

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



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. J. D. WATT (Arthur): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Conservation.

MR. CLERK: Madam Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture and Conservation beg leave to present the following as their first report. Your committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Watt as Chairman. Your committee recommends that for the remainder of the session the quorum of this committee shall consist of seven members. Your committee has considered Bills: No. 32, An Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act; No. 93, An Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act; No. 98, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act, and has agreed to report the same without amendment. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. WATT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills. The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

HON. M. B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary & Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights) introduced Bill No. 114, an Act to repeal Certain Acts relating to Certain Corporations.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name and that of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

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

MR. STEINKOPF: The Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Resolution No. 1: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act by providing, among other matters, for a new method of calculating the amount of refund payable to persons whose annuities have been deferred and who may die before payment of the deferred annuities commence or before they have received the full amount deferred or contributed, as a result of which additional amounts may have to be refunded in respect of those persons.

Resolution be adopted.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Is the Honourable Minister going to explain exactly what this is going to do?

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, this will have the effect of rectifying a financial situation that has cropped up. It won't in effect cost the fund any more money but will make it a little easier on the beneficiaries by the way they calculate the amount that is coming to the beneficiary.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, . . . under the Civil Service Superannuation Act, that if an employee contributes to the Act for a number of years and then leaves the employ of the province that he get back only his own contribution without any interest on that contribution?

MR. STEINKOPF: That is correct.

MR. MOLGAT: Does this amendment propose to make any changes in that regard?

MR. STEINKOPF: No, that's not the intent of this . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the government would consider when it is making changes in the Superannuation Act to bring in some amendments that would provide for anyone withdrawing from the Act to receive his own contribution at least as it is now, but at least interest on that as well if he does not get the government share, because it seems to me

(Mr. Molgat, Cont'd.) . . . that we are faced with situations at times where employees can be with the government for some twenty years or so and then through -- some cases -- no fault of their own, it may in fact be through death, coming out of the plan and not getting anything back except the exact amount that they put in. During all that time the fund has been collecting this money it seems to me that the least they should get would be that interest on their payments.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I understand this matter has been before the House on other occasions and there hasn't been any unanimity of thought on it. I would like to inform the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that we are at the present time giving very serious thought to that particular matter.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask a further question of the Minister at this time? Supposing an employee is with the government say for some twenty years and dies. What does his widow get from the fund at that point?

MR. STEINKOPF: The widow would get the same amount that the person would get if they were leaving, without interest.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I would strongly recommend that there be a review made of this whole procedure to see if we couldn't improve that particular aspect of it, for people withdrawing from the fund or for people dying before they come to the term when pension is available to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 2. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The County Courts Act by providing among other matters, for the fixing of the salary or other remuneration of clerks and bailiffs of the County Courts.

HON. S. E. McLEAN (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, that Bill is related to the changes which are taking place in respect of the judicial districts and the county court districts and in view of the fact that there will be a change in the method by which clerks and bailiffs will be paid under the new system, in some cases, it is necessary to bring it in as a money bill. There are other divisions in the Bill of course, relating to the organization of the courts which we will be discussing when the matter is before the House on second reading.

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

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

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

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

MR. STEINKOPF introduced Bill No. 116, an Act to Amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 115, an Act to Amend The County Courts Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery on my left where there are seated some 31 Grade 5 students from Polson School under the direction of their teacher, Miss Edwards. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Kildonan. In the Speaker's gallery, there are some 10 ladies from St. Andrew's Guild from Fort Osborne Barracks. This group comes from the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I lay on the table a supplementary return to Order of the House No. 35 on the motion of the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. RUSS PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the First Minister or the Minister in charge of procedure in the House. Has the government any other bills to be introduced before prorogation?

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Madam Speaker, in answer to that question, there may be one or two minor bills. I think there is one to do with the Department of Education; but there are no

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . bills or any substance yet to be introduced. They are all relatively routine matters.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, although the First Minister privately informed me what I would like to know, but the people outside of this House are anxious to know and I thought perhaps a public statement may be better -- and I have not given him any notice about it. A lot of people are waiting to invest a few dollars savings in the best security in the world and this is in their own province, but they don't know, and I don't know the reason why, the Provincial Treasurer keeps it a secret. My question is, is there going to be a bond issue this year for those investors of less than \$100,000 who are still holding their money, either in the basement or in the bank -- (Interjection) -- or in the mattress, to find out where and when and how can they invest their few dollars of savings.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I thank my honourable friend. He's one of the warmest supporters that we have in this matter of the Manitoba savings bond and I appreciate his interest. I anticipate there will be an issue. The matter is being considered at the present time and it may be possible to make an announcement about it reasonably soon but the final decisions have not yet been made.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. I asked him the other day about the statements that were attributed to him in Brandon regarding assistance for the new buildings for the Manitoba Winter Fair. He advised me at that time that he would check into it. I wonder if he is able now to advise the House as to the situation and the proposed government contribution to the same.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I did check on the news report. I made no commitment in Brandon whatsoever in connection with the exhibition buildings.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Committee of the Whole House.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole to consider the following bills, No. 20, 26, 48, 66, 67, 68, 94, 95, 96, and 97.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 20 was read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 26 was read section by section to section 10 and passed.

HON. R. G. SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, in the schedule on page 4 there is a typographical error in the signature. It should be R. G., not B.

Remainder of Bill No. 26 was read and passed. Bills No. 48, 66 and 67 were read section by section and passed. Bill No. 68, section 1 to the schedule 3 was read and passed.

MR. SMELLIE: As amended, Mr. Chairman? There was an amendment in the signature at the end of schedule 3, also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we have not reached that yet. And at the end there is a typographical error there -- the correction is there's only one "l" in levels.

The remainder of Bill No. 68 was read and passed. Bill No. 94 and 95 were read section by section and passed. Sections 1 to 5 of Bill No. 96 were read and passed.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, the amendment in schedule A? Schedule A as amended? The name at the bottom . . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh yes, there's a . . . the name here, the mayor is signed as Carriere and it should be Lauman, as amended.

The remainder of the bill was read and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 97, section 1 passed . . . . .

MR. GRAY: . . . . . questions to Bill No. 97, which also applies to other bills, other similar bills. Is there . . . . . by anyone as to the charges of those in charge of cemeteries in the urban or rural districts. In other words, the cemeteries are not a private enterprise. They buy so many hundreds of acres of land; they come to the province to get incorporation, after that someone unfortunate to die has to go to them, bargain for a plot, and sometimes I

(Mr. Gray, Cont'd.) . . . don't know whether they have the money to pay for it or not, the charges are very very high -- and I have individual cases, I know individual cases anywhere in the province, I'm not going to even suggest anyone -- and they come to them and they say it'll cost you \$800 or a \$1,000 and they are charging that much in some cases, or probably more, or probably less. The relative, the father or mother whoever it is died, the dead body is either in the house or in the mortuary or in the funeral parlor, and they stay down there with all this sorrow and suffering and tears in their eyes bargaining with a certain group of people who are in charge of it, who at the same time wanted to make a reserve money or a profit, I don't know what you call it -- I apologize for every word I utter because it may be wrong -- as how to bury this particular individual. You must understand the feelings of the relatives and the situation in general. So my question now is to whom it may concern -- in other words, in a general situation here we are giving now the power -- I am not objecting to it -- the power to a certain community in Manitoba to create a cemetery and become the bosses of it and then what -- where do the relatives come in?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1 passed, 2 passed . . . .

MR. GRAY: Isn't there an answer from anyone? If not, I'm going to ask the sponsor of the Bill.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend has to address himself to the contents of this bill, any particular clause of it . . . .

MR. GRAY: All right then I'll be out of order once in a while.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . and the sponsor of the bill will be glad to deal with it, but I'm afraid I can't undertake to deal with the general question he raises in this way. However, if he wants to address his question to this particular bill I'm sure the sponsor will give whatever answer he can.

MR. GRAY: I shall.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this will help at all on the general question of cemeteries. I might say that there are certain cemeteries that are private enterprise that's true, and different municipalities have their own -- or different cities have their own municipal cemeteries, and I've yet to see any town -- not any cemetery of course, but if there's only the one cemetery in a certain town -- I think before they get the permission to operate a cemetery they usually make some kind of an arrangement with a municipality to take care of a certain portion of these people, take care of municipal cases, welfare cases and so on, and I don't think -- it hasn't come to my attention anyway -- that anywhere in Manitoba, any Manitoban has ever been refused a plot. Of course there are some people that run this as a business, as a private enterprise, they go ahead and sell some of these plots during the life of these people, they pre-sell these -- pre-need -- and the cost at certain times are fairly high, but this is strictly a private enterprise. But here in Winnipeg there is a municipal cemetery for the City of Winnipeg and most of the other districts around have their own -- the municipality have their own cemetery, or at least some arrangement with some of these cemeteries where these cemeteries will agree, for a certain cost, to take care of those that are less fortunate. So I don't think that there's too much -- this is just general information, but I can answer -- I might be wrong in certain cases, but I don't think that this is so bad, I think that the people are protected. I wish to add to the honourable member that I certainly have nothing to do with this, it's just information that I've been able to receive during the course of my work.

Sections 1 to 10 of Bill No. 97 were read section by section and passed.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, in connection with Section 10 and the other pertinent section, I'd like to ask the sponsor a question. Who in the government, if anybody, is responsible to see that the funds collected for perpetual care of these plots, are properly invested? The Honourable Member from Inkster raised this point. I think that's what he wanted to talk about. We've had experiences in the past where funds have been collected from the people for perpetual care of cemetery plots; the moneys never were invested and the investors never did obtain the services that they paid for. Now this happens to be a community cemetery, that is, under the direction and ownership of a municipality in a town but I believe that the same provisions appear in the other statute we have covering cemeteries and perpetual trust funds and perpetual care. I would like to know from

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, Cont'd.) . . . the sponsor of the bill or anybody else in the House, that is from the government, who is responsible to see that these funds are properly invested, that all of the funds that should be invested are so invested?

