

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier & Provincial Treasurer)(Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the resolution standing in my name.

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

MR. ROBLIN: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whereas . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: We read it on the next stage, Mr. Chairman. I move the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . passed.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): I'd like to ask in connection with this resolution -- I trust it is a proper question to ask at this particular stage -- but when the Honourable the First Minister was closing the debate yesterday he made reference to further steps or possible steps after the committee had considered the matter. If I remember correctly he used such phrases as "the further survey or consensus of opinion" -- I'm not sure whether the words "election" or "plebiscite" or some other . . . . -- my honourable friend shakes his head. Possibly I was just dreaming this up over night, but I thought that I had heard from my honourable friend that there were some further steps likely to be taken after the committee and I was wondering if he could inform us what stages he had in mind or are these of a secret nature at the present time?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I announced no new policy in my speech last night.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, speaking on the resolution before us, I'd just like to make one point, that is, it has been mentioned and referred to as an "all-party committee" and I would like this understood that that is not the case and that we should not refer to it as an all-party committee because I represent a constituency but I also represent a party in this House, and therefore I would like to see people refrain from using that -- especially members -- using that term. I have no desire to be on the committee; I'm not making any request to be on the committee; but I would like to have this understood that I also represent a party in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted a certain resolution, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, whereas the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at its Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature on the 14th day of April, 1964, adopted the following resolution: Whereas in Manitoba, constitutional provisions, juridical decisions and political determinations prescribe three general principles of government action in the field of public school education namely: 1. The separation of Church and State as that expression is understood in Manitoba; 2. The dedication of public funds to the support of a single public school system open to all children; 3. The freedom to maintain private schools supported by private funds; and

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . whereas it is in the public interest that all Manitoba children be afforded the maximum educational opportunities in the public schools; and whereas the public schools stand ready to provide 100% of their services to private school children at all times; and whereas a child lawfully enrolled in a private school is at present entitled to none of the services offered by his public school, while if there enrolled and attending he would be entitled to all of them; and whereas such a policy of "all or nothing" may be replaced by an open door policy of shared services within the ambit of the said principles and without contravening them; and whereas a program of shared services may entitle a child attending a private school to avail himself at a public school of such of its services as may be desired and which could be provided without detriment to the public school,

Now therefore be it resolved: that a special committee of 9 members of the Legislature be appointed to consider the advisability of introducing a program of shared services without detriment to the public schools;

And Be It Further Resolved: that in its consideration of the aforesaid the Committee shall adhere to the principles set out in the first preamble hereof;

And Be It Further Resolved: that without limiting the generality of the foregoing the Committee shall consider: 1. The way in which existing private schools may be accredited for shared services and, without interfering with present rights in respect of new private schools or the attendance of pupils thereat, the conditions under which any new private schools may be accredited for shared services at the public schools, taking into account those limitations necessary to assure the integrity of the public school system itself. 2. The specific services at the public school which may be made available to children attending accredited private schools and the ways, means, terms and conditions of their availability at the public schools under the authority of the public schools. 3. The way in which the public schools may obtain provincial grants for shared services provided thereat.

And Be It Further Resolved: that the said Committee may hold such public hearings as it may deem advisable and shall report its findings and recommendations. And whereas it is deemed advisable that a Special Committee consisting of nine members of the Legislature be appointed to consider the advisability of introducing a program of shared services without detriment to the public schools within the meaning of the above resolution and to hold public hearings as may be deemed advisable during recess after prorogation and report its findings and recommendations at the next session of the Legislature;

Therefore Be It Resolved that a Special Committee consisting of Hon. Messrs. Hutton, Johnson, Roblin, Messrs. Campbell, Martin, Mills, Paulley, Tanchak, and Watt be appointed to consider the advisability of introducing a program of shared services without detriment to the public schools within the meaning of the above resolution adopted by this House on the 14th day of April, 1964:

And Be It Further Resolved: that this Special Committee have power to sit during the present session and in recess after prorogation and to report to this House on the matters referred to them at the next session of the Legislature: and that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund to the members of the said committee the amount of expenses incurred by the members in the performances of duties ordered by the Committee in recess after prorogation as are approved by the Comptroller-General; and that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund all other expenses of a kind and nature required to assist the committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution and the said resolution adopted on the 14th day of April, 1964, provided the same have received the prior approval of the Treasury Board.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.  
MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Dauphin): Madam Speaker, yesterday the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked me about the inquest at Thompson, arising out of a recent air traffic crash. I wish to inform the House that the inquest has been fixed for Friday, April 17th.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, if we are ready to go into the business I would suggest that we go into Supply right away and we'll come back to the Committee perhaps when we have more bills to consider in the Committee later on today. Is that suitable? So I move, seconded

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . by the Honourable Attorney-General, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule C.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, we were on Schedule B were we not yesterday, and I have obtained the figures from the Minister regarding a program of unused appropriations.

I'd just like to make a brief comment, Mr. Chairman, on one particular highway in Manitoba and that is the road to Thompson. Now I have here a number of copies of one of the Thompson newspapers, the Thompson Citizen, indicating the progress that is being made on that particular piece of road. Here for example is an issue, Thursday, January 23rd and the headline is "Highway Work Progressing Well" and in the story it proceeds to say, "The road has not been gravelled but it is bearing up well under the traffic," and this is the traffic of construction trucks going back and forth. There's an indication that even without gravel that the roadbed would be ready for light traffic fairly soon. Now on the 30th of January, '64, the same newspaper indicates that as a result of this particular story the week before, some enterprising citizens of the area decided to test out the highway and it's written here, in fact in Thompson terms, "Thompsonites, with their pioneer spirit of adventure, started driving south in the wee hours of Saturday morning. The first cars out over the highway left here at 2:00 a. m. Saturday morning for The Pas and they arrived at The Pas Saturday afternoon experiencing no trouble along the road. The return trip Sunday was also trouble-free." Now subsequent stories -- this is the issue of March 12th -- indicates there had been a very substantial amount of traffic, in fact the story here on the 12th of March: "Traffic increases on road south. Since that time hundreds of cars have completed the trip between Thompson and southern points and as each week went by have reported a steady improvement in the condition of the highway." Now, I understand, Mr. Chairman, that during the course of the winter there has been substantial improvement as well in the highway as construction went on. I'm told for example that Simkin's Construction, who were the successful bidders, started work in early winter and that by January 30th had the road passable for traffic. At that date there remained 50 miles of winter road. This was at the end of January. Apparently, a month later they were able to do considerable more work and the individual who was travelling on this indicated that there was only 14.3 miles of winter road left and that since that time -- and this is approximately early April -- that it's down to five miles of winter road. I'm also told, Mr. Chairman, that south of Wabowden where the road base has been completed, or had been by the 15th of March, there's a very large stockpile of gravel along the highway.

So the request that I make, Mr. Chairman, at this time of the Minister is this. Would it be possible while winter conditions are still with us to complete the graveling and use the stockpile of gravel so that at least light traffic would be able to use the highway during the course of the summer, because unless that is done fairly soon, it seems to me that we will be faced with the situation of having the road base in, but having no gravel on it would make it almost impracticable for this coming summer, whereas if the gravel could be spread out on it now it would give access to the people in Thompson for this summer. I think this would put them ahead one whole season in their operations there.

It is my understanding that in addition to the passenger vehicle travel this winter, there has also been a fair amount of trucking going on, that some of the local distributors have been bringing their goods in by truck from The Pas, in some cases from Flin Flon, and this has been very successful. Well, quite obviously during the frozen season this makes sense, but when we come along to the spring thaw, if there is no gravel this will have to stop completely, so I would appeal to the Minister at this time, and due to the fact that the road base apparently is reasonably well completed, that there is gravel stockpile in the vicinity, if he could not proceed at once with the graveling to permit at least light traffic for this coming summer.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works)(Minnedosa): The Honourable Leader of the Opposition obviously has some reports that I haven't had, probably from people coming

(Mr. Weir, Cont'd.) . . . through. I wasn't under the impression that the grading was that far along, but on the other hand I haven't had anything official for some time and it may have come a considerable distance. There has been quite a bit of traffic over it. As a matter of fact, I understand that the Honourable Member for Churchill drove down over it the other day in his Buick Wildcat, and considering the fact that I think that the Honourable Member for Churchill is a fair load in itself for the Buick Wildcat, and the fact that it was able to cover a road like that I think speaks well for the road. But all I can say I think, Mr. Chairman, is that I'll certainly have it checked, and if there is anything that we can do to expedite it we will certainly do it, but the Honourable Leader of the Opposition presents a more optimistic outlook for early summer travel than what we have been able to anticipate in the department. If progress has been better than what we expected this winter we will certainly be happy to see what we can do.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I might just point out to the Minister that the March 12th issue of this same newspaper gives the map and detail of what has been completed to date, and I would gather from the indications there that it would be possible to get something done for this summer. I understand further that the work crews were pulled off I believe the early part of April from any further construction, and that the thing is ending now. This is why, if he could check into it very soon and if it's possible to get the gravel out, that I would appeal to him to do so.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that I have found that even from my looking at a project, what I think is completed and what the engineers and the people on the job think is completed and ready for gravel, are sometimes two different things, and it may well be that there is some other work to bring the grade up to standard before gravelling can be done, and all I can do is repeat that I'll certainly have it checked into.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 passed. Item 2, Centennial, passed . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder . . . . missed but I didn't realize we were going quite that quickly. On Item 1, the University, was there any carryover and what are the projects covered by this item?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . financing at the University but the particular buildings that are covered by this are the following: The alterations to the old Science Building, the University College, the Medical Building, the Fine Arts Building, Athletic facilities, the residence, and some miscellaneous items. Those are the buildings that are included in this appropriation.

MR. MOLGAT: Alterations to the old Science Building, the University College, the Medical Building, the Fine Arts, then I missed . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Athletic facilities, the residence, and some miscellaneous items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 passed, 2 passed.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . statement on this subject, was he?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . Mr. Chairman, because I want to try and get the objectives of the government clear in connection with the Centennial operation.

First of all, in this sum of \$2 million there are a number of components, and the breakdown is as follows: our share of the project at Brandon \$150,000; our share of the Peace Garden program, \$50,000; the per capita grant of \$1.00 that we propose to make available to all municipalities, \$950,000; the balance \$850,000 is this year's installment towards the main project, the Manitoba Art Centre in the capital city.

Now I think that the House would probably be interested in a statement of the sequence of events that has led up to the selection of the present site for an Arts Centre in the City of Winnipeg and some account of the various transactions that have gone on in securing that property, and any other facts that members might think should properly be related to it.

The first thing that I would like to say is to remind the House that for many years now the Province has indicated its interest in the urban renewal of the City of Winnipeg, and the location of this Arts Centre is related to that general aim. I have a statement here which I am going to read which will give the general picture in this connection.

In 1958, the Province made a written offer to the City of Winnipeg for the purpose of rehabilitating Point Douglas, and as part of the plan suggested the location of the new City Hall in that area as the focus of a general program of renewal of the historic part of the City. To assist in examining the proposal, the Province, the City of Winnipeg, and Central Mortgage

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . and Housing Corporation jointly, approved a panel of urban renewal consultants consisting of Professor Anthony Adamson of the School of Architecture of the University of Toronto, also vice-chairman of the National Capital Commission in Ottawa, Mr. H. H. G. Moody, and Mr. Eric Thrift, then director of the Metropolitan Planning Commission. In June 1959 this panel recommended against locating the Civic Centre in Point Douglas, largely for reasons of uncertain traffic development there. The City of Winnipeg accepted the proposal at that time and declined to go ahead with the overall program that had been proposed for the area. However, Messrs. Adamson and Moody recommended the retention of the City Hall in its traditional site and suggested the possibility of opening up an area on the East side of Main Street as a redevelopment program -- members will recall that report which is public information.

