

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

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 10th, 1961 .

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Fourth Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: The Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their Fourth Report. Your Committee has considered Bills No. 27, An Act to Amend The Insurance Act; No. 72, An Act to Amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works that the report of the Committee be received.

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

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts beg leave to present the following as their First Report.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, this is a rather lengthy report and I would like to suggest that it might be reproduced in Hansard and that we might dispense with the reading of it by the Clerk at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House agreeable that we dispense with the reading? Agreed.

FIRST REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

"TO THE HONOURABLE THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA:

Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts beg leave to present the following as their First Report:

1. Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. McLean as Chairman. Your Committee met on the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 7th and 8th days of April, 1961.
2. Your Committee recommends that for the remainder of the Session the quorum of this Committee shall consist of seven members.
3. There had been referred to your Committee for investigation, certain charges made in the Legislative Assembly by The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.
4. These charges, which were made during the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and later during the consideration of the estimates of the Department of Public Works, may be summarized as follows:
 - (a) that with respect to two comparable sections of Provincial Trunk Highway No. 12, a section constructed after June 30, 1958, had cost more per mile than a comparable section constructed prior to June 30, 1958;
 - (b) that with respect to the said Provincial Trunk Highway No. 12, and in the area from Piney Corner to South Junction, unnecessary flagmen were employed during a period of construction in 1959, for political and patronage purposes and that the said persons were employed by reason of their personal political affiliation;
 - (c) that during the course of a By-Election held in the Electoral Division of Pembina in the months of November and December, 1960, bribes and threats were used relating to road construction in the constituency and in reference to the By-Election;
 - (d) that the general programme of road construction was being used by the Government for political purposes;
5. Evidence relating to these charges was given to the Committee under oath and a certified transcript thereof has been filed with the Clerk of the House.
6. Also filed with the Clerk of the House are the following exhibits:
 - Exhibit No. 1: maps submitted by John Tanchak, M. L. A.;
 - Exhibit No. 2: list of flagmen submitted by John Tanchak, M. L. A.;

(First Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, cont'd.)

Exhibit No. 3: documents submitted by Steve Lucko;

Exhibit No. 4: original letter from Errick F. Willis, Minister of Public Works, to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Rural Municipality of Springfield, dated April 20th, 1959;

Exhibit "A": copy of a letter written by Errick F. Willis, Minister of Public Works, to the Secretary Treasurer of the Rural Municipality of Brokenhead, dated April 15th, 1959.

7. With respect to the charge set out in paragraph 4 (a), The Honourable the Minister of Public Works, during the consideration of the estimates of the Department, presented to the Committee of the whole House, figures of the actual cost of construction showing that the section of the road constructed after June 30, 1958, was \$620 per mile less than the comparable construction carried on prior to June 30, 1958. The Minister of Public Works further established that he had given this same information to the Committee of Supply during the 1960 session and that the figures had also been discussed before the Standing Committee on Public Accounts in 1960. Upon this information being given by The Minister, The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition withdrew this charge. No further evidence or witnesses were presented to your Committee on this matter and it was not pursued further before the Committee.

8. With respect to the charge concerning the employment of flagmen (paragraph 4 (b)), evidence was called by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, in the person of John Tanchak, M.L.A., for the Electoral Division of Emerson. Mr. Tanchak gave evidence as to the persons employed (see Exhibit No. 2) and stated that, in his opinion, the employment of the said flagmen was unnecessary. Mr. Tanchak was unable to give the political affiliation of the persons named in Exhibit No. 2 and declined to make any charge of political employment or patronage. On cross-examination, he did not deny that of the 11 persons named by him 9 of them had been employed by the Department of Public Works under the Liberal Progressive Government prior to June 30, 1958. Mr. Tanchak concluded his evidence by saying that, in his opinion, the employment of some of these persons was "unnecessary."

9. Mr. George Collins, Deputy Minister of Public Works, was called and gave evidence to the Committee with respect to the employment of the aforesaid flagmen. Mr. Collins' evidence was that upon receipt of complaints from the Tourist Bureau, tourists, the customs officers, the travelling public and the District Engineer and for specific reasons, which he detailed to the Committee, the flagmen were necessary for the protection of the construction project and the protection of the travelling public. It was on the recommendation of the District Engineer and those immediately responsible for the construction work, as well as himself, to the then Minister of Public Works that the flagmen were hired. Mr. Collins stated that the men were employed as the result of recommendations made by himself and members of the Department to the Minister of Public Works and that they were employed by the Local District Engineer and the Superintendent in charge of construction. Mr. Collins also later gave in evidence that of the 11 men named by Mr. Tanchak, he could only locate a record of 10 and that of these 10, eight had been employed by the Department of Public Works under the former Liberal Progressive Government of Manitoba. Mr. Collins pointed out that the entire construction project in question had been carried out during the months of May, June, July and August 1959, and that the men in question had been employed for intermittent brief periods as required. Mr. Collins further stated that in the case of construction work carried on for the Province by private contractors the contractor is required, as a term of the contract, to provide flagmen for the protection of the construction project and the travelling public.

10. Mr. Steve Lucko of Beausejour, Manitoba, was then called on behalf of The Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Lucko produced a copy of a letter dated April 20th, 1959, and addressed by The Honourable Erric F. Willis, then Minister of Public Works, to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Rural Municipality of Springfield, with respect to an access road from Provincial Trunk Highway Number 15 into the Townsite of Oakbank. This document was marked "Exhibit No. 3" in the proceedings.

11. Mr. Lucko stated that in April 1959, he was a Councillor in the Rural Municipality of Springfield and that the council were and had been anxious that the Province of Manitoba should take over the aforesaid road as a Provincial responsibility. He stated that he and the Municipality

(First Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, cont'd.)

were pleased to have the Province assume the responsibility for the road as an access road, but indicated his disappointment that the road, in addition to being taken over by the Province, had not been reconstructed. Mr. Lucko, while acknowledging that he was a brother of William Lucko, a former Liberal-Progressive Member of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly for the electoral division of Springfield, stated that he did not appear before your Committee in support of any political charges. Mr. Lucko also agreed the arrangements made were a regular matter between any municipality in the Province and the Provincial Government.

12. Mr. Fred Klym, M.L.A., gave evidence that in April 1959 he had conveyed to the then Minister of Public Works, the desire of the Reeve of the Rural Municipality of Springfield, and some citizens thereof to have the aforesaid road taken over by the Province. He agreed that at the time of conveying this information to the Minister of Public Works he was a Progressive Conservative Candidate in the Provincial Election then in progress.

13. On Tuesday, April 4, 1961, the Secretary-Treasurer of the Rural Municipality of Springfield, appeared before the Committee pursuant to subpoena issued and presented the original letter from the Minister of Public Works addressed to himself and dated April 20, 1959. This letter was filed as "Exhibit No. 4" in the proceedings. The Secretary-Treasurer further stated that the taking over of the road by the Province was in the public interest and was beneficial to the Municipality.

14. On Tuesday, April 4th, 1961, two witnesses, namely, William Berry and Stanley Bird, both of the Rural Municipality of Pembina, in Manitoba, farmers, appeared before your Committee pursuant to subpoenas issued April 3rd, at the request of The Leader of the Opposition. Both acknowledged that they had originally been requested to appear before your Committee by Mr. C. Cousins, the defeated Liberal Progressive Candidate in the aforesaid Pembina By-Election.

15. The witness William Berry said that Mrs. Thelma Forbes, M.L.A. had visited the Berry family home on a social and political visit. During the visit the By-Election was discussed. He said that although he could not remember Mrs. Forbes exact words, his interpretation of Mrs. Forbes' remarks was that the By-Election was a vote of confidence or non-confidence in the Government, and that if it was a non-confidence vote the Notre Dame-Manitou Road would not be built. He admitted that Mrs. Forbes made no threats, promises or bribes.

16. Stanley Bird said that Mrs. Forbes called at his home during the By-Election on a combined social and political visit, he having been a former pupil of hers. Mr. Bird said that he interpreted Mrs. Forbes words to mean that this was a vote of confidence in the Government and that if the Government Candidate was defeated, the road would not necessarily be completed. He stated categorically that Mrs. Forbes did not say anything which he could treat as a bribe, threat or promise.

17. Mrs. Forbes was called as a witness. Mrs. Forbes gave evidence that during her visit to the Berry home and to the Bird home the By-Election was discussed. She testified that she had said the Government was running on its record and that there were no promises of any kind being made, either with respect to the Notre Dame - Manitou Road, which she understood was a subject of discussion in the local neighborhood, or any other matter. She said she could give no assurance of further work being done on the road irrespective of the outcome of the By-Election. Mrs. Forbes further stated that she had said that as she could give no assurance of completion, if the Progressive Conservative Candidate was elected, she could certainly give no assurance that the road would be completed if the Liberal Progressive Candidate was elected. She further testified that she had made these same statements in many places and on numerous occasions during the Pembina By-Election. She testified that she made no promises or threats and had offered no bribes.

18. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was called as a witness and questioned concerning the flagmen employed on the construction of Provincial Trunk Highway No. 12. He said he had no personal knowledge of the political affiliations of the flagmen employed, but did state that in his opinion and notwithstanding the evidence of the Deputy Minister of Public Works, their employment was "unnecessary", and therefore political in its nature. Although asked to do so, the Leader of the Opposition declined to call further witnesses to support his opinion.

19. Your Committee in considering the evidence given finds as follows:

(a) with respect to charge 4 (a) in view of the fact the Leader of the Opposition withdrew

(First Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, cont'd)

the charge in the House and that no evidence was called and no further reference made to it, your Committee finds that the charge respecting the construction costs on Provincial Trunk Highway No. 12, is without foundation;

(b) your Committee finds that the action taken by the Deputy Minister of Public Works, and officers in that Department in the employment of the flagmen on Provincial Trunk Highway No. 12, as requested by people on the scene, was necessary and advisable for the protection and guidance of the travelling public and the performance of the work being done. The Committee records that the Leader of the Opposition brought forward no evidence or witnesses to substantiate the charge that the employment of the flagmen was related to political or patronage considerations. Your Committee finds that there is no evidence to substantiate the charge made;

(c) with respect to the Access Road from Provincial Trunk Highway No. 15 to Oakbank, the Committee finds that Mr. Fred Klym, while a candidate in a Provincial election, conveyed the desire of the Reeve and certain citizens to the then Minister of Public Works to have the road in question taken over by the Province of Manitoba. Your Committee further finds that the action of the Department of Public Works in taking over the road was in the public interest and was for the benefit of the Rural Municipality of Springfield and the citizens of the community generally, and in accordance with the existing policy of the Department of Public Works;

13. (d) with respect to the charges relating to the By-Election in the Electoral Division of Pembina and in particular to the Notre-Dame Road, the evidence of Mrs. Forbes as to her discussions with William Berry and Stanley Bird was clear and unequivocal. Your Committee finds that

(i) Mrs. Forbes said to William Berry that "we were making no promises in this By-Election, I could not promise that if the Conservative Candidate was elected that the road would be built and so therefore I certainly could not see how anyone could assume if the Liberal Candidate was elected the road would be built; but what we were asking for was a vote of confidence"; and that

(ii) she said to Stanley Bird that "I was making no promises and that I couldn't promise if the Conservatives member was elected that the road would be built, therefore I could not assume it would be built if the Liberal member was elected"; and that

(iii) she made these same statements in many places and on numerous occasions during the said By-Election. Your Committee further records that while Messrs. Berry and Bird did not remember or recall exactly what Mrs. Forbes had said, they did agree that she had used no bribes, threats or promises.