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): . . . ask the Attorney-General. Maybe he's more acquainted with this clause in this Bill than I am. Maybe he could inform the committee.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): . . . the changes in The Cemetery Act setting up the perpetual care funds. These were under the administration of the Department of Health but when it became such a, really a security problem, that is, a matter of the bookkeeping end of it, investment and so on -- for that reason the management of these funds was transferred to the Department of Public Utilities. Unfortunately, the Minister isn't in the House so I can't ask, but these people have to, in getting their licence each year from the Department of Health, have to submit their statements to that department of the government.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I see that the Minister of Public Utilities is in his seat now. Would he care to tell the members of the House as to what precautions are taken to see that these trust funds are properly invested and that the buyers of plots receive the protection that they're entitled to under these Acts?

MR. STEINKOPF: The trust funds are scrutinized by the Public Utility Board. I'm not sure on what basis, whether it's once a year or two or three times a year but it's within their field of responsibility. They each have to submit their statements and I think you'll find the information in the annual report of the Utility Board but I'll check and get some more information for you on it if you like.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well, Mr. Chairman, the reason I raised this is because in my own constituency we had the unfortunate incident of where a firm had purchased a plot of land and fenced it. I think they were called the Sunset Memorial Gardens. They picked up several thousand dollars from people who wanted to buy plots and be assured of perpetual care and this particular cemetery was never improved and nothing further was done, and they must have held a licence. Now the reason I raise this point is that you must have the follow-through to see that if anybody obtains a licence that he carries out the provisions of that agreement and he carries out the provisions of the statutes. Well in this particular case it wasn't done and more than a year had passed before it was drawn to the attention of the government, and it was too late then to do anything and these people lost their money.

Remainder of Bill No. 97 was read section by section and passed.

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

Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered certain Bills and asked me to report as follows: Bill No. 20, 48, 66, 67, 68, 94, 95, 96, 97 without amendment; Bill No. 26 with amendment, and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

Bills No. 20, 26, 48, 66 and 67 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that Bill No. 68, an Act to validate By-law No. 3783/64 of The Rural Municipality of Assiniboia and By-law No. 9859 of The City of St. James and an Agreement between The Rural Municipality of Assiniboia and The City of St. James executed pursuant to those By-laws be now read a third time and passed.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): . . . oppose the third reading of this bill but I rise to call the attention of the House to the situation existing which has made this bill necessary. Now this bill impinges on the jurisdiction of the Metro Corporation of Greater Winnipeg in two respects; one, in respect of garbage disposal and, two, in respect of land use.

Under The Metro Act, the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg has been given exclusive jurisdiction in planning and land use and it also has been given exclusive jurisdiction in respect of garbage disposal. Now that is in the whole Metropolitan area. Unfortunately, due to the clash which occurred and has been going on continuously between the City of Winnipeg and Metro, Metro has never been able to exercise the exclusive jurisdiction with which it

(Mr. Hillhouse, Cont'd.) . . . was endowed by this Legislature in respect of garbage disposal, and it has not the power under its Act to do it in a piecemeal manner. The City of St. James and the Municipality of Assiniboia, they have been faced with a problem where it became absolutely necessary and essential for them to find additional grounds for garbage disposal and the only way that they could circumvent the jurisdiction which this House had given to Metro was by bringing this Act into this Legislature to validate it, and in effect what we are doing is to that extent amending The Metro Act to make this possible. Now this situation, Madam Speaker, in the Greater Winnipeg area is a very serious situation and there are other municipalities in this Metropolitan area which find it necessary and essential within the course of the next few months to acquire sites for garbage disposal. Now as things now stand they are unable to do so legally because you have given that jurisdiction to the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, and I understand that the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg has asked the government to change The Metro Act so that they can exercise the jurisdiction in respect of garbage disposal piecemeal rather than on a whole basis, and I suggest -- and I did suggest to the Minister yesterday when this matter was before Committee that the government give us an undertaking that they will introduce legislation at this session, amending the Metropolitan Act so's it won't be necessary for the municipalities in the Greater Winnipeg area to come here to have their agreements validated by a special act of this Legislature. I know that the City of West Kildonan and the municipality of Old Kildonan and another municipality of West St. Paul are in the position right now, due to expansion and due to development, of having to find new sites for garbage disposal, and they'll be placed in the same position as the City of St. James and the Municipality of Assiniboia was placed in unless we bring in legislation now permitting the Metropolitan Corporation to deal with the matter of garbage disposal in respect of one or more municipalities in the Greater Winnipeg area.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I must agree with the Honourable Member for Selkirk when he says that this matter is a serious situation, and I'm pleased that he agreed that he did not intend to oppose this bill, although he wished to draw to the attention of the House that this serious situation does prevail. The question of garbage disposal is one on which there has been some discussion between the Metropolitan Corporation and the province. I would not suggest to this House that Metro has requested this change. They did draw the situation to our attention; after some discussion between the parties it was agreed that this matter would not be raised at this session of the Legislature, that it would be deferred for the time being in the hope that a more satisfactory situation can be achieved by agreement between the area municipalities; and also that it was felt that it was not desirable to do something that was against the will of some of the area municipalities at least until we had the report of the Michener Commission. In the meantime there is a serious situation in the two municipalities in question. They must have an area for garbage disposal immediately. They had the opportunity to purchase this property. Metro is well aware of what is going on. The piece of property in question is almost immediately adjacent to another piece of property which Metro had suggested could be used for this very same purpose and where the same land use controls were in effect, so that I think no harm is being done if Metro does take over this field of activity. The plot that's being authorized to be purchased here can be conveyed to Metro by the municipalities and operated by Metro in the usual way.

MR. HILLHOUSE: But may I ask the Honourable Minister a question? Would the Minister agree with me that the present situation is in contradiction of the true spirit of Metro?

MR. SMELLIE: No, I would not agree with this. Metro knows of this particular situation, they're not prepared to cope with it at the present time. This is a situation where the House is being asked to cover an emergent situation that cannot be looked after in any other way.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, I'd like to say a word on this. I don't think there's any conflict here. Metro, as the Minister pointed out, is fully aware of the situation. It had to be corrected; the land has been selected after a lot of discussion and investigation by both parties, including Metro; the action had to be taken immediately, who actually runs it for the next year or so is immaterial -- whether Metro take it over, which ultimately they will no doubt, is immaterial. The problem had to be solved at this moment, is being solved and I don't think it will upset the future in any way.



Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Bills No. 94, 95, 96 and 97 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, it is obvious that marketing board legislation can become very complicated, especially when one considers the regulations that accompany a marketing board act. In my opinion Bill 76 is no different, is no exception. The Minister has said that all that Bill 76 will do is to remove unnecessary powers from a Marketing Board and thus make it more acceptable to the people. The Minister may be right in this respect but there's more to the bill than that. This bill is going to give wide powers to someone, because regulated marketing must have these powers. The question then, Madam Speaker, is to whom is the bill going to give these wide powers. It appears to me that instead of giving these necessary powers to producer marketing boards this bill is giving to the Crown appointed Manitoba Marketing Board and of course to the Cabinet itself. In my opinion this is unnecessary and a mistake. Too much power is being left to the discretion of the Crown and the Ministers. Furthermore, Madam Speaker, the bill is so worded as to give rise to varied interpretation. I think that this will cause a great deal of dispute and will be a lawyer's dream. Past experience in other provinces has shown that producer marketing boards operate best when their functions and powers are outlined in statutes instead of leaving so much to the discretionary power of those engaged in active politics.

Madam Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture stated that anybody that could read, if they read the old bill and the new bill that he is now proposing, could see that this would be a better bill. Well I have not read the old bill, I've tried to read the new one, Madam Speaker, and I don't trust my own judgment but I would like to read into the records part of a statement made by a person that is supposedly someone that is an expert in marketing board legislation, and I refer to a speech made at Portage la Prairie on April 3, 1964 -- the Manitoba Hog Producers Association -- and the statement is that of Mr. C. F. Tallis and these are the words that he said, and I quote: "In concluding, one of the things that bothers me as a lawyer about Bill 76 that without going into any details in my sincere view, and this is confirmed or fortified by Mr. Harrison's position, that as far as the enforcement provisions of this bill and the mechanics of it as it is presently drafted, it is fraught with nothing but trouble. Secondly, it seems to me that having fought so hard for the basic legislation which you have under the present Act, there is no sound reason that I know of that has been advanced in any province for sort of throwing away legislation which was acquired by primary producers who literally slugged it out to use the blunt term. In my view it is a backward step if your organization stands up and lets the present natural marketing Act be applied by Bill 76. I say this quite sincerely." End of quote, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, when my leader spoke on this bill he asked the Minister to reconsider and withdraw the bill or give it further study. My colleague, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, when he spoke on this bill made the same suggestion. The Honourable Member from Lakeside when he spoke on this bill suggested that the government should not proceed with this bill but let it go to the committee that will be sitting in between sessions, the Statutory Regulations Committee, and I think that these people, my leader, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and the Honourable Member from Lakeside, have much more experience than I do in these matters, and I think that their opinions and the opinion of Mr. Tallis, who I have just quoted, should be given serious consideration, Madam Speaker, and I would suggest to the Minister that he take a very serious look at the request made by the gentlemen that I have mentioned and not proceed with the Bill at this time, but let it go to the committee for further study.

MR. MOLGAT: Before this Bill comes to a vote, I would simply like to ask a question of the Minister. If his question satisfies me, then I will not need to make a speech. Is it the intention of the Minister to refer the Bill to the committee that will be sitting between sessions?