The Government's proposal of 1958, however, indicated provincial interest in a rehabilitation scheme in the historic part of Winnipeg beginning in the southern part of the Point Douglas area. Since 1959 the Government has not lost sight of this objective. It was the motive for the Government working with the City of Winnipeg to relocate the City Hall from the site at Broadway and Osborne to its old location on Main Street, and to develop the Broadway and Osborne site as a Memorial Park.

In following the design for redevelopment in the south part of the Point Douglas area, the province sought various approaches. Two lines of policy subsequently studied in this connection were the location of the Manitoba Arts Centre in the area and the plan for the Civic Development Corporation, which it was hoped would draw the active support of a number of prominent citizens, sharing the desire to see the heart of Winnipeg renewed. Both these approaches were guided by the concept of all levels of Government working together with private citizens in urban redevelopment, a formula that has already shown marked success in several other cities. The idea of placing the Manitoba Arts Centre in this area arose from the acknowledged concept that major government building projects wherever possible should comprehend subsidiary benefits, such as the improvement of an urban area in addition to providing the specific services for which the projects were established.

We could not anticipate that we would have sufficient funds available to establish the Manitoba Arts Centre and also to develop the historic part of Winnipeg. The location of the new Winnipeg City Hall and the proposed Manitoba Arts Centre in the same general area thus provided an opportunity for obtaining two desirable objects at once with the maximum benefit from the funds available and I think that -- I pause for a moment just to underline this idea, because I think it is very important to get that clear, that it's necessary when making investments of this kind, if you possibly can, to get the maximum benefit out of it, and we took the view then and we still do, that we haven't the funds to operate an Arts Centre and Urban Renewal both, so if we combine the two in an overall project then we get the maximum advantage from the funds available.

After reaching these conclusions about the Manitoba Arts Centre and redevelopment, and before any public announcements were made, to avoid speculative price increase the government decided that it should begin to assemble and secure property on which the Manitoba Arts Centre could be constructed. Mr. Maitland Steinkopf, then a private citizen, and Mr. James A. Richardson, also a private citizen, were invited to assist the government in putting together a suitable piece of property in the redevelopment area for the proposed Manitoba Arts Centre. Because of its location directly east of Main Street, opposite the new City Hall, and with Professor Adamson's and Mr. H. H. G. Moody's views in mind, a block roughly bounded by Main Street, Market Avenue, James Avenue and Martha Street was selected. The three pieces of property comprising the aforementioned block inclusive of city-owned property were obtained. The assembling of these properties was completed in September of 1962. In carrying out the request made by the government, Messrs. Steinkopf and Richardson retained the National Trust Company to handle the transaction.

In connection with the purchase of the property, it should be noted that Messrs. Alvin Druxerman and H. Bernstein, who owned the largest of the three properties involved, were informed that the purchase of the property was for the construction of a Manitoba Arts Centre and was not intended for any other purpose. The co-operation of these gentlemen in selling their own property and in helping to assemble the other properties was valuable and much

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . appreciated. They were assured if for any reason their original property was not used for the construction of the Manitoba Arts Centre it would be returned to them.

The opinion of competent advisers confirms that the purchase price for the whole property was just and reasonable. Indeed, I think it can be safely said that the present value is considerably more than the purchase price that was paid out at the time. In this connection the amount paid for the property thus acquired can be compared with the value of the property which the City of Winnipeg is now acquiring for the construction of a parking centre in the vicinity of the new City Hall. The first property, that is, the Arts Centre property, approximately 62,000 square feet with Main Street frontage was acquired for a total purchase price of \$590,000, the assessment with buildings being \$226,300, and in a Return tabled to the Order of the Honourable Member from St. George, details of those transactions and previous values have been put on the public record.

The property to be purchased by the City of Winnipeg, approximately 54,000 feet -- in other words, somewhat smaller than the property we have -- is understood to be valued in the area of \$3/4 million. So I think those comparisons give an idea as to the relative value of the property in that part of the city.

While the government had authority to incur these expenditures under the terms of The Reserve for War and Post-war Emergencies, it was felt it was desirable as well to seek specific confirmation by the Legislature under the terms of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation Act 1963, since the purpose of the land acquisition came under the terms of that Act. Incidentally, members will recall my saying at that time that we had this intention of locating the Arts Centre near the present City Hall.

This statement gives the sequence of developments in connection with the present land assembly for the Manitoba Arts Centre and a number of reasons why the particular location was decided upon. Informal discussions have been held with the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg to review the general plans for the Manitoba Arts Centre and to prepare both traffic and project development plans in the near future. We believe that we can achieve the harmonious development of the area in co-operation with the City of Winnipeg, all other Metro municipalities, Metro itself, the province, the public and the cultural bodies which are directly or indirectly interested in the Manitoba Arts Centre.

On the Orders of the Day on March 2nd a statement respecting the architects, the Building Committee and the Designing Committee was given by the Provincial Secretary as Chairman of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation. By continuing consultation and the furnishing of information as plans are developed, we are confident that when the Centre is erected it will serve the needs of the Province of Manitoba for many years to come, and help to promote the redevelopment of Metro Winnipeg.

Now, there are a number of comments that I would like to make in connection with that statement, to underline some of the points made. I should like to say, first of all, that we think it is essential, under the circumstances, that the Arts Centre should definitely be considered as part of our Urban Renewal Plan, and once that decision is made then the area of location is pretty well localized because you're fairly well limited as to where that construction should take place if you wish it to have a decisive effect in connection with Urban Renewal. Not only that, but it happens that since these discussions began, in our negotiations with the Federal Government we were successful in asking them to put up \$2-1/2 million towards the cost of this project, but they laid down two conditions: first of all that it should be for one project only. In other words, we cannot take their \$2-1/2 million and spend it on several projects around the province -- that was ruled out, and I think it was a wise provision on their part. Secondly, they stipulated that it should be, as far as possible, in the capital city. So that when you add their conditions to the views that the government already had, it can be seen that the location of the Arts Centre was pretty well confirmed in those developments that took place.

Now I would like to also say that the City of Winnipeg has recently, as members know, agreed that this is the right location as far as they are concerned for this project, and we also have, as I said in my statement, an understanding with the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg in respect of the matter.

Now, there are one or two things that I would like to say about the development of this



(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . idea, because there has been a lot of discussion in the press and a lot of concern expressed by people who are active in cultural activities, and who have wondered whether they are going to be properly considered in the development of this project, or whether they are liable to be faced with some fait accompli or some plan laid down in respect of this matter without their having had a full opportunity to make their views known. And I want to give an assurance to all concerned in this matter in this respect. I would like to say that up until the present time it has been premature, in our opinion, to do anything more than we have done so far. After all, until the question of financing is pretty well nailed down it does not seem practical to get to grips with the people who are interested in cultural activities and the rest in order to develop these ideas. And I report to the House that it was only in January of this year that we learned officially and for certain that the Federal Government was going to make a contribution. We had stated that we would make a contribution of \$3 million on the part of the province. In January we were informed that the Federal Government had decided to make a contribution of \$2-1/2 million, so it is coming along. Since then we have been having conversations with the municipalities of the Metropolitan area to obtain their views on this matter, because we were of the opinion that they, too, should contribute to this matter, and we have suggested to them that between the lot of them they should make themselves responsible for something in the nature of \$2-1/2 to \$3 million. Those negotiations are not complete. However, it is satisfactory to record that the City of Winnipeg, who are the largest single contributor to this and whose contribution in any event will be, I think, about \$2 million, have indicated their approval in principle, as I understand it, of their taking some share of this cost in one way or another, the precise details not yet being clear. It thus appears that we are now in a much firmer position with respect of the financing of this project than we have been up until the very present, having in mind some \$3 million from the province, some \$2-1/2 from the Federal Government and some \$2 million from the City of Winnipeg. We expect that we will get co-operation from other municipalities in one way or another, but the extent of that co-operation at present is unknown.

We also expect to solicit private contributions from people who have an interest and who have supported these cultural activities over the many years. We have quite an ambitious goal, some \$3 million which we hope to raise with private contributions, and as soon as the public share has been settled upon then I think we will be in a position to begin whatever steps are necessary to encourage the citizens to make whatever contributions they wish to make to this matter.

But it now appears to us that we have a very large sum of money definitely available to us and we are now in a position to begin those consultations with people who should be consulted in this respect. The Manitoba Centennial Corporation has been set up; it is in business, and it is the body that will be getting in touch with the various groups who are interested in this matter and endeavour to obtain the benefit of their views. We are very conscious of the fact that the people who in the past years have interested themselves in the problem of the museum are people who really ought to have something worthwhile to say about a new museum for example, if this should be in the order of priority. And we feel as well that those people who have been active in Art Gallery activities ought to have something worthwhile to say in connection with any undertakings that are put in hand in connection with that kind of a project. And so we foresee a very considerable advantage being derived from having the opportunity to consult with these various people about the projects that will be put into force.

Architects have been appointed. There is a consortium of three very good firms in the City of Winnipeg. We have established a committee, a design committee as we call it, that will act as the liaison body, I expect, in assembling these views of which I have spoken. And we are also having a building committee set up so that when the design is approved and the architects have done their job, we have a committee who will be following through the construction of this project.

Now, this means, of course, that the Centennial Corporation ought to very soon be thinking of appointing a manager. Just as we had to appoint a manager for the Pan-American Games, I think that similarly we will have to appoint some competent person to be a manager to handle all these details and act as the Executive Officer of the Centennial Corporation and draw all these threads together. But up to the present time, when we were still engaged with the problems

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . of public financing, it seemed premature to do that. Now that the public financing question now seems to be pretty firmly on the rails, it is likely that we should go ahead with the appointment of a project manager and get this job going just as quickly as we can.

One thing I would like to say is that there seems to be an impression that the property that we have already acquired is all that would be thought necessary for an Arts Centre. I don't think that's the case. I think we will have to acquire much more property in that general area. I'm not just sure where or how this should be done. This will have to be looked into further. But there's been some concern that we have one block and we're going to put everything one on top of another and have sort of a jumble. Well we don't want that. We need more property. We want elbow room. We want green space around here. We don't want this project to be submerged by the rest of the neighbourhood; we want it to bring the rest of the neighbourhood up, and that means that we're going to have to have more property and more elbow room in developing this matter, and I just say that to the committee because I think they would like to know that that is our view of the situation.

Now I've covered a good many points in connection with this project. There may be other questions about other Centennial activities that I should report on. We have been in constant consultation with the City of Brandon and have proposed to them that there should be some kind of a project of a suitable character -- suitable and permanent character -- in Brandon, and they have responded enthusiastically to this. We are suggesting that our contribution should be \$150,000.00. It will be matched by the Federal Government contribution, and we believe should be matched by the municipality as well, and believe that it will be. That project is under the control of the Centennial Corporation and is in process at the moment.

Another permanent structure that we feel should be done is to do something at the Peace Gardens. We have there one of the most impressive memorials to international relations, good international relations, that one could seek, and it seems to us appropriate that we should take this opportunity in Manitoba to improve our facilities and our investment in the Peace Gardens. We intend to allocate \$50,000 for that. The Federal Government, I think is willing to put up \$25,000 for that in one way or another, and there will be a \$75,000 investment, as we see the picture now, in the Peace Gardens. These sums, of course, all the sums I've mentioned, are open to a change as the situation develops and plans become firmer and costs become clearer, but these are the general orders of magnitude about which we are thinking.

We also, as has been previously stated, we are also offering to municipalities throughout the province a dollar per capita from the province, which is being met by a dollar per capita from the Federal Government, and we hope will be matched by some local money as well, and this money is available for any project of a permanent nature that the municipalities have in mind. What we are encouraging them to do wherever possible is to club together, because there may not be large sums in some municipalities, but if municipalities get together to establish a park or an old automobile museum or anything that they think might be suitable, then we get a considerable pool of funds and something quite substantial can be done in that event. So that we have this kind of program going.