Your Committee finds as a fact that Mrs. Forbes offered no bribe and made no threat or promise in respect of the said road or in reference to the said By-Election.

(e) Having considered all of the evidence brought forward and every opportunity having been provided for interested parties to call further witnesses and/or present further evidence, and having found that the detailed allegations have not been substantiated in any manner or particular, your Committee finds that the general charges that the road program for Manitoba has been used and is being used for political purposes and that there have been threats and bribes, have not been established and are without foundation.

20. Your Committee had before it the Report on the Financial Estimates of The Manitoba Hospital Services Plan for the years 1961, 1962 and 1963. This report had been referred to your Committee pursuant to Resolution of the Legislative Assembly agreed to on the 30th day of March, 1961.

21. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare, together with the Commissioner of Hospitalization and Senior Officers of The Manitoba Hospital Services Plan, appeared before your Committee.

22. Members of your Committee directed questions to the Minister, and the Commissioner, and the fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to examine into the said report. Your Committee further heard representations from members of the public. No restriction was placed upon the line of examination.

23. The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer and the Deputy Provincial Treasurer appeared

(First Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, cont'd.)

before your Committee with respect to the issue and sale of The Manitoba Savings Bonds.

24. Your Committee received all information desired by any member from the Provincial Treasurer and the Deputy Provincial Treasurer with respect to the said Manitoba Savings Bonds and all necessary papers were produced for examination. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to examine into the offering for sale of the said bonds and no restriction was placed upon the line of examination.

25. Your Committee has further examined the Public Accounts of the Province of Manitoba for the fiscal year ended the 31st day of March 1960, as published and finds that the receipts and expenditures of the monies have been carefully set forth and all monies properly accounted for. Your Committee received all information desired by any Member, from the Minister, Heads of Departments, and members of Comptroller's Office with respect to receipts, expenditures and other matters pertaining to the business of the Province and all necessary papers were produced for examination. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to examine vouchers or any documents called for and no Restriction was placed upon the line of examination.

All of which is respectfully submitted, (Signed) "Stewart E. McLean", Chairman."

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, when concurrence will be moved?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that I propose to move concurrence in the report tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas) introduced Bill No. 103, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act (2).

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) introduced Bill No. 105, An Act to amend An Act respecting The Town of Souris.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) introduced Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Brandon Charter (2).

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions in my name and the name of the Honourable the Minister of Health.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1, Resolved it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide for the certification of qualifications of tradesmen, and among other matters, provide, (a) for the appointment of Boards of examiners in respect of certain trades and for the payment of remuneration to the members thereof; and (b) for the employment of staff and the payment of their remuneration. Resolution be adopted?

MR. PAULLEY: What trades are covered?

MR. CARROLL: That's a good question, Mr. Chairman. There are no trades mentioned in this, presumably they will be -- they could be those trades which are now under apprenticeship; they could be expanded, of course, to take many other trades which don't lend themselves

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) to apprenticeship training. Briefly, the purpose of this is to provide for a certificate of proficiency to an individual who has had considerable experience and who has the skills necessary to pass an examination to indicate his degree of proficiency in a particular trade. Now there are some trades which don't lend themselves to apprenticeship; there are people who are self-employed who certainly want to have something to indicate that they are proficient in their particular skill. And this, of course, we think will be a good thing. It will indicate to the public that the individual who holds himself out as a tradesman is, indeed, a qualified tradesman. I think it does give the individual too, something to aim to -- a standard to aim for, and we think it will be good for the individuals who become qualified as well as the general public. It has been asked for by both management and labour organizations. We think it's a good thing for the province.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in the past few years there have been discussions in the Assembly in regard to automobile mechanics. Some question has arisen from time to time as to the qualification of auto mechanics. Can the Minister indicate -- will they be covered under this or is it the intention of the department to have qualified mechanics designated as such in the various garages in town?

MR. CARROLL: I didn't quite get that, but certainly this will take care of auto mechanics who are presently working and who want to have a certificate of proficiency -- something to show that they are qualified in their trade. Incidentally, this is all on a voluntary basis. There's nothing in the statute which would force people to obtain this at the present time, although there is a section there which would enable it to become compulsory at some time in the future if it was deemed to be in the public interest. In other words, it may be that if there was a great deal of pressure, say, to licensed TV repairmen; if there's some evidence that they are not performing properly and that there should be a standard established and at some time it should be required that they should have a certificate of qualification before they practice then we might be able to consider that some time in the future. But at the present time it's strictly on a voluntary basis and we do think that it does establish a standard which will serve a very useful purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Resolution No. 2, Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Hospital Debentures Guarantee Act, 1960, by providing that the amount of the monies payable under debentures issued by The Dauphin General Hospital the payment of which may be guaranteed by the Provincial Treasurer on behalf of Her Majesty in right of Manitoba, shall be increased to seven hundred thousand dollars.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, last year we passed an act concerning The Dauphin, Brandon and General Hospitals wherein the province agreed to guarantee certain debentures in the case of these voluntary hospitals. This amendment merely increases the amount. Last year we passed \$450,000 and the total borrowing requirement is in the neighbourhood of \$700,000, and this makes provision for this increased additional loan requirement this year.

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

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 106, An Act respecting the certification of qualifications of tradesmen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 100, An Act to amend The Hospitals Debentures Guarantee Act 1960.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House the Return to an Order of the House No. 14 in the name of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead. I'd also like to lay on the table of the House a reply to a question dated March 24th in the name of the Member for Brokenhead; a Return to an Order No. 13 in

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead; a Return to an Order of the House No. 8 in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead; a Return to an Order of the House No. 15 in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 74 An Act to amend certain provisions of the Statute Law No. 1 for second reading.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I feel I should say a few words on second reading of this Bill because, of course, in large part this bill represents the work of the Onus Committee which sat during recess after our last session, and this bill incorporates the recommendations of that committee which agreed by and large to abolish most of the onus provisions in the Statutes of Manitoba which were reviewed by that committee. I should mention that the bill is not exhaustive in that it does not cover all of the onus provisions which were dealt with by the committee. Honourable members will recall that there were, I think, one or two of these onus sections which were repealed, or for which repeal is being sought in The Liquor Control Act. Any other statutes that are before the House and are being amended will contain repeals of onus sections that pertain to those Statutes. I understand that there will be some amendments for instance to The Game and Fisheries Act whereby the onus sections in that act will be repealed in that separate Statute. So this act does not purport to be all inclusive of the report of the Onus Committee, but it does contain a large number of the onus sections which were dealt with by the Onus Committee. There are other matters in the bill dealing with minor typographical errors and one or two new matters which are contained in this bill as well; but the main point to which I would draw attention is the repeal of the onus sections as heretofore mentioned.

I think this bill marks a forward step in the development of the administration of law in the Province of Manitoba. Certainly we appreciated the co-operation and assistance that we received from all sides of the House in the consideration of these different onus sections and I think members on all sides are to be congratulated for the view that they took in dealing with this problem and in recommending as they did, the repeal of the bulk of these sections. I think it is a bill that augurs well for the future of the administration of law as I have already mentioned, and one that certainly will be a boon to the people of Manitoba who must appear before our courts.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in what the Honourable the Attorney-General has said and to congratulate him on the speed and alacrity with which he has sought to carry into effect the recommendations of the committee that was established to look into the onus sections in our various statutes. This is a step in the right direction and I feel that the government is entitled to be complimented in taking this step which is the first step in bringing back into our law the old established principle that a man is innocent until he is proved guilty.

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

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli) presented Bill No. 80, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act for second reading.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak briefly to the principle behind this bill. I should mention there has been considerable speculation over the past few weeks as to the actual provisions that are made in this bill. Some of this has not been too accurate -- some of the speculation that has come to my attention, and some of it is completely off the track in saying that all private adoptions were to be prohibited and all would have to be done through the Children's Aid Society. This bill is rather lengthy because it makes two main changes in the Act. These are first, adoptions. Now Part 8 of the present Act if read at all literally assumes or provides that all adoptions follow a pattern, the pattern being that married couples wishing to adopt a child apply to the Director, the Director then investigates their fitness to take a child and if favourable the child is placed. If the placement is suitable the Director approves the adoption. Now if the Director approves, the court can hear a petition for an absolute decree. Now apart from one provision for children who have been in a de facto adoption situation for seven or more years, the present act does not recognize the many private adoption arrangements that are quite normal and natural in our society. In fact it requires that these adoptions should go through the mill, so to speak.

Now what are these private adoptions? An example is a widow with a child remarries; she and her husband want the child to be legally the child of both. Or a divorcee remarries,

(Mr. Johnson, (Gimli), cont'd.) or an unmarried mother places a child with her own parents or with relatives or with friends who wish to adopt the child. These are the types of private adoptions which the present act is rather unrealistic with. The amendment to the adoption section makes it quite clear that a definite procedure is to be followed in the case of so-called private adoptions and another definite procedure for those people who apply to the director or a society for a child. Many of the present provisions of the act are retained but it appeared proper to rewrite the whole of Section VIII of the act at this time and that's why it is such a bulky document before us. The second main provision of this Act is to make it absolutely clear that a parent or parents surrendering or relinquishing their child for adoption or through committal of the child as a neglected child, the right at that time regardless of any previous expression of preference, to decide as to what shall be the religious faith or religious up-bringing of their child.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the bill is before members. I would suggest that most questions could be cleared when the bill is in committee. But I would like to enlarge on the two points I have brought out. As I see the bill in my mind's eye there is first of all the situation at present where nothing is to prevent adopting parents going to an unmarried mother and making possibly arrangements for adoption after delivery. This act makes it mandatory that a ten-day period lapse after the birth of this child before the mother can give her final consent. Following this the party are required, within 30 days, to notify the director in writing as to the fact that they have made this adoption. As you see at the present time after a two or three year period where a situation such as this has gone on, the director may be called upon to come and appear in court and give his consent to this adoption and it places the director in a very tough position. This legislation incidentally is being entertained in other provinces in Canada and I think is in effect in some. The other main provision is that in lieu of the decision of the courts, about a year and a half ago, the decision of Chief Justice Williams in the court, when he stated that once an unmarried parent expresses a preference for the religious upbringing of the child, she can at no time change her mind. This act says that at the time of the court committing the child to an agency, or at the time of giving final consent to the adoption of her child, the parent shall state the religious preference at that time.