MR. HUTTON: No.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, in that case, I'll be forced to oppose the Bill if that is the intention of the Minister and of the government. It seems to me that the case has been well

(Mr. Molgat, Cont'd.) . . . made, Madam Speaker, in this debate, that we are proceeding by the change in this Act in making the very drastic changes in the whole matter of Producers' Marketing Boards, and that in order to have an Act that will be workable, that will be acceptable to the producers -- and after all this is the purpose of the Act in the first place -- that the producers should be given an opportunity to prepare their comments and their briefs for presentation to committee. Here we are, Madam Speaker, likely in the closing days of the session and this Bill is going to be sent to the regular Law Amendments, will be going through directly to the next Law Amendments Committee presumably, or possibly Agriculture Committee, which will meet sometime this week or early next week. I don't believe that the producers who are interested in this can be ready to make their presentations on this Bill in time for this committee meeting.

I need only refer, Madam Speaker, to some of the bills that we have received this year and that have been sent to committee. For example, the Pharmaceutical Bill. If it had not been at that time for the presentations made by other parties outside of this House who were vitally interested and directly affected by this legislation, it is quite possible that we would have ended up with a bill on our statute books that would have been extremely harmful to the livestock industry in the Province of Manitoba. It was sent to committee. In this particular case, the situation was fairly straightforward and fairly clear. The farmers groups came to the committee, made their representations and the Ministers changed the bill, withdrew it and amended it so that it was acceptable.

We are now dealing with a bill, Madam Speaker, that has even deeper implications, that will have implications for over a much longer period, that may change completely the structure and the future of marketing boards in this province. Surely it would be in the interests of the producers themselves, in the interests of the government, that this bill not be rushed through at this time. It came in fairly late in the session, and I suggest to the Minister that it would be in his own interests to refer this to the Standing Committee and give a chance to the producer groups who are vitally interested in this. One need only look, Madam Speaker, to some of the meetings going on in the province at the moment, the discussions going on between various farming organizations, that this is a most serious bill to them, and we should not be moving it, or passing it at this time in attempting to give it third reading at this session. It should be referred to this committee; given a full airing; and I'm sure that we'll end up with much better legislation in the long run. I plead with the Minister again, Madam Speaker, to refer it to the Standing Committee. I am sure that it will be in the interests of his department as well.

HON. G. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I introduced this bill with some satisfaction. I have had reason to be very saddened by the attitude both inside of this House and outside of it to a very sincere attempt on the part of the government to revise our marketing board legislation in the Province of Manitoba so that it would not only provide for the successful operation of Producer Marketing Boards where they were desired by the producers in question, but also would provide for these operations to the satisfaction of the general public, and that the legislation might provide the assurance to all concerned that orderly marketing was indeed being carried out in the public interests.

One of the saddest things, Madam Speaker, about this legislation is that while the members of the Opposition have called upon the Minister to study, have called upon everybody to give this matter of great importance their full attention, many of them didn't even read the old Act. They didn't care enough about it to put any thought or any study into it. How many of them have read the old Act. How many of them have read the regulations under the old Act or the current Act? How many of them have taken the trouble to check with other provinces and other provincial legislation? I can make the charge I think and make it stick, that with maybe one or two exceptions, none of them have taken the trouble to examine this matter. If it is so important to the people of Manitoba, if it's so important to the producers of this province, couldn't they have taken the trouble to study it, to study the previous act, to check on the old regulations, to check on legislation in other provinces? It makes me sick, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: I may have a question of privilege here. The Minister is making a blanket statement. I can assure him that I did check the old Act and the members of my group did so, and took the new Act in consideration along with the old Act in our discussion of the debate.

MR. HUTTON: Did the honourable member read the regulations under the old Act?

MR. MOLGAT: I must say I do not have the regulations under the old Act.

MR. HUTTON: I didn't think he had read the regulations.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Just to make this equally applicable to our own group, this falsification, I certainly read the old Act.

MR. HUTTON: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead, Madam Speaker, read the regulations under my supervision.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I said I read the old Act. I didn't say I read the regulations, but the regulations can only be passed under the authority of the Act.

MR. HUTTON: I say, Madam Speaker, that I'm very saddened at the attitude of the opposition in this House to this legislation. There was a great deal of study and work went into it. Behind this Act lay the attempt of the Manitoba Marketing Board and the government of this province to devise, plan, and approve plans that would meet the needs of the grower groups and meet the acceptability -- or be acceptable to the general public.

There was a Vegetable Marketing Board while I have been Minister. There was a vote on the Vegetable Marketing Board two years ago. It was unsuccessful. At the present time, the potato growers have a request for a vote on a potato marketing plan resting with the Manitoba Marketing Board and it has received very careful consideration by the government of the province, by the Manitoba Marketing Board and by myself. We have become aware through our attempts to deal with these matters of some of the problems that are involved, and it was with a view to bringing the legislation in line with the thinking and the needs of today that we proposed these changes in legislation, Madam Speaker, that is 25 years old and has only been used once. And when I say that the existing legislation is repugnant and offensive to too many people, it is true.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside may not like it, but the fact is that it's true, and all he has to do is read the editorials in the Free Press and the Tribune whenever there's a proposal under the old Act to know just how acceptable that old legislation is, or any scheme under it is to the general public in this province. If the honourable members of the Opposition, the Official Opposition and the NDP really think that there's any merit in orderly marketing, then they'd better give some careful consideration and lend their support and their help to drafting an Act that is acceptable, as well as giving the necessary powers to the producers.

It was with particular regret and disappointment that I listened to the Honourable Member for Lakeside. He tried to make a comparison between the Canadian Wheat Board and producer marketing legislation and organization. In the case of the Canadian Wheat Board, we had behind it years of experience, trial and error, both as a compulsory system in wartime and as a voluntary organization during the 30's, used as an attempt to support prices to the producers in the 30's. It was dealing with a storable product, a product that could be stored cheaply for years. There is wheat in our elevators today in western Canada that is seven years old. There's no problem in respect to the storage of this product. There was no problem in the relationship between the Canadian Wheat Board and the co-operative wheat handling organizations in Canada, because the Canadian Wheat Board did not come between and interfere with the relationship between the producer and his co-operatively-owned organization.

To compare this with compulsory producer boards where they're dealing with perishable products, where they're dealing with the difficulties of storage -- you don't store a 200-pound pig -- you don't store a product that has to be moved on to the market. That pig won't stop growing, you know, and he still has to be fed. They talk about that in terms of wheat. It leaves me pretty cold. There is a problem of the relationship between the producer co-ops and compulsory producer marketing boards, a real problem.

In a recent issue of the Country Guide, the president of the Ontario Farmers Union is quoted as saying that in Ontario, FAME, the proposed co-operative meat processing and packing organization, he says that if FAME is going to stay the marketing board is going to have to go; and if they're going to keep the hog marketing board in Ontario, then FAME better pack it up and pay the money back to the producers. Now this is coming from the president of the Ontario Farmers Union. There are real problems -- sticky problems, tough problems, involved.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside said -- and I don't know how he could get on both sides of the fence as he did, he's a real gymnast -- he told us how this government in its great

(Mr. Hutton, Cont'd.) . . . wisdom implemented The Coarse Grains Act requiring the compulsory marketing of coarse grain through the Canadian Wheat Board. It passed the Act and then after it had operated for some time, I think it was two years, then they called for a vote of the producers to see whether they liked it or not. Then he turns around and he faults this government because we propose to demonstrate to the people of Manitoba, to the hog producers of Manitoba, what a central marketing agency would be like, and he faults us for doing that before we have a vote, using the same method that the honourable gentlemen opposite used. He said that they were willing to take the responsibility. Well this government is willing to take the responsibility here for doing this. But that's beside the point. That's on the Shewman report.

But what is the complaint about this legislation? Honourable members in the opposition have said that they agree that the producer should not have control over the trade at the retail level; that if they had control over themselves and their organization, if they were given the monopoly at the producer level, this is enough. There's no quarrel about that. They are given this in Bill 76. No one has taken issue with the fact that where you give a group of people a monopoly that there's anything much wrong with a body responsible to the government policing this monopoly to make sure that people abide by the regulations and the laws that are necessary to maintain that monopoly. Nobody has quarrelled with that principle, that intent of the Act; but they object, they say, to taking powers from the producer group and giving them to the Manitoba Marketing Board. This supervisory role, they don't want that. They want to give these sweeping powers to a producer marketing board and let them go their merry way. When they say that the Manitoba Act is so terrible, I'd like to know how many of the members have read the Ontario Act. I'd like to read parts of it to show you how powerful the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board is. Section 10 says: "Where the board delegates to a local board any of its powers, or vests in a local board powers to promote, regulate and control the marketing of a regulated product, the board may at any time limit the powers of the local board in any or all respects; and (b) revoke any regulation, order or direction of the local board made or purporting to be made under such powers." At any time it can remove those powers without notice -- the powers of the board over the local board in Ontario. "The board may require any local board to furnish to the board particulars of any proposed change in the purposes of the plan at least ten days before the proposed change becomes effective; (d) to carry out any purpose of the plan that the board deems necessary or advisable." Let me repeat that -- to carry out any purpose of the plan that the board deems necessary or advisable -- to vary any purpose of the plan as the board deems advisable.

Now we're talking about the central board -- to cease or desist from the carrying out of any purpose or proposed purpose of the plan that the board deems unnecessary or inadvisable. The fact is that in Ontario where they've had a generation of experience in marketing boards, where they have a score of marketing boards operating right now, they have found it essential and in the public interest to have a strong Ontario marketing board to supervise and control the operations of the producer board and to offer that feeling of assurance to the public at large that these boards are operating in the public interest.