Then of course, as the Minister said the other day -- the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources -- in addition to all this we have our parks projects which have already been discussed by the House, so it seems to me that we have a rather ambitious program ahead of us in connection with the appropriate observance of the Centennial, both of the nation and of the province, and we hope that all these things will turn out to be satisfactory and good for the public. Now there may be questions about this that I have not covered, and if there is any point the members raise I'll be glad to do what I can to answer.

MR. FROESE: . . . the amount allocated for distribution on a per capita basis, is that all that the locals or the municipalities will be getting in this respect for Centennial purposes, or are there any other additional grants that might be forthcoming?

MR. ROBLIN: No, those are the grants that are anticipated at the moment.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): . . . to local projects in the rural area for Centennial construction. I understand that only projects that do not presently qualify for other grants will be considered; that is, it would be impossible, for instance, in Neepawa to build an Infirm or Elderly Persons' Housing Unit because it does qualify for a grant, and there are other

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . projects of a similar nature that qualify, for grants. I wonder if we could have this cleared up:

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think that we as a province have any objection to combining funds to get the maximum use out of it. There is a restriction that the Federal Government put in, and I read it: "The total contribution of the Government of Canada which includes contributions from other Government of Canada sources, such as winter works, toward the cost of an approved project, shall not exceed 50 percent of the eligible cost. If the payment of a grant under this program should bring the total contribution of the Government of Canada to an amount in excess of 50 percent of such cost, grants paid under this program will be reduced accordingly." Now that's their regulation but we have no provincial regulation to that effect, and I think that with a little thought a joint project can be worked out that has Centennial money from the province, Centennial money from the Federal Government, plus other grants if it qualifies in other ways. The only limitation that we have is this federal limitation; there is none on the provincial contribution. So I think it could be quite possible to work out something of the nature that my honourable friend suggests.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . in charge of this department particularly had any comments to make himself. Is he going to make a statement or not?

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (Provincial Secretary & Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Mr. Chairman, I hadn't planned on making any statement. I think it was well covered by the Premier. I can't think of anything that he's left out. It would be a little redundant if I got up now, except I look forward to the work of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation. I think that the province is getting into the spirit of the celebration itself. The matter of money has been a sore point with many municipalities and with many communities and organizations, but I'm happy to report that pretty near all of them are resolved and that now the matter of getting into the celebration seems to be the most important thing. Besides the money matters there of course will be other things that will be done during the course of 1967. I'd like to refer maybe to the exchange of students, the matter of taking students from Manitoba and sending them to other provinces for periods ranging from a week to maybe a whole semester at school. Some of the imaginative programs being planned by the Federal Government -- they plan to have various exhibitions of a Canadian content travel from one end of the country to the other. They have in mind in this connection a train with all kinds of things on it, a train that would come to Manitoba, and be located wherever there are train tracks. I hope there'll still be a lot of them around by 1967. There are now some 167 different types of projects being considered by the Federal Centennial Committee. These will all be available to Manitobans at no cost and will not conflict with the Federal-Manitoba plan, financial plan, which is designed mostly for permanent memorials of the Centennial. We have received so far some 60-odd suggestions in Manitoba. Some of these are going to be processed until after the date suggested in our memorandum of August 1st. We've encouraged all municipalities -- that is under the federal grant scheme. These will all be considered; they're rather varied, different types, many of them in the cultural level. I would think that this will be a very, very busy province in 1967 and a very happy one.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . just ask some questions regarding some of the projects that are here. The first one the Minister mentioned was our share of the Brandon project. I wonder if he could give details of what the Brandon project is.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, it's really up to the people in Brandon to finalize this. We have proposed to them for their consideration that they might consider an auditorium. That is something that they've been talking about for some time out there, particularly if it could be constructed in co-operation with Brandon College. It would then serve a dual function of being a civic building and also a college building as well, and I think negotiations have been taking place between the College and the City of Brandon with respect to this particular idea. But I don't think that they have come to any final decision on this matter and as far as we're concerned we are more or less agreeable to whatever idea they think is best for their community. That's one suggestion which has appealed to them and I think they're studying it. It may well turn out to be the project.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I note from minutes of the Winter Fair Board in Brandon that here it appears that the government now is saying that they are leaving this up to the people

(Mr. Molgat, Cont'd.) . . . of Brandon but that in fact the Manitoba Government took a very active part in promoting the project without discussion with the people who are primarily involved, I would think, and that's the College. I'm quoting from minutes from January 6th, 1964; the speaker is the Member for Brandon constituency -- he's not in his seat at the moment -- and he advised, and he's speaking to the meeting, he advised that when the Manitoba Cabinet met in Brandon last year, Premier Roblin had suggested that an auditorium located on the campus would have government support as the Centennial project for Brandon. Then going on to other meetings, Mr. Chairman, one of January 31, 1964, -- this would be a full year later I presume, if not more, and the speaker is Mr. McGregor. Mr. McGregor said that the College Board has never discussed the construction of an auditorium on the campus, and advised that that Board has never been officially advised of any meetings or discussions concerning any auditorium or auditorium-arena project. Later on there is a question asked of the speaker, Mr. McGregor, and he stated that he had had no contact from anyone in this regard. Mr. McGregor also suggested that if any organization or government felt that construction of such a proposed auditorium would affect Brandon College, he feels that contact should have been made through the Board of Directors of the Institution.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in this case the government has acted, as I think it much too frequently acts, by making a decision and then advising other people of what its decision is, and I don't think that there's been proper contact in this case with the people in Brandon who are primarily involved. The Brandon College where apparently the government is recommending that the building should be placed, are saying themselves in January of this year that they have not been approached, and yet a year or a year and a half ago the government was proposing exactly that.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the situation is quite as black as my honourable friend fears. It is perfectly true that some time ago in Brandon I did have discussions with the Mayor about a Centennial project and we did discuss this suggestion which is here now, but I want to make it abundantly clear that that was not presented to him as a government decision. It was a suggestion -- after all, people talk about these things. We have to come to some agreement to see in what area of activity a project should be thought of. And that was the proposal that was made at that time. I think there's one thing that should be made very clear and that is that it is the responsibility of the municipality, of the City of Brandon, to decide on this thing and to decide whether or not it is interested in a joint venture with Brandon College. That's not up to us to decide. We may suggest it if we like, but it's not up to us to decide it in our view. So that's one aspect of the matter.

And then I'm a little bit puzzled, I confess, by Mr. McGregor's statement because I read those minutes too, and I know that Brandon College has considered the advisability of this project, and I know that when they came to see us the matter was raised, and it has been discussed by people of Brandon College who asked us that if they went into this arrangement would we allow their share of the cost of maintaining this building to be considered as part of our grant that we make for the maintenance of Brandon College itself. And they got an affirmative answer that if they were in this proposition and they had to carry a share of the operating cost of this structure, that provided it was a genuine arrangement for the convenience of Brandon College we would consider that as part of their costs when they came in to discuss their grants with us. So, as I say, I'm a little bit puzzled. It may well be true that they received no letter from us about this matter. I don't see why they should. It's a matter for them to decide and it's primarily a matter for the City of Brandon to decide, so it's not a question of our imposing our views. If Brandon come back and tell us they don't want an auditorium in co-operation with the College, well, we'll look at something else. Our views are by no means fixed. I merely give that information to the Committee to indicate what discussions have taken place and where we do stand at the moment.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the minister says that he doesn't understand Mr. McGregor's statement. Well it wasn't only Mr. McGregor's statement, because further on in these same minutes of January 31, 1964, on page 2, the statement is -- and I don't know to whom it refers by name -- but it says, "The representatives of the College Board were asked if they had been consulted concerning the possibilities of building a Centennial auditorium on the campus. They said they had heard rumors only and that nothing direct had ever been

(Mr. Molgat, Cont'd.) . . . referred to the Board of Directors nor have the Directors ever discussed such a project," so it's not Mr. McGregor alone, Mr. Chairman. It appears to be certainly the representatives of the Board.

However, Mr. Chairman, this is only an indication of what happened in Brandon. There is a much more serious situation here in Winnipeg with regard to the proposed Arts Centre and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this Government has not consulted. Sure, the Minister tells us this morning, in his statement, that they are now going to start consulting, that they had problems from a monetary standpoint and until they had those resolved they could not discuss it with anyone else. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is going at the project in reverse, that the proper course of action in this matter, if the government wanted to proceed with an Arts Centre, was to discuss first of all with the people primarily involved in Art matters; to discuss with, for example, the Theatre Centre who are conducting here in Winnipeg a very vigorous theatre activity, one of the best in Canada, and I believe that they have not been consulted. There should have been consultations with people from the Art Gallery. Not too long ago in the newspapers there was reported that the Art Gallery director had not been consulted. There should have been discussions way, way back with all of these people, the people representing the Museum, the Symphony, the Ballet. Surely if we are going to proceed with expenditures of the amounts that my honourable friends are proposing, then the people basically involved in the purposes of these buildings should be consulted in the very initial stages to ascertain from them the type of program in which they feel they should participate, the type of program which they feel is required; and a paramount matter, Mr. Chairman, and one that is before the citizens of Winnipeg a great deal, the matter of the location of this centre. I mentioned some of the groups -- there are probably many others, Mr. Chairman, who should be consulted. I'm speaking now of the specific art groups involved.

But there are other people, Mr. Chairman, who are vitally involved in this proposed project and these are the various planners. This government, when it introduced the Metropolitan Corporation Act, gave the responsibility for planning, as I understand it, certainly for major thoroughfares, to the Metropolitan Corporation, and yet there was no consultation with Metro, if we are to judge from the statement that Metro themselves have made, with regard to the thoroughfares in this area or the development of this area. I believe from what I have seen that there has been very little consultation with the City of Winnipeg in this regard. Mr. Chairman, this has been a case where this government some years ago made up its mind on its own that it would proceed with the redevelopment of this area. Well, now, it may be right in that regard; possibly the area requires redevelopment; but Mr. Chairman, I submit that they have not consulted with the remainder of the people involved. They have proceeded in this in their typical fashion of making a decision and then at a later date bringing in the people who should be concerned and who should be contacted in the early stages -- not after a decision is made; and this is the situation that we are faced with here right now in Winnipeg and I say that the people of Winnipeg are not satisfied. My honourable friend may be satisfied with this location, but I can tell him that he had better start talking to the people in Winnipeg, because by and large from what I have found out, they are not satisfied with the actions of this government in this regard. Mr. Chairman, there will have to be a lot of questions answered by the government before this whole matter is cleared to my satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, what contact has there been made, for example, with the architects? Last fall I believe my honourable friend received letters from the architects of Manitoba and from the School of Architecture, asking exactly what was going on, trying to find out from the government what their plans were, recommending that there should be a competition for this project. No competition has been called, Mr. Chairman -- the government is proceeding on its own. After some pressure it decided to appoint a group of three architects. This was not the request of either, as I understand it, the Architectural Society or the Faculty of Architecture at the University of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, there is real concern in Winnipeg about the location that this government is imposing on the municipalities and the people of this area with regard to this Arts Centre. I understand, Mr. Chairman, from news reports, that sometime in February Metro submitted a confidential report to the Manitoba Government. Here is the news report at that time --

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . Tribune, February 28th: "A confidential Metro report accuses the Provincial Government of ignoring Metro and other interested groups in planning the \$8.5 million Arts Centre. The report was presented to the Province at the start of the present session. It says a 1958 study showed the area planned for the Arts Centre could not be recommended for redevelopment until firm plans for the thoroughfares in this area were produced. It adds that the Provincial Government has established a private corporation to undertake the redevelopment of an area which previously was considered too costly. Because of rumours that the Centennial Corporation planned to locate the Arts Centre east of Main Street opposite the City Hall, Metro allowed for such a development in its master plan. You cannot produce a development plan, particularly for downtown, on rumours." This, Mr. Chairman, is a report to the government, or to the news story, on the 28th of February of this year. At that time Metro was saying that they had no direct contact from this government, that they had to operate on rumours as to what is going to be done in that area.