These are the main provisions of the bill and as I say, the bulkiness of it is due to the rewriting of Part VIII to bring it up-to-date at the same time. This is not intended to reverse the decisions of the courts in the Hallas case as was mentioned in the House here by one of the members previously. The Hallas type of problem can only be prevented when sufficient foster homes of a particular religious faith are available so that children don't have to stay temporarily in foster homes of another religious faith. However, we feel that these amendments will bring our child welfare legislation into modern terminology, and I feel, are in the best interests of the public.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, speaking only for myself -- I don't know whether my views are the views of my group or not -- I'm going to vote for this bill for second reading with this reservation; I don't think the bill has gone far enough in respect of Section 131 of The Child Welfare Act. About all the bill does in respect of that section is that it changes the law as was stated by the Chief Justice in that recent case. It gives a mother, an unmarried mother, the right of a second choice in respect of religion. But this bill doesn't go far enough in my opinion, inasmuch as it does not give a mother -- it does not give the Director I would say, or an agency or a society, the same right as is possessed by the mother. Now if the Director were given the same right as is possessed by a mother, then I think that more children in Manitoba would be adopted. When the bill comes into committee it is my intention to move an amendment either to strike out the whole of Section 131 of the Act or to give to the Director the same rights as is enjoyed by a mother. Because after all the Director, once that child is committed permanently to the Director's care, the Director is then in loco parentis to the child and exercises all the rights and privileges and all the obligations of a parent to that child, and to me it seems most illogical that the Director should not have the same powers in respect of the religion as the mother herself possesses.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I will not oppose this bill going into committee, but when it does go into committee I'd say that I would reserve the right to have certain points clarified as well as to bring in certain suggestions and recommendations to the

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) said committee.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just one question. I too, like the two honourable members who have just spoken am quite in favour of the bill going to second reading. As a matter of fact I'm glad because of a number of changes in the Child Welfare Act itself that are contained in this bill. One thing that is disturbing me at the present time is that I cannot see -- maybe it is legally here or in legal terminology that I can't read into it at the present time -- is the question of retro-activity insofar as the changes concerned. As I understand it, and I know of at least two cases, Mr. Speaker, that had this been the act a few years ago the situations would have been resolved. Now I would like to know if the Minister is in a position to tell me, and assure me -- and I hope he can assure me -- that in some cases at least that have been standing still as the result of the decision of Mr. E.K. Williams, and I'm not referring to that particular case itself, but some that have been held up from being proceeded with and concluded. My question is, and I'm sure the Minister is aware of the situation I'm speaking of at the present time, my concern is -- will the legislation enacted apply to cases such as those that I have in my mind at the present time?

MR. M.A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, some of the questions I intended to ask have already been referred to by the last speakers. I have one left. Why should the inspector or the director of the welfare be the judge as to where a child is being placed? I assume that his only duty should be to see that the foster home, or the foster parents, are reliable; they will take good care of the child; that they may have the consent of the mother, whether married or not, and to see that the child's future is protected. I would not like to leave in the hands of the director of welfare for him to have the full say whether a child should be adopted by someone or not, except as I've said to see that the child's future is fully protected.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, in replying to some of these questions I think probably some of them can be better dealt with in committee. However, as my understanding is that as far as retroactivity goes I do not believe the retroactive clause is necessary; it's just a matter of getting this legislation through in order to enable us to move on the type of case that the Honourable Leader of the CCF is mentioning. Secondly, of course the committee must realize that the present Child Welfare Act, Section 131, goes on to say that the children shall be placed only in the homes of the major religious faiths, Roman Catholic, Protestant and Jewish, and then goes on in subsection 131 (2) to say that in cases of temporary placement and so on that the agency can place children in homes of another faith on this temporary basis. I think when members are weighing the desirability of child welfare legislation in the broad sense, and in attempting to respect the religious beliefs of the major faiths, that they keep in mind that the agencies in this province over the last twenty years have reversed the situation which existed in the early '40s in that 80 percent or more of children are now in foster home situations, whereas previously 80 percent were in institutions in those days, whereas that has been reversed and less than 20 percent of children are in institutions today. This has been created largely through the voluntary Children's Aid Societies who have set a model as a child welfare agency in Manitoba and we must think of the thing in the very broad sense that the present act but for the amendments whic I am proposing here today, have in large measure emptied institutions and set up the foster home situation we have here today. In talking to many of the foster parents, or one woman who had had over 75 small children in her care over the past years, told me frankly she became closely attached to every one of them, but she had understood very clearly from the various societies that they would do everything within their power and she would co-operate with them to the maximum in finding that child the ideal home for it. I think we must realize that we'll have to look at both sides of this question when we come to law amendments; but I do think that this will go a long way towards correcting the situation that exists in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 88. The Honourable the Minister of Public Works.

HON. JOHN THOMPSON, Q.C. (Minister of Public Works) (Virden) presented Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 89. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) presented Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act, for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable the First Minister that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, the budget debate is always one that, even though it may not last as long as some others in this Chamber, is of very great importance to the Province of Manitoba and I'm pleased to make my small contribution to it at the present time. The members of the House will be pleased I'm sure to hear that I do not intend to follow the rather lengthy budget speech that was delivered the other evening by the Honourable the First Minister clause by clause or even page by page. I have only a few comments to make on the budget speech itself; then a few to make on other matters that are not directly contained in the budget speech as delivered, and I trust it will not take me as long as some of my other utterances on similar occasions have done.

I have no quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with the economic outline that the Honourable the First Minister gave in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer except to say that I believe when he indicates that the gross national product grew by nearly three percent during 1960, and he later uses the figure between two and three percent, that he has perhaps not taken into account the fact that according to the information that I have that prices rose during that period by approximately one percent, which would mean that the actual gain was perhaps only in the neighbourhood of one percent. So I would think that there is reason for the concern that my honourable friend showed in dealing with the economic situation in Canada and in this province. I thought as a matter of fact, that the First Minister seemed to be rather of two minds in this connection. He was trying to be realistic, I believe, in recognizing the fact that conditions in the nation and in the world have a good deal of effect on our economy here in the middle of this continent, but on the other hand he was determined, I think, to express a degree of confidence that I imagine that his facts and statistics did not fully carry out.

Now I would spend less time on this one particular point, Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the fact that my honourable friend continues to make critical remarks of the policy of the previous administration with regard to investment in the public sector of this province. Last year I found it necessary to spend a good deal of time on this particular question, and I notice that although the document this year does not in my opinion offend as badly as a year ago, the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer has not found it possible to deal with his own administration and leave the question of former policies to take care of themselves. An example is on page 7, and there are others, where this statement appears. "To an important degree this massive public investment has been necessitated by the need to overtake a considerable backlog from past years." Well now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it's profitable for us to spend too much time in rehashing the arguments that have gone on here over the years in this particular, but if my honourable friend is going to continue to make those statements then I must, and shall, continue to reply to them, because I must remind the House once again that when he's suggesting that the former administration did not accept its responsibilities with regard to the investment in public works and services of different kinds in this province, that he himself when he was aspiring to the leadership of what he then believed to be a Conservative Party urged us to go slower than we were doing with regard to public investment. Now my honourable friend simply can't get away from that position, and if he wishes to try and explain or excuse the extreme spending of today by insisting that there was a backlog unfilled by the former administration, then he must be prepared to be reminded that he gave us some advice re public investment at that time. He wanted at that time, Mr. Speaker, to be a "conservative" in the true sense of the word. He has changed greatly I think in the meantime, but he told us, as you will remember Sir, because you were here at that time, that he told us that a million dollars less should be spent on the highway program of that particular year; 1952, I believe it was. Our expenditure proposed at that time was \$16 million and my honourable friend said a million dollars should be diverted to other uses; and he gave us a warning against utility borrowing as well.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that my honourable friend with that basis, that background, has no right to continue to say under these circumstances that his expenditures today are due to the backlog from past years. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, we did not take the honourable gentleman's

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) advice, because just at the time that he was warning us to slow down and to spend less money, and to take a million dollars off the highway program, we were continuing to ask this House for authority to borrow. We borrowed in the very year he was talking about, and for every year afterwards as long as we stayed in office, huge sums of money, and ones that I think were quite compatible with the needs of those days. In 1954 we took the authority here to borrow \$41 million; '55 more than \$20 million; '56 \$30-1/2 million; '57, \$59 million; '58, more than \$42 million, or an average of thirty-eight and a half million dollars every year during that period until we went out of office in 1958, in addition to current expenditures that rose in that period from \$54 million in the very year that he was urging us to slow down, to \$80 million in our final year. So I repeat, and I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that as long as my honourable friend and I are here, we will likely continue to argue with one another about this background, but as long as he makes these statements I shall reply in time. My honourable friend simply can't get away from history in this regard, and he must remember today I'm sure, when he's leading the kind of a government he is with the sort of policies that they have, that at one time he did aspire to lead a Conservative Party.

Then we have a statement on Page 11 with regard to agriculture. "But we must emphasize" says the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, "our concern for the unsatisfactory state of net farm income. While production has held well, net farm income continues to lag behind the net incomes of the economy as a whole." Then a couple of sentences which don't change the context, and he ends with this statement; "However, we must continue to press those measures which will give to the farmer a more substantial share of our economic benefits." Well, I agree with him; but I'd like to know what has the honourable gentleman done about it in the field that he promised us that he was going to act.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, when my honourable friend sat on this side of the House, he used to tell we folks who occupied the treasury benches that we were not doing enough about agriculture, and he said that we continued to ask Ottawa to do everything for us. More recently, however, since he's been in office, he has recognized the fact that so far as agriculture's main problems are concerned, and it's most important aspects, that it does depend very greatly upon the national and even the international situation. I think he has found out that Ottawa can do more, much more for agriculture in the national sphere than we can do at home. And so when my honourable friend was speaking in the House just two years ago -- at a session immediately before an election -- my honourable friend has this to say -- and I'm reading from the transcript of his statement on March 16th, 1959. This is what he said about agriculture. Talking about the continuing committee in Ottawa he said, that there must be a prelude to a resumption in the near future of the full Dominion-Provincial Conference. "This is particularly true", and I'm reading from the text now; "This is particularly true for Manitoba, as there are a variety of other matters in addition to tax-sharing arrangements which are also ripe for consideration. I propose to refer now to some of the more important of these problems. At the head of the list I place the situation in respect of our agricultural economy. Governments have been attempting, both at the federal and provincial level to provide a measure of security for the farming community. In its efforts to adjust to an ever changing situation, agriculture has been called upon to bear a burden often in excess of the burden borne by other sectors of the economy. Uncertainty of income, risk of greater, even total loss, are the perpetual partners of the prairie farmers. The Government of Manitoba feels a prime responsibility to speak strongly on behalf of Manitoba agriculture. We have already demonstrated our vital interest in provincial and national policy in the fields of agricultural credit, crop insurance and production and marketing research. Other long-term agricultural policies including soil and water conservation can be undertaken most effectively by means of Dominion-Provincial co-operation." And with that introduction here is the key statement; "However, there are some interim decisions particularly in matters of market and price which are most urgently required. The factors bearing on the cost-price squeeze in our agricultural economy may well require protracted investigation and debate if they are to be clearly identified and properly eliminated; but the effect of the cost-price squeeze on the farmers well-being crystalized as they are in declining net farm income, cannot be left to protracted discussions. There may be room for differing views on various solutions put forward, but most of us will agree that the farm problem is real, acute, and demands action not only by government but by the industry itself. While doing what we can as

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) a province, we believe it is our responsibility also to request a place among top priorities for discussion and decision respecting outstanding agricultural questions at the full Dominion-Provincial Conference level. A greater measure of equality between agriculture and other sectors of the economy is our constant goal." That was a statement of policy with regard to what my honourable friend was going to do two years ago, Mr. Speaker. It was a recognition of the fact that the most urgent problems of agriculture lie in the federal, or even the international field. My honourable friend said that we had done or were prepared to do what we could in the provincial field, and I recognize the fact that measures that my honourable friends believe to be helpful have been undertaken. But what about the federal field? What has my honourable friend succeeded in getting his friends at Ottawa to do? What representations and proposals were made at the Federal-Provincial Conference, and what has been the results? Here's the statement in the Budget Speech of a couple of evenings ago: "However, we must continue to press those measures which will give to the farmer a more substantial share in our economic benefits." What's my honourable friend been doing in three years? He was going to make some representations and they were going to get action from the proper people. I would like to have a report on what has been recommended and what has been accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not dwell any longer on agriculture, and I will make no comment on the portion of the Budget Speech dealing with power and telephones, except to mention, once again, that the same honourable gentleman who now takes great pride in the progress that has been made by both of these utilities -- and justifiably so -- was warning us not many years ago that the telephones might come out; that the electric light might be turned off and the roads might not be used. Mr. Speaker, if I had said such things at any time, or even if I did now when the economic climate is much different to what it was then, I'd be accused of being an out and out pessimist. My honourable friend's gloomy predictions didn't come true in our time and I'm not even expecting them under his administration, but my honourable friend at least should remember again what he has said in the past when conditions were different to what they are now. Today some of the provincial administrations are recognizing that there will be a difference because of the economy slowdown in Canada as a whole.

