



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



I N D E X

Tuesday, July 14, 1959

	Page
<u>Proposed Resolution</u> , re Fire Prevention Act: Mr. Thompson, Mr. Paulley .....	893
Mr. Thompson .....	894
Mr. Campbell, Mr. Paulley .....	895
Mr. Campbell, Mr. Shoemaker, Mr. Thompson .....	896
<u>Proposed Resolution</u> , re Child Welfare, Mr. Johnson (Gimli) .....	897
<u>Questions</u> : Mr. Gray (Mr. Johnson, Gimli) .....	897
Mr. Orlikow (Mr. Johnson), Mr. Shoemaker (Mr. Thompson) .....	898
Mr. Campbell (Mr. Thompson), Mr. Guttormson (Mr. Willis) .....	899
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re Motor Vehicles (Mr. Paulley) amendment (Mr. McKellar) amendment to amendment (Mr. Hillhouse): Mr. Strickland .....	899
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re Farm Implement Tax (Mr. Ridley) amendment (Mr. Roberts), further amendment (Mr. Molgat): Ruling by Mr. Speaker .....	900
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re Minimum Wage (Mr. Harris), amendment (Mr. Groves), amend- ment to amendment (Mr. Wright): Mr. Reid .....	901
Mr. Paulley .....	902
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re School Construction Costs (Mr. Miller): Mr. McLean .....	903
Mr. Prefontaine .....	905
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re Deficiency Payments (Mr. Schreyer): Mr. Alexander .....	906

Second Reading of Bills

<u>Bill 77</u> , re Guaranty and Western Trust Cos. (Mr. Scarth) .....	909
<u>Bill 61</u> , re S. D. of St. James (Mr. Stanes) .....	910
<u>Bill 62</u> , re St. James Charter (Mr. Stanes) .....	910

Committee of Whole House, Supply

<u>Mines and Natural Resources</u> : Answers to Questions, Mr. Evans .....	910
Discussion of Minister's Statement .....	911
Field Surveys .....	920
Mines Branch: Statement, Mr. Evans .....	920
Discussion and Questions .....	924
Forestry Branch: Statement, Mr. Evans .....	938
Discussion and Questions .....	939

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, July 14th, 1959.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.  
Reading and Receiving Petitions.  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.  
Notice of Motion.  
Introduction of Bills.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

HON. JOHN THOMPSON (Minister of Labour) (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Resolutions standing on the Order Paper.

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

MR. THOMPSON: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1 - Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Fire Prevention Act by providing, among other matters,

(a) for the appointment of more than one Deputy Fire Commissioner;

(b) for an increase, from \$1.00 to \$3.00, of the fee paid to the Assistant Fire Commissioner for each report made by him; and

(c) for an increase in the maximum amount annually levied on fire insurance companies for the Fire Prevention Fund, from one-third of one per centum of premium receipts to one per centum thereof.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, it has been government policy to obtain revenue from the fire insurance companies to cover the activities of the fire commissioner's office of this province. We find that the revenue available under the present percentage collected from the fire insurance companies is insufficient to meet the activities of our fire commissioner. Therefore, it is found necessary to increase the rate of recovery which is based on the annual premiums collected by fire insurance companies in this province. We find it necessary to increase the rate from one-third of one percent to one percent. This purely sets a ceiling of one percent. It is not intended that this one percent will be collected this year or next but it gives the fire commissioner an opportunity to budget according to his need and to have available sufficient funds to meet that need.

Another part of the proposed legislation deals with the fee for fire inspections throughout the province. In many of the centres of Manitoba - in some of our towns and villages and other centres - the local secretary-treasurer or constable or fire chief is called upon to investigate a fire and make a report to the fire commissioner. It is felt that the increase proposed brings his compensation within reason.

MR. CHAIRMAN: .....

MR. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word or two in connection with this. Of course, any increase in the amounts which the insuring companies have to submit to the government for this particular fund, I presume eventually will find its way into the assessment on the people who take out fire insurances. From observations in the past, it appears to me that not too great expenditures have been made from this particular fund for fire prevention in the province. I'd like to know of the Minister what amounts are in the fund at the present time and what amounts have been paid out of this portion of the fund directly for fire prevention.

It seems to me that for some considerable period of time that in this section of the Departments of Labour, there has not been adequate staff to cover inspections throughout the province of fires which have occurred. And also, it appears to me, from reading the brief

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . report of the Fire Prevention Branches which is attached or part of the annual report of the Department of Labour, that there hasn't been sufficient staff to even make a half reasonable inspection in respect to fire prevention itself. And I'd like the Minister to elaborate on his statement. We can appreciate what the resolution intends to do insofar as the finances are concerned but I'd like to hear from the Minister the state of this particular fund at the present time; and what actually the government apart from being able to increase the fees in respect of the reports of the fire commissioner; and also for the appointment of one more - or more than one deputy fire commissioner. I don't think that's going far enough. I think it's a tragedy that each year, particularly in the winter months, we hear of, it seems to me, an increasing number of deaths as a result of fire which may or may not have been prevented had we had a fully efficient fire prevention bureau. And I mean by that, Mr. Speaker, no criticism at all of the fire commissioner and his staff at present because I do know that in the past they have been really overworked and have done a good job with the facilities with which they've had to work. But I would like to hear from the Minister a little bit more on this very important subject.

Now the Minister in the introduction of this resolution said, if I recall his words correctly, that this is an increase which will permit them to go up to one percent. He said he didn't know if or when this would be done. I would suggest to the Honourable the Minister that he be a little more specific, because if the department has not got plans for increasing the services under the Department of Fire Prevention, then I would suggest that there is no necessity for the increase or this legislation - proposed legislation - for an increase. And surely my friend the Minister of Labour must have something in the back of his mind as to why he's requesting this increase in the percentage of the premiums on fire insurance. And I'm sure the House would be most interested to hear from the Minister the two points that I raise, namely, the state of the fund at the present time and the amount which has been extended from it. And what plans actually has the government which warrant the increase of the levy on premiums contained in this resolution?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party, I would like to point out that the fire commissioner has a total staff, including himself, of seven at the present time. A month ago he had a total staff of five. We have doubled the number of assistant fire commissioners in the past month. In other words, we have increased the number of two assistant fire commissioners to four. We have two new assistant fire commissioners and they, of course, will help us to carry out the activities of the Department.

Now the work of this branch is simply to inspect all public buildings for fire hazards; to investigate suspicious fires; and to investigate fires where lives are lost; and any other fires of significance. They also conduct a travelling unit which visits municipalities throughout Manitoba and in co-operation with local officials and local fire departments demonstrates types of equipment suitable for various communities and demonstrates various activities in fire fighting. It also trains local firemen. Now these are some of the activities and, as I say, we have increased the staff of the Department.

My honourable friend referred to the loss of lives which, of course, is utmost in our thoughts and a very tragic situation, but I might point out that although we're not satisfied that we have achieved the ultimate goal, I might point out that there were less lives lost in '58 than in '57; 22 persons lost their lives in Manitoba in 17 fires in '58, and 60 were injured. And in '57 29 fatalities occurred in 20 fires. There has been a reduction in loss of life. But, of course, I quite admit that the desired objective has not been achieved in this respect. I think, Mr. Chairman, the reason that we ask for this increased revenue is that we have increased already the staff of the department and that we are considering further increases in the staff.

We cannot say definitely whether we will use the full one percent of the levy or three-quarters of one percent. The levy at the present time has a ceiling of one-third of one percent. A few years ago the ceiling was one-half of one percent and it was reduced again to one-third, and now we are setting it back to the full ceiling of one percent. We are not in a position to say at the moment how much further we shall expand our department in the fire commissioner's office, but we have under consideration further additions to the staff than those which we have already made.

Respecting the amount in the fund at the present time, I regret that at this stage of the

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.) . . . . Bill I have not that information with me or the amounts paid out which were asked by the honourable member but I shall certainly be glad to provide those figures on the second reading of the Bill.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, any increase in taxation such as this where authority is taken to triple a tax in both cases is something that is of considerable importance. And certainly the question of fire prevention is important too. But I'm afraid I don't share the opinion of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party nor of the Minister when they agree that there should be a great increase in this particular service. I think that the checking of buildings, particularly public buildings, to see that the necessary fire precautions are taken, incorporated in building plans, things of that kind, is a proper function of the government. But when it comes to expanding to the distance that my honourable friend the Leader of the CCF Party proposes so that they are going to do the fire prevention work of the province as well, I think that's something that is much better left to the insurance companies themselves. They have capable people who work at this. I'm not suggesting that the ones in the Department are not capable, but I think their activities should be restricted to the inspection of the public buildings and the elimination of fire hazards or anything else that offends the Code. But to attempt to go further than that, I think is just a duplication of something that the companies both individually and collectively are doing now and can do better than the government can do it.

It would be a duplication and that kind of duplication that causes increased taxes such as we see suggested in this resolution. Because from \$1.00 to \$3.00 is a 200% increase, from one-third of 1% to 1%. I recognize what my honourable friend says, that they don't know that it will use it all, that it will all be required at the present time but departments have a way of using up the money that's allocated to them. And I would expect that what he said in conclusion that they intend to still further increase the staff, is what will happen.

Now, I have no objection whatever to the people who pay the premiums for fire insurance carrying this service. I think they're the ones who should carry it rather than the general taxpayer. It's pretty much the same people as a matter of fact. But I certainly do have an objection if the government decides to continue to raise the fees by 200% increases at a time to expand their work to where they're duplicating what the companies are already doing, and doing very, very well. Because it's certainly to the companies' interest themselves to do a good job of fire prevention and fire prevention is, when all is said and done, the real thing that we want to encourage. Because if fire prevention is well done, then this tragic loss of life that both the honourable gentlemen have spoken of will be reduced to a minimum. So I would counsel my honourable friend to not take the advice of my other honourable friend regarding more and more increases in the staff, and still larger assessments on the premium payers. Because undoubtedly they're the folks who carry this cost.

MR. PAULLEY: Once again, Mr. Chairman, I'm very glad to be able to differ with my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition. It seems to me that on all matters of this nature the foremost consideration in the mind of my honourable friend seems to be saving a dollar. We are most concerned with the saving of lives. I agree with my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, that insofar as the year 1958 over 1957 did show a small reduction in the loss of life as the result of fire. But I think that he would agree with me that in many respects the loss of life by fire has been due to chance or luck, because there is nothing to prevent in this current year an increase over last year. It's one of those things that just happens.

I appreciate the remarks of my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, in the job that the insurance companies are doing themselves, and of course we expect it of them. It is their job. But I suggest that rather than them doing the job, that it is the responsibility of government as well, because it isn't everyone who is covered by fire insurance. And why all the -- particularly in our larger built up areas the fire insurance companies are doing a tremendous job. I think the government can do a job in the sparsely settled parts of Manitoba. And I think it is generally in that field that we haven't had the fire protection, or fire prevention services which the government can offer under situations like this. We have seen in the report on the Indian and Metis references to very poor housing conditions where in some communities there seems to be a concentration of abodes or small shacks, and I would suggest that in those particular areas the insurance companies as such are not particularly interested

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . because of the fact that chances are that they are not covered by insurance. I suggest that under the Department of Labour and its fire prevention branches, that that is a good field.