I wonder if we really, here, appreciate the powers that are given to a producers' marketing board. We are creating a monopoly of a particular product and we are handing it over to these producers. Under the old Act we created a monopoly. We gave sweeping powers to them and then we had a very ill-defined -- a very ill-defined role for the Manitoba Marketing Board to play in all of this. The old Act gives the power for a producer board to go out and seize the product and dispose of it without any recourse to the courts, without the due process of law. What is the case in Ontario today? They have to go through the courts and every man is given his day in court.

Now surely the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, the Honourable Member for Elmwood, and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition are not prepared to stand up and to fight against these changes are they, which will guarantee to the citizens of this province their day in court? Both the Leader of the Opposition and the NDP have introduced resolutions into this House asking for a public defender so that people could know their rights in law and retain their rights in law, but on this question they seem to be prepared to deny the individual his right to his day in court.

(Mr. Hutton, Cont'd.)

If you take the Ontario Act, it's worded differently; it's drafted differently; but in intent and in purpose it's not very different from Manitoba's Bill 76. Manitoba's Bill 76 still gives the producer boards all the powers they need. I didn't when I introduced this first, I didn't deal with it clause by clause -- you're not supposed to -- you're supposed to talk about the purpose and the intent of the legislation. If there are mistakes in drafting they can be brought to the attention of the committee and amendments can be made, but since everybody else has gone after this bill, and in detail -- they seem to agree in principle and intent but they say these tremendous changes have been made -- I'm almost forced to deal with this at this stage, to point out some of the changes and just how they affect the operations of the marketing board and the public at large in Manitoba.

In the first place, Part I of this Act deals with the Manitoba Marketing Board. Under the old Act, the Act provided for the establishment of a Manitoba Marketing Board but it didn't set out the purposes of that board -- not one purpose was defined in there. In this Act the board's purposes are set out clearly, distinctly; anybody can understand what they are. They are to advise the Minister concerned, to supervise the operation of the producer boards and marketing commissions. When we say "supervise the operation" we mean to see to it that the producer boards use the powers that are given to them within the powers that are given to them and that they don't in any sense go beyond those powers to enforce the regulations and supervise the work of the inspectors. You have to see to it that people abide by the law. In its wisdom, or otherwise, the Government of Manitoba feels that when we make a law, then the government or an arm of the government should see to it that that law is abided by.

As far as producer boards are concerned, it says in the old Act that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may by regulation provide for the establishment of a producer board to administer -- and here's the difference -- under the supervision of the Manitoba board's regulations respecting the marketing of a regulated product. And then it's given the power to appoint agents; it's given the power to set prices; it's given the power to require information from producers; it's given the power to establish the time and the place and the agency through which regulated products or any variety or class thereof may be marketed by the producers; and it's given the power to establish the quantity and the quality. Now I don't know of any more powers that it needs to operate successfully.

And then, of course, Part III gives the same powers to a marketing commission if at any time in the history of this province the government of the day feels that it is in the interests of the public at large that there should be such commission established. Part IV deals with the general powers that are required, and I cannot see how it detracts from the operation or the effectiveness of the producer marketing boards. There is one thing in this Part IV that is extremely important and probably more important than any of the other changes that have been made -- or just as important as any of the changes that have been made -- and something to cause everybody to stop and reflect, and that is, in Section 32 (e) which provides for the submission of a plan for the control and regulation of the marketing of a natural product to a vote of those producers of the natural product whose income from the sale of the natural product exceeded \$500 in any period of 12 months, ending in the 12-month period immediately prior to the taking of the vote. Here we are talking about giving the franchise to producers, or, alternatively disenfranchising certain producers.

I was most interested by the statement that was made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside in his comments on this bill. He said he'd make it tough. That's his answer to it -- he'd make it tough. He'd not only set up a very high percentage to have a successful vote but he wouldn't let anybody who just had one sow vote. He didn't call that a producer. Well, Madam Speaker, if he doesn't call a man who has the bodies from one sow a producer, he's going to knock out at least 50 percent of the people who market hogs in Manitoba, because according to our statistics a sow should present its owner, with average management in Manitoba, with 15 pigs every year. Now at current market prices that's at least \$500 so this means that as far as the member for Lakeside is concerned anybody who had one sow or less -- maybe they might have half a sow; I don't know how they'd manage that -- but the one-sow producer he's automatically out. This means that half of them are out. He wasn't satisfied with just leaving at one sow though, he was going to ask for more -- I don't know how many more. But I'd like

(Mr. Hutton, Cont'd.) . . . to give some figures because they are pertinent and they need to be taken in account by those who are going to sit on that committee and listen to representations. We did give this bill a great deal of thought and study. Now, if he goes to two sows, well if he goes to two sows and he gets an average of 15 hogs per year per sow, he's going to have around 30 hogs to sell and he's just going to knock out 81 percent of all hog producers in Manitoba because 81.31 percent of all the producers in Manitoba marketed less than 31.1 hogs.

Now I think we want to be pretty careful about how we approach this question of who is going to vote and who isn't going to. I know it is one of the things that has given grave moments and hours of doubt to the members of the Manitoba Marketing Board, because you know in this country it doesn't matter whether you're a millionaire or you're a pauper or you're on relief, you have a vote. The man in my constituency who is the wealthiest and the man in my constituency who is the poorest, both of them are equal and have a vote. Now, when it comes to marketing boards we are faced with a terrible dilemma. We are faced with the fact that philosophically in a democratic country it is a dreadful thing to talk about disenfranchising people. On the other hand, we are faced with the practical fact that is as hard on a thing like this to give a man who has \$10,000, \$15,000, \$20,000 invested, one vote on the future of his business and we give a man who keeps a pig in a barrel with no cost, no investment, who can be in or out, and we give him an equal vote on the future of his business. This is a real headache and it's something for everybody in this House to ponder. What do you do? Well it seemed to us -- and we examined all sorts of alternatives -- to consider it as a percentage of his income -- what are you going to do? Are you going to ask him for his income tax returns? Find out how much money he's got in the bank and how much interest he's getting on it, and so forth? This isn't very practical. If you depart from the principle of one pig one vote, then -- but this is the principle, one pig one vote. If you depart from that then any decision you come to is an arbitrary one, and so what do you try to do? You try to say, now what does constitute an honest expression of opinion? And so you say, well \$1,000 isn't very much today. Ah, but to the guy whose income is only \$3,000 or \$2,000, it's half his income, and so we started to bring her down, and we came to this arbitrary proposal -- not a decision, a proposal to the Legislature that we ought to give consideration to a figure of \$500.00 because it would serve as a means of identifying a producer, and so this is our proposal.

I was very sorry that we didn't hear any comment from the Opposition on this most important facet of this Act. I was extremely sorry that we didn't hear one proposal or one comment except to make it real good and high, and the only way you can interpret that proposal was to knock out 80 percent of the producers. Oh, they would be controlled. They'd be controlled all right, but they wouldn't have any vote; 80 percent of your hog producers in Manitoba would be controlled but they wouldn't have any say as to whether they went into it or not. Not very deep thought given to that suggestion I'm afraid.

What does it mean in terms of other products? -- \$500.00, what does it mean? It means 100 turkeys, 100 laying hens, the pigs from one sow, two steers, five acres of potatoes, (some will tell you it's only one acre if he's a good producer and he gets a high price, but on the average about five acres of potatoes) two acres of carrots, a half acre of tomatoes, a third of an acre of strawberries. What does it mean to the producers who will vote, approximately what percent will vote? At \$500.00 it means that 50 percent of those who raise and sell hogs, either one or more, 50 percent of the hog producers would get a vote. It means that in hens and pullets 65 percent would be ruled out -- only 35 percent would get a vote. In turkeys only 35 percent would get a vote. In potatoes about 90 percent would get a vote.

Well, that's one of the headaches that we need to consider in committee, and I am extremely sorry that so little thought has been given to this bill, obviously, by the members of the Opposition, because it is an extremely important bill. It was so important that I called in all the commodity groups in Manitoba and the farm organizations and I consulted with them and set out, told them about the principles and the intent of the bill, quite a long time ago. As soon as the bill was printed copies were sent out to all of them. I know that they don't all agree. I'm completely aware of the controversy outside of this Legislature on this bill, but I believe that much of the controversy revolved around the drafting of the bill and that it is not directed towards the purpose and the intent, and as far as drafting is concerned when we get to committee stage our Legislative Counsel will be there and I think that if there are spots that are weak

(Mr. Hutton, Cont'd.) , . . . we can amend them, but the purpose and the intent of the bill are here, and that is to provide for a practicable, workable producer marketing board scheme and to give the public at large adequate assurance that their interests are looked after too, and we have departed from the concept that because these producers in some way have been considered underprivileged or wronged in the past, should have the wide arbitrary powers given to them, and in the new bill if a man is charged, a producer is charged, or anyone else is charged under the Act he gets the due process of law. He goes to court. There is no arbitrary seizing of the product. In Ontario where they have had, as I said, 20 years' experience and scores of marketing boards and lots of trouble with them, they adhere to the due process of law through the courts to enforce the marketing board legislation, and there is no seizure, there's no detention, and I don't think that we're doing wrong here in Manitoba to try and provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural products, etcetera, to make sure that everybody retains their right to their day in court, and that the said personal and property rights that everyone of us here are charged with respecting and protecting, are protected under the provisions of the bill; and I know I've probably talked for nothing. I hope I haven't underneath. I know it's difficult for members of the Legislature when they've taken a stand to back down from it, but I hope underneath that some of the members of this Legislature don't really believe in their hearts what they say.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the Minister permit a question? The Minister made a big point about how it is necessary to avoid the appearance of arbitrary powers. I want to ask him if this doesn't strike him as being the ultimate in arbitrary powers, and I quote under this Act: "The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations providing for the control and regulation within the province of the marketing of any natural product grown, raised, harvested or . . . in the province by the producers thereof." In one fell swoop this is arbitrary as power can be, and so the question is not how arbitrary but where does the power get . . . .