Then we have a statement on Dominion-Provincial relations, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it's a most negative pronouncement and most disappointing. I shall not take the time to go into it fully at this time because it's understood that there is to be a special session to deal with the new arrangements, and we shall have the opportunity then of developing this matter more fully. But in the meantime, I would like to ask my honourable friend where are his high hopes of three years ago, and two years ago, and one year ago? This is the best my honourable friend could muster for the situation, on Page 27; "On the whole, I think it may be said that the new plan does Manitoba no harm at the present; in the latter years of the agreement it is likely to do some good through moderately increasing provincial revenues." That doesn't sound much like what my honourable friend expected a short time ago. And it certainly doesn't sound much like an implementation of the promises that Messrs. Diefenbaker, Fleming and their colleagues were making when they were campaigning for election, or before they were campaigning for election when they were criticizing the policies of the former government in the House. What did they say then? They said that they were really going to do something constructive with regard to Federal-Provincial relations, and they were loud in their condemnation of the government of that day because of centralization and because they were starving the provinces, because the municipalities were the forgotten people. Then when the election time came along, Mr. Diefenbaker made it very, very plain that there wasn't going to be any more of this take it or leave it attitude that he said the former government had adopted, but in this case all the provinces were going to agree. And did my honourable friend agree when they met for this conference? I think not! Mr. Speaker, we'll have an opportunity to discuss this question very fully, but I think in the meantime we have to recognize the fact, unless my honourable friend can show this House differently, I believe that we'll be inclined to view that this program as presently proposed to us, is one that's built to satisfy Ontario, and that while it may do Manitoba no harm, as my honourable friend says, no harm at the present, it certainly is intended to bale out the Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada in his relations with the Province of Ontario, and I say that's contrary to the spirit of the Federal-Provincial

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) agreements. I claim that we had a right to expect something better. I'm not blaming my honourable friend for not trying to advance Manitoba's cause, but I certainly am blaming the Federal Government for not living up, even to the slightest extent, to their election promises. I'm sure that the Honourable the Prime Minister didn't have everybody in agreement on this occasion as he had told the electors of Canada that he was going to achieve. Apparently the Honourable the First Minister of this province wasn't in agreement, because we had a clipping from the Free Press in July 28th that is headed "Roblin in a Snit" -- I would imagine if there's anyone in public life today in this province that can get in one, it's my honourable friend. "Premier Duff Roblin flew home from the Dominion-Provincial fiscal talks today in a bad temper. Roblin was annoyed by a story in the Ottawa Citizen that quoted him as saying: "I'm afraid we have had a Fleming government for the past two years." I agree with him! I think we have. The story also stated that Mr. Roblin had said that anyone of his Manitoba Cabinet Ministers could take over his job and do as good a job as he had been doing. I would change that word "good", but otherwise I would agree with that statement too. Here's what the statement said, according to J. A. Hume of the Citizen staff: "Fear that Canada has had a Fleming government in recent years was voiced yesterday by Honourable Dufferin Roblin--"and so on, and so on, and so on. My honourable friend was pretty cross about this, according to the press. He got so cross about it that as soon as the story appeared in the Citizen, there's this statement, "Charles King of Southams, which owns the Citizen, and Tom Gold of the Free Press went to see Mr. Roblin in the Conference Room. Mr. Roblin said; "I am furious; better not say anything, that would make it worse." I don't think you could have made that conference worse. I will admit what my honourable friend points out in this Budget Speech, that the present suggestions are not as bad as the ones that were responsible for the getting him in the "snit" at that time. But they're bad enough; and they're certainly not what we expected, what we had a right to expect after what had been said by the man who is now Prime Minister of Canada -- he said even after he was Prime Minister let alone what he had said before.

Mr. Speaker I have a very short comment to make on Savings Bonds. My honourable friend is pleased about the success, as he calls it, of the Savings Bonds. I wouldn't want to detract from any feelings of satisfaction that he has in that regard, and I think that the response may be, at least partially, and maybe largely, for the reasons that he's given of people being willing or anxious to invest in the bonds of this province. But I think that another reason is the fact they're a pretty attractive bond under these circumstances -- pretty attractive -- and I would imagine that my honourable friend maybe now thinks that they shouldn't have been made quite as attractive as they were. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain pointed out the cost that they could be to the Province of Manitoba if they were largely converted at the first due date. But in addition to that I think there are other risks that the province simply must recognize, because, Mr. Speaker, these bonds after six months from issue are payable on demand. As a matter of fact at that time they become a demand note, on October 1st and thereafter. I would imagine that because of that factor that a very large reserve must always be kept ready to cover any contingency such as them being cashed in in large measure. In other words the amount of money available for use will I think be much less than the total appears to be. Now why would such a contingency happen? Well, if there should be a rise in the interests rates, and we don't know, of course, whether there will or whether there won't, but there could be, if times continue to get tougher, if we had a serious crop failure in western Canada, if we had some action by any Canadian government, not necessarily this one, but almost any Canadian government that would shake the confidence of the investor, Manitoba could be called on to redeem a very large proportion of these bonds at any time. I think this would be most likely to happen of all if the Canada Savings Bonds should be issued at an interest rate as high, practically as high or higher than the rate that these are carrying. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this could happen, because Canada itself pioneered this field; it has found it a very acceptable way of raising money; it does not have to, I think, take the same risk that a province does with regard to the cashability, because it has the Bank of Canada backing it up. I'm not suggesting that it's in the interests of Canada for them to turn the crank and issue more money, but I do say that if they're put in a corner they can do that, and the Province of Manitoba can't. The Province of Manitoba would have to go to the chartered banks or, on short notice, float another loan. I think that that's a difficult proposition, because just at the time that these circumstances would be likely to cause a run on

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) the savings bonds would be the very same time it would be difficult to either borrow from the chartered banks or to raise money in the general money market. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we must remember, we must keep in mind, the experience that Manitoba had just about 30 years ago now, with the Manitoba Provincial Savings Office. It wasn't something that would indicate to us that a huge operation of this kind is necessarily prudent.

I have only a brief comment, Mr. Speaker, to make with regard to the taxes that have been imposed. Quite frankly, if the government finds it necessary to spend so much money they of course have to raise taxes when the occasion requires. I can't fault them in general on that. Nor do I think that a raise in gasoline and diesel fuel taxes are as bad as a sales tax would have been. But we must recognize the fact that Manitoba now has, or will have when this tax goes into effect, the highest gasoline tax of any province west of the Maritimes -- even of course with Saskatchewan, but higher than all the rest -- higher than Quebec, than Ontario, than Alberta and British Columbia. And that's something I think we need to be concerned about because my honourable friend in his Budget Speech said that we've become accustomed to being one of the provinces with a low level of taxes and that the new borrowings and this raise won't change that situation. But it does change it for us to join with the Province of Saskatchewan in being the very highest in gasoline tax. -- (Interjection)-- The very highest except the Maritimes.

Then, while the same is not true with regard to diesel fuel, I have the feeling that the differential between gasoline and diesel is putting a penalty on efficiency. I don't see why the efficient operation should be discouraged. It's true that the weights are greater of either the machine itself or the load that it carries, and I think that should be taken care of by the truck licence rates rather than by the fuel. I think that inasmuch as the trucking industry is our best method of keeping freight rates down, that we should be very careful about adding to their costs. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in all these matters, it's the consumer that should be kept first in mind, and this increase will definitely be one upon the consumer as indeed all increases are.

I notice too, Mr. Speaker, that as well as the Special Session to deal with Federal-Provincial financial relations, that we will be dealing with hospital premiums at that time so I shall say no more on that subject at the moment.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that no one will be greatly surprised to hear that I have a word or two to say with regard to the debt of the province. The table on Page 31 gives the comparison of Public Debt; it's certainly an interesting one and when combined with the table on Page 37 of the Guaranteed Debt, if my additions are correct, we would find that at the end of December, 1960, we were, in Manitoba, in the unenviable position of having a Gross Debt of almost half a billion dollars, \$495 and three-quarter millions in round figures. That's at the end of December, 1960. That's a pretty rapid increase, Mr. Speaker. Right at the door of a half billion dollars. Now what it is at the moment I don't know. I've searched the budget speech and I don't believe it's given; if it is, it escaped my attention. But taking the authorizations that were granted last year I would suggest that it's considerably over that figure as of the end of March 1961, probably in the neighbourhood of \$520 million. Then if we take the Direct Capital Supply that has been voted, \$45 million, the guarantees that are authorized, \$24 million for the Hydro-Electric Board, \$6-1/2 million for the Manitoba Power Commission, now a part of the Hydro Electric Board, we would be up to \$595 and a half million, plus. Then if we would take the \$40.8 million of the new issue of Savings Bonds we would find that we would be anticipating a total direct and guaranteed debt in the neighbourhood of 636 million dollars--odd by the end of the fiscal year that we have now ended. Mr. Speaker, that's a tremendous step for a province of this size. As I figure it out, the comparable total as at March 31st, 1958, was \$283 million in round figures, or an increase in three years of \$353 million -- well over \$100 million a year. I think that's something that the people of Manitoba should pay attention to.

Then on Page 32, my honourable friend directed our attention to the per capita debt as shown, both net and gross and guaranteed. I found that interesting because the net debt per capita as given on that page shows Manitoba to be practically double that of the Province of Saskatchewan. Once again -- (Interjection) -- well it's a conservative government at least in Saskatchewan, financially speaking, and compared to my honourable friends in this province.

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) And the debt service charge, as I read the Saskatchewan news, and compare it with the tables in the budget speech of Manitoba, the debt service charge is seven times as much in the Province of Manitoba as it is in Saskatchewan. I mean the percentage, not the charge, the debt service percentage of the total expenditure. But, Mr. Speaker, they're probably too conservative in the Province of Saskatchewan to be compared with this government; so it's better I think to look at Manitoba's comparisons -- keep right within our own province. For the year ending March 31st, 1960, in round figures, the total debt charges were given as \$2,665,000; for the year ending March 31st, 1962, the one we've now entered upon, they're given as \$7,683,000-odd; almost three times, Mr. Speaker, what they were two years ago. Practically 100 percent increase per year, and that's pretty bad. Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, there's some debt repayment in those figures, so perhaps we should take the interest alone. Well the interest was shown in the year ending March 31st, 1960 as less than \$8 million -- \$7,000,827. Now I'm aware that my honourable friend achieved that result by sleight of hand. It was a tricky piece of bookkeeping; it wasn't right; it wasn't honest; but he's stuck with it. -- (Interjection) -- No it was not honest to present it in that way.

MR. ROBLIN: my honourable friend should not make a remark like that.

MR. CAMPBELL: I made that remark and I stay with it. It was not honest to present it in that way.

MR. ROBLIN: That's your opinion

MR. CAMPBELL: It's my opinion that I am giving.