Mr. Chairman, there have been other planners. I have not got the name of the gentleman involved -- I believe he is a gentleman who came here from Toronto, who recommended strongly that the Arts Centre not be placed in that area, that it be placed in another area of Winnipeg, but preferably close to the business community and not isolated where it is now. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that what's happened here is that some years ago this government decided that that area needed redeveloping. Later on the decision was made that Winnipeg needed an Arts Centre, so having those two matters the government decided, "Let's bulk the two and let's make a redevelopment and Arts Centre combined in that area. But Mr. Chairman, that does not necessarily agree with the need of an Arts Centre and I come back again to the very point, Mr. Chairman, that had there been consultation by this government instead of unilateral action by themselves, had they consulted the people involved they would not be in this position right now. The Premier admits that they have paid a large sum of money for the present land. This is in the Order for a Return, \$590,000, and that they will need substantial extra land in addition to this, and I think this is correct, Mr. Chairman, because as I see it, this does not provide for parking, the other requirements of such an Arts Centre.

Mr. Chairman, I am told that land could be purchased in other parts of the City closer to the business and financial centre that we now have, for about the same amount of money, if not for less. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the government is now telling the people of Manitoba, "Well, now that we've made our decision, you come in and help us and we'll see what we can work out of this whole thing." Mr. Chairman, this is simply not satisfactory. There are going to have to be much better explanations than those. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that there's possibly no better description of what has been going on than an article which appeared in the Tribune on Saturday, April 11th. I'm referring to an article entitled "Hirsch Fears Gallery May Be Stalin II." If I may quote, Mr. Chairman, quoting directly from that article: "Mr. Hirsch was appointed two months ago the Manitoba Arts Centre committee and has yet to be asked to a meeting. I have never been called. Whether they have met or not I don't know. There have been rumours, rumblings behind doors, and vague mysterious smiles, but that is all I hear or see.' Just by contrast he is already booked for twice monthly meetings with the Ottawa Art Centre Committee and has received acknowledgments from Prime Minister Pearson! 'I only mention it to show the difference.' The Federal Government he says is doing things in a business-like, smart manner to prevent the birth of a monster. 'I'm curious and moderately impatient about what is going on in Manitoba'."

Mr. Chairman, this man is on the committee. He has according to this been on the committee for two months. He says he's curious to know what's going on.

What is the philosophy behind it? What is its concept. Is it going to be a foretaste of what this City will be in 50 years? When you build you must build not just for now, but for the future. In most cities we have heard a great deal of discussion involving the public on what the people would like an Arts Centre to be. The point of view of all sorts of people, of the average citizen particularly, would be beneficial, but in Winnipeg none of this has been done. It's as if the people involved are holding it so close to their chest we don't know that they are suffocating. Either that, or the City just isn't interested. If the Manitoba Arts Centre lays an egg, it should be laid right at the door of the people planning it. In 1964 it cannot be used as an excuse that such a thing has never been done before and they didn't know. Painful examples

(Mr. Molgat, Cont'd.) . . . of monstrosities are Edmonton, Calgary, and Vancouver -- just sitting there, examples of what can happen when not enough sensible planning is done.

Mr. Hirsch had some ideas. There should be an immediate meeting called of people working in various organizations -- people who can be expected to contribute ideas. There should be a full disclosure to the public of the ideas to be discussed. He would like to see a survey made. What use are the existing facilities going to be put to? What is to become of the Civic Auditorium and the Playhouse? What about the Manitoba Theatre Centre's theatre? It is inadequate for its services. The school is over-crowded and they are working in unheated offices bursting at the seams. We should make sure that whatever is built is not built in the spirit of a mausoleum -- removed from the average citizen of this city. On the contrary, every effort should be made to have the Centre easily accessible to all the people. "It is not criminal to build an Art Gallery where office workers go to eat at noon. If it is to attract people, it must be built for places where it will attract people. In every Canadian city art is being removed from its exclusive strange pedestal on which it has been resting for ages in our society. It must be done here too. What we want to hear is, "See you at the Art Gallery Cafeteria," and on and on, Mr. Chairman. This, Mr. Chairman, from a man who has been appointed on the committee, presumably responsible for that area.

Mr. Chairman, this points out exactly what I've been saying that this government did not consult. They made a decision on their own to build the Arts Centre in the area where it's going, and now they're telling these people who are vitally concerned, "Like it or lump it. We've made up our minds." They're telling the municipalities involved, who are going to have to put up a large part of this money, "This is where it's going to go. Whether you like it or you don't like it, there's the cost." This is exactly what we're faced with. Knowing full well, Mr. Chairman, that the City of Winnipeg and Metro and other people have been considering other things in the City of Winnipeg. What about the plaza that was considered some years ago? What consultation have they had with people who were planning these other projects? I submit, Mr. Chairman, none. I say to this government, Mr. Chairman, have another look at what you are doing. You have now gone ahead for three or four years completely on your own. Let's have another look at this whole situation. It's late now, very late; but it may not be too late, and I submit that the location at the present Arts Centre should be reconsidered completely.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . made by my honourable friend. I'd first like to say that by and large I agree with what Mr. Hirsch says about how we should proceed with the development of this centre. He has a lot of good ideas there and I don't take any exception at all to the fact that he has expressed them publicly. The whole point that I'm trying to say is that until we have the financial structure of this thing in shape, we are not really following a sound course in proceeding with the plans. So it follows that you have to get the money, and then when you know how much money you've got you are then in a position to invite these discussions and to have these consultations of which Mr. Hirsch speaks, and of which my honourable friend speaks, and which I think undoubtedly will have to take place.

The one thing about which the government must take the responsibility for, of course, is the location of it in its present site, and I've explained why we have done that, and I think our reasons are sound. I can understand why other people may wish to suggest other sites for the location of this Centre but I think the reasons that compelled us to suggest and to obtain this property are sound reasons, because if you're spending this amount of money you must get the maximum advantage out of it, and to have it in conjunction with Urban Renewal is I think the right thing to do. To put this in a place where urban renewal is not needed, as has been suggested by some, would I think not be wise under the circumstances. So we have to take the responsibility for the general location, and we have to take the responsibility for providing the money, or making the arrangements. After that is when the other people come into -- their views come into play; and I think that we certainly are going to see that that is done. I think the trouble is that there have been a lot of rumours and people have been impatient, and we have not told them the reasons why we have not been able to consult them yet -- I'm giving these reasons here. Perhaps we would have been wiser to have made that in some public statement at another time, but it hasn't been done; it's been done at this particular time; but when the reasons are explained I believe that people will find them as acceptable.

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.)

Now in spite of that I do not think that this charge of lack of consultation is borne out by the facts. What I want to do is to read to you a statement made by the City of Winnipeg in this respect. This came up in the City Council the other day and one of the aldermen made a speech that could well have been made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, because Alderman Zuken said -- and this is the report in the newspaper the other day, April 14th. He said he wanted to register his protest at the way in which the project was being developed. Quote. "Mr. Steinkopf has been keeping this whole thing under wraps and out of sight of the public. The people should have been taken into his confidence. What is there about this project that has to be kept secret?" Now the answer and the right answer was given and it wasn't given by the Minister or by me, but was given by the Mayor of Winnipeg. Mayor Stephen Juba said that he felt the charges made by Alderman Zuken against Mr. Steinkopf were unfounded and very unfair. And I think Mayor Juba is in a position to know. Mayor Juba said that Mr. Steinkopf had been doing very well in a difficult job and had taken the City Council fully into his confidence as far as the planning of the project was concerned. "We have every assurance," says Mr. Juba, "that Mr. Steinkopf will not proceed with the Arts Centre until the artistic people have been consulted. After all, this thing is in the financing stage and these things are not done overnight."

Now that's just what I've been saying and the Mayor of Winnipeg backs me up. He has been consulted; his Council has been consulted; we've been in close touch with them over a lengthy period. I myself phoned the Chairman of the Metropolitan Corporation when these rumours reached me that he and his men were not being properly consulted, and found out that he was satisfied that we had been keeping in reasonable contact with him and that in fact they are going ahead now with the plans for the traffic and zoning and other matters that are connected with this. So this statement, that has been given wide publicity, that we have not consulted the Metropolitan Corporation and kept them in the dark, and we have not consulted the City of Winnipeg and kept them in the dark, simply are without foundation, because they have been consulted. I myself have discussed this whole matter with the 19 mayors and reeves of the City of Winnipeg, of the Metropolitan area. I went to a special meeting on two occasions, one of which was last autumn, one of which was fairly recently, in which I went into this whole thing with the 19 mayors and reeves of the City of Winnipeg, from one end of it to the other, and explained what the government was doing to them. That unfortunately didn't receive any publicity -- this was not an open meeting -- but the mayors and reeves of the 19 member municipalities have been consulted about this, have been informed of the government's plan. And I want to say -- and I hope this won't be considered a breach of confidence -- that I did not receive at that meeting any objections, any objections from any of these mayors and reeves, not one of them, with respect to the overall concept involved in this connection. That includes 19, all of them, and I can say that while I'm not in a position to say, and I wouldn't want to put words in their mouths, or claim from them that they are endorsing what the government is doing -- they have no responsibility for that whatsoever -- I merely say that they have been fully consulted and my impression of the meeting was that they approved of the general concept that has been put before the Legislature in this matter.

I also point out with respect to rumours that I stood in this House in March last year and told the Legislature then that we were going to establish this Arts Centre opposite the City Hall, near the City Hall in the centre of Winnipeg. I wonder if members remember that? Last year -- a year ago. This is no secret. There is nothing hushed up about this. I stood up in my place on the occasion of the debate on The Centennial Corporation Act and gave this information to the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba. So that has been on the public record ever since that time.

And if members think that we have not been talking with these various cultural groups -- I don't know the details of all the conversations the Minister has had, but I know perfectly well that the Cabinet received a delegation from the Manitoba Museum Association in which we had a very cordial discussion about their views on the matter, several months ago. They presented to us, they presented to us their plans, what they would like to see done. They've had a study made of the museum end of this project. They have plans drawn up; they know exactly how they want to proceed; they know how much money it's going to cost; and they have given us their



(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . full views with respect to the museum. And as far as I know other consultations have been held. If the Minister wants to speak about them, he certainly can.

Now with regard to the architects: It's perfectly true that the architects were concerned about this, but they have written the government a letter telling us of a resolution passed at a meeting of the Manitoba Association of Architects, when they say that they "were gratified that the Government of Manitoba has now brought Manitoba architectural firms into the development of the proposed cultural centre."