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, the people of Manitoba gave the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to the Legislature these powers. They're not arbitrary powers. We're responsible to the people of Manitoba. You can't have a marketing board. This is in the old Act. The only way it can be constituted is by regulation, and who's going to establish the regulations but the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council? It's part of our legislative system.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . . a question too. When the Honourable Minister rather early in his address mentioned as an evidence of the fact that the present Act was repugnant to a great many people in Manitoba, did he mean to say, "if you look at the editorials in the Free Press and Tribune," or was that a slip of the tongue? Did he intend to say, "if you'd look at the letters to the editor?" I think perhaps that was a slip of the tongue, was it?

MR. HUTTON: There are many, if you look for them. I just have one at hand. Free Press, September 23, 1958: "Against Compulsion" -- in an editorial: "Many prairie producers don't give a whoop about compulsory marketing boards. This is the only conclusion to be drawn from attempts made in Manitoba and Saskatchewan this year to set up boards to market some agricultural products. Earlier in the year a vote was taken among Manitoba vegetable growers to determine how many were in favour of the Vegetable Marketing Board. The proposal received just 55 percent of the votes cast. This fall, Saskatchewan egg producers were asked to express opinion on an egg marketing board; 65 percent vote in favour was required. When the results were in, 65.1 percent of those voting favoured the board, but in spite of this vote the Saskatchewan government decided not to establish a marketing board for the very good reason that out of Saskatchewan's more than 20,000 egg producers only around 6,000 bothered to vote. Obviously, most chicken farmers are content to sell their eggs as they do now and have no desire for a compulsory board." That one isn't as strong as some that were written.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend is answering my question by saying that he did mean the editorials, did he? Then I would like to ask him this question. Does he really think that the editorial writers of the Free Press and Tribune reflect the thinking of the farm people of this province?

MR. HUTTON: I have a great deal of respect for newspapers, in this sense, that they do influence public opinion. They influence public opinion, and they also reflect to some extent public opinion; but on the question I want to also remind the Honourable Member for Lakeside that when I made that statement about it being repugnant and offensive, that there were

(Mr. Hutton, Cont'd.) . . . two members of his government who thought it was pretty repugnant and offensive -- at least two of them -- in the spring of 1958.

MR. TANCHAK: . . . the honourable minister a question? Under the existing Marketing Act, we have the Honey Marketing Board, and one of the Ministers of the House here praised it not so long ago. I would like the Minister of Agriculture to tell us whether this organization is functioning properly.

MR. HUTTON: The Honey Marketing Board. Well, I'm happy for the opportunity to say that the Honey Marketing Board is functioning properly, and when they were in my office during consultation on this bill, they told me that they had never used the powers that have been originally given to them, that they wouldn't dare use those powers that were originally given to them. As a matter of fact, they were in accord with the principle and intent of the bill.

MR. SCHREYER: Did the Minister mean what he said? Did he mean it when he said that under the old Act decisions reached by the marketing boards were not appealable to the ordinary court? Did he mean that?

MR. HUTTON: No, what I meant was that they were free to take certain action like . . . and so forth, . . . it was the law of "shoot first and talk afterwards."

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation on the second reading of Bill No. 76.

A standing vote was taken with the following results:

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 100. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

Continued on next page . . . . .



MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I will be very short. We have a new Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and I'm sure that he doesn't know it all and I don't claim that I know it all, so maybe what I have to say we'll both profit since we're both not too smart in this event -- Both of us.

The Minister told us when he introduced this bill that it is the intention of this government to phase out the granting of timber permits to residents, that's the smaller man, the smaller residents that take out 10, 15 or 20 cords per permit. In some areas a few years ago, the resident was able to obtain a permit to cut about 40 cords, then it dwindled down a little until this year the quantity -- or the last few years, the quantity has been reduced considerably, and now in some areas the permit is permissible for only about 9 or 10 cords.

The residents, especially the ones who are just establishing themselves in these areas, have been depending on this privilege to augment their income, especially during the slack income months. Even some established farmers in the area were forced to depend on this extra income to make ends meet, as we say. And why so? Because the government in most of these areas has been, and is restricting the sale of land adjacent to these settlers, and a lot of this land is typical arable land. Therefore, if they cannot expand, they must have some other source of revenue. These farmers are not able to expand their operations adequately so that their enterprise would become self-sustaining or economical.

Here I would like to state that large tracts of good agricultural land -- and I'm talking of some particular areas in my constituency. -- are standing completely idle now. The timber has been cut off, or the timber has been destroyed by fire and these lands are idle. Most of these lands, quite a few, and especially the first two townships, the land is very good for agricultural purposes and there is no reforestation here by regeneration. It is covered by willows and maybe poplar. Of course if we wait long enough there'll be poplar obtainable for the Sprague plant, but I think that there is plenty even now and I suggest that these arable tracts of land which are suitable for agriculture be offered for sale so that these farmers would not have to depend forever on this extra income to make living in these areas, and this applies to many other parts of the Province of Manitoba I understand. These lands would then become a revenue to these communities after they've been placed on the tax roll and it would help other people.

Now we can say that the government would lease these lands out to the farmers who were interested, but I find that the farmers are not too interested in leasing out these lands because they do not wish to spend money on improvements which are required when they lease, because they see no permanent tenure in this system. Therefore, they keep on depending on these few extra cords that they can cut and make a few extra dollars. There are still many parcels of land covered with timber and they're adjacent to these resident settlers, or resident landholders. These lands could be reserved for timber permits for the small fellow rather than have the large commercial undertakings exploit them. I said that last year -- I mentioned that, that a certain area, say several miles in depth surrounding a community should be reserved for this purpose and with proper care it would last many many years for these people who would like to supplement their income, instead of permitting these large operators to cut this timber out say in one year or two years. In this manner, these forests would last for a number of years yet and these local residents would be able to make use of them.

On reading this bill and listening to what the Minister has said -- now maybe I shouldn't say this but I think I'm free to do it -- it seems to be slanted in favour of the larger operator and I think that the bill is completely forgetting the small fellow. He's being forgotten, the fellow who is used to the cutting of a few cords of pulp to supplement his income. I would like the Minister to consider this. Maybe something could be done about it. I do not intend to oppose this bill on second reading because I believe that it has some good features in it, but I would like the Minister to consider what I had to say here, a plea for the smaller fellow.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I just want to add a very few words to what has been said by my colleagues in this regard. I think the points made by the Member for Emerson should be considered by the Minister. I noticed that in his presentation of the bill he stressed very much the fact that the settlers' permits as such were no longer to be actually in effect, but that there would be a number of other types of permit. Now the only weakness I see in the particular structure is that these are not actually listed in the Act as I see it, that these are at the discretion of the Minister. And while looking over the old Act I did not find settlers' permits

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) . . . . exactly as a matter of compulsion, that is they weren't there by statute, it had been understood, as the Member for Emerson indicated, that these were so many cords per settler. I presume that the Minister, in making up the regulations, will have the same structure, because as the Act reads I understand it to be simply at the discretion of the Minister, and naturally we would want to see it based on a standard practice where every settler will be entitled by law to a certain protection in this regard and not be simply by the will of the Minister in each case.

When speaking on this bill my colleague, the Member for Ethelbert Plains, mentioned some of the penalty clauses and some of the rather strict rules that are incorporated in the Act. I know that my honourable friend the Minister will say, well a number of these are taken from the old Act, and on checking the old Act there is some truth to this. However, I would suggest to him that in re-writing the Act that it is not necessary to follow what was in the old Act, and if there are improvements to be made that these should be made in the Act.

I think that the points made by the Member for Ethelbert Plains were well taken, that providing some of the conservation officers and others with the right, or the obligation in fact that the Act imposes upon them, may be somewhat drastic; that there may be a number of cases here where we should not allow quite as much discretion to the officials and somewhat more protection for the public. Certainly some of the penalty clauses might be very drastic. For example, in certain sections, anyone who goes in and cuts a tree is subject, as I understand it under the new Act, to a penalty which may involve two weeks in jail. Well surely there should be some more discretion given to the courts in a case like that because we could end up with some rather difficult situations. I think it has been in a number of parts of the province accepted that people may go out and cut a Christmas tree, for example, not completely within the Act admittedly, but it does happen, Madam Speaker, and if this were to mean that these people could suddenly be brought before the judge and in the failure of paying the penalty imposed would have two weeks in jail, I'm sure the Minister himself would not want to see these drastic procedures followed.

So I would say to him, don't necessarily follow the old Act in this regard. If there are some penalties there that are not proper, then let's change them at this time and make the penalty in accordance with the seriousness of the offence.

HON. STERLING LYON (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I'll close the debate by mentioning a few of the points that have been raised in the debate.

First of all, dealing with the remarks made on Monday by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert, I would point out, as his Leader has already forecasted, that a number of the sections to which he took some exception relating particularly I think to the control -- first of all Section 3, the control of the conservation officer or of the department over forestry operations generally, he will see that Section 3 of the new Act is almost word for word with Section 4 of the old Act. But his point is well taken, because it was neither the intention under the old Act nor is it the intention under the new Act for the department to have control over forestry operations on anything other than Crown lands. And while that has been the policy in the past and will be the policy in the future, I thank him for bringing this to our attention because it's a very valid point, and we intend at the committee stage to make certainty double sure and to put that point in so that it will be clear to all because certainly the Act, as it presently stands, might be open to the interpretation that my honourable friend made, and that is neither his desire nor the intention of the government.