MR. ROBLIN: Well that's fine.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's right, and my honourable friend has to live with that figure because of the way he worked it out, and so if we take the corresponding figure we find that his interest charge is 334 times as much as it was two years ago. This of course is on the direct debt; it does not include the guaranteed debt; and that's the statement as far as I can see it with regard to my honourable friend's financial management of this province.

And so, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I simply must once again put on the record something that I read into it last year but it's too good to keep and should be put in in connection with the record of that time, because my honourable friend made a speech back in the time that he was campaigning for the Leadership of the Conservative Party, when he was pretending to be a real conservative, and he told us -- (Interjection) --. I am restricted to parliamentary terms. And here's what he said at that time, and I want my honourable friends to listen to this in the light of what he has just presented to this House in his own economic review. Here's what he said speaking on the budget debate.

MR. ROBLIN: What year was that?

MR. CAMPBELL: 1952 I believe.

MR. ROBLIN: In '51?

MR. CAMPBELL: In '52.

MR. ROBLIN: You're sure it's '52?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. "But, Mr. Speaker," and this is a quote from my honourable friend's speech of that day; "But, Mr. Speaker, there is something far more important than exchange rates when you come to talk about the provincial debt. There is another consideration which we should not overlook, and surely that is the size of the provincial debt. We were told the other night that last year it was \$135 million; this year it will be \$158 million; and next year it will be \$175 million, which will be the peak that we have ever aspired to in this particular connection. And we hear a lot of definitions: we hear about gross debt; we hear about self sustaining debt; we hear about gross dead-weight debt and net gross dead-weight debt. Let us be careful lest we deceive ourselves with words. What is this phrase: "Self-sustaining debt"? Well let's take an example here. The highways right now when they are covered by capital borrowings are considered to be dead-weight debts. But, Mr. Speaker, if you had a Highway Commission as they have in some parts of the world, with the right to levy the gasoline tax and that sort of thing, in other words to sell the highways, they could come to this government and borrow funds. We would lend them the funds, and they could sell the highways to the public and pay us back the interest on our money, and we would call that self-sustaining debt. That is precisely the procedure that takes place when you authorize a telephone system to have a monopoly on phones in this province, or the power commission to have

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....a monopoly on power in this province. You could call anything self-sustaining debt provided you balance and define your terms nicely. We know what happened in hard times, whether you call them self-sustaining or dead-weight or whatever you call it. The people do not use the roads; the people who don't use them take out their telephones as we have seen them do; they economize on electric light. Some of these self-sustaining debts may require a prop or two before they are through. There's a funny thing about debt, Mr. Speaker, no matter what you call it, you still have to pay it back, and I say that we should regard this steady increase in the gross total of the debt of this province with some concern." My honourable friend said that when next year he said the debt was going to be \$175 million, and now when it appears to me that next year it's going to be well over \$600 million, my honourable friend is quite complacent about it. --(Interjection)-- Yes they change.

Well now that leads me into a subject that I have spoken on before here and that's the question of taxes. Debt and taxes -- D.T. As a matter of fact my honourable friend almost gives me the DT's when he gets his debt and his taxes up so high. In connection with taxes I want to mention another matter that properly belongs before this Assembly, and that I think we're justified in making reference to. I want to speak briefly about Metro Government in this province. We're going to have consideration of a bill here soon and I think it should be thoroughly considered because after a year since the legislation was passed, less than a year's operation, I think we should review what has happened up to now. I want to say in connection with this general subject of taxes that we must remember that we gave to Metro the authority to spend money, spend it in large sums without the responsibility for collecting that money. And we gave it the authority also to spend a lot of money on capital ventures without a reference to the ratepayers or the electors. Mr. Speaker this was a time-honoured right of the City of Winnipeg and of other municipalities, and I maintain as I did a year ago, that when we were moving to remove from them this time-honoured right, that it should not have been done even in fairness without a referendum, but on the practical grounds leaving alone the fair ones or the moral ones, on practical grounds. I think the moral ones were very strong because here was a right that the people had come to depend upon was being taken away from them, but on practical grounds I think we would have avoided many of the difficulties that Metro has experienced and they would have avoided a lot of the misunderstanding that has developed with regard to them, if we had had a referendum, because it would have given the people the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the proposal; becoming acquainted with the system in general. There are virtues to it; there were good reasons for some sort of an authoritative body to take over these matters of inter-municipal concern, and I think a campaign and a referendum would have been most helpful to the people to have a better understanding. I think that the misunderstanding that exists so widely today with regard to Metro is largely due to the fact that like some other things that we could mention here, this was pushed upon them too quickly. They didn't get a chance to get acquainted with it; they hoped for some thing better; they find out that it costs a lot of money and they're inclined to be critical. We don't want the people to be unduly critical because it will take a while for Metro to show its benefits, and I believe there are some that can accrue. But no, Mr. Speaker, it was the government that insisted on forcing this upon the people quickly. The government was too high and mighty for such a sensible procedure as a referendum and the campaign that would have accompanied it and the educational process that would have been involved in it. They had to, once again, show their vaunted leadership by forcing the plan on the people without any expression of opinion. They were sure that they knew better than the people of the municipal councils what was good for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that if a referendum had been held at that time that it would have passed, because the sentiment of the public was in favour of something of that kind being done. But no, and now in my opinion Metro simply is following the government's example in going too far, too fast. The government is mainly responsible, I think, for its difficulties. First by giving it such arbitrary powers; second, by authorizing it to extend its activities so quickly, and over so many services with the resulting high cost, before the people are acquainted with it and fully conversant with its long-term plan of operation. The fact is the people are starting now to find out what some of us told them at that time, that it is another and expensive sphere of government, and you can't expect that another sphere of government is going to come in and not cost some people a good bit of money. That should have been explained to the people;

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . if it had been explained to them they would have been ready instead of it coming as the shock that it has to them. But apart from the philosophical consideration, Mr. Speaker, and apart altogether from talking about what should have happened because we've got Metro now and the question is to go on and make the best we can of it.

The real question, the one that I want to end my talk on, is what about the tax situation? I think that the people are becoming very tax conscious these times and I think it's time that they were. The Metro taxes are substantial. I don't think that the public was well informed as to how much Metro would cost, and even though their costs are substantial and are levied upon the people, upon the municipalities, the municipal taxes are up as well, and that confuses people, and disturbs them, and annoys them, and so the tax situation is of great concern today, Mr. Speaker. We all know about the increase in school taxes and that is raising taxes in not all municipalities but the most of them, and it's raising them in contravention of what the government told the municipalities would happen. For two years it's been raising them, and the end is not yet, because the construction program is only well under way. All through this area provincial taxes are up, metro taxes are high and they're new and in spite of that the municipal taxes are up as well. Let us take Winnipeg as an example. The increase there this year of seven mills means that on an assessment of \$10,000, and I don't suppose that's a high assessment these times, that's \$70 of new taxes for the people of Winnipeg on that assessment. If you took the gasoline tax and took an average rate -- I don't know what it would amount to, let us say \$14 or \$15 -- so they'd have a new tax from Winnipeg and a new tax from the province on gasoline, \$84 or \$85 let us say. Mr. Speaker, that's a lot of money to a lot of people in the City of Winnipeg, and in other municipalities as well. Perhaps they're not as much in some municipalities, they differ greatly; but the tax increase on top of what people already had is very very substantial. In Winnipeg not only the metro tax, which is largely new, but the other taxes are up as well, making a total of the seven mills that I mentioned. And it's customary for a lot of people when they mention the tax situation to talk about how it bears upon the elderly people or the pensioners, old age or otherwise, or those on fixed income. That's true, Mr. Speaker, and that's valid. But don't forget it bears on the young people too and I don't know of anyone who is more tax conscious these days than the young couple starting up, trying to get along. Then the young couple with young children; then the little older couple with children in school; the still older couple with children at high school or university, or both. Mr. Speaker, the tax increases, and particularly the realty tax increases, are a burden to all classes, and all groups and at all age levels, and they're becoming justly conscious of them today.

The point I think that should be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, is that from the taxes on real property there's no escape. My honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer can put a tax on gasoline as he has done, but if the folks find it unbearable they can at least run their car less. He can put a higher cost on liquor as he has done; if they don't want to pay that tax they don't need to buy as many beverages. They don't need to take part in the amusements that are taxed, or many of these other things. But from the real property taxes, the tax on the peoples' homes there is no escape; they can't get away from that one. My honourable friend the Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs was quoting with satisfaction the other day the fact that the tax collections are high, that that was an evidence of good times in municipalities. Mr. Speaker, it's no evidence at all; they've got to be high. People have got to pay these taxes or they lose their homes; they have no option. With these others there is an option, but not with the taxes that impinge on the man's home. Then we have the situation with regard to tax arrears, and there's when it really is getting to be dire straits for the taxpayer, knowing that he faces the losing of his home if they go unpaid or his property as the case may be; if he lets it go to tax arrears there's the best evidence that he's in difficulty. The tax arrears are up as the information that's been furnished to us has shown -- the latest we have is 1959 -- but they're up more than three-quarters of a million dollars over 1958; and the tax sale certificates are up. And I say that that's a serious situation. It's a dangerous situation when they get to the place where taxes are going into arrears and properties going to sale. This I maintain, Mr. Speaker, has implications for the government too, because if the tax situation gets to that point then people are going to cut down, of necessity. They're not going to let their homes go before they cut down on some of the higher revenue taxes this government depends on, gasoline and liquor and auto

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....licenses and amusements, and even the phones as the Honourable the present First Minister said, even the phones he said a few years ago will come out if times get difficult enough. So this tax situation has implications for the government of this province as well as the municipalities and although we, properly, Mr. Speaker, although we properly put the individual homeowner and the individual's home in first place when we're discussing these matters, don't make any mistake about it, these taxes are important to business and industry too, and to the extent that they go up and up, municipally and provincially, they curtail the ability of our industries to compete nationally and in the markets of the world with the product that we are wanting and the industry that we're wanting to encourage here. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the tax increases that have taken place have done more harm to our local industries than the assistance that my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce is so proud of having extended to them.

I close on the note that I have spoken on many times in this House, Mr. Speaker, that we must in this province, we definitely should in this province, pay attention to the question of debt and to the question of taxes. And I think that this government has not been doing the job that it should have in those regards and I consequently do not feel like voting confidence in it. So I move an amendment, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Carleton, that this House regrets that the Government while greatly increasing the province's debt and taxes has through its policies contributed to the sharp rise in municipal debt and taxes.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: This is an appendix to the main motion. Are you ready for the question?

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

MR. COWAN: I have a question, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would permit a question? If you oppose the increase in the provincial debt, why did you, during the last three years, vote for every single item that helped to make up the increase in debt, excepting for the increase of \$1,000 in your salary?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, there are some inaccuracies in that statement. There are some other matters that I opposed, but leaving that aside, my honourable friends realize the fact that I have pointed out time and time again that in the early days we took the position that the electors having had this program laid before them, that it was only fair that my honourable friend should have the opportunity to put it into practice. Then we have continued to vote, even though expressing our disapproval of the way that it was done, we have continued to vote the supplies knowing, knowing Mr. Speaker, that this government ran on a program of this kind and the public have a right -- they have a duty to put it into effect -- the public have a right to see how it works out.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare the terms of the resolution standing in my name. --(Interjection)-- Oh, he's not here? In the name of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, this resolution will certainly represent something of a change in pace from the previous proceedings in this House, and it leads me to the reflection that I sometimes wish that our debates were conducted on a little different line than the ones we usually follow, because this business of making set speeches day after day rather than proceeding with a debate in a current fashion in which all those who are interested in commenting give their views at the same time, is perhaps something that detracts from what is sometimes called the cut and thrust of debate in this Assembly. It would have been nice to pursue the debate that we have just concluded for the time being but I'm afraid it is to be quite otherwise.

