at least an outline of the -- I certainly don't expect the Minister to give us a detailed description of this amount of money, but it is a considerable increase over last year. Could he give us what we might call a broad statement of policy on this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What was it for?

MR. CARROLL: \$10.6 million.

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't expect him to read the individual items, but something of the broad program. I presume a good bit of it is for modernization in the cities, similarly in rural parts and so on. Could he give a breakdown of the large items?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, you realize that the Capital authorization is for something more than what will actually be required because part of this is on a two-year program. Underground conduits, City of Winnipeg, \$1,070,000; Underground cable, Winnipeg, \$2,101,000; Aerial cable and exchange lines, Winnipeg, \$1,517,000; Buildings and land, Winnipeg, \$5,275,000; Buildings and lands, Provincial, \$556,500; Rural lines, Provincial, \$2,173,500; Exchange plants, Provincial, \$891,500; Central Office equipment, Provincial, \$2,712,500; Central Office, Winnipeg, \$4,261,000; Toll lines, Long Distance, \$1,399,000; Toll equipment, Long Distance, \$2,597,000; Radio telephone communications, \$354,000; Microwave radio relay equipment, \$1,098,000; Special, \$1,900,000; Subscribers' station equipment, \$2,403,000; Automobiles, Trucks, Tools, mechanized equipment, \$500,000; Office furniture, \$123,000; Contingencies, \$100,000; adding to \$31,000,000. Commitments for the '62 - '63 year, \$14,432,000; gross requirements, \$16.6 million; for replacements, \$2,148,000 etc.

MR. GRAY: How many years will it take to spend the money?

MR. CARROLL: Well, we expect to spend \$16,600,000 next year. The balance of it is equipment that must be ordered well in advance. Some of this telephone equipment must be ordered two years in advance to get it in here in time, to have it manufactured and here in time to go in service. We can't go ahead and commit a half a microwave tower or a telephone. We've got to get authorization for a telephone building that may not be in place two years from now; we've got to get authorization for it today so we can get the equipment ordered although it may not be built next year; it may not be built until the year after. But we do plan to spend next year, \$16,600,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) - passed. (2)

MR. CAMPBELL: Could we have a breakdown of this one, Mr. Chairman? This too, percentage-wise, is greatly increased over last year. Could we have the program?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is not here but he has left me with the projects which he has in prospect. I should mention that some of these, in fact most of these are not certain things because there's a good deal of negotiation to take place between the municipalities and others concerned, but we feel these are the ones that are likely to come to completion during the coming year. There's the balance of the Neche-Gretna-Altona Project; and new projects are in Hartney, Stonewall, Deloraine, MacGregor, Birtle, Erickson, Russell and Winkler. As members know, this is the project that brings water from the source of supply to the gate of the town or whatever it is. Now these projects are not fixed or certain and they're just in the negotiation stage but we think we should have authority because they may come to fruition.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, in this one, as far as this particular vote is concerned, it's not in any way tied up with the plumbing course and the water on farms.

MR. ROBLIN: It's a good thing I'm answering questions because I would give the short answer - no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 1 - passed. Schedule B 1 (1) - passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Here again, Mr. Chairman, can we have the breakdown?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): The Institute of Technology -- this covers our anticipated expenses for land acquisition, architect's fees and the building that will be done during the fiscal year. The site has not been selected yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) - passed. (2) - passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, there's some others in that No. (1), Mr. Chairman. There's also soil erosion -- oh no, I understand. (2) is the one where we come to acquisition of land and land settlement projects. Could we have the breakdown on No. 2?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, it is for recreational development at the Falcon Beach and district; roadside developments; Trans-Canada Highway camp and picnic grounds; camp grounds and picnic sites in forest reserves; camp grounds and picnic sites outside forest reserves; recreational roads; roads and fireguards in southeastern Manitoba; buildings and lookout towers and other roads

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.)....and fireguards; and it is also for land acquisition for the game and waterfowl management; and for the Grand Beach acquisition; and, in general, some areas we are taking some land inside forest reserves, too.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is it wholly within the Mines and Natural Resources Department?

MR. WITNEY: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Could we have -- or has the Minister the recreational projects, the amount of it separately?

MR. WITNEY: Yes. For Recreation alone, Recreation and Development, it comes to \$309,000.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister whether there is anything there to clear up land for future settlement, maybe in a year or five or ten years from now?

MR. WITNEY: For future land settlement?

MR. GRAY: Yes.

MR. WITNEY: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2) - passed. (3) - passed.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to again register my opposition to the floodway around Greater Winnipeg. Since I did register my objections some three weeks ago I have had the occasion, I believe for the first time, to go through this famous report, the Royal Commission on Flood Cost Benefit, 1958; and I say that I should have gone through this report much sooner but I was like the other members of the House in 1959, when the report was tabled, there was no copies made available to the ordinary members of this House. There was only two or three copies, I believe, made available to the Leaders, the different Leaders, but the members at large did not receive a copy of this report and had no chance to study it except by borrowing it from their Leader if they cared to.

Now I say that this report was tabled on March 18th, and after tabling the report the First Minister went on to make his famous flood announcement. Now none of the members had had a chance to analyze the reasoning behind the majority report supplied to the government. I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the members of the Cabinet themselves had the chance to read the report and analyze it because we find from a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture, that's in Hansard on Page 788, and I will quote from Hansard; "The economic report of the Royal Commission on Flood Cost-Benefit which recommended construction of a floodway was received by the government on February 9th, 1959. On February 27th, 1959, just a few weeks after, Manitoba presented the Federal Government an outline of its flood control policy, particularly in respect of the Greater Winnipeg floodway, and requested financial assistance towards the cost of undertaking such a major program."

Now the members will remember, I am sure, that this was the time when the Cabinet was dispersed all over the Province of Manitoba trying to sell the school division plan. We learned from the newspapers at that time that it was difficult to get a quorum of Cabinet Ministers in the building here. There's no mention in this statement made by the Minister of Agriculture that there was consultation with Ottawa at all. The statement says the Province presented Ottawa with its program; told Ottawa that they were going ahead with this floodway around Winnipeg. They did not consult in any way, shape or form according to the statement. They just wrote Ottawa that they were going ahead whether you like it or not. We're going ahead with this program; we approve it; we agree with the majority report and that's that; and we want 75 percent. Now this, to my mind, Mr. Chairman, was not the right way to approach the matter when we expect -- especially a 75 percent contribution. I say that although the First Minister told us the other day that he arrived at this conclusion because it had been recommended by a very strong Royal Commission; he agreed that the previous government had appointed strong men and they had made complete surveys; that that was the reason why they approved of it. But, Mr. Chairman, we know that this government had, in the election of 1958, come out favouring the floodway around Winnipeg; even before the report was tabled, some eight or nine months, and I would like to quote from Hansard for March 19th. This is the second day of the debate, from the Honourable Member for St. Vital -- here I see he's coming into the House now -- and he told us about the idea of the government in 1958 before the Royal Commission handed out its recommendation to the government. In speaking on this debate the Member for St. Vital said this, on Page 115, --mind you, remember this was said in March, 1959 --

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.). . . . "In the last election campaign," -- that's in 1958 -- "much was said about flood control and it was the policy of our party and we put it in our literature, it was one of the planks of my platform, so to speak, that the Conservative Party was prepared if given the opportunity to take office, to take action on flood control. We made this promise and this government has kept its promise within a very short time of its assuming office."

Now we all heard many candidates at that time blaming the previous government for doing nothing in respect to flood control and the floodway even; and here is the member for St. Vital telling us in 1959 that eight or ten months previously the government had pledged itself to adopting this policy of a floodway around Winnipeg. Now it's not surprising that the government in the short lapse of two and a half weeks agreed with the majority report of the Royal Commission without consulting Ottawa at all. At that time I had no chance to read this book and no members in this House had read it, and I'm still wondering whether the Cabinet Ministers themselves had read it. There are some things-- (Interjection) -- No, at the time that the announcement was made, and they didn't give us a chance at all to discuss this matter on its merits. --(Interjection) -- I was not canvassing, Sir. You were canvassing and trying to tell yourself you knew better than I that an election was coming; that you were in a capacity to call an election and I wasn't.