I suggest too, Mr. Chairman, that that is a sphere in which previously, due to the lack of staff and finances, that the fire department of the Department of Labour have not been able to do a thorough job. And I suggest that as a field with which I hope the new Minister of Labour being granted additional funds will be able to have the staff to go into these areas. It is true that in co-operation with the municipalities, our public buildings are inspected periodically. But I would suggest that notwithstanding that, there is still room for more inspection of these buildings. And I disagree most heartily in this with my friend, and say once again that in this there may be relatively small amount in the overall picture of governmental expenditures, that there's a job yet to be done, and that the government, headed by my honourable friend, did not do the job that could be done in this important field of fire prevention.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend says that I seem to be always wanting to save a dollar. Then he immediately steps out from there to say that he and his group are interested in saving lives. Well, it would be just as logical and no more ridiculous for me to suggest that he is interested in duplicating service. Now, I'm sure he isn't interested in duplicating service. I don't think he realizes the duplication of services that he's advocating a lot of the time. But I can tell him that we're just as interested in this group in saving lives as he and his friends are. What I don't like to see is duplication of service. And this job that he's advocating is being done anyway, being well done by people who are qualified, who have a financial stake in it. And incidentally, the advertising that they do and the promotional work they do for fire prevention, applies to the people who don't have insurance just as the ones who have insurance. It's true that their inspections of buildings are for those who have insurance, but the general advertising that they do in promotional work affects people who haven't insurance just as well. And I always regret, I'm not averse to saving a dollar, that's true, but I hate to see duplication of effort that results in wasting a dollar, or in this case, many thousands of dollars.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Is it a fact that the fire prevention fund takes care of inspections of public buildings only? Now, my experience in the insurance business is this, that these fire insurance companies will make a very thorough investigation of the physical risk but don't seem to be too much concerned about the saving of lives. Now, I can't recall in my 20 years of experience of any inspector coming to Neepawa to inspect any risks that we had written, and if they did they certainly didn't come to see me. I'm wondering if a town can make a request of the department to have all buildings inspected in the town, that is all business buildings where the public go in and out of. If a town can make a request of the department and have an inspection made, I'm interested too, as the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party is, in what one-third of the premium produces.

It seems to me that the insurance industry is one that has enjoyed a very buoyant economy over the years and surely the premium dollars have been mounting very rapidly. And that alone should produce quite an increase in the amount that would be contributed by the insurance companies to this fund. And I'm wondering what the insurance companies, how they feel about a 300% increase in the fees that they might be expected to pay.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, in respect of the comments of the honourable gentlemen, in connection with the remarks of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, according to my information we inspect only public buildings. We inspect all public buildings where people gather, children, adults and everyone. That is one of our major activities, one of our major concerns. I'm not sure that we should expand the operation to cover inspection of all private buildings, but we can take that matter into consideration. I think probably the suggestion from the Honourable Member for Gladstone that we do so would differ very much from the comments made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition who feels that we should restrict our activities and not expand them.

In reply to the Leader of the Opposition I would like to make this statement. That this collection - this percentage collection on premiums - this fee, or as he chooses to call it - a tax, is a very small item in the operations of fire insurance companies. Now, what are the large items in their operation? The operations which they conduct increase in cost mainly

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.) . . . through fire losses. That is where the premium rises to the individual insured person. This is an insignificant matter compared to the possible increase in premiums to all the insured people of the province through losses. And we experienced last year in Manitoba a total loss in fire of \$3,782,329.00. That is the expenditure which raises premiums to insured people. It's not this insignificant item of 1% or three-quarters of 1% on the total premium collected by fire insurance companies. Our policy in this regard is simply this, that an ounce of prevention will save dollars to all the insured people and the insurance companies. And that is the policy on which we intend to operate and on which we have expanded the activities of the department and will consider further expansion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted? Passed. Resolution No. 2. Resolved it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Child Welfare Act by providing, among other matters, for the payment of certain maintenance costs for certain neglected children.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON, M.D. (Minister of Health and Public Welfare)(Gimli): Mr. Chairman, this resolution - this Bill is related to the policies of the Social Allowances Act and provides for the expenditure of funds by the province on all children committed by the juvenile courts to the care of the Director or the Children's Aid Societies. It amends those sections of The Child Welfare Act which provided that when a judge commits a child to the care of the Children's Aid Society, he shall make an order against the municipality where the child is a legal resident. The amendment is that the judge shall make an order against the province rather than the municipality. And related to this amendment is a further amendment that the amount of the order shall be set, not by the rates establishment committee as at the present Act on which there was municipal representation and representatives of the Society, but now by the Public Welfare Advisory Committee. And that is really the content of this resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted? Passed. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from 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. Thompson introduced for first reading Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Fire Prevention Act.

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

Mr. Johnson (Gimli) introduced for first reading Bill No. 23, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. M.A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Public Welfare. There are districts in Canada who have serious polio epidemics. May I ask the Minister to give -- assure the public that the situation in Manitoba is not as bad. I also would like to find out whether we have sufficient vaccine, and thirdly, whether the parents are urged to make use of it, particularly during this time where many cities of United States and Canada are worrying very much about the polio epidemics.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member was good enough to give me notice of his question today and I just wish to bring the House up to date and to answer these questions. Only two cases of polio have been reported to the Department in '59. The first case being an Indian boy, 1 1/2 years of age, from Gillam in January, and the second case an Indian boy, aged 22 months, from Fort Alexander Indian Reserve reported early in July.

Now, we receive a weekly report from the Department of National Health and Welfare from the Chief Epidemiologist of Canada, giving a break-down by province, and the latest returns for Canada for the week ending July 4th show the total cases to date as 35. Of these, six had occurred in Newfoundland, seven in Quebec, four in Ontario, one in Saskatchewan, four in Alberta, one in British Columbia and ten in Northwest Territories. During the week ending June 27th, only two cases had been reported in Canada, one from Saskatchewan and one from Alberta. And during the week ending July 4th, six cases reported, all of these being from

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . . Newfoundland. It is therefore not evident according to the reports thus far received that polio is reaching epidemic proportions anywhere in Canada.

The polio vaccine program in Manitoba may be summarized briefly as follows: The free vaccine program was commenced in 1955 when the vaccine first became available, but because it was in short supply, it was limited that year to school children in the first three grades. As further supplies became available, the program was extended by stages to cover all children from six months of age to those in Grade XII high school. It is estimated that under this program approximately 260,000 children in this age group had received those three doses by the end of 1958. Because Manitoba is considered an endemic area in Canada for this disease, and because the necessary supplies of vaccine were available, the government announced in July last year that the distribution of free vaccine would be extended to the adult population up to the age of 40. A further extension of the program was announced in February of '59, to give a booster dose to all school children who had completed their three doses of vaccine by June of '57. Now, since last July when the program was expanded, the department has distributed over 800,000 doses of vaccine. The monthly distribution has been: January 16,000; February 20,000; March 83,000; April 140,000; May 98,000; June 61,000; July 13,000, this year. We do not have accurate figures as to the numbers of adults in the age group of 18 to 40 who have completed their whole immunization program. It is estimated that there are approximately 275,000 people in the province in this age group. We would estimate that approximately 50% have had the required three doses.

We are doing everything we can through public health immunization educational programs and through our schools to inform the public concerning the advisability of the vaccine. As for the prediction of the proportions of what such an illness - as to what may occur, I think this is something that one can never foretell. Our best guard against the possibility of an epidemic is a vigorous vaccine program such as we have -- as you see, we have managed to get carried in the past year and before that as the vaccine was available. I might say that the director of our provincial virus laboratory has done some very original work in titrations of blood to find out the level of polio antibodies in the blood and has this past month published a paper in the Canadian Medical Journal showing the very definite value of the vaccine as a preventative agent.

MR. GRAY: A . . . . . question, is there any law which can compel at least for the children to take the vaccine?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): No.

MR. GRAY: No compulsion, eh?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): No law that I know of, Sir. Certain people do refuse diphtheria or polio vaccine but they are very few and far between.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): A supplementary question to the Minister on this question. I didn't ask him about this in advance, I only got this this afternoon - but Friday's issue of the New York Times carries a story about the use of live virus and I just quote one sentence from it - "Dr. Albert Sabin of Cincinnati told Congress that the cost per dosage of his vaccine administered by mouth instead of by injection would be approximately one-hundredth that of Salk Vaccine". The Sabin vaccine would cost just pennies a dose, only one dose is required to immunize as compared to four doses for the Salk vaccine. I wonder is the government looking into the possibility of using this?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Yes, I read the article the honourable member mentions. I haven't seen it given officially in the journals. Our Deputy Minister who attended the Dominion Council of Health meeting in April had not received information on this, and that is really all we know at this time.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I have been advised that an inspector has recently gone out to Austin to inspect these 15 steam threshing engines there and as a result of that inspection has condemned each and every one of them and this has caused grave concern to the directors because they feel that they will not be able to hold their annual threshermen's reunion. I wonder if the Honourable the Minister is prepared to give his statement on that?

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with the event which is taking place at the Austin museum, I believe starting tomorrow. I have asked the Chief Inspector of the



(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.) . . . mechanical and engineering division, Mr. DelBegio, possibly ten days or two weeks ago to arrange the necessary inspection and he did send an inspector to Austin. The report I have received was that certain engines were approved which I understand were not part of the museum itself. I think possibly four engines were approved. The Department itself takes the attitude that these engines are hazardous and that their age possibly brings a possibility that they might be unsafe. I have asked - I was talking to the inspector of this division of the mechanical and engineering division just two hours ago and asked him still to make a further check and see if at least some of the machines cannot be approved. And that I trust will be done.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Minister if it is a fact that the steam engines belonging to the museum itself as differentiated to those that belong to private individuals, if it is a fact that they were not tested at all?

MR. THOMPSON: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, four of the engines belonging to the museum were tested, were checked by the inspector of the Labour Department but he has given no certification of approval to them at the moment.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, my question was though, were the other engines apart from those belonging to the private individuals, were they not tested at all? Was there no test made on them?

MR. THOMPSON: According to the information I have received the others were not tested, they were considered incapable of performance because of their age and their structure according to the Department.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, has the Minister of Public Works any statement to make regarding the logs in the Fairford River?

HON. ERRICK F. WILLIS, Q.C. (Minister of Agriculture and Immigration) (Turtle Mountain): Our inspector went and examined the logs in the Fairford River and made a report to us. His report was that in his opinion the level would probably be lowered one tenth of one foot by taking out the logs. We have asked him to take out the logs to see what happens and the instructions have gone forward.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The logs will be taken out immediately then?

MR. WILLIS: They will.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate . . . . .

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Speaker, pardon me. Before the Orders of the Day are reached I beg leave to lay on the table of the House, Return to an Order of the House No. 4 on the motion of the Member from Elmwood.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk in further amendment to the amendment as follows: "By striking out the first paragraph thereof and substituting therefore the following: 'whereas the number of insured persons have been continuously increasing with a relative decrease in the number of claims made against and put out by the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.' (b) By deleting the last paragraph to the amendment and subjecting therefore the following: 'Further be it resolved that the government after due study give consideration to the advisability of increasing the maximum amount payable out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and of increasing the minimum requirements under Section 140, subsection (4), of The Highway Traffic Act provided in the opinion of the government such increases are deemed advisable and in the interest of justice and humanity'." The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. B. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, as I can see very little principal difference in the meeting between the amendment and amendment to the amendment, because I think there is no doubt from the standpoint of justice and humanity, consideration should be given. And I believe it has been and is being given to raising the present maximum limits payable from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund from the \$10,000.00, \$20,000.00 levels. It seems logical also that the present minimum statutory insurance limits should be raised by a like amount and at the same time. We might consider the ideal limits of as high as \$50,000.00 and \$100,000.00 but nevertheless, I don't think that we should recommend that at the present time. I think if these limits were doubled or possibly raised to a \$25,000.00 - \$50,000.00 limit I believe it

(Mr. Strickland, cont'd.) . . . would be more in keeping and more liable to have reciprocal agreements maintained between our neighbouring provinces. I think we've been a long time and I believe Manitoba was the leader in getting these reciprocal agreements; and also in having the Fund raised from the \$5,000.00 - \$10,000.00 level to the \$10,000.00 - \$20,000.00 that we have at the present time. I think it is very necessary from the standpoint of individuals travelling in our province that we maintain our reciprocal agreements. We also have a ceiling at the present time on our Unsatisfied Judgment Fund of \$300,000.00 and I would think that prior to raising these limits that we should increase this fund level to at least \$500,000.00. Now to do that it would possibly be necessary to raise our levy which we pay each year on our license fees from the 50¢ to the \$1.00. I think the people of Manitoba who were previously canvassed when it was decided to raise the limit from the \$5,000.00 - \$10,000.00 to the \$10,000.00 - \$20,000.00 were overwhelmingly in favour of the increase, and I think that today they would also favour raising this limit from the \$10,000.00 - \$20,000.00. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I favour the amendment to the amendment as made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Pembina, and proposed motion and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and further amendment thereto. I might say that on July 10th, 1959, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, Mr. Molgat, has moved a sub-amendment which reads as follows: "That the resolution as amended be further amended by deleting all but the first paragraph thereof, and substituting the following: 'Whereas where such farm implements have in the past been made subject to excise and sales tax when they were used for some secondary purposes, snow blowing of municipal roads in the municipality in which the import farmer resides, therefore be it resolved that this government ask the Government of Canada to make such changes in the laws as are necessary and essential to exempt from the imposition of any subsequent duty or tax any farm implement or tractor, including any or all equipment or accessories, hydraulic or otherwise imported as aforesaid, and subsequently but temporarily used by any farmer of Manitoba for some secondary municipal purpose in the municipality in which he resides'." I might say that the Honourable Member in his sub-amendment assumes that the amendment to the main motion has already been agreed to by the House for he refers in his sub-amendment to the main motion leaving out all of the words of the proposed amendment. May I refer the honourable member to Sir T. Erskine May's "Parliamentary Practice", 16th edition, page 426, which reads as follows: "An amendment to a proposed amendment cannot be moved if it is proposed to leave out all the words of the proposed amendment." In such a case the first amendment must be negatived before the second can be offered. Beauchesne also specifies on this point, Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules from 4th Edition, 1958, Citation 205, reads as follows: "It is the practice in the United Kingdom House of Commons that an amendment to proposed amendment called a sub-amendment in Canada, cannot be moved if it proposes to leave out all the words of the proposed amendment. In such case the first amendment must be negatived." This rule is now accepted in Canada.

In the wake of these two authorities I must rule that the amendment to the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is out of order. I might also add that the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is in fact so similar to the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Morris, Mr. Shewman, and decided by the House on June 30th, 1959, that in my opinion, this is a question already decided by the House. Our rule No. 59 provides that no motion, the subject matter of which has been decided by the House, shall be made during the same session. The motion is out of order.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to challenge your adjournment, but just to make a comment on this . . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: You may not debate the rule of the Speaker, you may make a motion to

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.) . . . challenge the ruling of the Speaker -- (Interjection) -- Call in the members.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm not challenging it.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, you're not challenging. The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye an amendment hereto and as further amended, that the motion be amended by striking out all of the words after the words: "Government of Canada" where it appears in the second line of the second paragraph thereof, and substitute the following: "To make such changes in the laws as are necessary and essential to entirely exempt from any duty or tax any farm implement or tractor including any or all equipment, accessory, hydraulic or others, purchased and used for agricultural purposes." Are you ready for the question?

Mr. Speaker after a voice vote declared the motion defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House now is the proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Pembina: "Whereas farm implements coming in from United States are exempt from excise and sales tax for farm operations in the Province of Manitoba; therefore be it resolved that this government ask the Government of Canada to make necessary provisions in order that farm implements coming in from the United States to the Province of Manitoba be exempt from excise and sales tax when used for clearing snow from the roads when used within the municipality where the farmer resides." Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: I move that the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks - I don't know if I have this right here, I'd better have a look at it. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. A.J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment to the amendment of the resolution on minimum wages, I think the Honourable Member for St. James favours price control, because he mentions regardless of how much you earn it is what price you have to pay for commodities that should be considered, which is true. But we have no jurisdiction in this Legislature to advocate price control but we can recommend to the Minimum Wage Board when it reconvenes. It is an independent body appointed by this government. In their wisdom they may, however, review the wage scale and not recommend an increase.

It is the intent of this amendment to the amendment that the minimum wage scale be definitely increased, and I believe we are justified in proposing same at this time to protect employees in that category from unscrupulous employers. I've heard of employers who regularly change staff to take advantage of our minimum wages. Other firms place their employees on weekly basis work in excess of agreed hours at no extra pay to get around minimum wage. I've heard of a case where the City Welfare Department was enquiring about a firm employing one of their residents who had applied for welfare to eke out a bare existence for his family because he couldn't make ends meet on minimum wages. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure if these firms paid a decent living wage, they would gain in efficiency and in production, because it would be of no advantage to them to change staff to maintain low production costs and high profit basis. This could be accomplished through efficiency and goodwill of employees which is not at the present time, as many of these firms are unorganized and cause the greatest headaches to the Labour Department when employees desire to organize.

I thought I would present this minimum wage question from a different angle so I checked through Welfare Department as to the cost of minimum maintenance or existence for a married couple with one child, and this is quoting from the City of Winnipeg records, Mr. Speaker. "A married couple, with one child, the minimum allowance for food, light, water, rent and fuel and clothing comes to the amount of \$130.06 a month." In Kildonan where I believe our scale is not as high, it comes to \$106.08, but we have a recommended schedule for \$130.68, that's a married couple with one child. Now I will just give you another item, married couple with three children - the City of Winnipeg schedule - \$169.63; Kildonan - \$129.81, and a proposed change is \$156.66. Now, Mr. Speaker, these same men, regardless of whether they are married or single, or amount of family they have, in Manitoba have a minimum wage scale for

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.) . . . . 40 hours a week would receive \$96.00 per month. Now this, compared with the minimum welfare scale, is not even equitable. Here our own local government sets this scale as to what the minimum existence should be, realizing this as a minimum standard of living. Yet, when it comes to minimum wages there seems to be a misconception as to what a living wage scale should be.

The Manitoba Federation of Labour, Mr. Speaker, presented a brief to this government last fall and here is what they recommended: "We recommend that the minimum wage rate for all workers be \$1.25 per hour; the present rate in Manitoba, as you know, is 60¢ for male and 58¢ for female." And then it goes on to say that the situation regarding wages for unskilled labour in Manitoba - "The average rate per hour, according to a survey of the economics and research branch of the Federal Department of Labour, 1956, see page 27, Labour Gazette, July, 1957, is \$1.35 per hour." This is a rate more than double that of our highest minimum wage. Now, and we emphasize this, that Canada average for labourers in manufacturing, according to the same source for 1957, is \$1.55 per hour. So, Mr. Speaker, whether we favour price control or increase in minimum wages, we all know personally that present scales should be reviewed and raised to cope with the cost of present day living. Many of the honourable members are aware of the hardship minimum wage scale causes the citizens in that category. So here, Sir, is an opportunity for all of us to work for the people of Manitoba. Let us take a forward look and a forward step, not a backward one, in implementing a new minimum wage scale. Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would just like to say a brief word or two in connection with this amendment to the amendment. I think it is obvious the reason the amendment to the amendment was moved was because in our opinion there was no directive in respect of the amendment to the main motion. But my main purpose in rising at this time, Mr. Speaker, is to say a word or two in connection with the point which was raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk the other day in this debate. I am sorry that the honourable gentleman is not in his seat at the present time. But if members of the House will recall, the honourable member raised the question of this being a motion of non-confidence in the Minister in accordance with the Fair Wage Act, both in respect of this amendment to the amendment and the amendment itself, and the purpose of my rising at this point is to disagree with my honourable friend. Because as I read the Fair Wage -- Employment Standards Act, Mr. Speaker, not the Fair Wage Act, The Employment Standards Act, in connection with the setting up and directives to the Minimum Wage Board, Section 22 of The Employment Standards Act, I think, sets out the starting of an investigation by the Minimum Wage Board. And the section says that a board, upon written authorization of the Minister, may with respect to the area for which it is appointed, make recommendations in writing respecting (a) the standards of minimum wages to be paid to employees, (i) of different ages, (ii) who are learners, inexperienced, handicapped or special employees. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all deference to my honourable friend from Selkirk, that there the board may do something if authorized by the Minister.

And then further on in the Act, and I think this is the main point of my contention that this would not be a motion of confidence in the Minister of himself, is this in Section 24, subsection (1) says: "That for the purpose of preparing recommendations as mentioned in Section 22, a board shall conduct such enquiries and receive from interested persons such representations as the board deems necessary or advisable." Section (2) " A Board at the direction of the Minister, or shall it be direction of the Minister enquire into the conditions of labour prevailing in any occupation, the hours of employment therein, and the wages payable therefor." And then, and I think that this is significant - Section (3) says "That a majority of the members of the board may require the chairman to convene a meeting of the board for the purpose of considering whether recommendation shall be made to the Minister."

So I suggest, in deference to my honourable friend from Selkirk, that neither the amendment nor the amendment to the amendment is tantamount to a vote of confidence in the Minister, because under the Employment Standards Act itself, the board which is constituted by, I believe, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or the Minister, has the right itself to call these meetings and to make recommendations to the Minister. I thought, Sir, that I should raise this point to the members of the House in order that my friends opposite, if they so desire, could support the amendment to the amendment without the fear of it being, as in the opinion of my honourable

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) . . . friend from Selkirk, a motion of confidence in the present Minister of Labour -- of non-confidence.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution for the Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak just briefly on this resolution and to indicate that I am opposed to the resolution and not prepared to support it when it comes to a vote. I think first of all we must look at the resolution as to the actual meaning of it, namely that the school grant formula as it applies to secondary schools be 75% of construction costs of all secondary schools. Now first of all, that would include secondary schools in parts of the province which chose not to become school divisions. And, as a matter of government policy, it has been stated both before February 27th and since, in this House that the grants which were associated with that plan would only be paid to those parts of the province which accepted the obligations and responsibilities which form part of the new plan - the divisions' plan. We have not departed from that position and, indeed, I have not heard any sound argument why we should do so. I think we must assume that the people of the four portions of the province who voted against the formation of school divisions knew before they did so, the grant system that would be applicable to a school division and the grant system that would be applicable to their case if they chose to remain outside the school division plan and they made their decision accordingly with those facts before them.