However, Sir, in beginning my remarks on this question, perhaps I may be allowed to refer to a quotation taken from a speech delivered here a few months ago by someone whom most of us know very well, and who is certainly one of the most respected and, in my opinion,

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) one of the wisest journalists who are writing in Canada today. I refer to the statement made by Mr. Max Freedman when speaking in Winnipeg not so long ago when he used these words: "The British Commonwealth is the golden bridge of the 20th Century." He went on to say, "The place where freedom speaks with the boldest and loudest voice is in the British Commonwealth of Nations and its closest ally, the United States." Then again, "It is because we are safe, secure and free that if we are worthy of our citizenship we try to help those who cannot stand by themselves." And Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I put forward today, in my opinion, has its justification in the propositions that were enunciated by Mr. Freedman when he made that speech in Winnipeg from which I have just quoted.

I think Sir that I had an opportunity to watch the British Commonwealth, this "golden bridge of the 20th Century," in action at close quarters as other members of this Chamber have done or other former members of this Chamber at least have done, and all of us too perhaps, a little more remotely. But I had the opportunity of watching it in action at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting in Australia not very long ago, and there, Sir, we found the representatives of some 51 parliaments and legislatures within the British Commonwealth. Some of them were veterans of the parliamentary scene, representatives of the Mother of Parliament, of the so-called white dominions which have had independent status for some time. Some of them came from the nations of the Commonwealth perhaps of the Tyrols, from Ghana, from the Malayan States, and others came from parts of the Commonwealth where they are aspiring to self-government, such as Sierra Leone and Nigeria and countries of that nature. But it was, Sir, a remarkable experience to see such a widespread representation of men and women of every culture, of every colour to be found in the ranks of humanity, of many different religions, of exotic dress, of every variety of English accent that you could think of; in short, every kind of person that the five continents of the world can afford. They were met, Sir, not so much to voice their differences, though these did exist, nor to pass jarring resolutions, nor to engage in propaganda for or against one another, but in an effort, I believe, to examine one another's problems and to see whether through discussion and explanation and fellowship we could somehow find that path which leads to understanding among the nations.

The process by which we approached this task was unique in my experience, but oh, so effective, because for three or four weeks -- I was not with them all the time; I arrived a little late -- these 100 or 150 parliamentarians lived together and travelled together throughout the length and breadth of Australia seeing all there was to see, visiting every state and enjoying the hospitality of the Australian people, which is very warm indeed. It was only after this seasoning process of living and travelling together for several weeks and getting to know one another in a unique and intimate fashion that this body met officially in the House of Representatives at Canberra for their final week of formal discussions of their agenda. And by that time, Sir, they were not just the representatives of differing nations; they were not jostling politicians with different points of view to express; but they met, I think, as comrades -- I think I may say friends -- having achieved in travelling together and in living together that initial breakthrough of association and of understanding which is so vital to relations between men and women of the East and of the West, establishing that basic fund of goodwill and feeling of kinship which is what we all are striving for among the nations of the world today.

Well anyway, we met in parliamentary style in the House of Representatives in Australia, and each day we devoted ourselves to different topics; the main ones were international affairs in defence, economic co-operation within the Commonwealth, and the subject which interested me very much, the problems of the under-developed territories of the Commonwealth. Each day one of the more important dominions -- to use that expression -- would take their turn in opening the debate. Then there would be a contribution from the rest down to the very smallest and it was indeed a fascinating experience to hear them talk. But Sir, we were united in one technique and in one tradition, and that was in the technique and customs and traditions of Parliament, and there was that aura of a well understood common procedure in custom which we all knew and respected and followed. I could tell you, Sir, of some of the speeches that were made by the Prime Minister of Australia who has repeated that oh so important thought that war is much too important a matter to be left to the generals. He elaborated on that in connection with nuclear warfare in a way which would interest this House I know. Lord Attlee,

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.). . . . representing the United Kingdom, spoke to us on the theme of Pericles, "freedom is the sure possession of those alone who have the courage to defend it," a theme which has come down to us so bright and so meaningful and so vivid through all the centuries since Pericles first uttered it on the Speaker's Rostrum in Athens. And then there was the speaker of the Indian House of Parliament Lok Sabha who wore his Gandhi cap and his homespun garment which are the uniform, it seems to me, of a Congress politician in that country, giving us a frank and passionate exposition of Indian policy, the policy that we call non-alignment between the power blocs, that in the very speech that he gave us underlining the full commitment of his country to the essential ideas of the western point of view in a parliamentary democracy and individual freedom. There was the speaker of one of the Indian Legislatures, this was from the Punjab, a Sikh who wore those colourful turbans that his people are so proud of, a man who had been put in gaol, by the way, by the British in his struggle -- in his part of the struggle of his country for independence. It seems to me that one of the essential qualifications of a successful politician in India today is to have been put in gaol by the British at one time or another. But I remember him looking across at us who were the white minority -- don't forget that -- the white minority at this gathering, and saying to us, and these were the words he used because I wrote them down, after telling us of his history and his personal part in the struggle of his country for independence, he said to us, "We have chosen you. None is so welcome in India as an Englishman at present, because you left to us the priceless heritage of the parliamentary system and British justice."

Then there was the Member from Nigeria; I wish I could express to you the impression that he left with us. He was the government whip; he was one of 58 brothers and sisters. He did not disclose to us how many wives his father had had; there were a good many. He had only one. He spoke to us of Nigeria's coming independence, which was just around the corner those days, and he conveyed a sense of dignity and of realism and of self-reliance which was as fresh and stimulating as any breeze that ever blew across the prairies of Western Canada.

I suppose, Sir, that I could recite a good many other instances that took place in that interesting conference, but to me there were three things that stood out. First of all, that Canada was universally liked and universally trusted. At that inner sense we had a unique position among the white members of the Commonwealth in being regarded as completely disinterested in any unpleasant connotation of the word "interest". Secondly, there was a very deep response and keen appreciation of what the Colombo Plan had meant in the raising of the standard of life in countries of the Commonwealth and others -- because it extends beyond the Commonwealth-- and of the great contribution that it made to stabilization and to world peace. But thirdly, and this they made abundantly clear, that the underdeveloped nations of our Commonwealth had a great need for much more than was being done by us in the developed nations of the Commonwealth to help them take their place among the nations of the world. They made it clear that what they wanted was some share of the ordinary know-how that we have. The kind of thing we never think about. How to fix a tractor; how to keep an internal combustion engine going, say, in a Ford car; how to run a local municipal government; something of the practice of modern agriculture. Those things which in a word, we would describe, I believe, as the kind of training that is provided by technical education at around the secondary level of instruction.

But another thing they said was, that it was not only what they needed; it's not only a question of what was required, the question of "where" was equally important in their view. They wanted to see the training offered on their own home grounds. They said it was much better to send one teacher to them to teach many students than to try and send the students to the teacher here. And they pointed out to us how much more economic it was, how much better value you got for your dollar. Not only that, but how much more practical, in the grass roots sense of that term. Because they pointed out, as is I think quite clear, that in this instance where the teacher comes to the pupils the students are learning their skills in their own homes; in their own home country; in the places where they will have to practise it; in the places where they will have to learn to make do with the human and material resources that they have at hand; and the advantages of bringing Canadians technical skills and implanting them on a nation or in African soil. They told us how much less it would cost to do it there than under our relatively high-cost economy; and how more useful and appropriate it would be if the teaching was done in their own lands and in their own country. And they told us what a valuable contribution they thought this would make to world peace.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....Now, Mr. Speaker, I would not like to have it thought that this proposition is something that I thought up myself, because anyone who follows this particular matter in the developments abroad today will know that many, many people have proposed this idea. I admit that it was borne in on me in a way never before by my personal experience, but it is not my idea; it's their idea. But I was interested also to read an article in the Globe and Mail not too long ago in which the same point was made by a Roman Catholic teacher priest who is visiting Canada after 21 years in Africa, the Right Reverend Romeo Guibault, Principal of a college in Basutoland, who says that Canada should be educating Africans in Africa instead of bringing them here for the purpose. "This is not the life they're going to live," he said. The Oblate Father would have Canada educate in Canada only a selected handful of students; Canada would educate the rest in their home environment.

I seem to have a good file, Mr. Speaker, on this subject from French-speaking persons because I see here that Monsieur Mendes-France the former premier of France made much the same point in speaking in Toronto earlier last year when he said, "The greatest help the West could give underdeveloped countries was in the form of education and technical training in the other underdeveloped countries themselves. "There," as he put it, "the West can provide for the creation on the spot of the elite and of thewithout whom nothing really consistent can be built." We had a delegation of Indians to Canada not too long ago to the Ontario Agricultural College where they are reported as having made the same point. We have the Commonwealth Educational Conference of 1959 which met at Oxford in England with representatives of all members of the Commonwealth, dealing with the problems of education including technical education, and they, too, talked about this particular problem. And I was interested to see that in the United States the same idea is taking hold, because there a report recently was issued to the effect that the State Department is studying proposals to make more meaningful the contributions that they can make to the growth of less developed nations. And they have evolved exactly the same idea, in a sense, that we're considering here in the fact that arrangements are being discussed for the State of Nebraska to take an interest in the Republic of Senegal, and the State of Michigan to take an interest in the Republic of Nigeria, thinking that this direct contact between a local government and a government overseas might perhaps be more meaningful in terms of identity of problems than it would be if it were done in some other way. So these ideas are not original with me.

Of course there are people who will say, "This is all very well and it sounds good but what's it got to do with the Province of Manitoba? Is it constitutional in the Province of Manitoba that we should be considering proposals of this nature?" Well, that's a question on which there is room for differences of opinion. I myself believe that it is constitutional. I think it's constitutional because, in the first place, education is our responsibility. It is not strange that we should be taking an interest in education. Within our country it is a matter for provinces, primarily, rather than for the Federal Government. And what we are being asked to do in the suggestion that we have been discussing with the Federal Government, is that we should find, train and pay the regular salary of three teachers. That's all. Whereas Ottawa would place them and make good those other expenses — and they are very considerable -- which are involved in sending people away to teach outside the country, with the result that while Manitoba would be paying about \$30,000, Ottawa would be paying about \$20,000 or \$25,000, something in that neighbourhood, in that respect. So it is clear that beside education being a matter in which we do have a concern, that we are not suggesting that Manitoba should have its own foreign policy or set up its own Department of State or indulge in any activities directly of this nature, but that it would be done through the regular channels that presently exist, regular constitutional channels that are established, and that our part would be confined to a co-operative effort with the Government of Canada, in the way in which I have suggested to you.