Well, Mr. Chairman, in this report there are things that have astonished me since I studied this report, and I dare say that after studying it thoroughly I am coming to the conclusion that this thing should not be proceeded with at all, because after all the estimates on flood cost-benefit are based to me on wrong assumptions. The cost-benefit ratio is based on the assumption that even with respect to a flood of the 1950 magnitude, that all dykes would be over-topped and that there would be a damage of \$140 million. It's very very surprising to me, Mr. Chairman, and I wish the honourable members should read some of the material in this report. I will read from Page 40 of the Report of the Royal Commission. On page 40, at the top of the page: "Our estimate of the damages that would be caused in Greater Winnipeg if a flood of the 1950 magnitude were to recur today is much higher than the total amount of damages paid by the Red River Valley Board and the Manitoba Flood Relief Fund. In very considerable measure this is due to the fact that the major part of St. Boniface was protected by the Lyndale dyke in 1950, whereas our estimates are for the damages that would occur if flooding became general behind the main dyking system. Almost one-third of our estimated damages and other losses for a 1950 flood are those that would occur in the City of St. Boniface." Now, Mr. Chairman, is there any member of this House who believes that with the present dyking system around St. Boniface, that a flood of the 1950 size would be total loss there, that it would be over-topped and the damages of such a flood would amount to \$140 million?

Mr. Chairman, I've read this thoroughly and I've discussed it with other people and they come to the same conclusion as I am coming to, and they repeat that in other parts of their report. With respect to the historic floods that we hear so much about, the data that they have, to my mind, can be challenged. Now they state on Page 15 -- that's with respect to the Assiniboine River: "continuous records of flood flows on the Assiniboine River are available only since 1912. Information about earlier historic floods is sketchy and incomplete." That's what they say about the Assiniboine River. But with respect to the Red River, on Page 14 they seem to have a different story, and I would like to quote as to how they came to the levels that they base all their figures on. That's on Page 14: "That our records of the flood elevation"-- and I'm quoting -- "reached in 1826, 1852 and 1861 are as good as they are, is in large measure due to the careful records made by Sir Sanford Fleming in 1879." You see the records are good because of records made by Sir Sanford Fleming in 1879. Now let's listen to this: "In examining the river in the area from Winnipeg to Selkirk with a view to choosing a suitable location for a crossing by the CPR, Sir Sanford questioned local inhabitants who had witnessed the area of floods; and on the basis of their evidence" -- some of this evidence was 53 years old about the 1826 flood -- "and on the basis of the evidence of the old-timers and the high water marks they pointed out, drew up a set of elevations for these three historic floods at various points between the mouth of the Assiniboine and Selkirk."

Now this is astounding to me, Mr. Chairman, that the levels of those floods was arrived at by an engineer in 1879 after consulting with the inhabitants -- and that's with respect to the three historic floods going down to 1826, 53 years previous. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that to

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . me I cannot see that this can be very accurate to estimate these levels. In fact, we've heard the Honourable Minister of Agriculture tell us that there was only Stony Mountain that was out of the water in the year 1826. Well we have the map here which shows a different story about the 1826 flood. It shows in green there, but still we're far from Stony Mountain yet where there's no water. Brooklands, Assiniboia, St. James were not flooded in 1826. There's not only Bird's Hill and Stony Mountain that were not flooded. This is the map that this Flood Commission has presented to us in this book so that, to my mind, there has been some exaggerations about those floods. I wonder whether this data is very good. It's based on hearsay by the old-timers and marks possibly on trees and possibly on houses, possibly some basements of houses were raised. Can we think that this is very accurate and say that we will have another flood like 1826? In how many years? Nobody knows, but to base all our trust on this evidence, to me, is not sound and reasonable.

One thing that worries me is the fact that we have not yet had from the First Minister or the Minister of Agriculture a statement to the effect that the Federal Government agrees with the majority report. No statement to this effect has been made. Now, to me, that would have indicated that the Federal Government -- if we had such a statement that their economic experts -- I don't mean their engineers with respect to a location of floodway one mile this way or one mile the other way -- but their economic experts after studying this report, would they agree with the majority or the minority? That's what I'm wondering about. We've asked for the correspondence now for three years and we haven't been able to get it, Mr. Chairman. It has not been tabled. Two years in succession my colleague from St. George has asked for this information. I've asked it time and time again. This looks "fishy" to me. I think that the Federal Government is dragging their feet on this. It seems to me that they don't agree with the principle of this floodway in itself. They have spent already \$5 million on the present dykes; there's the Perimeter Road; and there's the removal of the Lister Rapids that could be done. The members should know possibly that the Red River is 26 feet deep at Redwood Bridge and only 12 at Lombard Street and 15 at St. Boniface Hospital. Maybe something could be done there. But to go ahead and spend all this money at the present time on the information we have, I think, is not justifiable, especially when we don't know whether Ottawa agrees with the principle of the project at all. I say that this is not right, Mr. Chairman. The First Minister said the other day that a taxpayer is indivisible; it doesn't matter who pays. That's what he led the House to believe. Well to me it makes a lot of difference who pays. This should be settled with the whole Dominion of Canada if it's any good; and we should have the best experts, economic experts to decide whether we should go ahead with it. As far as the information I've got now, I think I'm rallying to the position of my fellow colleague from St. George. I think that this is not sound. It should not be done. I think the costs are too great. We were always told that the ratio is 1 to 3. It is not 1 to 3 at five or five and a half or six percent interest. The Royal Commission says that at five percent interest the ratio is 1 to 2.3, not 1 to 3, and this makes quite a bit of difference. I say that the First Minister, after having had this report from the 9th of February to the 27th of February '59, should not have told Ottawa that he was going ahead; that he should have consulted with Ottawa. This should have been at that time -- a combined project. He should have been sure that Ottawa was agreeing with the principle of the thing; that it was a sound economic proposition. But, no, he rushed ahead just before the election. They had stated a year previous that they wanted this floodway and the majority report suited with their own opinion of what was politically expedient, I suppose, and the announcement was made. The members of this House had no chance to look into this report and study it. Up to now I've had to borrow this one because I have not had one of my own at any time. I say that we should not go ahead and I object to the expenditure of this sum of money at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I think we're being rushed. I think Ottawa is being forced into this in spite of themselves. Oh, I knew all the time, Mr. Chairman, that we would get something from Ottawa. There is a system whereby they can help, The Ottawa Water Control Assistance Act, whereby they would pay 37-1/2 percent. They knew all the time that Ottawa would give something, but I say that there should have been a thorough consultation with Ottawa on this project. The Honourable the First Minister said the other day that I was a frustrated man because Ottawa was going to contribute something to rescue him from his difficulties on this

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)....premature announcement. Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy if Ottawa paid 75 percent. I'm not a frustrated man at all. I'm fighting for Manitoba. I think that if this is going to be done, it should be done and paid for -- at least 75 percent after they have accepted the majority report and they have taken the responsibility. This is a navigable stream. They should pay at least 75 percent but before they do that they certainly will make sure that it is economically sound, otherwise they'll be dragged in, possibly to pay 50 percent, and that's what we're led to believe. The First Minister said that he'll carry on his negotiations. He should have carried on his negotiations before making the announcement and getting votes in 1959 on this pronouncement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure you know very well, Sirs, and we all know that in 1950 if we had rushed in and said, okay we'll save everyone here even if we have to pay the whole shot, we would not have received 75 percent from Ottawa. The ex-Premier of this province saved this province many millions of dollars because he made a deal at the right time. The Premier of Saskatchewan did not rush into a scheme of the South Saskatchewan River Dam on his own. He did not say, "we'll do it alone." No, no, he consulted Ottawa time and time again, and when there was a firm agreement, it was jointly announced from Ottawa and from Regina. That's the way that a business deal should be done. One party should not rush ahead. They should consult the other party and get the best possible deal; and I say that I object to the expenditure of this money at this time.

.....Continued next page.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I really enjoy speaking in rebuttal to the Honourable Member for Carillon. He's so ridiculous, he's all wet. He never dried out from the 1950 flood. Like everybody who has a spurious gospel to promote, they like to lift things out of context, and he's a master at this art, a master at it. And this is what he has done tonight, this is what he has done tonight -- I'll say something worthwhile. -- (Interjection) -- I'm quite sure. I had the privilege, if you want to call it that, Mr. Chairman, of taking part in a television broadcast that dealt with the flood, and the most ridiculous thing that anyone ever witnessed was the Honourable Member for Carillon assuring the people of Winnipeg that they should rely on dikes and they had a grim reminder by way of a film taken during the 1950 flood. This is the policy of the former administration and this is where the people would find themselves if they were to be so careless as to ever rely on the like administration and the policies of the former administration. It's a joke. That's all it is. It's just a joke. -- (Interjection) -- Well let's use some common sense. This honourable member suggests in the first place that Manitoba should sit here on its hands and refuse to do anything to ensure the safety of the people and the economic strength of the province unless someone else will pay 75 percent of the costs; and he went so far in the television broadcast as to say if Ottawa offers 60 percent we shouldn't take it. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, yes, oh, yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I made no mention of either 60 or 40 percent.....