Now he referred to section -- and I know with second reading perhaps we shouldn't be enumerating these sections, but because they were referred to specifically I will refer to them -- he referred to Section 7 of the present Act which refers to the powers of search of the conservation officers or any officers employed by the Department. We're certainly prepared to take a look at that section as well. That section, I would point out, is the same as the old Section 40, subsection (3). There has never been any abuse of it to my knowledge but we're quite willing to look at some modification of that that he might be willing to suggest to us, or if he suggested it might be expunged, we're quite willing to have that matter looked at as well because really these are not what you would call the substantive parts of the Act in any case. These are the peripheral matters that relate to helpful aids for enforcement of the substantive

(Mr. Lyon cont'd) . . . . provisions, and so we're quite happy to have any constructive suggestions as to how they might be improved.

Section 38, the same as the old Section 40, subsection (1), again that was merely brought forward into the new Act. If my honourable friend has any modifications to suggest we'll be quite happy to hear them and to consider them at the committee stage. The same applies to Section 39.

There is one suggestion there that I think is very much worthwhile. I think more than anything there was a typographical error in that section because it should read that the fine will be \$500 or, in default thereof, two weeks imprisonment. That was the old section and that was the wording that was intended in the new section, and an amendment to that effect will be brought forward.

He made some reference to the provisions of the new Act relating to Dominion timber berths. Again I have to point out, Madam Speaker, that these sections in the new Act are exactly the same as the sections were in the old Act and that there really is nothing new brought in to the proposed legislation except the new Section 23 which does give the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council powers to negotiate with the holders of Dominion permits or Dominion timber berths, and to acquire them by sale. That power was specifically forbidden, or was not given in the old Act, and that is the only additional power that is given in the new. So we're quite happy to look at those suggestions that have been put forward and to deal with them at the committee stage as I have indicated.

I appreciate the comments of the Honourable Member for Emerson and I subscribe to his statement that he's looking at a neophyte in the field of forestry and that I hope that together, under the proper tutelage and the proper help from the officials in the department and other people, why we'll both come along remarkably well with our new responsibilities and learn quite a bit about forestry. He has an interesting suggestion about the sale of arable tracts of land in forest areas for agricultural purposes. That of course is bound in to the Crown leasing policies but certainly something that could be looked into.

He accepts the fact, or he comments on the fact that while granting of rights by permit will still continue that it will be phased out, that is in the pulpwood and the boxwood area, as was indicated in my earlier remarks. He talks about certain areas being reserved for local people. It's a greatly complicated problem in this day and age to know how much you should reserve for permit people. It's an actual fact that in parts of Manitoba today almost 100 per cent of the allowable cut has to be distributed at the present time among settler permittee holders, and this leaves absolutely nothing for any other type of operation to work upon.

Now this is a situation that I'm sure he wouldn't want to see continue and it's a situation that proper forest management technique indicates cannot be continued, and that is why there must be the abolition first of all of the settlers type of permit and the phasing out of the other type of small permit operation in the long run, in order that we may get more efficiency into the utilization of this resource for which all of us in this House are trustees on behalf of all of the people of Manitoba. That really is the aim of the legislation before him: how better to utilize this resource that we have for the greater benefit of all of the people of our province, without at the same time doing too much prejudice to those who perhaps have had an over-monopoly, if I may use that expression, an over-monopoly of certain of these resources in the past.

The Leader of the Opposition -- I appreciate his comments about the permits, the other types of permits that we have been talking about. He can have some of these questions answered when we get to the committee stage, but I should point out really that there are no new types of permits contemplated in the new legislation. The permits under 12 (c), the silvicultural permits and the permits under 12 (d), I think it is, the pulpwood-boxwood permits, are permits that always existed, but the manner in which they will be given out will not be by ministerial discretion in each case but rather by regulation as is prescribed in the Act, and regulations will be drawn up after the Act is proclaimed setting forth conditions under which permits of this kind are available. There will be, I can assure him there will be standard practices for the granting of these permits; that is the pulpwood-boxwood permits and the silvicultural permits. They will be given out by regulations under standard conditions but of course the incidence of areas as to where these permits can be given will be

(Mr. Lyon cont'd) . . . . . dependent upon the staff through their management practices, indicating what areas can be utilized for silvicultural permits where forest management practices are being carried on.

So those are the only comments I would make at this stage. If there are other questions of detail we will be happy to try to answer them at the committee stage, and I again commend the bill to the members of the House and ask for their support for it.

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

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 106, an Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba), 1962, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, there is very little that I think I can add at this stage to what I said in committee when the resolution from His Honour was brought in. Now this bill really does two things. It permits the averaging of incomes for farmers and fishermen who meet qualifying provisions and to elect to average income for the purpose of determining their tax. I am told by the federal authorities, whose idea this is, this gives them a slightly better break on the average income than they have had before.

Secondly, this provides for the acceleration of corporation income tax payments as provided in the federal budget proposals of 1963. One of the ways in which Mr. Gordon decided to help try and balance his budget was to make it necessary for the people who owed corporation tax to pay it sooner than they did previously. This is a one time only effort I'm afraid but it was deemed advisable by the federal parliament so they've done it and, in accordance with the terms of our tax collection agreement, we are bound to make the same regulations possible under our statutes.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XV, Item 1, Administration.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker -- or Mr. Chairman rather, before getting into a general statement on the estimates, I would like to take this opportunity to say a word or two about the staff of the Department of Welfare. I think those who know the work of this department will agree that they have been taking on substantial additional responsibilities in recent years and they have been really accepting very heavy work loads without complaint and doing it very willingly, and for this I would like to pay tribute and express my sincere gratitude.

I would also like to say a word about the man who is primarily responsible for the administration of this department, Mr. K. O. Mackenzie, who has been a dedicated servant of this government and the people of Manitoba for a good many years. I believe we'll all agree that he's a very conscientious, hard-working individual, one who is well respected, not only by his staff but by people engaged in the welfare field in Manitoba and well beyond the borders of Manitoba as well. I would like to express my personal appreciation to him for his long-suffering attempts to educate me in matters relating to welfare, and if he has not been completely successful I will say that it is not through any lack of effort on his part but more the lack of response from myself.

Also, I'd like to say a word or two about one or two departures from the department this year. One is Mrs. Patterson, Mrs. D. L. Patterson who has been a member of the Department of Welfare staff for 33½ years and who worked and served the department faithfully throughout that period of time. She was always ready and willing to accept increased responsibility and worked her way up through various phases of responsibility in the department to become Director of the Central and Interlake Region, and I would like to say that the Government of Manitoba, and indeed the people of Manitoba, appreciate her long years of dedicated service in that capacity, and I would like to wish her well in her years of retirement.

One other person that I would like to mention is one who may be better known to the

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . . . members of this House because of his forceful personality, and I refer to Mr. John Lagasse who brought very special qualities to the service of the people of Manitoba. We remember him best for his work in studying the Indian and Metis of Manitoba and for his work in setting up our community development program. He did serve the people well and with great dedication, and has moved on now to service as Chief of the Liaison Division of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, and I know that his many friends and associates in Manitoba wish him well in his new area of service.

We have also been very fortunate to acquire some very skilled and capable people in the department. I would like to mention some of those at this stage. Mr. Freeman Compton who is taking John Lagasse's place, comes to us with some 14 years experience working with the Government of Newfoundland and the federal government in the Northern Affairs department, and brings with him a great deal of experience in the particular field in which he is engaged, having served in Manitoba as a community development officer for some two years before being promoted to this senior position in that particular branch.

I would also like to mention Mr. Lee Glassco who is working with us as head of our Salter Jarvis project and who has a master of social work degree. He has served for three years with the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society as a supervisor before coming to us, and I would like to say that he heads up a very special group of individuals doing a wonderful job in that particular sphere of activity.

I would also like to mention Mr. Al Ross, also a master degree in social work, who has served over five years with the Children's Aid Society of Eastern Manitoba before coming to act as Director of Child Welfare for the department of Manitoba.

Mr. A. J. Kitchen will be well known to all members of this House, having served with the government as the Director of Corrections since 1949 in the Attorney-General's Department. He brings to us some very special qualities and abilities at the senior administrative level, being the assistant to the Deputy Minister. We are very pleased to have him as a member of our staff as well.

Mr. Waterer is our welfare director operating with the Department of Health in our new Care Services Division. That branch is doing an exceedingly capable job in looking after the needs of people who require special care and we will likely hear more about the work of that group during the estimates. Mr. Ed Sarna has been appointed the Director of Northern Welfare Services, having served with the department for some 10 years and having had leaves of absence on two occasions to complete his professional training in social work. Mr. J. Waite, master of social work degree, has been promoted to fill the position of district supervisor which was left -- at least of the director of the Central and Interlake district after the retirement of Mrs. Patterson. But I would like to say that there are many others in the department that I would like specially to mention but certainly time does not permit on this occasion. I would like to say how happy I have been though to have been supported by such an able group of civil servants in my work in that department in the past year.

All of the members of the House will be aware of the fact that our welfare estimates reflect a continuing increase in the needs of Manitobans for the services of the Department of Welfare or the municipalities or agencies which are supported by welfare grants. One might well ask why our welfare needs should be increasing at a time when our country as a whole is enjoying more prosperity than ever before in our history. Canadian statistics show that Manitoba is not alone in this trend toward increased costs, and I took special note of the statistics which were prepared for the deputy ministers' meeting in Ottawa in February of this year in which the federal increase in welfare costs showed an increase from \$23 million to \$158 million at a time when Manitoba's costs were going up from 3.5 to \$13.1 million. This was during a nine-year period and it reflects an increase at the federal level of some 600 percent, whereas the increase in Manitoba was some 300 percent, and these are just rough calculations. Furthermore, the figures that we have for Manitoba indicate that our costs are below the national average, while at the same time we are providing assistance and services of a standard among the highest being given in the Dominion of Canada.