I would suggest that in the past we have done other things which might be compared to this kind of activity. To go a long way back, in the First World War we contributed some \$160,000 which was worth a lot more then, I guess, to the then Imperial Government in connection with that great challenge. In 1953 a contribution of \$54,000 was sent from the people of Manitoba for European flood relief. I suggest that was a good thing to do. In 1959 we took Europeans who are not citizens of this province or indeed of this nation; we brought them into this country and we took care of them in our tubercular hospitals and I think that most members would agree that that was a good thing to do. We do, of course, pay our annual contribution to the Commonwealth

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . Parliamentary Association itself which is analogous in one respect. But we do more than that, because we already spent the money of the taxpayers of Manitoba to educate foreigners, to educate other members of the Commonwealth, who will not be spending their lives here as citizens of Canada. And I think on a moment's reflection you will agree with me that we have at our university today many students, scores of students from the Commonwealth and indeed from other nations outside the Commonwealth, who are being educated at our universities and whom our taxpayers help to pay for, because there is very substantial contribution made by this Legislature to our University. And these students from foreign lands get the benefit of it even though they are going back home to their native locations when they finish here. No one suggested that we should make any special charge to them because our taxpayers are being asked to support them. Nor do I think anyone would wish to make such a suggestion. So in a rather passive way, if you like to look at it in that respect, we are already using the money of the taxpayers of the people of Manitoba to provide education to the kind of people that I have been talking about. So it seems to me that from the constitutional point of view it's a good line of argument that what we are doing is proper. But even so, Mr. Speaker, there will be folks who will say to me, "It doesn't matter what you say about all this but as far as we're concerned, the question is, and the real question is, that charity begins at home, and home is in Manitoba." Well, Mr. Speaker, that statement is profoundly true and profoundly correct, because charity does begin at home. And I am sure that our first responsibility is to meet the problems we face in our own province. I do not think anyone could maintain otherwise. And our first responsibility is to deal with our direct obligations of the domestic problems that we face in the Province of Manitoba. And we have these problems in technical education today. Make no mistake about it. That is one reason, Sir, why we have so increased the public debt and the debt of the municipalities, which we support, to build larger high schools. That is why we have provided for over 400 rooms now for technical education in the new high schools that have been built in Manitoba, because we realized the problem that we have right here at home in respect of technical education. This is why, Sir, we are providing for an Institute of Technology to be built in this province, because one of our aims in that institute is to provide a place and an opportunity for our citizens of Indian and Metis extraction who need the same kind of care and assistance that I've been talking about, to get the technical education that they need if they're to be fitted in as good citizens in this province. It doesn't do any good to gloss over those problems or to try and maintain that they don't exist and require our attention. That is why, Sir, we have spent millions, literally millions of dollars in the effort to improve technical education for our own people. That is why we have spent millions, and literally millions, of dollars in social assistance to Indians and Metis. I think the Minister said once that they cost us \$3 million more because of their particular circumstances than they would if they were dealt with under the same environment as other citizens of Manitoba. That is why we have put all this money into our social allowances program. Since we came in, \$14 million more on current account for education -- \$14 million vocational education is up very greatly indeed since we came in. Social allowances -- almost any aspect of our services to people, our services for human betterment, are up very substantially since we came in.

The Member for Selkirk the other day mentioned retarded and crippled children, and I respect his point of view on that. I read the other day a statement by Dr. Keith Armstrong, National Executive Director of the Canadian Council for Crippled Children and Adults, saying that help given to a handicapped Canadian child is at a better average than in the United States or many nations of Europe; there is no reason why any crippled child in Canada should be seriously in need of help, he said. I don't know whether I'd be quite as optimistic as he is in that statement, but it does indicate our concern and the degree of help that we are trying to make available to these people. I could say that insofar as the deaf, and blind, and retarded and crippled children of Manitoba, since we came into office the amount of money that we have appropriated for their care has gone up well over 50 percent from what it was when we came in, and I think those things are interesting and important to know, but I would agree with the Honourable Member for Selkirk and with other members of this House, that we must do ten times and a hundred and ten times for our citizens in Manitoba on these important problems, but I would also submit that we must learn to share what we have even if it is only a token, with others in the world, because while it is true, Sir, that charity begins at home, I have never heard it said that charity

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.).....should end at home, and it seems to me that in all out ethical and moral dealings we adopt that point of view, that while charity begins at home it does not end there. And some may say to me, "Where is home?" Is it just this city and province? Is it just this country? Mr. Speaker, read the headlines in the newspaper today and you will find that home is in the Congo just as much as home is here. We are truly citizens of the world in a way that we never were before, and it seems to me that a co-operative proposal with the Government of Canada, like the one that I put before you now, is something that ought to engage the imagination and the support and the approval, if only as a token, if only as a gesture from the people of the Province of Manitoba. We are being asked to co-operate -- let me put it another way -- we are suggesting that we should co-operate with the Government of Canada in providing technical educational assistance to some nation of the Commonwealth along the terms that I have outlined to you.

The amount, what will it be? Well, probably 1/250th or 1/300th of our budget; less than one day's profits of the liquor business, if you want to look at it from that point of view. It's only a small step, but I say, Sir, that it is a significant step and it is a step worth making because it indicates an expansion of our own direct concern; it discharges at least fractionally some of our obligations as our brother's keeper. It is not a woolly or a sentimental idea, but it is something considering of what we have done in the past that we would be justified in doing now. And it seems to me this opportunity of co-operation to provide this kind of help to people in some other part of the globe is an opportunity to engage in one of the great adventures of the human spirit; an opportunity to teach those who give, to give humbly, and to let those who receive, learn to receive with dignity. It is an opportunity to strike a positive blow for peace in our time, for the brotherhood of man, and surely, Mr. Speaker, such an act by this Legislature will be sanctioned and approved by the people of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

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

.....continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (1). The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the second reading of Bill 61 to seek an amendment to Bill 62, The Metro Act, which was a government-sponsored bill last year and supported by all members in this House -- (Interjection) -- well the majority of the members in this House -- because we thought it would benefit the citizens of Greater Winnipeg area, and as soon as the bill became law, Sir, the government appointed a Chairman and the Chairman appointed an Executive Director. And last fall, after we had the election, since that time we've had nothing but trouble in Greater Winnipeg area because of what Metro is trying to do. There has been criticism on this bill as originally presented and passed by the government because it does not allow, Sir, any representation by any area municipalities, and there does not seem to be any good feelings between the municipalities, Council, Metro and the city. I think, Sir, as far as I'm concerned, I've had more people beefing about Metro than anything else in this present session. I am sure if the people were given an opportunity to vote for Metro again it would receive a resounding majority in defeat.

What's wrong with the bill? Are we going too fast? Or the original act hasn't got in it what it should have? Well, Sir, the commission looked in this question for quite a number of years. It made its report to the government and then its report was disregarded. It looks like to me a bunch of amateurs got hold of the idea, what they wanted, and they prepared the bill, which this Legislature passed, and it turns out that it's now not good enough, Sir, because the Metro is now presenting a bill with all these amendments. How many pages? Twenty-five. How many sections? Fifty-five. All these amendments, we are told, will make it easier for Metro to operate. Is it going to benefit the people? Is it going to help them? I just don't see it, Sir. There is only one thing to do and that is cancel it out altogether and start all over again with something that will work. It is unheard of, Sir, that so many amendments should be asked by Metro council just after a period of four months in office. People are worried, Sir, the way taxes are going up, the City of Winnipeg's increase seven mills -- the largest in the history of the city. True, half the increase is for Metro, the other half is for school costs. Although, Sir, I'm not supposed to be talking on school costs at the present time, nevertheless the government had said when we started school divisions that municipalities were going to get more help. Why are the taxes going up? When Metro first started, Sir, we were told it would cost us 50 cents per \$100.00 taxation. What is happening now? The mill rate is around four mills for Metro and mayors of municipalities who had been on the Metro investigation committee are now criticizing it, and I believe many mayors are ready to throw the whole Metro bill in the river because many have expressed a lot of dissatisfaction the way Metro is operating. People generally, Sir, are of the opinion that Metro is now operating, but Metro is operating apparently in opposition to the wishes of many municipalities. What the outcome will be I do not know but it is definite that Metro, in my opinion, should have been given a workable act in the first instance. They should have gone on for four years, the council members that have been elected without the need of any amendments, because they're what I figure on an interim trial basis, and the act shouldn't be amended at all; they should work with what they have or if it is found they cannot work with what they have, then instead of bringing in an amendment to practically one out of every five sections, bring in an act that they can work with, a new Act, not an amended Act. An Act which is more reasonable; an Act which will give the services to the people in the Metro area that they really need. The way it is now, Sir, Metro says we can't work under it. The fault must lie with the government that proposed the bill; it must lie with the Legislative Assembly that passed the bill and didn't have enough foresight to see that this was going to happen, but in good faith I'll say, Sir, the members of all parties supported the bill because it was said it was for the welfare of Greater Winnipeg area.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with a few sections of the bill, if the members want to get hold of their Bill 61. The first section; all the taxation, everything going up, what do we propose to do? Passed by legislation an additional sum of \$10,000 for entertainment, entertaining visitors. Well, Sir, as I understand The Municipal Act, each councillor, a third of his indemnity is for expenses, tax-free, and I'm sure, Sir, that if we put this here clause in, spend another \$10,000 when they have an expense account, I don't think it's quite right. And I also noted briefly in a news clipping in the paper where Metro Council are going to send six

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.) delegates to the Mayors' Convention in Halifax. That, Sir, in my estimation, is a waste of money also, and especially executive directors with their high salaries, that definitely they could pay their own way. So to this section, Sir, I definitely say "No".

Section 3, which reads, "The council may appoint a deputy or an assistant or both to any one or more of the executors appointed under Section 1", and so forth. Well, Sir, setting up more deputies for the directors, the directors who are high paid men, and now they want more appointments of high paid deputies. This looks to me, Sir, like more empire building, more high-priced assistance to the poor high-priced directors.

Section 4, Sir: Section 4, the explanation: Present authorized, only the investment, cash surplus which it does not wish to put into reserve funds by amendments, and expression is widened and so forth. Well, Sir, the present section in the Act if not amended places the responsibility of investing funds in a council where I think it properly belongs, the elected representatives. We have a ten-man council, an executive-director, and if the executive-director of finance, Sir, must have all this power to sell bonds, stocks, debentures, etc., in my own opinion, Sir, it's too much power for one man not an elected representative. Also now, the Chairman thinks the job is too heavy for him to sign cheques; he's going to give it to one of the directors, that somebody sign cheques. Well, Sir, it's different when you spend money in private enterprise and when you spend public funds. Public funds; the only ways and means that we have of controlling them are through our elected representatives. I can readily understand when the divisions were set up why they split them up so no one municipality could have control of any of these here councilmen. Thus these councilmen for the next four years are free-lancing and responsible to no one municipality, only sections of municipalities.

Section 6, Sir. I noted under Section 6 where a person dissatisfied with a by-law has only one month to appeal. Well, Sir, this is not enough time. The average person or the majority of them don't even know anything about these by-laws until they receive an assessment bill or a tax bill. And I believe, Sir, the period should be at least one year.

Now, under Section 7, it says here it's self-explanatory, subject to any limitation imposed on it under any act. Well, Sir, as I looked through this section, it gives Metro the right to impose on all municipalities a business tax, the purpose of it, to provide an amount equal to a rate as fixed by the Metro Council. Secondly, such other amounts, if any, as may be required by area municipalities. Now, Sir, I understand most of the cities have a business tax. Does this mean that it will be double business tax? If there is not a double business tax, then Sir, what is the meaning of this line that I read, "subject to any limitations imposed on it under any act"? What if the city has a business tax now, Sir; what happens to their charter? Is it necessary first to amend the City Charter? I believe, Sir, before this Section 7 is enacted, in my opinion it should be looked into very carefully.

Now Section 8; the provisions as to current borrowing are revised. Well, Sir, I couldn't understand why this amendment is necessary because I can see nothing wrong under the present act of borrowing. Also under the same section, Sir, they're seeking another power -- to borrow for unforeseen requirements. I don't think this power, Sir, is given to any other municipal corporation in Manitoba. If they find they're going to have an over-expenditure, they have to get the approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Why then shouldn't Metro Council have to get the approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs or at least the Municipal Board before they spend monies for unforeseen expenses that they didn't provide for or have the funds for? If Metro needs it, Sir, then all the other areas should also have it.