MR. HUTTON: Yes, he said, 60 or 40 or anything less than 75.

MR. PREFONTAINE: The honourable member must take my word for it because.....

MR. HUTTON: He doesn't want to go ahead unless the Federal Government is going to pay 75 percent. He said here a few minutes ago unless the whole of Canada is willing to share in the cost of this thing we shouldn't be willing to go ahead. Well, this could be likened to a drowning man going down for the third time and when someone offers to help him, he said, "Well, unless you come all the way, I'm not going to try." How ridiculous can you be? He says that there are no records available in Manitoba, and went to a great deal of trouble to ferret out something in the report here that might indicate that, but I have another report here that was sponsored by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources in October 1950, and the report is made by an R. H. Clarke, and I expect that is the Mr. Clarke who is now associated with the Department of Northern Affairs at Ottawa. I'm not sure but I think that is the same man. I want to read a few excerpts from this report: "History of Red River Flooding"-- (Interjection)-- No, it was put out by the provincial government, the former administration, in October 1950. It's quite interesting. I had occasion to look through it here not too long ago anticipating that the Official Opposition in the House were going to find it expedient for political purposes, to oppose the construction of the Winnipeg floodway. Considerable information is available with respect to the more serious historical floods in the Red River basin. With the exception of eight years, continuous records of the peak spring flood stage at Winnipeg have been kept by the City Engineers office from 1875 to date. During this period the highest flood stage recorded prior to 1950 was 26.3 feet City datum on May 6th, 1882. Prior to 1875 there are records of the more serious floods only. The floods of 1826, 1852 and 1861 were chronicled by competent historians and extracts of their accounts of these floods are included in appendices I to XIX. According to these reports, the site of Winnipeg was completely covered with water and the whole valley appeared rather like a lake. In May 1826, the river rose to about elevation 37 feet City datum according to the high water marks determined by Sir Sanford Fleming. In "The Red River Settlement -- Its Rise and Progress" by Alexander Ross, a work written before the 1852 flood, there is an eye witness account of the flood of 1826, extracts from which appears Appendix I. Before this account had issued from the press, Mr. Ross was to witness the inundation of 1852 and he added a separate account of it in an appendix to his book. Extracts from his account of the 1852 flood appear in Appendix VII. Donald Gunn also witnessed the 1826 flood and set forth an account of this flood in his book, "The History of Manitoba," which was co-authored by C.R. Tuttle and this account is presented as Appendix II. And there are additional accounts. During the 1852 Flood which occurred in the month of May, the river rose over its banks and flooded the valley reaching an elevation of about 35 feet City datum. Descriptions of this flood are presented in Appendices VII to XVI. In regard to this flood Sir Sanford Fleming gives an account of an interview with Archbishop Tache of St. Boniface as follows, and so on. I could go on and read more and more there.

MR. PREFONTAINE: May I ask the Minister a question? Where are the official records of the '52 flood?

MR. HUTTON: They come from competent historians and eye-witness accounts.

MR. PREFONTAINE:hearsay.

MR. HUTTON: Well, we're hearing a lot of hearsay these days around here. A lot of hearsay, that's right! And I think that we have reason to put a little more faith in this type of hearsay than we have in some of it that we've had to listen to. Well, I think I'll just read some of this; it's as good to listen to as some of the material that we've had to listen to in this House of late. "His Grace was good enough to afford me the benefit of his local experience." Now the hearsay is from His Grace, the Archbishop of St. Boniface. "In the year 1852, the river overflowed its banks and completely submerged the level prairie for several miles on each side. The water rose until it stood at least 3 feet, six inches above the general surface of the ground around the palace of St. Boniface, and it seemed like a vast lake extending in all directions, the whole country was submerged from Minnesota north to Kildonan. The site of the City of Winnipeg was completely under water and the nearest dry land in that neighbourhood was at Birk's farm, some four miles away. The flood remained in this state for more than two weeks. Separate accounts of 1826 and 1852 floods are in close agreement and the facts are so presented that it is possible to note the marked similarity between these floods and that of 1950. A characteristic feature of these floods is the long duration of the peak and near-peak stages. The overflows lasted about six weeks with the crest stages occurring at about the end of the third week in May. The flood of 1861, to which reference is meagre, reached a level four feet below that of 1826 and was the last major inundation until 1950 when the water rose to within two feet of the 1861 level."

Now I want to read you out of the recommendations of the Royal Commission, some very pertinent statements. On Page 1: By computing the probably flood frequency, the probably size of floods and the amount of damage likely to be done, the Commission estimates that at present day costs, at present day costs, and with present population, the anticipated floods, threat of floods and fighting of floods in the three areas studied, represent an annual average economic loss to the people of the Province of Manitoba of approximately \$14 million. This means that the total cost on an average for the next 50 years with no gain in population, with no increase in price levels will be \$700 million. Section IV - Floods do not occur with any regularity. The frequency of flooding is important to know, but it is equally important to remember that even with a frequency expectation of once in a hundred years, that once may be next year. A year ago we thought that we had had it -- a year ago. There was a great deal of fear. Now we heard here in earlier debates on the floodway, how this \$64 million or \$65 million didn't mean a thing; it was actually going to cost the province, over the next 50 years, two or three hundred million dollars. This statement here shows that even if it does, even if it does cost two or three hundred million dollars, if we don't do anything, with no increase in the population and no increase in prices, we stand to lose \$700 million. -- (Interjection)-- the average losses that we can expect are over \$14 million per year. Well, the Honourable Members from St. George and from Carillon are enthralled by the year 1950 because that was the year that they were making history, especially the Member for Carillon, he was making history in 1950, and he's been making it since, and especially of late, trying to argue the point that the people of Manitoba and the people of Winnipeg would want to go through the circus that they went through in 1950. Which one of them will guarantee to the people of Greater Winnipeg that they're not going to have a flood greater than 1950? The experience in this province has been that of four major floods that are recorded, three of them have been greater. There's no guarantee; there's no guarantee at all that we're not going to have a flood larger than 1950. In fact chances are that we will; the chances are very good, and the more years that go by, the poorer our chances are of escaping a flood of those proportion. So I say Mr. Chairman, that the arguments that the Honourable Member for Carillon has put up tonight do nothing to destroy the good judgment, or the concept of good judgment, that this government has in proceeding with this floodway, and the other works -- let me emphasize, the other works that go -- an announcement I trust will be made in the House before the House does adjourn for this session, of what we intend to do with respect to the Assiniboine River. And I might point out that the Pembina River is also under active consideration at this time.