We in Manitoba share to a greater or lesser degree a tremendous economic development taking place in our country in organization, in automation, all of which is accompanied by an equally significant social change in our society. What are some of these changes that are

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . . . . taking place? Some thirty years ago, as the people of our province lived primarily in rural communities in a farm-dominated economy, thirty years ago, automation was something that we read about in Science Fiction magazines. Today, just one generation later, most of our population is rapidly becoming urbanized. Our economy is no longer predominately agricultural and many thousands of our citizens have felt the direct or indirect dislocating effect that these changes have made. Whole new industries such as television, unknown a few years ago, affect our daily lives today.

During this same time there have been drastic changes in the size and make-up of our population. Twelve years ago in 1952, we had only 40,000 people over the age of 70. Today, there are 18,000 more, or a 45 percent increase. It would appear that because of the kind of housing and the requirements possibly of industry for mobility, that there's little room or place in our family units for the elderly today, and at a time when there are more of them than ever before. It should not be hard therefore for the members of the committee to recognize, to understand why one-third of our welfare estimates during this coming year, or \$7.2 million will be expended to meet the needs of Manitoba's elderly people through old age assistance, through supplementary assistance, in care institutions, in medicare and through elderly persons' housing.

I spoke a few minutes ago about the drastic change in the past thirty years in our population make-up. While the number of elderly has been increasing beyond the average, so has the number of young people under 20. In 1952 there were 291,000 under 20. Today, this number is increased to 397,000, an increase of 30 percent, which represents 39 percent of our total population in Manitoba. The tensions and disruptions in family life brought about by these social changes in our society have adversely affected the lives of larger and larger numbers of our children. The greatly increased numbers of neglected children brought to the attention of the Children's Aid Society, the increased numbers of juvenile delinquents, the increased numbers of separations, desertions and divorces, all reflect the social cost of a vast impersonal increasingly materialistic society. It is therefore understandable that we will be spending on the needs of children for child protection services, maintenance care during the coming year, an amount of \$2.8 million. In addition to making provision for the needs of children and the elderly, the estimates provide for the needs of families disrupted either by unemployment or by lack of income through the loss of the breadwinner by means of desertion, separation, death or disability.

Members of the committee will agree that while Manitoba's rate of unemployment over the past few years compares favourably as the Minister of Industry and Commerce told us the other night, that we still have a very considerable problem, and particularly during the winter months. The requirements of employers for highly educated and highly skilled employees creates a serious problem, particularly for those who cannot meet the increasing standards. We know that the Minister of Labour in talking on this subject indicates that the manpower authorities tell us that Canadians entering employment today will be subject to the disruptive influence of changing employment some five times during their work life; and the other night, in a program sponsored I believe by the federal Department of Labour, we were told that white-collar workers will be required to take training or re-training at least twice on a formal basis during their period of employment.

I'd like to pose a question as to what happens to an individual who can't hold a stable job in the employment market. What happens to an individual whose employment has been terminated, either by automation or by a movement of jobs out of our province? What happens to the people who migrate without the skills or the educational background from areas where the natural resources can no longer support them? If unemployment continues over a long period of time a person will lose confidence and pride in himself. He may lose respect at home as head of the household and as breadwinner. It is not uncommon for friction to develop around the household where you have an extra adult with no responsibility. Frustrations may turn to despair and demoralization. It is not uncommon to have drinking problems develop in such cases. It may well result -- and if the pressures get too great, in many cases the head of the household, the father, often skips out and leaves the family to fend for themselves. Either that or you have other marital discourse which results in family breakdown of one kind or another.

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . . . .

But perhaps the greatest tragedy is its effect upon the children of such a household. It may well result in mediocre accomplishment at school. With these family disruptions, the unhappiness in the family and all of the other problems associated with it, it may result in truancy, early drop-outs, delinquency, problems with the law, and of course the most important probably is the repeat performance of the inadequacy and dependency created in the new generation. The slums of any metropolitan area show grim evidence of where some of these tragedies end, and I emphasize some, because certainly not all result in this kind of tragedy.

To meet the needs of unemployment, over \$4 million or a fifth of the welfare estimates will be spent in aid to municipalities, to transient unemployed or for unemployed in unorganized territory. I've made reference to the disruption of families by the loss of the breadwinners through death, desertion, disability, separation or similar difficulties. Included in our estimates is a sum of \$4.6 million required to meet the needs of such families.

In considering our many problems, I believe we should not overlook the special problems of youth, the adults of tomorrow. Dr. Bargaen, Superintendent of Edmonton Public School Board, spoke in Winnipeg last week at the Teachers' Convention, and he spoke about some of the very perplexing problems facing youth today, and I'd just like to read into the record some of the things that he said that youth are facing today. The heading of the article -- and this comes from the Tribune report of his speech dated March 31st, and the heading is: "Science Plus Living in Past Equals Chaos." He believes that technological inventiveness has outstripped our mental and emotional abilities to cope with change. He predicts an accelerating rate of social dislocation, psychological maladjustment and educational displacement. He forecasts an increase in the kind of problems that we're facing today.

He goes on to provide some answer. "We must train creative and stable young people who can provide the thought and leadership necessary to deal wisely and purposely with our rapidly changing society. It must re-introduce" -- and he's talking about the educational system -- "it must re-introduce the re-emphasize strong moral values to give youth something concrete and unchanging upon which to base their lives. Let me emphasize the greater the rate of change, the greater is our need for a sense of security for unchangeable and unchanging values which give direction and purpose to the life which we live. What we need today more than ever before are individuals who remain stable in an exceedingly unstable world."

Perhaps we've all been guilty of creating the impression that our young people are only important insofar as they can develop the kind of skills which will enable our society to function more efficiently. We're constantly stressing the value of education in terms of financial return and leaving the impression that it is only the job or the technical ability which is important and not the individual, all of which adds up to insecurity and a lack of sense of belonging and worth among our young people today.

I recently read the recommendations of a commission studying public assistance in the Province of Quebec, and I'd like to read the first recommendation that was made by that commission. "The Quebec government should, within the limits of its responsibilities, intensify the application of an overall economic and social policy oriented towards the solution of the problems of which the Minister of Family and Social Welfare has in great part to endure the consequences without being able to correct all its causes." I believe that this is what our government is attempting to do in Manitoba. I'm convinced of the soundness of the policy of our government for a program of balanced development, with emphasis on both the economic and social advancement of our province.

We've heard the Minister of Agriculture talk about programs of agricultural development, crop insurance, agricultural credit, ARDA; we heard the Minister of Industry and Commerce talk about the work of his department, the Manitoba Development Fund, COMEF, the research councils, design councils, the projects to attract industry, the projects to increase sales of Manitoba products abroad, and these are all important, and on the other hand, in the fields of social development, we've heard the part of the government's role explained in the Department of Health, in the Department of Education, Corrections; we've heard about urban renewal; and all of these things are part of the social development program. The function of the Department of Welfare will help to round out this program of social planning.

In the early states of the development of our province, welfare was carried out largely by

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . . . . municipalities with substantial assistance from charitable and church organizations. The depression of the 30s proved the inadequacy of these agencies and brought emergency assistance from the federal government which was soon withdrawn when this emergency disappeared. Unemployment insurance came forward to help meet the needs on a short term basis of those individuals who for one reason or another were forced out of employment. Gradually the province became more involved in assistance to those in need, including the aged, infirm, the blind and the disabled. The Social Allowances Act passed in 1959 marked the most significant change in approach to the problems of those in need. In this legislation the government recognized that there are problems which are beyond the control and ability of individuals to meet. The responsibility of government was clearly outlined. Section 3 of The Social Allowances Act says, and I quote: "To take such measures as are necessary to ensure that no individual lacks the things, goods or services necessary to his health and well-being." In administering this program we recognize that individuals differ and families differ, and it is necessary therefore to have adequate casework counselling to assist individuals and families to properly utilize their own resources first.

The philosophy of our department and the government is that we must do more than the stretcher-bearing type of activity involved in meeting the financial needs of the dependent. We must be more than transmitters of public funds to those in need. We must, in addition, help to solve their problems in order that they may be reinstated as functioning members of our society. We are, as you know, experimenting with the most difficult problems of welfare recipients in the Salter-Jarvis area. This project was provided for in our estimates last year and I'm pleased to report that very interesting and encouraging results are being shown even in the initial stages of the development of this project.

You will recall that this project was jointly sponsored by the City of Winnipeg Welfare Department, Winnipeg Foundation, Community Welfare Planning Council, the Childrens' Aid Society, Neighbourhood Services centres and the Province of Manitoba. Its purpose is to improve the situation of the multi-problem family; to assist their rehabilitation; to provide an integrated and more effective means of providing service to them; to better understand their problems in order that we might prevent this kind of human tragedy from recurring.

The multi-service project was the first such project to be undertaken in Canada. The director was hired on June 1st and was assigned four senior welfare workers in September, and the Salter-Jarvis project actually got under way October 1st of last year. Although the project has been under way for only six months there are indications of favourable changes which lead agency officials to express hope after years of despondency that some of these people can be helped. Teachers, ministers, nurses, health inspectors and other social workers have indicated that there are gradual but marked changes in the families who are involved in the project. Some of these changes are as follows: an improvement in school attendance; a reduction in delinquency; substantial improvement in the hygiene practices and housekeeping; greater interest in improved housing in the urban renewal area. I'd like to point out here that many of those people did not want to move out of those areas because there was a community spirit that developed there and some of them seemed to lean on this kind of security which was the only security that they knew; and a few have even been reinstated to financial independence.

While these things are happening, we realize that much remains to be done. Problems of alcoholism, marital discord, mental illness and retardation and lack of gainful employment still take their toll of family life.