So these points of difficulty which my honourable friend raised are being handled; they are being dealt with; consultations are taking place; and I think that if we are given sufficient time to complete the work that is called for in this connection that there will be very few complaints when the job is done. But it has to be faced that it is a question first of all deciding the finances of the matter, and when that is done we are in a position to come to grips with these other questions. But I want to make it clear that we gave the statement of policy as to the location of this item over a year ago in this Legislature; that we have consulted with a number of the people who are involved. We've had cabinet delegations with the one that I have mentioned; and both the City of Winnipeg and the Metropolitan Corporation, and the 19 mayors and reeves, meeting in their body, have been informed of our activities. So I think that if these facts were generally known, if they were generally known, that there would be a lot less concern with respect to the government's approach and method of handling these problems. And I repeat my contention that I think we are proceeding in an orderly manner and that in due course everything that is necessary will be done in connection with this project.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is now saying we are consulting. Yes, Mr. Chairman, now they are consulting. But what about three and four years ago when they made the decision to purchase that land? There was no consultation then, Mr. Chairman. There was no indication then to the municipalities concerned. As far as I know, according to news reports, and here I'm quoting again from this same Tribune report when Metro was complaining: "Mr. Steinkopf" -- and this is February 28th -- "Mr. Steinkopf met with mayors and reeves of Greater Winnipeg Thursday night to get an indication of how the Arts Centre will be supported." Here we are, Mr. Chairman, two years after the government has purchased the land, made the basic decision of location, and they start to meet with the mayors and reeves to see how it will be supported. To carry on with the same news article. "He said today that the meeting" -- that is, all meetings of the Mayors and Reeves Association are informal and closed to the press -- "was successful. The municipalities indicated generally they support plans for the Arts Centre on Main Street. The Provincial Government will contribute \$3 million for the Centre, the Federal Government \$2.5 million. Greater Winnipeg municipalities are being asked for \$3 million, and it is hoped that \$3 million can be raised through private donations." Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that the municipalities indicated general support. It seems to me that since then I have seen statements emanating from St. Boniface that they are not satisfied with the arrangement, that this goes counter to some of the plans for thoroughfares and bridges insofar as St. Boniface was concerned. But once again, Mr. Chairman, it comes back to the same point, that the government now says we are starting to discuss with these people. Yes, he met with the museum group last fall, but, Mr. Chairman, the government made a decision apparently back in the summer of 1961 to proceed and purchase land in that area. They made the basic decision of location strictly on their own with no consultation with other people. And now they're pushing this down the throats of the groups concerned and the municipalities concerned. That's the point.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is not going to get into an argument with me on this point because the government accept the responsibility for having decided the location of this Arts Centre. I've made that quite clear. We accept the responsibility for that. We are the people who are charged with the disposal of a large amount of public funds and we have to accept that responsibility. We do accept it. We made the decision about the location of the Arts Centre and we accept the responsibility for having made that decision. There is no argument about that. I don't see how we can discharge our responsibility if we refuse to accept responsibility for that. We do. We accept it fully. The mayors and reeves, the first meeting that I think we had with them was at least in October of last year -- it wasn't in February -- in which the whole thing was gone over with them at that time and that was our discussion with

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . them. So we certainly accept the responsibility for the location. I don't see how it can be done otherwise. Any other public activity that we engage in, any public construction program, we have ultimately -- we've got to make the decision of where it's going to be. We did that. But as I conceive it, once we have made the decision about the location, and once we have made the financial arrangements necessary to carry it through, then we are in a position to have these consultations of which we have spoken, and we certainly have had many consultations and we'll have many more, but I have no hesitation in saying that we accept the responsibility for the location and the reasons have been given and I think they are sound reasons.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . . Minister says, that they're spending large sums of money. He speaks as if the province is going to put up the largest amount of money for this area. That's not the case. The Minister himself states that the Provincial Government will contribute \$3 million for the Centre, the Federal Government \$2.5 million, almost as much as the province, but Greater Winnipeg municipalities are being asked for \$3 million, as much as the province itself, and \$3 million he hopes will be raised through private donations. So this makes a total, according to my calculations Mr. Chairman, of \$11.5 million in total, of which the Provincial Government is putting up \$3 million, and yet they make the basic decisions, strictly on their own -- no consultations. For reasons of their own they decide that's where the Centre's going to be and now they're telling other people who'll be putting up the largest part of the money, "Like it or lump it. This is our decision."

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . completely ignores the development of events. It's very easy for him to come and say this now, but he has to understand very clearly that when we started this thing, last year for example, no later than last year when I first spoke about this matter in the House, the only contribution of which we were aware at that time, the only contribution was the contribution of the Government of Manitoba. We did not know how much was going to be obtained for this at all. We were in this matter alone. It was only in January of this year that we were able to secure a federal contribution. In fact, in November of last year we thought we were going to get no federal contribution because a statement had been made by the Federal Government indicating that they were not making any further contributions apart from the dollar per capita which had already been agreed. It was only after the present Provincial Secretary went to Ottawa -- and I must give him the credit for this, who made the proposal to the Federal Government that this was not right and that they should make a contribution to every province; in view of the fact that they were committed to the Montreal Fair and the Confederation Building in Charlottetown, that it was only right that they should make a contribution to some other project in all the other provinces -- that they agreed to do so, and I think it can be said quite safely that it was his recommendation and his suggestion which persuaded Mr. Lamontagne, the Federal Minister in charge, to make the recommendation to the Federal Cabinet. So it was not until that date that we knew there was any federal money, and it is only in the last few days that we have had a firm undertaking that there will be any municipal money. These people don't have to contribute. There's no law that says they have to, and if they don't we'll have to go ahead with the money that we've got, but fundamentally this started out as a provincial project. As time has gone by these other people have expressed interest in it, and have put up their money, and they've done so because they've approved in general of what we're doing. The City of Winnipeg would not be making an undertaking to contribute by far the largest municipal share to this project if they didn't approve of it. Of that you can be sure! And they have now said that that's what they're going to do. So I really don't think that the picture's quite the picture that my honourable friend would like to think. This started out as a purely provincial project -- a purely provincial project; and it was on that basis and at that time that we took the responsibility for making a decision about location. Let's get that clear. It was when our money was the only money in the kitty that these decisions were made, and we were right to make them at that time because these things take long enough as it is. It was after that that the other contributors came into the picture, and I can assure you they would not have come into the picture if they didn't agree with what we are doing. Therefore I think that that important factor certainly must be taken into consideration in any discussion of this matter.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): . . . which has gone on for some time, mainly because the picture to which the Honourable the First Minister referred has been both

(Mr. Cherniack, Cont'd.) . . . black and white in alternating colours with nothing in between, and I think that I would like to put a little gray into this picture. I am inclined to feel that the general accusations made against the government for making the decision which it did has merit, but I do recognize that the First Minister has taken full responsibility for the selection of the location. To that extent he is not trying to slough off the consultation aspect and agrees now -- well, I don't think he ever challenged the fact -- that the consultation has been taking place as to the nature of the development but I believe never as to the location of the development.

I have a little experience in planning, Mr. Chairman, based on some years in municipal life and as a member of the Planning Committee of the Metro Corporation, and with my layman's approach to the problem I am inclined to think that the location is the proper choice. Having said that, I must also say that I have acquired a great deal of respect for professional planners and I regret the fact that the government did make the choice as to location without consultation with, well at least without advising us that there has been any consultation with professional planners. Once the question of location has been settled, as it was by the government, then of course it is necessary to bring in the professional planners to plan how to best develop that location mainly on a question of approaches and traffic problems, and I'm sure that they will co-operate in that field. But I do think that there should have been some effort made to obtain their consideration to the problem of location. And when the Honourable the First Minister says that it was government money at that time and appeared to be only Provincial Government money, then the Provincial Government had the responsibility to make the decision, I'm not inclined to fully agree with that either because it was still the people's money and it was still the money which is being put up by the people -- it's not as if the government is a separate entity -- and I think that it was proper that the municipal authorities should have been consulted in that it was really their money as well as government money. It's only identifiable as in the hands and trust in the Provincial Government.

Of course I look back with some amusement to the debate that took place only in the last few days, yesterday, where the government was accused of not accepting responsibility for a certain policy involving expenditure of moneys, and that came from the same side that's attacking the government for making the decision. I don't agree with the way in which the government made the decision. I am inclined to feel that the decision was a correct one but correct only in terms of that aspect of an Arts Centre where people make a special trip to participate in it. There has to be a distinction made in the minds of all of us as to the two types of attraction that an Arts Centre holds. One is in the performing arts where people will make a special trip, where they require good traffic facilities, and where they require proper parking. When they make a special trip to see a performance, be it ballet or symphony or theatre or wrestling -- if you want to call that art, and I suppose it is a form of entertainment -- acting, then I think the choice of the location is less important in terms of accessibility and the choice of redevelopment is, I think, a justifiable reason for moving it into an area that requires that. When, however, it is the type of service that is being offered of the drop-in individual type of thing like an art gallery, like a museum, like a library, then I think it is important that that type of service should be provided where people go and where people are normally, in order to have it available to them for the odd 15 minutes, the odd hour that they would like to fit it into their program. And for that I think there has to be a great deal of consideration given. There is still the Auditorium, which I believe belongs to the City of Winnipeg and which is located much closer to the centre, both the financial and the shopping centre of the City, which must be made use of and which I can conceive of as being a very good spot for this type of art centre, that is the art gallery, library, museum type of thing, and I would like to think that the government's decision as to location which is fixed of the area across the City Hall does not prevent the government from thinking in terms of locating this type of service that I speak of in an area other than the specific location, and again I mean an art gallery and museum, a library. So that I hope that we can get some kind of assurance along that line.

As I recall the report which was made some years ago to the City of Winnipeg after the Honourable the First Minister proposed the location of the City Hall east of Main Street, I think there was criticism not only of the traffic problem but also of the railway situation, the link between the two railway stations, the CN and the CP. I think it was pointed out that this, too,

(Mr. Cherniack, Cont'd.) . . . was adverse not only in terms of traffic but in terms of development of the area towards the river. The vision as I recall it was that from Main Street to the river there had to be a beautiful vista; there had to be a development of the green spaces of which no doubt the Honourable the First Minister spoke.

And this is in line with another thought I had which I am sure will not be acceptable for the Centennial project and yet which I feel is something that will have to draw the attention of the planners of this province, and that is the general reclamation of river banks. The City of Winnipeg in the years of development has ignored what is the most beautiful part of the City, in the development and use of the river banks for public purposes, and I do not think it was in the financial ability of the City to do even on a long-range basis that very important task of reclaiming to the people of the province the availability of the rivers, the two rivers which run through the city and through its suburbs, and I wish I had the time to have brought with me a plan which the Metropolitan Corporation prepared a couple of years ago at my request showing the amount of land that could be re-claimed that is in the hands of public or charitable organizations along the river, and I recall that as one looks at the Red River north of this very area we're speaking of, there's a great deal of land there which could be taken at a minimal cost -- well, at a relatively reasonable cost -- and there are also areas along the Assiniboine. I would have liked to have felt that something could have been started at this time with the Centennial plans, it being an excellent justification, also in terms of urban redevelopment -- and urban renewal.

One third suggestion, if I'm counting correctly, is that since the government has already stated through the First Minister that it recognizes that one block of land is not sufficient for the long-term purposes, I am wondering whether the government is considering an approach to the zoning aspect of that area of the town in order to freeze it and prevent speculation. I think that the government made its decision as to location on the basis of the costs that might go skyward in the event of speculation once the government's plans are known. The government's plans are now known. The development can be forecast by anyone with even hampered vision, and therefore it seems to me that there has to be something done in order to plan for the freezing of zoning in that area, and again it is something which I imagine involves the co-operation of the Metropolitan Corporation, so that although I regret the fact that the government felt it necessary to make the decision without consultation, I am not in full accord with its reasoning that it being provincial government money it had the right, because I think that it is still subject to the -- should be subject to the review of the municipal planners, yet I personally favour the site and I say it again as a layman, because as far as I know, only laymen made the decision as to the location of that site, I still endorse the location for the visiting -- I wish I knew the term I could use -- for the type of art centre to which people will go for a performance as compared to the type of centre which I think should be in the more central part of the city, namely that of the museum, art gallery and library.

continued on next page . . . . .

MR. STEINKOPF: I just would like to say a few words, firstly on the site. There is little that I can find disagreement with. So far as the last speaker is concerned, in matters relating to the future planning of the area, it's true that the decision apparently was made completely by laymen, but without the help of the various experts and the reports that were available, such as the one that you referred to, that particular report was available, in determining where the site was to be located, and any number of sites -- the idea of an Art Centre is not new. It hasn't been thought of in the last three or four years. It's something that's been going on since the Auditorium has been built to the best of my knowledge, and there have been a series of reports.

Another thing that -- it has been pretty well agreed by all parties that the location should be somewhere in downtown Winnipeg, and then when one takes a look at the map it is fairly limited. The area that is involved -- it's only a matter of a few blocks one way or the other that we are talking about.

The problem of the river banks, the railway -- all of these things have been considered, and I'm sure that when the whole picture unfolds, as it will over the next few months, that it will be most acceptable by all concerned.