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.)....It does nothing to destroy the concept of the good judgment that this government is using in proceeding with these projects. On the other hand it discredits the Member for Carillon for the short-sightedness, for creating what must be interpreted widely as a partisan view on the floodway and the welfare of the people of Manitoba. There can be no argument. If we don't believe the people that are, by experience, by training, qualified to examine, study and pass judgment on these things, then we shouldn't resort to this approach in establishing the validity of a certain procedure or a program or policy; we should leave it up to people with the vast experience that the Honourable Member for Carillon has. But I am of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the majority of the people in Manitoba would rather trust the recommendations of the Royal Commission than trust the questionable judgment of the Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to say very much except to say this, Mr. Chairman, that there was a minority report, one of the outstanding members of that Royal Commission who has studied like the others and met the experts from the United States and all over and arrived at a different conclusion. And I say that this government now says that it adopted this policy because it was recommended by a Royal Commission. Well, I know that the same government has ignored recommendations that were made unanimously by Royal Commissions and good commissions. The one on the Winnipeg Metro situation -- they had recommended eight cities and the eight mayors of these cities to form a Metro Council and this was ignored. It was a unanimous report and the report had been praised by the government but the government chose to ignore it. What about the unanimous report on Education? They made certain recommendations that the government is ignoring. With respect to a minority report that a 100 percent, we'll go with it. Now this doesn't seem to me totally logical. With respect to the historic floods, yes I know that the old-timers 30, 40 or 50 years after in fact, and even at that time wrote tall stories about these floods. I could write stories about the '50 flood. I travelled in a canoe over the Morris Bridge and I went by canoe right into the second storey of the school in St. Jean. There was a big lake down there; it's a low spot and there were low spots all around here and people were getting into second storeys in 1950 and they certainly did the same in 1826, but as I said before there was no official data at that time at all. The old-timers had no good highways to get out of the city; no roads, no graded roads whatsoever; they had oxen and horses and they followed trails to go to upper places; they couldn't save themselves or move away in an hour or half an hour like we can today. There were no graded roads at all; they had to take trails and they went away and they saw pools of water all over I suppose at that time, but this did not necessarily mean that water extended from the river all over-- there was water all through the province at that time. I suppose like in every spring. Go to any place -- not this year there's not much water, but in an ordinary spring -- and you see lakes of water everywhere. I say that I think this has been overdone to a certain extent, these previous floods. We have no official record of them; they were made out by talking to old-timers who have shown marks, they don't say where, but marks some place, and I say that we are spending so much money on the basis of these stories, so much money. The estimates have been made on the assumption that all dikes would be over-topped, even a flood of 1950, the dikes that we have would be over-topped. Well I don't agree with that, it's a wrong assumption and the estimate of \$700 million to me doesn't stand up after we've studied that closely. I don't think it stands up at all. It's just guess work and based on the wrong assumption. Mr. Chairman, we all know that we have dikes now that have cost money and we know that we can save ourselves against a '50 flood much better than we were able to in 1950; and moreover we have the perimeter road which we can raise to save Winnipeg from a flood of the '51 if the figures are right, and maybe of the '52 magnitude because we have that now which we didn't have in 1950, and I say that before spending so much money we should be surer ourselves.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, may I just take one minute reluctantly to defend the government's policy. When Noah built the Ark, and if it were not for this I think they would have no legislature here tonight, and probably he had the foresight. I feel that precaution is more important than the cure. I'm always in agreement with the Honourable Minister of Health when he says that anything we can do to prevent the disease is worth doing. Nobody knows whether there's going to be a flood or not, and I have very little confidence in the flood committee which is being reported here from time to time. It's only a guess on their part.

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....Probably they make some measurements, but no one knows whether there's going to be one or not. I do know one thing, that in 1950 it was a very tragic situation in Winnipeg or Greater Winnipeg. People have lost their homes; they have lost their belongings. It's true that a certain amount of money they received for the damage, but that isn't the point. Running a home means much more than the government pays them for it at the same time. There was a danger of an epidemic and fortunately through the assistance of the Health Department, either the Province or the City, they prevented it but it could have been a very very great tragedy. I have had the unfortunate experience to come out for two or three weeks to help put up dikes; help the people to move out from other places; working in a certain group, and I remember it distinctly, the agony, the hardship and the painful experience of those who have lived through 1950. I do not remember any other flood, but I do remember in some European countries, or the one where I lived, where the spring flood extended 65 miles and washed out and wiped out settlements of 100, if not thousands, of inhabitants. So what is money? For God's sake what is money? True it doesn't grow on trees, but we have in Ottawa a machine that you turn and dollars come out, so in order to protect the people of this neighbourhood and in order to protect the farms, in order to protect the cities, what are they worrying about? If, God forbid, there is a flood what would the Honourable Member for Carillon say then. He'll probably travel again in a canoe to the second floor. That's all he can do. -- (Interjection)-- I did it too, I didn't say that you didn't. I don't say that you didn't, but the nature of the honourable member is and he's said it quite openly the job of the opposition is to oppose. That's all he says, oppose. Now if the government will decide to send the honourable member for a trip all over the world at the expense of the state he'll also oppose. I think, Mr. Chairman, that whether the commission was right or wrong I don't know and they don't know, but if the government comes and propositions to safeguard the health and the lives and the property of the people of this province, let's do it. I'm not worrying about the money which we have to borrow now. Posterity perhaps will pay for it. We spend a lot of money. We spend money on war, millions and millions of dollars. I don't know whether it's necessary or not. I'm not close enough to the scene to know, and if they say that it's necessary to protect Canada, to protect the people of Canada and we need \$16 billion today, I would still perhaps agree because I don't know. In order to protect one live or a thousand lives it's worthwhile. So why argue about it. We've been arguing about it for days and days and days. The government will win out anyway so why worry about it. I am speaking as an individual, speaking as the Member from Inkster. I'm going to support the government on this because I don't know anything otherwise. Not knowing, it's my duty not to speculate on the lives and the misery and the sickness and the evils of our province.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave that item -- I'm not going to get into the flood-- but I would like if the Minister is able to give us a breakdown of this \$3 3/4 million. How much -- and I have one or two questions, he may be able to give me the answer to these -- how much of this money will be used for actual construction purposes of the floodway? How much will be used for land acquisition and expropriation costs in respect of the Red River Floodway? And I'd also like to know, Mr. Chairman, because of its effect on my own constituency of Radisson, how much is the expenditure in the Capital Supply before us for the Seine River flood diversion, flood protection, and if the expenditure in respect of the Seine River will complete the whole project for this current fiscal year?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, I would like particularly to know what is the appropriation for the Assiniboine River and what is the work that's planned?

MR. REID: I would like to ask the Minister what the government is doing to assist people residing along river banks in cases of land erosion? Why I mention this is the banks along the Red River right from Emerson to the Locks at Lockport last fall the Federal Government was responsible for the Locks and also lowering of the river. For some unknown reason last fall they lowered the river down to winter level in a period of 24 hours instead of 10 days or the normal two weeks, and engineers tell me that this water seeps under the banks for a distance say a quarter of a mile, with the result when it was lowered in that period of time these banks just collapsed like a deflated balloon. And the people, especially in my constituency, I don't know if the other areas, have spent thousands of dollars on the banks along there with the participation of the municipal and provincial governments, and now I understand these people

(Mr. Reid, cont'd).....are going to take action against the Federal Government seeking redress for these damages. I was just wondering if the Provincial Government is assisting these groups in any way in fighting their claim or whether the Provincial Government was aware of this condition last fall?

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister will be on his feet I'd like to know how much of this amount will be spent on the water control and drainage project?

MR. HUTTON: I'm going to answer the question with respect to river bank erosion. I have brought this to the attention of the Federal authorities under whose jurisdiction the Locks are operated, and they tell me that they understand the problem and that they will endeavour to do their best to carry out letting the water down as gradually as possible. Of course they have to relate this to the boating on the river and there are some difficulties; they have to start earlier in order to lengthen the time in which they bring the water level down and there are some problems, but they have assured us in the department that they will endeavour to do their best to co-operate. Under soil erosion, water control and drainage.....

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister goes on. Has the Federal Government admitted legal liability for that damage?

MR. HUTTON: No. They are quite adamant in their stand.

MR. HILLHOUSE: They blame it on land drainage do they not?

MR. HUTTON: On what?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Land drainage.

MR. HUTTON: No, no they -- of course there's I think a dispute of long standing as to who is responsible on the navigable streams for river bank erosion. They claim that the only basis on which you can determine their responsibility is if you determine that the erosion is due to the shipping, and we as yet have not been able to establish that fact and been successful; but we nevertheless continue to try to do this. Insofar as soil erosion, water control and drainage projects are concerned, there was an unexpended portion, March 31st, this is an estimate made some time ago, of \$374,350; we are asking for an additional \$750,000 which will give us a total of \$1,124,350 for the 1961-62 year. There was an unexpended portion under the Seine River-Lake Manitoba and Red River Valley Flood Protection of \$1,280,000 and with an additional \$3 million this gives us \$4,280,000. The Seine River is complete except for the diversion structure; it will be in use this spring if we should experience anything like we've had in the last couple of years, in '59 and '60. I haven't a complete breakdown on Lake Manitoba as to what is outstanding there. The remainder, of course, will be spent in land acquisition and so forth for the floodway.