Let us now look at another phase of our work which deals with those whose problems or handicap is one of culture and custom; whose lives have been set aside or segregated from the rest of society by federal government treaties, and for those others who live on the fringes of civilization and who depend to a large extent upon the local natural resources for their livelihood, a source of livelihood which for many has proved inadequate in recent years. This program is known as Community Development, not only in this House but throughout Canada. Perhaps we should recount how this program differs from other programs of economic and co-operative development which have been promoted from time to time by people who were making a conscientious effort to help improve the lot of people of Indian origin in Canada. The essential differences lie in the philosophy of Community Development which encourages people to utilize their resources for the fulfillment of goals which they have set for themselves. It is an



(Mr. Carroll cont'd). encouragement of local leadership, local interests and local participation in the achievement of local goals. The role of the Community Development Officer is like that of a technical consultant, to assist the local people in providing information and in encouraging and maintaining their interest and enthusiasm in attaining their goals. The program has resulted in many successful and worthwhile projects to date. It is helping to build confidence in these people and a sense of pride in accomplishment. It dispels the theory that they are lacking in ambition and initiative, and some are now seeking new goals within their ability to achieve.

In most of the areas where Community Development is functioning there is a growing realization among the people that their children will have to move out into the main stream of provincial life if they are to enjoy a substantial improvement in standard of living. The startling fact is that the rate of population increase among our Indians in Manitoba is double that of the white population. Furthermore, the resources upon which they depend for a livelihood in many cases have long since proved to be insufficient to provide for their needs. The result has been that some, in spite of the difficulties involved, in spite of deficiencies in education and training for a new way of life, have faced the challenge and moved out seeking employment opportunities. This requires a courageous and pioneering spirit when one considers the obstacles to be overcome, the obstacles to meet this new way of life. There's a language, a custom and a cultural barrier to be overcome; there is some discrimination; there's the cold impersonal atmosphere of the world outside. Many will need help in meeting this challenge and we're providing in these estimates some help by way of a placement program for these people. This will be done in co-operation with the Advisory Committee on Employment which is headed up by Frank Price and which committee is showing a very keen interest in the problems and are showing a very keen desire to help us and help them to overcome these problems. We will also be working in close co-operation with the placement service of the Department of Indian Affairs.

An exciting new departure from tradition is being provided for in these estimates with the Welfare Department in co-operation with the Department of Education, providing special training and supervision for an experimental program involving six teachers in isolated schools. These teachers will be trained in Community Development philosophy and skill and will serve as community teachers in addition to their public school responsibilities. This program will be jointly sponsored by the Department of Education and ourselves. I have great faith in the possibilities of this program. We believe that we can attract good teachers who will accept this challenge, who will not only teach but who will help in meeting the needs of these people in under-developed communities.

One of the most recent programs of our department is our Fitness and Amateur Sports program. This program, together with Community Development and Elderly Persons' Housing are preventive social measures which I am convinced will be helpful in combatting those forces contributing to the breakdown of family and community life. This program, as is our H program, can only be effective if the volunteers on municipal government continue to develop their public recreation, fitness and amateur sport activities. The true measure of success of this program is the degree to which more and more citizens, young and old, are participating in healthy recreational activities.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Fitness Advisory Committee under the chairmanship of Jim Daly for their helpful advice and counsel during this past year. I would also like to congratulate the University Board of Governors for their recently announced decision in establishing a school of physical education in Manitoba.

This year for the first time our Welfare estimates include our special investment in homes for the elderly and infirm. It is estimated that over a million dollars in grants will be made in the next fiscal year to elderly persons' housing hostels and personal care homes. In this field our support of housing and care homes for the elderly is only effective because of the concern of voluntary, charitable, religious, municipal and other non-profit groups. While the province will be spending over \$1 million in grants towards the construction of these facilities, the non-profit sponsors through their contributions and loans will be spending three to four times that amount. Tribute must be paid to the host of voluntary agencies working in the field of the aged. They are the boards of the elderly housing projects, the day centres, the Age and Opportunity Bureau, just to mention a few, and while paying tribute to these organizations I must emphasize that the voluntary community in child and family welfare, in health services

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . . . . and recreation, is equally important.

Manitoba's welfare services have always worked in co-operation and partnership with the voluntary community. I'm happy to report that the Manitoba Government, in co-operation with the Community Chest, Welfare Planning Council and the Winnipeg Foundation is entering into a needs and resources study of welfare services in the Greater Winnipeg community. A policy study committee has been formed under the chairmanship of D. A. Thompson, Q. C., and which includes many able and experienced citizens from our voluntary community as well as three of our senior civil servants. The members of the policy committee are Miss Anna Speirs, Mr. Sol Kaneé, Darrell Laird, Alex Robertson, Russ Robbins, David Slater, Dr. K. R. Trueman, Senator Yuzyk, R. M. Burns, Dr. M. R. Elliott, Mr. K. O. Mackenzie.

It is obvious that the economic and social changes of which I have spoken have put tremendous pressures on all welfare services, their organizations and financing. Members know the difficulties the Community Chest have been having in raising sufficient funds to meet the needs of their agencies. Members also know the interest that labour and the business community have expressed in the idea of a United Fund or Appeal. We are also aware of the discussions that have been going on with respect to the need for priority for welfare services. It is in this total field that the major agencies providing services, planning and financing have recognized the need for a full review in the Greater Winnipeg community of the needs and resources in social welfare. Our department and the Department of Health will co-operate fully in this social services audit.

Mr. Chairman, in this brief account of some of the activities of this department, I have indicated the concern of this government for the well-being of the people of Manitoba. In some respects our program is traditional, common to all other welfare departments, but in other respects we have broken with tradition to experiment with new ideas, new ways of attacking new as well as long-standing social problems. We believe that it is a forward-looking program which, along with the government's other investments is designed to bring about the fullest possible development of our human resources including the restoration to personal independence for those of our citizens who for one reason or another are now deprived of that status.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, it is up to the First Minister to whether he wants to call it 5:30 or permit me to carry on. I don't think for the first time, in my history in Legislature, I'll finish my few remarks in ten minutes. I'm afraid of one thing, Mr. Premier, that they may take away my arguments which I would like to give it to them. It's up to you entirely.

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend continues now I think the committee would be quite willing to allow him to resume his discussion next time it sits so that he can keep his place in the order of things.

MR. GRAY: And I want to assure you it will be no surprise to you at all what I'm going to say. At the beginning of this session I had questioned the wisdom of changing the portfolios of our cabinet ministers. As the session carried on I probably changed my mind, because so far I think that every member of the cabinet who has assumed a different portfolio made good, and I think it's a good experiment, and those who have not made good -- I don't say there were any -- perhaps will find out themselves where they belong. When the present administration was elected and the present Minister of Welfare was called to deal with a portfolio -- I believe Public Utilities -- I felt that he is a young man, cold-blooded business man dealing with so-called dead wood, and has no heart or soul. The same opinion I have had when he assumed the responsibility of Minister of Labor although I haven't heard very much criticism against him, but I definitely did not believe at any time that he has a heart and soul, judging by the presentation he made today. True that he works under hardships and restriction, but at least they emphasize either with the permission of the powers that be or he's on his own, that he knows what he wants and as long as he knows what he wants, as outlined in his brief, I'm saying that the province can look forward to continued improvement in one of the most important departments, as called Social Service. He's dealing with human suffering; he'll be dealing with human pains, not knowing which pain is worse than the others, not knowing whether the misery of having cancer or TB or any other illness whether one is worse than the other, but the fact is that he has been thinking about it otherwise he would not have presented such a nice paper. He is at least thinking about it, how to relieve the pain and suffering of our community, in the help which he has outlined in the estimates and the help he has outlined today.

(Mr. Gray cont'd) . . . .

We had a member in this House, Mr. Prefontaine, a very fine, aggressive, cultural gentleman -- I'm sorry to see him leave the House -- and he always advocated, said "Damn the Opposition. We are in Opposition. Anything they do, give them hell. Oppose, oppose, oppose. Perhaps this is the proper thing to do, but that is not my schooling and this is not my training. I won't oppose anything they don't do but I take the liberty to tell them that this improvement although not sufficient is extremely important -- important not for me -- and I don't care whether the government gets credit for it as long as the people who need it get it, so I am not of that school, and if my group hangs in the market square tomorrow for what I have said I'll have to take that chance. So I feel to tell the Minister that I am surprised and pleased and that does not eliminate me from giving him hell where hell is due, but at the same time I am very pleased the way he has adjusted himself to the very important position he has. So I believe in giving the devil his due. Even the devil has his . . . . .

If you peruse carefully the items under Welfare you will find that each item is not another sidewalk of cement or concrete; it's not another road, four-lane or two lanes. It's dealing with pain, suffering, necessary help, from cradle to the grave. That's what it's dealing with. We would like to see that the family service be increased, and the mothers who have small children where the father has died or disappeared should be helped and helped well, because no one in this world including the best social workers can take care more profitable for the children; no one as bad as some cases may be, but in general they are the ones to look after the children. They are the ones I would trust them with sending them to school, giving them their meals, bringing them up properly, get them to church and get them to any other religious organization where they could perhaps get a little different environment and avoid the so-called teenagers' troubles that we have today. They could do it, providing in the opinion of the powers-that-be they could get sufficient funds to carry out their program in our interest. I say their program in our interest because a wrong child is an expense outside of the suffering that the family may have. That's a terrific expense, and it's much more economical and much better to give them another loaf of bread, to give them the facility of having proper housing, to give the facility of protecting their health, let them grow up, let . . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member will allow me to interrupt him, I guess I should now move the committee rise, but I'm sure we'll all be glad to give my friend priority in speaking when we next meet, so I move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee rise.

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

Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply is considering a certain resolution, has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that the House do now adjourn.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.