The matter of the Hirsch report in the Winnipeg Tribune of last Saturday is important because of its timeliness. It couldn't have been timed on a better basis than for today. In the report, true, there is very little that one can find fault with, other than the fact that in comparing the approach that Ottawa is taking to the one that has been taken here in Manitoba and that Mr. Hirsch suggested he's been invited to meet twice a month on the planning of the Ottawa cultural centre, I'd like to refer to a paragraph here in a recent press report attributed to the federal Forestry Minister, Maurice Sauvé, who was in Winnipeg, and he talked about culture. One of the things that he said was, "The Federal Government" -- and now I'm quoting -- "is spending about \$35 million on a National Theatre in Ottawa and similar Art Centres in the ten provincial capitols as part of Centennial preparations. Some people are already muttering about white elephants and deficits but these centres will forge a cultural revolution that could do more to unite Canadians than any other institution since the creation of the CBC. If we accept these goals they will provide a unifying force. If we concentrate our energies on the means to achieve them, we will unite this country. Let us not concentrate on what divides us, two nations or ten nations. Let's concentrate on one Canada."

The point here is that the federal government is writing a cheque, a complete cheque in full payment of the Ottawa Art Centre, and it will be a very substantial cheque and for a very substantial and important Art Centre. It is a very simple matter for them to call in the experts and to ask them to help design this project, whereas the size of our project, the type of project that we're going to have, is still very much undetermined and will not be determined until such time as we have a pretty good indication of how much money we'll be able to spend on it.

We have had presentations from the Men's Musical Club -- and while I'm mentioning them I would recommend to all here that they take in the Manitoba Musical Festival, one of the finest in the world, that is now going on in the City of Winnipeg -- their presentation, and they are just as much concerned about how the Art Centre is built as any of the other cultural groups. We've had a presentation from the Symphony, from the Museum, as has been mentioned by the First Minister. The Theatre Centre has prepared a presentation and submitted it, and there have been a series of meetings with the top people of most of the cultural organizations in the Greater Winnipeg area, and it is intended to enlarge the committee just as soon as we know the extent of the operation.

Matters of zoning and traffic certainly will be co-ordinated with the Metropolitan Corporation. We have had meetings with the Metropolitan Corporation both as a group and with various members of their group. They have made some very rough sketches of the area, and in general the feeling amongst all of those involved I think is just about as good as one can achieve, realizing that anything to do with art is in itself a rather contentious problem. To get these people involved all thinking of one mind is going to take a Solomon himself to try and do it but I think that we have done as well as could be expected and in relation to other cities, quite a bit better.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister, in his explanation of the purchase of the land in that area, indicated that the sellers had first option to buy this land back if the government should decide not to proceed with an Art Centre. He also indicated that the land could be sold, if I understood him correctly, for at least what the government paid for it. We are

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) . . . . therefore in a position, Mr. Chairman, where I don't think there has been a decision that is irreconcilable here. There could be a change. I'd like to suggest to the government that at this late hour they get all of the people involved, all of the Art Groups concerned with this, and all the municipalities concerned with this, give them the information that they have given the House this morning, that there is a possibility of changing this location, and ask them then, in the light of those circumstances, what they would recommend; and I think that they will find that almost all these groups will recommend another location than the one that the government are settled on.

MR. STEINKOPF: . . . is that another one location, or each one recommend another location? Is there a suggestion that there is another location that they would all agree on?

MR. MOLGAT: I think that there could be agreement on another location other than this one -- yes. And it might turn out that they will not recommend one centre, grouping everything, but possibly two different types of structures. In any case I would recommend that there be an opportunity for these people without the pressure of a set location, to re-analyze this whole matter.

MR. CAMPBELL: I take it from the statement that the First Minister made, that the final decision about Centennial plans rests with the municipality concerned. Is that correct?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . that is insofar as municipal projects are concerned, yes;

MR. CAMPBELL: These grants that have been announced will be made available and then the decision, in general, will be made by them. Now we have had some considerable discussion about the Winnipeg area. We've had a little bit of discussion about the Brandon area. I recognize, of course, that the situation in Metropolitan Winnipeg is to some considerable extent influenced by the City of Winnipeg itself, and yet we have some other major areas as well, for instance, Portage la Prairie. Are there plans on the move in Portage la Prairie? Knowing His Worship the Mayor of Portage la Prairie as well as I do I would expect that he has made some proposals. Are there some plans underway there?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . there will be the \$2.00 per capita they have from each of the two governments. The particular projects we've been talking about this morning are really not local ones, in that sense. They are province ones. The one in Winnipeg happens to be the provincial project in this connection, and a little bit different from the others, but I am not aware of a specific proposal yet from the City of Portage la Prairie but I am sure we are going to get one.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . and the Brandon plan. Is that one -- I believe it's provincially inspired too? Why would Brandon get a provincially inspired one rather than Portage la Prairie or Dauphin or -- well, especially Dauphin? Well Transcona is in this Greater Winnipeg area here where it must of necessity be to quite an extent tied in with the central development, but some of these outlying areas I would think would qualify for some special assistance as well.

MR. ROBLIN: The problem that we come up against here is the problem of where do you draw the line because every municipality would like to think of itself as a special case and no doubt could make a pretty good argument that it was a special case. But we simply had to make an ad hoc decision that the two major cities in the province should be selected for province-wide projects, particularly as the City of Brandon does agree to the Brandon College -- that will give that more than a local character; and that is the reason for the selection of those two. It's purely ad hoc, I must frankly say so, the Peace Gardens similarly being a particular project.

But in order to deal with all the other municipalities we thought that our parks project, which is province-wide, and which brings a substantial park development in three major areas of the province, would be in a sense the same kind of thing for other sections of the province. Otherwise if you don't do that you fritter away your money in small projects all over the place which really don't do the trick and really couldn't be conscientiously recommended. So that we've done it that way and then said to the municipalities, "We recognize your special position and we make this \$2.00 per capita available." We earnestly hope that Portage, for example, would get together with Portage Rural and the two of them combine something and then they would have a fairly substantial sum of money and could do something quite decent with it. And we are encouraging municipalities as far as possible to club together, as it were, and go in for a joint park, or a joint library, or whatever they feel that they need, and thus get something substantial.

MR. FROESE: . . . . the government is going to contribute \$25,000 for the Peace Garden

(Mr. Froese cont'd) . . . . project. Are they making any stipulation as to what this money is supposed to go to, or is it left open?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, this \$25,000 is taken out of the per dollar per capita arrangement, and there's no stipulation provided it meets the broad set of terms they have. There's nothing very definite about it. It has to be for some permanent project.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3 passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would explain to me why in this schedule on Item No. 3 we have the million and a quarter dollars in respect of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board and the investigations on the Nelson River, when at the same time we have a capital for the Hydro itself of \$30 million.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to explain that. The million and a quarter shown here represents the contribution by the Provincial Treasury as such toward the Nelson River investigation. There will also be a contribution by the federal government as such toward the cost of it. And these are a direct responsibility of the province and have to be shown separately. The \$30 million shown in the next item for the Hydro itself is merely a guarantee. It's merely a financial authorization for them in the normal course of their business. So they are two quite distinct things and have to be dealt with separately.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . eventually. The main point is, what happens eventually. Will eventually the users of Hydro, or the purchasers of Hydro, if it's exported, have to absorb the million-odd bucks?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . Mr. Chairman, if this thing is a success, we get our money back. That's what my friend wants to know.

MR. FROESE: . . . That was going to be my question, so it's already answered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . passed, Manitoba Agriculture Credit Corporation passed. 3. Municipal Works Assistance passed . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: . . . I want to explain this, Mr. Chairman, because on the face of it it looks as if the province is going to borrow \$20 million. Now that is misleading. This is what you call a wash transaction. What's going to happen is that we get \$20 million from the federal government, we pass it on to the municipalities and we are just the intermediary, but because of the peculiar financial arrangements of these things involved in, we need authority for the Legislature to act as if we were putting up this money ourselves, although we're not really doing it. It's a wash transaction and won't cost the provincial taxpayers as such anything at all. It's merely a bookkeeping requirement. It grossly inflates our borrowing picture but I hasten to assure members that we're really not going to be stuck for this.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . the debt structure of the province though.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . which we are not going to do, so as I say a wash transaction.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Hansard staff will have trouble with the term so maybe I could help them at the same time as checking it myself. Is that wash? WASH -- is that -- what's the significance of that term?

MR. ROBLIN: It means in and out. It means in and out. We get \$20 million from Ottawa. We lend \$20 million to the municipalities. So that it's in and out. It's wash. It cancels out. But in order to give us the authority to lend the money to municipalities we need this on the statutes to do it. But actually it isn't our money. We don't borrow any. We just pass it on.

MR. PAULLEY: Shouldn't the word then be whitewash, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: The Chairman was rather fast on the previous item in reading the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. Is there any monies unexpired or any authorizations that haven't completely expired under this item?

MR. ROBLIN: We have a carryover of unused appropriations from last year of \$1,550,000 to which you ought to add this appropriation of \$2.1 million, giving us a total lending authority for the coming year of \$3,650,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . passed. 4. Manitoba Hydro Board -- passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'll give the figures here on authority that's used and unused. Members want that. Unused authority at the end of the last fiscal year is estimated to be \$26,629,000.00. We are now asking for another \$30 million which will give money to be spent, authorized spending for the coming year of \$56,629,000.00. We don't really expect to spend

(Mr. Roblin cont'd) . . . . that all. We expect to spend about \$30 million of it, leaving us with a carryover of \$26 million. That sounds like a horribly large sum of money, and indeed it is, but in dealing with these matters we've found it advisable from experience to always have a little something in hand. So that little something will be about \$26 million we expect. This money will be spent on the completion of Grand Rapids and other regular capital expenditures of the Hydro Board.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, will this be the final borrowing for Grand Rapids then?

MR. ROBLIN: I think there's more here than Grand Rapids requires.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with Grand Rapids the strike is now terminated. Is the Minister in a position to be able to say that this will ensure now the delivery of power by the fall?

MR. ROBLIN: As of this moment all is well.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): . . . the First Minister. Is it true that studies are now being carried on in connection with the Mid-Continent Area Power in reference to the possible export and sales of hydro-electric power into the States?

MR. ROBLIN: We are represented on the same body that my honourable friend speaks of. We are represented on that Mid-Continent Research body that looks into the question of power requirements and part of the studies that are taking place in connection with the Nelson have to do with the sale of power in the United States. So to that extent they are connected.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, is the sale of the proposed export of power tied in with the present or the next phase of the study that will be going on in reference to the Nelson River development? Is this a correct assumption to make?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, the first thing we have to do is to be absolutely certain what our costs are and then we know whether we've got any sale at all.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I make reference to a bulletin release just of last week where it says that negotiations are tied in with the development of the Nelson River system and at present the transmission costs are being investigated and details as to the economics of this project. I simply bring this up because it would seem from this article that there is some very active negotiation or discussion going on in reference to the possible market for the export of our power that we may get from the Nelson River development, and it would be indicative that we're more or less tying in the immediate development of the Nelson in terms of possible power outlet in the United States. Now if this is correct, which this article would seem to indicate, I think that this is a step in the right direction because this truly is the basis, or the embryonic approach on which I do feel that much can be done to develop the Nelson River, and I just merely make this suggestion and ask the question because there's a little bit of a difference in the remarks of the First Minister as to what has been issued in the form of publicity.

MR. ROBLIN: Well I'm sure these discussions are going on, Mr. Chairman. It's highly likely that they are, but it doesn't mean that's the only market. That's the only point I want to make here. There may be a market in Ontario. We're not sure yet which is . . . . .

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): On the 8th of April the First Minister tabled an Order for Return which reads: "Supplementary Return to Order of the House No. 35, on motion of Mr. Guttormson, dated, March 10th, 1964, partial Return tabled by the Honourable Maitland Steinkopf, Minister of Public Utilities, March 18th, 1964." And I for the life of me can't understand the Return. It lists 13 questions that I asked. There are no answers, and then below it, it says, "Government department report is under," lists a number of departments, and opposite each department it says, "Nil Return." I don't understand the Return and why it was tabled and what it is supposed to mean. Will the Minister advise me at this time?