The question was asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition as to what funds are allocated to works on the Assiniboine and there are none specifically authorized for this work. We anticipate that even though our decision in this regard will be made shortly, here again we will require the approval of the Federal Government in respect to the decision that we come to, and although preliminary work could be begun, it is not anticipated that in 1961 -- the present year -- that we'll be in a position to expend any large amounts of money. We are asking for -- oh, it's already been dealt with I see. I wasn't aware of the category of the Manitoba Water Supply Board.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may just -- I asked the Minister one or two specific questions; I don't recall him answering them. One question was: How much for actual construction of the Red River Floodway, how much for land acquisition contained in the Capital Supply. And also I asked him in connection with the Seine diversion. Now he did say to me that it's, if I recall correctly, that it's completed all but the structure. Now I asked how much it will take to complete the Seine diversion. He did inform me as he did some time previously if I recall correctly, what the situation is insofar as this present year is concerned, that in the event of any flood they can remove some barricades, as I understand it, remove some temporary barricades in order that the diversion may be utilized in the event of high water this year. But I would like to know from him when the structure as he mentions will be completed, because I understand that the Minister means by the structure, the control gates at the outlet into the Red. I'd like to know whether that will be completed this year for sure and the amount of the completion. But I'd also like the answers if he has the breakdown of actual construction costs for the fiscal year we've just entered into on the Red River diversion; and also if he has the breakdown, as to how much of this will be for land acquisition.

MR. HUTTON: It is estimated that the monies required in 1961-62 for the Seine River, completion of the Seine River which includes bridges, diversion structures and seeding of channel and some right-of-way payments -- \$110,000. There is also monies, this is the government's share, there are some monies that will be forthcoming from the municipalities which will apply. As far as the Red River Channel diversion is concerned, I would expect that by far the majority of the monies voted will be expended for land acquisition, because although we are in negotiation with the railways at the present time for the construction of their bridges, and it is anticipated that the Highways Department will handle the construction of the highways bridges, it's not estimated that the se structures can be gotten underway before the coming winter which I think is obvious. Once we have completed the negotiations with the railways for instance they in turn must have either their engineers or consulting firms design the bridges and then by the time the tenders are let and so on, it will be I think some time next winter before there will be any actual construction. Although I'm not making this as a firm statement, I think it is considered by the engineers to be wise to undertake the construction of all the crossings before they undertake any excavations. They feel that it is more economical to divert the traffic, whether it be rail traffic or highway traffic, once they have the new crossing in; otherwise if they were to undertake excavation at this stage they would disrupt traffic of all kinds and incur greater costs than are otherwise necessary. I should also point out that there are some real problems in regard to tying together the loose ends of the existing traffic system once it's severed on both sides of the channel. This is something that the Highways Planning Division has been working at; I can't tell you just what stage they're in but they have to take into consideration the fact that municipalities are being severed, school districts are being cut in half. It may require some reorganization on a school district basis and the communication requirements of the community have to be related to the crossings that will be provided. I'm not sure that they have even firmed up their estimates insofar as all the crossings are concerned. Quite naturally they will put a crossing at No. 1 and some of the other major highways, but they also have to relate the existing roads and so on to the crossing and give the best possible service within reasonable costs.

MR. PAULLEY: Are we correct, Mr. Chairman, in presuming then that insofar as expenditures for the floodway is concerned that there will not be any actual construction costs of any great magnitude on the floodway, but the expenditures insofar as construction itself is concerned will be more or less still planning and making provisions for these matters that the Minister raises? If I recall correctly he said that the major portion of the Capital Supply to be voted in respect of the floodway was for land acquisition. I wonder if the Minister could indicate the approximate amount of money for this purpose?

MR. HUTTON: I beg your pardon? -- (Interjection).

MR. PAULLEY: Well, yes I can appreciate that. Well, maybe Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the point taken by the Honourable the First Minister insofar as disclosing the approximate amount that might be available for this and I can understand that readily. I wonder if he could possibly give me an answer to the over-all amount then that is considered for the purpose of the Red River Floodway and then it would take a real Philadelphia lawyer to try and assess the amount for land expropriations; and acquisitions and actual construction.

MR. HUTTON: Well, we have a total of \$4,280,000 in this vote which covers the Seine River, Lake Manitoba, Red River Valley flood protection and also there will be -- there may be some expenditures in relation to the Assiniboine River by way of preliminary investigations and so on. -- (Interjection)-- No.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, did I not hear the Minister say that the remainder would be for the floodway, and can't the Minister tell us what the remainder is?

MR. HUTTON: Well, the requirements for the Seine River are \$110,000 and, I think the requirements for -- I don't want to give a figure here on Lake Manitoba because I don't know where the account stands at the present time or just what has been paid in respect to this work. This is the only other work, other than the Red River Valley, the Red River Diversion and the Assiniboine. I would suggest that the amounts in respect to the Assiniboine would be small since it's work of a preliminary nature.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, a supplementary question to my previous one. The Minister said that soil erosion, water control and drainage projects are \$1,124,000. Does he anticipate any money onto Fish and Dennis Lake out of this amount?

MR. HUTTON: No, I don't think there's anything in the estimates for this work.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable the Minister didn't give very much information regarding what is contemplated on the Assiniboine River. I understood him to say that he thought it would be very little; they were preliminary investigations. He said that those preliminary investigations could be begun, but what I would like to get is what are the nature of even the preliminary investigations? There have been investigations by the Red River Basin people and there have been some studies since that, and so I have my other two main questions before the Minister at the same time -- he will remember I'm sure that I mentioned the Holland Dam at the time the current estimates were being considered. I would like to know the present situation with regard to the Holland Dam, and then, I suppose, the Russell Dam as well. I wonder if we could deal with those?

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, I was just going to ask the Minister whether he has anything for the headwaters of the Pine River in his estimates?

MR. HUTTON: For the dam structures? Yes, two earth filled headwater dams. Last summer it was determined that in order to arrive at a decision as to which projects on the Assiniboine we should undertake, we had to carry out a cost-benefit study.

I think that there is a general emotional appeal in the construction of a dam rather than a diversion. You'll recall that the delay in water control on the Assiniboine has been due to the fact that it was suggested that we look at the possibility of water storage on the Assiniboine in the area approximately north of Holland. It was suggested that a dam in this area or a reservoir in this area might be constructed which would take the place of the Portage diversion, and so PFRA were asked to come in and make an investigation to determine whether a dam in fact could be built; whether there were good enough foundations and good enough soil in the area to put up this structure. Now they completed their work last summer and they told us that it was physically possible to build a dam in the area north of Holland, and they told us the price it would likely cost. They gave an estimated cost on it. Then we had to determine which of these projects, the Portage diversion or the Holland Dam we would proceed with. Well I know that some of the members in the House made it plain that they don't like experts or specialists or cost-benefit studies, but still when a government is faced with the responsibility of making a decision between a project that is roughly in the \$10 million class, and one which is roughly in the \$18 million class, you have to have some basis on which to make a decision as to which project you'll proceed with. And so we decided that there should be a cost-benefit analysis made of the two projects, not just the two projects, but also relating them to the proposed reservoir in the upper reaches of the Assiniboine and to the floodway, the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. Now, Mr. Kuiper of the University of Manitoba a man who has had a great deal of experience in hydraulic engineering, a man who has trained in Holland and who knows something about this business and who also had experience with the PFRA and who is considered one of the authorities on this subject I think in Western Canada, was asked to undertake this work and he accepted, and with assistance from other members in the government's service they carried out a cost-benefit study. The results of that study I trust will be made public to the Legislature before we go home at the end of this session, and the decision of the government on the basis of this study will be made public. Now it doesn't matter which we choose, whether we choose to build the Holland Dam or whether we choose to construct a diversion at Portage, there will be of necessity negotiations with Ottawa once again; there will be a necessity to make detailed surveys in the field to determine the nature of the work we're up against, and I suggest that some monies will undoubtedly be expended in pursuing this matter, no matter which project we undertake to do. I know it's all engineering and you talk about preliminary engineering studies and further engineering studies and so forth, but you can do quite a bit of engineering, say, for \$50,000, \$100,000, and depending upon the year and so on, I think that we'll be able to carry out any work that is necessary in getting water control on the Assiniboine underway.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the Minister has no objection to putting on the record the estimated cost of the Holland Dam? The fact that he mentioned the comparisons being between the two figures of approximately \$10 million and approximately \$18 million means, I suppose, that the latter was the estimated cost of the Holland Dam.

MR. HUTTON: Yes, \$17-1/2 million, I believe is the figure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: - passed. 4 - 1 (4) - passed.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, under (4), Agriculture Research, would the Minister make a comment exactly what is being contemplated on in spending \$1 million.