The second point is that this would mean the provision of 75% construction costs of a one-room high school. As indeed it would mean to any high school if this motion were to pass in this House. And again I would point out that it was never conceived or thought of that such a thing should be done. You will recall the recommendation of the Royal Commission -- of the interim report of the Royal Commission on Education which recommended certain grants towards the construction of high schools, and while it has been represented that they were primarily interested in grants -- by means of the grant system, in encouraging larger high schools, those who have spoken have overlooked one important aspect of that report which was clearly pointed out, namely, that because of the fact that high school education was to be made universally available under this plan, that much additional accommodation would be required for high school purposes, and it was to compensate school boards and school districts and municipalities for those additional costs that it was recommended in the report that larger grants be made available for high school construction. Indeed my recollection is that they suggested that the period during which the additional grants would be made available should be restricted because it was thought that the period of expanded construction due to increased enrollment which in turn would be due to the fact that high school education was being made available without distinction across the province, would be -- would occur within a limited period of time. I think it is unrealistic to suggest, and certainly unrealistic to suggest in the light of that recommendation that a one-room high school should receive 75% of the cost of construction, because a one-room high school is obviously not being constructed due to any expansion in the high school population in the particular area being served.

Now the plan - the principles of the grant schedule were based in large measure not entirely in this case, but in large measure, upon the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and we saw -- considered it advisable to make some variation from the recommendations which they had made in that respect. I would point out however, that this plan as I have already indicated, this grant, this type of grant schedule with a large maximum follows the in general principle, the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and may I just remind the House that the Royal Commission was appointed by the Liberal administration in this province, they take credit for the good things that the Commission recommended, and this is one of the things which the Commission recommended and the proposal, the principle follows the general principles outlined in their report.

Then may I also remind the House that this matter of the grant schedule as it affects construction costs was very carefully considered by the Committee of this House which

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . considered the Bill last October and November, and the members who were then members of the House will remember that it was very keenly discussed, many suggestions were made and several alternative proposals were considered in order to remove any element of unfairness in the schedule as it was then proposed. And may I remind the members of the Liberal Party in this House, that it was one of their own members, the then Member for Rockwood-Iberville, Mr. Bend, who moved in Committee that the grant schedule for the construction - toward the construction of high schools be exactly what it is in the Bill at the present moment. We accepted the motion that was presented to the Committee by the member on that occasion and this represents, I presume, the considered opinion of the members of the Liberal Party at that time, and I think that it is much too soon to be suggesting any change in that. Surely if it seemed satisfactory then and it was one of the points that was considered more carefully - not more carefully, but to greater length than any other of the provisions of the Bill at that time.

Then too, there has been no indication of a need to change the grant schedule. To my personal knowledge, as far as I know, the question has only been raised in this House, no trustee, no board of trustees, has suggested the necessity for any radical change in the schedule up to the present time. Now that's perfectly understandable, because many of them have not had an opportunity of even assessing fully their needs for high school rooms and indeed will not know whether they will require twelve-room high schools, or ten-room high schools, or four-room high schools, or as the case might be, and I think that it is necessary to allow the plan to have a further time of working. I'm not necessarily certain that for all time it will be considered that the largest grant should go to the twelve-room high school. It may be that some other number of rooms would be the most suitable. I am prepared, of course, to always keep in mind the necessity of reviewing that particular point in the light of circumstances as they develop, but up to this moment they haven't developed, and no one is in a position to say what it should be.

It could be, and I'm only suggesting this possibility, that the emphasis should be put on a ten-room high school or an eight-room high school, but certainly we do not have the facts or figures or the information that would lead us, or give us any sound basis for making a decision on that point at the present time.

And then too, there is a misconception, and this misconception I must say dies hard, it -- I suppose that it was raised at every one of the 58 meetings at which I had the privilege of speaking during January and February and that is that the number of rooms is necessarily related directly and positively to the number of classes, but as the Honourable Member for Arthur pointed out the other day, in speaking on this resolution, that it is quite conceivable that if you have four classrooms, one classroom of Grade IX, one classroom of Grade X, one of Grade XI and one of XII which is not an unusual situation, and I think would make a very acceptable high school in many parts of the province, that you would require a school that would qualify for grants on eight rooms, because there is included, as well as actual classrooms occupied by the pupils space which is used for auditorium, library and laboratory facilities and so on. Indeed, in one or two instances, I have school inspectors build it up to ten. Now I'm not saying that that would be the case in every case, but I'm merely pointing out that one mustn't assume that this -- the number of rooms for which a school will receive a grant is limited to the number of classes in the school, because these additional facilities are required and for good high school education and indeed, are provided for under the grant schedule, and so that there is no basis for suggesting that this system, this method of grants works to the disadvantage of any particular part of the Province of Manitoba. Some suggestion, or some argument was presented that the equality of opportunity argument was an argument for saying 75% right across the board. Of course, that isn't the -- that's a misconception again of the expression or the term of equality of opportunity, because what I suspect those who have spoken are more concerned about is, reducing the cost to the taxpayer, all of which is a very important aspect, but there's nothing to indicate, absolutely nothing to indicate up to the present time, that this schedule of grants for construction of high schools is working against the provision of equal opportunity for high school education. Indeed, the whole evidence is quite to the contrary, that the divisions are rapidly making provision for providing high school education for all the boys and girls in their respective divisions, that transportation is being provided for, with substantial grants

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . where buses are required, to assist in the purchase of the buses. For these reasons Mr. Speaker, I feel that the resolution is premature, unnecessary and would only do harm in that it would suggest or place the grant schedule on what may very well prove to be a quite unrealistic basis, and one that wouldn't do any particular benefit to the boys and girls of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, to my mind this resolution is one of the most important resolutions that has been brought during this session. I believe that the last argument of the Minister of Education is possibly his best argument, that we should give a little more time to elapse before we decide to change the Act, but I'm sure that the members of this House realize that there was no unanimous opinion last fall when we considered this matter of grants because I remember very correctly and distinctly that the leader of the -- present Leader of the Opposition, my Leader, mentioned in Law Amendments Committee that he for one believed that the grant should be on a flat basis, the same for all the schools -- highschoools, and I supported him strongly on that account at that time.

Now the Minister of Education says that we should not give an inducement for one-room high schools in the form of higher construction grants. Well, I would bring to his attention the fact that I mentioned before that in the Seine River division, and there might be many cases along the same line in Manitoba, there is one part of the Seine River division where it's impossible to transport the kids, the children, the students, from the place where they reside to the nearest possible high school, and I have in mind transporting the children from Woodridge to La Broquerie which would be some 30 miles over a road that is closed in the winter time. Now, in the Woodridge - in south-eastern Manitoba, in which is the Seine River, there are not -- there is not the population for a four-room high school. Children there are not the population for a larger high school, and it's unthinkable to think of transporting these children to La Broquerie, and we must realize that they are in the Seine River division and that the assessment around that area is very, very low. It's unorganized territory - only sand, crew shacks, the assessment is very low. Who will pay the 60% of the high school that will eventually have to be built there? It will be the rest of the area, lands around LaSalle or Lorette, St. Anne, higher assessed land, and I say that will be unfair to the residents of those better areas where the assessment is higher, and I think that it will penalize the whole division if the grants available to construct a high school in Woodridge are only 40%. Now the Minister stated that the reason for the 75% was to compensate this bid for additional costs due to the new school plan, because it would bring more students to its school. This is possibly true in some parts of the province, but I suggest that it is not true in the cities because the population is there, because they were constructing twelve and sixteen and twenty room high schools previous to the plan.

What has the City of Winnipeg done or the City of St. Boniface done to qualify for these grants? Have they had additional costs? None whatsoever, no additional costs at all. They just passed a resolution suggesting that the name be changed from Winnipeg School District to Winnipeg School Division, and that's all. Now this money that will be spent according to the Royal Commission on education was to be spent as an inducement to have larger high schools in the country, not in the cities because there were twelve-room schools already, and Mr. Speaker, nowhere in the Royal Commission's report - we see that they suggested a sliding scale of grants, they suggested only that the rooms in the high schools should be of twelve rooms, one for a division, and if necessary two twelve-room high schools for a division, and I'm sure of what I'm talking about now, because I studied it very closely at the time and I remember very vividly. Now this plan - sliding scale was engineered, was thought out by Minister himself or the Government, suggested to us last fall and the members remember very well that we had just about a week to consider the whole matter. We did not know how it would work, but when the Government came throughout Manitoba, addressed so many meetings -- and I think I should commend them for that -- it was made very plain that the Government at that time did not say, "Well, we'll want only one twelve room high school, as the Royal Commission had recommended. In a division you can have as many high schools as you want." And this statement is repeated by all the Cabinet Ministers I think speaking on the plan: You can have as many high schools as you want. People voted in favour of the plan, except for four divisions. There will be another vote and I'm quite sure that all the province will be in the division set-up before long. But I repeat that people were under the impression that the

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . Government was not against the smaller high schools in the centres where they believed they should have, and where it's reasonable that they should because of the long distances to attend a central high school if one must plan for the division in view of the size especially of the divisions. So that I believe that the Government is wrong in standing pat on this Bill that was passed last fall in respect to construction grants and I am quite sure that the future will prove that this is a mistake. It would penalize the sparsely settled districts. The districts that were supposed to be encouraged by the plan, they will be penalized and districts where the high population like the cities, they will be rewarded and they will have no merit whatsoever in establishing twelve or more room high schools because they - they were doing that before, they don't deserve the inducement and those that deserve it, will not get it, and I say that is wrong, I say that the motion should be passed, and I believe that if the Government sticks to its decision as stated by the Minister now, that it is wrong and would be found wrong before long.

MR. E. R. SCHEYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Brokenhead when introducing this resolution, touched on the general farm situation, and while I can agree with that part of his preamble, I cannot agree with many of the statements made in his speech, and also with the speeches of some of his colleagues when speaking on agriculture. I feel it is very important that we as members of this House when speaking on farming, stick to the facts and that we also realize and know what we are speaking about. When members of this House give a false picture and present false facts, it is small wonder that our non-farming population is confused about the present farm problem. We are now being forced to ask the Canadian taxpayer for help and I feel it is very important that he should know why we need that help and that he should also know why we feel he should pay for it.

I would like now to correct some of the statements made by the Honourable Members of the CCF Party while speaking on the general picture or the general situation of agriculture. First of all the Honourable Member from Inkster, I'm sorry he's not in his seat at the moment, speaking on agriculture stated that one of the problems of agriculture in Manitoba was that individuals in this province buy up two, three, four, five thousand acres of land, come down with big machinery, and these are quotes from his speech, "Come down with big machinery, put their seed in, take a month's rest, come back and harvest it, deliver it to the elevator, go to Honolulu and we don't see them on the farms any more."