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend was asking something about whether the departments of the government were using the Drake Construction people for transportation, or water hauling or something of that description. Was that not the point? And when we canvassed the departments I think they gave us a nil return. But perhaps when we're in the Law Amendments Committee if we could get together I could understand his question a little clearer and see if I can get an answer for him.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well I'll have to show it to him. I'm not saying there is anything wrong. I just don't understand it.



MR. ROBLIN: I think that completes all the items in the committee, Mr. Chairman, so I move that the committee rise.

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

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

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . Madam Speaker, if we could go into Law Amendments Committee now, but I understand that there is some feeling that perhaps we could deal with Concurrence right away. So if that's agreeable, I'll move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the resolutions reported in the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: 1. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$73,040, Legislation, Other Assembly Expenditures for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

2. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$352,016 Legislation, Comptroller-General's Office for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

3. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$43,000, Legislation, Legislative Printing and Binding for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

4. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$62,630, Executive Council, Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

5. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,000, Executive Council, Federal-Provincial Conference for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

6. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$120,000 Executive Council, Grants and Miscellaneous for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

7. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$271,205, Executive Council, Libraries and Historical Research for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1965.

8. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$309,140, Treasury, Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

9. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$175,175, Treasury, Taxation Branch for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

10. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$40,500, Treasury, Insurance Branch for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

11. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$12,000, Treasury, Fidelity, Hold-up, etc. for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1965.

12. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$143,000, Treasury, Miscellaneous for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

13. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,730,000, Treasury, Grants, under the Unconditional Grants Act to Municipalities, Local Government Districts and other local areas for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

14. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$110,215, Provincial Secretary, Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

15. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,560, Provincial Secretary, Queen's Printer Office for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

16. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$33,140, Provincial Secretary, Manitoba Gazette for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

17. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$234,530, Provincial Secretary, Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

18. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$307,000, Provincial Secretary, Civil Service Superannuation Act for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

19. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$66,000, Provincial Secretary, Civil Service Group Life Insurance for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

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

20. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$75,790, Provincial Secretary, Purchasing Bureau for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

21. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$60,000, Provincial Secretary, Workmen's Compensation Board for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

22. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$34,090, Provincial Secretary, Information Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

23. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$65,625, Provincial Secretary, Emergency Measures for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

24. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$402,070, Education, Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

25. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$37,584,250, Education, Education Grants for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

26. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$642,055, Education, Teacher Training for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

27. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,956,778, Education, Student Instruction for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

28. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$209,847, Agriculture and Conservation, Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

29. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,426,456, Agriculture for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

30. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$126,678, Agriculture and Conservation, Economics and Publications for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

31. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$595,972, Agriculture and Conservation, Agricultural Development for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

32. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$182,300, Agriculture and Conservation, Agricultural and Horticultural Societies for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

33. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$73,320, Agriculture and Conservation, Co-operative and Credit Union Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

34. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$580,609, Agriculture and Conservation, Economic Research for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

35. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,000, Agriculture and Conservation, Assistance re Seed and Fodder for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

36. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$141,050, Agriculture and Conservation, Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

37. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$441,000, Agriculture and Conservation, Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

38. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$38,000, Agriculture and Conservation, Predator Control and Grasshopper Control for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

39. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,790,090, Agriculture and Conservation, Water Control and Conservation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

40. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,328,000, Agriculture and Conservation, Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

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

41. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,259,000, Red River Valley, etc., for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

42. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$286,330, Attorney-General, Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

43. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$560,240, Attorney-General, Land Titles Offices for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

44. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$494,675, Attorney-General, Law Courts for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

45. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$40,890, Attorney-General, Legislative Counsel for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

46. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty....

MADAM SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that while concurring in Resolution No. 46, this House regrets and deplures the highly improper action of the Attorney-General in flagrantly disregarding the independence of the judiciary when he requested opinions from the Chief Justice of Manitoba and from the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, in respect of certain matters which were then the subject of political debate in this House.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I don't propose to make any lengthy statement because we've had a pretty good debate on this topic all the way through. I just want to make one or two observations which will be very brief; and that is to defend the action of the government in this respect.

I feel that if the impropriety that is charged against us were a fact that the judges would have been the first to let us know. Now it is perfectly true that one judge did express his opinion, one judge in the Court of Appeal, but the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal did not take that same view because he answered our letter, and he also reported that while one of the other judges had some reservations on the subject he felt under the circumstances that they should reply as well. And also I would like to read into the record the last paragraph of the letter from the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench which bears right on the point, and he says as follows: "We have given careful consideration of the desirability or otherwise of writing this frank expression of our views. We are aware that this is an unusual course which may be understood and be the subject of controversy. However, the material enclosed with your letter indicates real uneasiness on the part of some that the practices referred to might be improper and impede the due administration of justice in the province and we came to the conclusion that this expression of our views was necessary and appropriate." Well, I think with those few comments I can give in a nutshell the government's case on this matter. The matter is certainly open to debate and we felt that under the circumstances it was wise to get this opinion and we find that with the one exception referred to the judges who were consulted did not find this an improper course and that we were within propriety in acting as we've done. So I think that we will not vote to support the amendment of this.

MR. HILLHOUSE: ...naturally I take the opposite view.

MR. CHERNIACK: ...closing the debate. Madam Speaker, when I first heard the Honourable the Attorney-General report on his action in addressing these letters to the Chief Justices, I, in my own mind questioned the propriety of doing what he did. It appeared to me that had our Party been involved in a problem of this type we would have rather addressed ourselves to the Law Society, or maybe better than that the recognized leaders of the Bar in Canada to obtain their views. The fact, however, is as the Honourable the First Minister stated, that the Chief Justices did reply and it seems to me that if their independence was thrown into doubt at all they would have been the first to rebuke the Attorney-General rather than wait for this House to do so. The fact that they did not deem it necessary I think is an indication that they felt that their independence was pretty well assured and I really don't think that anybody can suggest that their independence was questioned. I feel that -- although I had doubts and I still have doubts as to whether or not the letter should have been addressed -- the language is too violent in this resolution and I think that the principle involved is much too important to become a sort of a political issue to be brought into the picture and our group feels that in

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)... some way endorsement of this resolution could be interpreted as a rebuke to the chief justices for replying to this type of "improper action." To that extent we feel that we cannot go along with the resolution and must vote in opposition to it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I can assure you that there's no intention on my part to even imply a rebuke to the Chief Justice of Manitoba or the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench. My resolution is entirely directed to the Attorney-General. I think we must bear in mind the fact that at the time that the Attorney-General wrote this letter, it arose out of a debate concerning the estimates of his own department and in other words, he was seeking the opinion of the Chief Justice of Manitoba and of the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench for Manitoba as to how he was running his own department. Now that's the reason why I consider that his action was highly improper.

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

A MEMBER: The Ayes and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The question before the House -- the motion made by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. Those in favor please rise.

YEAS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Vielfaure.

NAYES: Messrs: Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Peters, Roklin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 13; Nays 39.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 47. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,885, Attorney-General Miscellaneous for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

48. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$421,414, Attorney-General, Juvenile and Family Courts, Probation and Parole for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

49. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$775,190, Attorney-General, Detention Homes for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

50. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$103,910, Attorney-General, Administration of Estates of the Mentally Incompetent for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

51. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,350.00, Attorney-General, Provincial Buildings and Other Projects for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

52. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$992,583, Executive Division, Health for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster that while concurring in Resolution 52, this House regrets that the government has not seen fit to institute a comprehensive medicare program covering all citizens in the province, particularly in view of the fact, as stated by the government, that medical, optical, drug and dental care is being provided by the government at a cost \$5.11 per month per individual to certain citizens who are generally agreed to be in a category requiring more than average medical services.

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

A MEMBER: The ayes and nays please Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Gray, Harris, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Harrison, Hillhouse,

(Nays, cont'd).. Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Smellie, Smerchanski, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 7; Nays, 44.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 53 -- Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$21,768,048.00 Health Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

54. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$185,650, Health, Provincial Buildings and Other Projects, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

55. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$278,930, Department of Mines and Natural Resources, Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

56. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,446,535, Mines and Natural Resources Forestry Branch -- Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

57. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$325,080, Mines and Natural Resources, Wildlife Branch -- Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

58. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$415,000, Mines and Natural Resources Fisheries Branch -- Administration for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1965.

59. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,391,935, Mines and Natural Resources -- Field Operations for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

60. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$286,210, Mines and Natural Resources -- Surveys Branch for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

61. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$552,415, Mines and Natural Resources -- Mines Branch, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

62. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$282,705, Mines and Natural Resources -- Air Service, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

63. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$216,570, Mines and Natural Resources--Lands Branch, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

64. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$924,275, Mines and Natural Resources -- Acquisition of Land, Land Settlement Projects, etc., for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

65. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$249,000, Mines and Natural Resources, Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement -- Chargeable to Capital Division for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

66. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$63,830, Public Utilities -- Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

67. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$106,540, Public Utilities -- Public Utilities Board, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

68. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$24,520, Public Utilities--Censor Board of Manitoba, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

69. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$942,860, Public Utilities -- Motor Vehicle Branch, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

70. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$568,560, Public Works -- Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

71. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,418,033, Public Works -- Operation and Maintenance of Government Buildings, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

72. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,141,735, Public Works -- Highways--planning, Design and Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Ethelbert

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... Plains that while concurring with Resolution No. 72, this House recognizes the fact that the government in spite of its publicity to the contrary is curtailing its highway program while at the same time drastically increasing road taxes.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, before you ask the question, what is meant by road taxes?

MR. MOLGAT: Road taxes .....licences for motor vehicles, licences for drivers, gasoline tax, all these taxes are related to the motor vehicle industry.

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, I have no great desire I don't think to go into a long winded defense of this particular amendment, but I think that I would like to say just a few things because there were some discussions on these items in committee, and I didn't have too much information to discuss them at that particular time and I think I would like to say a word or two about them now. There has been a considerable number of comparisons of the estimates of the bygone years with the estimates of the last few years, particularly on the current basis, and I might point out, Madam Speaker, that any comparison of totals of the estimate years of the former government and the totals of the recent estimates is fairly fictitious unless it's gone into item by item because there have been quite a number of changes.

For example all of the drainage costs which used to be found under the Department of Public Works are now found under Agriculture and Conservation, and they make quite a sizeable difference in the current estimates of the Department of Public Works. Other changes have taken place, for instance this is the first year that taxes don't show up under the Department of Public Works, they show up under the Department of Municipal Affairs. And in speaking of actual amounts spent, while it isn't in this amendment that's before us, it was certainly discussed in committee and I have had the figures totalled of the five year period beginning '53-'54 and ending in the '57-'58 years as opposed to the '58-'59 years ending in the '62-'63 year, and the gross expenditure in the first period '53-'54 to '57-'58 was \$102,247,971.00. The expenditure in the '58-'59, '62-'63 period was \$170,768,546.00. There were recoveries of course in both periods and the net figures for the same periods is \$92,890,075.00 as opposed to \$159,545,594.00.

And there's been discussion of what's been paid from capital and what's been paid from current. In the first period '53-'54 the amount of money that was paid from revenue division was \$79,030,866, and from the capital division was \$23,217,105.00. In the second period the '58-'59 to '62-'63 period the amount of money paid from the revenue division was \$53,003,003; from the capital division \$117,765,543.00. It does indicate Madam Speaker that there is considerably more money being paid out of capital than was previously the case but certainly on the average more money has been spent. I think that we can be extremely thankful that the costs of our road building are not increasing at any greater rate than they are and be quite happy that in most cases our expenditures are less than what our estimates are.