MR. HUTTON: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I haven't the detail with me of the building program, but the greater part of this, I expect at least 90 percent of these monies that are being voted here tonight will be used in the construction of the new animal science building. I think there was sufficient carry-over or sufficient monies to apply against it, and these monies will meet the expenditures in the current year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: B (2) -

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, on (2) I have a matter that I would like to raise, and I'm glad to see that as well as the Minister of Public Works that the Minister of Public Utilities is here too because he may have some of the information in this regard. I'm informed that in connection with the building of the Grand Rapids plant that there has been a contract let to a firm called Drake-Pearson, I believe, for water transportation. If my information is correct, and I must say that it surprises me some if it is correct, then this contract runs for four years beginning in 1960, and if it is correct it indicates that it is a flat rate per ton of freight allowed to this particular firm. Now I would like to get the details from the Minister of Public Utilities. Meantime, I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works if he could give us a report on the road, what state it's in now and what condition, and if it is able to carry traffic not only in the winter but during the summer season?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it the road to Grand Rapids is in reasonably good condition. I'm not able to say what weights will be permitted on it in the spring season but grading has been completed and one portion of gravel has been laid and I believe we have in the estimates for this fiscal year we have now entered, gravelling of the entire road. As far as I know it will carry traffic normally with the exception of spring periods.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that some of this money that's being appropriated under these capital estimates will go to that road, will it? I suppose it will be one of the ones

MR. THOMPSON: for the gravelling of that road.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, the point that I was going to raise with the Minister of Public Utilities was that after the government, quite properly in my opinion, making a special effort to see that this road was constructed in record time, why would it at the same time knowing it was constructing a road, why would it tie itself up to a long time contract for moving the freight -- large quantities of freight by water? Is there some information we could get?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I think there's a very good reason why the contract was let in the manner in which it was. To begin with, the powersite of course has to be completed I believe by 1964; there are very large tonnages to be moved into that site during the early construction stages; particularly large quantities of cement for the grouting project and oil and building materials, supplies of various kinds for the camps and for the initial construction stages of that plant. Now as you will recall, large tonnages had to be moved in last summer and further additional large tonnages next summer. There was no assurance that this road could have been completed in one year and if it hadn't been for the exceptionally fine weather and the wonderful efforts of the Department of Public Works the road never would have been completed. So far as the bridge is concerned it won't be ready until late next summer. There was no assurance that during the first two years of construction that they would be able to move anything at all by highway into that construction site so that in consideration of the problem they had to make arrangements for large quantities during the first few years. Now the kind of equipment that was available on the river, at least on the lakes would certainly not be sufficient to carry the quantities of materials that had to go in there with the result that after investigation they determined that they might better run it over a longer period because the contractors involved were going to have to pay off the special kind of equipment that would be required and in the long run it would work out to the advantage of the Hydro Board to have the longer term contract. It was let out by tender as the members will recall. There were several bids; they took the lowest of the tenders that were available. Incidentally the quantities we're talking about, there was 25,000 tons that had to go in during the first summer; 50,000

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) tons during 1960 — no, I'm sorry, 25,000 tons in 1960; 45,000 tons in '61; 45,000 in '62 and 30,000 in '63. The contract was let to the lowest tender at \$23.10 per ton. Our estimates satisfied us that the total cost of transportation for the job for a combination water transport covering the guaranteed tonnages referred to above and at the tendered unit price together with the haulage of the residual requirements by motor transport over the highway would be less than the cost which would be incurred if we were to supply only our requirements for the first year and part of the second year by water at extremely high unit prices, because of course they have got to write off their capital cost of specialized equipment and so on. They've given a great deal of study to this matter and they've come to the conclusion that this is in the best long run interests of the people of Manitoba to make this commitment over a fairly long period.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I can see the argument quite plainly as far as the first summer is concerned and perhaps even the second one, but I would certainly think that for the third and fourth years when the road is completed and will be presumably in good shape that I would be very doubtful of it applying. Did the Minister say that it is a flat rate per ton? For instance some of the articles that were being transported I understand were cement on the one hand, cement in bags, and another was corrugated iron culverts. Now for instance would those be moved at the same rate per ton?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the flat rate on tonnages was \$23.10 regardless of the commodity. I believe that covers the cost of loading, off loading and putting into storage at the Grand Rapids end of the project.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is the Minister aware, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure he is, that a reputable firm, owner of a fleet of trucks was prepared, in fact I believe he made an offer to haul gasoline and oil in there for less than half that rate?

MR. CARROLL: He may have some difficulty getting across there next summer until the bridge is in. There is one of the real problems that we've got. Spring restrictions, and certainly no assurance at the time that these arrangements were entered into that the road would be ready or that the bridge would be ready, so in the judgment of the board this was the cheapest way to move the kind of quantities that they had to get in there over this period of time. They appear to have given it a great deal of consideration by their experts and I think these people can be considered to be experts in this particular field.

MR. CAMPBELL: I have no doubt of that, Mr. Chairman, except that it does look -- in these things an element of hindsight comes into it I admit -- but now that the road has been completed doesn't it look with firms ready to carry the material at a greatly less cost that the estimates that were made have just not been borne out in fact?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, the criticism I've heard of this particular freighting contract is that the local navigation people around Selkirk weren't given an opportunity to submit tenders. Now I would like to know what length of time was allowed a tenderer to submit a tender and what equipment that individual or corporation had to have in order to comply with the tender? My instructions are that the Drake-Pearson Company at the time they submitted they didn't own any boats up in this part of the country at all; they bought them down east and that there were boats around Selkirk that could have been used or could have been converted, but that the people down there tell me that by reason of the time element that they were precluded from submitting an application in respect of this tender.

MR. CARROLL: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the tenders I expect were called in the usual way. I think there were three companies bidding on this contract. Obviously they managed to get their tenders in on time. I certainly know there was no intention on the part of the board to preclude anyone who had a bonafide tender to submit. This is the first I've heard of anybody being precluded. I don't know whether there's any substance to this or not.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Does the Minister know whether or no the Drake-Pearson Construction Company had bought land in that area for docking facilities before your tenders were published?

MR. CARROLL: I would have no knowledge of that. I would be very interested in having that documented if it is true.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give us a breakdown of this item into two parts; the portion that's going towards highways and related projects as one part of the breakdown and the other matters. And I'd also like to know whether any of the carry-over from previous years is going to be added to this capital for expenditure this year?

MR. THOMPSON: I'm not sure that I'm clear on the first part of your question; the breakdown as to highways and other

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I asked for related projects as one amount, and all other matters as another amount. That is breaking the highways away from the structural buildings and so forth.

MR. THOMPSON: Oh, this is all highways.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Pardon?

MR. THOMPSON: It's all highways. There are no buildings in this figure. (Interjection) Yes, all road capital.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Is there no capital for other public works than roads?

MR. THOMPSON: No.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: No buildings of any nature going up in 1961.

MR. THOMPSON: Not under this estimate. We've already dealt with some buildings as you recall under the first item, Schedule B 1. (1). No there's no buildings under this particular item.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Where do we find the item for buildings?

MR. THOMPSON: We refer to provincial buildings under Schedule B (1) sub-paragraph 1.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, what about the question about the carry-over?

MR. THOMPSON: Would you like that over a period of a year or so? I think I'd better commence at the end of last fiscal year and give the figures. The expenditures in '59-'60 I think should be mentioned. I believe in Hansard of last year I find that I stated the figures over the period since we assumed office in June 30th of '58 but I notice that in the expenditure for '59-'60 I gave a figure slightly different from what it is because the year had not ended at that time and we were estimating. I'll give you the actual expenditure in '59-'60 which was a gross \$31,435,364 less a recovery of \$2,646,307 or a net expenditure of \$28,789,057. I don't know whether you're interested in the cents or not -- so that the carry-over of authorization March 31st, 1960 was \$27.9 million. We voted in the spring session of '60, \$20 million, so that we had an authorization available April 1st, '60 of \$47.9 million. The estimated expenditure for the year just ended, '60-'61 is gross \$29.8 million and recovery \$5.1 million, or a net expenditure of \$24.7, and the estimated authorization then as at April 1st, 1961 was \$23.1 million. We are now asking for a vote of \$18 million, so estimated funds available April 1, 1961 will be \$41.1 million. The monies to be paid out of that are \$30 million and 95 less recovery of \$4 million or \$26 million, which will leave an estimated available authorization for the following year of \$15.1 million. So our net expenditure for the coming year will be \$26 million.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Is that \$26 million for highways only or does that include aids to municipalities and other figures?