Section 9 provides for the corporation to give accountable advances. I ask you, Sir, has any other municipality in Manitoba the right to give accountable advances? No! So if Metro will have that right then all other municipalities also should have it.

Section 10: The amendment of Section 10 says - "The amendment makes debentures a joint and several obligations of the corporation and area municipalities instead of just an obligation of the corporation." Sir, this was not the original intent of the Metro Act. The original Act was government policy; this should not be enacted, Sir, without the consent of all the area municipalities. It could have the effect of spoiling the credit of the City of Winnipeg and the credit of all other municipalities in the Metropolitan area.

Section 11: Section 11, Sir, indicates they have changed their method of issuing debentures in their dealings with the Municipal Board. I would like to know the reason why this

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.) should be done.

Now Section 16, Sir, I do not understand what is meant by amendment to Section 47, Sub-section (4), but as you read the last six lines it says, "the Municipal Board shall authorize" -- "shall", remember the word "shall" -- "shall authorize the borrowing upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed," and so forth. Well, Sir, I don't see why the Municipal Board should be forced to approve borrowings by a Metro Council or the corporation, while every other municipality in Manitoba has to make an application to the Municipal Board for the approval of any municipal debenture issue. And the Board "may" approve the borrowing, not "shall". I would like an explanation of that, Sir.

Now Section 21 of the bill, amending Section 78, gives the sole and full responsibility of certain Metro Corporation. Now under subparagraph (d) of that Section 21, it reads: "The erection and placing of buildings and other structures." Now I would like to know, Sir, does this include the giving of building grades and establishing of building grades? My understanding is that Metro does not want to establish the building grades. They want to leave that to the area municipalities.

Section 22 to amend Section 82 of the original Act; the Metro Corporation is to be given the sole authority for licensing of electrical contractors and plumbers. Well, Sir, this is a power that has been given to the area municipalities by The Municipal Act. Does this mean another loss of revenue to each district who are now licensing plumbers and electricians?

Section 27 amends Section 92 of the Act and establishes a Board of, five persons appointed by by-law of the Metro Council. Why are more people who are going to be paid by Metro for doing what is the job of Metro Council necessary, Sir, and what are the Metro councillors going to do with all this help they are getting? And all those appointments that they are going to make; is it a way of making more expenses for the municipalities or a way of giving better service to the areas? I believe, Sir -- I could go on through more but it was not my intention to go through the whole Act -- but I believe what I have covered are very important points to the Greater Winnipeg area and these amendments should be given serious consideration by the committee before they are passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to participate in the discussion of this bill but I feel that I should, to some extent, make my comments in regard to the establishment of the Metro Municipality Board. I feel that possibly there's room for criticism; possibly they have moved too fast; maybe we have created a Frankenstein, as one member said recently, but my personal opinion is that any new group that is formed needs to have a trial basis. I know there's room for criticisms based on the initial acts that have been made, the comments some of the papers have made, but I feel that in order to be fair that any kind of a board, something that has been newly established in any province, should be given a period of trial so that within a short period of maybe a year or two, we are in a position to judge exactly the merits of this particular board. It's very easy to get up and be critical without knowing the potentialities. As I said again, from time to time we have to be fair-minded in this. This is a new project. I think before it was even considered this government considered all aspects of a Metro Board on the basis of experts who have considered other metro boards in existence in Canada. There were a lot of merits because of the fact that duplications have and do occur, and are occurring and are continuing in Greater Winnipeg, for many, many years. There's no doubt in my mind, as I said, the initial costs of putting something of this into operation does involve the fact that you have to elect a new group of representatives for Greater Winnipeg. But in all fairness I, as a member of this Legislature, feel that I would be in a better position a year from now or two years from now to be able to stand in this House and express my grievances or my commendations or recommendations of the Act of the Metro Board than I am in a position to do today, because they have only been in power for four months. And I think it's only fair that we should give this Board an opportunity to operate and let's wait the minimum of a few years before we can see the merits or demerits of the Metro Board operating in Greater Winnipeg.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a word or two in connection with this bill. I realize that it is a very important matter, the whole question of the effects of the Metropolitan Government on the people of Greater Winnipeg. I appreciate the fact that many people

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) are disturbed at the present moment with the results of Metro. There have been many criticisms, many of them that are fully justified in my personal opinion. I would say to follow that, to be fair, that many of the activities of the Metropolitan Council have found great favour with me. If we recall in this House when the Metropolitan Bill was introduced, at that time, of course, by the administration following hearings, I think that it will be recalled that as far as the individual members of the House were concerned, particularly on this side of the House, that we were free to raise any points that we thought should be raised as individuals. I notice that the amendments that we have before us today have not been introduced by the government but have been introduced by a private member, which indicates to me that insofar as the government itself is concerned they are not supporting the bill in its entirety. I think it would be fair for me to predict that insofar as the government is concerned, that while they did not feel that they were in a position to support the bill and thereby ensure its support both here and in the committee, that they feel that there should be ample opportunity for consideration in committee of all of the aspects of the bill. I feel that way too, Sir, I feel that there will be some differences of opinion within my own group as to the merits or demerits of some of the proposals contained within the bill. I feel that that is something that is understandable. I think that it is desirable insofar as a bill of the nature of Bill 81 is concerned. I would appreciate having an opportunity in committee to hear the pros and cons of the recommendations, or amendments rather, Mr. Speaker, that are proposed in this bill. I reserve to myself the right to agree or disagree with them. And I want to assure the House at the present time that I think that as members of this House, that we should continue to treat the bill with the same outlook as we did Metro itself; that we have within our respective groups the right to agree or to disagree with the individual items. So I say, Sir, speaking not as the Leader of my group at this time but purely as an individual, that we should allow this bill to go to second reading, at which time we will have an opportunity to ask questions not only of the sponsor of the bill but of the members of Metro staff and the Metro Council themselves as to why after only a year of operation, or a year since the first bill was passed, all of these amendments are necessary. I might say, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared that if Metro Council and its director and staff can substantiate parts of this bill, substantiate to my satisfaction, then I would be prepared to accept them. As I say, there are many clauses in here that will not receive my support, but there are others which I would like to have further information on, and therefore suggest it be given approval to go to committee for these purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 81, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2). The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker, in the discussion that we had on the other Metro Bill, it was brought out, I think, by the Honourable Member from Kildonan that the Council of Metro had, through a private member, brought an act or a bill to this House pointing out a number of what you might call mistakes that they thought we had made in the original Metro Bill. Now there are, I think, similar mistakes in the Metro Bill that perhaps we should recognize ourselves, and one of these would be corrected by the bill that, at the present time, is before the House. The original Metro Act provided for tax levies for Metro services to be apportioned amongst the area municipalities in accordance with the proportion of the rateable property in that municipality to the rateable property in the area as a whole, according to assessment. The principle of the Act, therefore, is a proportionate sharing of costs amongst the various municipalities. Now the original Act, as we know, departs from this principle to the extent of allowing Metro to take a share of business taxes from the area municipalities, and it can also allow in some municipalities a reduction in the assessment where lands are being used for agricultural purposes or in persons of municipalities where Metro services and facilities do not benefit the lands in question. The Act goes further and gives Metro Council the power to make grants to poor municipalities for the sole purpose of lightening their share of the load or their share of the Metro tax burden. And it is the intention of the bill before us to remove this power. The section in question, of course, defeats the principle of sharing of Metro costs in

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) proportion to assessment amongst the area municipalities. What it amounts to, Mr. Speaker, is welfare payments to certain areas of the Metropolitan area. The Municipal Act, on the other hand, does not allow municipalities to do this for either poor taxpayers or for the poorer areas within the boundaries of their municipality. For example, an old age pensioner that owns a home in a municipality that's fully paid for, that is having trouble meeting their tax liability to the municipality, much as many municipal councils would like to afford relief in these cases they're prohibited from doing so by The Municipal Act. For example, school taxes. These old age pensioners or older retired people, many of them resent paying school taxes. And I think that many of our municipal councillors can see their point of view, but they are prohibited by The Municipal Act from giving relief in these cases. And also in many of our municipalities we have poor areas, that is, areas where the people have smaller homes; where they are living on smaller incomes, and much as our municipal councils or city councils would like to give relief to these areas within their boundaries, they are prohibited from doing so by The Municipal Act. Now if there are some grounds for departing in Section 4 of the Act to the original principle of the Act with the exceptions which the original Act makes, then why are these grounds not also available to the other municipalities? Why don't they have the same power to depart from the original principle of The Municipal Act, or cities to depart from the original principle insofar as taxation and assessment from their Charters? I would not deny that there are grounds in many instances for doing this, but we should consider this Bill in the light of the principles that have been established in The Municipal Act itself. And if we are convinced that there are grounds for considering this, then there should be, I maintain, a special formula for doing this written right into the Act by the Legislature itself. This should not be given -- this power to make these grants to poorer areas should not be given arbitrarily to the Metro Council any more than we're prepared to give the same consideration to the other municipalities. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons that I have given, I think this bill should be passed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 47. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE presented Bill No. 47, An Act to provide a Charter for The City of West Kildonan, for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 56. The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield) presented Bill No. 56, An Act to validate By-law No. 1659 of the Rural Municipality of Springfield, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. KLYM: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a result of the Rural Municipality of Springfield Council receiving a petition from the Village of Oakbank from all the owners of land fronting on three streets. They requested that granolithic sidewalks be installed on the mentioned streets. The work has been done and a debt of \$4,600 has been incurred as a result. It is deemed necessary to issue and sell debentures to the extent of \$4,600. This is to be used to pay for such work and no other. It is proposed that the said sum of \$4,600 -- \$2,600 be levied by an appropriate frontage charge on the land fronting and abutting on the work, and that a further \$2,000 be levied and charged against the municipality as a whole by an appropriate mill rate. The payments are to be spread consecutively over ten years at five percent per annum and the yearly amount of payment, principal and interest to be \$595.72. The sidewalk property annual sum to be \$336.71 and as a special municipal tax \$259.01, which total \$595.72.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, respecting the next order of business may I suggest that we proceed with the second reading of the two private bills, being the last items on the Order Paper today, so that if they are approved they may go to Private Bills Committee which meets tomorrow. This perhaps would be convenient to do. Then when we have disposed of those we could then return to the resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and those other private resolutions that follows.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? Second reading of Bill No. 45, An Act to incorporate The Commonwealth Savings and Loan Association. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) presented Bill No. 45, An Act to incorporate The Commonwealth Savings and Loan Association, for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 58. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights) presented Bill No. 58, An Act to incorporate The Great North Savings and Loan Association, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, the powers sought by the incorporators are very similar to those now enjoyed by the Investors Syndicate of Canada Ltd. and the Western Savings and Loan Association. There is a condition precedent to their being able to carry on business if they raise at least \$250,000 in paid up capital or paid in capital, capital surplus. There is a further provision in the bill that they may sell investment contracts such as we know are being issued by those carrying on the same type of business, and a reserve in the bank will have to be maintained suitable at all times to the Public Utility Board. The remainder of the company's objectives, I think, are well-known. They lend money on mortgage loans and so forth, Mr. Speaker, and insofar as I can see the bill is regular and seeks no unusual powers.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you might agree it is 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock this evening.