From the standpoint of revenues, the actual revenue in '57-'58 for instance was \$19,978,000. and the estimates for '64-'65 is \$35 million. The total expenditure on highway in '57-'58 was \$30,257,289, less a recovery in excess of \$2 million bringing the total Manitoba expenditure down to \$27,800,000.00. In '64-'65 -- I might say, Madam Speaker, in the expenditures in '57-'58 the figures were broken down as \$20.5 million from current and \$9.7 million from capital. In 1964-'65 there's \$15.2 million from current and \$27.3 million from capital making a total of \$42.6 million with recoveries of approximately \$2.6 million leaving a total Manitoba expenditure of \$40,017,535.00. While there have probably been years in the recent past when expenditures have gone over this I think that it is unjust to say that they are declining this drastically and inferring that they are not meeting the needs of the people.

I think that I should point out that these tables have been made up by the department on the same basis as was used by the Honourable Mr. Greenlay in preparing his budget of 1958, and it's pointed out that the budget figures were estimates only and that the actual revenues exceeded the budget figures by \$2.9 million. So Madam Speaker, I don't think that I've any desire to go any more deeply into it at this time except to point out that I don't think that there is any real foundation for the amendment that's before us.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, pardon me, Madam Speaker, I don't intend to go into the argument we had here on the estimates of the Honourable

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)... Minister, but I would just like to point out a few facts that make the argument of the Honourable Minister falacious and unfounded. All we have to do insofar as the first part of this resolution is concerned -- and that is the matter of taxes -- all I have to do to support that particular contention is to point out gasoline taxes went up. No question about that at all is there? You double the drivers' licences. Even those two points alone show an increase in the taxes that were originally meant for road purposes. There's no question about the gasoline tax bringing in several million dollars.

Now, insofar as the taxation part of this particular resolution is concerned, it's a known fact. There's no denying that. As to the matter of the curtailment of the highway program, that is also a fact which is borne out by the information given us by the government from time to time. All we have to do is look at the annual reports and we can see less roads being built, highways, every year for the past several years. This isn't taken out of a hat. It's a matter of record. And there's no defence to that.

Now, what about all the capital that the Honourable Minister has mentioned -- the capital authorizations. We have in carry-over today, according to the figures given us by the First Minister yesterday -- and I think I got them right -- we expect to have \$25.8 million carry-over. That is authorizations made by this House that have not been spent. We can't figure them as spent in the figures that have been given this afternoon, if I heard correctly. Include that \$25.8 million. This year we're asking \$15 million for roads. We're already told in advance that \$1.8 million of that is going to be carried over. That means our road program is down to \$13.2 million for this coming year -- (Interjection) -- Oh, yes, yes, yes -- I'm talking about the capital -- (Interjection) -- Well, but that's the figures you gave us yesterday.

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend misunderstood them.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well, I may have. If I have, then we'll just say that that argument is not valid and we'll forget about it. But the point remains that the road building program of this government has been getting smaller every year. That's money-wise. If we take it mile-wise -- which is the criterion by which we should measure the road program of this government -- mile-wise it's worse than it is capital-wise, because you are building less miles of roads for the same amount of money. Every year it becomes less and less. So actually that is the argument, and as far as the resolution itself is concerned, is substantiated by facts supplied by the government themselves. It's a matter of record and it's right in the records of this government.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, when the estimates of the Department of Public Works were discussed in the House, I was stormed in and I could not partake in the discussions. I felt rather bad about it, but I was very happy to learn of the decision of this government to do something about Highway 32. This is the first time that any monies are being spent capital-wise in my constituency since the Conservatives came into power. I think this is a record, and being an occasion like this I thought I'd send a special gift over to the Minister recognizing this very event. I have here a letter opener which contains three coins dated 1963, and I would like to send this over to the Minister if one of the page boys would come forward. I think the Minister will be reminded of this whenever he sees this on his desk and I hope he uses it quite often, because -- (Interjection) -- it's actual money. But as the coins were locked into that opener, likewise the moneys have been locked in the coffers as far as the constituency of Rhineland is concerned in connection with road progress. We didn't receive any of it, and we're very happy now of the Minister's decision to do something this year and that Highway No. 32 will receive some attention and some work done.

Now, coming to the motion before us, I have to agree with the Member for Ethelbert Plains that I don't like to see these large carry-overs from year to year that we're authorizing. I feel that these moneys that have been authorized they should be used, and that we should get work done on our roads and that we get highway improvements; because certainly in my constituency we could stand a lot of improvements and a good number of new roads that are needed very badly at the present time. So I will have to support the amendment, but at the same time I wish to thank the Minister for his decision in giving us this road.

MR. WEIR: .....enter the debate again, but may I express my appreciation to the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and may I say how happy I am to see that he has used good Canada money and not the money that the Honourable Member for Morris periodically refers to

(Mr. Weir, cont'd)...when once every year or two he makes a speech in the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: All those in .....

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker ..... a word or two. I feel I should lest it be thought that we in this group were going to vote in a dilettantish way simply to vote without indicating why, we are going to support the motion for the reason given by the Member for Ethelbert Plains. He put it very simply and also very indisputably in the sense that taxes for road purposes, or road taxes as they're sometimes called, have increased. There's no denying it. Secondly, it is not as though there is a lack of available revenue for the government to increase its public works program because the carry-over is simply too high. It's hard to justify in my opinion. There are areas in the Public Works Department program that have been allowed to peter off. The access road program has come to a virtual halt, and that is also hard to justify, and so therefore it seems to me that it's very obvious, very easy and very simple to support this motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I'd just like to go over very briefly some of the things that have been said in the debate here previously. It seems to me that what the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains said during the discussion on estimates and this resolution that we're proposing now, are absolutely and completely accurate. I'd like to refer, Madam Speaker, to the Hansard No. 52, March 23, 1964, and the Member for Ethelbert Plains was at that time speaking on reply, or rather at the time of the introduction of the estimates on the Minister's salary. Now, we all know that this government has been saying "across the province" constantly. The Minister repeats it, that until they came in there were no highways built; that all of the highway program in Manitoba is thanks to them; that before that there were no roads, and on and on and on.

Now, the facts are, Madam Speaker, that apart from last year when they were first elected, when we had that fall session of the legislature, and they at that time asked the House to vote \$35 million worth of capital, apart from that one year, I believe that the construction figures every year have been less than what they had been in the years of the previous administration. And certainly, certainly Madam Speaker -- I'm speaking from memory on that part of it, I may have missed one year, but this -- the biggest year was the election year. That's one thing for certain. And certainly the revenues that they have collected, Madam Speaker, from all motor vehicle sources have gone up very substantially, and today this government is not spending as much on construction as it is getting out of the motor vehicle licences and taxes, including the gas tax. And these, Madam Speaker, are the figures: In 1957 the revenue from the gas and motor fuel tax was \$12.7 million; last year, \$26.3 million -- from 12.7 to 26.3. In the case of the motor carriers, all licences and so on, in 1957 it was \$6.2, 1964 estimated \$8.7. Now the revenue from both sources, that is gasoline tax and motor vehicle licences and drivers' licences -- in 1957, total of the two \$18.9 million. This coming year the revenue is estimated to exceed \$35 million. This Madam Speaker, is beyond what the government is spending. I submit that there has been a tremendous increase in the taxation and no corresponding increase in construction.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; Nays, 31.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I believe that in a minute and a half we have no longer the right to sit at this particular session because the order is such. Now I also believe that



(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)...there may be people waiting in committee because of the proposed law amendments. I thought we would be through by concurrence but I see that we're not. I wonder whether the Minister could indicate whether we will be going into committee to suit those people and continue this afternoon on concurrence.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I thank my honourable friend for raising the point. I don't really think there is anybody waiting for us in committee and my intention was that we would adjourn at the usual time but meet in committee at 2:30 instead of re-assembling here and adjourn this House until say 3:30. That would give us time to finish up our committee work, there are about six bills in there, bring them back in and proceed with the procedure on the Bills. So we can either sit here 'till we complete concurrence if anyone wants to do so -- I'm not sure how many more resolutions there are to be moved -- and complete concurrence now or we can rise and meet in the committee at 2:30 but I'd like to get some suggestions. -- (Interjection) -- All right we'll try and complete concurrence and then we'll adjourn 'till about .....

MR. PAULLEY: .....ordinary estimates. I don't know about Supply, I'm not quite sure of that.

MR. ROBLIN: We'll see how far we get. Let's go ahead.

MR. PAULLEY: I mean the money Bills. They've got to go to committee first don't they? The money resolutions have to go to the committee first.

MR. ROBLIN: I think just let's get concurrence over and then we have to bring in a lot of Bills and go through all that procedure. We won't try and do that now. Just get concurrence over and that will be that.

MR. PAULLEY: All right.

MR. CLERK: 73. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,854,000, Public Works, Highway Maintenance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

74. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$200,000, Public Works, Automobile Garage, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

75. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$383,350, Public Works, Provincial Buildings and Other Projects, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

76. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$385,120, Municipal Affairs, Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

77. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$93,450, Municipal Affairs, Municipal Board, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

78. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$24,000, Municipal Affairs, Local Government Districts, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

79. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$221,018, Municipal Affairs, Municipal Assessments, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

80. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$259,110, Municipal Affairs, Special Municipal Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

81. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$102,280, Municipal Affairs, Municipal Planning Service, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

82. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$300,000, Municipal Affairs, Urban Renewal -- Chargeable to Capital Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

83. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$156,830, Administration, Labour, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

84. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$190,110, Labour, Mechanical and Engineering Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

85. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$177,245, Labour, Employment Standards Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

86. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$59,395, Labour, Apprenticeship and Industrial Training Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

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

87. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$77,065, Labour, Labour Relations Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
88. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$244,505, Industry and Commerce, Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
89. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$101,140, Industry and Commerce, Business Development Branch, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
90. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$101,640, Industry and Commerce, Trade Development and Marketing Branch, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
91. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$144,570, Industry and Commerce, Engineering and Technical Services Branch, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
92. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$180,685, Industry and Commerce, Economic and Business Research Branch, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
93. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$89,710, Industry and Commerce, Regional Development Branch, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
94. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$354,295, Industry and Commerce, Tourist Development Branch, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
95. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$33,060, Industry and Commerce, Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
96. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$12,565, Industry and Commerce, Manitoba Research Council, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
97. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$281,750, Industry and Commerce, Manitoba Development Fund, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
98. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$30,000, Provincial Building and Other, Industry and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
99. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$342,764, Welfare, Executive Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
100. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$16,381,586, Welfare, Welfare Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
101. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,512,025, Welfare, The Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons' Allowances Board and Disability Allowances, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
102. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$109,940, Welfare, Fitness and Amateur Sport, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.
103. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,103,000, Welfare, Homes for the Elderly and Infirm -- Chargeable to Capital Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965.

Capital Supply, Resolution 1. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for capital expenditures \$37,630,000.00. Resolution 2 .....

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside that while concurring in Item 2 of Schedule 3 of the Capital Estimates, this House regrets that the government has failed to take into its confidence those associations and groups vitally and primarily interested in respect of the location, design, planning and activities of an Art Centre as part of the program of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation.

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

MR. MOLGAT: The Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 18; Nays, 32.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: 2. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for capital expenditures, \$2,100,000 for Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

3. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for capital expenditures, \$20,214,355.03.

4. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for capital expenditures, \$30,000,000 for Manitoba Hydro Electric Board.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . concurrence, Madam Speaker, I would propose to move the adjournment and -- just a minute here, I've got to get some advice. If there's no objection to this procedure we might just put the Capital Supply through Ways and Means. That may be what my honourable friend was thinking of. This usually doesn't take long. And then when we reach that stage I think we can adjourn. So I would move that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair so that the House may resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means to consider Capital Supply, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various capital purposes, the sum of \$89,944,355.03 be granted out of Consolidated Fund.

Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

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

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Capital Supply Estimates. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various capital purposes, the sum of \$89,944,355.03 be granted out of Consolidated Fund.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, following up the previous suggestions I would now move the adjournment of the House until 3:30. I may need leave to do it at that particular time. I would ask for it, and suggest that the Committee of Law Amendments meet at 2:30 and we can probably dispose of the business before that committee in reasonable time and be back here at 3:30.

I would therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that the House do now adjourn until 3:30.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 3:30 Wednesday afternoon.