MR. THOMPSON: That's for highway construction. This is a highways program.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, last week I asked the Minister regarding the clearing of the highway and if I remember him correctly he said that it was in the contract that they had to clean up along the highway between Gypsumville and Grand Rapids and that the contractor would still have to do it. My question is, now that the contractors have left the job and the road is built except for the gravelling, how is this road going to be tidied up now that they've gone? Are they going to call those contractors back in?

MR. THOMPSON: As I understand it the trimming has been completed. Is that not the way you see it?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not in a position to say it hasn't been. The reports coming from the area say it hasn't been trimmed; I haven't seen the road so I'm not in a position to say. But all reports I hear, say it hasn't been trimmed at all. I can't say from my own knowledge.

MR. THOMPSON: I can only say that according to the information I have the trimming has been completed in accordance with the contracts, the three contracts; but if it has not of course the contractors will have to come back and do it. I should mention that of the \$26 million figure which I quoted which will be the cash expenditure in the new fiscal year, approximately \$4.6 million is a carry-over of monies committed in the fiscal year just ended.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, we had quite a discussion on this question last year but I think it's of such importance that the matter should be raised again this year. I think I've got

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) the figures generally jotted down as the Minister gave them to us, that there was a carry-over from '59-'60 to the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1960 of \$27.9 million, that in 1960 estimates, Capital, we added another \$20 million, giving a total of \$47.9 million. For the fiscal year just ending, there was an expenditure of \$24.7 million giving a carry-over into the now fiscal year of \$23.1. We are now being asked to pass Capital Supply of \$18 million which will then make totals of monies available \$41.1 million. The Minister anticipates or estimates that the construction for 1962, the present fiscal year, will amount to \$26 million, so therefore there would be a carry-over on the basis of these figures into the year 1962-1963 of \$15.1 million. Now I can't understand for the life of me, why it is necessary for us to grant Capital Supply of the amounts of money that we're requested to on this Schedule "B" today for \$18 million, when there's going to be a carry-over into the fiscal year, based on the figures the Minister gave us, into the fiscal year of '62-'63 of some \$15 million. Now just glancing and considering the long term program for the next 20 years of road building in Manitoba, and the Minister has indicated to us that the plan has not been accepted as yet by the government, of some expenditure of \$24 million, if I remember the figure correctly, some \$24 million each year for the next 20 years. It seems to me it's wrong for the department to request \$18 million in Capital Supply this year when \$3 million would give to the department sufficient monies to carry out a \$26 million program which they have for this year. In the fiscal year just ending, which I think was considered as one of the better years that we've had in the last number of years for road construction due to weather conditions, the total expenditure was \$24.7 million. The department prides itself that because of the weather conditions it was able to go ahead with the biggest program of road construction, if I recall the statement correctly, in the history of the province. It prides itself, and justifiably so I think, Mr. Chairman, with the fact of the construction of this 112 mile road into Grand Rapids. But here we are in a year like that that has just ended, apparently the greatest road construction year in the history of the province of \$24.7 million -- yes the net figure, Mr. Minister, the net figure that we're now being asked for Capital Supply which will give us a further carry-over for the fiscal year starting on the 1st of April in 1962 -- for the fiscal year 1962-1963 of \$15.1 million. Now surely Mr. Chairman, this should not be necessary to this degree. I think it would be ample as far as Capital Supply is concerned for the department -- and I appreciate the fact that they should have a cushion -- but if in the greatest year that we've had in the history of the province our total expenditure, less of course, as the Minister mentions, recoveries of \$24.7 million, that this Capital Supply could be considerably less. When one thinks of the long term program that we've had laid before us of \$24 million Capital expenditure on roads over a period of years, the question I'm sure that becomes uppermost in some people's minds at least is the additional costs on top of all this for interest rates and the borrowing of money. Now I don't know, it's my understanding that the department only borrows as they require the money, and in that way cuts down on the interest that they have to pay. And I can appreciate that. But I do suggest, and I suggest this in all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, that it appears to me that it is not necessary for the department to have available votes to the degree of \$41 million for road construction when as I say in the best year that we've had the total expenditures including recoveries was \$24.7 million. And I think that insofar as the Capital Supply Bill before us that instead of \$18 million as is requested by the department, that if the request was say for a figure of say \$3 million or \$5 million, which would give them a total available for the department of \$28 million, that would be sufficient. I can't understand why it is that these huge amounts are continuously being requested by the department when it is obvious in light of road programs that it would be an impossibility to spend this amount of money in the present fiscal year.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I think we discussed this rather fully last year and there was disagreement on these carry-overs. I can only add now that in our opinion it gives continuity to our road planning; it's a continuous process; it enables planning and some commitments into the following year and it doesn't cost anything. It doesn't do any harm or injury to the province. If there's no expenditure it doesn't cost anything for interest because not a nickel of this money is raised until it is put into use, so that no interest is paid on it and there's nothing wrong with it that I can see. It doesn't do any harm; it can only do good. So we have followed this policy.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Utilities

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) if he would be kind enough to furnish the committee with a copy of the tender in respect of the Drake-Pearson contract for hauling to Grand Rapids by water. I would also like him to give us the newspapers in which that tender was published and the date of publication.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I see that under this item there is among other things the matter of including acquisition of rights-of-way and I rise on a rather specific point. As I say it's specific, in some ways some members here might not consider it too important, but I think there is a principle involved here. I must express regret at the manner in which the department has gone about the acquisition of right-of-way and the restriction of access to properties around Lockport. I know that individuals there have had difficulty with the department for two years consecutively now and it appeared this last fall that we were on our way to a rather harmonious settlement and solution. But I have now found, and the individual concerned has allowed me or even asked me to use his name, if necessary, to bring to the attention of this House the fact that the department seems to be using rather big stick methods in acquiring property and restricting access in Lockport. Mr. Frank Weibe owns the concession facilities there and the Department of Public Works has been negotiating with him for the purchase of the front part of his property and they've been holding out a carrot to him saying that if he will accept \$1,500 they will then remove a fence which is restricting access to his property, a fence which, I feel, the department had no business putting there in the first place. And I'll get to that in a moment. Now he has received a letter to the effect that if he will not accept this \$1,500 which is offered to him, then they will not agree to the removal of a portion of this fence which is blocking somewhat access to his property. And, of course, in his business this is a very important thing due to the fact that it's a drive-in with heavy traffic going in and out and it's necessary that access be free and unimpeded. Now, I said just a moment ago that I felt the department really shouldn't have restricted the access in the first place by the erection of this fence. I say that because while on the east approach to the bridge in the last several months they've erected a steel fence, on the west approach to the bridge, the same type of business prevailing, drive-in food concessions, traffic just as heavy if not heavier, completely free access, completely free access, no fence whatsoever. If you approach this from the safety factory, then it seems to me that the department could have been consistent and insisted upon, and in fact, ordered the erection of a fence on both approaches to the bridge. This has not been done. Personally I rise in my place to express regret and, more than that, to protest at the manner in which the department has sloughed off this man's -- well, this man has definitely been put in a disadvantageous position -- chartered buses carrying people, tobogganers and outings and so on can no longer negotiate properly into his property and order food as they have in the past. The payoff is that now he receives a letter saying to him, well, part of this fence will be removed if you accept the \$1,500; if you don't then we'll continue being as tough as we were before. I don't think this is right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I believe I've heard something of this before. I'm sorry that I'm not up-to-date on the situation, but I would suggest that you bring this man in and we'll have a meeting about it with the Right-of-Way Department at the very earliest opportunity.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some explanation on the word "Incidental" -- I'm not too clear on that. Could I have a right to assume that possibly the Minister reconsiders some highways like No. 7 and then it qualifies under the incidental expense?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, without labouring the point too much, I would, if at all possible like to get some explanation from the Minister as to why the department has insisted in the past upon the erection of a fence restricting access to property on the east approach to the bridge and has not made the same demand or has not ordered the same work to be done on the west approach? There must be a reason and probably a logical one. I'd like to know what it is.

MR. THOMPSON: I'm afraid I can't give you that information; I haven't anything on it.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, will any of the equipment be hauled into Grand Rapids by the highway after the ice leaves the Saskatchewan River and before the bridge is constructed?

MR. CARROLL: Will any equipment -- do you mean earth-moving equipment and things like that?

MR. GUTTORMSON: No, no, any of the material required for construction of the powersite.

MR. CARROLL: I think there are some materials moving in by truck. Yes, I believe so.