MR. SCHREYER: While my colleague isn't in his seat, I wonder if I could just inform the House that the Member for Inkster preceded his statement by saying that he wasn't too sure of several things in agriculture.

MR. ALEXANDER: If the member is not too sure about several things in agriculture - and I'm sorry he's not in his seat - he shouldn't be talking about the subject and not making statements, - he should be responsible for what he says in this House. That Mr. Speaker, is a great statement to make on the farm picture of Manitoba. A statement like that on Manitoba's agricultural situation by an individual who is completely unfamiliar with farming in Manitoba today, is just plain nonsense, and as a matter of fact I think statements such as this, by a responsible individual actually damage the position of our agricultural community and do nothing except confuse the issue. Also in some cases they confuse our city friends, with the result that we as a farming group get a considerable amount of unfavourable publicity.

The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that in Manitoba only 2.2% of our farms are over 760 acres and that less than one half of 1%, .4 of 1% to be exact are over 1,120 acres in size, and I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this is total acreage, not crop acreage.

The Honourable Member from Brokenhead criticized the Federal Government for its proposed change in policy as far as hog marketing is concerned. I think, Mr. Speaker, that most of us will admit that the present system is not working satisfactorily, and in effect, has actually worked to the disadvantage of the average farmer in that it has encouraged vertical integration, particularly in Eastern Canada of wheat packing plants and commercial feed houses.



(Mr. Alexander, cont'd.) . . . . The honourable member quoted from the Ottawa Hansard to prove that the Federal Government was as he called it 'shilly shallying around'. I would like to quote from page 5580 of the Federal Hansard of July the 7th, and it was on the Orders of the Day and a question by the Honourable L. B. Pearson, Leader of the Opposition. "May I ask the Prime Minister whether the Government proposes to take any action before the end of the session with regard to the recommendation as to a deficiency payment made by the second or supplementary delegation of western farmers who were in Ottawa a few weeks ago?" And the answer by the Right Honourable J. G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister, "Mr. Speaker, some ten days ago the honourable gentleman asked me if I would make a statement as to the tenor of the legislation to be introduced and whether there would be any additional legislation introduced over and above those to which reference has already been made. Before the termination of the session, and at the earliest possible date, a general indication in that regard will be given which will of course include the answer to the question just asked by the honourable gentleman." That's speaking in Ottawa at the present session. This session at Ottawa, yes.

The honourable member also mentioned the cost-price squeeze. Myself, I don't think he did justice to this question. The farmer of today is faced with a continuing spiral of costs which continue to go up every year. Machinery has shown a steady increase, not only new machinery but also repairs have put a substantial increase on the farmer's cost of production. This has been brought about primarily by the general economic situation in Canada over which the farmer has no control whatsoever. This situation has resulted in benefits to most of our non-farming population in higher salaries and wages and in a higher standard of living. It has, however, worked in entirely the opposite direction as far as our farming population is concerned, because the greater part of our income is determined by what other countries can afford to pay for our produce. This I feel is the basic argument as to the reason why we should get assistance from the Canadian taxpayer. Our cost of production is to a large degree determined by economic conditions in Canada, but our income on the other hand, is determined very largely by economic conditions outside the country. The Honourable Member from Brokenhead also mentioned that the only way to reduce the cost-price squeeze is to implement a payment -- or implement a system of deficiency payments. This, Mr. Speaker, is utterly wrong. That is like tackling only one side of a question or problem. Recently in this very House we spent a considerable length of time debating the estimates of the Provincial Department of Agriculture. The department who is brought in are to assist the farmer in lowering his cost of production for the benefit of not only the farmer, but also to the benefit of the consumer and also to the benefit of the general economic situation of the province. I would like to state now, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason why our farmers have been able to keep going the past few years is because they have increased their efficiency. Our efforts in the provincial department should be to continue to help them along that road, but even so they have not been able to keep up with the increased cost of production and I think we should also emphasize that deficiency payments, any form of deficiency payment in itself is not the final answer, but that they are necessary as a stop gap measure while a more permanent solution is being found.

We now come to the farmers' last delegation to Ottawa and also to the best method of payment, and I would like first of all to say that this delegation idea was promoted initially, being of a non-partisan, non-political nature, and I have spoken to quite a few farmers in my district and they have stated that if they had known that this was going to be a political football, if they had known that this was going to be used for some political parties as a political issue in a provincial election, they would have had nothing to do with it. It seems to me a great shame, Mr. Speaker, that an honest effort by a group of farmers should be used, namely by the CCF Party to try and make some political hay.

Now as to the method of paying; I went on record last year in the winter session, as stating that I thought the acreage payment would be of more benefit to Manitoba than the method which had originated in Saskatchewan. I would like now to give some figures as to how the bushel payment would have affected the two provinces. In the crop year of 1955-56 the average grain sold for permit-book holders was as follows: wheat, for the Manitoba farmer, 816 bushels, for the Saskatchewan farmer, 2,021 bushels; barley - Manitoba farmer, 569, Saskatchewan, 491; oats - Manitoba farmer, 310 bushels, Saskatchewan, 383 bushels. Applying the deficiency payment requested by the farm delegation, we get an average payment per farmer of \$265.89

(Mr. Alexander, cont'd.) . . . for the Manitoba farmer, and an average payment of \$523.77 for each Saskatchewan farmer. In 1956-57 the average deliveries are as follows: wheat - Manitoba, 983 bushels, Saskatchewan, 2,008 bushels; barley - Manitoba, 562 bushels, Saskatchewan 480 bushels; oats - Manitoba, 505 bushels, Saskatchewan, 201 bushels. The average payment for that year works out to \$538.93 for each Manitoba farmer and \$848.15 for the average Saskatchewan farmer. In 1957-58 it works out as follows: wheat - Manitoba, 982 bushels, Saskatchewan, 2,259 bushels; barley - Manitoba, 570 bushels, Saskatchewan, 473 bushels; oats - Manitoba, 457 bushels, Saskatchewan, 220 bushels. The average payment for that year works out to \$490.39 for each Manitoba farmer and for Saskatchewan \$835.78. In other words, for the three years that deficiency payments were requested, if they had been granted on the basis that were asked for, the average Manitoba farmer would have received a total \$1,295.21; the average Saskatchewan farmer would have received \$2,207.70. The figures given, Mr. Speaker, are as I say, average ones. I think we should also look at the maximum of \$1,500.00. At an average bushel payment of 30 cents for wheat, a farmer would have to market 5,000 bushels of wheat to get up to the maximum. At an average payment of 20 cents a bushel for barley, he would have to market 7,500 bushels. Now I would like to ask the Honourable Member from Brokenhead and the Honourable Member from Fisher how many farmers in their constituencies would receive the maximum payment? I would venture to say that if the bushel payment had been in effect last year when the acreage payment plan was paid, that many of the farmers in their constituencies would have received a lot less money than they did. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan farmer and the Saskatchewan Government were advocating this bushel plan, because it was quite obvious that out of the total amount that the Federal Government allocates for this plan, the Saskatchewan farmer was going to get the lion's share. That is why some of us in Manitoba advocated a more equitable way, or method, of payment. What I can't figure out is why the CCF Party in Manitoba was so anxious to play 'follow the leader' with their socialist friends in Saskatchewan and sell out the interests of the Manitoba farmer in the meantime. If we can devise some plan that will give a more equitable or equal distribution to the average farmer in Manitoba, it will benefit the province as a whole.

We must realize, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers are in need of this money and when they get it, it is going to be spent; and if the Manitoba farmer gets his share he is going to spend it in Manitoba, which will give the whole economy of the province a boost. If the acreage plan, possibly, won't do the job, maybe we should use, possibly, initial quota as a method to pay the payments on.

The Honourable Member from Brokenhead went on further to state that unless deficiency payments were granted on the original basis there was going to result in over-production of livestock, and he said in this regard "that it is the fact that there has been no deficiency payments on grain that has caused the farmer to go over into livestock production, causing disequilibrium in that field of agriculture." Mr. Speaker, there again we have a statement that is not completely true. First of all, we should look at the fact that deficiency payments asked for, for the three years on wheat were 22, 35 and 31 cents, respectively; 12 - correction - 13, 24 and 23 cents for barley, and 4, 15 and 12 cents for oats. There is very little wheat fed and this plan is actually encouraging the growing of a grain which is already in over-production and in a surplus position, particularly in the Province of Saskatchewan. One of the large factors which has forced farmers into livestock was not even mentioned by the CCF member, and that is our quotas. A lot of farmers unable to market their grain, their surplus, being because of quotas, have turned to livestock and are marketing it in that manner. And as long as this surplus situation exists, farmers, particularly in Manitoba, are going to keep in the livestock business to the same degree as they are at present. And a 20 cent payment on barley, or a 10 cent payment on oats is not going to encourage very many of them to change their minds. When we get in the fortunate position where our grain quotas can be relaxed, then we might see a drop in livestock production or population in Manitoba.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say again that some of the statements made by the CCF Party on agriculture have actually been of disservice to the farmers of this province. In the matter of deficiency payments I think that a more equitable system could be worked out on either the acreage plan or possibly, as I said, on the unit quota basis. The main thing, I think, for it is for us to ask for assistance for the Manitoba farmers, put forth their views as

(Mr. Alexander, cont'd.) . . . farmers in this province, and leave the rest then for negotiation up to Ottawa and our Federal members.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne, that the resolution be amended by deleting the third and fourth paragraphs, and substituting: "AND WHEREAS a large number of farmers are in financial difficulties" and by deleting "that deficiency payments be immediately" in the third line of the resolution, and substituting; "that an immediate payment of cash assistance be," and by deleting "assured to them" in the fourth and fifth lines and substituting; "assist them in attaining."

Mr. Speaker read the amendment.

MR. P. WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote, declared it carried

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R.L. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might beg the indulgence of the Manitoba House and have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand. Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: . . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Second reading of Bill No. 77. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

Mr. W.G. Scarth, Q.C. (River Heights) presented for second reading Bill No. 77, an Act respecting Guarantee Trust Company of Canada and the Western Trust Company.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is in respect to two companies, two trust companies, incorporated by Federal statute; that is, the Western Trust was incorporated in 1906, and the Guarantee Trust in 1925, by a special Act of the Parliament of Canada. On February 24th, 1958, Guarantee Trust Company made an offer, after an arrangement had been made with the directors of Western Trust, to buy all of the 10,050 issued shares outstanding, of Western Trust at an agreed figure of \$180.00 per share. The Western Trust Company par value of shares was \$100.00. The offer was approved by the Honourable the Treasury Board of Canada before the Guarantee Trust purchased the shares, and in regard to the offer it may be said that every shareholder of Western Trust agreed to sell, and each turned in his shares to the Royal Bank of Canada, Main Branch in Winnipeg, for sale, so that the position is now that Guarantee Trust Company holds all of the 10,050 outstanding shares of Western Trust Company. Under date of February 21st, 1959, the two companies entered into an agreement which is marked as Schedule A to this Bill, whereby the Guarantee Trust Company would take over the entire assets, undertakings and liabilities of the Western Trust and carry on the business heretofore carried on by Western Trust, and, as a matter of fact, just manage it and take over all of their liabilities. Under date of March 12th, 1959, the Honourable the Treasury Board of Ottawa gave approval to the agreement. This present Bill, Mr. Speaker, is one which ratifies the deal between the two companies, that is the Guarantee Trust Company taking over as a going concern the Western Trust Company, and it imposes upon Guarantee Trust all of the obligations and undertakings now imposed -- which now stand in the name of Western Trust. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that if this Bill goes to Committee, the Honourable S.S. Garson will appear as counsel for the trust companies concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Any questions?

MR. CAMPBELL: The only question I would like to ask and perhaps the sponsor of the Bill can answer it, is if everything has been done in a perfectly legal manner, and I have no doubt it has, then why does this legislature need to ratify the arrangement?

MR. SCARTH: It is -- this would be my interpretation to the answer the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. This trust company, the Western Trust, is operating in three different provinces and I would suppose it is a matter of civil and property rights whereby the province would step in and deal with the assets of this company within the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 61. The Honourable Member for St. James.

Mr. D.M. Stanes (St. James) presented Bill No. 61 for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, this Bill gives the School District of St. James the power to increase the indemnity of the Chairman and the trustees from \$1,000.00 to \$1,500.00 and \$500.00 to \$750.00 per year. The reason for this increase - the request for the power to increase up to these amounts is the increased responsibility of the School Board during the last few years. In addition to that, of course, they are also a Secondary School Division. It may be of interest to the House to know a few facts. The number of students in 1956 was 5,140; in 1959, 6,461. Number of teachers in '56, 175; in 1959, 240. Number of schools, 7 in '56; 12 in 1959, with two to open in the fall of this year. The budget has gone from \$850,000.00 in '56 to \$1,765,315.00 in 1959. All these increased responsibilities are taking much more time from the members of the School Board.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 62. The Honourable Member for St. James.

Mr. Stanes presented Bill No. 62 for second reading.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, there are two sections to this. In paragraph number one it deals with voting; at present anyone left off the voters' list cannot get a vote on election day. The amendment here to the City Charter allows for the assessor to issue a certificate provided he is assured that the person is entitled to vote, and with that certificate they are entitled to vote.

The second item on this Bill is regarding the costs chargeable on sewers. Prior to becoming a city, St. James came under the Municipal Act, and on becoming a city, it was excluded from the Municipal Act, and therefore, was not able to charge as previously \$3.00 a foot but had to revert back to \$4.00 a foot. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the cost of sewers have increased substantially and also under the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District, St. James in all its new sewage has to put down separate sewer systems - that for sanitary and that for drainage.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department 9, Mines and Natural Resources. 1. Administration.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition raised one or two interesting points last night and I thought I would try to provide a little additional information to cover them. He asked the question as to whether an insurance fund has been considered in connection with - I took it to mean damage as well as possible personal injury - with respect to hunting accidents and damage caused by hunters. There is in existence, of course, the compensation fund for livestock that are shot during an open season. The number of applications has been small and the amount included in the estimates this year is the same as last year, namely \$1,000.00, and is thought to be adequate. I might say, however, that in our discussions which I touched on last night, or mentioned, dealing with the question of accidents and the tragedy and the suffering and the financial loss that are occasioned in those regards, we have discussed insurance. I cannot say that we have advanced to the point where we have a plan to propose, but certainly it's under consideration, and is well worthy of consideration. I think the Honourable Leader has raised a very good point. I have good news for him with regard to the frost free days at the Pasquia. I find that Professor Ellis, who is so well known to us here has said in his report, Interim Report Number two, dated August 1956, and I quote from that report: "Frost free period in the Pasquia area estimated approximately 110 days, but it has ranged from a low of 65 days in 1924 to a high of 139 days in 1937". Now these figures compare with averages at the following towns: Russell, a 26 year average of 74 days; Minnedosa, a 54 year average - 87; Winnipeg, 63 year average - 106; and Dauphin a 31 year average of 109. So I am sure we are all relieved and glad to know that there is apparently a long frost free period at the Pasquia. Now how that will interrelate with the days or hours of sunshine, as was also raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I don't know. I am not able to say - we have no facts on that. But those two items, I think, are

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . good news. Now, I wonder if the honourable members care to raise further points or ask questions before we pass it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have - I want to come back to discuss feeding programs.

MR. EVANS: Oh yes, I beg your pardon, I had meant to reply to that. We have from those interested in the area, we have received a request for further consultation on this point and within the next two weeks a conference will be held of those concerned with the departmental officials to discuss what may be done for this coming year.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, - no not on this point but I want to mention - I am one of those who believes in discussing each item separately. But I want to take just one or two minutes, make a general statement, or ask a general question which will not come under each item, but it may come under four items. My general question is, are we considering of just claim of royalties or revenue from the gifts given to us by providence to the people of the province? Take for instance the mines section alone. By the way we are spending over \$3,000,000.00, I think it is, over \$3,000,000.00 in the estimates of the Mines and Natural Resources to make this Department, to see that the Department is developed, looked after, preserved and what are we getting out of it? Now take for instance the mines; and for example this expense of this particular department is \$425,000.00. The revenue we have received according to the annual report is \$300,000.00. Here we have a loss, not only of the -- just material we are giving to those who are exploiters but also to the particular section which we are looking after. Now the report indicates that in the last fifty years the production amounted to about \$700,000,000.00. I am just wondering, what did we get out of it in the last fifty years? From that particular - I am just taking one section because it's too much to go over each section separately. But my question on this section may apply on all others. I think that we are not getting sufficient - the people of the province are not getting sufficient for the privileges they are giving to certain enterprises, private enterprises. It's true that they are developing, they may take a certain risk, but on the other hand we have now established firms in this province in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, like Oil and Minerals, Forestry and everything else. We know that they are now making money. When do we get something out of it? I understand the policy of the province is that after they pay all their wages and expenses, and depreciation on the buildings and some depreciation on their machinery, and I take it - I may be wrong - that the machinery has been already depreciated ten times, then they are allowed to keep for themselves a certain amount; they are allowed to take out in salaries anything they wish, anything the traffic can bear, and then after all this, we get about - I don't know - about 8 percent I think of the net revenue. Well, I don't think it's sufficient; I don't think it's enough for us to do it. After all the fact that they have speculated, invested money to develop a business does not mean to say they get the same privilege forever. So, I feel that the income to the province, or the revenue to the people of this province, for something which belongs to the people of this province, is not sufficient in all departments as far as my reading of the report is concerned.

The next question I would like to ask is this; how does the reforestation meet the output? In other words, we have so much timber - so somebody cut so much timber, we have pulp. A lot of them are being destroyed by fire. To what extent - what percentage is the program of reforestation over the loss and the lumber used? That's about all in the main questions and, as I said at the outset, that I like to discuss each item separately. It's easier for the Minister, easier for us. But this is a very vital question which I'd like to get an answer to.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Inkster has opened up some rather broad avenues, but I'll try to answer the question as definitely as I can.

The figure that he uses of some \$300,000.00 revenue through the royalty tax in the Mines Branch was a considerable decrease over what had been hoped for in that year. In 1958 the prices, particularly of copper, fell and some mines were discontinued. And the estimated revenue to the province was very much lower. It had been estimated for that year that there would be a revenue of \$590,000.00 to the province which then would have compared with the \$400,000.00 expenditure that he noted and would, in fact, have yielded a profit in that year. That's in answer to that one particular question.

Then he notes although I've not been able to confirm the figure that \$7,000,000.00 have

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . . been produced by the mines in some fifty years. It must be remembered that out of that \$700,000,000.00 come the wages of all the people who obtained employment. And the money that went for supplies and other things which supported business in Manitoba. And so those are advantages to the province, to have opportunities to work and opportunities for a larger volume of business to other kinds of business, such as the supply houses and the meat packers and the other food processors, and even the farmer whose produce finds its way to the mines and is consumed there. But that is not to say that we feel content with the share that the province has had. I think this matter must constantly be under review because conditions change. It seems to me necessary to establish a policy so that it will be attractive for mining companies to risk their capital and to have them come into the province and make their great developments. At the same time, however, we must always be vigilant to see that the public treasury gets not only its costs but what the honourable member has called "a fair share" of these assets; these natural assets of the province for which we are, in fact trustees for the people. And so I accept his point of view that we must insure a fair share to the people and the public treasury but, at the same time, we are under the necessity of finding that middle ground where we can continue to attract new developments of all kinds to the province.

Then as to the percentage of the utilization of the forests that is being replaced by what he refers to as "the reforestation program". I wonder if he would accept this definition that most of the reforestation is being done by nature. Even in cases where fire has gone through, we find the most wonderful provisions in nature. For example, the pine cone retains its seed under intense heat while the fire is passing and opens only at a later date - at a later stage - to shake the seed loose, when the fire has presumably passed on and the seed can fall to the ground and regenerate itself. That is only an interesting little side-light in passing but, nevertheless, to me a quite wonderful fact. But nature reseeds itself both in the cut-over portions and also in the burnt out portions. Now if the Forest Management Plan has been properly conceived and the allowable cuts are set at the proper level, then as much new timber will grow, as many new trees will be seeded down to mature in 25, 40 or 50 years time as are taken. And it's the object of the Forestry Branch to set the allowable cuts at a figure which will at least maintain the areas of forests so that they are not depleted by the cutting and the fires that goes on in each year.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few comments on this particular Department. I'll try and follow the Minister's original, or the first speech that he made here yesterday. In speaking about inventories and increased reforestation, I was hoping that he would at that time mention something about research into our vase stands of poplar. We have hundreds of square miles of poplar, most of which is matured and overmatured and going to wast. It is a tree that grows very rapidly and, for some reason or other, it doesn't have the same market that the evergreens have in this province. Now your poplar is scattered right throughout the province, but in the mountain ranges it runs for - well you can say virtually hundreds of miles and outside of one or two little plants that we have in the province, no use is made of poplar at all. I think that it warrants a very intensive research program. There's some poplar being utilized across the line for pulpwood, but as far as I can gather, outside of one of the eastern provinces, I believe it's Quebec, that has a poplar pulpwood plant, there's none other in Canada. And I would very strongly urge that this particular question be looked into most carefully because it's a continuous source of supply. It isn't a tree that you have to wait for too long before it comes to a stage where it can be utilized.

On the question of reforestation, I was glad to see the Minister mention briefly regeneration. I don't think we are making enough use of the natural replacement of nature itself. I have noticed in many overburnt areas where the original stand of seedlings is exceptionally dense, they stop one another from growing at the rate they would otherwise, and I've sometimes wondered why we go to the trouble of putting in plantations and putting in seedlings and then planting them elsewhere, when we could very well get these seedlings from these dense growths especially in overburnt areas and re-plant them. We'd be doing two things. We'd not only find sources for these seedlings but we'd be thinning out the original stand and giving them an opportunity to grow better.

In the matter of overcut areas. With summer operations in particular, the areas are covered with a lot of slash and waste and so forth. And it takes years and years before the slash and the branches decay this waste material and give a new growth an opportunity to come along.