MR. GUTTORMSON: after the ice leaves the Saskatchewan River.

MR. CARROLL: Oh, I'm afraid I don't know.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will any equipment be hauled in by barge once the Saskatchewan River Bridge is constructed?

MR. CARROLL: Oh, yes. There's a four-year contract for water haulage. We contemplate that there will be water haulage during all of these four years. There might not be. The contract could conceivably be completed before the four years but we expect that it will be progressively, during these four years there will be water haulage into that area.

MR. GUTTORMSON: When is it expected that all the equipment will be in?

MR. CARROLL: Well I suspect that they won't be moving the last of the equipment in until it's required. It will be progressively, as the job advances they will be moving materials on to it.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister going to furnish me with the information I requested regarding the Drake-Pearson contract? Well would you be kind enough to hold this matter in committee until I get

MR. CARROLL: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is not covered under this capital item at all. I think this really doesn't belong in these capital items. I think this question should properly have been raised in my estimates under Public Utilities. I don't think the committee should be held up on account of this particular item here.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, that this is part of the capital money that is being used for that project and this is a proper place to bring it up.

MR. CARROLL: This is not part of the capital that is being used on that job at all. This is capital for the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board which was voted last year. It's certainly not involved in this estimate at all.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, there's nothing in the estimates of the Honourable Minister to cover this particular type of work.

MR. CARROLL: my estimates last week on the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board and ample opportunity at that time for members opposite to have raised this question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule C - passed.

MR. S. ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Public Works about any plans that might be in existence for changing or moving the weigh scale from the location at West Hawk Lake onto the Trans-Canada Highway. At the present time and for the past couple of years it has been necessary for trucks to pull off the highway down through a winding road for a distance of a mile or so to be weighed and to get back onto Trans-Canada Highway. This takes a half an hour or so for truckers to move past this point to be weighed, to be checked by the authorities. Now there's been talk for years about moving the weigh scale onto the highway, and each year I'm told it will be done this year. Is there any plans this year?

MR. THOMPSON: I have no information on that. I'll have to take another look at it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to impress the importance of this because this is a great financial loss to all the truckers particularly those who have to use this daily. It means in every instance a half hour stop plus considerable use of truckage and so forth to move off the highway down onto an old highway through a winding road and quite dangerous when it's icy in order to be weighed by the traffic people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule C (1) - passed.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the committee would like to know that with respect to the University this year monies will cover completion of the airconditioning system to the library, completion of the work to the Student Union Building, first payment on new Pharmacy Building; and addition to the Medical Building, first payment; Education Building, the first payment, that's for the Faculty of Education; certain additions to the old Science Building; first payment on residence units and certain miscellaneous items of equipment related to the Dental Building, Science Building, Isbister Building. They're really clean-up items to finish the work that has been done with respect to them. But the item under sub-paragraph 2 for Brandon College, the amount of money that is anticipated will be required during the fiscal year for capital expenditures under the arrangement which the Province of Manitoba has with Brandon College.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) - passed. (2) - passed. (3) - passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister of Education could indicate a breakdown between hospitals and homes for the aged on this item?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): You said Minister of Education.

MR. PAULLEY: Did I? Oh, I'm sorry I mean the Minister of Health and Welfare.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): This is the annual vote as the House knows. Every year the Federal Government allows or gives us somewhere in the neighbourhood of -- last year I think the total was \$900,000 -- we had a carry-over, as I recall, of around four -- it came to one million two and we match dollar for dollar in hospital construction grants with whatever allotment the federal people allow. We are pretty well committed by the end of this fiscal year to \$1,270,000. This included grants to the Manitoba School male unit that's been going on this year, as you know; the completion of the female infirmary at Portage. These are for our own use, Erickson Hospital, Rivers, certain renovations at the Psychopathic Hospital, the older portion; Misericordia, St. Boniface, Winnipeg General tunnel, Reston, Children's nurses residence, Arborg, Glenboro, Winnipeg General, heating plant Misericordia, x-ray; physiotherapy unit at Assiniboine Hospital, Ninette renovation to create some of the pavilions into full-time wards; Morris Hospital, Child Guidance Clinic; grant to the electro-cardiograph unit at the General, another at Portage. This was another small grant. The figures I just mentioned totalled around half a million and grants that will be used up by the end of March '61 -- that is, last year's vote -- the Dauphin, Brandon, Stonewall, Winnipeg General, Baldur, the Rehab Hospital and the West Kildonan Health Unit where we were able to secure federal grants and match them towards the creation of a health unit -- a portion of the school board, they wanted to get in on the central health unit facility. This totals around one million, two. In the coming year, the money we're passing this year, matched federally will be carried forward for projects which were largely approved, as you recall, before the survey went into operation, and includes further grants to Brandon, Dauphin, Portage, Selkirk, Grace. There has not been a wind-up to construction that was completed some time ago. There's a little problem there in getting the final architectural report. Hamiota, McCreary, Altona, we anticipate these grants in the coming year which will pretty well use up the federal allotment. Now the accountant to the department, the closest he could estimate this year in passing this vote was with the slight carry-over he has, plus the \$1.1 million that we will pass here, he will have sufficient monies in the coming year. Now of course we have a little report called the Willard Report which we'll have to study and see what the impact of this is in the future requirements.

The other portion of this report is made up of the vote for the Homes for the Aged where as the House may recall last year we had a vote here and we have quite a carry-over this year. I have here our latest monthly report where each month we have asked our Director of Housing to report on the number of contacts he's had during the month, visits he's paid, projects in operation, etcetera and we felt that for the coming year we probably had enough money in the vote to carry us in this coming year, but of course if we do require more, if some of our projects go ahead a little more rapidly than we anticipate at the moment, we will of course have to go up to this because it's in the statute as you know. But in the new beds for 1960 in my last report at the end of February are 203; the projects that are under construction at this time are Swan River, East Kildonan, Elmwood. Swan River is a hostel of 57 beds; East Kildonan - 24 housing units; 24 in Elmwood; 15 at Morden, for a total of 120. The grants released in the month of January or February of this year was \$20,000. We also have analyzed the number of beds, hostel type of beds in Metro and rural Manitoba and have tried to assess our needs and we find that this has possibly gone a little slower than anticipated. We were trying to anticipate the Willard Report and what role hostels would have in the future at the same time. We see a very great deal of restlessness in this area across the province where both municipal people, people at the local level are becoming extremely enthusiastic and concerned re the development of housing. We find that we have to go out and spend considerable time; we had the consultant services of an architect in the past year to assist us in designing the type of hostels, one-for-one components; hostels with small infirmaries; housing units alone. We feel that the entire success of these programs depends on the amount of community support and understanding that we can initiate at the local level. This type of accommodation is only successful if you have the support and enthusiasm of the local community and they're the ones that can

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.) make these places live. Otherwise we're just creating rooms for people and we're not carrying forward a program, so although I may be accused of being a little slow here I feel that we are now on solid ground in that we have our plans; we have information for people; we're ready to move at a moments notice. It's interesting that in the month of February and January 16 sponsors called us out; this month 23. By correspondence we're in touch with seven; we're at the talking stage with nine; we've had five group meetings in one month here; we're awaiting sponsors decisions in 18; where we have our initial discussions with the sponsors in an area we try to get municipalities to group together for this type of accommodation where the sponsors are asking a lot of questions and where we want the sponsor to come and tell us who is behind this in concrete terms. We have preliminary plans okayed for another four; four as we mentioned are under construction, and this is the story here. So in the coming year I have about \$350,000 to \$400,000 excess vote over the past two years which should -- (Interjection) -- Yes it's about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule C.

MR. PAULLEY: One more question. The Minister may not have it. He has this carry-over of between \$300,000 and \$400,000 as I understand it insofar as Homes for the Aged is concerned. On this vote of \$1,152,000 is there any proportion at all for the aged? Are you just going to carry on with the carry-over for the time being. Is that it?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): It could be, Mr. Chairman, this is a combined vote as you know. However my suspicions are, hospitals will probably take most of this and the department felt that we have enough money in the carry-over in the Elderly Persons Housing to carry

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule C - passed. Schedule D - passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, that completes the Capital Estimates and I suppose the committee would be willing to rise now and we could have a second reading of the resolutions referred from the committee and concurrent the next time government business comes up or thereabouts, so I give notice of that, and if it's agreeable suggest the committee now rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock, Tuesday afternoon.