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . . I believe someone suggested that probably in areas of that nature, we should have controlled burning. Take an overcut area that has been overcut so that you have no stand of timber at all in it and put a fire to it, to make sure, of course, it only covers the area that you want to burn over, you would hasten the growth of new trees by quite a number of years and, I believe, you would get a better stand of trees. Reforestation by regeneration is quite common in Manitoba. You see it all over the forest reserves as well as on many of the Crown lands. Now in the central portion of Manitoba, I would say roughly between Township 27 and Township 50, Ranges 20 and 21, part of 22, which covers several hundred square miles, we have nothing but Crown lands which at one time had terrifically big stands of timber on it. Fires let out of control almost annually have destroyed the original stands and don't give the young stands a chance to come along. You could go through this area and you'd see any number of young trees coming one year and you'd go back there in two or three years and a fire had destroyed them entirely. It might be well to look into the areas of this nature and see if we couldn't give them a little more fire protection than they are receiving at the moment. Most of the fires originate through acts of men. Sometimes where they want to improve the pasture facilities and so forth. In this particular area I think you could have a combined program. You could have a reforestation program and it would be strictly by regeneration although you could plant the area back into evergreens. With that you could combine a pasture - a community pasture. And there's one other interesting angle and that is that you could provide very suitable breeding grounds for upland birds as well as ducks. This whole area has gravel ridges running through it for miles - running north and south - and these ridges are anywhere from four or five hundred yards apart to a mile apart. The waterfall is from the east to west. And the water could be very easily trapped to the west of these ridges and make wonderful breeding grounds for ducks. I would urge the Minister to look into that possibility because I think it can be on a large scale and well worthwhile.

The Minister spoke about recreation in our forest reserves. And I think, Mr. Chairman, at this time, it would only be right and proper for me to acquaint the members of this House with one of the finest recreational areas in the Province of Manitoba and which is very little known. And I'm referring to the Duck Mountains.

ONE OF THE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HRYHORCZUK: The Duck Mountains at one time were considered to be the right place for a national park, and it was the logical place to have a national park and not the Riding Mountain. The only reason that the Riding Mountain got the preference was because it was closer to the heavily populated areas of southern Manitoba. But the Duck Mountains cover, oh, in the neighbourhood of a thousand square miles and there are hundreds of fresh water lakes - not ten, but hundreds of fresh water lakes in this mountain. Several years ago, the province started out on the program of constructing roads into these mountains and I'm glad that I'm able to report today that we have an all-weather road - a very good road, in fact - running from No. 10 to No. 83, that is from the east to the west. It runs right almost smack through the middle of the Duck Mountains and another road which is now under construction running from No. 10 - from No. 5 at Grandview to No. 10 at Minitonas. All of this road has been completed with the exception of about 12 miles that is now under construction. You then will be able to go either right down the Hog's Back, the divide on this mountain, from the south to the north or you could cross it from the east to the west. Beautiful scenery - the roads run along some of the finest lakes you could find anywhere in Canada barring no place. Good fishing. And at this point, I'd like to say this to the Minister, that what I would like to see, and I think many others who know that mountain would like to see, because eventually it's going to be the playground of Manitoba - the recreational area of Manitoba. There's no doubt about that whatsoever. There are cars coming in now from all over the United States. You can see license plates from California, Tennessee, Kentucky, Oregon and so forth and so on. And it's not even known to Manitoba just at the moment. But what I'd like to see in that mountain - I wouldn't want to see all of the good lakes opened up to the establishment or the building of cottages - I would suggest that a certain number of lakes that add themselves to a program of public recreation in the sense that you have public beaches, public kitchenettes and so forth, and not let it go to sub-divisions. There are a great many more people in the Province of Manitoba who cannot afford a cottage at a lake than there are those that can afford a cottage. And I think it's

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . . . good public policy to reserve lakes of that nature for the use of the family on the week's outing or a week-end where they can come into a place that's not commercialized. Where you really can be in the environment of nature as it was provided for the use of men. There are many, many lakes that could be used for that purpose. And I'm sure that the future generations of this province will be very thankful to those that went before them if a plan of this nature is carried out to the full. These roads serve several other purposes and one of them is, that complete utilization of the forest is made in this area. There are, well, several hundred men employed the year round. The roads give them an opportunity to go into the very heart of the mountain and take out the matured and over matured trees that should be taken out. It also gives them an opportunity to fight fires. I'm glad to report that for almost a decade now, we haven't had a serious fire in the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve. And I think a great deal of thanks is due to the settlers who are very careful as well as to the tourists and others that go in there. It's a beautiful mountain and any of the gentlemen in this Committee who have never had the opportunity to see it, I suggest you do so at the earliest possible date.

Now there's one other thing I'd like to mention while I'm on the Minister's speech. He made the statement in speaking about the population of our grouse in the province, he had this to say, "anything that can be done, of course, to preserve the flocks and the quantities will be done. But particularly we will study bag limits and the hunting seasons so that the proper hunting may be done when the quantities are large and the pressure removed when they are small". Well, I take exception to this part of the statement; "the proper hunting may be done when quantities are large". Now this is an erroneous inception insofar as the preservation of our game is concerned. We should never wait until the numbers of any of our game are large before we put in a little more intensive hunting - permit a little more intensive hunting. We sometimes feel that nature itself has a way of balancing things. Well, my personal observation of nature for the past 35 or 40 years led me to believe that there's anything but a balance of nature. Nature is inclined to go away up in population in numbers - away up into the thousands when you come to birds and then all of a sudden it will step in and reduce them to the point of almost of extinction. I think man should step in there. He should never allow any of our wild life to get too numerous because if you do that you're only leading to waste instead of benefit. A carefully planned hunting will not only give the sportsmen a lot of sport, not only give them a lot of free meat for the table of many homes but it will keep the population in balance with the feed and the environment in which they find themselves. Hunting should be kept at a level where we can always expect, outside of some epidemic or something of that nature, can expect that we will have a continuous supply of wildlife. And in this regard, I'd like to refer to the moose and elk hunts which have been permitted in the Dick Mountains during the past three years. And although several hundred animals are taken out annually, the population has not been reduced. The population is pretty steady, steadily the same as it has been when the hunt was first opened up. If the hunting was not allowed, I'd think that we would have struck a time when the population would have been too big and we'd have lost a very great percentage of that game. We sometimes become sentimental and overlook the fact that we must reduce our herds of animals and our flocks of birds, especially those that winter here because the numbers that can pull through any given year, depends on the feed available to them during the winter months. And that applies to the birds as well as the big game. And when you have a heavy snowfall, tremendous numbers of birds and animals die because of lack of feed. We have over-browsed areas in this province that must be looked into pretty soon especially in your deer population here in some parts of southern Manitoba, because we may reach the stage anytime where most of them will die out because of starvation. Now in the Duck Mountain area where moose and elk have been shot under open seasons for the last three years, as I said the population has not been decreased, but there's one interesting fact - for years and years prior to that this was a preserve, therefore, no hunting was allowed in there. And anybody that knows that region will agree that the number of animals in there was less than now after three years of hunting was allowed. And while on that particular subject, I would suggest to the Minister that he take the matter of an open season in the Riding Mountain up with the Federal authorities. I think that the Federal Government is making a very serious mistake in not opening the Riding Mountain to the hunting of big game, because the herds in there were very badly depleted - I think it was two or three years ago - and I'm quite sure that if hunting was allowed as it is in the Province of



(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . . Manitoba in the preserve, we wouldn't have seen the destruction of animal life that there was because of lack of food during the winter months.

I don't think there is anything I care to add at the moment but there are several items in the estimates of this Department that I will make a comment on as we come to them.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains for the constructive suggestions that he had made. With regard to poplar research, I might say that I've been in touch with one of the members of the University staff, and I wish at the moment I could recall his name but I'm sorry I can't, who has been making a study of this question. I understand that poplar makes a satisfactory building wood or structural timber for certain purposes under certain conditions. In some cases the dimensions must be slightly larger than Douglas Fir and it's highly desirable that it be treated with Boliden Salt or something similar to achieve the same weather resisting and decay factors that they have in fir and the additional dimension is required for a little additional strength, having to do, I believe, with the presence of knots in poplar to a greater extent than in fir. This matter is under study and one of the difficulties at the moment is this. That the accepted standards for the construction industry have been very largely based on those established in British Columbia in using fir and similar woods of that kind - Douglas Fir - as their standard of comparison. I hope we will be able to develop a new set of standards under which poplar may be used for certain purposes. It can't replace fir for all of them but certainly say, in certain structures that have no great stress placed on them and certain other purposes, it's hoped that we will be able to use poplar for that. An interesting field is opened up in the use of some poplar at least in the production of pulpwood. And with this additional reminder from the honourable member, I can assure him that this matter will receive continued and further study.

With regard to regeneration and thinning out the plots that are seeded in by nature. I feel that that is a possibility that we must look into. I have not heard it discussed in those terms and I can assure you that that matter will be taken into consideration to see whether seedlings can indeed be recovered from the wilds more cheaply and more efficiently than using nurseries for the purpose.

With regard to overcut areas that are left strewn with slash and should then be burned over in order to give a fair start to the new crop. My understanding is that the Forest Act does provide for the disposition of slash from any timber sale in a satisfactory manner and that slash to be gathered and burnt under the supervision of the Forest Conservation Officer. If this hasn't been done satisfactorily in all cases in the past, it's within our power to do so and I can assure the honourable member that the administration will be carefully followed in that regard.

I think there are great possibilities for the planned and combined use of certain areas as mentioned by the honourable member, the combination of forestry and community pastures, game preserves and recreational areas all at the same time. There's a great field to be further developed than even that has been done so far in wresting from all of our wild areas the maximum use of the public both in the return of cash and in satisfaction to the people themselves. That too, is a constructive suggestion that I propose to take under consideration seriously.

With regard to recreation in forest reserves and the very interesting, to me, description of the Duck Mountain area. I feel here too this point comes under the general point of planning on a broad scale for the use of our wild areas. I think it is quite right that certain areas should be set aside for cottagers and there they should be protected in a relative degree of privacy because they have acquired a summer home that they wish to use. But at the same time they must not preclude the use of our wilder areas by the general public. There is under consideration in a little different sense, the setting aside of what might be called a 'wilderness' area in Manitoba, east of Lake Winnipeg. It struck me quite forcibly the other day when someone from Los Angeles, who was connected with one of the great airlines down there, made the statement that Manitoba is of considerable interest to California as a holiday resort. And I asked him why, because Alberta with its many resort areas and other places are quite close by California and the reply was this; that Manitoba is one of the closest areas in which anyone can seek a 'wilderness' holiday. Now there is still time for us to examine and if possible locate a 'wilderness' area where people can go for canoe trips and camping out and fishing well away

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) .... from what might be called the ordinary resort areas. The idea has a good deal of merit. It has received some study and we will pursue that line further.

With regard to grouse bag limits, I'm glad the honourable member mentioned this because I would not have wanted to leave the impression that any increase of pressure should wait until the peak has been achieved. The decision to increase or decrease bag limits for any kind of game is based not only on the counts that are made or the census but on examination by the biologists themselves.

(Recording difficulties lasting approximately one minute.)

.....Continued on next page.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: When the Minister was commenting on the suggestion that overcut areas be placed under controlled fire to hasten re-generation, he mentioned the fact that under the rules of - regulations of the Department the slash and waste has to be burnt. But he omitted to mention the fact that in summer operations this is not the case and this is where you really have a lot of slash because you have all the bark peeled off your pulp and it makes an awful mess in the bush. And there's always a fire hazard in these areas, not man made but electrical storms and so forth when you have all this waste laying around. And also the fact that when we have little snow, they're not permitted to burn their slash because of the fire hazard in the coming summer.

MR. EVANS: . . . . . I shall certainly look into that aspect of it.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, I've listened to the very pleasant build-up for part of my constituency from the Honourable Member for Ethelbert, also from the Minister of Mines, but I want to give a little information to the other members of the House regarding a just as good or much better ground for scenic and pleasure work as well as for utility is that in the Porcupine Mountains a little further on, where the Department is doing some very excellent work in opening up roads and - I don't like to disparage anything that was said, but compared to the Duck Mountains, the Duck Mountains are only one, two or three with the Porcupine Mountains further north. And I would also like to make some comment on what the Honourable Member for Inkster said about the revenues derived from the Mines and Resources not being quite in balance with -- not being exceeding the amount of cost. Well, I think in this province of ours, when we get to the stage that we're spending in this present era, in this present decade, when we're spending 10 times as much on our forestry developments and our mining developments, than what. . . . . we're receiving from them, then we will be doing something. Because the everything in connection with forestry has in the last ten years under the regime of the Honourable Minister of the Opposition, they were too much concerned with what money we were getting out of these things and not with what we were putting into them. And I'm quite sure, after living in that country for the last 50 years pretty nearly, that the more we spend on our reforestation and on all the developments of that nature in that country that we will soon become on a par with some of the older countries like Norway and Sweden who were the first when they started their forestry development of over 100 years ago, I'm quite sure the first 50 years they didn't, they spent more than they took out of it. And that is the position we're in now. We're in our infancy stage so far as our forestry developments are concerned. And I'll be quite pleased when I see our forestry branch and our mining branch and all our natural resource developments spending for the next 10 years possibly five or 10 times more than they receive out of them. And I think that will be a sound basis which our children and grandchildren and descendants to come will rise and call us blessed.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I must object to one of the statements that the Honourable Member for Swan River made and that is that the former government was spending less than it was taking out or a similar amount. That just isn't correct. Not up in our area anyhow. The Porcupines, of course, are so far away from civilization, that you can't expect that there would be that amount of development there. But in the Ducks, I'm quite sure that, oh, probably 10 times as much was spent in there in development than was taken out in the way of permit dues and so forth. And I don't like to see the Duck Mountains belittled, because after all is said and done in the Duck Mountains is the highest point in the Province of Manitoba. We have what is known as the Baldy Mountain there of which the elevation is 2,727 feet. (Interjection) . . . Well, the 27 feet are still 27 feet. I agree with him in that we should not look to the revenues from forestry, but go ahead and plan our works as they should be planned and draw on the consolidated fund if we have to. But once again I want to say that he is out in his tallies if he thinks the former government was spending as much or less than they were getting out of it, because that isn't correct.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say a word or two at this juncture. I'm sorry my colleague isn't here because I'm sure that he would have a comment or two to make. Now, I appreciate very much the interest of the Honourable Member for Swan River in regard to the statements or remarks of my honourable colleague. And in rebuttal, it appears to me that my honourable friend mentioned the fact of the programs which have been conducted in the old lands of Norway, Sweden and he could have gone on to the Black Forest in Germany and many other countries, of a similar nature. I think what he did omit, however, is that to a

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . considerable degree the situations are in no way parallel. I think first of all there is a difference in the type of timber which is produced of the type of the forest which makes it far more easy for those countries to carry on this program. And also I think it is a fact that generally speaking our climatic conditions here in the Province of Manitoba in respect of forestry are such that they don't allow us to follow the practice generally that they have in the other countries. I think it is a truism to say that insofar as the forest products of Manitoba, we should do what we can to assure the future but it's not to the same degree, I suggest, as what my honourable friend from Swan River has suggested, in that of the different type of growth and it is not necessary from my observations of the long, long period of time for reforestation because I think that our trees here grow to its degree of maturity - it being smaller than the other areas such as B. C. and the other countries, in a much shorter period of time. I think it is true that insofar as our pulp wood stands, for instance, the relative number of years required for it to reach maturity, is a lot less than in the countries which my honourable friend mentioned.

And anyway my colleague, while he did mention forestry, had in particular, more in reference to mining. Now, just the other day we received an order for return, as for the former member for Assiniboia at the last session, asking for the amount of royalties, rentals, licenses, permits and fees and stumpage, from various mining companies in the province. And to illustrate the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company paid royalties in the year '57, '58 of \$50,004.67. For rentals licenses, permits and fees \$32,584.00, and in respect of stumpage they paid not a penny. And I think what my honourable colleague had in mind when he was speaking on the Minister's salary in this debate, that we were not receiving sufficient return, or enough return, to the Province of Manitoba, for the investments that nature has provided the province with. Now, I know we hear quite frequently in this House when we're talking of mining exploration, of the great risks that there are encountered by mining authorities, or mining companies. And I think to a considerable degree that there is. But I was very interested the other day to pick up a report of the Committee which sat back in 1946, on behalf of the Government of Manitoba. The Committee was called the Advisory Committee on Co-ordination of Post-war Planning. The report is dated January, 1946. And in reading this now, sort of an old report I find very many interesting items dealing with the future of the Province of Manitoba. I was very interested to read this. In connection with mining companies and explorations and what it had to say some 13 years ago in rebuttal to some degree of the thoughts that some of the members had as to the big gamble which takes place by our mining companies. And on page 104 of the report it says this: "In few other businesses is so great a risk taken in the initial stages as in mining, as only one enterprise in a hundred every repays the investment with the profit." Then it goes on, and I think this is the significant part: "Admittedly that successful 1% yields such satisfactory returns as to encourage the --- the search for ore deposits." It goes on to say, and I must add this in fairness, that it is obvious that this type of speculative business should be left to private enterprise and not for government participations. And then the report makes this sort of a recommendation. "Government should limit their activities to the reasonable encouragement and assistance of the search for and development of new mines. To wise regulations of their operation for the protection of the employees and the public, and provisions of transportation and sometimes power." I feel sure, Mr. Chairman, what my honourable colleague had in mind or in his mind, that we're going beyond this at the present time, that the net return to the province in royalties, and I just gave an illustration of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, as an illustration that the net return which the people of Manitoba are getting annually from the exploitation of the natural resources of our province, are not sufficient, first of all, to compensate for the taking out of the folds of the earth our God-given heritage, to use my honourable friend's term. Because as we know, they're irreplaceable, over a period of time. But in the meantime, we're not receiving sufficient for our present generation and to make a contribution to the expenditures of government. I thought, Mr. Chairman, that I should rise and point out, because I'm sure that that's what my honourable colleague has in his mind. He appreciates as we appreciate, that expenditures are made and possibly should be made. And I would suggest that possibly the expenditures that we may be making may be in some degree not sufficient. But, having made those expenditures, and I think it's an incumbent on government, to do and to receive a greater share of the revenue from our natural resources to cover, not only the expenditures that we're making, but to add materially to the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . development of our province. And I suggest that if honourable members, and it's available to all, would just take a look at the return that was tabled the other day, we would see without any question of doubt that the net return to the people of Manitoba from its natural resources are not even sufficient to reimburse us for the annual expenditures we are making in respect of the industry itself. And while my honourable friends opposite tell us repeatedly about subsidizing this or subsidizing that, may I suggest this, and I say this in all sincerity. I'm not trying to simply forward our general philosophy, Mr. Chairman, but I simply say this in all sincerity, that if the people of Manitoba are not getting even sufficient returns in royalties and rentals and the likes of that, from our natural resources to pay even on an annual basis for the expenditures which we are making as a government, then it is wrong. Because rather than getting a return, a rightful return, from the exploitation of our natural resources, we in effect, by making greater expenditures in return, are subsidizing the corporations which are exploiting our resources. Now, I appreciate quite fully that members of the House may turn around and say, "yes, but aren't we in the process creating employment, aren't we creating this or creating that?" Yes, the answer to that is yes. But I say in rebuttal to that; Is this a fact that while that is being done today, as we've had illustrated with the closing down of many mines in our northern country, aren't we in that process leaving as a heritage to our future generations yet unborn exhausted mines and exhausted resources? So I think we must temper one with the other all the way through. And I rose merely, Mr. Chairman, at this point to attest -- to point out what I felt was in the mind of my honourable colleague the member for Inkster. I would seriously suggest to the government that this whole field of return on our natural resources, taking into consideration the expenditures we're making for this purpose, that there should be a more even return to our expenditures if not a profit, which we are not now receiving on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the points that were raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster have been well restated by the Leader of the CCF. I think my reply in those cases would be just the same. The gain to Manitoba is taxes, and jobs and business. Those three must be taken into consideration together as the Leader of the CCF acknowledges. There are two other points that I think I might comment on at this time and that is that the royalty taxes, which are levied by the province, are proportionate to profit. They are based on a profit formula as the honourable member knows. And so in that event, if that profit accrues, our royalty taxes rise proportionately. The second is that in a developing economy and one where we think further developments can be made, it would be quite normal to make an investment today in the hope of further returns in a year or two, or in the case of a new mining development, beginning some three years later. After all, three, five years is a comparatively short time in the development of a great industry. I think he does well to call again to the minds of the Committee that very considerable risks are involved. I believe he was with the party when we visited Thompson and we went across that property or perhaps not well . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: May I just . . . . for clarification. I was with my honourable friend on a trip up north where we went into Moak and Mystery Lakes and saw some low grade ore bearing bodies of nickel and then eventually discovered that the mine was going to be located at Thompson where there was a tremendously higher valued ore body than the one we saw at Moak and Mystery Lake. I thought, Mr. Chairman, we'd better clarify that because I didn't see Thompson and we did see Moak and Mystery Lakes which is a different situation as what is now developed at Thompson.

MR. EVANS: I see what the honourable member means. The point that I was coming at was this, that we did pass a pile of drill cores on the ground that had been left there by another great mining corporation -- I've forgotten the name, Noranda, I believe. They had been over the property, drilled it and abandoned it before with greater science and skill or greater luck, International Nickel Company had found it. But up to the time that they made their decision that there was a commercial ore body there, my understanding is they had invested some eight to ten million dollars in exploration. A very considerable risk even for a large corporation of that kind and we must, in order to have that sort of thing continue, hold out a reasonably profitable opportunity to them. But again I say that we must be diligent to see that the Provincial Treasurer does get his fair share for the exploitation of these natural resources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's now 5:30, I shall leave the . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . the honourable Minister, may I interject this, that within a year or two years at the most, the net result of the expenditure of that \$8,000,000. will re-occur to the company . . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5:30 -- I leave the Chair.